

**The 2010
Technology Transfer Capacity and
Capability Mapping Survey**

**Étude 2010 sur la capacité et
l'expérience en transferts de
technologies**

*a study conducted for ACCT Canada
and sponsored by NSERC*

*Alex Navarre
Numinor Conseil Inc.*

*ACCT Canada AGM
Montreal
November 21, 2011*

Canadian 2010 TT Capacity and Capability Survey

The origins

- Take advantage of the need for a survey to populate the Innovation Atlas™ on clusters of TT competence to establish a benchmark on TT professionals in Canada

Thank-you to

- M. Szarka, R. Freedman, B. Sheridan, J. Scholtz
- The AUTM Metrics Committee
- NSERC, Bert Van den Berg

Caveats of this Study

- It is a first, an ambitious first
- The definition of TT was designed broadly
- Perception of the questions may have been different across respondents
- Universities, Hospital Research Centres and Sociétés de valorisation responded massively (95 +%)
- Colleges, CCTT/Cégeps, Polytechnicums were less responsive and some expressed concerns with the questions being asked

Key Questions in the 2010 Survey

- Number of knowledge transfer professionals in Canada
- Their TT and industry experience
- Performance objectives of TT offices
- Clusters of expertise
- The level of collaboration between themselves
- The willingness to share "best practices" or expertise

First Finding: A mature environment

University environment

- In 1990: ~ 50 TT professionals in Canada
- In 2000: ~250-300 TT professionals
- Today: 400 according to the survey
 - 44 % having over 5 years industry experience
 - 52 % having over 5 years TT experience

Collegial environment

- 230 TT professionals in Cégeps/CCTTs
- 85 in Colleges and Polytechnicums

First Finding (suite)

Concentration of experience

	TT Experience				Industry Experience			
	<< 2 yrs	2 à 5 yrs	>> 5 yrs	<i>Total</i>	<< 2 yrs	2 à 5 yrs	>> 5 yrs	<i>Total</i>
G-15 (18)	22	69	94	185	41	40	75	156
Average per office	<i>1.2</i>	<i>3.8</i>	<i>5.2</i>	<i>10.3</i>	<i>2.3</i>	<i>2.2</i>	<i>4.2</i>	<i>8.7</i>
Non G-15 (42)	25	51	87	163	50	33	56	139
Average per office	<i>.56</i>	<i>1.1</i>	<i>1.9</i>	<i>3.6</i>	<i>1.1</i>	<i>.73</i>	<i>1.2</i>	<i>3.1</i>

Second Finding:

A huge reservoir of sectorial competence

Case in point: levels 4 or 5 on a scale 1 to 5 for 27 categories

- ITC-Softwares-Multimedia: 38 institutions, including 4 CCTTs and 3 Colleges
- Ethics : 8
- Clinical trials: 14
- Green Energy: 36, including 8 CCTTs and 5 Collèges/Polytechnicums
- Nanotechnology: 21
- Music: 6
- Social Innovation and KT: 36, including 4 CCTTs and 6 Colleges/Polytechnicums
- Medical equipments: 46
- Technology Transfert Courses: 12
- Copyright and Trade Marks: 13

Third Finding: Diversity of objectives

- Recruitment is an issue, particularly in regions
- Performance priorities differ but are widely distributed between main activities
 - Services to inside clients
 - Industry partnerships and research funding
 - Contribution to institutional image building
- To make money, meet metrics such as # of contracts and regional economic development activities are half as important

Fourth Finding: Sharing experience between Offices

- 78 % of the offices receive help requests
- 33 % do not provide any help
- 40 % provide occasional/ad-hoc help
- 82 % of those providing little or no help would, if they were compensated
- Thus, the role of the Innovation Atlas™

Concluding remarks

- Presence of a cohort of 400 professionals, a majority of them having strong TT and industry experience
- Recrutement is an issue
- Objectives of the TT offices are multiple in nature
- College/Cegeps data require a separate questionnaire and support from this community
- Inter-institutional help will be enhanced if protocols for compensation are developed, a suggestion to enhance the use of the Innovation Atlas™