University IP-based Start-ups

The University as a Participant in the Innovation Ecosystem and How Can Governments support it?

Regional High-Level Summit for University Presidents and Senior Policy Makers on EIE

Osaka, Japan
November 25-27, 2019

Dr. Ashley J. Stevens
President

FOCUS IP GROUP, LLC

Organized by

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

In Co-operation with

OSIPP

INPIT

JPO

Some International Teaching / Strategic Assignments

- Téthys, Egypt
- G-TEC, Japan
- Research Norway
- Department of Biotechnology, India
- UTEN, Portugal
- IC2, Colombia
- SARIMA, S. Africa
- AUTM-CORFO, Chile
- KFUPM, Saudi Arabia
- Umm Al-Qura University, Saudi Arabia
- Slovak Center for Scientific and Technical Information
- Thailand Center of Excellence in Life Sciences
- NUS (Suzhou) Research Institute, China
- WIPO – Bulgaria, Estonia, Iran, Malaysia, Philippines, Serbia, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Vietnam

FOCUS IP GROUP, LLC

Agenda

- Scale of public sector innovation regionally
- Tech transfer's horrible business model
- The implications of this business model
- The good news – innovation is everywhere
- The issues with tech transfer in emerging economies
- Some solutions

FOCUS IP GROUP, LLC

Current Patenting Activity By Universities

Country/Economy	Number of Institutions	Number of Patents	%
US	66	4,248	73.0%
Taiwan	9	492	8.5%
S. Korea	8	269	4.6%
China	2	268	4.6%
Israel	4	146	2.5%
Japan	4	124	2.1%
Saudi Arabia	2	110	1.9%
Hong Kong	3	79	1.4%
Canada	1	31	0.5%
Switzerland	1	28	0.5%
India	1	21	0.4%
Total	101	5,816	

Global Patterns Of Innovation In 2013, A.J. Stevens, Technology and Innovation, 17:4, 159-167(9), 2016

Current Patenting Activity By National Labs / Research. Institutes

Country/Economy	Number of Institutes	Number of Patents	%
US	16	1,527	36.1%
S. Korea	2	933	22.1%
Taiwan	3	599	14.2%
France	3	460	10.9%
Germany	1	181	4.3%
Japan	2	138	3.3%
Belgium	1	88	2.1%
Singapore	1	66	1.6%
Australia	1	55	1.3%
India	1	55	1.3%
Holland	1	43	1.0%
Saudi Arabia	1	42	1.0%
Total	34	4,227	

FOCUS IP GROUP, LLC

Technology Transfer – a Horrible Business Model

- Hire and pay staff
  - Must be comfortable operating in the fog of uncertainty of early stage technologies
- Train them to change the culture of professors/scientists
  - Start to identify useful inventions coming from their research
- Pay for patent applications on the inventions they eventually disclose
- Market the inventions
  - Inventions typically 4 years old when licensed
- Eventually license 25% of the inventions
  - Write off the investment in the rest
- Wait while the licensees develop the inventions into products to sell
  - Some technologies don't work or aren't cost effective
- Finally start to receive royalties on the successful inventions
  - Give away 75-100% of the income
  - Wait for the patents to expire

FOCUS IP GROUP, LLC

Issues I've Identified in Developing Countries[1]

- Innovation is everywhere
- Universities lack scale in many countries
- Technology transfer's awful business model
- The Triple Helix model isn't understood
- Companies don't look domestically for innovation
- Licensing experience isn't a major part of commerce
- Risk capital isn't available
- Legal structures may not be suitable
- Local expertise grows from the ground up
- Keeping the local stars local

1 "An Emerging Model of Life Sciences Commercialization", Ashley J. Stevens, *Nature Biotechnology,* 35, 605-613, July 2017

FOCUS IP GROUP, LLC

Implications

- Years till self supporting
  - In U.S. in 2006:[1]
    - 52% of institutions spent more than they brought in
    - Only 16% of institutions kept enough money to cover operating costs
  - Modeled it since using AUTM Survey data
    - Not much better

[1] "How are U.S. Technology Transfer Offices Tasked and Motivated—Is It All About the Money?", I. Abrams, G. Leung and A.J. Stevens, Research Management Review, Volume 17, Issue 1, Fall/Winter 2009

FOCUS IP GROUP, LLC

Implications

- If tech transfer is such a big deal, why does it lose money?
  - If a tech transfer office is doing a good job
    - It'll get a 2-5% royalty on sales
    - Or own 2-5% of a start-up company that gets sold
  - So, 95-98% of the economic impact will be outside the university
    - In the private sector
    - Which supplied the investment to develop the technology

FOCUS IP GROUP, LLC

Implications

- This isn't about making money
  - It's about the economy
- Which is why governments should support tech transfer at their universities
  - It should be considered part of the country's core economic infrastructure
    - Like airports, railways, roads, internet etc.
- Support particularly important in the early stages
  - Typically for 10 years
    - Canada, Denmark, France, Japan, UK, Chile
- Many of the inventions that come from emerging country economies target local problems, opportunities and issues

FOCUS IP GROUP, LLC

Innovation is Everywhere

- The current generation is highly entrepreneurial
  - Globally
- Great project ideas everywhere
  - Chile
  - Colombia
  - Egypt
  - Portugal
- Business development skills can be taught
  - IC^2
  - SRI
- Someone has to pay for this

FOCUS IP GROUP, LLC

Universities Lack Scale in Research

- First priority for universities is undergraduate tuition
  - Graduate programs much smaller
    - Doctoral programs often even smaller
    - Best and brightest go overseas for graduate training
      - Will they come back?

FOCUS IP GROUP, LLC

Example – Chile

- AUTM-CORFO strategic partnership
  - Phase 1 Training
  - Phase 2 Strategic planning
    - 7 AUTM Experts hired
      - 6 U.S., 1 U.K.
    - 14 universities, I National Lab
      - Benchmarking
        - AUTM Survey
        - Purchased additional survey questionnaire
      - 5 year Strategic Plan
      - I year Operating Plan
  - Phase 3 Six additional smaller universities
    - Really, really small
      - 1 had a research budget of $900k and didn't offer Ph.D.'s!

FOCUS IP GROUP, LLC

Benchmarking

- Chile:
  - Low level of intellectual property creation in Chile
    - ~600 patents per year
      - Individuals receive more patents than companies
  - Relatively low level of academic research compared with US
    - If Chile was a single university, would rank 103rd in US (Tulane)
    - Largest, Concepcion, would rank 156th (Whitehead Institute)
  - Inventions are related to research funding
    - More research➔ more inventions

FOCUS IP GROUP, LLC

Benchmarking

- Chile:
  - But Chile more productive than US, Canada and Europe
    - 1 invention/$1.1 million
      - US 1 invention/$2.8 million
      - Canada 1 invention/$3.0 million
      - Europe 1 invention/$3.6 million
  - 4% licensing success rate
    - Same as US pre-Bayh-Dole
      - Government owned and licensed IP
  - Expenditures on patents 3x license income

FOCUS IP GROUP, LLC

Benchmarking

- These results expected for a country just starting to create a technology transfer ecosystem
  - Denmark 2000
  - Japan 1999-2004
- Scale issue meant the right solution for Chile was
  - 2-3 individual TTO's
  - Regional entities for the rest
- Not what government wanted
  - Prior attempt had failed
    - But it wasn't regional – included universities in Santiago + Valparaiso
    - Included the universities which could justify their own TTO
- Government now implementing this model
  - Three regional TTO's
  - All universities belong to one of the three

The Triple Helix Model Isn't Understood

- In many emerging economies, Governments see universities solely in workforce development terms
  - Not as sources of
    - Innovation
    - Entrepreneurship
    - Economic development
  - Hence low funding of research
- University leadership doesn't understand their role in an innovation ecosystem
  - Decision making is highly centralized
    - Loathe to delegate commercial decisions to TTO
      - Slows process
      - Results in "academic" decisions
      - Risk averse

FOCUS IP GROUP, LLC

Companies Don't Look Domestically for Innovation

- Industrial leaders in developing countries frequently look overseas for innovation and new technology
  - U.S.
  - Europe
- Don't look at local technology suppliers
  - Particularly not local start-ups
  - E.g., Chile / Mining
    - Swiss and German engineering companies supply innovation
    - Universities are active in these areas
      - Maybe some testing done at universities

FOCUS IP GROUP, LLC

Licensing Isn't a Major Part of Commerce

- Commerce in developing countries is product focused, not IP-focused
- So, not much expertise in licensing and transferring IP
  - Even in the commercial sector
  - Let alone the academic sector
- LES only has 32 national and regional societies
  - Those in emerging economies / regions often have little activity
    - Members often all lawyers
      - Few corporate members
      - No academic members
  - E.g., LES Chile
    - Established 2007
    - 30 members
    - No activities currently planned

FOCUS IP GROUP, LLC

Risk Capital Isn't Available

- Angel investment usually limited to market-ready projects
  - Not useful for technology development
  - E.g., in incubator in Talca, Chile
    - Companies were raising $10,000 - $50,000 per round
    - Only one company raised $100,000
      - That was the only one that had taken off
- No equivalents of SBIR / STTR programs
- Limited VC funds
- Philanthropic sources scarce
  - Generally limited to basic and clinical research
    - Not risk reduction

FOCUS IP GROUP, LLC

Risk Capital Isn't Available

- Even resource rich countries have issues
  - Early stages of innovation need very small amounts of money
    - Get's lost in the rounding
  - How funding is managed is critical
    - Skills may not be available
    - Resource-based economies don't have to deal with market risk
      - Extract it and there's a global market waiting
    - It's all about engineering risk
      - Different from technical risk of early stage technologies

FOCUS IP GROUP, LLC

The Issue is Exits

- The only reason someone invests in a company is in the hope of selling that investment at a profit
  - Not interested in dividends
  - The higher the risk, the higher the profit they want
    - VC's won't invest unless they can see a 10x return
      - Only expect to make that much on 1-2 out of 10 investments
  - Only two routes to exit
    - M&A
    - IPO
  - M&A
    - Often companies look overseas for innovation, not domestically
  - IPO
    - Emerging companies have weak capital markets
      - Particularly for development stage companies
      - NASDAQ an option for a very, very few.

FOCUS IP GROUP, LLC

Expertise Grows from the Ground up

- The people who run incubators are critical
  - They know where the local sources of risk finance are
  - They're the *de facto* local entrepreneurship business schools
    - They've seen what works and what doesn't work in that country
  - They know the local companies that are receptive to innovation
  - They can plug into international organizations
    - NBIA
    - IASP
    - AURP
    - AUTM

FOCUS IP GROUP, LLC

Keeping the Local Stars Local

- Best and brightest often go overseas for graduate school
  - Frequently want to stay and not return
    - Better professional opportunities
    - Entrepreneurial opportunities
  - Critical to get them to come back
    - Bring back what they've learned

FOCUS IP GROUP, LLC

Some Solutions

- Fellowships
- Joint projects
- International partnerships
- Strategic partnerships
- Seeding Labs
- Form a local tech transfer organization

FOCUS IP GROUP, LLC

Fellowships

- Tech transfer people come and work in a U.S. / European TTO for 3-6 months
  - Needs some sort of sponsorship for living expenses and travel
    - Typical cost ~$20,000 for a six month fellowship
  - Universities want some overhead support
    - $5,000-6,000 for a six month fellowship
- Effective
  - Forms lasting bonds and networks
  - Big exposure to best practices
- Opportunity to form ex-pat networks

FOCUS IP GROUP, LLC

Joint Projects

- Long term research collaborations
  - Tech transfer component
  - E.g., MIT with:
    - Cambridge U.K.
    - King Fahd University of Petroleum and Minerals, Saudi Arabia
    - Skoltech Institute of Technology, Russia
  - Requires massive government support

FOCUS IP GROUP, LLC

International Collaborations

- Inter-Governmental
  - WIPO
    - EIE
    - Emerging and Transitional Countries
    - WIPO Academy
  - World Bank
    - Serbia
  - EU
    - Structural Funds – Serbian, Bulgarian experience
  - APEC
- Non-Governmental Organizations
  - British Council / Newton Fund

FOCUS IP GROUP, LLC

International Collaborations

- Governmental:
  - US
    - USAID
      - Research Triangle Institute program in the Philippines
    - Dept. of Commerce
      - CLDP
        - Tech Transfer Fellowships
        - AUTM Scholarships
    - NSF iCorp program
      - George Washington University iCorp Center has \ ‘Franchised’ the program
        - Korea; Philippines, etc

FOCUS IP GROUP, LLC

Strategic Partnerships

- E.g., AUTM – CORFO
  - Requires the Government to “get” the Triple Helix model
    - And be prepared to fund it
      - Programs are expensive
        - ~$500,000

FOCUS IP GROUP, LLC

FOCUS IP GROUP, LLC

Forming a Tech Transfer Association

- Brings together like-minded people
  - Should be practitioner driven and run
    - Not commercial or government
      - Government support helpful / essential
- Forms a locus for interaction with government
  - Policy gap analysis / policy development
- Point of contact for international interactions
  - ATTP
- Successful models
  - SARIMA
  - FORTEC
  - USIMP
  - ITMA

FOCUS IP GROUP, LLC

Thank you for listening

Questions?

astevens@bu.edu

FOCUS IP GROUP, LLC