

## Verbale della riunione del CE Aippi del 27 giugno 2013

Oggi 27.6.2013, alle ore 13.30, presso lo Studio Ubertazzi, in corso di Porta Ticinese 60, Milano, si è riunito il comitato esecutivo di Aippi. Sono presenti i membri del comitato esecutivo signori: Ubertazzi, Colombo, De Angelis, Dragotti, Faggioni, Liuzzo, Muraca, Sanna, Sironi, Testa e il revisore Lavagnini. Assenti Arista, Galli, Pallini, Pietrabissa, Sartori, Studio Perani.

La riunione è convocata per discutere e deliberare sul seguente ordine del giorno:

- 1) comunicazioni del presidente
- 2) ammissione nuovi soci
- 3) strategic report Aippi Int.
- 4) varie ed eventuali.

Sul punto 1) all'ordine del giorno. Nulla.

Sul punto 2) all'ordine del giorno. Vengono ammessi i soci Beatrice Bigonzi (presentata da Valenti e Vatti), Licia Garotti (presentata da Mostardini per Studio Legale Bird&Bird e De Angelis), e Carlo Eligio Mezzetti (presentato da De Angelis e Bandera).

Sul punto 3) all'ordine del giorno, dopo ampia discussione il CE approva le osservazioni del gruppo italiano alle Bureau general observations sullo studio Aippi Strategic project Report and recommendations to Aippi Task-Force 18.9.2012 presentato in prima stesura da Liuzzo, Lavagnini, Dragotti e Sanna come da testo finale allegato al presente verbale.

Sul punto 4) all'ordine del giorno. Il CE approva la lista dei delegati del gruppo italiano al congresso di Helsinki e delibera di delegare Liuzzo e Sanna a sostituire rispettivamente il presidente e il segretario al congresso ora detto. Il CE delibera di patrocinare e sponsorizzare con euro 500 il convegno di diritto industriale che sarà organizzato nell'Università di Milano Bicocca il 27 settembre 2013 e con le solite modalità il convegno pavese di AIDA che si terrà il 13 e 14 settembre 2013.

Null'altro essendovi da deliberare, la riunione termina alle ore 14.30.

Il presidente

**Luigi Carlo Ubertazzi**

Il vice segretario

**Fabrizio Sanna**

## **Osservazioni del gruppo italiano alle Bureau general observations sul Aippi Strategic project Report and recommendations to Aippi Task-Force 18.9.2012**

Dear Stephan,

the Italian Group would like to share with you and with the Bureau some additional thoughts on Robin Rolfe Resources Strategy Report (hereinafter also “RR Report”).

Further to receiving the Bureau general observations on said document, and taking into account the consultations and activities stimulated by the RR Report in the last months, our Group established an ad-hoc committee, aimed to explain to our members at large the meaning of the RR Report and to take a more thoughtful position on the initiatives our Association is taking as a result, or in connection with, the RR Report.

For the sake of simplicity, we summarize our comments adopting the structure of the Bureau general observations.

### **Mission statement**

We agree with the mission statement proposed by the RR Report as reformulated by the Bureau.

We however note that “brand identity” does not fit well among the entities from which the society at large could benefit; at the same time we understand that this wording is meant to refer to trademark and distinctive signs protection.

We are more in favour of a wider definition and we propose to change the wording “*benefit from innovation, creativity, brand identity and fair competitions*” into “*benefit from a fair protection of Intellectual Property rights*”.

Such a change would make the mission more open to future emerging IPRs.

Furthermore we note that the mission implies a lobbying or at least advocacy role. While we are not against said role, this is not easily coupled with the study mission and would also require the allocation of specific resources. Some additional thoughts on this issue is in our opinion advisable.

### **Governance / Structure**

We agree with the proposal to redefine and reconstruct the Council of Presidents role and responsibilities. We note however that all the changes discussed in the Bureau general observations, including the ones related to Membership issues, are committed to the Bureau and Bureau advisory committees. This is not consistent with the spirit of the proposed changes. Furthermore, in our opinion a more efficient relationship between NRGs and the International association could be better achieved if the transmission link is mainly in the hands of the renovated CoP and not of the Bureau.

### **Operations**

We do not necessarily share the opinion that increasing the staff is a value or a goal *per se*; we are also not convinced that hiring an Executive Director and integrating this position in the association actual organization chart could be easily accomplished (past experiences are not encouraging).

We therefore suggest that such a move is implemented only once the need for an ED is actually emerging from the association operations.

Similar comments apply to the increase of human and technical resources, justified only if the services provided to the membership and to the NRGs are improved and extended, in particular for small NRGs, which may be more in the need of support by the Association structure..

### **Membership**

The growth of the membership *per se* is not an absolute value; we need to understand why we need to grow, how much we should grow and what are the benefits related to the growth target we devise.

The financial advantages of a larger membership could be also achieved by expenditure reviews, at least partially.

We are aware that the Membership Committee is studying and proposing innovative way to increase membership, properly tweaking also the financials (mainly the dues). These efforts should lead to a balanced and properly sized association, not a ever increasing entity (whose costs, after certain levels are outmatched, tend to increase more than the income generated by the larger membership).

### **Finances**

We may share the proposal to increase some services (to be previously agreed on) to NRGs and to the Members, a move which should precede the hiring of new staff.

IT resources are among the services to be further developed.

### **Scientific Work**

A more pivotal role of the dissemination of the results of AIPPI scientific work should not be interpreted as a choice towards the complete reshaping of the Association into an advocacy or lobbying organization. We are ill equipped for these kind of tasks, which would require a complete rethinking of the association operations (see also our comments on AIPPI mission).

We fully share the comments concerning the need to improve AIPPI website and we suggest to provide every published document with an executive summary or highlights, in order to make them more easily understandable and sharable. Some serious SEO work is probably needed, too.

The association should also support the development of NRGs websites, whose level (and updates) presently changes from site to site.

### **Congresses / meetings**

We confirm our favour for the move towards an annual meeting. We strongly suggest that the name Congress is kept.

We are open to consider new site selection processes, provided that they are transparently available to the membership at large.

\* \* \*