



Knowledge Transfer Study

2010–2012

<http://www.knowledge-transfer-study.eu>

info@knowledge-transfer-study.eu

Expert workshop

Knowledge Transfer from Universities and Public Research Organisations: Strategic Approaches for Intellectual Property Management

Sofia, Radisson Blu Hotel, 1 June 2012

Summary

Background

This workshop supported the implementation of the European Commission's 2008 Recommendation on the management of intellectual property (IP) in knowledge transfer (KT) activities and Code of Practice for universities and public research organisations (http://ec.europa.eu/invest-in-research/pdf/ip_recommendation_de.pdf). The event was part of a workshop series covering 39 European countries in 2011 and 2012.

Attendants

The workshop convened 20 stakeholders active in knowledge transfer, in particular from universities, public research organisations, knowledge transfer agencies, policy and industry. Attendance was by invitation only. See a list of attendees in the Annex.

Presentations

This summary includes the main points of the discussion and goes beyond what is included in the presentation files. The presentation files can be viewed and downloaded at <http://knowledge-transfer-study.eu/workshops/northern-balkans/>.

Main results

KT is a developing issue in Bulgaria, Croatia and Romania. Their KT policies need to be assessed against their particular background as relatively young democracies which are still developing their institutions and which until recently had a low priority for KT issues.

In **Bulgaria**, the government and PROs recognise KT and IP management as an essential issue. There are KTOs; relevant policy documents have been issued; and most of the relevant policy measures implemented and planned are in line with the EC Recommendation. However, KT is not yet a priority for public funding and for researchers.

Technology transfer in **Romania** is enhancing. While there are no KTOs at universities, PROs are developing networks with business, and researchers' attitude is shifting towards appreciating cooperation with companies. However, the share of public R&D expenditure in national GDP is only 0.47% which is one of the lowest in Europe.

Croatia's strength is a good quality of research at universities and other PROs. There are KTOs and an institutional framework to support innovation. However, there is a need for enhanced political commitment to support innovation and to focus R&D funding. A reinforcement of cooperation between science and business is necessary.

About the Knowledge Transfer Study 2010-2012



The "Knowledge Transfer Study" (monitoring study regarding the implementation of the Commission Recommendation and Code of Practice on the management of intellectual property in knowledge transfer activities in Member States and Associated Countries) is based on a Contract (No. RTD/Dir C/C2/2010/SI2.569045) between the European Commission, Research Directorate General, and empirica GmbH, the Maastricht Economic Research Institute on Innovation and Technology, and the School of Business of the University of Applied Sciences North-Western Switzerland.



1 Welcome and introduction

Liviu Stirbat, European Commission, DG Research and Innovation: the EC Recommendation and Code of Practice on Knowledge Transfer

In his welcoming speech, Liviu Stirbat outlined the importance of innovation and IP protection for the European economy to improve European competitiveness in the knowledge based economy. This is to be achieved specifically through better and more pervasive commercial exploitation. A specific issue is the relative failure of Europe, compared to its competitors, in developing its young innovative companies. More innovation is needed, but one should not forget that this also requires more research. Against this background the European Commission established the European Research Area in 2007, issued the Recommendation on knowledge transfer in 2008, and launched the Innovation Union initiative in 2010. The Innovation Union seeks to strengthen KT; IP brokerage, IP funds and model agreements are related ideas to be pursued.

The purpose of the Commission's Knowledge Transfer Study 2010-2012 is monitoring KT and IP management developments in 39 European countries in order to allow the Commission to develop further policies which will be required in the future. The purpose of the workshops is assessing the status of KT and promoting KT within countries as well as identifying whether the EC has missed important KT issues which need to be tackled.

Discussion

Dragos Seuleanu asked whether the shift from the term "technology transfer" to "knowledge transfer" is just semantic. Liviu Stirbat answered that "knowledge transfer" is broader, also including non-technological research findings. This is an important modification in understanding innovation because research in humanities is becoming more important also for technological innovation and service innovation. The term "knowledge transfer" is also used more frequently in the US – there is a general move towards "knowledge transfer".

Another question was whether DG Research and Innovation funds KTOs – which is not the case. The Joint Research Centre does, and they also have a patent portfolio. Recently the JRC also launched the "TTO Circle", bringing together some of the largest KTOs in Europe.

Following a question about the status of the European Patent, Liviu Stirbat said that preparations are running well and that plans are that the first unitary patent might be issued in 2014. The European Patent may reduce patenting costs by 80%.

2 Knowledge transfer and intellectual property protection at universities and public research organisations: current issues, good practices and challenges

2.1 Croatia

Presentation Dalibor Marijanovic, Director, Business Innovation Centre of Croatia

In Croatia, 7,104 researchers work in around **70 research institutions**. The Gross Expenditure on Research and Development in the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) is 0.73 percent. The country has 25 scientific research institutes, 11 private institutes, seven technology centres, 16 research centres in industry and a military research centre. Furthermore, Croatia has seven public and three private universities as well as four technology transfer offices (TTOs) at universities and one at a scientific institute.



The **institutional framework for the innovation process** from universities and other PROs in Croatia is as follows: In the research phase, universities and other PROs are supported by centres of excellence and technology platforms, and they can apply for competitive research grants. In case of a successful proof of concept, the technology transfer offices may protect IP created and consider launching start-ups. Incubation services may then support commercialisation with national programmes such as TEHCRO, RAZUM, IRCRO, and VENCRO as well as the international EUREKA programme. A guarantee fund may further support the way to the market.

In the **Innovation Union Scoreboard 2011**, Croatia is on place 25 in patent applications, takes the last place in growth performance for patent applications and the 27th place in license and patent revenues as percent of GDP. Around 1,800 patent applications were handed it between 2006 and 2010.

The five technology transfer offices in Croatia are at the Universities of Zagreb, Split, Rijeka, Osijek and at the Institute Ruđer Bošković. The offices are promoting KT in terms of education, consulting, commercialisation, contract research, licensing, and university spin-offs:

- The TTO at the **University of Zagreb** was established in 2008. Since then it conducted over 50 workshops on IP management and technology transfer and provided one-on-one assistance to over 60 research groups. It has filed eight patent applications and signed two licensing contracts. In addition, with the support of funds from the Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance (IPA), it has mapped technology potential and expertise at the (so far) six faculties of the University.
- The TTO at the **University of Split** was established in 2010. Besides other achievements, it provided so far 21 services in the field of intellectual property protection, supported 82 active clients and held 92 business-to-business meetings.
- The TTO at the **University of Rijeka** was established in 2009 and has since then received nine patents. Currently, a competency base at the University (in the IPA project) as well as a base of scientific and development projects are being prepared. Moreover, a regulation on the management of the university's IP was adopted.
- The TTO at the **University of Osijek** was established in 2010. Until today it launched 42 patent protection processes and was granted twelve patents, seven of which are in the process of commercialisation.
- The **Institute Ruđer Bošković – "Ruđer Inovacije"** supported the spin-out companies of Biozyne and Jezgra13. Moreover, it carries out several projects: Photonic, Authorized Diagnostic Center for Aquatic Animal Diseases, Smart Particle Analyzer and Quantum Random Bit Generator. In total, the Institute Ruđer Bošković – "Ruđer Inovacije" holds six patents and operates one licensing contract.

All in all, Croatia's key strengths lie in the relatively good research potential in the academic community and the good quality of universities and institutes. Croatia has gained experience in the implementation of innovation policy and established an institutional framework to support the innovation process. It has proven programmes to fund new product development in SMEs with appropriate financial instruments. The absorption capacities of SMEs for financing new product development are growing.

Croatia also faces several challenges. There is a need for enhanced political commitment to support the innovation process and to focus R&D funding in the academic community. Furthermore, smart specialisation of regions and a reinforcement of cooperation between science and business are necessary. Finally, investment in technology infrastructure and targeted financial instruments to encourage SMEs to invest in R&D would help Croatia's research institutions to develop further.



Discussion

In the discussion the issue was raised that technology transfer is often not reacting to market demand. Dalibor Marijanovic replied that in his experience in reality all KT is market driven, reacting to demands from companies, often to demands directly expressed by companies.

Vlatka Petrovic from the TTO of the University of Zagreb added that Croatia has as yet only a small community of KT managers. At the moment the office is focussing on matchmaking events and on formalising communication with large enterprises. The companies have expressed interest in having a single point of contact which will help them set up interdisciplinary collaborations across the University. The strategic questions are with which companies the TTO works and whether the office involves professional service providers. Croatia does not yet have a network of TTOs, but they are working on that – there is some informal collaboration. IPA may foster this development into formal collaboration.

2.2 Romania

Presentation Dragos Seuleanu, President, Foundation for Democracy, Culture and Liberty – Romania

In Romania, the Ministry of Education, Research, Youth and Sport (METS) is the governmental authority in charge of research and knowledge transfer. Through its **National Plan for Research, Development and Innovation** for 2007-2013, Romania introduced a number of priorities including, among others, support for technology transfer setting up new and innovative firms; promoting investment in research, development and innovation; and improving cooperation between universities, other PROs and industry.

In Romania there are 18 national research institutes and a national academy of science as well as plus numerous smaller PROs. Total expenditure on R&D relative to the national GDP is 0.47% in Romania, which is one of the lowest figures in Europe. There is no data about research spending in private enterprises, but Dragos Seuleanu believes the situation is better than one might think.

Knowledge transfer in Romania is developing: For example, the Horia Hulubei National Institute of Physics and Nuclear Engineering (IFIN-HH) established a promising Centre for Technology Transfer and Marketing in 2011.¹ The Centre allows developing technology, buying technology, and travelling abroad to learn about other countries' technology transfer practices. While there are no technology transfer offices at Romanian universities, Romanian universities and other PROs are starting to have connections with industry and to discuss among themselves what technology they can offer. A national council for innovation is being developed together with members of the business community. There are good opportunities for collaboration between PROs and SMEs since there are many active and innovative SMEs in Romania.

The Ministry of Research started to **increase public awareness** about the importance of research and innovation by launching a huge programme including a media campaign and communication with regional and local councils. The Foundation for Democracy, Culture and Liberty is also talking with local governments in order to increase awareness about innovation issues.

In Romania there is an **innovation voucher scheme**, starting five years ago, which is very effective. Companies can use vouchers when they seek to improve small products or

¹ See <http://www.nipne.ro/cttm/about-us.php>.



services which need specific research to be further developed. Vouchers in the values of 3,000 Euro, 5,000 Euro and 10,000 Euro are offered to support such research at PROs.

The **economic crisis** turned out to be a useful catalyser of innovation in Romania. The crisis changed the attitude of PROs towards realising the importance of a strategy for research and knowledge transfer. PRO researchers had to learn listening to business, not to governments because it is not a socialist government any more.

A successful case of technology transfer is the project named "DAnube Cross-border system for Earthquakes Alert" (**DACEA**). Together with experts from Bulgaria, the technology developed in the project allows to announce a forthcoming earthquake 46 seconds earlier than currently. This is much time saved, allowing to stop energy provision early enough for preventing destruction caused by damaged electricity and gas lines.

In order to further improve technology transfer in Romania, Dragos Seuleanu hopes that the European patent will be enacted quickly.

Discussion

In the discussion, Dragos Seuleanu further confirmed a changing attitude among Romanian researchers. Not long ago, researchers saw no reason to collaborate with companies, while companies did. Today researchers in the DACEA project find it is great to collaborate with companies because it helps to see their research results work in practice. Researchers want to be respected and to see that they are doing good for the country.

2.3 Bulgaria

Presentation Bojil Dobrev, Director, Scientific and Research Centre, University of Sofia

Bulgaria is home to 51 universities – 38 public and 13 private – with 175,000 researchers. 14 universities conduct research. Sofia University is the oldest and largest university with 300 research projects per year. 0.4% of GDP are spent on research, which is far below the average in the European Union (1.84). PROs are organised in the Bulgarian Academy of Science (BAS) with 42 institutes and 3,000 researchers.

The **knowledge transfer infrastructure** in Bulgaria is determined by governmental, academic and non-governmental organisations. Governmental institutions include the Ministry of Economics, Energy and Tourism (MEET), the Ministry of Education and Science (MES), the Bulgarian Patent Office (BPO), and the Agency for SMEs. Principal academic institutions include the Bulgarian Academy of Science (BAS), the IP Centre at the University of National and World Economy (UNWE), Sofia University and TTOs at nine universities and the BAS. Main NGOs are the Applied Research Fund (ARF), the Enterprise Europe Network, the Federation of the Scientific and Technical Unions, and the Union of Inventors.

As regards **knowledge transfer performance**, approximately 19% of the Bulgarian enterprises successfully introduced process innovations in 2010/2011. The share of companies that launched new and improved products or services was slightly higher (26%). As a rule, the technological solutions introduced by Bulgarian companies are adopted from foreign partners. At governmental level, the necessary mechanisms to monitor and review progress made by national public research organisations in KT activities are not yet available. Monitoring and reviewing is however performed through an NGO by way of the "Arcfund Innovation Reports".

There are a number of KT-related **policy documents**:

- the Patent Act (adopted in 1993);
- the National Reform Program 2010–2013;



- the National Strategic Reform Framework 2014–2020;
- the National Strategy for Research and Development;
- the Innovation Strategy;
- the strategy for development of scientific activities approved in July 2011 which sets the national scientific priorities for the period until 2020;
- the operational programme "Development of the Competitiveness of the Bulgarian Economy" 2007-2013. Priority 1 is about the development of a knowledge-based economy and innovative activities with specific objectives: fostering research and innovation implementation in enterprises, industrial property protection of enterprises and research organisations, and development of a pro-innovative business environment.

Planned policy activities include the following: A new Act on Innovations is under preparation, expected to be adopted mid 2012. There are plans to merge the National Research Fund and the Innovation Fund and to foster the establishment of Technological Parks (such as Sofia TechPark).

IP Protection is determined by the Patent Act. The Bulgarian Patent Office (BPO) has established a network of twelve IP contact points at eleven universities and in the BAS. The contact points provide consulting and information services on IP issues as well as training in usage of the patent data bases, and they maintain links to the BPO. The BAS itself adopted new guidelines for IP management and KT in 2009. The IP Center at the UNWE offers consultations and publications, it performs research in IP and it regularly organises IP seminars. The TTO at Sofia University has elaborated regulations for technology transfer and IP protection.

The majority of **patents** in Bulgaria are held by individuals (72%), followed by business (20%), the BAS (3.6%, 154 patents) and universities (3.2%, 136 patents). Of all patents granted for investors to foreign patent holders, 72% went to EU Countries. In the past ten years, an average number of 103 protection documents (half of the submitted applications) was issued every year. Significantly more applications were submitted by individuals than by research institutes or SMEs. Only 63 licensing contracts – with insignificant market value – were concluded for obtaining rights on inventions.

BAS serves as an instructive case: Three TTOs were established in 2007 to realise KT as a continuation of the technology transfer policy which was started with the establishment of the "GIS - Transfer Center Foundation" (www.gis-tc.org). GIS is an independent non-profit organisation co-founded by BAS in 2000. Since December 2010 BAS, in collaboration with the Bulgarian Industrial Association, has established six "knowledge regions" as infrastructure for effective KT. In 2009, the academy adopted new guidelines for IP management and KT as well as guidelines for the establishment of spin-offs. The BAS plans establishing ten new TTOs.

Another case is **TTO at the University of Sofia**. It was established in 2008 (Phare Project) and is part of the Scientific & Research Center at Sofia University since 2009. Since then, two patent applications and two cases of technology transfer took place. In total, 400 researchers and students were trained in commercialisation of scientific results. Moreover, 60 contacts with industry were realised and 15 technologies suitable for transfer to the industry were identified. There are regulations for technology transfer and IP protection. The TTO of Sofia University is a member of the CERN TTOs network.

Bulgaria faces several **challenges** in KT. There is no institution that is solely responsible for measures regarding KT and IP management but the responsibility is shared among different public authorities. Only 0.48% of the total employment is engaged in research (1.3% in the EU). There is a lack of entrepreneurial culture and skills among researchers and limited co-operation with industry. This is furthermore challenged by a low interest



from industry to invest in innovations. In general, researchers are not aware about IP protection and various commercialisation opportunities such as licensing. Only a small share of enterprises are aware of the significance of innovation for overcoming the negative effects of the financial crisis.

Those challenges require **policy activities**. The innovation system should be improved by updating the National Innovation Strategy and its linkage with the National Strategy for Scientific Research (developing a unified strategy) and furthermore by implementing an institution to coordinate the activities of all "players" in the field of innovation. There should be an improved access to funding through the introduction of guarantee schemes to finance research, innovation and KT and the provision of access to venture capital for science-intensive enterprises. The research base and its links with business needs to be improved through the creation of business incubators, science and technology parks, spin-offs, the development of new forms of public-private partnership and by an active involvement of business representatives in prioritising research organisations. This requires, moreover, support for innovation at regional level by developing regional programmes to support SMEs and raising awareness about IP protection among researchers.

As a **conclusion**, KT and IP management are recognised as an essential part of the research policy by the government and research organisations in Bulgaria. However, it is not yet a primary priority for public funding and for research. Most of the relevant policy measures implemented and planned so far are in line with the EC Recommendation on IP management in KT activities and the Code of Practice for universities and other PROs.

Discussion

The discussion revolved mainly around institutional issues. Dragos Seuleanu said the planned merger of the National Research Fund and the Innovation Fund reminds him to a similar activity in Romania – but the government now considers splitting the two institutions again. It was also questioned whether the mindset of the Ministry of Education and Science and of the Academy of Science is supportive for KT because they are not oriented towards business. Bojil Dobrev concluded that both researchers and industry need to realise that KT is for the benefit of both sides.

3 Case study: How national authorities can support capabilities and skills in managing intellectual property

Presentation Noémi Baho-Borzók, Deputy Head of Unit, Hungarian Intellectual Property Office, Innovation and Information Centre

In Hungary, according to the **Innovation Act of 2004**, Public Research Organisations (PROs) are required to establish an intellectual property (IP) management policy. The Innovation Act also defined a legal framework for spin-off companies according to which researchers can work for a spin-off company. As a consequence of this Act, PROs set up an internal IP policy and most PROs established Technology Transfer Offices (TTOs). Within this frame, the Hungarian Intellectual Property Office (HIPO) functions as a guide for setting up standard IP policies. However, HIPO's role in supporting PROs' IP management is not clearly defined by legal regulations and is therefore facing certain challenges: there is no background or history of cooperation with and support of PROs in this field and even though HIPO has competencies in a fraction of the complex field of technology transfer, financial and human resources are limited.

HIPO acknowledges the **importance of technology transfer** (TT) as TT supports the country's economic development. By contributing to the utilisation of research results generated from public money it also contributes to the life of the greater public. HIPO



approaches TT activities by motivating patenting activities and through cultivating relationships and contacts with most Hungarian universities and PROs.

Moreover HIPO partners with the **European Patent Office (EPO)**. EPO supports activities for PROs in TT directly and indirectly. Indirectly, it grants high-quality patents. Directly, EPO dedicates itself to projects like IP awareness campaigns, patent teaching kits, road maps to disseminate IP knowledge in universities and to a pilot project on the role of National Patent Offices in the TT process.

The **pilot project** aimed at making the expertise of NPOs available to foster TT from university to industry. Participating institutions were: Technical University of Lodz (TUL, Poland), Eötvös Loránd University (ELTE, Hungary), University of Ljubljana (UL, Slovenia), Lisbon University (LU, Portugal), Czech Technical University in Prague (CTU, Czech Republic) and Polytechnic University Bucharest (PUB, Romania). The pilot project had several steps. First, the NPO identified suitable partner universities. A tripartite working plan between the NPO, universities and EPO then indicated objectives, activities, a budget and evaluation indicators. In a next step, NPO and university representatives were trained in TT themes through seminars and meetings, which were followed by drafting a list of services provided by the NPO to the University. Finally, a three year plan was developed, defining the implementation in three phases: set-up, testing and consolidation.

The **services** included support of in-house capabilities (i.e. the support of the identification of research results with potential commercial value and inventors in the disclosure process), IP rights services (information on IPR possibilities/routes, search services, identifying patent attorneys), commercialisation (evaluation of commercial potential of disclosed innovations, advice in selecting potential industrial partners), and other (support application for new research funds, provide a user-friendly publication channel).

HIPO provides **support to TT** in three fields: awareness rising, IP services and enabling services. The awareness rising part addresses activities for researchers and PhD students, whereas the IP services provide support with IP matters for researchers (direct) and TTO staff and standard IP services. Enabling services include updating the university's IP policy, support of IP management documentation and development of IP pre-assessment methodology.

The pilot project had several **achievements**: The implementation of training on an intermediate level IP course and two special training items on database research, awareness events building active relationships and a number of deliverables for example an IP handbook for researchers and an update of ELTE's IP management documentation.

Retrospectively, the most important **benefits of the project** are immediate gains like IPR applications and the development of the IP infrastructure in-house. Further benefits include the building of relationships embedded in the TTO-researchers-HIPO community and the improvement in structuring the work with TTOs. Finally, there was an improvement of the utilisation of existing in-house expertise.

On this basis, **plans for the future** were created. Based on the pilot, a standard service offering will be developed, available to all TTOs. Furthermore, the extension of the present service portfolio based on best practices by taking into account the feedback about TTO needs and knowledge from other countries and organisations. Beyond the existing relationships, the TT service offering should be used to build relationships, extend the cooperation to more universities and develop stronger cooperation with PROs.

Discussion

In the discussion, Noemi Baho-Borzok said that Hungary does not yet have a KTO network. Furthermore, there is no universal answer to the question how a KTO should be funded and organised.



4 Panel discussion: Professionalising knowledge transfer and IP management in Northern Balkan countries: policy implications

Participants:

- A university's view from Bulgaria: Prof. Georgi Todorov, Dean of Faculty of Industrial Technology (FIT), Technical University of Sofia (Sofia, Bulgaria).
- A university's view from Croatia: Vlatka Petrovic, Head of Technology Transfer Office, University of Zagreb (Zagreb, Croatia).
- A business view: Gabriel Vladut, Director, Craiova Research Institute for Engineering and Automatic Systems / President, Romanian Association for Technology Transfer and Innovation (Craiova, Romania).
- An IPR policy view: Magdalena Radulova, Director, Directorate Marks and Geographical Indications, Bulgarian Patent Office (Sofia, Bulgaria).

Introductory round: assessing the current state of KT and IP management, capacities and skills in universities and enterprises

Vlatka Petrovic explained that the Technology Transfer Office of the University of Zagreb was founded in 2008. Initially, the office focused on IP commercialisation, rather than new ventures, but now offers support in all aspects of technology transfer. From the beginning, the office started with raising awareness among researchers and also businesses about the existence of the TTO and the importance of KT. In the early stages of the TTO, it was very important to have a clear mandate from the university management and to act in a professional manner in order to build up credibility.

Magdalena Radulova stated that the Bulgarian Patent Office realised that KT is very important for economic growth. The Office is seeking to increase the number of students trained in IP. It has created eleven research and IP information centres at universities. The purpose of these centres is, firstly, providing services to inventors and researchers, secondly, promote the importance of IP, and, thirdly, raising awareness about the IP system. There are plans to enhance these activities by including special education about IP at universities. These activities are the result of the European Patent Office project presented by Noémi Baho-Borzók in which Bulgaria also participated.

Gabriel Vladut stated that university researchers usually do not look at possible markets for their inventions, and companies do not look at universities to find inventions. At the regional level, money from the Structural Funds is often wasted because researchers and businesses do not cooperate on the regional level. In order to tackle these problems, the Romanian Association for Technology Transfer and Innovation created a partnership. The partnership includes the Ministry of Education, Research, Innovation and Sport, the National Patent Office and the Association for Business Environment. They started offering KT training at the regional level, joining people from universities, technology transfer and local administrations. This is the best way to develop local KT strategies. There is now a network of centres dealing with KT that interact. Furthermore, with the assistance of the Enterprise Europe Network, business development centres in the cross-border area of Bulgaria and Romania were established, which is not the most developed area in both countries. These centres also serve KT objectives.

Georgi Todorov said that in his job at the TU Sofia he does both research and education. A centre of excellence was established at the FIT three years ago. It conducts three types of R&D projects: 1) Projects supported by industry, 60% of which are carried out with international partners. These projects are mostly oriented towards short-term results. In



their framework, seven patents for the European market were developed. 2) Projects mostly funded by public organisations, e.g. ministries. 3) Self-support projects in which the research teams generate own ideas, and which have a share of about 10% of all projects. The problem in these self-support projects is who the owner of a patent is, in case a patent is granted.

How universities and other PROs could professionalise their intellectual property relationships with enterprises

For professionalising IP relationships with enterprises, **Vlatka Petrovic** suggests that it is very important for universities to develop IP policies. This is a complex issue for universities, especially for the large universities with departments from arts to engineering. Consequently, the process of developing an IP policy should not be rushed, and all stakeholders should be involved. As a first step, a set of rules and instruments for IP commercialisation should be in place, but there is no need to push for a comprehensive fixed policy right away, before an understanding of the issues is reached. Another issue is providing sufficient and sustainable professional resources to TTOs. This requires funding – from governments, national schemes and structural funds. Her experiences in dealing with companies vary. With companies from abroad negotiations are often complex and require involving external lawyers. With local companies the situation is usually completely different because they are not particularly knowledgeable about IP management – one almost needs to train them about IP.

Magdalena Radulova noted that raising awareness about the importance of IP management and how to use IP in practice is very important.

Gabriel Vladut stated that one should not put pressure on universities to commercialise. They need specialised centres that understand the rules of the market. Researchers usually cannot commercialise their inventions on their own. At the same time one must point researchers to business because innovation is indispensable for the economy and society. Innovation vouchers are an important means for developing new products and experimental models.

Georgi Todorov said that when R&D brings out something new, it is often necessary to conduct professional studies in order to be able to assess whether the finding is eligible for and worth patenting.

IP policy making: three wishes to governmental policy for improving knowledge transfer

On describing her three wishes to policy makers, **Vlatka Petrovic** went one step back to the issue of policy making. Her first wish would be that policy makers consider TT as a complex process and system that needs to be supported from multiple sides. This should be taken into account when formulating and carrying out policies, and policies should interlink. Second, she would like to see complementarity of KT grants and other activities such as taxation. Governments should provide an environment where everyone becoming involved in R&D is rewarded. Third, Vlatka Petrovic stated that there is always a lack of funding for research. In addition, research groups have been able to receive more funding when applying for several smaller projects, leading to fragmentation. Collaboration, whether with other research organisations or with businesses has not been consistently rewarded.

For **Magdalena Radulova**, the question about wishes to policy makers is difficult because the IPO is part of the government. She said that more resources to bring together academics, business people and IP experts would be helpful to foster KT.

Gabriel Vladut found that the three wishes to policy are a very difficult question. He would like to see many more small innovative companies in Romania. In order to achieve this objective, companies need to define a business strategy, to formulate a vision that can be presented to others, and respect the strategy once defined for a long term. In this



respect governments should provide political stability and not change policies with every new election.

Georgi Todorov had only one wish: More investment in R&D. No knowledge can be transferred if there is no R&D. Developing technology is the key. He likes what he saw in China: If a researcher invests one dollar, the government will give another one.



Annex

Annex 1: List of participants

Nr.	Title	Name	Organisation
1		Baho-Borzók, Noémi	Hungarian Intellectual Property Office, Innovation and Information Centre
2		Baho, James	n.a.
3		Dimitrova, Amelia	Ministry of Industry, Bulgaria
4		Dobrev, Bojil	Scientific and Research Centre, University of Sofia
5		Friederichs, Tanja	European Commission, DG Research and Innovation
6		Hristov, Dimitar	HIRON – Management Consulting
7		Hüsing, Tobias	empirica Communication and Technology Research
8	Dr.	Lilischkis, Stefan	empirica Communication and Technology Research
9		Marijanovic, Dalibor	Business Innovation Centre of Croatia
10		Petkova, Mariana	Institute of Animal Science Kostinbrod
11		Petkova, Svetla	BMC Ltd.
12		Petrovic, Vlatka	University of Zagreb
13		Radulova, Magdalena	Directorate Marks and Geographical Indications, Bulgarian Patent Office
14		Seuleanu, Dragos	The Foundation for Democracy, Culture and Liberty – Romania
15		Seuleanu, S.	The Foundation for Democracy, Culture and Liberty – Romania
16		Spahic, Amir	FOI - University of Zagreb
17		Stiptsova, Margarita	Bulgaria Economic Forum
18		Stirbat, Liviu	European Commission, DG Research and Innovation
19	Prof.	Todorov, Georgi	TU Sofia
20		Vladut, Gabriel	Romanian Association for Technology Transfer and Innovation

**Annex 2: Programme**

Time	Sessions
10.30 – 11.00	Welcome coffee and tea
11.00 – 11.15	Welcome and introduction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Liviu Stirbat, European Commission, DG Research and Innovation: the EC Recommendation and Code of Practice on Knowledge Transfer</i>
11.15 – 12.45	Country profiles Knowledge transfer and IP management at universities and public research organisations: current situation, good practice and challenges <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Croatia: Dalibor Marijanovic, Director, Business Innovation Centre of Croatia (Zagreb, Croatia)</i> • <i>Romania: Dragos Seuleanu, President, The Foundation for Democracy, Culture and Liberty – Romania (Bucharest, Romania)</i> • <i>Bulgaria: Bojil Dobrev, Director, Scientific and Research Centre, University of Sofia (Sofia, Bulgaria)</i> Discussion after each presentation
12.45 – 13.45	Lunch break
13.45 – 14.30	Case study How national authorities can support capabilities and skills in managing intellectual property <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Noémi Baho-Borzók, Deputy Head of Unit, Hungarian Intellectual Property Office, Innovation and Information Centre (Budapest, Hungary)</i>
14.30 – 15.40	Panel discussion Professionalising knowledge transfer and IP management in Northern Balkan countries: policy implications <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>A university's view from Bulgaria: Prof. Georgi Todorov, Dean of FIT, TU Sofia (Sofia, Bulgaria)</i> • <i>A university's view from Croatia: Vlatka Petrovic, Head of Technology Transfer Office, University of Zagreb (Zagreb, Croatia)</i> • <i>A business view: Gabriel Vladut, Director, Craiova Research Institute for Engineering and Automatic Systems / President, Romanian Association for Technology Transfer and Innovation (Craiova, Romania)</i> • <i>An IPR policy view: Magdalena Radulova, Director, Directorate Marks and Geographical Indications, Bulgarian Patent Office (Sofia, Bulgaria)</i> Discussion with the audience
15.40 – 15.45	Conclusions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Liviu Stirbat, European Commission, DG Research and Innovation</i>
15.45 – 16.30	Farewell coffee and tea
Moderation: Dr. Stefan Lilischkis, Knowledge Transfer Study manager, empirica, Bonn	