



المعهد القومي للملكية الفكرية
The National Institute of Intellectual Property
Helwan University, Egypt

المجلة العلمية للملكية الفكرية وإدارة الابتكار

دورية نصف سنوية محكمة يصدرها

المعهد القومي للملكية الفكرية

جامعة حلوان

العدد الرابع

يوليو ٢٠٢١

الهدف من المجلة:

تهدف المجلة العلمية للملكية الفكرية وإدارة الابتكار إلى نشر البحوث والدراسات النظرية والتطبيقية في مجال الملكية الفكرية بشقيها الصناعي والأدبي والفني وعلاقتها بإدارة الابتكار والتنمية المستدامة من كافة النواحي القانونية والاقتصادية والإدارية والعلمية والأدبية والفنية.

ضوابط عامة:

- تعبر كافة الدراسات والبحوث والمقالات عن رأى مؤلفيها ويأتي ترتيبها بالمجلة وفقا لإعتبارات فنية لا علاقة لها بالقيمة العلمية لأى منها.
- تنشر المقالات غير المحكمة (أوراق العمل) فى زاوية خاصة فى المجلة.
- تنشر المجلة مراجعات وعروض الكتب الجديدة والدوريات.
- تنشر المجلة التقارير والبحوث والدراسات الملقاه فى مؤتمرات ومنتديات علمية والنشاطات الأكاديمية فى مجال تخصصها دونما تحكيم فى أعداد خاصة من المجلة.
- يمكن الاقتباس من بعض مواد المجلة بشرط الاشارة إلى المصدر.
- تنشر المجلة الأوراق البحثية للطلاب المسجلين لدرجتى الماجستير والدكتوراه.
- تصدر المجلة محكمة ودورية نصف سنوية.

ألية النشر فى المجلة:

- تقبل المجلة كافة البحوث والدراسات التطبيقية والأكاديمية فى مجال حقوق الملكية الفكرية بكافة جوانبها القانونية والتقنية والاقتصادية والإدارية والاجتماعية والثقافية والفنية.
- تقبل البحوث باللغات (العربية والانجليزية والفرنسية).
- تنشر المجلة ملخصات الرسائل العلمية الجديدة، وتعامل معاملة أوراق العمل.
- يجب أن يلتزم الباحث بعدم إرسال بحثه إلى جهة أخرى حتى يأتيه رد المجلة.
- يجب أن يلتزم الباحث بإتباع الأسس العلمية السليمة فى بحثه.
- يجب أن يرسل الباحث بحثه إلى المجلة من ثلاثة نسخ مطبوعة، وملخص باللغة العربية أو الانجليزية أو الفرنسية، فى حدود ٨ - ١٢ سطر، ويجب أن تكون الرسوم البيانية والإيضاحية مطبوعة وواضحة، بالإضافة إلى نسخة إلكترونية Soft Copy، ونوع الخط Romanes Times New ١٤ للعربى، و١٢ للانجليزي على B5 (ورق نصف ثمانيات) على البريد الالكتروني: ymgad@niip.edi.eg
- ترسل البحوث إلى محكمين متخصصين وتحكم بسرية تامة.
- فى حالة قبول البحث للنشر، يلتزم الباحث بتعديله ليتناسب مع مقترحات المحكمين، وأسلوب النشر بالمجلة.

مجلس إدارة تحرير المجلة	
أستاذ الاقتصاد والملكية الفكرية وعميد المعهد القومي للملكية الفكرية (بالتكليف) - رئيس تحرير المجلة	أ.د. ياسر محمد جاد الله محمود
أستاذ القانون الدولي الخاص بكلية الحقوق بجامعة حلوان والمستشار العلمي للمعهد - عضو مجلس إدارة تحرير المجلة	أ.د. أحمد عبد الكريم سلامة
سكرتير تحرير المجلة	أ.د. وكيل المعهد للدراسات العليا والبحوث
أستاذ الهندسة الانشائية بكلية الهندسة بالمطرية بجامعة حلوان - عضو مجلس إدارة تحرير المجلة	أ.د. جلال عبد الحميد عبد اللاه
أستاذ علوم الأطعمة بكلية الاقتصاد المنزلي بجامعة حلوان - عضو مجلس إدارة تحرير المجلة	أ.د. هناء محمد الحسيني
مدير إدارة الملكية الفكرية والتنافسية بجامعة الدول العربية - عضو مجلس إدارة تحرير المجلة	أ.د. وزير مفوض / مها بخيت محمد زكي
رئيس مجلس إدارة جمعية الامارات للملكية الفكرية - عضو مجلس إدارة تحرير المجلة	اللواء أ.د. عبد القدوس عبد الرزاق العبيدلي
أستاذ القانون المدنى بجامعة جوته فرانكفورت أم ماين - ألمانيا - عضو مجلس إدارة تحرير المجلة	Prof Dr. Alexander Peukert
أستاذ القانون التجارى بجامعة نيو كاسل - بريطانيا - عضو مجلس إدارة تحرير المجلة	Prof Dr. Andrew Griffiths

المراسلات

ترسل البحوث إلى رئيس تحرير المجلة العلمية للملكية الفكرية وإدارة الابتكار بجامعة حلوان
جامعة حلوان - ٤ شارع كمال الدين صلاح - أمام السفارة الأمريكية بالقاهرة - جاردن سيتي

ص.ب: ١١٤٦١ جاردن سيتي

ت: ٢٠٢ ٢٥٤٨١٠٥٠ + محمول: ٢٠١٠٠٠٣٠٥٤٨ + ف: ٢٠٢ ٢٧٩٤٩٢٣٠ +

<http://www.helwan.edu.eg/niip/>

ymgad@niip.edu.eg

Intellectual Property policies in European universities

Marwan Abd El Raouf Eldaba'a

Intellectual Property policies in European universities Marwan Abd El Raouf

Introduction:

Universities are IP generator by nature. With active role of universities in researching and R&D, the importance of having IP policy to regulate the relation between many parties is needed; specially when we live in Corona virus era, where some universities are doing all what they can to provide the world with vaccine to save the human nature from this pandemic.

May this pandemic helped IP researcher to value more the role of universities in IP world and made it an important topic to define the main rules of any IP policy for university. However, it may accurate to raise the question about why universities need IP polices when they normally are for public servant by nature?

And the answer became logical nowadays which the fact of IP plays an essential role in both the research and teaching functions of universities and Public research institutions (PRIs). This includes IP created by universities/PRIs and also third-party IP that they use in their work. such as print publications, theses, software, films, sound recordings, computer presentations and multimedia works. These are generally protected by copyright. The Internet and modern technologies have fostered greater access to scholarly materials, but also prompted greater conflicts over their ownership and use. So, universities and PRIs need suitable IP policies to deal with the ownership and management of teaching materials, access to scholarly information and use of third-party materials.

Finally, Universities have a business model to follow and IP has an effective role to play in this model this role may contain three main points which:

a) Maintaining freedom to operate: Much of the IP generated by universities supports their own research and teaching, and therefore universities must ensure that they protect their own freedom to operate. For example, policies are needed to manage the IP in teaching materials in order to ensure continuity following departure of an academic, or to ensure that a researcher can publish his research following any research contract to ensure future access to the work being undertaken.

b) Translating knowledge with immediate application: Universities accumulate and integrate state of the art knowledge in the fields in which they operate and then transfer this knowledge, for example through teaching, providing continuing professional development and research. The effective protection of any proprietary teaching models and materials and research results needs to be considered in order to support the most effective transfer of such knowledge.

Knowledge without knowledge transfer is of no value to organizations established with a good public motive.

c) Creating and managing new knowledge: The vast majority of a university's output directly into the public domain by publication in journals or by free dissemination. The ability of researchers to publish must be preserved, but industrial contracts and IP protection need to be considered, for example by educating researchers on the necessity to file a patent application before publishing, or by allowing industrial partners to request delays in publication in order to accommodate patent filing. IP related activities may generate a small, but welcomed, proportion of a university's revenue, but can have a wider economic impact by enabling new knowledge to create new jobs and deliver innovation to the economy.

Study importance:

The value which came from academic work of universities is

worth to regulate with policies and rules may determine the right of these institutions and employee and third party, to build a bridge between science and industry which is “commercialization of IP assets”, So to its necessary to define those polices and discuss them to define the best possible way to protect researcher rights and to take a step toward commercialization.

The methodology of the study:

Analytical method will be used in to discuss the different area of each policy which the research may contain, the comparative method will be used also to compare between WIPO and European Union guideline the related area of the study.

Determination and limitation of the study:

The study focused on IPR policies specially the copyright provisions of universities and public research institutions with regarding to WIPO and European Union assistance by providing guidelines and templates

Study objectives:

- Discuss the IPR Policies guidelines from different perspectives
 - WIPO guideline for IPR policies of Universities
 - European Union Commission recommendations
 - United Kingdom's intellectual property office (UKIPO) recommendations.

Chapter one

WIPO model of IP policy for University and Research Institutions

WIPO published a model of IP policy for universities Prepared by the Department for Transition and Developed Countries, which contains the main provisions shall be included in any policy which (the scope of the policy, ownership of IPR, confidentiality, cooperation with third parties and commercialization). In addition, the main addition of this model is to suggest to a department for IPR Portfolio or transfer of technology desk, generally the model provides a wide range of protection for the researchers by making definitions wider as much as it could be to provide more protection to different cases; for example, the model defines the researcher as following:

- i) Persons employed by the Institute, including student employees and technical staff.
- ii) students, including graduate and postgraduate students of the Institute
- iii) Any persons, including visiting scientists who use the Institute resources and who perform any research task at the Institute or otherwise participate in any research project administered by the Institute, including those funded by external sponsors.

In addition, we can find the same intention to provide a wide range of protection in definitions of IPR, Copyright work, Intellectual Property, and the research agreement, the model tries to include every sense of protected work to the range of protection.

Policy scope:

WIPO recommend having a legal relationship with the researcher by which the researcher is obligated to apply and follow this policy and the research agreement may take different types as Research Service Agreement, Cooperative Research and Development Agreement, Material Transfer Agreement, Confidentiality Agreement, Consultancy Agreement and any Other type of agreement concerning research pursued by the researchers, all of them are qualified to be considered as research agreement and be governed by this policy.

The model recommend that the policy is concerned with IPR created after or on the time of the policy is effective not before that, and applied on agreements concluded after effectiveness date of the policy not before that weather a research agreement or cooperation agreement with third party.

Ownership of the IPR:

The policy made a different scenario to regulate IPR (Industrial Property) and copyright ownership. IPR ownership determined by the relation between the researcher and the institution and if researchers used the institution equipment's or not and, in most cases, rights return to institutions:

- Employee of the institution: IPR will returned to the institution in case the research made according to the role of the researcher in the institution or made by using institution materials and tools, and in case of sponsorship with any third party IPR returned to the institution then redistributed according the sponsorship agreement between parties

- Visiting researcher from other institution: mainly this governs by the agreement between both institutions, to determinate shares of each institution in project however in absence of mentioned agreement the rights belong to visitor's institution unless there is any effect on visited institution rights.

- Free visitors' researcher and student employees are trading as employee related to the policy

- Student will be granted ownership over IPR created during courses unless they entered into studentship or sponsorship then IPR returned to the institution to be redistributed according mentioned agreement, in case of significant use of Institute Resources in connection with research activity, student will be deemed to have agreed to transfer the IP Rights in such Intellectual Property to the institute as consideration for the use of institute resources.

However, the rule in copyrighted work that it belongs to the owner and the exception is when the work is a part of sponsored project by the institution and made for that sole purpose.

Confidentiality and conflict of interests:

The policy made an obligation on researcher to keep all information related to them work in institution which may affect the institution present or future financial position as secret under business confidentiality agreement.

The researcher shall sign NDA and conflict of interest agreements with any third party they enter with in relation may affect the confidentiality of institution information, and they shall include the institution policy in this agreement.

Commercialization of IPR:

The Institute encourages its researchers to identify research results with potential commercialization value and which may enhance the reputation of the Institute through bringing them to public use and benefit, the Institute is responsible for the protection and commercialization of the Institute's Intellectual Property-by the designated department as responsible for commercialization strategies

and follow up with researchers- the Inventor(s). However, shall be consulted in each phase of the procedure, institution to do so the researchers have obligation to present in writing the draft publications containing scientific results to the relevant Head of Department before publishing them, and shall state in writing that, to the best of their knowledge. However, this obligation of disclose and write a draft of publication is related to IPR (industrial property) since the copyrighted work is excluded from that.

Accordingly, WIPO define the main issues, which shall be discussed in each policy to cover all basic elements of intellectual property protection in research institutions. These main points may be summarized as following:

1. Set as many options as possible for the administration to have contractual agreements for knowledge transfer process with the inventors, more over types of agreements the management have more over the flexibility and securing both side rights will be accomplished.
2. The Policy shall include ownership rules for the creation to support the different types of Agreement the institution has.
3. The policy shall discuss the confidentiality issue and conflict of interest issue, by defining the approved and prohibited disclosures, in addition to defining the types of relations, which may revoke the rules, the key factor in this issue is the NDA, which shall be signed collectively with the policy or separately to define the previous mentioned issues.
4. Last core factor in WIPO recommendation is the commercialization rules which responsible to define the financial relation and benefits between the researcher and the institution.

Finally, the model considered as milestone for each institution to start with in the process of building its own policy. However, this model neglect two major points shall be discussed to complete the vision, the IPMO (intellectual property management office) role as the administrative body which shall be responsible for handling all IP

issues into the institution. More over the WIPO recommendations did not discuss the internal dispute resolution alternative.

Chapter Two

European Commission on the management of intellectual property in knowledge transfer activities and Code of Practice for universities and other public research organizations

This document published by European Research Area, it started with a message from the Commissioner for Enterprise and Industry” European universities and public research organizations are the world’s largest producers of scientific output, but Europe does not yet lead the world in the exploitation of knowledge the effective management of intellectual property (IP) generated through publicly funded research is essential to an effective exploitation of the research results. Making use throughout Europe of a coherent set of guidelines such as those contained in this Recommendation and Code of Practice can improve IP management between researchers and the private sector (including SMEs); reduce discrepancies between different national regulatory frameworks, policies and practices; and enhance the dissemination of knowledge throughout Europe”

The document contains two main points:

- European Commission recommendation and Council resolutions on IP management and code of practice for universities.
- Guideline for implementation of code of practices to build an IP policy in universities and PRIs generally.

Commission recommendation on IP management and code of practice for universities and the code of practices.

This recommendation for European states to consider it when

adopting IP policy in public research institution (PRI)

- 1) Setting transfer of technology as strategic goal.
- 2) Encourage public research organizations to establish and publicize IP management policies.
- 3) Support the development of knowledge transfer capacity and skills in PRIs.
- 4) encourage open access to research results, while enabling, where appropriate, the related intellectual property to be protected.
- 5) improve the coherence of their respective ownership regimes as regards intellectual property rights.
- 6) Ensure equitable and fair treatment.
- 7) Designate a national contact point, the tasks of which should include the coordination of measures regarding knowledge transfer.

Guidance for the implementation of the Code of Practice:

Effective management of intellectual property requires the establishment of internal policies to ensure an adequate handling of the results of research. Internal policies should cover questions such as the following and to provide answers:

- How can intellectual property be identified at an early stage?
- When and how should the IP be exploited and/or protected and/or disseminated?
- Who is the owner of new knowledge in different situations? (including in respect of non-employees such as Ph.D. or other students, or regarding software, publications, ...)
- How can I raise awareness among staff and students regarding IP issues in line with the publication/dissemination policy of the PRO?

- What incentives can be provided to ensure the implementation of IP policy?

Unlike WIPO recommendations which provide a clear and nearly complete model for IP policy to the institution, the European Commission only provide the institution with the key points to start with and to define the priorities of each policy as general recommendation could apply for almost each institution. So its fair to said that the European Commission give the National Intellectual Property Offices the freedom to design the policies without providing any types of models, only defining the priorities and asking the right questions.

This guideline and recommendations lead to national IP policies and national guidelines for IP polices for university and the most established guideline is UK Intellectual Property assets management for universities published by British Intellectual Property office.

Chapter Three

UK guideline of Intellectual Property assets management for universities

This guideline is published by Intellectual property office of UK with assistance by many other institutions, according to this guideline and with consider to the previous mentioned guidelines the main role of IP in universities can be summarized by the following:

- 1- Giving the institution freedom to operate, as teaching material is necessary to operate the institution so having IP policy can protect these assets means having a freedom to operate
- 2- Considered protection means continuing of transfer of knowledge by which the institutions have the main role to transfer the knowledge throw teaching, training and professional researches, Knowledge

without knowledge transfer is of no value to organizations established with a good public motive.

3- Creating and managing new knowledge, by generating a small but welcomed proportion of a revenue, which make the institution capable for generating more and more knowledge.

This document provide tips and guideline for policy makers started with thinking of IP and how it is important to the university business model and having a business model for the institution first thus the first step in setting up a system for the management of IP within a higher education context is to recognize how IP fits within the specific institutional business model, IP in a broad sense touches on practically all of the revenue streams open to them, and all the missions they pursue. What is often less clear cut is which IP strategy will best capture value for the institution as an organization, and some IP strategies will pull in opposite directions.

Regarding to drafting, the document advice policy maker to take into account the size of the university and to avoid many different details mainly to make it specific policy as one size policy will not be fit for the difference other university and regarding to employee relation the policy should provide clear rules for staff and students, particularly regarding disclosure and confidentiality and ownership. The policy should also provide incentives to promote compliance and implementation of the IP policies. Students sign up to university regulations and these regulations need to be aligned with the IP policy and need to express the position clearly and unequivocally.

The UK intellectual Property recommend to have a customized policy to fit each university with different circumstances to tackle following points:

1. Having clear guideline for both student and the staff, the situation

differs from student to staff and the policy shall consider both sides regarding ownerships, rights and obligations of both the researchers and the institutions and the collaboration with third parties , the policy should provide clear rules for staff and students, particularly regarding disclosure and confidentiality and ownership, as mentioned the legal position is differs from student to university staff specially in ownership issue.

- Staff ownership: as mentioned in WIPO model, institutions claim ownerships over IP generated from institutions employees unless parties of employment contact agreed on the opposed which often to happened in copyrighted work.

- Student ownership: As a rule institutions shall not claims IP ownerships claims over IP generated by students, however the situation may seem more complex than it appears from first look due to the agreements for funding or scholarships which students may have and give the university rights, shall be specified clearly by those agreements, in addition to having students in different stages from undergraduates , graduates, post-graduates, doctoral researcher, so it is common to distinguish between undergraduate and post-graduate students and, in turn research-based and non-research based post-graduates. Furthermore, student ownership of IP can be perceived as a particular problem in research projects sponsored by industry. For this reason, it is common for research and CASE studentships to be subject to a three-way contract that assigns ownership to one party

2. Conflict of interest polices with consider to IP is one of main element to have well established policy to decrease any chance for injustice or corruption, so to make it clear for every party each individual involves in the process shall sign conflict of interest disclaimer attached to the IP policy and contacts were signed, for example potential investors in a spin-out company may be associated with activities that the institution would consider harmful to its

reputation. It is important that any references to these conflict and ethical issues in an IP policy are completely aligned with an institution's guidelines and rules for such matters and references/links made to the relevant conflict and ethical policies, where such matters need to be clearly addressed.

3. Compensation and revenue sharing as the financial element is the most important element in the process due to the effect of this element over policy makers decisions so it's clearly important to have a clear terms for distribution of revenue between researchers and the institutions and the UK Intellectual property office has provided templates for revenue distribution in the annex of IP management report, and its important when drafting a policy in relation to exploitation it is useful to be aware of the benefits and disadvantages of licensing or spin-out, in order to have an idea of which form of exploitation is most suitable for the IP or technology surrounding it. Access to knowledge transfer services should be available in order to provide legal, commercial and financial advice for IP protection and enforcement.

The UK model is the most mature model from the previous discussed models as it contains all main point that each institution may need to build IP policy, as this model covers the discussed points in WIPO model from Ownership, scope of protection to commercialization issue and applied the general advices from the European Commission.

In addition; the UKIPO provide a checklist for reviewing IP policy in universities providing the main point shall be included in the institution's policy as follows:

1. Guidance for staff and students
2. Staff IP ownership
3. Updating of employment contract
4. Student IP ownership
5. Ethical considerations Conflict of interest
6. Benefits & revenue sharing
7. Awareness and communication
8. Monitoring policies

Chapter Four

Examples of Intellectual Property Polices for European Universities

Oxford University:

Oxford was one of the first UK universities to develop an intellectual property (IP) policy to govern the ownership and exploitation of IP generated not only by its staff, but also by students in the course of their studies.

Oxford's approach to exploitation of IP includes a generous revenue-sharing policy, which brings significant personal benefits to researchers, and a hugely successful and well-resourced technology transfer operation, Oxford University Innovation. Oxford University Innovation works with University researchers on identifying, protecting and marketing technologies through licensing, spin-out company formation, consulting and material sales.

Oxford designated part B from Statute XVI to regulate the policy of IP thus Part A regulating University property and both of Part C and Part D regulating authority to bind the University and Trusts issue.

Statute XVI

Property, Contracts, and Trusts; A Part of the University of Oxford's Statutes

1. The University claims ownership of all intellectual property specified in section 6 of this statute which is devised, made, or created:
 - a) by persons employed by the University in the course of their employment;
 - b) by student members only in the circumstances specified in subsection(3) below;
 - c) by other persons engaged in study or research in the University

who, as a condition of their being granted access to the University's premises or facilities, have agreed in writing that this Part shall apply to them; and

- d) by persons engaged by the University under contracts for services during the course of or incidentally to that engagement.

2. The University's rights under sub-section (1) above in relation to any particular piece of intellectual property may be waived or modified by agreement in writing with the person concerned.

3. The University does not claim ownership of any intellectual property which is devised, made, or created by University student members, unless that intellectual property was devised, made or created:

a- jointly with anyone else subject to section 5 of this Part of Statute XVI;

b- using University facilities or equipment (unless the terms of access for the facility or equipment provide otherwise);

c- in circumstances where that intellectual property is subject to obligations (including obligations imposed by contracts or grants) that the University owes to a third party;

d- using funding received from the University (unless the terms of that funding provide otherwise); or

e- in the circumstances specified in Section 5(1)(a), (c) or (d) of this Part of Statute XVI.

6- The intellectual property of which ownership is claimed under section 5 (1) of this statute comprises:

a. works generated by computer hardware or software owned or operated by the University;

b. works created with the aid of university facilities including (by way of example only) films, videos, photographs, multimedia works, typographic arrangements, and field and laboratory notebooks;

c. patentable and non-patentable inventions;

- d. registered and unregistered designs, plant varieties, and topographies;
- e. university-commissioned works not within (1), (2), (3), or (4);
- f. databases, computer software, firmware, courseware, and related material not within (1), (2), (3), (4), or (5), but only if they may reasonably be considered to possess commercial potential.

7. know-how and information associated with the above The University will not assert any claim to the ownership of copyright in:

- 1. artistic works not listed in sub-section (2) of section 6 of this statute, books, articles, plays, lyrics, scores, or lectures, apart from those specifically commissioned by the University;*
- 2. audio or visual aids to the giving of lectures;*
- 3. student theses, exercises and answers to tests and examinations save to the extent that they contain intellectual property claimed by the University under subsection (6) of section 6 of this statute; or*
- 4. computer-related works other than those specified in section 6 of this statute.*

8. For the purpose of sections 6 and 7 of this statute, 'commissioned works' are works which the University has specifically employed or requested the person concerned to produce, whether in return for special payment or not. 'Commissioned works explicitly exclude (i) lectures delivered by University Lecturers, Departmental Lecturers and the holders of University Chairs in fulfillment of obligations in their contracts of employment and (ii) works commissioned by the University Press in the course of its publishing business (save as may be separately agreed between the University Press and the person concerned).

9. Council may make regulations:

1. defining the classes of persons or naming individuals to whom section 5 (1) (c) of this statute shall apply;

2. requiring student members and such other persons as may be specified in regulations to sign any documents necessary in order to give effect to the claim made by the University in this Part and to waive any rights in respect of the subject-matter of the claim which may be conferred on them by Chapter IV of Part 1 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988; and
3. Generally, for the purposes of this part.

Conclusion:

Finally, after discussing many resources for IP policies with different levels from international to regional to national and eventually an example from university of Oxford,

It would be appropriate to compare each model with all others model to define which model has the most accurate rules for IP policies, and after conduct such comparison its fair to say that each model of the previously mention has its way to provide a guideline for creating the policy.

But the WIPO model shall be considered the most completed model. As it has the key points for creating the policy in addition it provided with a template to be followed step by step and article by article to draft the policy and finally provided a separate guideline for customize the policy with many alternatives to make it suitable for different legal systems.

European Commission recommendation only draws the borderlines for the national offices to follow and provide the institutions with a full-details guideline to draft the policy which accurately drafted from UKIPO model and perfectly applied into Oxford University which previously discussed.

Finally, this research finds that the main key points to build a general guideline for Egyptian universities and institutions are the following:

1) **Defining the policy objectives and purposes clearly**, to facilitate the widespread use of, through various modalities of access to, the Institution is IPR. In addition to IP management by set the framework for the translation of the IP arising from the Institution's research into products, services and processes. It encourages inventors to become Creators and to identify IP with potential commercial value. It also establishes clear rules and procedures for the management and Commercialization of such IP generated at the Institution. The third purpose of the policy is to secure the balance of interests as the IP Policy seeks to ensure the legal protection where applicable; effective management and Commercialization of Institution's IP; while at the same time not impeding with the traditions of education and scholarship, academic freedom, open and timely publications, Institution sovereignty, and the Institution's mission serving the public interest.

2) **The Scope of the policy**, after studying different types and model of IP policies for institutions the most accurate scope to include all types of IP under the policy application over all inventors whether staff members or students or visitors with of course specific regulation for each type of inventors. Inveentors must declare any existing IP they wish to exclude from the application of this Policy due to creation prior to their employment, enrolment or at the Institution.

3) **The enforceability of the policy**, the policy is binding on the staff members, students and visitors and the administration shall apply that throw including the policy into all employment agreements and enrollment documents for all staff members and students to be considered and binding on them.

4) **Intellectual Property Management Office (IPMO)**, the purpose of that office is to assist the Institution in managing and commercializing its IP in a form that will most effectively promote its development and use for economic and social benefit. In addition, the main responsibilities of that office to create and increase awareness to Creators, technology marketing and IP contract negotiation, IP contract management, and IP costs and revenue distribution. In addition, each

task of these has many sub-tasks to follow and provide to complete the role of the office as the link between the inventions and the outside world including the institution administration and investors and potential investment opportunity.

5) Non- Disclosure and Publication rules, the policy shall support the right of creators to decide when to publish their research results but Where a Creator identifies potential IP resulting from the research shall disclose such potential IP to IPMO promptly. In addition creators should be aware that premature public disclosure without IPMO approval may result in loss of IP protection rights, such rule may achieve the balance between the inventors/creators and the institution rights.

6) Evaluation of research result rules, IPMO will analyze the results such analysis will include: whether or not the subject matter is protectable as IP; an assessment of economic viability or marketability; and determination of any rights of external parties, such as a funder or collaborator. After evaluation, IPMO will prepare a preliminary report with findings that enable the Institution to decide if it will proceed with IP protection and Commercialization. IPMO shall share the preliminary report with the Creator(s), and seek their input. The Institution shall decide whether it wishes to protect and/or commercialize the IP. IPMO shall notify the Creator(s) of the Institution's decision within reasonable period. IPMO shall also make a determination in relation to the validity of any claim made by a Staff Member, a Visitor or a Student that they are the true Creator(s) of that IP and in relation to their rights under this Policy. Transfer of Ownership. In the event the Institution decides not to pursue IP protection and/or Commercialization, it will take steps to return said IPRs to the Creator(s), contingent on any other superseding contract rights of external party (ies)/sponsor(s).

7) Commercialization of IP, in case the institution decided to protect the IP it shall determine with reasonable period the most appropriate Commercialization strategy. As commercialization is an important process both IPMO and the creator shall have a role to do in this process, from creator side all reasonable support in the assessment, protection (including preventing premature disclosure and execution of any documents including deeds of assignment and deeds attesting to creatorship) shall be needed. And it shall be noted that the Institution shall have the sole discretion regarding the Commercialization pathway

of IP owned by it to choose between any option for example not limited licensing, assignment, creating joint venture or non-profit use or donation . Notwithstanding, the Institution will ensure that reasonable efforts are made to keep the Creators informed and, where appropriate, involved in the Commercialization of the IP to which they contributed. The Commercialization of Institution IP will be planned, executed, and monitored by IPMO.

8) Dispute Resolution, any internal disputes or questions of interpretation arising under this Policy must be referred to IPMO for consideration and the policy shall decided the appeal methods from IPMO decisions and the other alternative methods for dispute resolution according to the law, such as the internal arbitration by state council judges or any other method may the law No 49 of 1972 for Egyptian University regulation.

This Part shall apply to all intellectual property devised, made, or created on or after 1 October 2000 and is subject to the provisions of the Patents Act 1977.

References

- European IP Management: Commission Recommendation on the management of intellectual property in knowledge transfer activities and Code of Practice for universities including public research organizations http://ec.europa.eu/invest-in-research/pdf/ip_recommendation_en.pdf
- Council Resolution on the management of intellectual property in knowledge transfer activities and Code of Practice for universities including public research organizations – “IP Charter Initiative” http://ec.europa.eu/invest-in-research/pdf/download_en/st10323_en08.pdf
- World Intellectual Property Organization: http://www.wipo.int/portal/en/resources_students.html
- [EN \(europa.eu\)](http://ec.europa.eu)
- www.ox.ac.uk