



## Know IP - Stockholm Network Monthly Bulletin on IPRS

### Commentary

#### **What's the Environment (and Energy) Got to Do with it? Helen Disney & Meir P. Pugatch\***

Contradiction in terms - that is more or less what the general approach is towards the fields of intellectual property and the environment. After all, the existing common wisdom (or at least the popular perception) is that those who advocate strong protection of IPRs seem to care little about the environment. It is also no secret that the somewhat heated discussion currently taking place on the issue of IPRs and the environment usually focuses on the Convention on Biological Diversity and the disclosure provisions of patent applications that are based on biological materials.

Yet, the anecdotal story of one man – Prof. Shuji Nakamura – emphasises the crucial importance of IPRs to the creation of environment-friendly innovations. Widely reported in many newspapers at the time<sup>1</sup>, Prof. Nakamura was best known for receiving the largest bonus as a 'hired inventor' from his company, Nichia Corporation of Japan, as well as for paving the way for a revolutionary change in the manner in which 'Japan Inc.' rewards its inventors.

The original bonus of Prof. Nakamura, who was responsible for creating hundreds of patented inventions during his time at Nichia Corporation, was \$US 180 (approx. 20,000 Yen). After leaving Nichia for a new post at the

---

Helen Disney is Director of the Stockholm Network. Dr. Meir Perez Pugatch, Haifa University, heads the Intellectual Property and Competition Programme of the Stockholm Network.

<sup>1</sup>. BusinessWeek, A Green Light For Inventors in Japan, (11 July 2005 )

<http://images.businessweek.com/ss/05/06/0528asiastars/source/8.htm>

University of California an ugly dispute over the IP rights emerged between the parties with regards to the ability of Prof. Nakamura to continue his breakthrough research on blue light-emitting diodes (LEDs). Prof. Nakamura sued his former employer over what he believed to be a too small reward for his work. The Tokyo District Court concurred and shocked Japan by ordering Nichia to pay Prof. Nakamura the sum of \$US 180 million in reward for his inventions. Following some intense legal battles and appeals, the sides finally agreed to compromise on a bonus of \$US 8 million.

This month it was announced that Prof. Nakamura has won this year's Millennium Technology Prize, which is € 1million.<sup>2</sup> The Millennium Technology Prize is awarded by Finland's Millennium Prize Foundation for a technological innovation that significantly improves quality of human life and promotes sustainable development.

Prof. Nakamura will be receiving the prize on 8<sup>th</sup> September in Helsinki for his breakthrough invention of the blue light-emitting diode (LED) in the 1990s, which paved the way for an entire new spectrum of energy and environmental innovations, such as energy-efficient lighting, water purification, and energy savings.

Prof. Nakamura's breakthrough research and the patents he was awarded were originally carried out during his time at Nichia. The Tokyo District Court estimated that these patents will generate Nichia \$US1.1 billion in profits by 2010.<sup>3</sup>

Nakamura's story sheds some valuable light on the importance of IPRs to the energy sector and to the environment as a whole. First, it tells us that

---

<sup>2</sup> (<http://www.technologyawards.org/>).

<sup>3</sup>. BusinessWeek, *ibid*.



## Know IP - Stockholm Network Monthly Bulletin on IPRS

commercial incentives, not only of the company but also of the individual, is crucial to one's willingness and ability to try to develop breakthrough innovations. Second, it also tells us that when it comes to products that are based on 'brain-power', companies should show much more generosity and respect to their hired inventors. And finally, it is because of IPRs, and the ability to commercialise and exploit them, that environmentally - friendly technologies such as this one can be utilised in the markets and enjoyed by consumers.

Many government agencies understand this important connection. For example, back in the 1970s the U.S Department of Energy (DOE) formed a special unit called Inventions and Innovation (I&I) with the purpose of providing educational and financial support to energy-based companies seeking to commercialise their proprietary technologies.<sup>4</sup>

The DOE is also looking to commercialise its own innovations through a special company, the Energy TechNet.<sup>5</sup> The DOE argues that its tech-transfer, IP-related activities have led to \$US 4.92 billion saved in cumulative energy fuel costs through 2001, which equals US \$42.28 saved in energy fuel costs for each dollar spent by I&I. DOE also reports a cumulative 0.973 quadrillion Btus (British thermal units) saved since I&I's inception, cumulative direct sales well over US\$700 million, and generation of over US\$6 million annually in federal income taxes.

So what have IPRs got to do with the environment or with energy? Everything!

---

<sup>4</sup><http://www.eere.energy.gov/inventions/resources.htm>

<sup>5</sup><http://www.eere.energy.gov/inventions/energytechnet/>

### Topic of the Month

**Rightful or Restrictive - Will Consumers Ever Learn to Stop Worrying and Start Loving Digital Rights Management? Anne K. Jensen\***

Once seen as a technical issue mostly debated within the circles of IT geeks and the legal community, the topic of digital rights management (DRM) has now taken centre stage in the policy and legal debate in Europe. The EU's Directorate General for Information Technology and Media has just launched "A Public Consultation on Content Online in the Single Market" with the intention of paving the way for "a true European single market for online content delivery".<sup>6</sup> Questions on both the current and future use of DRM were included in the call for replies, which will help shape a Commission Communication on Content Online, due to be adopted at the end of the year. In the UK as well, the question of DRM was given high priority when the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Gordon Brown, launched the Gowers Review on Intellectual Property earlier this year. In the USA on the other hand, DRM became a hot potato as long ago as 1998 when the Digital Millennium Copyright Act (DMCA) was signed into law by President Clinton.<sup>7</sup>

DRM is usually defined as "any management of data concerning the description, layering, analysis, monitoring and enforcing restrictions imposed upon data" and is applicable to all forms of digital data, such as music, films, games and hardware.<sup>8</sup> In other words, DRM is used to help rights

---

\* Anne Jensen is Project Manager of the Intellectual Property and Competition Programme at the Stockholm Network

<sup>6</sup>[http://ec.europa.eu/comm/avpolicy/other\\_actions/content\\_online/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/comm/avpolicy/other_actions/content_online/index_en.htm)

<sup>7</sup><http://www.copyright.gov/legislation/dmca.pdf>

<sup>8</sup>[www.wikipedia.com](http://www.wikipedia.com)



## Know IP - Stockholm Network Monthly Bulletin on IPRS

owners control dissemination and copying of data.

While different forms of technically controlling the use and reproduction of software have been present since the 1980s, it's only in the last decade that the content industry and the entertainment industry in particular, have started incorporating sophisticated DRM technology into almost all their products. This increased dependence on DRM comes as a result of the ever-growing popularity of illegal downloading and file sharing among the industry's once loyal customers. Unlike analogue media, digital media files can be copied an unlimited amount of times without any loss of data. The media distributors have therefore had to move on from relying on copyright protection imposed on the physical copy of an artist's work, to DRM that allows for even further restrictions on reproduction.

The use (and some would say abuse) of DRM has attracted critics from a wide range of groups including the open software community, the legal establishment and consumers' organisations. Many open software campaigners claim DRM hinders interoperability and cite Apple Ltd's Fairplay DRM system, which has led the company into a swathe of legal difficulties<sup>9</sup>, as an example of this. Some prominent legal experts, while by no means united in their criticism of DRM, have claimed that DRM is a breach of purchasers' property rights.<sup>10</sup>

From a policy perspective, however, one of the most interesting perspectives on DRM is being put forward by consumer organisations such as the National Consumer

---

<sup>9</sup>. Music purchased from iTunes can be played on Apple's portable music player iPod only

<sup>10</sup>. Certain DRM tools might interfere with other devices already purchased by the consumer

Council in the UK. In their submission to the Gowers Review they write that "Appropriate use of DRM technologies may have a role to play in the digital market environment, but the way they are being used currently is causing a number of serious problems for consumers".<sup>11</sup> The problems referred to are similar to the ones listed by DRM critics from the IT and legal communities, such as constraints on digital products and possible infringement on consumers' property rights.

What is interesting about this approach is that it is not opposed to DRM *per se*, but rather to the way DRM technology is currently being applied. This is obviously a more fruitful approach to the issue than to simply dismiss DRM as unfair or to try to bypass the restrictions; a trend that seems to have become increasingly popular in certain circles.

From an industry perspective something had to be done to slow the ever increasing popularity of illegal downloading and file sharing, which is costing the industry billions of US dollars in lost revenue every year. The International Federation of the Phonographic Industry (IFPI) estimates that for each legally downloaded song, 40 songs are downloaded illegally.<sup>12</sup>

DRM was and still is the best solution currently available. But that doesn't mean the system is even close to ideal, neither for the industry nor for consumers. Despite sophisticated DRM the industry is still losing out to pirated music and illegal downloading. They are also becoming increasingly unpopular among consumers in general, and the legality of their methods has been questioned in a

---

<sup>11</sup>. <http://www.ncc.org.uk/intellectualproperty/gowers.pdf>

<sup>12</sup>. <http://www.ifpi.org/site-content/library/digital-music-report-2006.pdf>



## Know IP - Stockholm Network Monthly Bulletin on IPRS

series of high-profile and expensive disputes involving European consumer organisations.

So will consumers ever learn to stop worrying (or sharing files illegally) and start loving DRM?

There will always be people who strongly believe they should have access to the newest films and music without having to pay for it. Usually these people are the same as the ones who dodge bus fares or occupy houses; i.e people without an understanding of basic economics. But most consumers, however, understand that one pays for a service and are therefore willing to pay for the products offered to them; at least if they feel that they know what they are buying.

In an attempt to self-regulate the use of DRM and to improve the relationship with consumers, the IFPI has developed voluntary guidelines for its members on the labelling of CDs containing DRMs. The guidelines call for the outside package of CDs to contain information on both compatibility and rights holder versus consumer property rights.<sup>13</sup> So far however, these guidelines seem to have had little effect, as consumers still seem bewildered and surprised by the fact that they can't do anything they want with the products they purchase.

While we wait for DRM technology to become more consumer-friendly and efficient, many consumers will continue and perhaps even increase their illegal downloading, and the entertainment industry will continue to lose huge amounts of money. The latter group stand to lose the most from this situation, of course, which is why one would expect them to do their very best to improve DRM, rather than just cling to the *status quo* and argue that illegal downloading is like

---

<sup>13</sup><http://www.ifpi.org>

stealing from a shop. In the meantime consumers will not start loving DRM anytime soon.

### **Experts' Corner**

#### **IPR Mediation in an Increasingly Global and Technological Society - Jeremy Lack\***

Our global society is increasingly dependent on new technologies. One of the consequences of this is the growing recognition of the importance of intangible assets relating to these technologies, known as Intellectual Property Rights (IPRs). The increasing importance of IPRs is being recognised at all levels – political, societal and economic. IPRs move freely across borders, whether via the Internet or accompanying individuals in their travels. Yet, these same IPRs are governed by national laws, which vary in scope and effect as soon as they pass through one country's border to the next, or depending on the country in which the IPR has been created or is to be applied.

Despite attempts to harmonise the relevant laws at an international level (e.g., in the fields of copyrights, trademarks, design rights and patents), IPRs are territorial and only enforceable by national courts.

These laws have difficulty keeping up with evolutions in technology, and the courts themselves may not be equipped to handle such specialised cases. This often leads to inconsistent results when IPRs are litigated simultaneously in several countries (e.g., most recently the Amgen vs TKT erythropoietin patent cases ).

---

\* Jeremy Lack, Attorney-at-Law & Mediator, is the Director and General Counsel of Medabiotech SA. He is counsel to Etude ZPG, a Geneva-based law firm and a Door Tenant with Quadrant Chambers in London [jlack@lawtech.ch](mailto:jlack@lawtech.ch)



## Know IP - Stockholm Network Monthly Bulletin on IPRS

Data recently compiled by Michael Elmer of the US law firm Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner LLP demonstrates the significant variance in the typical costs, time and success rates of patent litigation in the ten countries where these sorts of disputes are most often litigated (See Figure 1 below).

Although complex and international disputes may be better handled by specialist arbitral tribunals, in certain jurisdictions IPR disputes are deemed to involve issues of "public policy" or *ordre public* (e.g., where determinations of validity are involved). This may make them "non-arbitrable" or render the enforcement of a multi-jurisdictional technology or IPR-based arbitral award difficult to subsequently enforce under the New York Convention. The confusion that often results from these disparate national IPRs, legal regimes, and dispute resolution mechanisms affects all levels of society, and can lead to huge wastes of human and financial resources.

These drawbacks in effective IPR dispute resolution create great business uncertainty in the private sector, affecting multinationals and small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) equally. Regardless of their size, the livelihoods of all companies may depend on the enforceability of their or their competitors' IPRs. An excellent example of this can be found in the recent rounds of patent litigation involving Blackberry PDA devices, used across the world, where the future use of these popular devices was jeopardised by patent proceedings in the USA.

Mediation provides an excellent environment in which parties involved in complex IPR disputes or negotiations (e.g., pre-emptive mediations to prevent future disputes from arising) can safely discuss and assess their

alternatives within the complex and confusing international arena.

National courts and arbitral tribunals can only focus on past events and apply narrowly construed national laws to the facts of a case (which often leads to inconsistent results, as demonstrated by the much-discussed *EPILADY/Improver* cases in the 1990s, where the same patent was litigated in several countries with contradictory results).

Furthermore, due to new accounting requirements relating to goodwill allocations on corporate balance sheets, there is a growing need to better understand the impact of IPRs in financial statements. In 2003 Alan Greenspan, the recently retired head of the US Federal Reserve, raised the question of whether current company valuation methodologies, which are based on assessing tangible assets and cash flows, are relevant in a society that is increasingly dependant on intangible assets. This question is particularly worrisome when considered together with a recent PriceWaterhouseCoopers report that estimates that over 70% of the value of the S&P 500® companies index consists of their intellectual property assets.

Problems also often arise following court or arbitral tribunal judgments that find that two or more parties jointly own an IPR. Co-ownership can have different consequences under different national IPR regimes (e.g., granting joint rights in some countries – where the co-owners must agree on everything, severable rights in others – where each co-owner may deal separately with licensees, and creating an inability overall for either co-owner to grant exclusive licenses without the mutual consent of the other in all cases). This can lead to unbearable consequences for all parties concerned, and other stakeholders affected by co-ownership situations.



## Know IP - Stockholm Network Monthly Bulletin on IPRS

**Figure 1: Top Ten Global Patent Litigation Jurisdictions by Number of Patent Infringement Cases for 1997-2001, as Applied to a Sample Information Technology Patent Dispute**  
(Source: Michael C. Elmer, 2005)

Country	No. of Lawsuits Filed	Historical % of Decisions In Favour of Patent Owner <sup>14</sup>	Typical Costs per Case (US\$ million) <sup>15</sup>	Typical Time to 1 <sup>st</sup> Judgment (months)
USA	11,652	59% <sup>16</sup>	3.5	30
China <sup>17</sup>	4,894	46%	0.45	24
Germany <sup>18</sup>	3,850	41%	1.7	20
France <sup>19</sup>	1,862	55%	0.75	37
S. Korea	1,651	--	--	--
Taiwan	1,478	--	--	--
Japan	1,186	20% <sup>20</sup>	1.5	26
Brazil	620	--	--	--
UK <sup>21</sup>	601	25%	1	14
Canada	382	--	--	--

be taken into account as well as community interests (including even indigenous rights). The parties can discuss and agree to a solution based on future needs, and not just past facts, which respond to their true

Mediation, on the other hand, allows all national laws and perspectives to

business interests and not simply their legally posited rights. The mediation process also allows parties complete flexibility over procedural and substantive issues (subject only to anti-trust constraints). This process can still lead to litigation or arbitration, but where the parties can agree beforehand on certain rules of procedure aimed at controlling the costs and accelerating the time to judgment (e.g., by limiting discovery, what questions will be asked of which experts and witnesses, and narrowing down the number of legal points remaining for adjudication).

<sup>14</sup>. Patent held to be valid (where assessed) and infringed.

<sup>15</sup>. Note that in some jurisdictions, e.g., Germany, France and the UK, the losing party also has to pay the other side's fees.

<sup>16</sup>. US national data are based on averages from bench trials (i.e., trials by judges only) where both validity and infringement were found. For jury trials (i.e., where lay jurors determine issues of fact) the average national statistics are 68% of cases in favour of patentee, where both validity and infringement were found. This explains the growing trend towards jury trial in the USA, especially in the Northern District of California, which has the highest pro-patentee statistics in the USA.

<sup>17</sup>. Data for China includes administrative and trial court infringement actions. The total number of patent cases filed in China exceeded the USA in 2003.

<sup>18</sup>. Based on Dusseldorf court statistics

<sup>19</sup>. Based on Paris court statistics, provided by Me. Pierre Véron of Véron et Associés.

<sup>20</sup>. This is a mean taken from statistics for Tokyo (which has an estimated 15% patentee win rate) and Osaka (which has an estimated 25% patentee win rate)

<sup>21</sup>. Based on High Court of England & Wales statistics.

The parties can also agree to different outcome-based scenarios depending on the court or arbitral panel's decisions, whereby the parties can agree to limit the consequences of the decision in the future, or agree on the calculation or damages, such that they are able to get rid of worst-case scenarios and obtain business certainty earlier on. Other alternatives include mediation followed by last-offer arbitration ("MEDALOA") or combined MED-ARB procedures, whereby different issues relating to the same



## Know IP - Stockholm Network Monthly Bulletin on IPRS

dispute can be separated and resolved by separate means (e.g., using neutral expert evaluations for findings of fact).

This shift towards an increasing recognition of mediation for resolving IP disputes is apparent in several countries and institutions. In the USA, the US Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (the appellate court in most US federal IPR cases) instituted a pilot mediation scheme in October 2005. In the UK, the UK Patent Office implemented a new Dispute Resolution Scheme that came into effect in April 2006. In France, a group of 45 of France's leading companies signed a new Charter in November 2005, pledging to attempt to resolve future disputes through mediation with the Centre de Médiation et d'Arbitrage de Paris (CMAP). In Switzerland (where the author is based), a new national law on Civil Procedure is being drafted, which will include mediation as well as arbitration at a federal level. In Europe, a new EU Directive on mediation is being discussed at Parliamentary level.

At a more global level, a new Mediation Alliance (MEDAL) was created in September 2005 between five leading national mediation organisations (ACB in Holland, ADR in Italy, CEDR in the UK, CMAP in France, and JAMS in the USA) and the International Chamber of Commerce (ICC) is breathing new life into mediation, by starting to organise international mediation moot competitions (the first of which occurred in January 2006). The International Trademark Association (INTA) is actively promoting the use of mediation to resolve international trademark disputes and provides detailed information as well as a video on its website. Finally, the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), a pioneer in the field of mediation of IPR disputes since 1994, through its Arbitration and Mediation

Center set up to respond specifically to these issues, is seeing a notable rise in requests for mediation. These trends indicate the growing importance not only of mediation as an emerging form of ADR generally, but also the need to resolve international IPR disputes more effectively.

In summary, although mediation may not provide a complete solution to all IPR disputes, it is likely to lead to better, faster and cheaper dispute resolution processes in a growingly complex IPR and technology-based world, regardless of whether the mediation itself ends up providing a final settlement agreement. It can be used in combination with parallel litigation and arbitration proceedings to provide similar benefits.

### **In the News**

#### **G8 Statement on Combating IPR Piracy and Counterfeiting – Paul Vandoren\***

The G8 Summit was, as usual, preceded by a number of Ministerial as well as experts meetings addressing specific subject matters with the aim of reaching consensus on draft declarations to be ultimately endorsed by the political leaders of the G8. This was undoubtedly also the case under the current Russian G8 Presidency.

"Combating IPR Piracy and Counterfeiting"<sup>22</sup> constituted the first text on which consensus was reached at experts' level before the St. Petersburg Summit took place and on which no further Ministerial involvement was required. The

---

\*. Paul Vandoren is the Deputy Head of the Delegation of the European Commission to Russia

<sup>23</sup>. G8 Statement adopted by the Heads of State and Government at the St. Petersburg Summit on 16 July, 2006 on "Combating IPR Piracy and Counterfeiting"



## Know IP - Stockholm Network Monthly Bulletin on IPRS

statement is useful, because it sends a clear message to all interested parties and creates a general framework for action on this important problem, which increasingly affects right holders and society at large around the world.

Firstly, the G8 Members confirmed their commitment to strengthening both individual and collective efforts to combat piracy and counterfeiting. Indeed, the fight of combating piracy and counterfeiting is not only in the hands of public authorities, but also of private right holders. In this context, public private partnerships in developed and developing countries are more and more recognised as useful tools for effective intervention. Such efforts will contribute to the sustainable development of the world economy, including through innovations, as well as the health and safety of consumers all over the world.

Secondly, the G8 Members recognised that combating trade in pirated and counterfeited goods is a complex problem, which can be solved only through individual and joint efforts by all nations and relevant international organisations, such as the World Intellectual Property Organization, the World Trade Organisation, the World Customs Organisation, Interpol, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, and the Council of Europe.

Thirdly, it was considered necessary to give priority to promoting and upholding laws, regulations and/or procedures to strengthen intellectual property enforcement, raising awareness in civil society and in the business community of the legal ways to protect and enforce intellectual property rights and of the threats of piracy and counterfeiting, and also to providing technical assistance to developing countries. The need for close co-operation between law enforcement agencies, including customs authorities, was underlined.

Fourthly, an action plan, consisting mainly of the following measures, was agreed upon:

- Creation of a website on enforcement of intellectual property in each G8 Member;
- Support to the OECD for its on-going work on the estimated economic consequences of piracy and counterfeiting on national economies, right holders, public health and safety;
- Setting up technical assistance pilot plans in developing countries for capacity building in this area;
- Improvement of border enforcement through increased customs co-ordination and exchange of enforcement information and best practices;
- Study of possibilities for strengthening the international legal framework on the enforcement of intellectual property rights.

All in all, not a bad result, which did not aim at overshooting the level of ambition, which can be achieved in the G8 context. The content is fully in line with the increased commitment of the European Commission with regard to the enforcement of intellectual property rights, both inside and outside the European Union.

### **News Flashes**

#### **Top Stories in the World of IP and Competition**

- The world's largest music company, Universal Music, announced last week that it would make its music available on SpiralFrog, a free downloads service. Downloaders will need to play a 90-second video advert for each song, plus revisit the SpiralFrog site to play further ads at least once a month, to avoid the files being 'locked'.

To read more go to *The Times*, [www.timesonline.co.uk](http://www.timesonline.co.uk)

- In an article in the Guardian, Action Aid and other campaigners are



## Know IP - Stockholm Network Monthly Bulletin on IPRS

accusing biotech giant Syngenta of biopiracy. Syngenta patented the plant "Spellbound Busy Lizzie" last year and it was a commercial success. Now, however, the company is facing accusations that the plant is actually stolen from the mountains of Tanzania. To read more go to *The Guardian*, [www.guardian.com](http://www.guardian.com)

- According to recent figures released by the insurance broker Marsh, Chinese companies are likely to increase their counterfeiting activities by more than 1000% each year. This number is 200% higher than the European Commission estimated the increase to have been in 2004 and illustrates what a huge problem this represents to legitimate companies. To read more go to [www.counterfeit.com](http://www.counterfeit.com)

- In a survey on CD piracy carried out by research company Ipsos, it is estimated that the UK music industry lost £165 million in revenue last year due to pirated CDs, which is the equivalent to 10% of all sales. The survey led the British Phonographic Industry (BPI) to call for tougher penalties on this type of crime. To read more go to *The Guardian* [www.guardian.co.uk](http://www.guardian.co.uk)

- An application that reportedly removes the protection code in music licensed through Microsoft has been circulating the web over the last few weeks. Although software that can break DRM codes is not new, this application is said to be unique because it can free music which had been downloaded on PCs through Windows Media supported subscription services. To read more go to [www.Informationweek.com](http://www.Informationweek.com)

### Upcoming Events

**Joint WIPO and Stockholm Network Seminar on "IPRs, SMEs and Health-related Public Private Partnerships – Climbing Up the Value Chain", 25 October 2006, WIPO Headquarters, Geneva**

On the 25<sup>th</sup> October 2006 the WIPO Division on Small and Medium-sized Enterprises and the Stockholm Network Intellectual Property & Competition Programme will be hosting a seminar on the topic of IPRs, SMEs and public private partnerships at the WIPO headquarters in Geneva.

Chaired by Guriqbal Singh Jaiya, Director of the WIPO SME Division at WIPO and Dr Meir Perez Pugatch, Head of the Stockholm Network IP & Competition Programme and Senior Lecturer at Haifa University, the central theme of the seminar is: **IPRs, SMEs and Health-Related Public Private Partnerships - Climbing Up the Value Chain**

The seminar will focus on the methods by which IPRs can be used by different SMEs - such as university tech-transfer bodies, research hospitals and spin-off companies - to form partnerships with larger companies in the biomedical field and develop new treatments and new medical technologies. The seminar will also study national and international policies which can encourage of the use of IPRs in private-public collaborations.

The full programme can be found on the following link: [http://www.wipo.int/sme/en/documents/pdf/stockholm\\_network\\_program.pdf](http://www.wipo.int/sme/en/documents/pdf/stockholm_network_program.pdf)

Speakers include:

**Guriqbal Singh Jaiya**, Director, SME Division, WIPO



## Know IP - Stockholm Network Monthly Bulletin on IPRS

**Dr Cathy Garner**, Chief Executive Officer, Manchester Knowledge Capital, UK

**Dr Meir Perez Pugatch**, Head of the SN IP and Competition Programme and Senior Lecturer at Haifa University, Israel

**Dr Nikolaus Thumm**, Senior Economic Counsellor, Swiss Federal Institute of Intellectual Property

**Dr Itzhak Zaidise**, Acting Director, Sheba Medical Centre, Israel

**Helen Disney**, Director, Stockholm Network, UK

**Caroline Schwab**, Program Officer, SME Division, WIPO

To RSVP please e-mail Anne Jensen  
[anne@stockholm-network.org](mailto:anne@stockholm-network.org)

Places are limited.