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Topics

- Role and Composition
- Large Issues
- Specific Questions (22 & 23)
- Role of Public Policy
- Role of KT Forum
Expert Group

- **Task**
  - to identify the problems in achieving a framework for KS in Europe: propose the ideal solution for Europe: determine achievable intermediate steps: consider responses to consultation.
  - to advise the Commission on development of a Code of Practice

- **Members**
  - practitioners; policy makers; IP lawyers

- **Evidence**
  - standards: policy: research funding: IP specialists
The Consultation
Questions

- **Question 22:**
  What should constitute a European Framework for knowledge sharing between research institutions and industry based on identified good practice and models?

- **Question 23:**
  Are there specific R&D related issues, such as the grace period, joint ownership regimes and the research exemption that need to be looked at from a European perspective?
Q.21: Open Access

- Clarity required on:
  - terminology
  - what level of access should be provided
  - economic scenarios for immediate or delayed access

- Issues of ownership, privacy and quality of data

- Could necessitate a Grace Period
  - 12 months - brings management issues for PROs
  - < 6 months - problems for industry funders
  - Should be addressed in IP management strategies
Q22: Principles of Enabling KS

Knowledge Sharing = Building sustainable partnerships

- Strong KS requires an ecosystem approach
- Effective KS requires change in policy & practice
- Sustainable KS requires capacity building
- KS requires a European solution
Aspects Considered

- Capacity Building
- Cultural and Organisational Change
- The Marketing and Visibility of Intellectual Property Rights
- Intellectual Property Awareness
- Funding of Research
- Spin-Off Companies
Q23: IPR & R&D

Issues

- Need clarity of responsibility and of management
- Need is to
  - To harmonise process & practice in the detail
  - To facilitate delivery
  - To remove obstacles to competitiveness
  - Look at these obstacles in the ecosystem context; why do they exist?
Aspects Considered

- Ownership of Intellectual Property
- Professor’s privilege
- Copyright Materials
- Students
- Joint Ownership
- A ‘Bayh-Dole’ Act for Europe?
- Inter- and Intra- national incoherence
What Public Policy can do well

- Set out principles in a Code of Practice
- Clarify expectations & rewards
  - Outcomes & goals
  - Metrics
- Provide support for development of professionalism and standards of KT
- Achieve clarity & consistency on IP ownership in public and joint p/p research funding
What is NOT needed from Public Policy

- Unintended consequences
- Conflicting expectations
- Unnecessary obstacles
- Micromanagement
- Regional nuances
What does not need Public Policy

- Changes within cultures of institutions
- Change in the expectations between industry and academia
- Capacity building and the establishment of standards for professional knowledge sharing in both industry and PROs;
- Implementation of the principles of the Code of Practice for Knowledge Sharing
Exercise Influence

- Commission: unified approach
- Research funders: consistent rules for the management and ownership of IP
- Member States: consistency & review legal and fiscal measures that prevent or complicate knowledge sharing
- Universities/CEOs: change expectations & culture (Open Innovation)
- Practitioners: standards; common policies and practices
Ecosystem

A unique and dynamic relationship between a group of living things and their non living environment

= A framework of coherent public sector policies, laws and processes with a shared understanding of expectations, a common purpose and no man-made obstacles