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Regulations and legal instruments for innovation: four key dimensions

- Research contracting & consulting
- Intellectual property ownership & licensing
- regulations and legal instruments for innovation
- Spin-offs
- Mobility of researchers in HEIs & PRIs

Not yet included in the current version of the questionnaire
Topic 4. Research contracting and consulting

Topic 5. Intellectual property

Topic 6. Spin-offs
Figure 4.1. Allocation of revenues from research contracting and consulting at HEIs: Is the decision taken at the national or at the HEI level?

(Percentage share of 14 OECD countries)

Note: This figure corresponds to question 5.1.A. Information on Estonia is not yet available.

Interpretation of the figure: Six of the 14 OECD countries included in the figure (i.e. 43% of them) have national provisions establishing the allocation of earnings from research contracting and consulting services at HEIs, while in the other 8 the allocation of revenues is decided at HEI level.
Figure 4.2. OECD-6 countries with national revenue sharing schemes for earnings stemming from research contracting and consulting at HEIs

(Share of earnings from research contracting and consulting services at HEIs allocated to researchers, research units and HEIs)

- **Note**: 9 out of the 15 countries analysed so far do not have national revenue sharing schemes: CZE, EST, FRA, IRL, JPN, PRT, CHE, GBR, USA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Research unit / laboratory within HEI</th>
<th>HEI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>50%-100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%-50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note**: This figure corresponds to question 5.1.A.

**Interpretation of the figure**: In Austria, researchers earn 35% of revenues stemming from research contracting and consulting services provided at HEIs, and HEIs earn 65% of revenues.
Figure 4.3. Do government agencies provide standards and guidelines on open access to research results from public-private partnerships?

(Percentage share of 14 OECD countries with guidelines and standards on open access)

Note: This figure corresponds to question 5.4. Information for France is not yet available.

Interpretation of the figure: In 71% of 14 OECD countries included in the figure, government agencies provide guidelines on open access to research results from public-private partnerships.
Topic 4. Research contracting and consulting

Topic 5. Intellectual property

Topic 6. Spin-offs
Figure 5.1. Allocation of revenues from IP created from publicly funded research at HEIs: at what level is the allocation of revenues decided across OECD-15 countries?

(Percentage share of OECD-15 countries with national revenue sharing schemes and with schemes set at HEI level)

Note: This figure corresponds to question 6.1.A.

Interpretation of the figure: Six out of OECD-15 countries (i.e. 40% of them) have national provisions establishing the allocation of earnings from IP created from publicly funded research, while in the other 9 the allocation of revenues is decided at HEI level.
Figure 5.2. OECD-15 countries with national revenue sharing schemes for earnings stemming from IP created at HEIs

(Share of earnings from IP created at HEIs allocated to researchers, research units and HEIs)

Note: 8 out of the 15 countries analysed so far do not have national revenue sharing schemes: CZE, EST, FIN, IRL, JPN, PRT, CHE, GBR, USA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Research unit / laboratory within HEI</th>
<th>HEI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%-50%</td>
<td>0%-50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>50%-100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%-50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This figure corresponds to question 6.1.A.
Interpretation of the figure: In Austria, researchers earn 35% of revenues stemming from IP created from publicly funded research at HEIs, and HEIs earn 65% of revenues.
Figure 5.3. Do government agencies provide standards and guidelines for licensing of IP?

(Percentage share of OECD-15 countries with guidelines and standards for licensing of IP)

Note: This figure corresponds to question 6.2.

Interpretation of the figure: In 47% of OECD-15 countries (i.e. 7 out of 15 countries), government agencies provide guidelines and standards for IP licensing.
Topic 4. Research contracting and consulting

Topic 5. Intellectual property

Topic 6. Spin-offs
Figure 6.1. The capacity of researchers at HEIs to take temporary leave to participate in spin-offs: At what level is it decided across OECD-15 countries?

Note: This figure corresponds to question 7.1. A. Austria is not included in the figure because decisions are the result of collective bargaining agreements.

Interpretation of the figure: 57% of OECD-15 countries (i.e. 8 out of 15) have national provisions regulating the capacity of public researchers at HEIs to take institutional leave to participate in spin-offs.
Some decisions regarding university-industry interactions are taken at HEI/PRI level in many countries (e.g. revenue sharing schemes)

Several questions capture more autonomy but say less about “flexibilities” for relations with industry

Capturing differences in national policy approaches to:

- Public researchers’ participation in spin-offs (“actual” contractual options and opportunities for researchers)
- Share of time public researchers can spend on contracting and consulting services for industry
- Conditions for mobility of public researchers (legal contexts are all always flexible)
1. Feedback on the research policy indicators developed so far

2. Are there other dimensions of national policies affecting industry-university linkages that could be explored?

3. What relevant indicators could be developed of national differences in researchers’ “actual” opportunities?