



LICENSING EXECUTIVES SOCIETY  
BRITAIN AND IRELAND

newsxchange™

The Newsletter of the Licensing Executives Society Britain and Ireland

Issue 139 January 2012

### Damage Limitation: Valuing the IP in Insolvency Cases

For those of us that are involved day to day with IP issues it is self-evident that IP underpins every aspect of a business. It may therefore be sometimes surprising to us that many organisations are still not protecting or maximising the value of their intangible assets. An area that is particularly neglected is IP in relation to bankruptcy or insolvency, that, unfortunately is all too common in these difficult times.

Insolvency practitioners need to have a good understanding of the value of the assets remaining in a company. Administrators or liquidators will need a complete and detailed list of all the assets in the business that they may have to dispose of it. Preserving these in advance of that is therefore vital. Having IP rights that could be sold on as part of these assets can help the company and its creditors in such a situation.

However, identifying the intangible assets may not be straightforward. For example, if a company facing insolvency co-owns IP rights with another company there can be tricky issues to resolve even with expert help. Few insolvency practitioners are experts in IP and may not understand the quality and value of the intangible assets being disposed of as part of a sale before or after insolvency, meaning that creditors may question the value realised unless the IP value issue is robustly dealt with. The buyer of a business in insolvency needs to know that they will be acquiring all the valuable IP available.

While intellectual property rights are normally viewed as assets, this might not in reality be so. There may be a requirement for ongoing registration and prosecution costs, perhaps in more than one jurisdiction, to retain the value of patents and trademarks. The organisation in administration might have contractual obligations for example to maintain a patent or trade mark according to an existing licence.

The IP issue needs to be considered at an early stage, as a great deal of the value often resides not just in the IP (patents, trademarks, designs, trade secrets and so on) but in the intellectual assets (know-how, processes), and intellectual capital (reputation, relationships and contracts). Once key employees leave, this knowledge may leave with them. If at all possible the business should be kept from insolvency if the hidden assets of the business need to be kept intact.

Dealing with this kind of scenario from an IP perspective can actually sometimes be a race against the clock, as IP rights can be lost or diluted if they are not taken care of in a timely manner - the rights could be lost forever.

Whatever the situation, there will be a need for due diligence to determine to what extent the intellectual property is actually owned or licensed by the insolvent company and whether it has value.

However, sometimes it is not possible to rescue a business and it is placed into administration. Whilst the business is no longer able to trade viably, it may still have intangible assets with material value; in some

cases, these may form the dominant component of value. This value needs to be recognised within the consideration for a trade or direct sale, in order to properly satisfy and safeguard the interests of creditors.

Such insolvency practitioners normally want to work with IP specialists who have expertise in valuing intangibles within insolvent businesses which is within the administrators' budget and can be delivered within the tight timescales often essential to concluding a fast and satisfactory sale of the assets. The approach should be based on recognised IP valuation methods and meet the standards required for dealing with businesses in administration.

There are many examples to demonstrate that IP can realise significant value in insolvency. Whether sold with the core business and assets or sold separately, those involved in the insolvency can work successfully with IP experts to design strategies that extract maximum value from these assets.

**Jackie Maguire, CEO**

*Coller IP*

[Further information about Coller IP](#)

\* \* \*

## President's Diary



The Society in Britain and Ireland has now instituted a new grade of membership, following the approval of a motion that was put to an Extraordinary General Meeting that was held on 1 December. The Society has created a corporate membership grade, which will allow companies to nominate and pay for membership for several staff; these staff members must be named, so the personal nature of the Society will not be lost.

Council recommended this development as a means of deepening the involvement of corporate professionals who are involved in business development, collaborative technology development, and licensing. One of the strengths of LES is that it brings together different professionals from different sectors – business development staff who negotiate transactions, patent attorneys and lawyers; the Society also brings together people from a varied and differing industrial sectors: fast-moving consumer goods, chemicals and life sciences, to name just three. This variety is a key strength of LES – it is not a lobby group, but rather a body that aims to create networking and professional development opportunities that will allow for the professional growth of individuals, and the consequent development of their business interests. The deepening of the industrial membership base will allow LES to serve better the interests of all members, by ensuring the retention of this unique and rich mixture. Importantly, Council has made no distinction between industrial and legal firms: the equal treatment for all professionals in our Society will be maintained.

Council consulted with several senior industrialists and lawyers before launching this initiative, and there was widespread support for such a membership grade. At present, LES B&I has one or two members in a number of firms, and several members in only a handful of firms; if the membership base can be extended so that many firms have several members, LES will be able to market its services and meetings to a wider audience, and to involve these individuals in the life of the society, to the benefit of all members.

Council now plans to revise the Society's publicity materials and to market actively this arrangement, in order to develop the corporate membership base. I am optimistic that this development will be important for

the growth of the Society, and I thank you for the support for this approach that was shown at the EGM, where the introduction of the new grade was approved by a unanimous vote.

I wish you a happy, successful and rewarding New Year.

Mark Wilson  
*President of LES B&I*

\* \* \*

## **Pubs against the Premier League: The European Court ruling on live Football Broadcasting rights**

### Background

Mrs Murphy is a pub owner who used decoder cards imported from Greece to show Premier League (PL) games. QC Leisure is a stockist and supplier of foreign decoders to pubs and the general public in the UK. Mrs Murphy was prosecuted by Media Protection Services Limited for the use of an “illicit” Greek decoder card. QC Leisure were sued for copyright infringement by the PL. In their defences Mrs Murphy and QC Leisure both raised important questions about the relationship between the EU principles of free movement of goods and services and highly lucrative European broadcasting rights. This led to a series of questions being referred to the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU) by the English courts.

Very briefly, Mrs Murphy and QC Leisure argued that the way in which the PL enters into its contracts with various broadcasters throughout the EU, among other things, infringed EU principles of free movement of goods and services and EU competition law. Specifically certain contractual provisions restrict the ability of:

- PL broadcasters to screen live pictures outside their own designated territory.
- Mrs Murphy or QC Leisure to either view, or purchase decoders to view, live PL matches from any source other than the exclusive national PL rights holding broadcaster (i.e. Sky and ESPN can only broadcast their exclusive pictures in their allotted UK territory).

The PL, in response, relied on a range of provisions in EU copyright and broadcasting law as well as CJEU precedent going back to the 1970s which supported, or appears to support, the notion of exclusive licensing in the context of broadcasting rights.

### The Recent Decision

On 4 October, the CJEU ruling was published. In what many saw as a blow to the PL, the CJEU found that restrictions on the import, use and sale of foreign decoder cards giving access to PL matches were contrary to the EU rules on freedom to provide services and competition.

There were two main facets of the decision.

1. The first was that the Court emphasised that the PL could not put an absolute block on sales between European Member State territories. The CJEU held that national law which prohibits the import, use or sale of foreign decoder cards was contrary to the fundamental EU freedom to provide services. This could not be justified by the objective either of protecting intellectual property rights or of encouraging the public to attend football stadiums. Therefore Mrs Murphy should be allowed to go to another Member State in order to get a decoder and a decoder card.
2. The CJEU did however make reference to a number of copyright issues. The sting in the tail for Mrs Murphy is that there appear to be unresolved issues to do with the copyright in the PL graphics, logos and the PL anthem. This may mean that publicans like Mrs Murphy would need to receive consent from the rights holder (i.e. the PL) to broadcast PL matches which come with the associated branded logos and graphics. As Mrs Murphy broadcasts those logos when showing the live games, one interpretation of the Court's ruling is that she would need further authorisation from the PL to show the pictures.

### The impact

The biggest impact of the ruling will undoubtedly be on the PL itself and its licensees such as Sky. The PL will not be able to prevent the free circulation across borders of decoder cards giving access to Premier League matches. This could lead to pan-EU licensing of the rights. The PL continue to argue that the copyright issues highlighted above will still prohibit publicans like Mrs Murphy broadcasting live PL football matches using her Greek subscription.

### Conclusion

The above implications are but speculation at present. This is because the answers that the European Court has given will now be interpreted in the High Court in coming to its final decision. From a practical perspective it may not be until the end of the current PL season that a decision is taken by the English courts. It means that rights holders, publicans and European consumers will have to wait a little longer to see who has ultimately won this match.

### **Daniel Geey, solicitor in the Sports Group**

*Field Fisher Waterhouse LLP*

\* \* \*

### **Snap Happy: What organisations can learn from the Braehead shopping centre photo scandal**

In times of rapidly advancing technology, cameras are ubiquitous. Chances are, as you are reading this article, you will have easy access to a camera on your person or at your desk thanks to the proliferation of smartphones and other convenient digital photography solutions.

However, the 'snap happy' culture which has led to instantly uploaded shots on facebook and flickr is coming under fire from authorities' response to threats of terrorism, protection of privacy and data protection concerns.

The recent incident where a father was the subject of intense questioning from police and security at Braehead shopping centre in Glasgow for taking a photo of his four year old daughter is a prime example of not only the power of social media to propel a story to the national news, but also of the public response to concerns of terrorism and security overriding a common sense approach to an innocent activity.

So, with the Christmas nativity season (nearly) upon us, and incidents such as that at Braehead, Glasgow receiving such widespread publicity, what are individuals rights when it comes to taking photos in public and how can organisations save themselves the embarrassment of a PR disaster?

### **Public Places**

In general, taking photos in public spaces is not prohibited in the UK. While some areas (such as royal parks) require special permits to take commercial photographs, snaps taken for personal use are perfectly acceptable and not subject to byelaws or the Data Protection Act.

There is a restriction on taking photos in public places such as roads, pavements and cycle paths where passage of traffic is being obstructed. However, the enforcement of such activities will depend on the attitude of the photographer and the authorities. A photographer who complies with officials will likely be told to move on and stop causing the obstruction.

### **Terrorism and Security**

The Official Secrets Act 1911 prohibits taking a photograph in a 'prohibited place' where this might be useful to the enemy. This could include nuclear power stations. Under the Terrorism Act 2000 (as amended), it is an offence to take (or possess) a photograph containing information likely to be useful to a person committing or likely to commit an act of terrorism.

The legal test for both these pieces of legislation is quite high, requiring that the photo must have been taken for the purpose of 'being useful to the enemy' and prejudice security. It should be borne in mind that the Terrorism Act (as amended) gives the police the power to stop and search any individual they suspect of being a terrorist, but they must have a basis for their suspicion. While officers have the power to view digital images under stop and search powers, they do not have the power to delete digital images or destroy film at any point during a search.

### **Public Buildings and Private Places**

Owners of private buildings such as shopping centres or football stadia can impose any conditions they see fit on entry, such as a restriction on taking photographs at, for example, football matches or concerts.

While private shopping centres such as Braehead can impose whatever restrictions they see fit on customers, a common sense approach to issues such as photography can avoid a well meaning security guard, perhaps over-zealously following protocol, from turning into a full blown PR crisis.

### **Common Sense Approach**

The issue of personal photographs of children for the family album is not new in provoking the ire of the press. Recently, the media reported on parents attending school nativity plays to be told by school representatives that photography was banned as it was "in breach of the Data Protection Act". This led to the UK Information Commissioner issuing guidance for organisations to adopt a common sense approach to taking photographs at such events. The approach taken by the UK Information Commissioner is a useful barometer for organisations in shaping such policies for its customers or clients while on its premises.

Where organisations do not have such a policy dealing with issues such as on-site photography to formalise its approach this, at best, can lead to confusion among staff and security should such a situation arise and, at worst, can lead to a full blown PR disaster such as that experienced by the owners of the Braehead Shopping Centre.

**David Gourlay and David Gallagher**  
*McClure Naismith LLP*

\* \* \*

## Meeting News...

**LES Scotland Meeting (1st November 2011, Harper Macleod)**  
“One Franchise, please! Do you want fries with that?”

The Licensing Executives Society (LES) November event was held at Harper Macleod’s office in Edinburgh and provided an excellent insight into the real world commercialities of franchising. The focus of the speakers was on the part which intellectual property assets (‘IP assets’) play within franchising and all the speakers were unanimous in agreeing that IP assets play a crucial role. The event was hosted by LES Scotland Committee member Chris Bartlett who welcomed the audience and the speakers.

**David Kaye and Michelle Graham. David Kaye is a Partner and Head of the Retail and Franchising department of the law firm Harper Macleod and Michelle is in the Business Advisory department who specialise in IP and technology matters.**

---

David set the scene by giving a brief overview of the development of the legal landscape relating to franchising including an insight into the legal documentation that you would expect to find in franchising today. The basic premise being that the franchisor in such an agreement retains ownership of the intellectual property and as the network of franchises grows, the value of the intellectual property and the brand grows accordingly with it.

Michelle took the audience into the nitty gritty of legal issues and gave a detailed account of the IP assets that most commonly exist in franchising agreements and gave some useful guidance on commonly occurring issues that should be dealt with. This included ensuring that goodwill accrued by a franchisee transferred to a franchisor and taking steps to ensure that a franchisee does not infringe the franchisor’s brand rights. There are many types of franchise and if the agreement only covers the trademark of the franchisor then there are obvious pitfalls regarding the other IP assets belonging to the franchisor as well as misuse of the trademarks.

**Euan Fraser. Euan who has been advising franchised businesses for many years founded AMO Consulting in 2000, a franchising consultancy advising clients throughout the UK and overseas.**

---

Euan gave a fascinating insight into the world of franchising and focussed on exploring the differing franchising models. Many in the audience were surprised about the pervasiveness of the franchising business model which is being used by the likes of Marks and Spencer, Ralph Lauren and Nike. Many of these brands are keen to make use of franchising which is, along with the growth of intellectual property exploitation, becoming ever more attractive as a business model.

Euan explained that in choosing the right model businesses/franchisors must think about a great many factors including: speed of access to market, control over service delivery, creating a profitable start point and importantly what is the “hook” that will draw in the best franchisees. This is usually IP – the knowledge of how the business works and why it is successful.

Euan used Ekko Glass Crush & Collect service (a glass crushing and recycling service), a company which has recently launched franchising opportunities, as an example of a company protecting a strong IP portfolio and encouraging businesses to replicate their business model.

**Suzie McCafferty – Platinum Wave Ltd offers international franchising support services. With Smart Cartridge Suzie also developed first hand experience of growing an international franchise business from the ground up. She also has experience in managing large corporate franchise operations.**

---

Suzie regaled the audience with her story of developing the Smart Cartridge franchise from scratch to a successful international brand with the company having more than 70 franchisees across six countries. From the humble beginnings of a single store in Haymarket, Edinburgh, she said that entering the world of franchising happened by chance when customers made enquiries as to whether franchise opportunities existed. From there Suzie and her business partner investigated the business franchise model and went on to successfully franchise Smart Cartridge including through international markets.

Suzie explained that potential franchisors, when contemplating a franchise agreement, must ensure they do the following: keep up to date with the latest trends, register the relevant IP such as trade marks to protect the brand. She also said that keeping a tight grip on franchise agreements, reviewing the business' supplier network regularly and streamlining IT systems and infrastructure were crucial in preparing for a potential franchise.

She then moved on to give her views on how to make a success of international franchising. Intensive market research is crucial, she said, to prepare for entry to such a difficult business model in an international environment. By making the model relevant to different markets the franchisor will be more likely to succeed in challenging conditions. Suzie went on to highlight the strengths of the franchising models including accelerated growth and increased brand awareness. It isn't all plain sailing, however, and there are many business challenges such as the initial outlay and recruiting the right partners.

Suzie ended her presentation with her top tips for success which included knowing your market and your competitors, seeking the correct professional advice, proving your concept to make sure your brand and business model will stand the test of time and not to underestimate the constant investment required to make the franchise a success.

**Thanks to Harper Macleod who hosted the event and provided fantastic hospitality.**

**Nat Baldwin**  
*Metis Partners*

\* \* \*

## **Members...**

### **Fundamental Intellectual Asset Management Course, South Africa**

Hayley French and Christi Mitchell were invited by Alan Lewis (LESI President) to help run the "Fundamental Intellectual Asset Management Course" in Montague, Western Cape, South Africa. Hayley and Christi presented most of LES 102 – Filing and Managing the IP Portfolio and LES 103 – The Deal, Valuation and Negotiation. We had a great group of students to teach, one had even made it all the way from Zimbabwe. Alan and Lesley Lewis made sure that we saw as much of South Africa as possible during our short stay and really looked after us.



*Christi Mitchell and Hayley French with  
LESI President Alan Lewis and Lesley Lewis*



*Unusual zebra crossing in  
Montague, Western Cape!*

## **New Members...**

Dr Andrew Sant, Crown Packaging UK Plc

**Interests Include:** Consumer goods, Metal Packaging

Mr Michael Knapper, Norton Rose LLP

**Interests Include:** Pharmaceutical, Consumer goods, Energy

Mr Tomas Gärdfors, Norton Rose LLP

**Interests Include:** Healthcare, Biotechnology, Pharmaceutical, Animal, Plant, Food Science

Mrs Elaine Anderson, New Opportunities

**Interests Include:** Biotechnology, Pharmaceutical, University

Ms Fay Owston, BT Plc

**Interests Include:** Telecommunications, Computer Software, The internet

Dr Jim Millen, Allergan

**Interests Include:** Biotechnology, Pharmaceutical

Miss Emma Beazley, Sony Europe Limited

**Interests Include:** Computer Hardware, Consumer Goods, Electronics, Internet,  
Telecommunications, Computer Software

Dr Adrian Dawkes, Pharmaventures

**Interests Include:** Healthcare, Biotechnology, Pharmaceutical

Mr Thomas Gaunt, Ablett & Stebbing

**Interests Include:** Environmental, Computer Hardware, Electronics

## A Whole New Ballgame

In 2007 as “retirement” approached I started to think about what would come next. I’m not one for the TV, slippers and a pipe, but neither could I see myself on world cruises and such like. In the final years of my time at the UK-IPO (and getting that name change realised a long-held desire of mine) I had increasingly become more involved in the political end of intellectual property; its relationship with innovation, economic growth, and development. Indeed, I had become active in the discussions at WIPO (World Intellectual Property Organisation) on the subject of the “Development Agenda”, had chaired the so called “Group B plus” (developed economies and all members of the EPO) and had written some pieces on this for the ICTSD (International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development). So, some requests to speak on this in India and elsewhere seemed to indicate that this is where I would plough my furrow for a while.

However, at this point something entirely unexpected happened. Michal Svantner of WIPO asked me whether I would like to work with him in his Division. Michal’s Division carries the unwieldy title of “The Division for Certain Countries in Europe and Asia” and covers countries of the former Soviet Union, the ex-communist states of Eastern Europe and the Baltic, the countries of former Yugoslavia, plus – for some reason Cyprus, Greece, Malta, Israel and Turkey. Michal and I had discussed IP issues many times and he seemed to like my approach. I said I was interested.

Since then I have had one of the most rewarding (though not financially!) times of my long career. Most of the countries in the Division are termed “countries with economies in transition”. In other words they are changing from state-controlled command economies to market driven economies based on private enterprise. To do so they need to build a new economic infrastructure, create business-minded citizens, encourage innovation, and introduce new ways of thinking into politics and the bureaucracy. A well functioning IP system is clearly an important component of this and in most of the countries needs to be built completely anew. Obviously those countries in the EU or the EPO have much less to do than the others.

Our sponsor!



In general countries have already been actively revising their laws so as to be TRIPS compliant, and EU compliant in some cases. In addition there has been considerable pressure on them to improve their enforcement capability. However, I saw little evidence of anyone helping them to develop institutions to facilitate innovation and growth in their own economies. What help there was seemed to be patchy and disconnected rather than strategic. I had said as much – rather loudly sometimes – and it was this that attracted Michal, who was in the process of creating a toolkit for assisting the countries in his Division. This can be found on the WIPO website at <http://www.wipo.int/dcea/en/tools/> where PDFs of the completed first version of the tools can be found. I have been involved in the preparation of three tools, the one on the management of Academic Intellectual Property, IP and Nation Branding, and the creation of an IP Strategy, the last of these being the main focus of my activities.

This has not been a desk job. It has involved lots of travel to countries some of which still have characteristics of soviet society; complex entry requirements, expensive visas, border guards who can appear quite intimidating, and some interesting ideas with regard to hotel facilities. In Central Asia I have worked in Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic, Belarus, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan, undertaking detailed work in Belarus and the Kyrgyz Republic. I have also worked in Serbia, Croatia, Republic of Macedonia, and Montenegro in relation to IP strategies.

So, what is involved? First there is a series of discussions with the IP Office and other government departments, including enforcement agencies, to understand the political and **economic** background and the priorities of the Government. That is followed by meetings with business representatives, Universities, and members of creative and cultural bodies to identify their needs and priorities. I have found this much more effective when the local IP Office feels a sense of ownership and is ambitious for change and modernisation, and so ideally I have benefited by working within a team as an advisor and coordinator, rather than as an author of the plan.

We then write up a strategy document which sets out priorities and objectives within the context of the national economic and political framework. Part of this document is an Action Plan which identifies what is to be done, who is to do it, when it is to be done, the nature of the deliverables, and estimated resources required. This is cross-checked with government and business.

The next step is to obtain a government decision to undertake the Action Plan and agree the necessary resources and project methodology. This is the stage when national political circumstances can cause delays depending on the stability of government, the relationships within coalitions, and other political objectives. The persuasive selling point of the strategy has to be recognised as delivering growth and wealth creation. Simply modernising the IP system is not sufficient. Relevant educational and awareness campaigns have to be drawn up to maximise the understanding of what the strategy is intended to achieve. These latter stages have taken me into areas completely new to me as a product of our well-established political and economic context.

Plan written!



It is not only in the official work that things are new. Each country has its own cultural characteristics (though drinking large amounts of cold vodka seems to be a fairly common legacy) and I find it endlessly fascinating to learn about the history of the country and the hopes and fears of its peoples. It has also been a humbling experience to work with people committed to improving the life experiences of their citizens despite the difficulties caused by economic and political collapse following the end of the Soviet Union. Life is hard, but the commitment is incredibly strong. The reward is a wonderful sense of achievement when the job is done and more so when I am able to help mentor a young inexperienced team and help them become real professionals who would also impress in more established systems. It is all about confidence. Intelligence is always present and knowledge can be acquired. I have just received the following message from one team

“We have some great news to share with you! Our strategy was approved yesterday! The Prime minister has signed the governmental regulation about the National Strategy on the Intellectual Property and Innovations development. We are all so glad! And we also want to congratulate and thank you! Without your participation and help we couldn't have done that! Now we have a lot to do and hope we will be able to implement our strategy fully. “

That made me feel really good as having done something worthwhile. Thank you Michal!

**Ron Marchant CB FRSA**

*Previous Chief Executive of the UK-IPO*

**Are you an IP Hero?**



As many attendees browsed the room at the LES USA & Canada Annual Meeting in San Diego, CA, sipping on their coffee and mingling around the room filled with exhibit booths, they were intrigued by a large man on a booth with his shirt open revealing an IP Hero emblem. So who is this man at the Murgitroyd & Company booth, and what is going on in the brains of these European patent attorneys?

For many years Intellectual Property Professionals have contributed to their organisations, overcoming significant obviousness objections, executing successful licensing deals, and taking measures which resulted in cost savings or revenue generation. Many professionals who have worked extremely hard to transform their organisations from merely good to exceptional, but never got the recognition they truly deserve. So, we at Murgitroyd & Company put our heads together to find a way to show our support to these hard working individuals in the IP field that we like to call “IP Heroes”.

As many IP Professionals know, it takes many pieces of a puzzle to make everything fit within a company. There are attorneys, foreign agents, IP managers, counsel, administrative staff, etc. who work together to form a successful team. The secret lies in choosing the right partners to be part of your team. Get the formula right, and a good organisation can become a great organisation - and those who make the right choices, we believe, can truly be called “IP Heroes”.

For example, see how Cheryl J. Tubach, Chief Property Counsel of J.M. Huber Corporation became an IP Hero.

Whether you are a part of a multinational corporation, university technology transfer department, law practice or start-up company, any IP Professional can become an IP Hero. With this in mind, Murgitroyd & Company has decided to become the sponsor of the IP Hero Awards which recognizes these exceptional professionals. Each month an award is given to show appreciation to those in the field and prizes are given to the winners. Who doesn't love prizes? The winner for each month will receive a bottle of Murgitroyd 12-year-old whisky, customized trophy, IP Hero T-shirt and an invitation to a special IP Heroes-only dinner at IPO 2012.

So how do you become an IP Hero? Well, you or someone you know may already be one. Anyone in the IP field who has made an outstanding contribution to their organisation is eligible to become the next IP Hero. You can either submit your own story or nominate someone you believe is an IP Hero at <http://iphero.net/nominations/>. You may also cast your vote at <http://iphero.net/vote/> for your favorite hero and all nominators receive a free IP Hero T-shirt. Awards are issued on monthly basis (15th of each month) and decided by popular vote (by your peers). All non-winning nominees will be automatically rolled over to next month's vote, while new nominees are added. Winners will be presented at events/conferences

Murgitroyd & Company attend, but the winner does not have to be present to win. Visit <http://iphero.net> to read the official rules.

If you would like to see a real hero in action, be sure to check out the "IP Hero" movie which features IP Hero, James Allen, battling Corporate America in these tough economic times.

The following are just a few nominees currently running to become the next the next IP Hero. For a full list of nominees, visit <http://iphero.net/vote/>.

*Scott Frank- for his IP leadership at Bell South/AT&T and for his tireless efforts to give back to the IP community (30 votes currently).*

*Bill Barrett - for his book iProperty and his innovative approaches for invention extraction (87 votes currently).*

*Mauro Di Liddo - for his novel business approach to create, protect and to monetize his trademarks (332 votes currently).*

*Steven Collier - for his IP leadership at Fluidigm and his mentorship of countless IP professionals (70 votes currently).*

If you would like to help honour accomplishments of IP professionals in the areas of leadership and innovation that are worthy of recognition, nominate someone today at <http://iphero.net/nominations/>. This is your chance to show support to those who should receive some credit for a job well done!

Are you an IP Hero?

Please visit [www.iphero.net](http://www.iphero.net) for more information.

IP Hero Awards

Sponsored by Murgitroyd & Company (European Patent & Trade Mark Attorneys)

[www.iphero.net](http://www.iphero.net)



LICENSING EXECUTIVES

BRITAIN AND IRELAND



**LICENSING EXECUTIVES SOCIETY  
BRITAIN AND IRELAND**

"Advancing the Business of Intellectual Property Globally"

### **Moving Company/ Changing Address?**

Please remember to tell our administrator, Jennifer Kirkcaldy, if you change your office address so that we can continue to send you LES information.

**LES Administrative Office,  
Northern Networking Events Ltd  
Glenfinnan Suite  
Braeview House  
9-11 Braeview Place  
East Kilbride  
Glasgow  
G74 3XH**

Please also remember to change your contact details in the membership directory on the LESI website ([www.lesi.org](http://www.lesi.org)). As a service to our members the editor will print any change of company and location in newsXchange™. Please contact Jennifer Kirkcaldy, [les@northernnetworking.co.uk](mailto:les@northernnetworking.co.uk)

### **Membership**

Enquiries should be addressed to Jennifer Kirkcaldy at the LES Administrative Office:

Tel: +44 (0) 1355 244966 Fax: +44 (0) 1355 249959

Email: [les@northernnetworking.co.uk](mailto:les@northernnetworking.co.uk)

The membership application form may also be found on the LES B&I website: [www.les-bi.org](http://www.les-bi.org)