International Knowledge/Technology Transfer Leadership Summit

Geneva, Switzerland (Oct. 13-14, 2022)

autm
Transforming Ideas into Opportunities

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

In October 2022, **AUTM** and the **World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO)** hosted a two-day leadership summit in Geneva, Switzerland, where 36 knowledge and technology transfer (K/TT) leaders from 29 countries and territories gathered to discuss the current state of practice and future direction of the field.

This event, AUTM's third global summit and the first held in conjunction with WIPO, was intended to be a dialogue among peers and experts. The high-level meeting offered a common discussion platform for key issues that influence K/TT.

"WIPO is glad to get involved with this talented, knowledgeable and geographically diverse group of experts on tech transfer," said Marco M. Aleman, WIPO Assistant Director General for IP and the Innovation Ecosystem, in the Summit's opening remarks. "The fluid transfer of knowledge from university labs or research settings to the marketplace is the biggest challenge in the innovation process. We must improve our knowledge of what works and what doesn't work to support innovation."

> **To make this journey a success, you must have the mind of an engineer and the nose of a CEO. This mixture is quite complex. We want to help you do more and to do it better.**
>
> **- Marco M. Aleman, WIPO**

The meeting included a question-and-answer session with WIPO Director General Daren Tang. Participants were pleased to be afforded the opportunity of a direct exchange with the Director General to actively engage ideas. The session delved deep into issues such as the benefits and challenges of governmental funding of K/TT and diversity and inclusion across the innovation ecosystem. To support open conversation, it was agreed that attendees could speak without being quoted by name in this final report.

Key Panels, Discussions and Recommendations

Models for Government Funding and Technology Transfer

Support provided to K/TT offices by federal governments around the globe varies greatly. For example, for more than a decade, Research England — which is responsible for funding and engaging with English higher education providers to create and sustain a healthy research and knowledge exchange (KE) system — has funded aspects of KE capacity and growth in the United Kingdom, while other countries hae little to no direct government support of technology transfer beyond the research component.

Summit attendees took an inventory of the current state of governmental support, including perceived benefits and drawbacks. The goal is to provide transparency for the global K/TT industry and funding decision makers to consider.

Panel Takeaways

K/TT capacity building varies around the globe.

The current state of practice across the world is quite mixed. For example, countries like Italy, Estonia, India and Pakistan offer funding for capacity building, including staff and programs. The UK has provided K/TT capacity-building funding for decades, including more than $300 million a year for the last three years. Meanwhile, the United States and various European Union member countries don't provide any direct funding for K/TT capacity building (e.g., staff and patent expenses).

New Zealand and Australia, among other countries, provide proof-of-concept funding mechanisms, but little funding for personnel and resources related to the fundamentals of performing K/TT, such as intellectual property protection and licensing. Some countries use a match model for funding, such as Italy and New Zealand for proof-of-concept funding, but the success and sustainability of this model pose a major concern, as K/TT has few funding sources and is not considered a profitable business model.

In countries that provide government funding for K/TT capacity building, money is most often provided via a competitive application or proposal process. The criteria for funding eligibility are not standardized. Most notably, regional or institutional exclusivity is not a criterion, meaning that multiple K/TT service providers could be funded in a single region or for the same institution. This is a cause for concern, as one of the most challenging scenarios involve internal complexity caused by multiple "stakeholders" confusing university innovators.

In some cases, proof-of-concept or other K/TT grant funding is made available by the government but is provided directly to the innovators, not the tech transfer office (TTO). There is agreement that this is not a best practice, as it disincentivizes the innovator from working with the TTO, creating confusion about how and by whom IP is owned and managed on behalf of the institution.

The largest concerns related to federal government funding of K/TT

The mandate for K/TT isn't matched by the level of funding to conduct it

K/TT is largely an "unfunded mandate." In most countries represented by Summit attendees, K/TT is important to a country's innovation ecosystem; its successful performance is partially mandated by its government, as the government allows institutions and funding recipients to own the intellectual property that results from contracts. Nevertheless, it was agreed that the level of funding by the government in those countries doesn't match the high expectations to successfully perform K/TT. This is clearly highlighted in countries like the United States, where federal agencies require awardees to report on IP commercialization outcomes resulting from their research funding; those same agencies provide zero funding to TTOs for tech transfer capacity. Even in countries where government funding of K/TT exists, it is agreed that the level of funding is not commensurate with the government's expectation or need for the delivery of commercialization successes.

There is too much project-based funding in lieu of base funding

While there is some government funding for K/TT capacity, the funding is largely project-based and not necessarily funding for the basic functions and capabilities of the TTO and its needed operations. The project-based approach is described by most as opportunistic and unreliable and does not actually form a consistent and equitable base of capacity to advance research innovations. Instead, it funds fleeting trends, one-off ideas and research projects with the promise of commercialization. But this doesn't actually build capacity for what is agreed to be a volume profession. Picking and choosing projects, at early stages with lots of unknowns, misses the mark and undercuts projects that could be serviced with base funding, raising the capacity to serve all projects.

The source of funding isn't always aligned with research strategy

While government funding for K/TT is available, to some extent, the source is focused on business or economic development, not science, technology and research. This is a high-risk strategy, putting a burden on K/TT to marry business community interests with research outputs that may not be aligned. The reason for this misaligned source of funding is a general lack of knowledge and understanding of the importance of how K/TT relates to research and development work; K/TT is not just a transaction but, if done right, a technology de-risking, proof-of-concept (POC), validation and product development process – especially as it relates to startups and their need for resources from the business community to develop products.

Translation funding is provided to innovators without involving the K/TTO

When POC or other K/TT grant funding is made available by government entities, it is sometimes delivered directly to the innovators and not to the K/TTO. This is not a best practice, unless the POC grant requires the K/TTO's involvement. That's because it can disincentivize the innovator from

working with the K/TTO, potentially confusing the translation process and management responsibilities on behalf of the institution. Meanwhile, it does not actually build the capacity of the TTO and effectively cripples the management of research and the validation of testing results. In the United States, the National Institutes of Health (NIH) offers a POC program under its NIH Research and Commercialization Hubs (REACH) program, in which POC funds are distributed to a management group on campus that includes the TTO. In this best practice scenario, the TTO is required to engage with innovators in the POC mini-grant application process.

Making accountability foundational

Accountability should be a staple of the relationship between governments and recipients of K/TT funding. A discussion and pre-agreed goals should be set to map outcomes-based reporting (commercialization successes, startup venture follow-on funding and exits, jobs created, economic development, products on the market, etc.) and not just outputs reporting (inventions, patents filed, and licenses executed). Meanwhile, governments need to recognize that K/TT has a long timeframe (more money today does not mean more companies or products tomorrow), and success metrics should be based on that understanding.

The model for reporting is different from country to country. For example, project-based reporting is used in some countries, while others only require broad periodic reporting from the TTO. There is no clear understanding between policy makers and the K/TT industry related to goals-based expectations and the strategic purpose of reporting.

Outcome goal reporting should not be established without discussing expectations with TTOs and considering industry verticals and the differences in outcomes and timelines of commercialization pathways between those verticals. Further, outputs should not be abandoned as reporting metrics, as those are critical to show the pipeline development that is likely to produce outcomes.

The benefits of regional K/TT

Most K/TT activity is dedicated to advancing innovations arising from a specific research institution and often not those from the surrounding community. However, it's widely agreed that innovation happens everywhere, but commercialization only happens where it is resourced. Models across the world successfully provide regional K/TT services and support, such as in India, where the government funds regional TTO entities to provide K/TT support throughout a region. In the United States, regional TTOs are not currently a state of practice; nearly all TTOs in the US serve a single research institution only. However, there is a growth of emerging TTOs at minority-serving institutions and smaller universities.

One model in the state of Kentucky (United States), called Kentucky Commercialization Ventures (KCV), is considered a national model for the provision of K/TT services to small regional universities and community and technical colleges. KCV is a TTO funded by the Kentucky state government that serves "all public institutions of higher education in Kentucky that don't otherwise have a dedicated TTO." Essentially, this is a regional TTO entity, centrally serving numerous smaller universities but with the support and partnership of the two leading research universities in the state, to leverage their programs, tools and knowledge. This model was written into the recently passed US CHIPS and

Science Act in which the US government authorized the development of regional TTOs at academic institutions or entities affiliated with academic institutions.

K/TT could be impactful for smaller universities and other institutions of higher education, but the development of such support presents major challenges in culture, time and availability of faculty who spend most of their time with a heavy teaching loads, and the lack of policies and infrastructure (including ecosystems to support K/TT in rural areas). The faculty workload presents the largest barrier to the successful implementation of commercialization processes, but student-focused programming, such as student-led startup ventures, is ripe for molding with great support at such institutions, and government funding to support these efforts is very worthwhile.

The question of sustainability

A consistent theme from the Summit was that government funding of K/TT should not be viewed as a temporary bridge to self-sustainment. K/TT's mission should be societal, based on economic impact from research and ideas, and not focused on revenue generation. KTT is about impact, not income. While revenue generation is a beneficial byproduct that has the potential to self-sustain, as it does at very few institutions across the world, the majority of TTOs and K/TT activities provide unparalleled additional value to the research enterprise, the university culture, the surrounding regional economy, and other stakeholders, including faculty and student career development. Government policy makers must understand clearly that the key mission of K/TT is societal and economic impact that is broader than revenue generation for the inventing institution. Lack of clarity on this key mission and a focus on maximizing royalties will create conflicts that will limit the K/TTOs' ability to produce larger economic and societal benefits, from optimally advancing research to marketable products and services that save lives and improve the human condition.

Diversity and inclusion across the innovation ecosystem

There is a growing awareness of the need to expand the diversity of the innovation ecosystem beyond majority classes and social innovation endeavors, and to expand K/TT's scope, operations and aspirations beyond commercial goals to address social and basic human needs.

Empirical data shows ecosystems that prioritize diversity and inclusion are more creative, innovative and foster more productive work environments. In addressing this topic, Summit attendees discussed inclusive solutions and best practices and how they can be applied to everyday problems and challenges in the field.

Diversity and inclusion across the innovation ecosystem

There is a growing awareness of the need to expand the diversity of the innovation ecosystem beyond majority classes and social innovation endeavors, and to expand K/TT's scope, operations and aspirations beyond commercial goals to address social and basic human needs.

Empirical data shows ecosystems that prioritize diversity and inclusion are more creative, innovative and foster more productive work environments. In addressing this topic, Summit attendees discussed inclusive solutions and best practices and how they can be applied to everyday problems and challenges in the field.

Key Takeaways

K/TT and Investment Funds Driven by Social Purpose

There is a great cultural paradigm shift developing, and K/TT professionals need to address alternative business models focused on user/societal needs. A growing number of impact funds can provide support to social innovation and purpose-driven projects. It was noted that, whether the objective of a business is social or purely financial, there is a requirement for the business to be sustainable, and social ventures themselves can be highly profitable.

The public sector is taking steps in this direction. In Australia, for example, TTOs have "triple impact KPIs" (i.e., commercial, social, environmental), with a strong social benefit component, to ensure that companies adhere to their social responsibility rather than just following commercial return. Licensees are obligated to have a company constitution that reflects social impact requirements.

New Zealand encourages the triple imoact model along with a budget framework for wellbeing. This is not specific to New Zealand alone — large corporations in Chile are obligated to include social impact as a value driver in addition to the commercial or economic value for shareholders.

In addition, there is an emerging understanding and demonstration of models that encourage and involve different communities including ethnic minorities, women and young innovators. One example is the Malaysian Innovation Fund, which identifies the challenges of disadvantaged groups and supports them to start contributing to the economy.

Recommendations:

- Consider alternative K/TT paths to value creation and be open to diverse communities: Identify underrepresented groups in society and encourage them to solve their own problems with innovative solutions.
- Define K/TTOs' success not in terms of mere profitability, but rather in terms of impact. Incorporate triple impact indicators (commercial, social, environmental) in project evaluations. Take advantage of the rising number of impact funds available worldwide.
- Employ in every K/TTO at least one person who is knowledgeable about social and environmental impact evaluation.

Gender inclusion in academic IP commercialization processes

Female participation in STEM (science, technology, engineering and math) and leadership positions varies significantly from country to country, as do public policies to help raise underrepresented gender engagement. In the EU, women represent about one-third of all researchers, and their numbers are growing, but there are great differences between regions.

In Australia, the issue of gender inclusion is predominantly cultural, with women dropping out of the workforce once they have children. In Brazil and Chile, there are more women than men employed in K/TTOs, but they are largely in operational roles, not leadership. In some situations, participation of women in K/TTOs is lower because there are fewer women in academic tenure positions.

Meanwhile, some countries are working hard to make meaningful changes. In Chile, for example, the government is very active in promoting a gender agenda through dedicated programs in universities. In Saudia Arabia, laws that support female emancipation are quickly changing the culture. Pakistan has established for the first time an award (SHINE, meaning SHe INvented and Empowered), for women who invent and commercialize a new technology or a new process. In Korea, Tech Frontier is a mentor-driven program for women entrepreneurs.

It also was noted that the issue is wider than male vs. female participation and that these discussions should also include non-binary genders.

It was suggested that governments create a comprehensive policy framework at the national level that incorporates both top-down and bottom-up approaches with realistic targets, that they track progress of women in STEM and relevant managerial posts, and that they encourage girls to be part of innovation processes starting in elementary school.

Recommendations:

- Raise the profiles of female role models: successful KTT leaders and entrepreneurs.
- Include women as early as possible in the processes of academic IP and K/TT. Increase the presence of women in K/TT juries, panels and conferences, and share lists of interested female candidates to avoid the same women always being chosen.
- Create an inclusive female community within each TTO, with more representation tactics, juries, success stories, peer mentoring and learning.
- Advocate

Support the next generation to become future innovators and managers

There is a recognized need to create new structures/networks to educate students about innovation and entrepreneurship. Many initiatives are underway around the world. For example:

- A program at Leiden University (PLNT) in the Netherlands created a community of students willing to become entrepreneurs. The program is quickly spreading through the Netherlands, and to provide support, ASTP is offering free tech-transfer coaching.
- A university in New Zealand established an investment committee for young entrepreneurs, being groomed to become future national industry leaders, to discuss startup proposals.
- In Saudi Arabia, the King Abdullah University of Science and Technology (KAUST) produced a massive open online course on entrepreneurship in the Arabic language, which after a few months was followed by 120,000 people, mostly young adults.
- In Ireland, the government set up a program to select 30 students, from a pool of thousands of 12-to-18-year-olds, to get startup funding based on scientific proposals. IP is taught in the UK from elementary school.
- Brazil has several entrepreneurship programs targeting young children.
- Chile developed a program for schools aimed at teaching entrepreneurship and to connecting interested students.
- Australia created an “innovation vacation” program, a day camp where younger students can learn about prototyping and startup methodology.
- The Korean Young Innovators Program is, similarly, a day camp with a competition.

Based on these examples, value was seen for the following government-led national initiatives:

- Investing more in new types of educational programs.
- Creating new structures for students that provide a place for dialogue, coaching and funding.
- Connecting students with industries and investors and providing them with role models.
- Organizing summer camps related to societal problems and innovative solutions.
- Empowering K/TTOs creating programs that engage junior faculty, post-docs and graduate students in tech transfer, commercialization and entrepreneurship.
- Collecting and analyzing case studies from different countries aiming at supporting youth participation in STEM, startups and managerial positions.

Recommendations:

- Mentor young students and support their inclusion in TTOs' activities as innovation fellows or interns.
- Start education on IP and tech transfer in schools.

Hot Topics

The Summit included time to address topics of interest, offering attendees a chance to share their perspectives on issues or current challenges. The questions were:

> **We've been successful at tapping into researchers' desire to make a difference in the world by helping them see some of the opportunities that commercialization can provide. We give them proof of concept funding and partner them with a mentor.**
>
> ***– ATTENDEE***

How do we raise researchers' awareness of the impact of their work in society?

There is a belief that researchers around the world often don't consider the products and services that could germinate from their work. This invariably leads to questions about the degree to which research funding is contributing to societal impacts.

So how do we instill a culture in public research organizations that is conducive to IP creation and commercialization? Attendees felt that building trust between K/TTO staff and researchers is central to addressing that challenge.

Recommendations:

- Organize K/TTOs so processes are swift and transparent.
- Create institutional support to engage researchers in programs to raise awareness and build capacity in areas such as entrepreneurship, IP and market validation, among others.
- Support top-down measures to help researchers engage more in K/TT, such as incentives to direct research toward a higher degree of utility.
- Recognize success in technology transfer as a contributing factor when assessing researcher career progression.

How do we best measure the impact and value created by IP commercialization and knowledge/ technology transfer?

The K/TT community has traditionally focused too narrowly on IP commercialization and associated metrics, such as patenting, licensing and spinout / startup company creation, which in fact reflect a very small part of the societal benefits generated through knowledge and technology transfer. This focus on current metrics has missed the fact that far more revenue is generated from collaborating with industry, enabling access to facilities and equipment, and providing consultancy. This has a significant impact for the companies, from small and medium-sized enterprises to multi-national, that the organizations work with.

It is important to recognize that impact is created not by the TTO itself but by subsequent developments in the marketplace and society, which may be a long way downstream and which we are still not adept at measuring as it is not straightforward to do so.

[Pull quote: “The root of the problem is the university doesn’t create impact. The narrative has painted us into a corner. People want to see services, jobs, etc….The only way we can assess that impact is to review them. That’s what we’re the worst at. We do the deal; we create the startup and there it goes… we should go back in 20 years and look at value... the only way we can assess impact is to track research uses.”

> **“The root of the problem is the university doesn’t create impact. The narrative has painted us into a corner. People want to see services, jobs, etc….The only way we can assess that impact is to review them. That’s what we’re the worst at. We do the deal; we create the startup and there it goes…we should go back in 20 years and look at value...the only way we can assess impact is to track research uses.**
>
> ***– ATTENDEE***

Reccomendation:

- Focus not on TTO outputs but on measuring the use of technology (recognizing the longer timeframe of that output).

While there is no doubt that research commercialization greatly benefits society and creates a positive impact on society and in the marketplace, it remains challenging to communicate the process to stakeholders.

Reccomendation:

- Better communicate to all echelons of leadership that the tech transfer cycle is lengthy, and the delivery of substantial impact requires time and money and is sometimes extensive.

K/TT outcomes are determined by the environment at the inventing institution, including the nurturing of innovative faculty, staff and students, funding of both early-stage research and later-stage proof of concept studies, embedding (and rewarding) a strong K/TT culture in the organization, incentivizing researchers and designing programs for building skills and capacity. However, this is seldom recognized when assessing outputs and impact from technology transfer activities.

Reccomendation:

- Consider a more holistic approach to assessing output and impact.

Economic development or technology transfer – which should come first, and how?

This is the classic chicken or egg conundrum: you have a great invention, but there are no companies to advance it. Or, industry is interested in advancing inventions, but no research institutions are creating them.

There is no doubt that research and development are key to economic growth. It is advantageous to establish baseline objectives and metrics for quantifying the outcomes of any support actions. It is also important not to confuse objectives with metrics – and if the main objective is economic development by way of R&D, then transferring technology is an effective way to achieve that.

An economy that makes efforts to implement technology transfer needs a developed and well-consolidated R&D base (that includes researchers, companies, and investors), which will provide leads for the processes to work. Timing and timelines are important factors.

> **“The short answer is you can’t have an egg with no chicken or a chicken with no egg.**
>
> ***– ATTENDEE***

Findings:

- Developing a well-functioning innovation system requires investment in a strong R&D base and, alongside this, establishing an effective technology transfer mechanism.
- Croatia and the Baltic States are good examples of this success strategy. These EU Member States cooperate with the European Commission and have received funding to invest in R&D, which has led to successful knowledge and technology transfer.

How can open science and IP protection/licensing be reconciled?

There is an urgent need to raise awareness concerning the issue of IP protection around products and services developed in the context of open science — a movement to make scientific research and its dissemination accessible to all levels of society — and to establish a balance that encourages collaboration and innovation while ensuring confidence among partners to enable delivery of outcomes to the market.

There are many considerations.

While R&D environments are frequently dictated by confidentiality and secrecy requirements, open science can be used to attract and connect collaboration partners and other actors to an innovation network. The main challenge is that these relationships need time to gain the momentum needed to enable an effective innovation environment.

Should some technologies not be licensed at all, and instead be freely available? Some open innovation ecosystems have implemented successful mechanisms for the protection of IP. Open science can be used to measure innovation's impact, as it entails a broader scope than just focusing on patenting, licensing, and spinouts.

- The success of CERN (the European Organization for Nuclear Research) has created an important example regarding open science.
    - The research infrastructure was established without the expectation of extensive commercialization, yet work enabled and undertaken there has yielded substantial downstream commercialization of R&D based products.

Summit Attendees

Mohammed Aljafari is Director, IP Commercialization Office iPARK — Royal Scientific Society in Amman, Jordan.

Alessandra Baccigotti is a Knowledge Transfer Manager, Head of the Intellectual Property Protection Unit of the Knowledge Transfer Office at the University of Bologna, Italy.

Andrew Bailey is the Senior Manager: Innovation in the Research Contracts & Innovation Department at the University of Cape Town. Andrew is the President of the Southern African Research and Innovation Managers Association (SARIMA).

Tim Boyle is Director, Innovation & Commercialisation at the Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation (ANTSO) and Founder & Chief of the *nandin* Innovation Centre. Tim is the Chair of the Alliance of Technology Transfer Professionals (ATTP) and a Director of Knowledge Commercialisation Australasia (KCA).

Alison Campbell is CEO of the UK Government Office for Technology Transfer and a former Board Chair of AUTM.

Almesha L. Campbell is the Assistant Vice President for Research and Economic Development at Jackson State University, University, and the 2023 AUTM Board Chair.

Giancarlo Caratti is the former Head of Intellectual Property and Technology Transfer for the European Commission, Belgium, and currently Active Senior Advisor of the European Commission.

Shirley Virginia Coutinho founded the Technology Transfer and Intellectual Property Office at PUC-Rio and serves as the Executive Manager.

Kevin Cullen is the Vice President for Innovation at King Abdullah University of Science and Technology (KAUST) where he leads the University's intellectual property portfolio, helps create and support new businesses, joint ventures, and collaborations with industry partners.

Dominic De Groote is the Chair of the Course Review Committee of the Alliance of Technology Transfer Professionals (ATTP) and Sr. Business Development Manager Pharma at Ghent University in Belgium.

Muhammad Anwar Fareid is the Director of Innovation and Commercialization at the National University of Sciences and Technology (NUST) in Pakistan.

Darren Fast is the Director of Partnerships & Innovation at the University of Manitoba where he is responsible for intellectual property management, creating startups, as well as facilitating collaborative industry/research partnerships.

Tom Flanagan is the Director for Enterprise and Commercialisation at University College Dublin, where he leads innovation, entrepreneurship, and enterprise development at NovaUCD, Ireland's premier incubator/accelerator.

David Gulley is founding Director of the Technology Transfer Office (TTO) of the Puerto Rico Science, Technology, and Research Trust, a regional TTO serving the island's public and private universities to identify, evaluate, protect, market, and transfer the most promising research discoveries to industry.

Debra Hall is a Director of the Kiwi Innovation Network (KiwiNet), and Chair of the Investment Committee, which deploys the NZ Government's Pre-Seed Accelerator Funding into projects moving through the commercialisation process.

James Hutchinson leads the KiwiNet Innovation Network (KiwiNet), which has the combined power of New Zealand's Universities, Crown Research Institutes and other research organizations that receive public funding.

Laura MacDonald is the Chief Executive for ASTP (the pan-European members' association for knowledge transfer professionals).

Tamsin Mann is Interim Managing Director at PraxisAuril, the UK's national association for Knowledge Exchange professionals, and leads on policy and communications work for the organization.

Amanda McAlpine leads the Knowledge and IP Transfer team within Meat & Livestock Australia, serves as a Director, Knowledge Commercialisation Australasia (KCA).

Ian McClure is the Associate Vice President for Research, Innovation and Economic Impact for UK Innovate at the University of Kentucky. He was the 2022 AUTM Board Chair.

Ignacio Merino Lopez is Executive Director of Hub Tec, Chile.

Nedeljko Milosavljevic is the Director of the Center for Technology Transfer at the University of Belgrade in Serbia.

Helena Montiel is the President of Redtransfer, the Spanish association of knowledge transfer, innovation and research management professionals.

Maria Del Pilar Noriega E. is the R&D and Innovation Director of Daabon Group, Colombia; member of Alliance for Biomass and Sustainability Research (ABISURE) and member of SECOPIND (IP Network).

Vlatka Petrović is the Acting Head of the Centre for Research, Development and Technology Transfer at the University of Zagreb.

Orakanoke Phanraksa is an IP policy specialist at the Technology Licensing Office, the National Science and Technology Development Agency (NSTDA), and also currently serving as advisor for the international affairs division at Thailand Science Research and Innovation (TSRI), where she leads to establish the technology transfer professionals network in Thailand.

Tõnu Pihelgas is a coordinator of Baltic States and Estonian Knowledge and Technology Transfer Networks and Legal Officer for Business Relations in Tallinn University of Technology.

Marli Elizabeth Ritter dos Santos helped found Brazil's Innovation and Technology Managers Association (FORTEC). She was the group's first President and today serves as an Advisory Board member.

Samsilah Roslan helped found the Innovation and Technology Managers Association (ITMA) in Malaysia, where today she is Board President.

Victor Sánchez serves as President of the National Network of Technology Transfer Offices in Mexico; He is CEO of Pragmatec, a technology transfer office with a focus on the life science sector in Latin America, and is International Operations Manager at Global Ecosystem Dynamics Initiative.

Thomas Schmidt is Head of Technology Transfer at the University of Southern Denmark (SDU), which serves as the technology transfer office for SDU and the research hospitals of Southern Denmark Region.

John Shim is a vice president and professor of Technology Commercialization Division at Seoul National University of Science and Technology and is also Vice Chair for KAUTM (Korea Association of University Technology Transfer Management).

McLean Sibanda is the Managing Director at Bigen Global Limited (South Africa & Mauritius), and is immediate past President of the Advisory Council of the Int. Association of Science & Technology Parks. An intellectual property (IP) specialist, he was the chief drafter of South Africa's legislation on IP from publicly funded research.

Fazilet Vardar Sukan is the Director at Sabanci University Nanotechnology Research and Application Center.

Stephen Susalka is the Chief Executive Officer of AUTM, a 2,000+ member non-profit association, focused on supporting and enhancing technology transfer globally, and oversees staff operations of the Federal Laboratory Consortium for Technology Transfer, which supports federal technology transfer for more than 300 federal labs across the US.

M. Carme Verdaguer is the Managing Director of the Bosch i Gimpera Foundation, the Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Centre of the University of Barcelona and Vice President of RedTransfer, the Spanish association of knowledge transfer, innovation and research management professionals.

Vijay Vijayaraghavan is the Founder of Sathguru Management Consultants, a global technology transfer organization with a presence in 12 countries.

WIPO Staff, Technology Transfer Section, IP for Innovators Department, IP and Innovation Ecosystems Sector, Geneva.

Olga Spasic, Section Head

Lien Verbauwhede Koglin, Counsellor

Mattias Karisson Dinnetz, Senior Program Officer

Olga Kusanova, Technology Transfer Consultant

Alla Tiunova, Young Expert

Lorena Rojas Vega, Fellow

AUTM Staff

Barbara Gunderson, Professional Development Director, Chicago, Illinois

Leef Smith Barnes, Chief Marketing Officer, Washington, DC

autm
Transforming Ideas into Opportunities

One Parkview Plaza, Suite 800
Oakbrook Terrace, Illinois 60181
Phone: +1-847-686-2244
Fax: +1-847-686-2253
info@autm.net

WIPO
WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION

World Intellectual Property Organization
34, chemin des Colombettes
CH-1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland
Phone: (+41) 22-338-9111
Fax: (+41) 22-733-5428