

CA/142/04

Orig.: en

Munich, 16.11.2004

SUBJECT: Report on public EPO hearings – summary

DRAWN UP BY: President of the European Patent Office

ADDRESSEES: Administrative Council (for information)

SUMMARY

This paper is a summary of the three public hearings held by the European Patent Office on the future of the European Patent System. These hearings were organised in order to give a broad input from innovative SMEs, applicants, attorneys and the finance sector to the November Council debate.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Subject	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. STRUCTURE AND METHOD OF THE HEARINGS	1
III. CONFERENCE THEMES AND ATTENDANCE	2
IV. FINDINGS OF THE HEARINGS	4
A. HEARING IN PRAGUE	4
a) Composition of the audience	4
b) Workshop results	4
c) Results	5
B. HEARING IN MUNICH	6
a) Composition of the audience	6
b) Workshop results	6
c) Electronic consultation results	9
d) Summary and comparison of results	10
C. HEARING IN THE HAGUE	11
a) Composition of the audience:	12
b) Workshop presentations	12
c) Consultation round	13
V. CONCLUSION	13
ANNEX 1 THE SPEAKERS AT THE THREE HEARINGS	15
ANNEX 2 LIST OF PARTICIPATING ENTERPRISES AT THE HEARINGS	17

I. INTRODUCTION

Following the decision of the Administrative Council in June 2004 to embark on a strategy debate on the future of the patent system in Europe, the European Patent Office (EPO) launched a series of public hearings among key user groups of the European system with the aim of gathering insight on their perception of what that future should be. Under the heading “Your input to the future of the European patent system is needed” the Office invited innovative small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), representatives of the European industry and patent profession as well as representatives of the finance sector to present their views at three conferences in Prague, Munich and The Hague. The delegates of the member states of the European Patent Organisation were encouraged by the President of the EPO to attend as observers.

The Office provided and prepared the stage for the hearings, but did not take part in the programme and discussions. Support as well as co-sponsorship for the hearings came in particular from the Institute of Professional Representatives before the EPO (epi), UNICE and the Munich-based ifo Institute for Economic Research who all provided the Chairmen for the conferences and actively promoted the events in the short time available. Similar active support for the hearings also came from the European Association of Craft, Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises (UEAPME); the German Association of Engineers (VDI); the Licensing Executives Society International (LESI); the International Association for the Protection of Intellectual Property (AIPPI); the International Chamber of Commerce (ICC); the European Private Equity and Venture Capital Association (EVCA) and the Intellectual Asset Management magazine. Many of these organisations provided key note and expert speakers.

Invitations were sent out with explicit reference to the consultation process launched by Administrative Council on its website. While this process focuses on PCT-related questions in the co-operation within the Organisation, the Office took the view that the strategy debate should be based on a broader approach and also take opinions of user groups into consideration. Accordingly, the central theme of this debate was “who does what to create value in the patenting system in Europe”. This perspective was subsequently also taken up by the Chairman of the Council and endorsed by the Administrative Council in its 98th meeting.

II. STRUCTURE AND METHOD OF THE HEARINGS

To stand in line with this perspective, the conference programmes were arranged in such a way as to enable maximum active participation of those present. Furthermore, workshop methods were applied that seemed most promising for the delivery of results, taking the different audiences into account. Professional

reporters took notes during the workshops and produced summaries of the findings.

The conferences were opened with plenary sessions in which key notes were delivered to introduce the overall theme. Various topics were then explored in workshop sessions with experts during which the participants were encouraged to formulate and express their own perceptions and expectations. Two of the three conferences ended with a plenary consultation session at which a digital voting and, in one case, a discussion of the findings of several workshop sessions took place.

III. CONFERENCE THEMES AND ATTENDANCE

The conference themes were as follows:

Prague, 25 October 2004: Hearing for small and medium-sized enterprises

More than two-thirds of the EPO's applicants are small and medium-sized enterprises. They also constitute the backbone of the European economy. Empirical research clearly shows that these enterprises frequently do not use the patent system since they encounter a number of barriers to patenting, such as cost considerations, procedural and legal complexity and uncertainty regarding their patents' economic value. The conference aimed at providing information on some of these aspects, and at exploring the views and concerns of European SMEs. Particular focus was put on what improvements in local and general IP support will break down these existing barriers and assist SMEs in pursuing their business strategy.

Munich, 2nd November 2004: Hearing for industry and patent professionals

Europe's industry and patent professionals are the most frequent users of the European patent system and have contributed vastly to its development and success. The conference aimed at deepening the discussion initiated at the "Mastering the Workload" Customer Workshop in February 2003 by approaching the subject from a structural perspective and broadening it by introducing new elements. In broad terms, the focus was on what changes to the system would improve its functionality, efficiency and effectiveness.

Within this framework, the hearing addressed relevant issues from four different angles:

- The patenting process in Europe: How is value created today by the process? What can be improved? Are there synergies? Are there redundancies? What quality values in the patent process lead to economic success?
- The patent system in Europe: How is value created by the system as such? Is accessibility an issue? How would the perceived benefits of the system change if there was a reconfiguration in terms of who does what? What are the general priorities for improvement in the system?
- Use of rights: In the emerging knowledge economy the use of provisional and granted patent rights is in flux. Licensing, patent pools and the like are major growth areas. How does this influence the way in which both the patent process and the patent system should look and behave?
- Litigation: The strength of a patent system is built on the twin pillars of the patent process and enforcement. But to what extent does the patent process influence enforcement and vice versa? What are the dynamics and how could these two pillars be made to interact in a way which improves the overall strength of the patent system in Europe?

The Hague, 4th November 2004: Hearing for the finance sector

In its Lisbon Agenda, the European Union stated its aim to turn Europe into the most competitive knowledge-based economy by 2010. In such an economy the patent system will play a key role in managing the network flow from knowledge to innovation and the creation of economic value. It will also act as an important interface between the technology and finance sectors. This conference sought to bring together patent professionals and finance experts with a view to broadening understanding between the two sectors.

A total of 223 participants registered to take part in the hearings. The greatest attendance was noted in Prague, where more than 100 representatives of SMEs from 13 member states were present. Czech and Slovak enterprises were particularly numerous among the participants. As the most specialised conference, the hearing in The Hague attracted 29 attendees, among them a number of specialists from high-profile organisations and institutions.

IV. FINDINGS OF THE HEARINGS

The workshops have lead to clear results in terms of concerns, views and demands expressed by the users. Most of the opinions presented are also backed by the electronic consultation process, the results of which were not displayed in the plenary to avoid one question influencing another.

The hearings produced a large number of results. This paper summarises the essential points raised by the participants.

A. HEARING IN PRAGUE

a) Composition of the audience

Most of the more than 100 participants were innovative SMEs from the field of industrial manufacturing, the chemical/pharmaceutical industry and research institutions.

More than half of them indicated that they had no experience with either their national patent office or the EPO. The EPO was slightly better known than the national office. In terms of filing activities national patent applications prevailed: 41% had filed between two and five applications in the last three years, 24 % ten and more. 55% had not filed a European application during that time, 17 % one and 14 % between two and five.

b) Workshop results

The overriding concerns expressed by the participants were

- **Costs:** translation costs are too high; the cost for obtaining a patent and for litigation can scare SMEs away from the system.
- **Timeliness** of the patent grant and litigations processes: long delays in either procedure leads to high financial risks for SMEs. In view of short product cycles, high-tech products are particularly affected by lengthy procedures. The EPO should take this more into account. Time is paramount for SMEs, while larger companies are more interested in quality patents.
- **Complexity** of the system in Europe: separate national systems for obtaining patents and for litigation are not helpful for SMEs when compared with the US system.

- **Litigation:** the present litigation system is too risky (varying verdicts), lengthy and expensive for SMEs. Participants showed great interest for concepts of a Europe-wide litigation system, such as the European Patent Court under the CPC and the EPLA. It was also proposed that the EPO should set up an insurance programme to cover legal costs.
- **Institutional support** for SMEs: participants repeatedly inquired about the possibility for the EPO to operate at local level.

c) **Results**

31 participants took part in the electronic consultation during the consultation session. The results have to be regarded as mainly reflecting perceptions. The most important findings are as follows:

(i) **Important features of the patent system in Europe**

The quality of the patent, the consistency of harmonised procedures at all levels and the simplicity/efficiency of the grant procedure are the most highly valued features of the present system. Cost-efficient access to the system as well as an easy and efficient enforcement system were also judged very highly, especially as the present cost burden and enforcement risks were identified as the two most important barriers for SMEs to access the system. The high costs are also the most prominent wish for a change, followed by enforceability of the patents and an even higher consistency of the procedures (reduced risk).

(ii) **The role of the patent offices**

National patent offices:

The primary role for the national office lies in giving support to SMEs as patent information and service provider. However, only 20% of them believe that their office is better equipped to perform this task than the EPO. 90% of the voters agreed that patent offices should in general be more active in informing industry, 67% said they needed help in retrieving patent information. Another task for NPOs (71%) is to receive national patent applications and check formalities, and 61 % were of the opinion that their national office should also carry out searches and examinations in the context of national procedures.

European Patent Office:

The clear task of the EPO is to carry out searches and examinations and to grant patents, which received more than 80% each. The EPO is also seen as the most important producer of patent information (87%).

(iii) Judging the status quo of the patenting system in Europe:

The participants underlined the need for SMEs to rely on a consistent patenting process in Europe (60%). They prefer to have the choice of the initial authority that should carry out the work on their patent application. While 47% believe that the quality and consistency of the patenting process is not affected if the EPO outsources its work to other patent offices, 67% were of the opinion that, when dealing with PCT applications, the Office should always carry out a supplementary search when the first filing search had been done by an NPO. 43% were of the view that it did not matter to them which authority carried out the initial work on their applications, but only 30% were of the opinion that it didn't matter whether a PCT search was carried out by their NPO or the EPO.

B. HEARING IN MUNICH

a) Composition of the audience

The large majority of participants were patent professionals, either in-house patent attorneys of companies, attorneys working in the free profession, representatives of firms of attorneys at law, followed by heads or managers of intellectual property departments. The conference was attended by 70 external participants coming from 17 of the 29 member states of the Organisation.

37 attendees also participated in the electronic consultation round. Of these, well over 90% indicated that they were "well" or "very" experienced with the EPO, 79% had filed European patent applications, 77% national and also PCT applications. Most represented companies with high (more than ten) to very high (more than 100) annual filing activities in the last five years. 78% said that their business had a global orientation. Nearly two thirds of the attendees said their companies were active in licensing.

b) Workshop results

In view of the audience and its high degree of specialisation in patent matters, the workshops were conducted applying the "Open Space Technology" method. This method aims at achieving maximum audience participation and involves the production of topical papers by each workshop group. Each participant was invited to attend two workshop sessions. As a consequence, a substantial number of papers could be presented as output in which many discussion topics and, in some cases, concrete proposals were listed.

(i) Workshops “The Patent System”, “The patenting process”

Workshop Theme: “The role of national patent offices

- national offices should have a strong role in providing services and giving information and advice to SMEs
- mainly NPOs receive national first filings and furnish a reliable search report on which decisions for subsequent filings can be based
- PCT work seems acceptable only under conditions of strict quality control by an independent body and after verification that the respective office meets the PCT qualifications
- direct work for EP cases is not acceptable, and there should be no automatic recognition of PCT search reports by the EPO
- EPO must be free to decide whether or not to recognize international search opinions (see also below)

Workshop Theme: “Recognition” of international search opinion in PCT Chapter I:

- Political agreements on recognition of International Search Opinions drafted by an NPO as ISA cannot affect the responsibility of the Examining Divisions under the EPC
- Possible future role of NPOs in PCT work does not change the EPO’s work in essence and quality. EPO examiners must always be free to conduct additional searches in the regional phase
- Cooperation with NPOs in terms of providing good search tools and training is more fruitful for the European patent system than the debate of who gets a piece of the cake
- The EPO should consider ISA-activities from national offices in Europe in the same way as US- and JP-activities are treated today (complementary searches, ESR produced by EPO, reduction of search fee)

Workshop Theme: “Extended search report” – EP procedures

- no outsourcing of extended opinions
- any sub contractors for searching only must be under full control of the EPO

Workshop Theme: “Patents and the EPO”

- strong pleas for a strong, consistent and high-quality procedure (reduce risks)
- no partnership contracts: EPO must do the whole work, focusing on its core tasks (full examination and grant of patents)
- EPO must improve its public image (transparency, communication)

(ii) **Workshop “Litigation”**

- emphasis on the need of a centralised litigation system within the framework of the EPC
- one patent- one court-system, EPLA proposal as model
- training of patent judges should be organised by the European Patent Academy and be partly financed by the EPO
- improve the quality of the European patent (strict application of Articles 84 and 69 EPC) in order to ensure a good litigation system

(iii) **Workshop “Use of rights”**

- quality of the patent and the search/examination and opposition procedure are seen as being of paramount importance
- quality defines the reliability of the right
- quality resides in the consistency of procedural approach
- quality is backed by clear regulations and case law (e.g. scope of claims)
- quality should not be sacrificed to increase quantity
- quality creates value in patents
- Features of value creation: timeliness of the procedure, flexibility in the patenting process, efficiency of opposition procedure, legal certainty for patentees and third parties. All of these need to be provided by the EPO
- “No search” and “no examination” policy in certain technical fields stifles innovation in these areas

- creation of independent advisory boards to suggest policies for these fields
- EPO should assume activities for inventors and SMEs in the field of using patents for licensing purposes. Could be done through the European Patent Academy
- EPO could step up its information activities by indicating external organisations who give support in this field on its website

c) Electronic consultation results

The most important findings are as follows:

(i) Importance of features of the patent grant procedure

Quality of the procedure (87.5%), coverage of novelty (72%) and of inventive step (67.7%) obtained the highest ratings. Just over 51 % gave highest priority to the coverage of non-patent literature, while in-time delivery of the core products achieved mainly middle values. Communication and transparency is also seen as an important / very important feature of the procedure, while clarity of the search report received lower marks in terms of value peaks. A coherent procedural approach was also judged higher (reduced risks).

Among the use values for granted patents, legal certainty obtained the highest rating.

(ii) Features of the patenting system

The cost-efficiency of the procedure (100%), the prospect of obtaining a quality patent and the scope of geographical protection (both 96.9%) were rated as being of highest importance, followed by efficiency of the procedure (93.3%). Easy and efficient enforcement was also deemed highly important (90.3%). Slightly lower values were noted for consistent and harmonised interconnected procedures (77%) and the freedom of choice among patent authorities (67.9%).

(iii) The role of patent offices

National patent offices

There was a clear perception among the participants of the roles for national patent offices: local support for SMEs (40%) and receipt of national patent applications / formalities check (25%) received the highest ratings. 18.3% thought that national searches could also be carried out by the NPOs.

The detailed look at each of the features confirmed these findings. 82% saw a role for the national offices as receiving offices, and 51.7% thought these offices should also check formalities. Strong emphasis was put on their role as patent (94%) and general information (60%) providers. A role in the European granting process was distinctly denied: Neither searches (59.4%) nor examinations (almost 84%) should be carried out by NPOs in the European patenting process.

European Patent Office

Search, examination and grant/opposition received the highest marks, followed by appeals. However, the EPO's role as patent information producer was seen as being less important. 60% attributed a role to the EPO in this respect.

These findings are also confirmed by the assessment of individual tasks of the Office in the patenting process: Issuing search reports (90%), carrying out examination procedures (in both cases European and international) (96%) and the grant of patents (100%) are seen as being the most important roles of the EPO.

(iv) Opinions

The results were confirmed in the final questions dealing with PCT issues. 93.8% agreed that keeping centralisation of the patenting procedure is important. The participants also clearly expressed themselves in favour having their patents processed entirely by the EPO (73%), as opposed to 10% who could agree to have split responsibilities of the national office and the EPO. Furthermore, the participants confirmed that they prefer a free choice of the ISA for their applications (87%) and expressed themselves strongly against any form of re-routing of their dossier by the selected ISA to another office without their written consent, irrespective of whether that ISA is the EPO or a national office. Just 3.6% of the participants thought that the EPO's subsequent search and the first search carried out by an NPO are identical: While exactly half saw them as overlapping products and 46.4% felt that they are complementary.

Finally, 97% of the participants agreed that there should be a Common Court System for European patents.

d) Summary and comparison of results

Both hearings produced an indication of how the patent institutions and process in Europe are seen and experienced by two major user groups. The results can be read as a way of "testing the water". The points of common interest are:

- Both user groups see clear roles for the different patent offices involved: The role of the national offices predominantly lies in support, information and advice activities at local level and mainly for SMEs, while the EPO's main role is to operate the European patent granting process.
- The results also show a clear division of tasks for the Offices in the grant procedure: Of the SMEs 61 % see a task for their NPO in searching and granting patents at national level, and an even clearer one for the EPO in the European patent procedure (81% in searching, 84% in examination and granting). In the case of PCT applications, only 30% of the SMEs see a possible role for NPOs. Larger enterprises see no role for national offices in carrying out European searches (59.4%) or examinations (83.9%).
- There is coherent support for the EPO's control of the PCT process: Where outsourcing occurs, strong criteria of quality control by the EPO should be applied. SMEs believe that the EPO should always carry out supplementary searches if a national office as acted as ISA.
- Both groups expressed the opinion that the applicant should be able to choose the authority that processes his application.
- Quality and cost-efficiency are of primary concern for both groups. SMEs see litigation risks also as a major barrier to using the system.
- There is a strong demand for a harmonised litigation system.
- The need for more transparency and information about the patenting system in Europe is strongly expressed by both user groups.
- SMEs attribute to the EPO a prominent role as patent information provider.

C. HEARING IN THE HAGUE

The hearing was held in the form of a workshop covering three different themes. These were:

- “Basell II” and patents
- Financial evaluation of patents
- Use of intellectual property to secure venture capital

There was no voting session.

a) Composition of the audience:

There were representatives from various sectors, including economists, analysts, consultants and directors of finance, from 11 member states.

The speakers presenting the workshop topics included representatives from Deutsche Bundesbank, PricewaterhouseCoopers, KPMG and Triangle Venture Capital Group who had been nominated to speak by the European Private Equity and Venture Capital Association (EVCA). The meeting was chaired by a senior researcher of the ifo Institute of Economic Research, Hans Schedl, while the key note was held by the Editor of "Intellectual Asset Management" magazine, Joff Wild.

b) Workshop presentations

The workshops offered a wide insight into the evaluation mechanisms for intellectual property. The presentations were followed by lively debates. In all presentations, the need for quality patents to better manage legal certainty risks was emphasised. The venture capital expert made frequent reference to the European patent system and presented several reform proposals for the EPC from the perspective of the venture capital industry. These included:

- option for putting the patent grant procedure on hold
- flexibility in handling deadlines in the procedure
- right for competitors to file requests for examination
- rapid closure of the examination procedure after issuance of R 51(4) communication by the EPO as this often leads to green light for obtaining venture capital
- ensure highest quality standards in services by keeping search and examination concentrated in the hands of the EPO
- EPO should provide a non-binding opinion on infringement

c) **Consultation round**

To the question of the Chairman “What can the patent system in Europe do to help you and the finance sector?” the participants submitted the following observations:

- The EPO should facilitate a neutral communication platform so that when patents are registered applicants should be advised of certain points of contact that would offer a valuation. Perhaps this could be achieved by exchanging information through the EPO's website.
- Europe has been increasingly lagging behind the United States in terms of competitiveness. The EPO can do a great deal to improve this.
- Patents examination should be of a higher quality; there are some patents that slip through the cracks.
- The EPO helps companies to reduce risk with centralised proceedings.
- The EPO could provide better information to help SMEs understand the complexities of the situation they face with case studies or model examples.
- Patent know-how, economic know-how and finance know-how are not combined at the moment. The EPO has an opportunity to establish a consultancy in this area.
- The EPO could sponsor the set-up of liquid markets in IP.
- The EPO and national patent offices need to encourage IP owners to engage with the general public and the European Parliament to persuade them of the case for IP.
- Community patent is currently delayed by too many costly translations. These should be reduced. Community patent will be a failure if it is too expensive.

V. **CONCLUSION**

The hearings were well received by the respective audiences, and the topics addressed in the key notes and workshops considered relevant by the participants, as the lively discussions and results prove. The possibility to voice thoughts and concerns in public forum was positively acknowledged and appreciated by the participants.

Despite the short notice at which the hearings were arranged, response to the invitations was lively. In the case of the Prague hearing, well beyond the expectations of the Office such that registration had to be closed before deadline in order to avoid exceeding the capacity of the conference room.

The chosen formats also met the needs of the participants. Joint organisational efforts by the Czech Industrial Property Office and the EPO as well as the offer of one day of free information and consultancy in patent matters turned out to be an attractive formula for the SMEs. Feedback from participants and speakers confirmed the substantial interest innovative SMEs have in IP-related matters, which is also exemplified by the support given by UEAPME in the form of conference speakers and information dissemination among its member organisations. The formula adopted could well serve as a model for similar events in the future.

The conferences in Prague and Munich produced clear evidence that both user groups involved are active in global markets and therefore have a predominantly global perspective of the intellectual property protection system. This is also strongly expressed by the frequent reference to other protection systems in the workshops, such as the US and Japanese systems. In the perspective of SMEs the European patent system serves as an enabling factor for their global operations. Hence that group's strong emphasis on the need to have a consistent European granting procedure, and the mention of a need for a litigation system comparable to that of the US.

The hearing in The Hague, which was strongly supported by the Deutsche Bundesbank and the European Venture Capital Association, gave a clear indication of the growing interest the finance sector is developing for the patent system. The Basel II Agreement has placed IP rights in the context of risk management techniques to be used by banks. Procedures for the financial evaluation of intellectual capital also testify to increasing business activities of the finance sector players in the field of IP rights. Aspects such as the structure and quality of the applied patent grant procedure, as well as the legal certainty it produces for all parties involved, are of importance in this context, too. Perspectives adopted by finance experts are congruent with those expressed by the SMEs and the representatives of industry and the patent profession.

Finally, and most critical for innovative start-up companies, venture capitalists will almost never offer seed, or pre-financing, money without an IP portfolio.

ANNEX 1 THE SPEAKERS AT THE THREE HEARINGS

Prague, 25 October 2004:

BASF AG,
Chairman of UNICE's working group
"Patents"
Member of the Board,
Chamber of Patent Attorneys, Munich
Entrepreneur, Member of UEAPME
CEO, t-blade GmbH, Villingen (D)
European Patent Attorney
European Patent Attorney
eBusiness and ICT Project Leader,
NORM APME / UEPAME
Judge, Patents County Court
for England and Wales
Manager Partner, Triangle Venture Capital
Group

Klaus-Dieter Langfinger,

Uwe Dreiss

Richard Simmons
Mathias Kunz
Gabriele Gislon
Gwilym Roberts
Freek Posthumus

Michael Fysh

Bernd Geiger

Munich, 2 November 2004

Vice-Chairman, working group "Patents",
UNICE
President, epi
Advisor to the Vice-President IP, Air Liquide
European Patent Attorney
President, AIPPI
Lawyer, TaylorWessing, Munich
Co-Chair, LESI European Committee
Co-Chair, LESI European Committee

Jan Galama

Walter Holzer
Jacques Combeau
Heinz Bardehle
Örjan Grundén
Sabine Rojahn
Allen Norris
Jean-Christophe Troussel

The Hague, 4 November 2004

Senior researcher,
ifo Institute for Economic Research
Editor, Intellectual Asset Management
magazine
Banking and Financial Supervision
Department,
Deutsche Bundesbank

Hans Schedl

Joff Wild

Jochen Flach

Partner, KPMG Germany
Director Sales, Knowledge One Group/
IP Bewertungs AG
PricewaterhouseCoopers, Global
Competence Center for Intellectual Asset
Management
Triangle Venture Capital Group; EVCA

Klaus Ott
Guido von Scheffer

Holger Hinmmel

Malte Köllner

ANNEX 2 LIST OF PARTICIPATING ENTERPRISES AT THE HEARINGS

Company / Institution	Country
3M ESPE AG	DE
ABEIL SA	FR
Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic	CZ
AGFA-GEVAERT N.H.	BE
AIRC / FOCWA	NL
Alcatel SEL AG	DE
ALIACHEM A.S.	CZ
ASEKO	CZ
Association of Innovative Entrepreneurship of the Czech Republic	CZ
Association of Research Organizations (AVO)	CZ
AstraZeneca	SE
AWAPATENT AB	SE
Bavarian State Research Center for Agriculture/Institute for Plant Branding	DE
Beiersdorf AG	DE
Berggren Oy Ab	FI
Bochemie s.r.o.	CZ
Boehringer Ingelheim GmbH	DE
Bracco Imaging SpA	IT
British Embassy in Prague	CZ
Brno University of Technology	CZ
C.N.A. National Confederation of Italian SMEs and Craft	IT
Capital Partners Consulting a.s.	SLO
Capital Partners Group, a.s.	SL
Cepat AB	SE
Čermák Hořejš Mysbil a spol.	CZ
Ceska asociace telekomunikaci	CZ
Česká rafinérská, a.s.	CZ
ČESKÝ TELECOM, a.s.	CZ
Chemcon	CZ

Customs Directorate Hradec Králové	CZ
Czech Academy of Science (diverse Instituts)	CZ
Czech Technical University in Prague	CZ
Czech Tecnological Center of Inorganic Pigments a.s.	CZ
Dansk Industri/Confederation of Danish Industries	DK
Deutsche Bank Research - Macro Trends	DE
Domainfactory GmbH	DE
Ericsson GmbH, Eurolab R&D, Patent Unit Core Networks	DE
Farmak, a.s.,	CZ
Fédération Bancaire de l' Union Européene / European Banking Federation	BE
Financial Arbiter of the Czech Republic	CZ
Foretagarna	SE
France Biotech	FR
FREQUENTIS GmbH	AT
Gimac di Maccagnan Giorgio / Mac.Gi S.r.l.	IT
GlaxoSmithKline PLC	UK /IT
HMT Hight Medical Technologies AG	CH
Huber & Schüssler	DE
ICT Prague	CZ
ifo Institute for Economic Research	DE
International Chamber of Commerce (CZ)	CZ
Intellectual Property Assets Strategic management	CZ
INVENTA s.r.o	CZ
IP Bewertungs AG	DE
IPC Intellectual Property Consultants	DE
IVAX Pharmaceuticals s.r.o.	CZ
Komerčni banka, a.s.	CZ
Linde AG	DE
Linklaters De Bandt	BE
MAGNA STEYR Fahrzeugtechnik	AT
Masarykova universita v. Brně	CZ

MICROSOFT	CZ
Ministry of Industry and Trade	CZ
MOST Coal Company	CZ
Nokia Corporation	FI
NOVA LUMIERE	FR
Novartis International AG	CH
Nuclear research Institute Řež plc	CZ
NV Procter and Gamble Services Company SA	BE
OEZ s.r.o	CZ
OFICINA PONTI	ES
Okresní hospodářská komora Příbram	CZ
Open Source Risk Management	NL
Patent and License Services of the ASCR	CZ
Pfizer Limited	UK
PIMEC	ES
Plesner	DK
PLIVA-Lachema a.s.	CZ
PRN Ventures	CZ
Procter & Gamble Technical Centres Ltd.	UK
PYROCOM	CZ
RAVAK a.s.	CZ
REDA Tech., s.r.o	SL
SEDERMA SAS	FR
Seling	EST
Singing Rock s.r.o.	CZ
Swissbody	FR
Syngenta	CH
T-CZ, a.s.	CZ
Thales	FR
TOTAL FRANCE	FR
Total Petrochemicals Research Feluy	BE
Tributum Company s.r.o	CZ

TTS (Thinfilm Technological service) s.r.o	CZ
UNICE	BE
UNIPETROL a.s.	CZ
University of Maastricht	NL
University of Public Administration and International of Prague	CZ
Vereenigde	NL
Webasto AG	DE
Zacco Denmark A/S	DK
Zentiva a.s.	CZ

There were also representatives from major patent attorney partnerships as well as a larger number of small enterprises present.