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This is the second time that I have had the honor to write the foreword to the Annual Report of the Munich Intellectual Property Law Center. The first time, five years ago, I had just succeeded Professor Joseph Straus, the founding father of the MIPLC, as the Chair of the Managing Board. Hence, it seems time to assess how our Center has developed over the years and to reflect on future perspectives. Yet this foreword should not leave aside important developments that have taken place during this last year.

In the fall of 2013, the MIPLC celebrated its 10th anniversary. After 10 years, there is hardly any doubt about the MIPLC’s achievements. The Center has not only educated an impressive number of IP professionals from all around the world who later managed to find excellent jobs in diverse areas of IP practice and research. The MIPLC has also gained recognition in the global IP community as an institution that offers an internationally leading master’s program. This success builds on many factors, not least an internationally renowned faculty, the continued commitment of the four MIPLC partner institutions, and a highly dedicated staff. Some members of our faculty have been teaching from the very beginning and continue to teach with unrestricted dedication. The scientific and administrative staff, as the backbone of the program, is crucial for the happiness of the students while they are studying in Munich.

As a few institutional partnerships have expired during the last couple of years, the MIPLC has resolved to strengthen its promotional efforts and to develop new forms of cooperation. Therefore, we are pleased that our cooperation with the German Academic Exchange Service (Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst, DAAD) has developed very fruitfully, enabling us to accept at least two students from developing countries every year who could otherwise not join the program. Towards the end of the academic year 2012/13, the newly established Alumni Network managed to collect considerable financial contributions from former MIPLC students for the first grant ever of an Alumni Scholarship to an incoming student.

The strong dedication of our alumni to the MIPLC is also demonstrated at the annual Alumni Conferences that traditionally take place the day after the Graduation Ceremony in November. These conferences, which bring together a large number of alumni from different parts of the world, show best how much our alumni value the education they have enjoyed at the MIPLC. To see how much our alumni have progressed in their personal careers over the years and to experience the strongly-felt gratitude they express to the MIPLC is the highest reward that we can receive for our work.

Now, at the age of 10, MIPLC is leaving childhood behind and is entering its adolescence. Children require a lot of care. Yet the parents are often inexperienced and have to experiment. The latter was also true of the four partner institutions as regards the legal constitution of the MIPLC. The very informal cooperation and the central role of the Max Planck Society in the Center’s daily business have recently given rise to a series of issues and concerns that advocate a new debate among the partners on a different constitution of the MIPLC. In my opinion, this is a positive development. The MIPLC has by now sufficiently evi-
danced its academic excellence and its potential for a long life. It is now time for the four partners to renew their commitment by negotiating a new legal structure that will prepare the MIPLC for its adulthood.

In recent years, the MIPLC’s cooperation with other institutions within the European Intellectual Property Institutes Network (EIPIN), bringing together five leading European master’s programs in IP, has become even more intensive. The jointly organized conferences held twice every year, as well as the doctoral meeting, are well-established features of this cooperation. Most recently, the EIPIN partners have resolved to apply for EU funding for a joint doctoral program in the near future.

As can be understood from the above, the management at the MIPLC had to deal with quite a number of complex issues that did not regard the running of the program. The fact that the last academic year can be regarded as a very calm and satisfying one can be attributed both to the students and to the whole staff of the MIPLC. During the summer term of 2013, Filipe Fischmann came in as a new Program Director and Matthias Fink succeeded Julia Pracht as Administrative Director. Both became strong pillars of the MIPLC from the very beginning of their work. Simultaneously, it was time for the MIPLC to say goodbye to both Seth Ericsson and Julia Pracht and to thank them for years of hard and efficient work. Seth will stay with the Max Planck Institute as a Research Fellow, while Julia moved on to work for the OHIM in Alicante in the future.

I would like to thank the whole MIPLC team for all their support, efficient work, and dedication during the last year. As can be seen from the above, this year was not without challenges. In spite of those, all members of the team had to continue their daily work and to guarantee the high quality of the master’s program for the students. Indeed, at the end of this year, these challenges have not completely disappeared. Yet there is ample reason to look into the future with optimism. The strong dedication of the staff and the faculty to the master’s program as well as the strong commitment of the four partner institutions will remain the foundation of the future existence and success of the MIPLC.

Professor Josef Drexl
Chair of the MIPLC Managing Board
1.1. Awards and Nominations

In June 2013, Queen Elisabeth II approved Professor Bill Cornish’s appointment as a Companion of the Most Distinguished Order of St Michael and St George in recognition of his services to promoting understanding of British law in Central Europe.

Professor Jay Dougherty was designated Director of the Loyola Law School Entertainment and Media Institute.

In 2013, Dr. Henning Große Ruse–Khan joined the University of Cambridge’s Faculty of Law and the Centre for Intellectual Property and Information Law (CIPIL) at Cambridge as a University Lecturer. He is a Fellow at King’s College.

Professor Dietmar Harhoff joined the Max Planck Institute for Intellectual Property and Competition Law in 2013 as Director of the newly-created department “Munich Center for Innovation and Entrepreneurship Research.” In June 2013, Professor Harhoff received the “Schumpeter School Award for Corporate and Economic Analysis” for his pioneering contributions to innovation and entrepreneurship research.

Johannes Heselberger and Dr. Christoph Karl were included in a directory of “German attorneys most often recommended by their colleagues” for work in the IP sector. The list was compiled by Handelsblatt, a German daily paper focussing on business and finance news.

Jay Hines was nominated to the Board of Directors of the International Trademark Association (INTA).

Isabelle Huys, Professor at KU Leuven, Belgium, and an MIPLC alumna (2006/07), entered the MIPLC faculty, thus becoming the first MIPLC graduate to come back as a lecturer.

Sir Robin Jacob, professor at University College of London, received the “UCL Provost’s Teaching Award” for a course on IP Transactional Law.

Professor Annette Kur was nominated as Yong Shook Lin Professor in IP by the National University of Singapore’s Law School.

“...What I especially liked about the program: The care that goes into making sure that everyone is doing alright is what I really like about this program. Everyone is ready to help and guide the students and that is also something we don’t find in most programs! (From the Program Evaluation)"
Dr. Rupprecht Podszun was awarded the „Forschungspreis Soziale Marktwirtschaft“ discerned by the Bavarian Industry Association. He received this award, which recognizes outstanding doctoral or postdoctoral theses dealing with the concept of a “social market economy”, for his postdoctoral thesis “Market Order and the Role of Civil Law Courts.”

Hogan Lovells has been named European Firm of the Year for its OHIM work by Managing Intellectual Property (MIP) magazine, recognizing Hogan Lovells’ Alicante office founded in 1996 by partner Dr. Verena von Bomhard. Moreover, Dr. von Bomhard was included in World Trademark Review’s list of “The World’s Leading Trademark Professionals” in the “Gold” category.

1.2. Staff
The academic year 2012/13 was marked by profound change in the composition of the MIPLC’s staff.

Towards the end of the academic year, in July 2013, Program Director Seth Ericsson left the MIPLC to further develop his research as a Research Fellow at the Max Planck Institute for Intellectual Property and Competition Law. He was succeeded by Filipe Fischmann, who joined the MIPLC in April 2013. Filipe was already a Research Fellow at the Max Planck Institute for Intellectual Property and Competition Law. He graduated from Universidade de São Paulo and completed his Master’s studies at the same institution. In São Paulo, Filipe also practiced law. During his studies, he took part in an exchange program with Munich, where he later completed his LL.M. and started his Ph.D.

In April 2013, Julia Pracht left the MIPLC to work for the Office for Harmonization in the Internal Market (OHIM) in Alicante, Spain. She was succeeded by Matthias Fink, who took up his position as Administrative Director of the MIPLC on July 1, 2013. Matthias is a law graduate of the University of Augsburg as well as of Lyon III – Jean Moulin University in Lyon, France. He holds an LL.M. in International Business Law and has worked at the European Parliament in Brussels, Belgium, prior to joining the MIPLC’s team.

The MIPLC thanks Julia and Seth for their tireless work and valuable contributions to the development of the Center and extends a warm welcome to Filipe and Matthias.
Ever since its foundation, the MIPLC has worked to establish close cooperation with a variety of partners from all over the world. In the period covered by this report, the MIPLC extended an existing agreement (MIPLC-SIPO IP Training Program, see sections 2.3. and 3.2.) and continued to work closely with its other partners. Two collaborations expired. Synoptic summaries of events during the academic year are presented below. A list of all partner institutions is available at the end of this chapter.

2.1. European Intellectual Property Institutes Network (EIPIN)
As in previous years, the members of the European Intellectual Property Institutes Network (EIPIN) cooperated closely in the framework of the 14th EIPIN Congress (see section 4.7.). Again, the EIPIN Congress included an EIPIN Doctoral Meeting (see section 5.2.). The University of Maastricht’s Advanced Master in Intellectual Property Law and Knowledge Management (IPKM) joined EIPIN as of the academic year 2012/13 and was warmly welcomed into the network by the existing partners.

2.2. Supreme Court of Japan
Judge Tomoko Tanahashi participated in the MIPLC’s LL.M. program in the academic year 2012/13.

2.3. State Intellectual Property Office of the People’s Republic of China (SIPO)
For the sixth time, SIPO sent a group of IP officials to Munich for a two-week training program. A detailed account of this program is provided in section 3.2. The following table provides an overview of all collaborations and cooperative activities in which the MIPLC has participated since its foundation in 2003.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cooperating Partner(s)</th>
<th>Objective(s)</th>
<th>Established in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>German Federal Patent Court</td>
<td>Education (internship)</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.miplc.de/cooperations/bpatg/">www.miplc.de/cooperations/bpatg/</a>;</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.bpatg.de/index.html">www.bpatg.de/index.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Intellectual Property Institutes Network (EIPIN)</td>
<td>Education (EIPIN Congress), research (EIPIN Doctoral Meetings), career</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.miplc.de/cooperations/eipin/">www.miplc.de/cooperations/eipin/</a>;</td>
<td>development, networking</td>
<td><a href="http://www.eipin.org/">www.eipin.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Mary Intellectual Property Research Institute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(QMIPRI, University of London)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magister Lucentinus (Universidad de Alicante)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre d’Etudes Internationales de la Propriété Intellectuelle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(CEIPI, Université Robert Schuman, Strasbourg)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Property and Knowledge Management (IPKM, University of Maastricht)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC-ASEAN Intellectual Property Rights Cooperation Program (ECAP II)</td>
<td>Education, networking, research</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.miplc.de/cooperations/ecap-ii/">www.miplc.de/cooperations/ecap-ii/</a>;</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.ecap-project.org/">www.ecap-project.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supreme Court of Japan</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Africa, Department of Mercantile Law</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.miplc.de/cooperations/unisa/">www.miplc.de/cooperations/unisa/</a>;</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.unisa.ac.za/default.asp?Cmd=ViewContent&amp;ContentID=211">www.unisa.ac.za/default.asp?Cmd=ViewContent&amp;ContentID=211</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIPO Worldwide Academy</td>
<td>Research, education (internship)</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chungnam National University of Korea</td>
<td>Research, education</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.miplc.de/cooperations/chungnam/">www.miplc.de/cooperations/chungnam/</a>;</td>
<td></td>
<td>plus.cnu.ac.kr/eng/sub0407.jsp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NALSAR University of Law</td>
<td>Research, education</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.miplc.de/cooperations/nalsar/">www.miplc.de/cooperations/nalsar/</a>;</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.nalsarlawuniv.ac.in">www.nalsarlawuniv.ac.in</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.miplc.de/cooperations/sipo/">www.miplc.de/cooperations/sipo/</a>;</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.sipo.gov.cn/sipo_English/">www.sipo.gov.cn/sipo_English/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea Institute for Intellectual Property (KIIP)</td>
<td>Research, education</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.miplc.de/cooperations/kiip/">www.miplc.de/cooperations/kiip/</a>;</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.kiip.re.kr/eng/">www.kiip.re.kr/eng/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dottorato di Ricerca in Diritto Commerciale, Università degli Studi di Catania</td>
<td>Research, education</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.miplc.de/cooperations/uni-catania/">www.miplc.de/cooperations/uni-catania/</a>;</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.lex.unict.it/dottorato/diritto">www.lex.unict.it/dottorato/diritto</a> commerciale/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Intellectual Property (IIP) of Japan</td>
<td>Research, education</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.miplc.de/cooperations/iip-japan/">www.miplc.de/cooperations/iip-japan/</a>;</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.iip.or.jp/e/">www.iip.or.jp/e/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Studies of IPR of Zhongnan University of Economics and Law, China</td>
<td>Research, education</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHIM Universities Network</td>
<td>Research, education, career development, networking</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities.en.do</td>
<td></td>
<td>universities.en.do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Max Planck Research School Competition and Innovation (IMPRS-Ci)</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chungnam National University Law School, Korea</td>
<td>Research, education</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plus.cnu.ac.kr/eng/M02/sub_0226.jsp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Institute of Industrial Property, Brazil</td>
<td>Research, education</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.inpi.gov.br/">www.inpi.gov.br/</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hongik University, Korea</td>
<td>Research, education</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.hongik.ac.kr/english_neo/">www.hongik.ac.kr/english_neo/</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Conferences and Training Activities

Ana Vogt Stoll, Valeria Anchini (both 2009/10)

Professor Josef Drexl, Chair of the MIPLC Managing Board

3.1. Alumni Conference “Contemporary Challenges in IP Practice”

As a cornerstone of its Alumni Network activities, the MIPLC in 2012 hosted its first-ever Alumni Conference. On 17 November 2012, one day after the Graduation Ceremony for the class of 2011/2012, close to 100 participants – alumni, faculty, current students, members of the Managing Board and the Scientific Advisory Board, researchers of the Max Planck Institute for Intellectual Property and Competition Law, as well as other members of the Munich IP community – gathered at the MPI to follow presentations on a vast array of IP-related topics.

A very particular feature of the conference was that all of the speakers were MIPLC graduates. The conference organizers were very proud to announce that the number of alumni willing to speak at the conference had been so high that not all of them could actually intervene!

Featuring – just as the MIPLC itself – diversity, the conference entitled “Contemporary Challenges in IP Practice” included speakers from five MIPLC classes and nine nations. The program was divided into five panels which reflected the main areas of Intellectual Property Law as well as the intersection of IP and Competition Law.

The conference was opened by Professor Josef Drexl – Chair of the MIPLC Managing Board – whose welcoming speech was followed by the panel on Copyright Law. Teresa Raposo Nobre (MIPLC graduate, Class of 2008/09) gave a talk on “Creative Commons/Open Culture Movements”: As Legal Project Lead of Creative Commons Portugal, she was just the right person to address this topic.

The second speaker was Oliver Galindo
Avila, a practicing lawyer from Mexico (MIPLC graduate, Class of 2008/09), who discussed possible impacts of creating copyright exemptions for digital libraries in the developing world.

The second panel - on Trademark Law - consisted of two speakers who shared their insights from the view of a legal practitioner. Michael J. Leonard – a practicing lawyer from the U.S. (MIPLC graduate, Class of 2004/05) - gave a talk on “The Madrid Protocol and Why Trademark Holders Should Not Be Afraid to Designate the United States”, whereas Vithika Sharma (MIPLC graduate, Class of 2006/07), a Senior Associate (Trademarks Division) at the Intellectual Property Support Practice at Legasis in India, spoke on “Global Trademark Portfolio Management: Strategy and Case Studies.”

The third panel shifted to Patent Law where Nicholas Stabinsky (MIPLC graduate, Class of 2004/05) shared practical experience on patent monetization by providing not only an assessment of current strategic practices, but also a prospective view on the future of patent monetization (“Patent Monetization: Where Are We Now and Where Are We Going?”). Isabelle Huys (MIPLC graduate, Class of 2006/07) - an Assistant Professor of Patent Law at the Faculty of Pharmaceutical Sciences of the University of Leuven in Belgium - guided the audience through “The Past, Present and (Uncertain) Future of Patents on Genes and Genetic Diagnostic Methods.”

In the fourth panel, the speakers turned to the intersection of IP and Competition Law. With a focus on the smartphones industry, Hee-Eun Kim (MIPLC graduate, Class of 2009/10), an attorney in the Brussels office of Covington & Burling LLP, explained what lessons could be learned from the investigations of the
European Commission in the area of standard-essential patents, and explored how companies could align their IP and competition law strategies. Marc P. Philipp (MIPLC graduate, Class of 2009/10) – business unit head for research management at Charité Universitätsmedizin Berlin, one of the largest university hospitals in Europe – spoke about “Technology Transfer and IP Exploitation in Public Life Science Research – Challenges and Approaches from the Perspective of Charité Berlin.”

Finally, the fifth panel was devoted to indigenous heritage and genetic resources. Eliamani Laltaika (MIPLC graduate, Class of 2006/07) focused on the challenges related to the protection of indigenous heritage and explored synergies and complementarities between the protection of indigenous heritage and intellectual property rights. Last, but not least, Yuanzhen Cai (MIPLC graduate, Class of 2011/12) analyzed the issues related to the protection of traditional herbal medicine.

The lively discussions which ensued after each presentation proved that the speakers had succeeded in choosing interesting, engaging topics for their talks.
3.2. MIPLC-SIPO IP Training Program

The sixth annual training program organized for the State Intellectual Property Office of the People’s Republic of China (SIPO) took place from September 9 to 19, 2013.

As in previous years, the training program consisted of lectures by highly experienced practitioners and academics as well as study visits to IP-related institutions. Lecturers included Dr. Richard Dissmann, Dr. Bernhard Hertel, Dr. Bertram Huber, Dr. Laura Jelinek, Dr. Alexander Klett, Claudia Naimi, Dr. Claudia Tapia Garcia, Dr. Boris Uphoff, Wolrad Prinz zu Waldeck, and Dr. Axel Walz. They covered a wide variety of topics from IPRs and Competition Law to IP Licensing Agreements, and from European Patent Law to Patenting Strategies in Companies. Also addressed were Licensing Practices and Challenges in the Telecommunications Industry, Border Enforcement Measures, and IP Protection at Trade Fairs.

The classroom sessions were complemented by an external full-day visit to BMW AG. At the beginning of the visit, Dr. Hannes Bucher, legal counsel, and Stefanie Jenauth, design paralegal, brought design enforcement to life in a highly interesting and practice-focused presentation on BMW’s perspective on design enforcement. Later on, the group enjoyed a visit of the BMW Welt and a guided tour of the production facilities.

At the German Patent and Trade Mark Office DPMA, the group was welcomed by Dr. Volker Rüger and Jürgen Tischler, Patent Examiners and members of the International Cooperation Section. After some introductory remarks by
Together with MIPLC Administrative Director Matthias Fink and MIPLC Program Director Filipe Fischmann, our Chinese guests much admired a special feat of Bavarian engineering...
3. Conferences and Training Activities

3.3. Global IP Fellows Program
In March 2013, MIPLC was honored to host the participants of the Global IP Fellows Program (GIPF) for their second conference of the 2012/2013 session. GIPF is a transatlantic initiative launched by the Federal Circuit Bar Association that brings together a select group of US and German practitioners to help bridge the gap of understanding between the US and Germany when it comes to different approaches and perspectives in patent litigation. The first session had taken place in Washington, DC, in September 2012.

The program in Munich started with a warm-up dinner to allow participants to reconnect before plunging into their busy four-day schedule. This schedule was thematically divided to cover policy & government, company & client, EPO & infringement hearings, and court systems & pleading culture. Besides visiting Siemens AG, the European Patent Office, and the Bavarian State Chancellery, the Fellows attended a patent infringement hearing at the Regional Court of Munich for a first-hand experience of German pleading culture. This experience was intensified the next day when Dr. Matthias Zigann, Presiding Judge of the Munich Regional Court, explained in detail the innovative scheme for patent infringement hearings that has been instituted at the Court, followed by detailed insights into pleading culture in German infringement proceedings by Dr. Klaus Grabinski, Presiding Judge of the Fed-
What I consider my most valuable experience at MIPLC: The tough schedule at MIPLC was a precious experience in learning how to observe deadlines and carefully map projects. In addition, the national diversity of the program was a valuable training for work in an international environment, which is doubtlessly very important in the field of Intellectual Property law.

(From the Program Evaluation)
I always think of this highly intensive program even after my studies are finished. The biggest gain I got from it is the strong adaptability I have developed. When I have to deal with a new challenge, I always ask myself: Comparing with the tasks I once handled in this LL.M. program, is there any problem that I cannot solve? Thanks a lot to this program which has made me stronger and let me appreciate again that there is not a thing we cannot surmount unless we give up.

I regretted that I could not take all available courses. A lot of heavyweight professors and practitioners from all over the world gave us so many high-level lectures. I was like a baby gathering nutrition from them, but I simply could not join all elective courses on offer because there is such a great number of them. On the other hand, I was so lucky to get the chance to be taught by these authority figures and to discuss the hot topics in IP with them face to face. The LL.M. program also supplies so many very good elective courses about Law and Economics, the only problem is my time and energy …

I have always appreciated my tutors. They contributed a lot to my studies. Maybe I was the one who always asked the most questions … They were all so patient and dedicated a lot of time to answering my e-mails or even sitting down with me to answer my questions. Besides, they encouraged me that I could do it, and I got a lot of positive power from them.

All in all, for me it was an entirely good decision to do this program at the MIPLC. Not only did I get a lot out of the courses which is really helpful for my job, but I also really like the MIPLC team, my tutors, and my classmates. I believe this program is the best one in the field of IP, and I was so lucky that at the MIPLC I was able to work with so many excellent people from around the world.
Dr. Henning Grosse Ruse – Khan is a University Lecturer in Intellectual Property Law at the Faculty of Law of the University of Cambridge and a Fellow at King's College. In Cambridge, he is a Fellow at the Lauterpacht Centre for International Law (LCIL) and at the Centre for Intellectual Property and Information Law (CIPIL).

Dr. Grosse Ruse – Khan also holds positions as external researcher at the Max Planck Institute for Intellectual Property and Competition Law in Munich and at the Centre for International Sustainable Development Law (McGill University, Montreal).

Dr. Grosse Ruse – Khan teaches IP and WTO Law at the University of Cambridge and further at the Centre for International Intellectual Property Studies (CEIPI, Strasbourg). He is a member of the editorial board of the International Review of Intellectual Property and Competition Law (IIC) and co-founder of the international IP network at the Society of International Economic Law (SIEL). His research and teaching focus on international intellectual property protection and development issues, world trade and investment law, as well as on interfaces among distinct legal orders in international law.

In addition, Dr. Grosse Ruse – Khan advises international organizations, NGOs as well as developing and developed country governments on international IP, WTO, and investment law issues. He works as a legal expert for the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) on options for incentivizing incremental innovation, especially by small and medium enterprises (SMEs), via a flexible IP system, such as utility model protection, in developing countries. Dr. Grosse Ruse – Khan is also engaged in designing courses on IP law in developing countries via WIPO and other international organizations.

A member of the MIPLC faculty since 2009, Dr. Grosse Ruse – Khan teaches “IP within Global Legal Orders” as well as “International and Comparative Copyright Law.” Since 2013, he teaches the new course “International Intellectual Property Law” (replacing international copyright, patent, and trademark law courses). Dr. Grosse Ruse – Khan’s courses receive rave reviews by his students: “It was excellent in every sense: in terms of the way each topic was introduced and explored further, in terms of the cordial and encouraging environment in which these classes were conducted. I would say these classes have helped me immensely in understanding various developments in international law at different forums and the conflicts and undercurrents that shape these developments.” (From the course evaluation for “IP within Global Legal Orders”, summer term 2013)
The LL.M. Program
Academic Year 2012/13

4.3. Curriculum
The list of courses offered in the academic year 2012/13 is available in Appendix 1.

The following new courses were introduced:
- Artistic Freedom and Control in Copyright (Professor Kristelia A. García)
- Chinese IP Law (Catherine Sun)
- Patents, Technology, and Society (Professor Dan L. Burk)
- Trade Secret Law (Professor Christoph Ann, Dr. Gintarė Surblytė)

4.4. Faculty
A list of all active MIPLC faculty members is available in Appendix 2.

The MIPLC was pleased and honored to welcome to its faculty the following new teachers:
- Professor Kristelia A. García, The George Washington University Law School (Artistic Freedom and Control in Copyright)
- Professor Isabelle Huys, Ph.D., University of Leuven, MIPLC Class of 2006/07 (Supervision of Master’s theses)
- Dr. Matthias Lamping, MPI (Licensing of IP Rights, International and Comparative Patent Law)
- Professor Martin Senftleben, University of Amsterdam (European, U.S., and International Trademark Law)
- Catherine Sun, China IP Ltd. (Chinese IP Law)
- Dr. Gintarė Surblytė, MIPLC Program Director (Trade Secret Law)
- Mark Traphagen, Traphagen Law PLLC (Enforcement of Copyright)
- Dr. Anna Wolters-Höhne, Bird & Bird LLP (Practical Training in European Patent Law)

Dr. Wolters-Höhne is a partner in Bird & Bird’s German Intellectual Property Practice Group with a focus on patent and pharmaceutical law. She advises national and international clients across various industry sectors, particularly in international patent disputes. The center of her practice is litigation before the civil courts, but also the cooperation before the European Patent Office and the Federal Patent Court. Many of her clients are from the life sciences and the electronics sector.

Dr. Wolters-Höhne studied at the Universities of Hamburg and Bordeaux. She has been awarded a doctorate from Heinrich Heine University of Düsseldorf. Her thesis dealt with issues of patentability of human biotechnological inventions in Germany and Europe.

Dr. Wolters-Höhne started as a faculty member of the MIPLC by teaching the course “Practical Training in European Patent Law” in the summer term of 2013. This is what one of her students had to say in the anonymous course evaluation: “This class was extremely enriching both in terms of learning the basics and learning the practicalities from a professional practice point of view. It dealt with all the core topics one can possibly encounter during patent litigation in Germany and other European countries. Some of the tactics, such as the use of US provisions for evidence collection in Europe, discussed in the class are practically useful and one would never learn such practices from books. Another area very comprehensively covered during the class was cross-border litigation. I also liked the hypothetical problem formulation that was used as the basis for the discussions throughout the class. This class really inspired me to think of the possibility of making a career in litigation. Thanks!”
4.5. Tutorials
The tutorial system used at the MIPLC is one of the core components of the LL.M. program and keeps receiving excellent ratings from students in the annual program evaluations.

The changes to the tutorial system introduced in the academic year 2011/12 were well-accepted by the students. Thus, the system was continued in 2012/13.

Tutors 2012/13
Hyewon Ahn, MIPLC
Rachel Alemu, MIPLC
Marisa Aranda Sales, MIPLC
Terrence Fernbach*
Paul Gagnon*
Eugenio Hoss, MIPLC
Andrea Hüllmandel*
Daria Kim*
Magdalena Kolasa, MIPLC
Nishanta Sampath Punchi Hewage, MIPLC
Jacaranda Rivera*
Owais Hassan Shaikh, MPI
Teresa Trallero Ocaña, MIPLC
Seyhan Uğurlu, MIPLC

MIPLC: Ph.D. students supported by an MIPLC scholarship
MPI: Max Planck Institute for Intellectual Property and Competition Law
* MIPLC graduates, now working in Munich

4.6. Internships
The internship program, offered during the spring break, provides students with an opportunity to apply their newly-acquired skills and knowledge in a practical setting.

In the academic year 2012/13, students spent four weeks with the following internship sponsors:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Student’s Nationality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bardehle Pagenberg</td>
<td>Munich</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Portuguese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird &amp; Bird LLP</td>
<td>Munich</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Brazilian, Bulgarian, Chinese, Indian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boehmert &amp; Boehmert</td>
<td>Munich</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hungarian, Indian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosch Jehle</td>
<td>Munich</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Indian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinker Biddle Reath LLP</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Italian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Patent Office</td>
<td>Munich</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Austrian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer LLP</td>
<td>Düsseldorf</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoffmann Eitle</td>
<td>Munich</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kroher Strobel</td>
<td>Munich</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Greek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max-Planck-Innovation GmbH</td>
<td>Munich</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Chinese, Indian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noerr LLP</td>
<td>Munich</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Swiss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vereenigde</td>
<td>Munich</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Indian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viering, Jentschura &amp; Partner</td>
<td>Munich</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Indian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wragge</td>
<td>Munich</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On a guided tour of Augsburg with Professor Möllers during the traditional “Day in Augsburg”
4.7 EIPIN Congress

One of the many advantages of studying at the MIPLC is the possibility to attend the EIPIN conferences. EIPIN is a network of European intellectual property institutes that brings together the Centre d’Etudes Internationales de la Propriété Intellectuelle (CEIPI) at the University of Strasbourg, the Magister Lvcentinvs at the University of Alicante, the Queen Mary Intellectual Property Research Institute at the University of London, the IPKM at Maastricht University, and the MIPLC itself. Every year, two of these network partners generously host the EIPIN annual congress, and around ten students from each institute are invited to take part in it.

The 14th Annual EIPIN Congress took place in Maastricht and Strasbourg and ten lucky students of the MIPLC had the chance to visit these captivating cities. Even before the conferences began, each of those students was allocated to a specific team, each comprising one student from every EIPIN partner and guided by a team advisor, and these teams were assigned two main tasks. On the one hand, each team was given a different IP topic for them to discuss and subsequently prepare a report on. On the other hand, every team had the responsibility to initiate the discussion in one of the panels during the conference.

The first part of the annual congress took place at the Faculty of Law of Maastricht University between 31 January and 2 February 2013. The main topic of the presentations was the “Treatment Equal or No-Less Favourable of Citizens in a Globalising World – The National Treatment Principle in an EU and International Context.” Being a relatively new partner in the EIPIN network, Maastricht University faced the challenge of organising an EIPIN conference for the first time, yet it clearly exceeded the expectations and wishes of everyone present. The speakers, who came from a range of different countries and constituted an interesting mix of scholars and practitioners, offered a stimulating and in-depth analysis of a variety of international IP issues. The organisers, on their turn, made sure that the participants had everything they needed, from enjoyable lunches and dinners to coffee breaks and events that allowed people to mingle, chat and discuss their favourite topics.

The first day of the Maastricht conference was essentially devoted to providing a general framework of the principle of national treatment from the perspective of different WTO Agreements, which included presentations from real experts on the field. The following day, the principle of national treatment was analysed from an IP viewpoint, when the speakers explained in detail how the Paris Convention, the Berne Convention, and the TRIPS Agreement deal with this problem. The presentations concluded with a very interesting panel discussion which brought together most of the speakers to a very enriching debate. Later in the evening, the conference organisers invited all the participants to a very pleasant boat trip along the Maas River, after which many decided to follow with a few drinks and some further networking in the local bars. The final day, the tired faces that slowly arrived to the conference room were rapidly awakened by a very interesting mock trial that engaged two of the students’ teams into yet another lively discussion. After the lunch break, two Japanese scholars offered a very inspiring overview and update of the IP system in Japan, followed by a memorable debate by a number of renowned scholars on the ever-burning topic of the unitary patent.

A couple of months later, we all met again for the second part of the EIPIN congress in the picturesque city of Strasbourg. The topic this time was “Human Rights and Intellectual Property: From Concepts to Practice” – a very appropriate topic for this venue. As a matter of fact, the first day of the conference was hosted in the magnificent European Court of Human Rights, where the participants were welcomed by Christophe Geiger, the director of CEIPI, and listened to some very interesting introductory presentations on human rights and their interaction with the European legal framework. By late afternoon, the organisers kindly
On the LL.M. program in general: MIPLC gives you a broad vision of Intellectual Property by covering both the European and the US legal systems. As a student, you are integrated in an international atmosphere and are part of the most well-known and prestigious IP program today. MIPLC faculty comes from all over the world and from different academic and professional backgrounds. They do not only come and teach, but you actually get time to exchange opinions with them, and they are always accessible. But for me what makes MIPLC so special is the new family you belong to. You share all your days during a whole year with 28 people from 18 different nationalities. They started being just classmates, but then they became friends and family. All of them have different backgrounds, different cultures, different approaches, and all this diversity enriches the LL.M. program.

On the EIPIN Congress: I personally give great importance to networking. I encourage students to take this chance given by the EIPIN Congresses to get to know people who have the same interests and the same field of specialization as you and who come from all over the world. Furthermore, the topics of the EIPIN Congresses are always really interesting and appropriate for the current times. The 14th EIPIN Congress took place in Maastricht and Strasbourg. Both conferences were closely related and addressed the national treatment principle in its EU and international context as well as human rights and intellectual property. I found the interrelation between human rights and intellectual property really interesting.
Faculty Portrait
Professor Dr. Karin Hoisl

Professor Hoisl is the Hans Sauer Foundation Assistant Professor for Invention Processes and Intellectual Property at Ludwig Maximilians University Munich (LMU) and a Senior Research Fellow at the Max Planck Institute for Innovation and Competition. Her research interests include Knowledge Management, Organization for Innovation, Strategic Management, and Intellectual Property Management.

After getting a diploma in business administration (major subjects: Innovation Management and Marketing, minor subject: Industrial Organizational Psychology) from LMU, Professor Hoisl did a Master of Business Research (MBR) at the same university. In 2006, she was awarded a doctoral degree (summa cum laude) in business administration for her thesis “A Study on Inventors – Incentives, Productivity, and Mobility.” LMU accorded Professor Hoisl her “Venia Legendi” in 2013 for her habilitation thesis “Knowledge Acquisition, Learning, and Innovation Performance.”

Among the many awards and grants Professor Hoisl has received were a Visiting Research Fellowship from the German Research Foundation (DFG) for a research stay at the Georgia Institute of Technology in 2010/11, the Jürgen Hauschildt Award 2012 of the Commission for Technology, Innovation, and Entrepreneurship of the German Academic Association for Business Research (VHB) for the best scientific publication in empirical innovation management research, and the DRUID Best Paper Award (DRUID Conference 2011, Copenhagen).

Professor Hoisl is a founding member of the European Policy for Intellectual Property Association (EPIP) and a member of the German Academic Association for Business Research (VHB), the German Economic Association for Business Administration (GEABA), the Academy of Management (AOM), and the Strategic Management Society (SMS).

An MIPLC faculty member since 2009, Professor Hoisl teaches the courses “Intangible Assets Valuation” and “Innovation Management” and has guided a number of MIPLC students as their Master’s thesis supervisor. Her students commented on her courses as follows: “The course was excellent. Especially the way economic valuation of intangible assets was described/taught provided an additional dimension to my education in Intellectual Property.” Another student had this to say: “I like this course so much. The explanation of all the ideas is very clear and helpful. Thank you very much, Professor Hoisl.” Yet another of her students advised future MIPLC students: “This course may seem unnecessary to incoming students. However, coupling this with the course by Professor Duffy (Economic Foundations of IP) and Innovation Policy (by Professor Harhoff) gives added perspectives to the understanding of IP and knowledge transfer. Professor Hoisl is a great teacher and highly helpful as well.”

4.8. Master’s Theses
Following the completion of their coursework, all MIPLC students are required to submit a Master’s Thesis of about 55 to 75 pages. The preparation of this work of in-depth research is a central component of the LL.M. program that requires independent thinking and strong analytical and writing skills.

The students of the class of 2012/13 chose the following topics, which dealt with current issues in the fields of IP and/ or competition law.

The average grade earned for the theses was 13 points on a scale from 0 to 18, with one student even receiving the top mark of 18 points. This highly satisfactory result demonstrates once more the high academic standard of the theses submitted.

As in previous years, the MIPLC took part in the OHIM University Network. In this context, Kalliopi Dani wrote her LL.M. thesis on a topic proposed by and with additional supervision provided by an OHIM staff member. Ms. Dani also participated in the Network’s Research Session in Alicante where she presented her thesis.

What I especially liked about the program:
Courses were great. The instructors were mostly nothing short of fantastic. This has been a year of learning. I have been able to expand my horizons this past year!

(From the Program Evaluation)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Country of Origin</th>
<th>Topic of Master's Thesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angwenyi, Vincent Nyambane</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Competition Law and Regional Integration: The Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arena, Egle</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>The Use of the Trademark “As a Trademark”: A Comparative Analysis Between the United States and the European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berzek, Fahri Suleyman</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>Protection of Non-Famous Trademarks in the Light of Territoriality with Unfair Competition and Bad Faith Doctrine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhangale, Manish</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Pharmaceutical Patents in India - Analysis of select provisions in Indian Patent Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dani, Kalliopi</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Community collective marks: status, scope, and rivals in the European signs landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Araújo Sousa e Silva, Nuno</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>The Ownership Problems of Overlaps in European Intellectual Property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dohmen, Fabienne</td>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>The Unitary Patent and the Unified Patent Court - The changing landscape of patent litigation in Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gao, Hui</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>How to Improve the Role of Academic Technology Transfer Organizations in Commercial Exploitation of Academia Based Technology in China?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gera, Nisha</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>The Human Embryonic Stem Cell Saga: A Post-Brüstle Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>György, Adam</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Can a functional analysis of design law concepts define the boundaries of the Community design right?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hernández-Martí Pérez, Cristina</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Is, will or should smell be protected?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurtado Álvarez, Miguel Ángel</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Comparative Advertising in Canada, the United States and the European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Javed, Muhammad Arshad</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Vertical Mergers in ICT: An Ex Post Assessment of the Google/Motorola Merger Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeong, Seung Joo</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Patent-Drug Approval Linkage in Korea under Korea-U.S. FTA - Based on Comparative Study on U.S. Hatch-Waxman Act and Canadian Patented Medicines (Notice of Compliance) Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuroshima, Keiko</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Comparative Study of Doctrine of Equivalents in Patent Litigation: Japan, the United States and Europe (Germany and the United Kingdom)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Löhri, Elisabeth</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Artistic Freedom and Control in Copyright: A Comparative Analysis on the Basis of Case Law of the Conflict between Artist’s Rights and Transformative Use of Artistic Works under German and United States Copyright Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lube Guizardi, Taiana</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Territoriality, Patent Litigation, and Anti-Suit Injunctions: a Comparative Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machek, Nina</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>How ‘Unitary’ is the Unitary Patent?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mpalo, Benson</td>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>Copyright Exhaustion and Access to Books: Difficulties in Making the Case for an International Price Discrimination Strategy for Southern Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhaar, Arshdeep</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Is Google Monopolizing Advertising? A Skeptical Examination of Competition Law Concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niedersüß, Dominik</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>“I Don’t Even Recognize You Anymore” - The Limits of the Protection of Alteration and Modernisation of Fictitious Characters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pantov, Ventsislav</td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>The Prevention of Cybersquatting in Europe: Diverging Approaches and Prospects for Harmonization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulagedda, Abhay</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Effects-based approach to Article 102 TFEU in Information and Communication Technology Markets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swaminathan Krishnamoorthy, Kothainayaki</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Crowdsourcing research and development creates patentable inventions. Does joint patent inventorship/ownership rule of US, German, and Indian patent law support the crowdsourcing innovation model?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanahashi, Tomoko</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Comparative Study of the Rights of Publicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wagh, Gayatree</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Comparative study of claim drafting of software patents in EU and US with respect to approaches of respective patent offices and effect of different case laws on claim drafting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zheng, Junjie</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Should Functionality Doctrine Apply to All Kinds of Trademarks? - View From a Comparative Analysis of the US and the EU Approaches</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.9. The George Washington University IP Summer Program

As in every summer, The George Washington University Law School offered to its students an IP Summer Program taking place at the MIPLC, thus allowing them to deepen their knowledge of intellectual property law while at the same time travelling overseas and being exposed to a different culture. 30 students participated in this program which has already become a tradition of GW Law. While most of the participants chose to stay in Munich for the entire program (July 1 – 26), a few of them could only make it to either session I or session II.

The IP Summer Program 2013 consisted of the following lectures, most of which were also open to and eagerly embraced by MIPLC students:

Session I:
- Philosophical Foundations of Intellectual Property Law
  Professor Michael J. Madison, University of Pittsburgh
- Patents, Technology, and Society
  Professor Dan L. Burk, University of California at Irvine
- Cross-Border Trade in Intellectual Property
  Professor Robert Brauneis, GW Law
- Artistic Freedom and Control in Copyright
  Professor Kristelia A. García, GW Law

Session II:
- European Intellectual Property Law
  Professor Christoph Ann, Technische Universität München
- Chinese Intellectual Property Law
  Professor Catherine Sun, China IP Limited
- Internet Law I
  Professor Rob Heverly, Albany Law School
- Trademarks and Geographical Indications
  Professor Mark P. McKenna, University of Notre Dame

The participants in The George Washington University IP Summer Program gather among the flags of the contracting states of the European Patent Convention in front of the European Patent Office

The lectures of The George Washington University IP Summer Program take place in the MIPLC’s classroom
4.10. Overall Results and Oehm Prize

To calculate the final grade a student has achieved, the grade earned for the Master’s Thesis counts just under one-third, while the grades attained in the courses contribute a little more than two-thirds.

The average student grade for the academic year 2012/13 was 13 points, which is the same as in the two previous years and again highly satisfactory.

The Oehm Prize went to Ms. Kalliopi Dani from Greece, who finished with an excellent average of 16 points. The Oehm Prize, awarded annually to the student with the best overall grade, was created from the generous endowment Siegfried and Gertrud Oehm made to the MIPLC.
MIPLC asked all the students to write a testimonial for you, the future candidates, to know what MIPLC really means to graduates. Well, there is not only one answer to that, but let me explain it in the best way I can. First of all, with no doubt, you will get the best education in intellectual property and competition law. This is without question. The knowledge you will get will be your guiding light through your line of work whatever your profession is. You will have the best lecturers from around the world which is a big opportunity for your career... Beyond the education part, there comes the international experience. You will meet many different people from all around the world and have the opportunity to live in one of the most beautiful cities in Europe. One year of international experience with international people is worth trying... Last but not least, the family part. For one year having close relations like a family with your classmates, seeing them everyday, sometimes studying until morning and then bumping into each other in the hall (don’t be scared, believe me: it is fun) will be priceless in your life regarding the friendship and partnership you will experience. You will know that in some other country where you used to have no one, now there is a guy you can rely on. So choosing MIPLC will give you at least the opportunities I tried to list, but an even more important thing is what you will contribute to this big family! Well, you will see it when you become a part of it...

As for me, the biggest asset I got from MIPLC was to learn Intellectual Property – IP – through a globalized perspective. In particular, the courses offered favor a vast comparative assessment of how different regional and national legal systems define their IP rights – which can hardly be found in other programs in the same depth. For the ones who are interested in an international approach and its appropriateness to IP as an area of law commonly involved in international commerce, the program offers a wide range of legal systems for students to vet into.

Also, apart from course selection, there are great opportunities to meet professionals from many places, as, for instance, in my class there were people representing 18 countries. In this context, there is plenty of room to exchange professional experiences and explore differences and similarities one can find across the globe in terms of IP protection.
I spent one unforgettable year at the MIPLC which was one of the biggest challenges I have ever been faced with. The academic and social life during this one year was an outstanding experience, allowing me to have exposure to the best IP scholars in the world and to meet students from many different countries and backgrounds. I can say that it was not easy. Moments of tension and exhaustion were followed by moments of happiness and satisfaction with our own work and results. Last but not least, it deserves mentioning that the academic facilities combined with the extracurricular activities such as the EIPIN conferences, study visits and so on are unique. The rest on the way to personal perfection is a matter of the student’s own desire for high achievements and ambition, both of which are not lacking in the MIPLC’s students.

Junjie Zheng, China

In one program, I was able to acquire knowledge of the international, US, EU, and Japanese IP law. I was taught by outstanding faculty members from all over the world. One advantage of this LL.M. program is the access to the library of the Max Planck Institute for Intellectual Property and Competition Law, which has an extensive collection of books. There I can find almost any book I need in the area of IP law.

Keiko Kuroshima, Japan

During the courses, I always faced my go-go schedule. I didn’t even realize that the beautiful foliage season had come around... Still, MIPLC’s intensive program gave me what I had really hoped for. This demanding and challenging daily life definitely constituted a giant step towards being an IP expert. Here at the MIPLC, you can learn from the most influential specialists and discuss with them. These experiences especially excited me. Now it’s time to fulfill my career. I am proud that I studied with highly motivated international classmates and that I am one of the MIPLC’s alumni.

Kothainayaki Swaminathan Krishnamoorthy, India

It was a great international and intercultural experience to study at MIPLC, where I had the opportunity to meet and network with current and future IP professionals from all over the world. Learning the US and the European patent law from renowned patent attorneys and chief judges brought the court rooms into the class room. It was exciting to have as professors the persons actually shaping worldwide IP law! The all-encompassing library of the Max Planck Institute for Intellectual Property and Competition Law is a true inspiration for IP researchers.
4.11. End-of-Year Excursion

It’s the end of July, the last exams have been taken, the deadline for the submission of the Master’s thesis is still 7 weeks off, what better to do than to finally enjoy the summer on an excursion to the “Bavarian ocean” Lake Chiemsee with fellow students as well as tutors and MIPLC staff? This is why a group of 21 met at Munich Central Station on July 29, 2013, to embark on the traditional MIPLC end-of-year excursion, the last “official” occasion for the students to spend a day together as a group before finalizing their Master’s theses and scattering around the globe.

Once arrived in Prien on Lake Chiemsee, many a student discovered a passion for the antique steam-driven little train that takes passengers from the train station to the ferry terminal. A smooth and easy boat ride took the group safely over to Herrenchiemsee Island, accompanied by a large flock of clever gulls scheming – much to the delight of the passengers – for bread crumbs on the ferry.

(continued on page 31)
Taking it easy after a strenuous year of studying: Students Ventsislav Pantov, Kothainayaki Krishnamoorthy, Paraskevi Kollia, Nuno de Araújo Seuza e Silva, Vincent Angwenyi

Cooling off in front of Herrenchiemsee castle: Fahri Berzek, Ventsislav Pantov, Adam György, Nina Maschek, Taiana Lube Guizardi, Vincent Angwenyi

All in the same boat on the way to Herrenchiemsee Island in Lake Chiemsee
What does the future hold for MIPLC Program Director Dr. Gintarė Surblytė? Hui Gao reads it out of her palm, while sceptical Eugenio Hoss (Ph.D. candidate and MIPLC tutor) looks on.

True gentlemen: Vincent Angwenyi and Nuno de Araújo Sousa e Silva carrying Paraskevi Kollia up the hill to the restaurant.

Eager to start lunch in a beautiful Bavarian beer garden overlooking Lake Chiemsee.

MIPLC staff Dr. Gintarė Surblytė and Ulrike Stubenvoll enjoying lunch.
Taiana Lube Guizardi, Hui Gao, Tomoko Tanahashi, Nina Machek, Kothainayaki Swaminathan Krishnamoorthy, Nisha Gera, Keiko Kuroshima

After ten months of intensive studying, they have finally tamed the beast: Nina Machek and Taiana Lube Guizardi.

Evening settles in on Lake Chiemsee, as the end-of-year excursion comes to a close.

After a leisurely stroll in the summer sun, Bavarian King Ludwig II’s Herrenchimsee Castle waited for the students to be discovered, where they learned much to their astonishment that Ludwig had aspired to building an exact replica of Versailles castle for himself on this little island. The central parts that actually were built took in the visitors in a stride, especially the hall of mirrors which, as one participant commented, would be ideally suited for his wedding celebration...

For lunch, the group assembled in a beautiful Bavarian beer garden overlooking Lake Chiemsee to enjoy a good meal accompanied by a well-deserved beer or two. Afterwards, the options were manifold: The scholarly one was having a look at the museum on German constitutional history in a former monastery on the island (important deliberations about the post-war constitution of West Germany took place here), the relaxing one was going for some ice cream and/or some more beer, and the most refreshing one was to have a nap on the grass under a large tree or at the beach. All available options were given a good hard look, and each of the valiant scholars came to his or her own conclusion …

On the ferry back, the beautiful views of the Bavarian Alps made some participants think about coming back after the submission of the Master’s thesis in mid-September, a pleasant idea to hang on to during the strenuous weeks which were to follow.
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Seung Joo Jeong performing one last appearance check

Professor Drexl during his congratulatory address

Professor Kort again acted as Master of ceremonies

Boys having fun while getting dressed for their graduation ceremony...

... as do the girls

The cap fits Fabienne Dohmen very well
4.12. Graduation Ceremony

On November 15, 2013, nearly all of the students of the MIPLC’s class of 2012/13 gathered in Augsburg’s stunning Rococo Hall to celebrate their graduation with their families and friends, lecturers, tutors, the members of the MIPLC Boards, the MIPLC staff, and other illustrious members of the IP community. Some of the students still lived in Munich to prepare for Ph.D. studies or doing postgraduate internships, while others had already returned to their home countries and had to fly in from all four corners of the world – a true homecoming.

150 participants – a record number – were welcomed by Professor Kort, member of the MIPLC Managing Board, who acted as the Master of ceremonies throughout the evening. After an address by Professor Tuma, Vice President of Augsburg University, Professor Drexl, Chairman of the MIPLC Managing Board, congratulated the members of the class of 2012/13 on their achievements, and Professor Heinemann, member of the MIPLC Scientific Advisory Board and Professor of Law at Zurich University, delivered the commencement address.

The graduation ceremony took place in the splendid Rococo Hall of Augsburg.

The a cappella choir “Die Vokalisten” performing.

Student representatives Adam György and Nina Machek delivering their address.

Alumni representatives Terrence Fernbach and Dana Kim during their speech.

Margit Hinkel handing out the caps to the graduating students.

Egle Arena receives her diploma from Dean Martina Benecke.
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Graduating students
Miguel Hurtado Alvarez
and Junjie Zheng

Graduate Nisha Gera

2013/2014 student
Nigar Kirimova

Ph.D. candidate and tutor Eugenio Hoss

A proud relative

MIPLC alumnus
Preston Richard

Happy graduates Cristina Hernandez-Martí
Pérez, Elisabeth Löhr, and Nina Machek

The class of 2013
posing for its official graduation picture
When the last sounds of the a capella choir “Die Vokalisten”, which accompanied the Graduation Ceremony by intoning tunes from times past and present, hand rung out, Daria Kim and Terrence Fernbach of the Alumni Advisory Board stepped up to the podium to welcome the class of 2012/13 into the MIPLC alumni community.

Nina Machek and Adam György, the Student Representatives of the class of 2012/13, delivered their views on the exiting, challenging, and rewarding year that lay behind them, reminiscing about major events and small occurrences during the year they had spent at the MIPLC, and thanking MIPLC lecturers, tutors, and staff for their tireless work and unflinching support of “their” students. The traditional class video transported students and other participants in the Graduation Ceremony back to the Welcome Day at the beginning of October 2012 and all the way through what will surely be looked back upon by the students as “the happy year we spent together in Munich at the MIPLC.”

Finally, the moment each and every student had been eagerly waiting for came about: Professor Benecke, Dean of the Faculty of Law of Augsburg University, delivered - amidst frenetic applause - the diplomas to the students proudly wearing their caps and gowns. Following the awarding of the Oehm Prize by Professor Drexl to Kalliopi Dani (see 4.10.), all the participants in the Graduation Ceremony enjoyed a hearty reception at which the students’ successes were celebrated and plans for the future made and compared. The party is rumored to have continued in Munich into the wee hours of the morning...

4.13.1. Lecturer Evaluation
To collect direct feedback from the class about the courses offered, all students are encouraged to participate in the lecturer evaluations. The new evaluation form that had been introduced in the academic year 2011/12 was continued: Students may rate lecturers on a scale from 1 (excellent) to 6 (unacceptable). The evaluation questionnaire consists of six questions, covering the professor’s
- Ability to present the subject matter in a clear and organized manner,
- Choice of course materials,
- Relationship with students,
- Ability to stimulate student’s interest in the subject,
- Ability to develop student’s analytical skills, and
- The student’s overall rating of the course.
Moreover, students may submit additional written comments.
For the academic year 2012/13, the faculty average was 2.15.

4.13.2. Program Evaluation
At the end of the academic year, all students are asked to participate in a program evaluation exercise that covers the program’s structure, the course content, the mentoring and support they have received, the MIPLC’s equipment, their professional perspectives, and their overall level of satisfaction.
The following charts present the evaluation results of the past nine academic years including 2012/13. Figures 1 to 3 reflect the breadth of assessments given by all classes, and highlight the 2012/13 results. As they clearly indicate, the students have had highly consistent opinions over the past academic years. The overall satisfaction with the program in its current form is 1.88 and therefore even higher than last year’s 2.04. The range of courses on offer was rated 2.08, as was the level of courses. Both grades are a testament to the high quality of the instruction offered at the MIPLC.
A different scale is used to evaluate the content of individual courses. On this scale, 3.0 means that the content level should be maintained, anything above 3.0 indicates that students feel the content should be decreased, and anything below 3.0 indicates that it should be increased. All responses of the current year, as demonstrated in Figure 2, are within the range of 2.42 to 3.65, showing that students are satisfied with the content of the courses they were offered during the academic year 2012/13 at the MIPLC.

---

**Figure 1:**
Students’ evaluation of the structure and the content of the LL.M. program, on a scale from 1 (I completely agree) to 5 (I completely disagree). The grey band demonstrates the spectrum of weighted average ratings for the classes 2004/05 through 2012/13. The black line indicates the average rating of the 2012/13 class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure and Content of the Program</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The courses are logically structured within the program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The balance of basic courses and specialized courses is appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The range of courses offered is very good.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The program offers sufficient possibilities to specialize within specific areas of IP and Competition law.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The system of examination evaluates performances fairly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The level of the courses is adequate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The workload of the program is manageable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extra-curricular activities are sufficient.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.0 1.5 2.0 2.5 3.0 3.5 4.0 4.5 5.0
The support provided by professors, tutors, and the MIPLC team again received high ratings, ranging from 1.71 for the career advice to 2.50 for the IT support. The mentoring during lectures was rated 2.15, the support provided by the MIPLC team 1.77. The tutorials were rated 1.73 for individual support and 1.81 for educational support provided, demonstrating that the tutors take up an important position in their tutees’ lives and provide support beyond the strictly academic.

Confirming the experience of past years, the MIPLC equipment was rated very highly. At the top of the list was the Max Planck Institute’s library at an excellent 1.12, followed by the MIPLC’s own classroom at 1.23. The importance of having an office, which scored 1.27, confirmed the – costly – policy of providing fully-equipped office space for each student. Even the “lowest” rating (1.50 for the MIPLC library) is still very satisfying and shows that the students very much appreciate the facilities and working conditions at the MIPLC.

Students had very positive views of their post-MIPLC perspectives, rating 1.62 for excellent knowledge of IP and competition law gained, 1.58 for the preparation received for a demanding career, and 2.12 for attractive career perspectives.

### Figure 2:
Students’ evaluation of the content of each course on a scale from 1 (increase strongly) to 5 (decrease strongly), with a value of 3 corresponding to “leave it as is.”

The grey band demonstrates the spectrum of weighted average ratings for the classes 2004/05 through 2012/13. The black line indicates the average rating of the 2012/13 class.
Mentoring and Support

I was very content with the mentoring provided by the lecturers during the courses.

I was very content with the tutors’ educational support provided.

I was very content with the individual support provided.

I was very content with the support given by and the communication with the MIPLC team.

I was content with the academic advising.

I have actively used the career advice available and found it useful.

I was content with the IT support.

Equipment

The library of the Max Planck Institute has been a valuable resource.

The library of the MIPLC has been a valuable resource.

Having an office was important.

The classroom is well equipped.

Assessment of Perspectives after the Program

The LL.M. IP program has given me an excellent knowledge of Intellectual Property and Competition Law.

The program is a good preparation for a demanding position.

The LL.M. IP degree opens up attractive career perspectives.

Overall Impression

Altogether I am satisfied with the LL.M. IP Program in its present form.

Figure 3: Students’ satisfaction with the support received during the program, the infrastructure, the career perspectives, and the program as a whole, on a scale from 1 (completely agree) to 5 (completely disagree). The grey band demonstrates the spectrum of weighted average ratings for the classes 2004/05 through 2012/13. The black line indicates the average rating of the 2012/13 class.

4.14. Professional Perspectives – Career Steps Taken by the 2012/13 Graduates

Helping to build opportunities for successful careers for graduates of the LL.M. program is one of the most important goals of the MIPLC. Enjoying a productive career in intellectual property is understandably also a key motivation of most students who enter the program! Each year, MIPLC alumni have found excellent jobs providing great opportunities for utilizing their knowledge and skills in law firms, corporate legal departments, IP institutions, and government-run facilities. As was the case for previous graduates, the 2012/13 graduates received various forms of placement support, ranging from letters of recommendation given by members of the Managing Board or the faculty to direct introductions at law firms and companies. The MIPLC approach is, wherever possible, to provide personalized assistance catering to each individual’s distinctive needs and strengths, rather than to follow a standardized formula for getting a job. The general result, it is hoped, is a good match between a graduate and an employer and, thereafter, a robust and productive long-term career prospect in IP.

The 2012/13 graduates were able to find desirable positions in the field of IP in all parts of the world. Employers included:

- Apple Germany, Munich
- Berzek Hukuk Bürosu, Istanbul, Turkey
- Brandstock Services, Munich
- Hernández Martí Attorneys at Law, Valencia, Spain
- Intel, Feldkirchen, Germany
- Japan Patent Office, Tokyo, Japan
- Lattenmayer, Luks & Enzinger Attorneys at Law, Vienna, Austria
- Max Planck Institute for Intellectual Property and Competition Law, Munich
- Ministry of Justice of Zambia, Lusaka, Zambia
- Patrick Mirandah Intellectual Property, Singapore
- Pinheiro Torres, Cabral, Sousa e Silva & Associados, Porto, Portugal
- Prüfer & Partner Intellectual Property Law Firm, Munich
- SBGK Patent and Law Offices, Budapest, Hungary
- Tokyo District Court, Tokyo, Japan
An overview of the career steps taken by the students of the first ten MIPLC classes immediately after graduation is provided in Figure 4. Of the 251 graduates from ten classes, 76% went to work for (patent) law firms, patent offices and IP institutions, government bodies, the private sector (industry, consulting, etc.), as scientific staff (universities, research institutes), or as freelancers. A further 16% chose to continue their education by pursuing Ph.D.s (13%) or other graduate degrees. 2% of all graduates took leave, and for 6% no initial information was available. It should be noted that this chunk includes those recent graduates who have decided to take a break after graduation and/or are job-hunting.

A somewhat different picture emerges when looking at the current employment situation of all MIPLC graduates, as shown in Figure 5. A full 85% are employed with (patent) law firms, patent offices and IP institutions, government bodies, the private sector (industry, consulting, etc.), as scientific staff (universities, research institutes), or as freelancers. This increase reflects the fact that most of the early graduates who moved into Ph.D. studies have completed their theses and have successfully entered the job market. Law firms and industry seem to be preferred employers for such graduates.
4.15. Alumni Activities

The MIPLC is proud of its highly diversified alumni activities.

All MIPLC graduates automatically become members of the Alumni Network, which is managed by the MIPLC administration. In setting up this network, the MIPLC desired to create a worldwide community among the alumni body and to facilitate opportunities for lifelong engagement in pursuit of three goals:

- Recruitment of suitable students for the LL.M. program
- Continuous optimization and development of the LL.M. program
- Creation of a culture of philanthropy among the alumni body to ensure the funding of scholarships for highly qualified applicants who could not study the LL.M. program without financial assistance.

In order to foster a spirit of supportive engagement between the MIPLC and its graduates and to facilitate alumni-driven initiatives on a professional and social level, an Alumni Advisory Board was set up to serve as a go-between for communication between the MIPLC alumni community and the MIPLC. The board comprises one elected representative from each MIPLC class. Regular meetings aim to increase networking across classes.

All alumni have access to a dedicated intranet. The Alumni Intranet hosts a Contacts and Expertise database into which all alumni will be entered upon request to allow for better networking across classes. It also maintains a calendar of events keeping track of alumni movement across the globe to international conferences in order to facilitate meet-ups.
On 17 November 2012, the MIPLC hosted its first-ever Alumni Conference. For a detailed account of the Alumni Conference, please refer to 3.1.

In February 2013, the MIPLC launched the Alumni Scholarship. The long-term goal of this new initiative is to fund a full tuition fee from alumni contributions. As a true effort of past students benefitting one of their successors, it is up to the Alumni Advisory Board to take a decision on the recipient of the Alumni Scholarship. Already in its pilot year, a great number of MIPLC alumni contributed generously to the Alumni Scholarship. A scholarship certificate will be presented to the recipient of the Alumni Scholarship at each Alumni Conference.

In addition, social events are organized on a regular basis to give alumni a chance to meet one another as well as current students. Such events include the annual Christmas Dinner in December and a regular “Stammtisch.” While currently confined to Munich, it is hoped that similar initiatives will develop in other cities that are home to a larger number of alumni, e.g. Washington, Tokyo, or Beijing. An alumni dinner took place in Beijing on 17 July 2013, bringing together former MIPLC Administrative Director Julia Pracht with a number of Chinese alumni.

The 43rd World IP Congress of AIPPI in Seoul, Korea, in October 2012 again provided an occasion for a small-scale reunion that brought together MIPLC alumni from several classes. Another such reunion took place at the INTA Annual Meeting in Dallas, Texas, in May 2013. Later the same day, GW Law hosted a reception for the greater IP community at which a number of MIPLC alumni and lecturers were warmly welcomed.
5.1. Ph.D. Students

During the academic year 2012/13, several students approached the conclusion of their Ph.D. studies, while one student submitted her completed Ph.D. thesis. The following students were working on their Ph.D. theses with the support of an MIPLC scholarship in the academic year 2012/13:

- **Second Generation Patents in Pharmaceutical Innovation**
  - Hyewon Ahn
  - Korea (MIPLC graduate of 2009/10)

- **Liberalization of the Telecommunications Sector in Sub-Saharan Africa: Customizing the Legal and Regulatory Framework to Promote Competitive Telecommunications Markets. A Case Study of Uganda**
  - Rachel Alemu
  - Uganda (MIPLC graduate of 2008/09)

- **Intellectual Property and Clean Technology in the Context of the European Legal Framework**
  - Maria Luisa Aranda Sales
  - Spain (MIPLC graduate of 2009/10)

- **Shaping Copyright Policy for the Online Music Sector in China**
  - Kan He
  - China (MIPLC graduate of 2009/10)

- **Deceptive Conduct before the Patent Office: Challenges for Patent Law and Competition Law**
  - Eugenio Hoss
  - Argentina (MIPLC graduate of 2010/11)

- **Harmonization of Trade Secrets: Requirements for Protection in the European Union**
  - Teresa Trallero Ocaña
  - Spain (MIPLC graduate of 2010/11)

- **The Patent Exhaustion Doctrine and its Applicability to New-Self Replicating Technologies**
  - Ali Seyhan Uğurlu
  - Turkey (MIPLC graduate of 2011/12)
5.2. Ph.D. Presentations

Doctoral candidates He Kan and Eugenio Hoss presented their Ph.D. theses in the Poster Session which took place on June 17, 2013, in the framework of the meeting of the Board of Trustees (Kuratorium) of the MPI.

5.3. EIPIN Doctoral Meeting
On January 30 and 31, 2013, right before the start of the 14th EIPIN Congress, the University of Maastricht hosted the annual EIPIN Doctoral Meeting. Every year, this conference brings together a number of doctoral candidates from all EIPIN member institutions and gives them the opportunity to present their research projects and discuss them with renowned academics and professionals.

This year, we had the chance to participate together with six doctoral students from the Queen Mary Intellectual Property Research Institute, the CEIPI of the University of Strasbourg, and the IPKM of Maastricht University. The context of the conference was extremely open and friendly and made for a challenging yet pleasant platform for each of us to present our research projects and ideas.

As participants, we presented our Ph.D. projects on “Harmonization of Trade Secrets Law: Requirements for Protection in the EU” and “Deceptive Conduct Before the Patent Office: Challenges for Patent Law and Competition Law.” Each of our presentations was followed by very valuable remarks from the very knowledgeable and heterogeneous audience, who kindly commented from a variety of different angles. Many of these observations lead to lively and enriching discussions that altogether made up a priceless experience.

We are very grateful to the MIPLC and the other EIPIN partners for giving us the opportunity to take part in this conference and would strongly recommend it to future doctoral students.

Teresa Trallero Ocaña
Eugenio Hoss

What I especially liked about the program: The fact that all the classes take place in one room. Close relationship with the staff. Altogether it is not just an LL.M. program, it’s a family.
(From the Program Evaluation)
5.4. The MIPLC Lecture Series
In 2012/13, the MIPLC continued its successful lecture series in which international IP experts give talks. During the period covered by this report, the following lectures were given:

Disintermediation in Copyright Law – A Skeptical View
Dr. Guy Pessach
(Hebrew University of Jerusalem)
November 27, 2012

The WTO “Paragraph 6 System”: Compulsory Licenses for Export to Third Countries – Diverging Theory and Practice?
Beatrice Stirner
(University of Neuchâtel)
December 5, 2012

The Apple v. Samsung Case: How Design Law in Europe Develops
Professor Charles Gielen
(University of Groningen)
January 8, 2013

EU Competition Law: Procedure and Process before the General Court and the Court of Justice of the European Union
Eileen Sheehan
(a référendaire (law clerk) at the Court of Justice of the European Union)
February 4, 2013

Patent Litigation in the Pharmaceutical Sector in Germany
Dr. Anna Wolters
(Bird & Bird LLP)
May 13, 2013

The Comparative Law and Economics of Standard Essential Patents and FRAND Royalties
Professor Thomas F. Cotter
(University of Minnesota Law School)
July 8, 2013

5.5. The MIPLC Book Series
The MIPLC Book Series, published by Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, continued to publish outstanding Ph.D. and Master’s theses:

Volume 18:
The United States Bayh-Dole Act and its Effect on University Technology Transfer
Joel Gotkin (class of 2010/11)

Volume 19:
Second Generation Patents in Pharmaceutical Innovation
Dr. Hyewon Ahn (class of 2009/10)

Volume 20:
Patent Strategy in Pharmaceutical Industry: Are Additional Patents Valuable?
Monica Donghi (class of 2011/12)

Of the class of 2012/13, four Master’s theses were chosen for publication:

Community collective marks: status, scope and rivals in the European signs landscape
Kalliopi Dani

Artistic Freedom and Control in Copyright – A Comparative Analysis on the Basis of Case Law of the Conflict Between Artist’s Rights and Transformative Use of Artistic Works Under German and United States Copyright Law
Elisabeth Löhr

“I Don’t Even Recognize You Anymore” – The Limits of the Protection of Alteration and Modernisation of Fictitious Characters
Carl Dominik Niedersüß
5.6. The MIPLC Master’s Thesis Series on SSRN
The MIPLC Master’s Thesis Series on SSRN was set up to publish selected LL.M. theses that were recommended for publication by the supervisor but whose thematic or geographic focus is too narrow to attract a sufficiently large readership for the Nomos series. The theses are available for free download. Of the academic year 2012/13, the following theses were chosen for publication as part of the series:

- **Competition Law and Regional Integration: The Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA)**
  - *Vincent Nyambane Angwenyi*

- **The Unitary Patent and the Unified Patent Court - The changing landscape of patent litigation in Europe**
  - *Fabienne Dohmen*

- **Patent-Drug Approval Linkage in Korea under Korea-U.S. FTA - Based on Comparative Study on U.S. Hatch-Waxman Act and Canadian Patented Medicines (Notice of Compliance) Regulations**
  - *Seung Joo Jeong*

- **Disclosure of Origin in Patent Law: How to Enforce it Best?**
  - *Paraskevi Kollia*

- **How ‘Unitary’ is the Unitary Patent?**
  - *Nina Machek*

- **Copyright Exhaustion and Access to Books: Difficulties in Making the Case for an International Price Discrimination Strategy for Southern Africa**
  - *Benson Mpalo*

- **The Prevention of Cybersquatting in Europe: Diverging Approaches and Prospects for Harmonization**
  - *Ventsislav Pantov*

- **Comparative Study of the Rights of Publicity**
  - *Tomoko Tanahashi*

- **Should Functionality Doctrine Apply to All Kinds of Trademarks? – View From a Comparative Analysis of the US and the EU Approaches**
  - *Junjie Zheng*

What I consider my most valuable experience at MIPLC: The international diversity in the classroom is probably the best thing about the program. It gives different perspectives regarding law, culture, and traditions when you have twenty different nationalities in your social circle and classroom on a daily basis.

(From the Program Evaluation)
As stipulated by the founding Cooperation Agreement between the partners, the MIPLC has two advisory boards.

The Scientific Advisory Board advises the Managing Board on the MIPLC’s LL.M. program as well as on financial issues. The Board consists of nine members, five of whom are external, i.e. not representatives of the MIPLC partners.

Furthermore, the Regulations of the Max Planck Society require a Board of Trustees to promote the relationship between the MIPLC and the general public interested in education and research in IP and adjacent areas.

For a complete list of the distinguished personalities the MIPLC was proud to have on its Scientific Advisory Board and its Board of Trustees during the academic year 2012/13, please refer to Appendix 3.

As the Board of Trustees meets on a bi-annual basis in even years, the only MIPLC board to meet in November 2013 was the Scientific Advisory Board.

6.1. Meeting of the Scientific Advisory Board

The Scientific Advisory Board (SAB) met on November 14 and 15, 2013.

Following the welcome by Professor Gielen, Chair of the Scientific Advisory Board, and a general report on the situation at the MIPLC by Professor Drexl, Professor Brauneis and Dr. Surblytė presented an overview of the academic year 2012/13 and the developments of the LL.M. program. Moreover, Margit Hinkel...
Born in Kyoto/Japan in 1975, Yuki Shimizu is a Consul in the Economic Division of the Consulate General of Japan in Munich. His responsibilities include all economic affairs with a special focus on IP issues.

Before joining the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in 2012, Mr. Shimizu has since the year 2000 held different positions at the Japan Patent Office (JPO), where he worked as a patent examiner in areas like TV circuits, moving picture compression, moving picture recording, and mobile communication. Moreover, Yuki Shimizu served as Assistant Director of the International Affairs Division of the JPO and as Deputy Director of JPO’s Policy Planning and Research Division. From mid-2007 to mid-2009, Yuki Shimizu returned to academia as a Visiting Scholar at the Fordham University School of Law in New York City.

A member of the Board of Trustees since 2012, Consul Shimizu therefore brings to the MIPLC comprehensive experience in intellectual property protection in a country known for its highly innovative companies.

When asked whether the MIPLC is well-known in the Japanese IP community, this is what Consul Shimizu replied: “MIPLC is getting known in Japan as the number of Japanese graduates grows. The Japanese IP Community in Munich, which Japanese MIPLC students belong to, is another media to disseminate information about the MIPLC.” As to the role the MIPLC, given its strong record of cooperation with the Japan Patent Office and the Supreme Court of Japan as well as the considerable number of Japanese MIPLC alumni, could play in strengthening the relations between Japan and Germany in the field of IP, Yuki Shimizu offered this thought: “Japan and Germany have a wide range of common challenges because they share similar industrial structure, high quality products, strong IP protection, etc. Unfortunately, the language barrier and the physical distance between both countries make an exchange of up-to-date legal information difficult. The MIPLC can play a very important role to make this exchange a lot smoother.”
### Appendix 1: Curriculum

#### Basic Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Authors/Editors</th>
<th>CHs</th>
<th>CPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Patent Law</td>
<td>Strauss, Moufang, Prinz zu Waldeck</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International and Comparative Patent Law</td>
<td>Adelman, Jacob, Katayama, Lee, Rader</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Copyright Law</td>
<td>Hugenholtz, von Lewinski</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International and Comparative Copyright Law</td>
<td>Brauneis, Ganea, Große Ruse – Khan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European, US, and International Trademark Law</td>
<td>Dinwoodie, Senftleben</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European, US, and International Design Law</td>
<td>Kur, Leaffer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European and US Competition Law</td>
<td>Kort</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfair Competition</td>
<td>Ohly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection of Geographical Indications</td>
<td>Gangjee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensing of IP Rights</td>
<td>Ann, Goddar, Lamping</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European and International (WTO) Law</td>
<td>Möllers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction and Conflict of Laws</td>
<td>Torremans</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Introductory Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Authors/Editors</th>
<th>CHs</th>
<th>CPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal Tradition (Civil Law &amp; Common Law)</td>
<td>Ann, Cornish, Crews</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Research and Writing</td>
<td>Crews</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to IP</td>
<td>Crews</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International IP Convention Systems</td>
<td>Crews</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Economics</td>
<td>Reinshagen</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Competition Law</td>
<td>Podszun</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Students’ Voices (regarding the curriculum):** In total, very well balanced. Some classes were so good that I would have loved to have them longer. *(From the Program Evaluation)*
### Elective Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>CH: Credit Hour (700 minutes of teaching)</th>
<th>cp: credit points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trade Secret Law</td>
<td>(Ann, Surblyté)</td>
<td>1 CH, 1.5 cp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy, Publicity, and Personality</td>
<td>(Ohly)</td>
<td>1 CH, 1.5 cp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP and Indigenous Heritage</td>
<td>(von Lewinski)</td>
<td>1 CH, 1.5 cp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical and Economic Foundations of IP</td>
<td>(Duffy)</td>
<td>1 CH, 1.5 cp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation Policy</td>
<td>(Harhoff)</td>
<td>1 CH, 1.5 cp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intangible Assets Valuation</td>
<td>(Hoisl)</td>
<td>1 CH, 1.5 cp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science, Patents, and Start-ups</td>
<td>(Hertel)</td>
<td>1 CH, 1.5 cp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>(Bassen, Poech)</td>
<td>1 CH, 1.5 cp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial Finance</td>
<td>(Kaserer)</td>
<td>1 CH, 1.5 cp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Management and IP in New Firms</td>
<td>(Patzelt)</td>
<td>1 CH, 1.5 cp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP Within the Global Legal Order</td>
<td>(Große Ruse – Khan)</td>
<td>1 CH, 1.5 cp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophical Foundations of IP</td>
<td>(Madison)</td>
<td>1 CH, 1.5 cp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Law</td>
<td>(Ericsson)</td>
<td>1 CH, 1.5 cp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbitration</td>
<td>(Karamanian, Wilbers)</td>
<td>1 CH, 1.5 cp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbitration Simulation</td>
<td>(Karamanian)</td>
<td>0.5 CH, 0.75 cp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Courses

- **Practical Training in European Patent Law**
  - (Karl, Wolters) | 1 CH, 1.5 cp

- **Protection of Biotechnological Inventions**
  - (Bagley, Straus) | 1 CH, 1.5 cp

- **Pharmaceuticals and IP**
  - (Bagley, Gassner, Kebekus) | 1 CH, 1.5 cp

- **Patents, Technology, and Society**
  - (Burk) | 1 CH, 1.5 cp

- **Enforcement of Copyright**
  - (Strowel, Traphagen) | 1 CH, 1.5 cp

- **Databases and Investment Protection**
  - (Leistner) | 1 CH, 1.5 cp

- **Entertainment Law**
  - (Dougherty, Loewenheim) | 1 CH, 1.5 cp

- **Artistic Freedom and Control in Copyright**
  - (Garcia) | 1 CH, 1.5 cp

- **Practical Training in Trademark Law**
  - (von Bomhard, Hines) | 1 CH, 1.5 cp

- **IP and Competition Law**
  - (Drexl) | 2 CH, 3 cp

- **Enforcement of Competition Law**
  - (Möllers) | 1 CH, 1.5 cp

- **Cross-Border Trade in IP**
  - (Brauneis) | 1 CH, 1.5 cp

- **License Contract Drafting**
  - (Soltysiński) | 1 CH, 1.5 cp

- **IP Prosecution and Enforcement**
  - (Codd, Heselberger, Kroher, McMahon) | 2 CH, 3 cp

- **Oral Advocacy**
  - (Ann, Nack) | 1 CH, 1.5 cp

- **Computers and the Law**
  - (Dreier, Lehmann, Nack) | 2 CH, 3 cp

- **Internet Law**
  - (Heverly) | 1 CH, 1.5 cp

- **Chinese IP Law**
  - (Sun) | 1 CH, 1.5 cp

---

CH: Credit Hour
(700 minutes of teaching)
cp: credit points
Appendix 2: Faculty

“...

Professor Christophe Ann
Technische Universität München

Professor Margo A. Bagley
University of Virginia, Charlottesville, USA

Professor Alexander Bassen
University of Hamburg, Germany

Dr. Verena von Bombard
Hogan Lovells, Alicante, Spain

Professor Robert Brauneis
The George Washington University Law School

Professor Dan L. Burk
University of California, Irvine, USA

Professor William R. Cornish
Cambridge University, UK

Professor Kenneth D. Crews
Columbia University, New York City, USA

Professor Edward Damich
US Court of Federal Claims, Washington, D.C., USA

Professor Graeme B. Dinwoodie
University of Oxford, UK

Professor F. Jay Dougherty
Loyola Law School, Los Angeles, USA

Professor Thomas Dreier
Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, Karlsruhe, Germany

Professor Josef Drexl
Max Planck Institute for Intellectual Property and Competition Law

Professor John F. Duffy
University of Virginia, Charlottesville, USA

Dr. A. Seth Ericsson
MIPLC/Max Planck Institute for Intellectual Property and Competition Law

Professor Dr. Peter Ganea
Goethe University, Frankfurt am Main, Germany

Dr. Dev Gangjee
London School of Economics, UK

Professor Kristelia A. García
The George Washington University Law School

Professor Ulrich M. Gassner
University of Augsburg

Professor Heinz Goddar
Boehmert & Boehmert, Munich

Dr. Henning Große Ruse – Khan
Max Planck Institute for Intellectual Property and Competition Law

Professor Dietmar Harhoff
Ludwig Maximilians University, Munich

Dr. Bernhard Hertel
formerly of Max Planck Innovation GmbH, Munich

Johannes Heselberger
Bardehle Pagenberg, Munich

Professor Robert Heverly
Albany Law School, Albany, N.Y., USA

P. Jay Hines
Cantor Colburn LLP, Alexandria, USA

Professor Karin Hoisl
Ludwig Maximilians University, Munich

Professor Bernt Hugenholtz
University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Sir Lord Justice Robin Jacob
Royal Courts of Justice, London, UK

What I consider my most valuable experience at MIPLC: Being taught by professors who are experts in the subject that they are teaching. This is the Unique Selling Point of the program and it is definitely not the case for most IP programs.

(From the Program Evaluation)
What I consider my most valuable experience at MIPLC: I can experience both the common law and the continental legal system in one place. The professors are high-quality and are from all over the world, which gives me a global exposure.

(From the Program Evaluation)
Appendix 3: Board Members and Sponsors

Managing Board

- Professor Josef Drexl (Chair)
  Max Planck Institute for Intellectual Property and Competition Law
- Professor Christoph Ann
  Technische Universität München
- Professor Robert Brauneis
  The George Washington University Law School
- Professor Michael Kort
  University of Augsburg

Scientific Advisory Board

Representatives of the partners:

- Professor Martin J. Adelman
  The George Washington University Law School
- Professor Reto M. Hilty
  Max Planck Institute for Intellectual Property and Competition Law
- Professor Thomas M. J. Möllers
  University of Augsburg
- Professor Holger Patzelt
  Technische Universität München

External members:

- Professor Antonina Bakardjieva-Engelbrekt
  University of Stockholm, Sweden
- Professor Vincenzo Di Cataldo
  University of Catania, Italy
- Professor Charles Gielen (Chair)
  University of Groningen, The Netherlands
- Professor Andreas Heinemann
  University of Zurich, Switzerland
- Professor Russell K. Osgood
  Retired President, Grinnell College, Distinguished Visiting Professor of Law, Washington University, St. Louis, MO, USA

What I consider my most valuable experience at MIPLC: The opportunity to receive mentoring from some of the most renowned and distinguished professionals and scholars in the field of IP and Competition Law!
(From the Program Evaluation)

What I especially liked about the program: In the first place, the quality of the faculty and the variety of classes. Furthermore, I personally liked the fact that the class is small enough and everybody receives personal attention according to their personal interests and preferences. During each of the lectures there were lively discussions, and all opinions were welcome. I also find the social and academic life at MIPLC very exciting!
(From the Program Evaluation)
The Center is grateful to the following organizations and individuals who have generously supported the MIPLC through donations and through scholarships, all of which have been of immense assistance to LL.M. students:

### Scholarship organizations
- Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH
- German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD)
- Gemeinnützige Hertie-Stiftung
- ECAP II (EU)
- EU-China Project on the Protection of Intellectual Property Rights (IPR2)
- Jean Monnet Program (EU)
- Program AlBan (EU)
- CONACYT

### Companies
- BASF SE
- Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals
- Papst Licensing GmbH & Co. KG
- Siemens AG
- A German manufacturing company
- A German pharmaceutical company

### Government and IP organizations
- Japan Patent Office
- Supreme Court of Japan
- Deutsche Vereinigung für gewerblichen Rechtsschutz und Urheberrecht e.V. (GRUR)
- Licensing Executives Society (LES), German Section

### Law firms and patent law firms
- Bardehle Pagenberg
- Bird & Bird
- Boehmert & Boehmert
- Charrier, Rapp & Liebau
- A Chinese law firm
- Dennemeyer & Associates / Dennemeyer & Company
- Kroher-Strobel, Munich
- McDermott Will & Emery
- Noerr LLP, Munich

### Individuals
- Professor Martin J. Adelman
- Jack S. Barufka
- Professor Robert Brauneis
- Professor Heinz Goddar
- Dr. Heinz Hammann
- P. Jay Hines
- Dr. Ulrich Kebekus
- Terrence McMahon
- Siegfried and Gertrud Oehm
- Dr. Axel Walz (SJ Berwin LLP)
- Erik Wilbers
- Dr. Yoichi Yoshizawa

### Board of Trustees
- Dr. Bertram Huber (Chair)  
  IP*SEVA, Backnang, Germany
- Professor Winfried Büttner (Vice Chair)  
  Director Corporate Intellectual Property and Functions, Siemens AG, Munich
- Professor Joachim Bornkamm  
  Presiding Judge, German Federal Supreme Court, Karlsruhe, Germany
- Terrence McMahon  
  Head of the Worldwide Intellectual Property, Media & Technology Department, McDermott Will & Emery LLP, Menlo Park, USA
- Dr. Michael Mihatsch  
  Ministerial Dirigent, Bavarian State Ministry of Science, Research, and the Arts, Munich
- Shira Perlmutter  
  Chief Policy Officer and Director for International Affairs, USPTO, Washington, D.C., USA
- Yuki Shimizu  
  Consul, Japanese Consulate-General, Munich
- Dr. Jochen Volkmer  
  Head, Trademarks, Designs, and Legal Issues Relating to IP Law Department, BMW AG, Munich
Public Sector and IP Offices

Attorney General's Chambers, Singapore
Beijing IP Office, Beijing, China
Beijing Seed Administration, Beijing, China
CIGAR Consortium for International Agricultural Research Centers, Montpellier, France
Charité Universitätsmedizin, Berlin, Germany
China International Electronic Commerce Center, Beijing, China
China Trademark Office, Beijing, China
Chinese Academy of Agricultural Science, China Center for IP in Agriculture, Beijing, China
Chinese Intellectual Property Office, Beijing, China
Ministry of Justice, Oslo, Norway
Ministry of Justice, Lusaka, Zambia
Icelandic Patent Office, Reykjavik, Iceland
Ethiopian Intellectual Property Office, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
Patent Law Firms and Trademark Law Firms

Office for Harmonization in the Internal Market, Alicante, Spain
Osaka District Court, Osaka, Japan
Shenzhen IP Office, Shenzhen, China
Standing Committee of the National People's Congress, Beijing, China
State Administration for Industry and Commerce, Beijing, China
State Food and Drug Administration, Beijing, China
State Intellectual Property Office, Beijing, China
Supreme Court of Japan, Tokyo, Japan
Tokyo District Court, Tokyo, Japan
Turkish Patent Institute, Ankara, Turkey
TUBITAK (The Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey), Ankara, Turkey
US Patent and Trademark Office, Washington, D.C., USA
Vilnius Commercial Arbitration Court, Vilnius, Lithuania
WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center, Geneva, Switzerland
Yokohama District Court, Yokohama, Japan

Law Firms and Patent Law Firms

Al Tamimi & Company, Dubai, U.A.E
Allen & Overy, A. Pedrizhck Sp.k., Warsaw, Poland
Aman Assafa Law Office, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
Amereller Rechtsanwälte, Munich, Germany
Anderson Mori & Tomotsune, Tokyo, Japan
v. Fünfer Ebbinghaus Finck Hans, Munich, Germany
Fugar & Company, Barristers and Solicitors, Accra, Ghana
Fujimoto & Fujimoto, Osaka, Japan
Gide Loyrette Nouel, Beijing, China
Gran & Angulo Abogados, Barcelona, Spain
Grette, Oslo, Norway
Grünecker and Partners, Munich, Germany
Guido Busko Law Office, Augsburg, Germany
Gusmão & Labrunie, São Paulo, Brazil
Hards and Franke Patentanwalte Partnerschaft, Munich, Germany
Havel, Holasek & Partners s.r.o., Prague, Czech Republic
Hernández Martí Abogados, Valencia, Spain
Herrera Diaz Abogados, Bogotá, Colombia
Heussen Rechtsanwaltsgeellschaft mbH, Munich, Germany
Hogan Lovells Horitsu Jimusho, Hakokuku Kyoto Kyodo Jigyo, Tokyo, Japan
Hogan Lovells LLP, Düsseldorf, Germany
Brevalex, Grenoble, France
Bustamente & Bustamente, Quito, Ecuador
Campos Ferreira, SA Caruturo & Associados, Lisboa, Portugal
Cavelier Abogados, Bogotá, Colombia
CCPIT Patent and Trademark Law Office, Beijing, China
Chien Yeh Law Offices, Taipei, Taiwan
Christoforos A. Christoforou, Nicosia, Cyprus
Cleary Gottlieb Steen & Hamilton LLP, Beijing, China
Covington & Burling, Brussels, Belgium
Dannemann Siemsen, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
Davis Wright Tremaine LLP, Seattle, WA, USA
DeHaul & Elliston LLP, Oakland, CA, USA
df–mp Munich, Germany
DLA Piper LLP, East Palo Alto, CA, USA
Donald M. Craven, P.C., Springfield, IL, USA
EP & US Patent Law Office, Munich, Germany
FoxMandl Associates, Bangalore, India
Fox Rothschild LLP, Philadelphia, PA, USA
Frommer, Lawrence & Haug, New York, NY, USA
v. Füner Ebbinghaus Finck Hans, Munich, Germany
Fugar & Company, Barristers and Solicitors, Accra, Ghana
Fujimoto & Fujimoto, Osaka, Japan
Gide Loyrette Nouel, Beijing, China
Gran & Angulo Abogados, Barcelona, Spain
Grette, Oslo, Norway
Grünecker and Partners, Munich, Germany
Guido Busko Law Office, Augsburg, Germany
Gusmão & Labrunie, São Paulo, Brazil
Hards and Franke Patentanwalte Partnerschaft, Munich, Germany
Havel, Holasek & Partners s.r.o., Prague, Czech Republic
Hernández Martí Abogados, Valencia, Spain
Herrera Diaz Abogados, Bogotá, Colombia
Heussen Rechtsanwaltsgeellschaft mbH, Munich, Germany
Hogan Lovells Horitsu Jimusho, Hakokuku Kyoto Kyodo Jigyo, Tokyo, Japan
Hogan Lovells LLP, Düsseldorf, Germany
Brachy and Dermarkar, Cairo, Egypt
Januar Jahja & Partners, Jakarta, Indonesia
Jones Day, Munich, Germany
Jurye's Law Office, Moscow, Russia
Katzarow S.A., Geneva, Switzerland
Keim IP, Munich, Germany
Kenyon & Kenyon, New York, NY, USA
King & Wood WPC Lawyers, Beijing, China
Koçhatıskı Zieba Rapla i Partnerzy, Warsaw, Poland
Krishna & Saurastri Associates, Mumbai, India
Lattenmayer, Luks & Enzinger Rechtsanwälte GmbH, Vienna, Austria
LAWIN Law Firm, Vilnius, Lithuania
Lazo, De Romana & Gagliuffi Abogados, Lima, Peru
Lee, Tsai & Partners, Taipei, Taiwan
Lloreda Camacho & Co, Bogotá, Colombia
Luís Leonards & Cía, Brasilia and Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
Malwd Patenantanwaltsgsmbh, Munich, Germany
Mclaine Law Group, Brunswick, GA, USA
Mehtem Güm & Co, Istanbul, Turkey
Meissen Bolte & Partner, Munich, Germany
Momsen, Leonards & Cia., Brasilia, Brazil
Montaury, Pimenta, Machado & Vieira de Mello, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
Müller-Böer & Partner, Munich, Germany
Norr LLP, Munich, Germany
NDT Patent & Trademark Agency, Beijing, China
Oh-Ebashi LPC and Partners, Osaka, Japan
OlarteMoure, Bogotá, Colombia
OlarteRaisbeck, Bogotá, Colombia
Olliff PLC, St. Louis, MO, USA
Olives & Cia., Mexico City
Panitch Schwarze Belisario & Nadel LLP, Philadelphia, PA, USA
Pepper Hamilton, Philadelphia, PA, USA
Petrovichev, Sofia, Bulgaria
Pupelnisky Patent and Trademark Attorneys, Moscow, Russia
Prüfer & Partner, Munich, Germany
ReedSmith LLP, Munich, Germany

Appendix 4: Present and Past Employers of MIPLC Graduates

54