

Index

- African Intellectual Property Organization (OAPI) 31
- African Regional Industrial Property Organization (ARIPO) 35
- Agenda 21 5
- Andean Community 188
- ASEAN 169, 186–7
 - see also* individual countries
- Australia 119, 139–41
 - design law 43, 198
 - empirical analysis of second tier patent system 126–38
 - in Australian patent context 127–8
 - Australian *versus* foreign applicants 130–32
 - country of origin of foreign applicants 132–6
 - individual *versus* company applicants 128–30
 - technology groups of applications 137–8
- innovation patents 18, 32, 139, 141
 - empirical analysis 127–8, 131, 134–6, 138
 - features 125–6
 - objectives 125
- patents 119–20
- petty patents 32, 119, 126, 139–40
 - empirical analysis 127–8, 131, 133–4, 137–8
 - features 122–3
 - history 120–21
 - objectives 121–2
 - review 123–5
- bargaining tools 42
- Belgium
 - patents 25
 - short term patent 18, 24
- Bentham, Jeremy 13
- biotechnology patents 93–6
- Brandt Commission 3
- Brundtland Commission 4–5
- Cambodia
 - utility models 34, 185–6
- case studies
 - Singapore 75, 110–17
 - electronic systems company 113–15
 - healthy lifestyle products company 110–13
 - water treatment company 115–17
- China 152
 - design law 154
 - economic and innovation climate 152–3
 - patents 153–6
 - utility models 32, 153, 154–6
 - empirical analysis 156–62
 - policy implications 162–3
- commercialization 36–7
- Community Design Right (CDR) 46–7
- competition, unfair 43, 49–55
 - interactions with other laws 56–7
- copying
 - benefits of 41
 - as creative imitation or misappropriation 66–8
 - innovation and 10–11
 - Singapore 104
 - unfair 35–6
 - unfair competition 43, 49–55
 - interactions with other laws 56–7
- copyright
 - Singapore 102, 103
- Cornish, William 43
- cumulative innovation 7
- Denmark
 - economic and innovation climate 22, 23
 - utility models 26, 27

- design law 24, 43, 44–8, 198
 - Australia 43, 198
 - China 154
 - European Union (EU) 45–8, 55
 - Germany 43, 198
 - interactions with other laws 56–7
 - Thailand 180
 - United Kingdom 24, 43, 47, 48, 55, 198
 - United States of America 44–5
- developing countries 3–4, 5–6
 - policy considerations 197–9
 - accretion approach 198
 - emulation approach 198–9
 - status quo approach 197–8
- discrete innovation 7
- economic climate
 - China 152–3
 - European Union (EU) 22–3
 - Germany 22, 23, 27–8
 - Japan 22, 23, 142
 - United States of America 22, 23
- economic development 3–5
 - innovation and 5–10
- Ericsson 10
- Ernst, D. 9
- European Innovation Scoreboard 22
- European Patent Convention 23
- European Patent Office 24
- European Union (EU)
 - design law 45–8, 55
 - economic and innovation climate 22–3
 - patent classification 25–6
 - three-dimensional classification 26–7
 - unfair competition 52
 - utility models 24–5, 40
 - see also* individual countries
- exporting IP products 65–6
- Finland
 - economic and innovation climate 22, 23
 - utility models 26, 27
- France
 - economic and innovation climate 23
 - patents 25
 - unfair competition 54–5
 - utility certificate 18, 24, 25
- Germany
 - design law 43, 198
 - economic and innovation climate 22, 23, 27–8
 - intellectual property institutional order 65
 - patents 27–8
 - unfair competition 52–4
 - utility models 28–31, 56, 65
 - current law 28–30
 - empirical evidence 30–31
- Geroski, P. 14
- Greece
 - utility models 27
- Guile, Bruce R. 36
- ul Haq, Mahbub 4
- Harare Protocol 35
- Hong Kong
 - utility models 32
- Howard, W. G. 36
- human development 4
- ideal law for minor innovations 199–200
- imitation *see* copying
- importing IP products 65–6
- Indonesia
 - patents 182
 - utility models 34, 182–3
- information and communications
 - technology patents 93–6
- innovation
 - copying and 10–11
 - economic development and 5–10
 - innovation climate
 - China 152–3
 - European Union (EU) 22–3
 - Germany 22, 23, 27–8
 - Japan 22, 23, 142
 - United States of America 22, 23
 - learning how to innovate 10–11
 - minor innovations 17
 - ideal law for minor innovations 199–200
 - nature of innovator and innovation 68–9
- Singapore 83–8
 - benchmarking 90–97
 - international comparisons 88–90
 - level of innovation 99

- utility models and innovation culture 150–51
- innovation patents *see* utility models
- intellectual property rights
 - import/export of IP products 65–6
 - justification 195–7
 - right type of intellectual property
 - institutional order 64–5
 - see also* patents
- International Patent Classification (IPC) 19, 21, 189
- inventor certificates
 - Mexico 189–90
- Ireland
 - economic and innovation climate 23
 - patents 25
- Italy
 - economic and innovation climate 22
 - utility models 25, 27
- Jaffe, Adam B. 59
- Japan
 - economic and innovation climate 22, 23, 142
 - patents 42
 - historical background 142
 - Japanese and foreign applicants 147
 - numbers 146
 - utility models 32
 - comparison with Korea 148–50
 - correlation between UM and innovation culture 150–51
 - decrease of UM registrations 145–8
 - historical background 142–3
 - individual *versus* company applicants 147
 - Japanese and foreign applicants 148
 - procedure and examination 143–5
 - scope of protection 145
 - subject matter and criteria of protection 143
- Jefferson, Thomas 14–15
- Juma, C. 37
- Kazakhstan
 - utility models 32
- Kim, L. 11
- Kitch, E. 196
- Korea (South)
 - utility models 32, 148–50
 - correlation between UM and innovation culture 150–51
- Kortum, Samuel 58–9
- Kumar, N. 37
- Kyrgyz Republic
 - utility models 32–3
- learning how to innovate 10–11
- Lemley, Mark 60–61, 62
- Lerner, Joshua 58–9, 62
- licensing 66, 200
- Lippoldt, Douglas 66
- Litman, J. 67
- Macao
 - utility models 33
- Machlup, Fritz 42
- Malaysia
 - patents 169–70
 - utility models 34, 170–72
 - empirical and policy analysis 174–6
 - examples of granted claims 173–4
- Mandeville, T. 7
- market failures 15
- mercantilism 13
- Mexico 188–9, 192
 - inventor certificates 189–90
 - patents 189
 - utility models 190–91
- Mill, John Stuart 14
- Millennium Development Goals 5
- minor innovations 17
 - ideal law for minor innovations 199–200
- Mowery, David C. 59
- Mytelka, L. K. 6
- national system of innovation (NSI) 9
- Nelson, R. R. 11
- Netherlands
 - economic and innovation climate 23
 - patents 25, 26
- Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property (1883) 20, 49
- Park, Walter 66
- Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT) 21, 111, 189
- patents 10–11, 13–16
 - Belgium 25

- China 153–6
- European Union (EU) 25–6
- France 25
- Germany 27–8
- Indonesia 182
- Ireland 25
- Japan 42
 - historical background 142
 - Japanese and foreign applicants 147
 - numbers 146
- justification 195–7
- Malaysia 169–70
- Mexico 189
- minor innovations and 17
- Netherlands 25, 26
- Philippines 183
- public goods and 15
- Singapore 76–82, 100, 102, 117, 186–7
 - foreign ownership of patents 96–7
 - ICT and biotechnology patents 93–6
 - triadic patent families 91–2, 93
- Taiwan
 - historical background 163–4
 - substantive law 164–6
- Thailand 180
- United States of America 57–61, 198
- Vietnam 176–7
- petty patents *see* utility models
- Philippines
 - patents 183
 - utility models 34, 186
 - empirical and policy implications 185
 - substantive law 184
- Philips 10
- policy considerations 64
 - copying as creative imitation or misappropriation 66–8
 - developing countries 197–9
 - accretion approach 198
 - emulation approach 198–9
 - status quo approach 197–8
 - final options 69
 - historical and economic climate of a country 69
 - import/export of IP products 65–6
 - nature of innovator and innovation 68–9
 - right type of intellectual property institutional order 64–5
- Portugal
 - utility models 27
- public goods
 - patents and 15
- public sector
 - R&D and 23
- regulatory capture 60–61
- research and development (R&D)
 - public sector 23
 - Singapore 77, 78, 117
- reward theory 14
- Rio Summit 5
- Rosenberg, Nathan 59
- Schumpeter, J. A. 6, 8
- Sen, Amartya 4
- Siemens 28
- Singapore 75, 117–18
 - case studies 75, 110–17
 - electronic systems company 113–15
 - healthy lifestyle products company 110–13
 - water treatment company 115–17
 - copying 104
 - copyright 102, 103
 - innovation 83–8
 - benchmarking 90–97
 - international comparisons 88–90
 - level of innovation 99
 - methodology of study 73–5
 - case studies 75
 - national survey 73–4
 - targeted survey 74–5
 - patents 76–82, 100, 102, 117, 186–7
 - foreign ownership of patents 96–7
 - ICT and biotechnology patents 93–6
 - triadic patent families 91–2, 93
 - research and development (R&D) 77, 78, 117
 - survey findings 97–110
 - demographic profile 97–9
 - level of innovation 99
 - need for utility model 105–7
 - statistical testing 108–9
 - usage of intellectual property system 99–105
- trademarks 100, 102

- utility models 102, 105–7, 111, 117–18
- small and medium enterprises (SMEs)
 - utility model and 38, 68
- Smith, Adam 13
- social interaction
 - innovation and 8
- Spain
 - economic and innovation climate 22
 - utility models 26, 27
- sui generis* laws 55–6
- sustainable development 4–5
- Sweden 24
 - economic and innovation climate 22, 23
- Taiwan 152
 - patents
 - historical background 163–4
 - substantive law 164–6
 - utility models 33, 162–5, 186
 - empirical and policy analysis 166–8
 - substantive law 164–6
- technology transfer 66
- Tesfachew, T. 6
- Texas Instruments 10
- Thailand
 - design law 180
 - utility models 34
 - empirical and policy implications 181–2
 - substantive law 180–81
- Thomas, Jay R. 62
- trademarks
 - Singapore 100, 102
- triadic patent families 91–2, 93
- TRIPS Agreement (1994) 21, 154, 189, 198
- Turkey
 - utility models 33
- uncertainty 40–41
- unfairness 40–41
 - unfair competition 43, 49–55
 - interactions with other laws 56–7
- United Kingdom
 - design law 24, 43, 47, 48, 55, 198
 - intellectual property institutional order 65
 - sui generis* laws 55
 - utility models 65
- United States of America
 - design law 44–5
 - economic and innovation climate 22, 23
 - federal trade dress law 50–52
 - need for second tier system 61–3
 - patents 57–61, 198
 - sui generis* laws 55
 - unfair competition 50–52, 62
 - utility models 18–20, 43
- Australia (petty/innovation patents) 18, 32, 119, 126, 139–40, 141
 - empirical analysis 127–8, 131, 134–8
 - features 122–3, 125–6
 - history 120–21
 - objectives 121–2, 125
 - petty patents 119, 126, 139–40
 - review 123–5
- Cambodia 34, 185–6
- China 32, 153, 154–6
 - empirical analysis 156–62
 - policy implications 162–3
- copying as creative imitation or misappropriation 66–8
- costs and benefits 39–42
 - benefits of copying 41
 - psychology and bargaining tools 42
 - uncertainty and unfairness 40–41
- examples 20–35
 - Africa 31, 35
 - Asia/Pacific 31, 32–4
 - Europe 22–7
 - international conventions and multilateral agreements 20–21
- ideal law for minor innovations 199–200
- Indonesia 34, 182–3
- innovation culture and 150–51
- interactions with other laws 56–7
- Japan 32
 - correlation between UM and innovation culture 150–51
 - decrease of UM registrations 145–8
 - historical background 142–3
 - individual *versus* company applicants 147
 - Japanese and foreign applicants 148
 - procedure and examination 143–5

- scope of protection 145
- subject matter and criteria of protection 143
- Korea (South) 32, 148–50
 - correlation between UM and innovation culture 150–51
- Malaysia 34, 170–72
 - empirical and policy analysis 174–6
 - examples of granted claims 173–4
- Mexico 190–91
- Philippines 34, 186
 - empirical and policy implications 185
 - substantive law 184
- policy options for developing countries 197–9
 - accretion approach 198
 - emulation approach 198–9
 - status quo approach 197–8
- Singapore 102, 105–7, 111, 117–18
- Taiwan 33, 162–5, 186
 - empirical and policy analysis 166–8
 - substantive law 164–6
- Thailand 34
 - empirical and policy implications 181–2
 - substantive law 180–81
 - theory and practice 35–9
- Vietnam 34, 177, 186
 - empirical and policy implications 178–80
 - substantive law 177–8
- Uzbekistan
 - utility models 33
- Vietnam
 - patents 176–7
 - utility models 34, 177, 186
 - empirical and policy implications 178–80
 - substantive law 177–8