Code of Practice on the Management of Intellectual Assets for Knowledge Valorization
"From concepts to implementation: mastering the code of intellectual assets"

Host: Tanja Sovic (TU Wien)
Guest of Honor: Peter Dröll (European Commission)
Co-Hosts: Sonja Polan (aws GmbH), Gabriele Köpping (Anton Paar GmbH), Angela Wieser (FFG mbH), Mostafa Moonir Shawrav (MCAA), Michael Freidl (Universität Graz), Patrick Lehner (Ludwig Boltzmann Gesellschaft)

Question 1: Collaboration: What are the characteristics of efficient intellectual asset management in companies and research organizations that promote successful collaboration between different stakeholders and maximize the use of research knowledge and intellectual assets?

- detailed discussion on the topic of **data**, **access** to usable, interoperable data, data that can be used for research: there should be
  - efficient **exchange** of data and interoperability;
  - support **to valorise** all this data;
  - **definition** of the **metadata**
  - **access** to the metadata
  - shared **vocabularies**
  - **new models**: use of data on the market
- clear **definition of "intellectual assets"** needed (categories & awareness)
- **awareness** raising:
  - **management** needs to commit to enter into successful collaborations
  - many people still have **fear** of collaboration – this needs to be overcome
  - to understand **the benefits** of collaboration
- the rules of cooperation must be defined in advance in order to create **trust** in the cooperation between the partners
- it is also important to define **the goals** within the company; if improvement and partnerships are not important, then there is no point.
- Knowledge-transfer via **digital services**: "apps", apis
- **New Open source models**: co-publication models (repository) + peer review papers – **impact** – **visibility** – **follow up** projects

Question 2: Incentives: What are the incentives for researchers and innovators (research institutions/SMEs/industry) to implement intellectual asset strategies in order to increase opportunities for value creation (e.g. career development, research assessment, etc.)?

- **Funding as an incentive:**

Spin-off Fellowship in Austria as an example that gives scientists the opportunity to implement their knowledge towards founding a company within 18 funded months. The success rate after the first round is 67%, i.e. 67% of the fellow teams have founded a company.

However, the central question in this program and others is **how IP agreements are communicated to the host organization and the fellows**. Here the fellows and Host organizations also sign these IP agreements, i.e. it is central for the researchers to clarify what the **IP guidelines of the universities** are.

But good programs are also those that **give scientists the opportunity** to **present their ideas to other sectors.** Because not all scientists want to start a business or work in another sector.

A good practice example for this is the **EIT HEI initiative** and something similar should also exist at the national level.
Customized fundings are needed. Funding for "Valley of death".

Overall, offices and programs that **support entrepreneurship** at universities through TT and incubators are very important. Such centres can also offer an **IP cross-check**, or if the centres cannot do this, this cross-check can be done through other organizations/contact points. For example, **a ONE-Stop Shop** where you can get an overview, information, contacts, etc. **about IP** is important.
It is important that **these subsidies are sustainable**.

Further incentives:

- **Continuing education:**
  Part of the funding to promote **business development skills** at universities or to enable further training and to promote **basic knowledge of strategic IP management**.
  Examples **include IP coaches at universities**, such as the Innoswiss start-up program.
- **Career opportunities / career development / trainings**
- **Trans sectoral exchanges** of stuff
- **Industry based** doctoral trainings
- **Supporting "administration" stuff** - TechTransfer Support, Funding Support, etc should be funded as well – incentives needed in this area– they are part of the research
- **Internal incentive systems** should be established

Question 3: Transformation: how to include different stakeholder (users, local communities, companies, NGOs, innovators and social partners) in the innovation process in a rapidly changing environment (AI/Ethics/Society/...) to accelerate progress and intensify knowledge utilization?

1) **Gruppe Freidl**

- Policy Level: inclusion of stakeholders (e.g. citizens, NGOs, gov. authorities,…) shall be "**rewarded**" equivalent to scientific publications (career relevance)
- Policy and Research Organisations: change of **mindset** of researchers, **incentives** are needed
- Research organisations (private and public): use **community building tools** like community of practice to involve stakeholders having different backgrounds
- Professional staff shall be established at research organizations to transform research papers (domain specific knowledge) into understandable **information for the public – SCIENCE COMMUNICATION**
- Important: **include people** (stakeholder) for a **longer time frame** – do not just ask about their opinion but **integrate** them from the beginning of the (applied research) project or prototype development
- Stakeholders (SMEs, industry, citizens,…): **motivation of/for stakeholders shall** be made clear, define what they get out of the process. Communicate to them!
- **Scientists**: need more **structured information** for applied research projects, especially if they are coming from abroad
- Discussions and events shall be done more often in English – a lot of researchers do not speak German and therefore they are excluded from "transfer" activities

2) **Gruppe Lehner**

Moving from an innovation to transformation perspective changes "the game" entirely:

- **Normative and ethical questions** are becoming central – transformation is always "political"
- **Values** for the different stakeholder groups have to be negotiated and the value of transformation itself has to be recognized

- Different **perspectives** and **organisational maturity levels** have to be acknowledged
- **Benefits** for the different stakeholder groups especially the users have to be considered and **incentives** for the involvement in transformation provided
- Transparent **roles** of the involved stakeholder groups are crucial, new specific roles as **systems convener, transformation manager or broker** will be needed
- Specific future **skills** are the basis for transformation
- Dedicated long-term **grants and support** for transformation is needed to foster the **collaboration** beyond silos
- Transformation has to involve **communities** at the local level must be **inclusive**
- Successes have to be **celebrated!**