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PRICES DON’T MATTER
LICENSING DOESN’T MATTER
PRICES ARE EVERYTHING
Why do we care about royalty flows?

Inputs
• Labor
• Capital
• Raw materials
• Technology

Intermediate goods

Output
Why do we care about royalty flows?

• Understanding the contribution of factors of production
  – Incentives for research and development (R&D)
  – Incentives for commercialization

• Facilitates the market for technology
  – Knowledge flow
  – Supplier initiated innovation
The Economic Contribution of Licensing to the U.S. Economy

Brian C. Moyer

June 8, 2016
BEA’s Economic Accounts

- **National Accounts**—Gross Domestic Product (GDP), Personal Income, Corporate Profits

- **International Accounts**—Balance of Payments Accounts, Trade in Goods and Services, Foreign Direct Investment

- **Industry Accounts**—Input-Output Accounts, GDP by Industry, Travel and Tourism Accounts

- **Regional Accounts**—GDP by State Accounts, State and Local Area Personal Income
Trend in Licensing Output

Billions $
Licensing Output by Industry

Billions $

2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014

Educational services
Performing arts, spectator sports, and related industries
Data processing, internet publishing, and other information services
Miscellaneous professional, scientific, and technical services
Publishing industries, except internet (includes software)
Broadcasting and telecommunications
Motion picture and sound recording industries

Source: Bureau of Economic Analysis
Licensing and Foreign Trade

• Licensing is the largest item included in the U.S. Balance of Payments statistics under “Charges for the use of intellectual property”

• Net exports of licensing is a major contributor to the U.S. Trade Surplus in Services—accounting for approximately 40 percent of the Surplus in 2015
Net Exports of Licensing

Billions $

Net Exports of Licensing by Type, 2013

Note: Data for 2013 are shown to avoid data disclosure restrictions with the 2014 data.
Net Exports of Licensing by Region, 2015

- Europe: Billions $40
- Asia & Pacific: Billions $30
- North America: Billions $10
- Latin America & Other Western Hemisphere: Billions $8
- Africa & Middle East: Billions $2
Technology Transfer Through FDI

Share of Employment by Foreign-Owned U.S. Businesses in Advanced Industries and Other Industries, by Selected Country, 2013*

* 2013 data are the most recent available, but the shares have tended to be stable over time.
Technology Transfer Through FDI

• Most foreign direct investment in the United States is not in advanced industries.
  • For the portion that is in advanced industries, investors must bring a certain level of technological capability in order to benefit from U.S. hi-tech innovations.
  • Berry (2006): “Lagging firms are not likely to be able to simply invest in a foreign country to build their technological capabilities... rather a firm’s prior possession of relevant knowledge and skill is crucial for this type of strategy to work.”

Economic Contribution of Licensing to the US Economy
USPTO – Washington, DC
June 8, 2016

www.lesusacanada.org
Who Is LES?
(Executives providing the IP Business Bridge)
State of Licensing
(as an economic contribution)

Threat/Bad View/Mafia
Licensing: Desire for Balance

1. **Strong Patent System** (High Quality; Thorough Searches; Educated Examiners; Adaptive to New Technology Waves)

2. **Well-Informed Federal Judges** (Active Educational Programs; Experienced Understanding)

3. **Effective Federal Legislation** (Enhances and Incentivizes Innovation Economy; Recognition that Legislation Cannot Address all issues so as not to over-regulate)
Licensing: LES Standards

• Service/Procedural Standards (e.g., ISO-9000)
  – Legislation points to other standards to follow
  – Fills the gap between legislation and private action
  – Allows private management of issues

• Different from but related to Standard Essential Patents (SEPs)
Licensing: LES Standards

• ANSI-Based (broad, open participation)
  – Patent Licensing Standards
  – IP in the Supply Chain Standards
  – IP Brokerage Standards
  – Valuation Standards
  – Board Compliance Standards (under initial development)
Patent Licensing Standards

• Ethical conduct in patent licensing
• License templates
• Patent assignment agreement templates
• Stand-still agreement templates
• Composition of claim charts
IP Brokerage Standards

- Ethical conduct in IP brokerage
- IP brokerage agency agreement templates
- Due diligence steps in IP brokerage
- Service minimums in IP brokerage
IP Protection in Supply Chain Standards

- IT security
- Physical security
- Employee training
- IP management maturity assessments
- Audit
- Reporting
Patent Valuation Standards Committee

• The naked patent licensing context
• Methodologies inside and outside of litigation
• Naked patent sales
• Patent value as part of a total IP package transaction
• Patent value in the context of FRAND
Time for Private Sector to Lead

• Initiate and Maintain Best Practices and Standards
• Implement High Ethical Behavior
• Emphasize Certifications for Licensing Knowledge (e.g., CLP)
• Educate Judicial, Legislative, and Executive Branches
• Focus on maintaining Innovation Economy
Licensing Trends No. 1

- United States economy still leads the world in technology commercialization and licensing (leader)
- Global economy is getting more educated and savvy about value of intellectual property and technology transfer/licensing (more competitive)
- Both rising-industrial and developing economies are hungry for more intellectual property and technology licensing education (rising interest/competition)
- Demand is still high for intellectual capital/knowledge
Licensing Trends No. 2

• Significance of Building Patent Portfolio around a Technology Platform in view of the recent changes in the last 4-5 years is important but often slow to understand

• Licensees and Acquirers want depth and strength (number and strong claims)

• Knowledge of and access to prior art is at an unparalleled state (we should take advantage of this to strengthen our patent system(s) in the United States and globally)—REWARDS!
Jeffrey S. Whittle has a global Intellectual Property practice and focuses on the energy industry. With an emphasis on technology-based transactions, his practice encompasses mergers and acquisitions, due diligence investigations, and patent opinions. Jeff also focuses on patent protection, portfolio analysis, and other various types of intellectual property contentious and counseling matters, including Inter Partes reexamination. Jeff has over twenty years of experience and served as the head of his former firm’s Technology & Intellectual Property Law Section. He has been recognized by Chambers USA, IAM Licensing 250, IAM Patent 1000, IAM Strategy 300, and The Legal 500 United States for his work in law and intellectual property.

In addition to his practice, Jeff is a member of legal associations including the Licensing Executives Society (where he is currently Chairman of the Board), American Intellectual Property Law Association and Federal Circuit Bar Association, among others. He also has served on M.D. Anderson Cancer Center’s Technology Review Committee, IP Law360’s Advisory Board, and on Wake Forest University School of Law’s Board of Visitors. Recently he was awarded and recognized with the Distinguished Service Award from the University of Houston Law Center.
Licensing Executives Society (USA and Canada), Inc.

www.lesusacanada.org
Economic Contribution of Licensing to the US Economy: Qualcomm Case Study
Qualcomm’s Business Model: A Virtuous Cycle

A Technology Enabler for the Entire Mobile Value Chain
The Mobile Technology Revolution: Fastest adopted technology of all time

FUELING ECONOMIC GROWTH
• Mobile contributed 3.2% to US GDP ($54B) in 2014 and is on track to reach nearly 5% by 2020.
  • Mobile value chain is directly responsible for more than 1 million jobs in the US

LICENSING OF CORE TECHNOLOGY IS ESSENTIAL TO RAPID AND COST-EFFECTIVE ADVANCEMENT
• Clear and cooperative licensing arrangements make it possible for companies across the value chain – and thus consumers and businesses – to access the most advanced technology.
• Effective industry-driven collaborations to solve technical problems, set standards and license IP have been key enablers in this revolution.

IMPORTANT CONTRIBUTOR OF US ECONOMY
• US abroad took in $130.36 billion from export of licensed IP and imported $42.12 billion in 2014
San Diego, California Impact

• Qualcomm’s presence in the regional economy adds $4.5 billion in direct and indirect economic activity annually – the combined effect is larger than six other major industry sectors in the region.
• Every job created by QC generates about 2.3 jobs in the region
• Every dollar generated directly by Qualcomm generates almost $2 of economic activity in the region.

Every year Qualcomm creates the economic impact of about one and half 2012 London Olympic Games
Wireless Technology Family Tree App
Thank you

Follow us on Facebook & Twitter

For more information on Qualcomm, visit us at:
www.qualcomm.com & www.qualcomm.com/blog

Qualcomm is a trademark of Qualcomm Incorporated, registered in the United States and other countries. Other products and brand names may be trademarks or registered trademarks of their respective owners.
Panel 2: The Role of Licensing in Trade, Investment, and Technology Transfer

- Marc Ehrlich, Associate General Counsel, IBM
- Elizabeth Kendall, Director for Intellectual Property and Innovation, USTR
- Keith Mallinson, Founder, Wise Harbor
- Prof. Walter Park, American University
- Moderator: Prof. Mark Schultz, Southern Illinois University School of Law, Director of Academic Programs and Senior Scholar, CPIP
IBM Granted Patents By Selected Country - 1/1/2016

US 35339
The Role of Licensing in Trade, Investment, and Technology Transfer

USPTO-CPIP Licensing Conference

Keith Mallinson
Founder, WiseHarbor

Alexandria, VA: June 2016
Mobile Ecosystem Revenues and Costs (2014)

- Operator service charges: GSMA Intelligence (100%)
- Handsets sales: IDC (39%)
- Network equipment sales: Infonetics
- Device modem chip sales: Strategy Analytics (4.1%)
- Apple App Store and associated sales* (2.1%)
- Patent licensing fees: WiseHarbor** (1.7%)
- R&D for 12 big mobile suppliers: WiseHarbor (1.9%)
- R&D: Boston Consulting Group, 2015 (4.6%)
- R&D: Boston Consulting Group, 2015 (9.4%)

*Only around 17% of phone users have Apple's iPhones. Android, BlackBerry and Windows Phone users buy their apps elsewhere
**Aggregate fees for all mobile SEPs and many other patents (conservatively high estimate of payments actually made)
Vertical Integration of OEMs hasCollapsed

- Almost all major developers of mobile standard-essential technologies have exited the handset market, while some of the brand names are still used independently of their former parents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Peak share year</th>
<th>Peak share %</th>
<th>Exited market</th>
<th>Prior year share</th>
<th>Sold to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualcomm</td>
<td>Small: CDMA-only</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Small: CDMA-only</td>
<td>Kyocera</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcatel</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>TCL: uses Alcatel OneTouch brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siemens</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>BenQ: bankruptcy followed in 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorola</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>Google, who then sold to Lenovo in 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ericsson</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>Sony, following 2001-formed JV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nokia</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Microsoft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All Change: Shifting Smartphone Market Shares

* Formerly Sony Ericsson.
** Includes figures for Lenovo, which acquired Motorola in 2014.
Many Smartphone Market Entrants Recently

*Includes figures for Motorola, which was acquired by Lenovo in 2014.
R&D Growth in Line with 74% Revenue Growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Sales (millions)</td>
<td>$353,836</td>
<td>$401,722</td>
<td>$510,840</td>
<td>$559,173</td>
<td>$582,011</td>
<td>$614,459</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total R&amp;D (millions)</td>
<td>$27,854</td>
<td>$30,829</td>
<td>$37,922</td>
<td>$39,970</td>
<td>$42,073</td>
<td>$48,386</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;D/Sales</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total revenues and R&D expenditures for eleven largest technology companies with a predominant or exclusive focus on mobile communications: Alcatel-Lucent, Apple, BlackBerry, Ericsson, Huawei, MediaTek, Nokia, Qualcomm, Samsung, LG, ZTE
## Total Royalties Below 2.8% of Handset Sales for Five Licensors who Own Most Mobile SEPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Royalties (millions)</td>
<td>Royalty Yield*</td>
<td>Royalties (millions)</td>
<td>Royalty Yield*</td>
<td>Royalties (millions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualcomm**</td>
<td>$7,878</td>
<td>2.09%</td>
<td>$7,862</td>
<td>1.91%</td>
<td>$8,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ericsson</td>
<td>$1,583</td>
<td>0.42%</td>
<td>$1,480</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
<td>$1,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nokia***</td>
<td>$688</td>
<td>0.18%</td>
<td>$791</td>
<td>0.19%</td>
<td>$1,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InterDigital</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
<td>$416</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>$441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcatel-Lucent</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>$63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$10,574</td>
<td>2.80%</td>
<td>$10,625</td>
<td>2.58%</td>
<td>$11,596</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*As a percentage of global handset revenues of $378 billion in 2013, $412 billion in 2014 and $439 billion in 2015 (IDC)

**September yearend

***Nokia Technologies: figures for patent, technology and brand licensing

Royalty revenues from audited company reporting in all cases
# Mobile SEP Licensing Fee Revenues and Royalty Yields on Global Handset Market

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major SEP owners with licensing programs:</strong> Alcatel-Lucent, Ericsson, Nokia, InterDigital, Qualcomm</td>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>$10.6 billion</td>
<td>Royalty Yield*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Patent Pools:</strong> SIPRO (WCDMA), Via Licensing (LTE), Sisvel (LTE)</td>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>&lt;$4 billion</td>
<td>Royalty Yield*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Others:</strong> including Apple, Huawei, RIM, Samsung, LG</td>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>&lt;$6 billion</td>
<td>Royalty Yield*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cumulative maximum:</strong> fees and yield for mobile SEPs</td>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>~$20 billion</td>
<td>Royalty Yield*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Royalty yields are total licensing fee revenues including lump sums and running royalties as a percentage of $412 billion in total global handset revenues.

In comparison to total consumer charges, including handset costs and $1.1 trillion in mobile operator services, which are also highly dependent on SEP technologies, the cumulative royalty yield shrinks to 1.3%.
WiseHarbor helps its clients solve commercial problems using market analysis.

Keith Mallinson is a columnist with IP Finance (http://ipfinance.blogspot.com) “where money issues meet IP rights”. This weblog looks at financial issues for intellectual property rights. Keith Mallinson writes on the subject of intellectual property in standardised technologies such as those used in 2G, 3G and 4G mobile communications.

My articles with IP Finance and in trade publications are listed and linked on the WiseHarbor web site: http://www.wiseharbor.com/publications.html
Selected Trends in U.S. and Global Licensing

Walter G. Park, American University
USPTO-CPIP Conference on Economic Importance of Patent Licensing
June 8, 2016
Alexandria, VA
## U.S. International Licensing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Outward Licensing (billions of real 2009 dollars)</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial processes</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer software</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio-visual and related products</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trademarks</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaffiliated (Arms-Length) Licensing</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliated (Intra-Firm) Licensing</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: www.bea.gov, Interactive Tables, International Services, Table 2.1
U.S. Outward Licensing by Destination, 2014

Source: [www.bea.gov](http://www.bea.gov), Interactive Tables, Table 2.2
## Global Licensing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>World Total (billions real 2009 $)</th>
<th>Share of Total Trade in Services</th>
<th>Share of World Total Licensing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>World</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: UNCTAD Statistics: Exports and imports by service-category, value, shares and growth, annual, 1980-2013*
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A Conference Co-Sponsored by
The United States Patent & Trademark Office and
George Mason University’s
Center for the Protection of Intellectual Property (CPIP)
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Role of China
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I. Licensing Revenue Compared
   – China vs World
   – China vs U.S.
   – Unaffiliated Corporate Licensing Receipts

II. Why is Licensing Revenue from China Low?
   – Industrial Concerns about Technology Transfer in China
   – Overreaching AML Enforcement
   – Low Foreign Participation Rate in Litigation
   – Low Damages

III. Challenges to Technology Transfer - Allocation of Liability
   – China’s forced allocation of liability - Indemnification
   – Consequences of forced licensor liability
Licensing Revenues: High Tech
China vs. World

* U.S. receipts from China and rest of world, royalties and license fees by type of intangible asset, 2004–2014 (million $) based on BEA/Census data
** High tech exports (China and the rest of world) 2004-2013 (million $) based on World Bank data
Licensing Revenues:
China vs. U.S.

- Total receipts from China ($million)
- Total payments to China ($million)
Licensing Revenues:
Unaffiliated from China vs. East Asia and Brazil

Percentage of US Licensing Receipts from Unaffiliated Enterprises

- China
- East Asia and Brazil (Korea, Japan, India, Brazil, Taiwan)
Why is Chinese Licensing Revenue So Low?

Weak IP Environment

- **Industry Concerns about TT in China:**
  - 59% of respondents expressed concern about transferring technology to China*.
  - Concerns include:
    - Lack of IP protection (75%)
    - Challenges to enforce licensing agreements (51%)
    - Government dictating or influencing licensing negotiations (32%).
  - 86% of companies surveyed said they were concerned about China’s competition enforcement activities*.
  - 49% of respondents believed that lack of IPR protection and enforcement constrains their investment in innovation and R&D in China**.

- **Disproportionate AML Use in the IP Context**
  - Antitrust fine imposed against Qualcomm for 975 million USD by China’s National Reform and Development Commission (former State Planning Commission)
  - The Qualcomm fine was almost **50,000 times the average patent damage award** as calculated by CIELA. It is also about **20 times higher than the highest patent damage award**, 45 million USD in a first instance trial against Schneider Electric, which many viewed as an outlier.

* USCBC Survey Data
** Amcham Shanghai Survey
Why is Chinese Licensing Revenue So Low? Weak IP Environment – Low Foreign Participation Rate in Litigation

SPC 2014/2015 Whitepaper on IPR Enforcement

Weak IP Environment – Low Damages

Source: Ciela Database

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stages</th>
<th>Average damages awarded</th>
<th>Median Damages Awarded</th>
<th>Win rate</th>
<th>Duration of trial /months</th>
<th>Number of cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>一审 First instance</td>
<td>158,643 (RMB) 25,200 (USD)</td>
<td>85,000 (RMB)</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>二审 Second instance</td>
<td>351,916 (RMB) 53,694 (USD)</td>
<td>200,000 (RMB)</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ciela Database
Challenges to Technology Transfer
Allocation of Liability – Indemnification

- *PRC Regulations on Administration of Import and Export of Technologies* mandates licensor liability regardless of contract:

- **Article 24(3)**
  
  - If use of the technology provided by the transferor as agreed in the contract by the transferee under a technology import contract infringes the lawful rights and interests of a third party, the transferor shall bear liability therefor.
Challenges to Technology Transfer
Allocation of Liability – Indemnification

• Consequences:
  – Foreign licensors transferring technology into China have a non-negotiable statutory obligation to indemnify licensees for third party infringement claims.
  – Increased risk and cost for foreign licensor
  – Decreased transmission of technology, particularly by small- and medium-sized business and start-ups
  – Possible anti-monopoly issues if licensee has market dominance

• Particular issue for startups
  – Freedom-to-operate (FTO) searches for startups are:
    • Expensive
    • Slow development of new products
Licensing Revenues Redux
Unaffiliated from China vs. East Asia and Brazil

Percentage of US Licensing Receipts from Unaffiliated Enterprises

- China
- East Asia and Brazil (Korea, Japan, India, Brazil, Taiwan)
Disclaimer

- The opinions expressed here are solely those of the speaker, and are not necessarily reflective of the positions, policies or practices of the United States Patent and Trademark Office.
Thank You!

Mark Cohen
Mark.Cohen@USPTO.GOV
Technology Protectionism and the Patent System: Strategic Technologies in China

USPTO – GMU CPIP conference on the Economic Contribution of Technology Licensing
Alexandria, VA, June 8th 2016

Gaétan de Rassenfosse
Holder of the Chair of Innovation and IP Policy
Ecole polytechnique fédérale de Lausanne (EPFL), Switzerland

@gderasse
About 80% of technology licensing negotiations involve a patent

Patents facilitate technology licensing:

- Exclusivity right that they confer protect buyers (and sellers)
- Disclosure requirement signals to potential buyers that the technology exists
A well-functioning patent system is a precondition for technology licensing

Industrial policy may induce frictions in technology licensing

Litigation/enforcement
Patent quality
Issuance
The national treatment principle is enshrined in international IP law treaties

“Each Member shall accord to the nationals of other Members treatment no less favourable than that it accords to its own nationals with regard to the protection of intellectual property”
“Industry representatives express mixed opinions on whether there is anti-foreign bias in the issuance or enforcement of patents in China. However, some non-Chinese firms reportedly find it more difficult to obtain patents in sectors that the Chinese government considers of strategic importance.”
Is there evidence of anti-foreign bias in the issuance of applications at SIPO?

Many factors affect the chance of being granted patent protection:

- Attorney effect
- Firm effect
- Invention quality
- Country of residence
- Technology effect
- Other effects
We estimate an invention fixed effect econometric model of the probability of grant at the SIPO.

We identify areas of “strategic importance” using the *National Medium and Long-Term Program for Science and Technology Development 2006—2020*. Strategic technologies have 5–7% lower grant probability (controlling for all the factors). Non-strategic technologies have the same probability of grant (controlling for all the factors).
Strong differences across technology fields

Percentage point change in grant probability for applications by foreign vs. Chinese applicants

**SEP**: Standard-essential patents
Most political efforts have been geared towards harmonizing IP law and ensuring better enforcement.

But more subtle barriers may remain, *e.g.*, issuance.

Illustrates that industrial policy creates frictions in the market for technology.

USG should ensure that NTP is being upheld.
Thank you
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Availability and Use of Lab Products

**Government**
- Research/Invent
- Regulate
- Public benefit
- Sometimes
  Consumer

**Private Industry**
- Develop
- Manufacture
- Distribute
- Market
- Sell
- Requires
  private capital

**Goal of Federal Licensing**
Trends in Federal Technology Transfer Activities (FY 2011 - FY 2014)

Index Value (FY 2011 = 100)

- Patents
- Invention Licenses
- Traditional CRADAs
- New Inventions
- Federal Intramural Research Budget
Federal Licenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2009</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
<th>FY 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Licenses, Total Active</td>
<td>12,598</td>
<td>15,166</td>
<td>12,077</td>
<td>11,544</td>
<td>15,604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Licenses</td>
<td>1,936</td>
<td>2,142</td>
<td>2,023</td>
<td>1,445</td>
<td>1,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invention Licenses, Total Active</td>
<td>3,854</td>
<td>4,081</td>
<td>5,452</td>
<td>5,388</td>
<td>5,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Invention Licenses</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Bearing Licenses, Total Active</td>
<td>5,282</td>
<td>5,324</td>
<td>5,452</td>
<td>5,388</td>
<td>5,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Bearing Exclusive Licenses</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>1,019</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>729</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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WIPO Activities and Resources in Support of Patent Licensing

- WIPO Training Programs
- WIPO Publications
- Patent Landscape Reports
- On-Line Resources: Patents and Technology Info
- On-Line Resources: Licensing
WIPO Academy Programs

- Distance Learning (DL) Course
  - Broad range of topics
    (http://www.wipo.int/academy/en/courses/distance_learning/)

- Professional Development Program
  - Patent Information & Documentation
  - Transfer of Technology and Licensing
  - Training Program on Patent Search and Examination
  - (etc.)

- Joint Master’s Programs in IP

- Summer School Programs
WIPO Training Programs
Supporting Licensing

- IP Management and Procedures
- Patent Drafting – basic and advanced
- PCT (Patent Cooperation Treaty) Training
- Patent Enforcement
- Patent Search & Examination
- IP Valuation
- Licensing & Commercialization
- SMEs
WIPO Publications for IP Management

- Patent Drafting
- IP Asset Development and Management
- Intellectual Property Audit
- Successful Technology Licensing
- Trademarks
- Industrial Designs
- Patents for SMEs
- Copyrights for SMEs
- Technology Transfer, Intellectual Property and Effective University-Industry Partnerships

WIPO Patent Landscape Reports

- Specific Technology Areas
  - Snapshots of patent situations
    - National, region, or global
  - Begin with a state-of-the-art search in selected patent databases
  - Examine patterns of patenting activity
  - Results presented textually and graphically
  - Provide info relevant to validity and legal status
  - Inform licensing analyses

- Patent Landscape Reports by Other Organizations:
WIPO Patent Landscape Reports

Microalgae-Related Technologies

E-Waste Recycling Technologies

Assistive Devices for Visually & Hearing Impaired Persons

Animal Genetic Resources
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Cooperation partner(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>Ritonavir</td>
<td>Medicines Patent Pool, UNITAID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>Atazanavir</td>
<td>Medicines Patent Pool, UNITAID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>Vaccines for Selected Infectious Diseases</td>
<td>World Health Organization - Cluster on Innovation, Information, Evidence and Research (IER)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>Selected Neglected Diseases (ongoing)</td>
<td>DNDi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change/Energy</td>
<td>Particle accelerator technologies and their industrial and medical use (ongoing)</td>
<td>CERN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change/Energy</td>
<td>Electronic waste (E-Waste) recycling and material recovery technologies</td>
<td>UNEP, Secretariat of the Basel Convention (SBC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change/Energy</td>
<td>Solar Cooking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WIPO Patent Landscape Reports

http://www.wipo.int/patentscope/en/programs/patent_landscapes/#reports
### WIPO Patent Landscape Reports


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Cooperation partner(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change/Energy</td>
<td>Desalination Technologies and Use of Alternative Energies for Desalination Report</td>
<td>IRENA, GIWEH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and Agriculture/ Environment and Energy</td>
<td>Palm Oil Production and Waste Treatment and Exploitation (ongoing)</td>
<td>The Intellectual Property Corporation of Malaysia (MyIPO) and the Malaysian Palm Oil Board (MPOB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and Agriculture/ Environment and Energy</td>
<td>Microalgae</td>
<td>Moroccan Office of Industrial and Commercial Property (OMPIC) and the Moroccan Foundation for Advanced Science, Innovation and Research (MASCIR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food &amp; Agriculture</td>
<td>Animal Genetic Resources</td>
<td>FAO - Animal Production and Health Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food &amp; Agriculture</td>
<td>Membrane Filtration and UV Water Treatment</td>
<td>GIWEH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food &amp; Agriculture</td>
<td>Plant Salinity Tolerance (ongoing)</td>
<td>FAO, ISF, AATF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabilities</td>
<td>Assistive devices and technologies for visually and hearing impaired persons</td>
<td>WIPO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WIPO On-Line Resources
*Patents & Technologies*

- **PATENTSCOPE**: [www.wipo.int/pctdb/en/](http://www.wipo.int/pctdb/en/)
  - Data services
    - PCT international application data: searches, subscriptions
  - Translation services
  - Video tutorials
  - Webinars
  - Links to external databases

- **ASPI: Access to Specialized Patent Information**
  - Public-private partnership between WIPO and leading patent info providers
  - For IP offices, academic institutions and research organizations in developing countries
WIPO Resources: Patents & Technologies

- ARDI: Access to Research for Development & Innovation
  - 20,000 journals, books, and reference works for 117 developing countries & territories

- WIPO GREEN
  - Interactive marketplace connecting technology and service providers in green technologies

- WIPO Pearl: Multilingual Terminology Portal
  - 10 languages (Arabic, Chinese, English, French, German, Japanese, Korean, Portuguese, Russian, Spanish)
WIPO Resources
Licensing Information

- In cooperation with Danish PTO (DKPTO)

- PATENTSCOPE Field Combination Search:
  locates patents & apps available for licensing


- Patents and Utility Models
  - https://www.ip-marketplace.org/overview/?cat=pa

- Technology for Sale & Technology Wanted


- On-line guidance to IP exchange, standard contracts, entering agreements, current IP valuation methods, etc.
Thank you

Matt Rainey
Director-Advisor, WIPO Academy
World Intellectual Property Organization
matt.rainey@wipo.int
Economically Impactful Licensing: the USDA Example

Mojdeh Bahar, J.D., M.A., CLP
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Office of Technology Transfer
ARS/USDA
Technology

Treatment for fresh-cut fruit & vegetables that maintain their natural flavor, texture, & color for up to 21 days
1995  USDA & Mantrose-Haeuser co-develop and co-patent treatment technology under a CRADA


Mantrose-Haeuser exclusively licenses technology & develops NatureSeal®

2004  NatureSeal® is used in McDonald’s Apple Dippers™
2015: McDonald’s served 250 million packages of sliced apples, more than 10% of all fresh sliced apples sold in the US.
Technology

Method for vaccinating chickens through the injection of eggs

1986  Exclusive license to Embrex
       Embrex awarded USDA-SBIR Phase I

1987  Embrex-ARS CRADA signed
       Embrex awarded USDA-SBIR Phase II

1992  Embrex introduces commercial produce called ‘Inovojet’ based upon SBIR-CRADA results

2006  Pfizer Animal Health acquires Embrex for ~$155M
2015 Inovojet used by nearly all U.S. hatcheries & ~15 billion eggs vaccinated worldwide annually
Technology

Gluten & allergy free rice flour for cooking
1984  Patent US 6,224,921: “Rice flour based low oil uptake frying batters”

2006  Howard Community College – Technology Assessment Program identifies a new value position- gluten free.

2007  CrispTek exclusively licenses technology & develops Choice Batter

2009  Choice Batter first sales
2012 $4.7M sales and 95 jobs in 4 states (MD, IA, IL, TX)
2012
$4.7M sales, 95 jobs in 4 states (MD, IA, IL, TX)

Howard Community College – Technology Assessment Program

CrispTek Formed

Exclusive License

ARS

TEDCO Grant

First Sales

Contract Manufacturer
Gluten Free, Kosher, Allergen Free

35 Grocery Stores

2 Major US Food Distr.

First Bulk Sale

400-500 Stores & 6 Major Chains

Sept-Dec 2006
Sept 2007
April 2008
July 2008
Sept 2008
May/July 2009
Sept 2009
Dec 2009
June 2010
Sept 2010
Thank you for your kind attention...

Mojdeh Bahar  
Assistant Administrator  
Office of Technology Transfer  
5601 Sunnyside Avenue, 4-1156  
Beltsville, MD 20705  
(O) 301-504-6905  
Email: mojdeh.bahar@ars.usda.gov
The Economic Contribution of Technology Licensing
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Disclaimer

All information provided is of a general nature and is not intended to address the circumstances of any particular individual or entity. Although we endeavor to provide accurate and timely information, there can be no guarantee that such information is accurate as of the date it is received or that it will continue to be accurate in the future. No one should act upon such information without appropriate professional advice after a thorough examination of the particular situation. Any similarity between any depiction in this course and any actual event, person or entity is purely coincidental.
### Credit Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credit</th>
<th>What is the credit?</th>
<th>What is the benefit?</th>
<th>What qualifies?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basic Research (§41)</strong></td>
<td>■ A federal tax credit for amounts paid to any qualified organization for performing basic research.</td>
<td>■ Equal to a percentage of the current year’s basic research payments that exceed the qualified organization base amount, 20% (13% net 280C(c)(3) rate)</td>
<td>■ Payments made pursuant to a written agreement to perform basic research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Energy Research (§41)</strong></td>
<td>■ A federal tax credit for amounts paid or incurred to energy consortia.</td>
<td>■ Equal to 20% of the amounts paid to an energy consortium.</td>
<td>■ Payments made to energy consortium for qualified energy research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Tax Credit (§41)</strong></td>
<td>■ A tax credit for performing qualified research in the U.S. to develop new or improved products or processes. The credit is available for federal (and certain states) income tax purposes.</td>
<td>■ Equal to a percentage of the current year’s qualified research expenses that exceed a base amount, 20% (13% net 280C(c)(3) rate) for the Traditional Credit and 14% (9.1% net 280C(c)(3) rate) for Alternative Simplified Credit.</td>
<td>■ Qualifying research activities meeting a 4 part test.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Orphan Drug Tax Credit (§45C)</strong></td>
<td>■ A federal tax credit for qualified clinical testing expenses relating to activities performed on a drug (or drugs) which has/have received orphan drug designation by the FDA.</td>
<td>■ The credit amount is equal to 50% of qualified clinical testing expenses. ■ The Research Tax Credit may not be claimed for the same expenditures included in the Orphan Drug Tax Credit calculation.</td>
<td>■ Qualifying clinical testing expenses, which are defined the same as qualifying research activities under the Research Tax Credit. ■ Differentiating factor is that the activities must be performed in relation to an FDA designated orphan drug.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, scientific, and technical services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale and retail trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of companies (holding companies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various services (include educational services; health care and social assistance; arts, entertainment, and recreation; accommodation and food services; and other services)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative/ support and waste management services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real estate, rental, and leasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, forestry, fishing, and hunting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and warehousing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of 2012 Returns Claiming a Credit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong> 15,873</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Data from 2012 IRS Statistics of Income, the most recent year available*
How and by how much do they enjoy it?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form 6765 Summary Information</th>
<th>Total Credits (in Thousands)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section A - Regular Research Credit</td>
<td>$3,438,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section B - Alternative Simplified Credit</td>
<td>$7,275,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section C-Current-Year Credit</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passthrough research credit(s) from partnership, S corporation, estate, or trust</td>
<td>$168,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current-year credit for Increasing Research Activities</td>
<td>$10,842,567</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data from 2012 IRS Statistics of Income, the most recent year available
Overview of Quantification Rules

Controlled group rules

— Greater than 50% ownership test – single taxpayer concept
— Exclusion of foreign research – but if a foreign member of the controlled group funds research activities in the U.S., no exclusion as foreign research and no exclusion as funded research
— As long as a member of the controlled group has rights to intellectual property, as long as the R&D activities take place in the U.S. and the other qualification tests are met, the costs can qualify
— Section 280C elections can and must be made on a yearly basis on timely filed original returns including extensions

Ability to claim credits for past years

— Recent ability to make retroactive ASC elections so long as the statute of limitations on assessment of tax is open
— Rev. Rul. 82-49, ability to claim credits from closed years if in a net operating loss (NOL) position and credits couldn’t have been used in intervening years
Overview of Quantification Rules

Qualified research expenses (QREs) generally include

- Wage QREs – direct performance, direct support and direct supervision of R&D
- Supplies QREs
- Contract research at 65% if payor has a right to the results of the research and the payor is at risk if the research is not successful
- Computer time sharing costs subject to rules on location and use

Other potential QREs

- Basic research
- Energy consortia research
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