

**Van:** Gasnier, Arnaud

**Verzonden:** za 7/5/2008 12:12

**Aan:** Tibor Gold

**CC:** 'Iain Ross'

**Onderwerp:** About the book review: "The Patenting Paradox"

Dear Tibor

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to react. I would indeed appreciate that some wrong statements and hasty conclusions could be corrected and reprinted.

First, in the Netherlands, PhD theses must be published by a professional publisher and costs must be borne by the PhD students themselves. Therefore, the "money spent" for this publication was actually mine. Nevertheless, I designed myself most of the cover (and the website). Also, I picked up all the "excellent and amusing illustrations". Pictorial credits should be given to the author!

Also, concerning my writing style, the book is a vulgarization book. And, as explained in the Foreword of the book, it is mainly intended for managers, executives and other actors of the patent systems, who are not IP experts. That's why I favored a rather metaphoric and illustrative style for making the topic more accessible to these readers. It required a tradeoff between being sufficiently precise to accurately reflect the basics and not being too technical to avoid losing the intended, non-initiated readers. Unfortunately, the language may then appear "rather peculiar" for some patent attorneys. Most importantly in my opinion, some readers of the book from the business community have already expressed a very positive opinion on the approach of the book.

Second, before stating that the number of the EP application is "wrong", any (good!) patent attorney would have noticed, from the application number, that it has been likely filed mid 2007 and therefore is not yet published (due to the 18-month delay). He would also know that not all the patent applications are published, some being abandoned beforehand.

Third, I am a European patent attorney and living in the Netherlands. I am in fact French and not Dutch. It is a bit misleading, I admit, for those who jump to conclusions. Also, it would be more accurate to say that I have "an academic affiliation" (as stated on the back cover of the book) than I am "an academic". I have spent only 20% of the last four years as a researcher in the field of IP management and gaming, while still having a professional activity in IP (started in mid 90's – I worked as a patent attorney for Swatch and Philips).

Despite the above details, I notice in the review that the use of gaming in the IP field has been acknowledged as a way to "disseminate awareness", to "achieve improved communication" and to "enhance decision-making", which is right to the point. Unfortunately, little emphasis on such usefulness for the firms (companies, research organizations etc.) has been made in your review. In fact, I was expecting more an in-depth discussion of my micro-economic approach (analyzing the blockades toward IP in

the firm) and the use of alternative solutions (gaming) to unlock these blockades, than some narrow-minded, prissy and superficial comments on the writing and editing style. This typical behavior explains why the IP field still remains the domain of a few experts, with little dialog with and understanding from the other actors of the firms who are in fine the actual users of the IP systems.

Finally, having played it since 2003, I confirm that the game is "great fun". In fact, "it is a pity" that Peter Lambert or you did not have the opportunity to play it before releasing the review.

If Peter or you are in The Hague area, please let me know. You are both kindly invited at TU Delft and I will then introduce you further to my work.

Best regards

Arnaud