

“To Diversity and Beyond!”

Report of autumn 2020 survey on IP Inclusive’s future



Executive summary

The survey

This survey was part of a consultation with IP Inclusive stakeholders to inform plans for the initiative’s development. It was run online during the fourth quarter of 2020. Two versions allowed for input from (a) signatories to the IP Inclusive Charter and (b) individual IP professionals. Participation in both was voluntary; responses to the individuals’ version were collected anonymously.

By way of context, respondents were given an outline of a proposal to incorporate IP Inclusive as a Community Interest Company (CIC) in order to put it onto a more sustainable footing for the future. The survey sought their views on the idea in principle, the degree of support (in particular financial support) they might be able to give and more generally what they valued about IP Inclusive and how they felt it should develop.

The respondents

Just under a third of our 151 Charter signatories, and an additional 14 individuals, responded to the survey. They spoke from a range of organisation types and sizes, and provided what appeared to be candid, well-considered and constructive feedback. We believe, therefore, that the results provide sufficient information on which to proceed to the next stage of planning IP Inclusive’s development.

Key outcomes

The main conclusions that we can draw from the survey results are these:

- Respondents were generally comfortable with the proposal to register IP Inclusive as a CIC.
- Their preferred funding model for the CIC was through Charter signatory subscriptions.
 - Most agreed that subscriptions should depend on organisation size, possibly with exemptions for some entities (eg sole practitioners and in-house departments) and/or an appropriate upper ceiling.

- Acceptable subscription levels ranged from about £100 pa for small organisations up to about £500 pa for larger ones; some appeared willing to contribute significantly more.
- We would need to articulate the scope and value of the “subscription package”, which might need to be tailored for different types and sizes of signatory.
- A subscription scheme would not necessarily rule out additional contributions, of both financial and other forms of support (for example event hosting).
 - However, IP Inclusive should remain open to involvement by all IP professionals and organisations, whether or not formally connected through the Charter scheme.
- Respondents also wanted us to consider raising funds through sponsorships, fund-raising campaigns for specific projects, and applying for external grants.
- Signatory respondents value most of the things we currently offer, to differing extents depending on their type and size.
 - We could therefore tailor our offering and the way we promote it.
- This value has been largely retained through the Covid-19 restrictions; the pandemic should not therefore discourage us from taking steps in 2021 to secure IP Inclusive’s future.
- The bulk of our funding, through subscriptions and/or sponsorship for individual projects, would be likely to come from the “large” private sector organisations (defined in this context as having more than 80 staff including partners/members/directors).
 - Additional funding could be sought via the IP sector membership organisations, a model which several respondents seemed comfortable with and in the case of the in-house signatories might be the only feasible route.
- Responses to the individuals’ survey suggested it would be inappropriate for us to seek funding from individual IP professionals as opposed to their employer organisations and/or membership bodies. Individuals are better placed to contribute time and expertise.

Many respondents quite rightly said they would need to know more about a proposed CIC and subscription scheme before committing their support.

As a general point, the number and nature of responses suggest we need to strengthen IP Inclusive’s engagement with its Charter signatories. This will be even more important if we become reliant on their financial support in future.

Next steps

The survey results appear to support the incorporation of IP Inclusive as a CIC and the introduction of Charter signatory subscriptions. We should now move to preparing more detailed proposals for IP Inclusive’s development during 2021, as a basis for further consultations.

We suggest this process involves the following steps.

1. Satisfy ourselves that the CIC model is (a) financially viable and (b) an appropriate vehicle by which to deliver on our stakeholders' current expectations.

If yes, then on the basis of the survey responses:

2. Draft outline plans for the structure and governance of the proposed CIC.
3. Draft outline plans for its funding, including through Charter signatory subscriptions.

If no:

4. Create an alternative plan for IP Inclusive's future in 2021 and beyond, for example scaling down or winding up the current initiative, or continuing but with funding from other sources.

In either case:

5. Publish the plans and consult again with stakeholders, including at our 2021 annual meeting, aiming to reach as wide as possible a range of Charter signatories, individual IP professionals and other actual or potential supporters.

And in the meantime:

6. Consider ways to improve engagement with our Charter signatories.

Whatever the outcome of these six steps, we should proceed with care in the development of IP Inclusive's structure and activities. We must be confident that changes will be supported, will not erode the inclusivity of the initiative or the goodwill it currently enjoys, and will yield sufficient guaranteed funds to sustain it.

Andrea Brewster OBE CPA EPA
Lead Executive Officer, IP Inclusive

Contents

Executive summary	1
1 Introduction	6
1.1 Background	6
1.2 This report.....	6
2 The survey	7
3 The respondents (survey page 1).....	8
3.1 General.....	8
3.2 Anomalous responses	8
3.3 Names and positions (Questions 1 to 4).....	8
3.4 Sector of operation (Question 5)	9
3.5 Type of organisation (Question 6)	9
3.6 Size of organisation (Question 7).....	10
3.7 Membership body affiliations (Question 8).....	10
4 Results from survey page 2: “Your thoughts on the CIC proposal”	10
4.1 Do you agree in principle with the proposal to establish IP Inclusive as a CIC? (Question 9) 10	
4.2 How would your organisation prefer IP Inclusive to develop? (Question 10).....	11
4.3 Additional comments (Question 11).....	11
5 Results from survey page 3: “The value of IP Inclusive’s work”	12
5.1 What do you and your team members value about your involvement with IP Inclusive (tick as many as applicable)? (Question 12)	12
5.2 How has the Covid-19 lockdown affected that? (Question 13).....	14
6 Results from survey page 4: “Funding options for the IP Inclusive of the future”	15
6.1 Roughly how much might your organisation be willing to contribute, annually, to retain access to the things you value? (Question 14)	15
6.2 Which type(s) of funding model do you think we should adopt (tick as many as applicable)? (Question 15).....	16
6.3 How would your organisation prefer to contribute (please select as many as applicable)? (Question 16)	17
6.4 Do you think that such contributions (in particular Charter signatory subscriptions) should depend on the size of the organisation? (Question 17).....	17

6.5	Do you think we should set a lower limit, above which a Charter signatory's contribution could be a matter of discretion? (Question 18).....	18
6.6	If we charged a Charter signatory subscription, would your organisation still be able to offer support in other ways, in particular by hosting events for us or providing speakers? (Question 19)	18
6.7	If we charged a Charter signatory subscription, would your organisation also be willing to consider donations or sponsorship for specific projects (like, for example, the 2018-19 website upgrade, the development of the Careers in Ideas resources, or a diversity conference)? (Question 20)	19
6.8	Would you consider making a personal financial contribution to IP Inclusive? (Individuals only) 20	
6.9	Additional comments about financial support (Question 21)	20
7	Results from survey page 5: "Additional feedback"	21
7.1	General.....	21
7.2	Charter signatories' survey	21
7.3	Individual professionals' survey.....	22
8	Discussion.....	22
8.1	Participation levels.....	22
8.2	Caveats.....	23
8.3	The overall picture	23
8.4	The detail	24
8.5	Other things we can learn from the responses	27
9	Suggested next steps	27
	Annex I Explanatory text from website	29
	The plan.....	29
	The outcomes.....	30
	Annex II Tables	31
	Annex III Anomalous survey responses	40

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

In the autumn of 2020, IP Inclusive Management (IPIM), the body that oversees work carried out under the IP Inclusive banner, began consulting with stakeholders about the future development of the initiative. In particular it wanted to know their views on a proposal to convert IP Inclusive into a registered “Community Interest Company” (CIC) during 2021, in order to put it on a more sustainable footing. Crucial to such a conversion would be the support – including financial – of the organisations that are involved in, and benefit from, IP Inclusive’s work.

Signatories to the IP Inclusive EDI Charter¹ were therefore invited to complete a survey which sought their views on the value of IP Inclusive, their hopes and expectations for its future, and the level of support they might feel able to commit in the future, in particular to establish and maintain a CIC. Emails about the survey were sent to both the “authorised signatories” and the “designated EDI officers” of all signatories, with reminders at appropriate times, to maximise the likelihood of it being completed by people, within the signatory organisations, having the knowledge and the authority to speak for their organisations’ future policies.

Individual IP Inclusive supporters were invited to complete a separate, anonymous, version of the survey: these invitations were circulated via the “IP Inclusive Updates” mailing list, supported by social media posts.

The information provided to these respondents by way of context also appeared on a dedicated page of the IP Inclusive website² and is reproduced in Annex I.

1.2 This report

This report, which is publicly available, summarises the key survey responses. It is intended for use by IPIM in deciding how IP Inclusive should develop during 2021, and in particular whether the CIC model is feasible and if so how the company should be structured and funded.

It was prepared by IP Inclusive’s Lead Executive Officer Andrea Brewster, who also created and managed the survey, and incorporates analyses of the “free text” responses conducted by several IPIM members: Julie Browne, Liz Dawson, Julie Dunnett, Julia Florence and Michael Silverleaf. All such responses (including comments submitted in an “other” response category) were separately analysed by two people.

The report covers:

- Information about the survey and its respondents (sections 2 and 3)

¹ See <https://ipinclusive.org.uk/about/our-charter/>

² See <https://ipinclusive.org.uk/to-diversity-and-beyond-developing-ip-inclusive/>

- The responses received in the three main parts of the survey and the final comments page (sections 4 to 7)
- A discussion of the results and their implications (section 8)
- Suggested next steps for IP Inclusive (section 9)

Where appropriate, responses to individual questions are tabulated in Annex II.

2 The survey

The survey was run online using IP Inclusive’s SurveyMonkey account. Participation was voluntary. In the Charter signatories’ version, respondents were asked for their names and positions, whereas in the version for individual IP professionals, responses were collected and analysed anonymously.

The survey questions were compiled by Andrea Brewster, with input from IPIM. The main ones were divided into three categories:

- In-principle thoughts on IP Inclusive’s direction of travel and on the proposed CIC model (survey page 2)
- The value, to IP professionals and their organisations, of different aspects of IP Inclusive’s current work (page 3)
- Thoughts on funding options for the IP Inclusive of the future, and the level of support likely to be available from its stakeholders (page 4)

Questions were also included, on page 1 of the survey, to gather basic information about the respondents, in particular the nature and size of their organisations (whether the Charter signatory or the organisation to which an individual respondent belonged) and their professional affiliations.

A “free text” box was provided on page 5 for respondents to add comments regarding their other answers or more generally about the underlying theme.

The Charter signatories’ survey was open to all signatories to the IP Inclusive EDI Charter, including the four founding organisations CIPA, CITMA, FICPI-UK and IP Federation, and the UK Intellectual Property Office (IPO). The individuals’ survey was open to all professionals working in the IP sector. Both were live from mid-September to the end of 2020.

In theory the links to the surveys were publicly available (eg via our website). In practice we have no reason to believe, from the results, that the responses came from anyone other than genuine IP professionals and IP Inclusive Charter signatories.

The survey questions are available alongside this report on the IP Inclusive website: see <https://ipinclusive.org.uk/to-diversity-and-beyond-developing-ip-inclusive/>.

3 The respondents (survey page 1)

3.1 General

There were 54 responses to the Charter signatories' survey. Taking account of the anomalies (see 3.2 below), this amounts to 47 of our 151 Charter signatories, ie 31.1% of the constituency.

Importantly (see below), the respondents represented a good spread of signatory types and sizes, including private sector, industry (primarily through the membership body IP Federation) and civil service and a range of IP sector roles encompassing patent and trade mark attorneys, solicitors, barristers, recruitment consultants, regulators, membership bodies and the IPO itself. They roughly reflect the spread of organisation sizes and types among the wider community of IP Inclusive Charter signatories.

The survey completion rate was 72%, with a typical completion time of 8 minutes. We believe this is an encouraging level of engagement for a voluntary survey of this type. It was pleasing to see that most signatories had responded fully and in appropriate levels of detail, with comments where necessary to explain or elaborate on their answers to the tick-box sections. Those who progressed beyond page 1 of the survey (basic signatory details) typically answered all of the following questions.

14 people responded to the individual IP professionals' survey, with a completion rate of 93% and a typical completion time of 9 minutes. These answers were collected anonymously. Again, although there were not many respondents, they did represent several different types of organisation.

3.2 Anomalous responses

There were a few anomalous responses to the Charter signatories' survey, which affect the way the results should be interpreted. These, and the way they have been handled in our analysis, are explained in Annex III.

3.3 Names and positions (Questions 1 to 4)

The people who completed the survey on behalf of their organisations appeared to be mostly partners, directors, managers or chief executives, suggesting engagement at sufficiently senior levels to give meaningful indications of the organisations' ability to commit support.

Of these people:

- 52.0% were the "Authorised Signatory" who authorised signature of the Charter
- 14.0% were not the Authorised Signatory but had a similar level of authority in the organisation

- 18.0% were a "Designated EDI Officer" for the organisation, and had the permission of the Authorised Signatory to reply on their behalf
- 2.0% were not a "Designated EDI Officer", but had the permission of the Authorised Signatory to reply on their behalf

These types of data were not collected for the individual professionals' survey, for which the responses were anonymous.

3.4 Sector of operation (Question 5)

Reflecting our current support base, the majority of signatory respondents operate in the private sector, although it is pleasing to see representation from industry and the civil service as well (Table 1 in Annex II). The 4 "other" responses indicated an even more encouraging spread, including "recruitment" and "business and career consultancy" (both presumably private sector); and "regulation". The final "other" response was "legal", and from the context we know this also relates to the private sector.

Respondents to the individual professionals' survey represented both industry and (again in the majority) the private sector. The one "other" response (representing 7.1% of this cohort) said "Pharma".

3.5 Type of organisation (Question 6)

Most of the signatory respondents were private sector organisations (see Table 2), including both patent and/or trade mark-specific practices and also wider law firms. There was one respondent representing each of the barristers' chambers and membership body categories, and two representing each of the business support services, government agency/department, recruitment consultancy, searching/information science provider and training provider categories. The one response in the "none" category was from the IP sector regulator IPReg.

Five said they worked in in-house IP departments – however, three of these were anomalies as identified in Annex III, one appeared from other information provided to be a private sector organisation and the fifth was a civil service department. We surmise that information about the behaviour and preferences of in-house corporate departments is best collected through their representative body IP Federation.

The majority of the respondents to the individuals' survey worked in the private sector, most of them in patent and/or trade mark-focused practices. There were however 4 respondents (28.6%) from in-house departments.

3.6 Size of organisation (Question 7)

Respondents were asked: “Roughly what size is the organisation? (Note that for this question, “in-house” also covers government agencies and charities.)”

Although over 40% of the Charter signatory respondents were large private sector organisations (see Table 3), the survey also captured the voices of at least some small and medium-sized private sector organisations, as well as sole practitioners, large law firms and small- to medium-sized in-house IP departments.

The two “other” responses were “Small private sector organisation representing a membership of small to large in house departments” (IP Federation) and “Public sector body, 1400 staff” (IPO).

Of the 14 respondents to the individuals’ survey, again the majority worked in large private sector organisations. Four said they worked in-house (one in a small, one in a medium-sized and two in a large department). One was a sole practitioner.

3.7 Membership body affiliations (Question 8)

Respondents were asked: “Which of the following membership bodies do people in your organisation belong to (please tick as many as applicable)?”

The results (Table 4) indicate a reasonable spread of Charter signatory responses, embracing organisations whose staff belong not only to the patent and trade mark sector membership bodies but also to those representing IP solicitors, barristers, licensing executives and tech transfer professionals. More than three-quarters, however, had people belonging to CIPA and/or CITMA.

All of the respondents to the individuals’ survey were in organisations with CIPA, CITMA and/or FICPI-UK members.

4 Results from survey page 2: “Your thoughts on the CIC proposal”

4.1 Do you agree in principle with the proposal to establish IP Inclusive as a CIC? (Question 9)

80% of the Charter signatory respondents and 64.3% of the individual respondents said either that they agreed in principle with the CIC proposal or that they did not have a strong view either way (see Table 5). Only three of the signatory respondents and none of the individuals said they did not agree.

This is a sufficiently positive response to warrant IPIM preparing more detailed proposals for creating an IP Inclusive CIC, which would hopefully clarify the views of the not insignificant number of respondents who at this stage said they were not sure about the idea.

Account should also be taken of the free text answers to Question 11 (see 4.3 below), which were an opportunity for respondents to elaborate on their answers to this and Question 10.

4.2 How would your organisation prefer IP Inclusive to develop? (Question 10)

A reasonable majority of the Charter signatory respondents said they would like IP Inclusive to increase the support it provides for IP professionals (see Table 6). However, we should not overlook the fact that over a fifth felt it should remain as it is, and 15.2% were either unsure or did not have a view either way. This suggests that whilst IP Inclusive growth would likely receive support from its stakeholders, it should make an effort to determine the reasons why some would prefer to maintain the status quo, to justify its development plans, and to focus its growth on the areas most likely to be valued.

All but one of the respondents to the individuals' survey said they would like IP Inclusive to increase the support it provides, the other being unsure.

The "other" responses received to this question are reviewed along with the free text responses to Question 11 in 4.3 below.

4.3 Additional comments (Question 11)

Respondents were given a "free text" option: "Please elaborate on your answers to Questions 9 and 10 if you like, for example if you have suggestions about how IP Inclusive should develop".

In the Charter signatories' survey, 17 out of 54 respondents provided comments. In the individual professionals' survey, 8 out of 14 people did so. Taking their responses together with those in the "other" category in Question 10, we see a fair amount of support for IP Inclusive's existing work – in particular its "communities"; its outreach work to improve visibility and accessibility of the IP professions; and the recent virtual offerings to increase engagement with professionals outside London.

Some respondents appeared less concerned with the initiative's structure than with the continuation – or perhaps extension – of the benefits it brings. One cautioned against allowing it to become overly bureaucratic.

Regarding the IP Inclusive structure, two signatories felt it was important to maintain a link between IP Inclusive, CIPA and CITMA and did not see the need for a separate CIC. Another was unclear

whether or not it could support a CIC financially. One indicated that it would need more information on the proposed CIC's governance before it could form a view.

Respondents (both Charter signatories and individuals) also offered the following suggestions, many encouraging IP Inclusive to adopt a more active role in the future:

- Focus on widening engagement, for example with all members and at all levels of signatory organisations (including with those who currently doubt the relevance and/or value of D&I improvements), in order to make IP Inclusive's current work more effective.
- Increase engagement with talent professionals (in IP firms and also in recruitment agencies).
- Maintain focus on diversity and access at the point of entry to the IP professions, and encourage D&I-improving recruitment practices (eg unconscious bias training, name-blind CVs and removing unfair barriers to career progression).
- Provide more guidance notes, training materials, codes of conduct and similar resources (eg for D&I audit, accreditations or D&I data gathering, or even a generic roadmap for success).
- Increase engagement on existing themes before expanding to additional areas of support, and emphasise D&I issues that are specific to the IP professions.
- Develop partnerships with third party specialists for events, ideas and solutions.

One of the individual respondents called for increased expectations of Charter signatories. Another said they believed IP Inclusive should take a more active campaigning and training role, rather than just supporting members of its five communities, noting the importance of engaging with people who do not identify with any of the IP Inclusive communities and who are not yet active allies.

5 Results from survey page 3: “The value of IP Inclusive’s work”

5.1 What do you and your team members value about your involvement with IP Inclusive (tick as many as applicable)? (Question 12)

At the start of this question, respondents were prompted to consider, for example, the number of IP Inclusive events that they and their colleagues had attended, or how often they had accessed IP Inclusive content and resources. The results are shown in Table 7.

It is encouraging to see that the areas we identified as of potential value to our supporters are indeed, for the most part, appreciated by Charter signatories. Those valued the most (in each case

by over half of the respondents, quoted here in descending order) were: access to support networks; resources; help in demonstrating D&I and/or CSR commitments; sector-wide networking and business development opportunities; and a sense of community. Our training was valued by just under half of the signatory respondents.

The item apparently valued the least was “PR opportunities”.

For the respondents to the individual professionals’ survey, training was proportionately more important. However, again resources, access to support networks, a sense of community and networking opportunities were all regarded as valuable by over half of the respondents.

It is interesting to look at how Charter signatories’ opinions varied with the type and size of organisation. The filtered responses in Table 8 show that among the small private practice respondents, training, resources, networking opportunities and a sense of community were all equal favourites, and access to support networks the most valued. Interestingly, each aspect (aside from training) was valued by a smaller proportion of respondents than in the overall cohort; it is possible that in a smaller practice, there are fewer resources to devote to D&I, and/or diversity seems less relevant, and/or inclusivity-related things such as support and community are more easily achieved within a smaller, closer-knit team.

The large private practice respondents consistently valued IP Inclusive’s offerings more highly than the overall cohort, with particular interest in the support networks which were valued by all 18 respondents. Demonstrating D&I and CSR credentials, resources and networking opportunities were also highly valued by this group.

For the very large private sector organisations (in this case, large multi-national law firms), all items were proportionately less highly valued than by the overall survey cohort, with the exception of networking, business development and PR opportunities. This is not entirely unexpected, and has probably been why many such organisations have provided such generous support in the past with, for example, event hosting and speakers. Access to the IP Inclusive support networks and community were the next most highly valued items. It is likely that these firms already provide D&I training and resources, and policies to demonstrate their D&I credentials, so have less of a need for such things from IP Inclusive.

There were nine “other” responses, two from individual IP professionals and seven from Charter signatories (including medium and large private sector organisations, one sole practitioner, an in-house (civil service) IP department and the IPO). Among these, other aspects of IP Inclusive’s work that were mentioned as having value to signatories were:

- Sector-wide round tables and the opportunity they provide to consult with a range of IP stakeholders
- Access to potential partners
- The opportunity to take part, in as well as watch, webinars and other events
- Internal PR as well as external

- The opportunity to “give something back” and support others, or more generally to help the sector develop its approach to D&I
- The incentive – and justification – for the organisation to be more active in the D&I sphere
- For those who already believe that improving D&I is the right thing to do morally, a channel through which to pursue that agenda

Overall the signatories’ comments suggested that IP Inclusive supports and motivates their D&I efforts, for the benefit of both their own organisations and the wider community. These respondents clearly regard D&I as important issues for the IP professions.

The two comments from individual respondents were similarly encouraging. One referred to the value of knowing that other people from their background had succeeded in the IP professions. Another said that IP Inclusive provides a structure, resources and motivation for their employer to take positive steps on D&I, adding that they saw an ongoing need for the initiative in the IP sector.

One signatory correspondent did admit to not knowing how its staff had used or valued IP Inclusive resources. We would hope that the survey prompted them to review this with their team members and thereby raise their awareness of, and engagement with, the initiative in future.

We can take from the Question 12 results that IP Inclusive does indeed offer value to its Charter signatories, in a range of ways, but that the most appreciated areas depend on the nature and size of the organisation. See the discussions in 8 below regarding our use of this feedback.

5.2 How has the Covid-19 lockdown affected that? (Question 13)

This question invited free text answers. 30 Charter signatories and 8 individual professionals responded.

The comments were a roughly 50-50 split of positive and negative. 17 respondents commented on the reduced effectiveness of online, as opposed to face-to-face, events, in particular of the associated networking opportunities but also potentially in terms of learning outcomes. 10 responses (some overlapping with the previous 17) were nevertheless positive in respect of IP Inclusive’s online events and resources, referring to the “opportunities” they presented; 7 indicated that they were able to access events more easily than before. One mentioned the particular value of the information IP Inclusive had provided on lockdown and mental health.

Three signatory respondents and one individual said that the lockdown had had no impact on the value of their involvement with IP Inclusive. One signatory said that the combination of Covid-19, Brexit and a potential economic downturn had simply refocused its efforts on fee earning. Three other respondents said that the lockdown had made community and support – and IP Inclusive’s efforts to improve those – more important than ever; one of these commented that IP Inclusive’s

training and resources had been very helpful in supporting the diverse needs of their staff, in a new working environment that had affected individuals in different ways.

Encouragingly, then, whilst a majority of the survey respondents would still prefer face-to-face events where possible, they have appreciated IP Inclusive's online offerings during the pandemic. It seems reasonable to conclude that the initiative has retained its value to the IP professions during this period and that the pandemic has not necessarily made this an inappropriate time for strategic steps to secure its future.

6 Results from survey page 4: "Funding options for the IP Inclusive of the future"

6.1 Roughly how much might your organisation be willing to contribute, annually, to retain access to the things you value? (Question 14)

There was a wide range of responses to this question: see Table 9. Two respondents (one working in-house and the other a sole practitioner) said "nothing", but otherwise there was general support for the concept of Charter signatories making financial contributions to IP Inclusive. Four signatories opted for the highest amount of up to about £2000 pa. Contributions of about £500 pa or less seem the most likely to be supported.

From the filtered responses in Table 10, most smaller private practices appeared to be comfortable with an annual contribution of around £100 pa, possibly a little more, whilst the larger ones (including the very large practices) seemed comfortable with up to about £500 pa.

These results tally with those in Question 17 (see 6.4 below), which indicated a clear preference for financial contributions depending on organisation size. However, whilst a good proportion of the "large" private sector organisations were comfortable with contributing more than £500 pa, the "very large" international law firms were not. As with Question 12, we surmise that IP Inclusive's work has greater value to organisations that do not have large in-house D&I teams of their own. Levying a subscription that varies proportionately with size would not therefore work well for our very large signatories.

For this question, the 13 "other" responses are likely to be just as, if not more, revealing than those constrained by the tick-boxes. Some respondents quite reasonably said they could not be sure at this stage, or that their likely contribution would depend on how IP Inclusive developed. Two stated outright that IP Inclusive should be funded by way of a premium on professional membership of eg CIPA or CITMA. Three said they were unclear what would be covered by a subscription, suggesting that the initiative's aims should be clear and costed whatever its eventual structure. Transparency of spend was also crucial to the IP Federation being able to contribute financially on its members'

behalf. Some suggested that subscriptions should depend on the size of the firm, whilst some quoted specific amounts which tended to be higher the larger the organisation.

There was no corresponding question in the individual professionals' survey.

6.2 Which type(s) of funding model do you think we should adopt (tick as many as applicable)?

(Question 15)

In the individual professionals' survey, the response option about sponsorship packages was divided into two: fixed-term packages and packages to fund individual ad hoc projects. The responses from both surveys are shown in Table 11.

Three-quarters of the respondents (both Charter signatories and individual professionals) felt that an annual signatory subscription would be a suitable way for IP Inclusive to fund itself in future. Sponsorship packages were also reasonably popular, and many respondents (in particular the individuals) felt we should be applying for relevant grants and/or running separate fund-raising campaigns. Charges for access to resources were the least popular, including in the context of directories and jobs board listings, whilst charges for events were selected by fewer than a third of signatory respondents and only one of the individual respondents: this fits with the current IP Inclusive model of providing products and services that are free at the point of delivery to individual IP professionals.

The filtered responses (Table 12) broadly mirror those of the overall survey cohort, except for the ones from very large organisations, whose three representatives favoured sponsorship packages and event charges over the subscription model. Charter signatory subscriptions were the most popular option for both small and large private sector organisations, particularly the latter. Among the small private sector organisations, fund-raising campaigns were a more popular option than for the overall cohort, whilst subscriptions and sponsorship packages were less so; this group was also less keen on paying for access to events and resources, but more keen on the idea of IP Inclusive seeking grants (ie views more in line with those of the individual survey respondents).

The apparent attraction of sponsorship and event charges to very large law firms would fit with the indication (see the Question 12 answers in 5.1 above) that for these organisations, IP Inclusive's value is in specific areas only and not across the full range of their D&I efforts.

In general the comments offered in the "other" category (11 from signatories and 3 from individuals) stressed the importance of our initiative being inclusive and its benefits available to all regardless of size or wealth or employer support, which fits with the fact that charges for events and resources were less popular. There was some concern that a sponsorship model might lead to larger organisations being unduly influential or more generally to IP Inclusive becoming "commercial". Four of the Charter signatories repeated the call for funding to come from other bodies such as CIPA, CITMA and IPReg, ensuring a fair contribution from all IP professionals.

In the comments from individuals, two suggested a voluntary subscription scheme and one a flexible model such as that done by Patreon³.

6.3 How would your organisation prefer to contribute (please select as many as applicable)? (Question 16)

Again this question revealed a clear preference for contributing through an annual subscription, with ad hoc sponsorship and events charges being the next most popular options (see Table 13). Like the individual respondents to Question 15, Charter signatories appeared to prefer to sponsor specific projects than commit to fixed-term packages. Contributions through charges for IP Inclusive resources were also unpopular.

Table 14 shows how these responses varied with organisation size. Again, subscriptions were proportionately more popular among the large private sector organisations than in the overall survey cohort. None of the filtered groups selected fixed-term sponsorship packages. Interestingly, ad hoc sponsorship was more popular among small private sector organisations than for the overall cohort, as were charges for access to events and resources, perhaps because they allow more flexibility.

The nine “other” responses did not add much to the ideas put forward in response to previous questions. Two said they would not mind paying a subscription so long as it was set at a reasonably low level, allowing them to make further voluntary contributions when able. Again there seemed to be a preference for including access to resources and events as part of the subscription package, rather than charging individual organisations or professionals for access.

There was no corresponding question in the individual professionals’ survey.

6.4 Do you think that such contributions (in particular Charter signatory subscriptions) should depend on the size of the organisation? (Question 17)

Most Charter signatory respondents believed that financial contributions to IP Inclusive should depend on the organisation’s size; only 7.3% (3 respondents) definitely disagreed with this idea. For the corresponding question in the individuals’ survey, two-thirds of the respondents agreed with the idea; the remaining third were not sure. See Table 15.

The filtered responses in Table 16 indicate that smaller practices are proportionately more, and the larger practices less, likely to favour this model. The three “other” responses, and the comments submitted in response to other questions (see for example 6.1 above), reminded that a sliding scale for financial contributions may need to be more nuanced than simply depending on organisation

³ An online membership platform through which content creators can run subscription services

size. There were calls in other parts of the survey (see for example 6.5 below) for sole practitioners to be exempted from signatory subscriptions, and for a ceiling to be set to avoid larger organisations being charged too much. One response to this question flagged that some large organisations have only a small number of staff involved in IP.

**6.5 Do you think we should set a lower limit, above which a Charter signatory's contribution could be a matter of discretion?
(Question 18)**

There was some support for this proposition but not overwhelming. Over half of the respondents either disagreed or were not sure about it (Table 17). Filtering revealed that the “no” responses came primarily from medium and large private sector organisations, plus one from a sole practitioner.

Four respondents offered additional comments. One suggested a waiver for sole practitioners; one a lower limit with recommended minimum supplements (still discretionary) linked to organisation size. Two alluded to the risk of losing smaller signatories or individual professionals, whose voices might be extremely valuable to the initiative, through prohibitively high expectations of financial input.

There was no corresponding question in the individual professionals’ survey.

**6.6 If we charged a Charter signatory subscription, would your organisation still be able to offer support in other ways, in particular by hosting events for us or providing speakers?
(Question 19)**

Although this was only a hypothetical question, it is encouraging to see that for the majority of signatory respondents, charging a subscription would not rule out contributions of other forms: 78.1% answered “yes” or “maybe” (Table 18). Only one respondent said “unlikely” and only one an outright “no”.

In the individual professionals’ survey, the corresponding question was worded: “If we charged a Charter signatory subscription, would you still be willing to offer your support in other ways, for example by helping us organise events, by speaking at events, by providing blog articles or by getting involved in other IP Inclusive projects?” None of the 13 people who responded to this question felt that a Charter signatory subscription would definitely prevent them from helping IP Inclusive as individuals.

The three “other” answers, all from Charter signatories, add valuable nuance to this picture. One felt that such a system could work in principle, depending on what was included in the subscription. One however queried why anyone would offer help if they were not allowed, due to not being able to pay a subscription, to belong to the IP Inclusive community. Thus, whilst a subscription scheme

would not necessarily rule out additional forms of support, care would be needed in (a) articulating the scope and value of the subscription package and (b) ensuring the initiative’s openness to involvement by all IP professionals and organisations, whether or not formally connected through the Charter scheme.

The final comment simply indicated a willingness to provide speakers and a venue for small events – offers like this are always appreciated.

6.7 If we charged a Charter signatory subscription, would your organisation also be willing to consider donations or sponsorship for specific projects (like, for example, the 2018-19 website upgrade, the development of the Careers in Ideas resources, or a diversity conference)? (Question 20)

The picture was slightly less positive when it came to additional *financial* contributions (Table 19). The responses to this question indicate that charging a subscription could significantly affect the likelihood of further financial contributions, although not rule them out completely. An encouraging quarter of respondents believed they would still be willing to consider further financial contributions, nearly half thinking that they would or might.

When filtered for organisation size and type (Table 20), the responses show that the large and very large organisations are proportionately less likely to limit their additional financial contributions if charged a subscription.

As in the previous question, the four “other” responses shine additional light on the percentages. One quite reasonably said that their answer would depend on the sums involved: a higher basic subscription would make them less likely to donate further funds. One alluded to the benefits of making a single contribution, which could more readily be budgeted for and would cover everything IP Inclusive intended for the year. Another said that although they might be prepared to sponsor specific and focused projects, they wanted in general to avoid ad hoc payments; ongoing work such as website upgrades would probably not be something they wanted to pay an additional sum for. This suggests that if we adopt a subscription model, we must be sure that the revenue it generates is sufficient to cover all our basic operating costs and key plans for the year, as we are only likely to be able to raise additional funds for special projects, particularly from our smaller signatories.

The reference in this question to website upgrades generated another interesting comment, which suggested that signatories’ marketing departments might get involved in supporting the IP Inclusive website and comms, possibly as a collaboration between different organisations.

There was no corresponding question in the individual professionals’ survey.

6.8 Would you consider making a personal financial contribution to IP Inclusive? (Individuals only)

This question only appeared in the individual professionals' survey. Well over half of the 13 respondents either would, or might, consider making a personal financial contribution (see Table 21).

We would hope not to have to rely on such sources of funding; this is after all a small sample of respondents who have self-selected for their interest in IP Inclusive. However, they might make a difference to ad hoc fund-raising campaigns for specific projects – where we have indeed, in the past, received some support from individual IP professionals.

6.9 Additional comments about financial support (Question 21)

6.9.1 Charter signatories' survey

Charter signatory respondents were invited to “elaborate on your answers to the questions on this page if you like, for example if you personally would like to support IP Inclusive but your employer or wider organisation is unlikely to.” There were 11 responses, which were generally supportive, in particular of a subscription scheme.

A couple of respondents warned that they would need to consult more with their colleagues before making any definite commitments. Several emphasised the importance of getting the details of a signatory subscription scheme right, for example:

- The cost should not be too high:
 - A low basic fee, with the option for those who could afford it to contribute more or in other ways, might be preferable.
 - We should avoid pricing smaller signatories out, thus reducing the inclusivity of our community and in turn its value to everyone.
 - A tiered fee, though helpful, should probably not be *directly* proportional to organisation size.
 - In general we should be sensitive to the impact of external issues such as Brexit and Covid-19 on our signatories' willingness – and ability – to contribute financially.
- The IPO – one of our earliest signatories – would not be able to join the scheme unless IP Inclusive's lobbying activities were clearly separated from those covered by the signatory subscription.

The IP Federation – a founding organisation and an important link to in-house IP professionals – also reminded that its members would be unlikely to be able to contribute themselves due to their status as departments within larger corporations having their own D&I programmes. It stressed, however, that those people do recognise the value of the IP-specific work that IP Inclusive does, suggesting that indirect contributions through the Federation might still be possible.

6.9.2 Individual professionals' survey

In the individuals' survey, the corresponding invitation was: "Please elaborate on your answers to the questions on this page if you like, for example about the amount and/or type of support you'd feel able to give." 6 out of the 14 survey respondents did so.

Although a couple indicated their willingness to contribute financially, most of the comments suggested it would be inappropriate for us to seek funding from individual IP professionals as opposed to their employer organisations and/or membership bodies. Individuals are better placed to contribute time and expertise.

One person expressed strong disagreement with the use of sponsorship schemes, on the basis that IP Inclusive should not be seen to be associated with any particular external organisation and that D&I activity should not be commercialised. This sentiment was not mirrored by other respondents, either individual IP professionals or Charter signatories. The respondent in question did however express in-principle approval of the CIC model and of Charter signatory subscriptions.

7 Results from survey page 5: "Additional feedback"

7.1 General

A final optional box, in both versions of the survey, allowed respondents to offer further comments on the questions. They were asked to be constructive, and assured that IP Inclusive Management would try to take their feedback on board in deciding the best way forward for IP Inclusive.

In the Charter signatories' version, 9 respondents provided comments. In the individual professionals' version, one person did so.

7.2 Charter signatories' survey

The comments provided by signatories were generally supportive of the success and importance of IP Inclusive's work to date and of the idea that it should continue to evolve and adopt a stronger footing. Several offered their congratulations on what had been achieved so far.

A few expressed cautions which we would do well to take into account in our planning, for example:

- The need for a sound financial footing for the IP Inclusive of the future
- The need for clarity and detail over what a Charter subscription covered, to help signatories "sell" the concept at board level
- A concern that the initiative might become too bureaucratic

- A concern that sponsorship schemes might create an undesirable hierarchy of supporters
- The importance of accessibility, particularly for those with fewer resources
 - Ideally events and resources should continue to be free at the point of delivery
 - Financial contribution schemes should not unfairly exclude or discourage any supporters

IP Federation provided some additional words of encouragement, pointing out the importance of its support for IP Inclusive because its members are well placed (a) to share, with the wider IP professions, the D&I practices already adopted in their employers' larger companies; and (b) as potential large clients of private sector professionals, to influence attitudes and behaviours.

7.3 Individual professionals' survey

The one response from the individuals' survey was also supportive. It emphasised the importance of IP Inclusive's ability to support and empower individual professionals within their own organisations.

8 Discussion

8.1 Participation levels

About a third of all our Charter signatories participated in this survey. For a voluntary survey published at a time of Covid-19 and Brexit complications, we find this reasonably encouraging. Those who responded spoke from a range of organisation types and sizes, and provided what appeared to be candid, well-considered and constructive feedback. We believe, therefore, that the results provide sufficient information on which to proceed to the next stage of planning IP Inclusive's development. In particular we believe it gives us a good basis on which to prepare more detailed proposals for converting IP Inclusive into a CIC, and to consult again with our stakeholders, in light of those new proposals, with a view to deciding the way forward during 2021.

Missing from this cohort of respondents are several organisations that have provided IP Inclusive with considerable support thus far. We expect a good proportion of those to continue to be supportive, including financially, and doubt that they would object to plans to strengthen and develop IP Inclusive and formalise its structure.

As with any survey, we can learn as much from those who did not take part as from those who did. It is clear that we need to find better ways of engaging with our Charter signatories, especially if we go on to implement a subscription funding model. See 8.5 below for further discussion on this point.

8.2 Caveats

Due to the relatively small number of respondents, the results from this survey should be interpreted with care. The quantitative data will not always have statistical significance (what look to be high percentages in the Annex II tables may represent relatively few actual responses) and are best used to provide a steer than a precise guide. The results from the Charter signatories' survey are more meaningful than those from the individual professionals' survey, which heard from only a tiny proportion of our overall support base.

Account must also be taken of the anomalous results identified in Annex III. We do not believe these will significantly impact on our overall findings, but they will skew the quantitative data somewhat.

Similarly we must take care not to make inappropriate generalisations from the free text comments. Although the survey respondents represented a range of business types, we have heard only a few voices from each, especially among the very small and very large organisations and the in-house departments.

We are aware that the people who take part in a voluntary survey like this have been “self-selected”, in the sense that they are the ones who already care about IP Inclusive and engage with it on a regular basis. We cannot be sure that our respondents reflect the views of the wider Charter signatory community. The worst case scenario would be that only the ones who completed this survey could be relied on to support – and fund – a restructured IP Inclusive; we need to factor that into our future plans. Equally likely is that many others would pay us if asked (for example through a signatory subscription), but have simply not found the time to complete the survey and/or are not overly interested in the details of IP Inclusive's development.

Bearing in mind the above caveats, we believe the survey results can be used as a guide to our stakeholders' opinions, sufficient to mandate us to proceed to the next stage of planning a structural transformation but not as a basis for definitely going ahead. It is important that we proceed from here with caution and transparency and allow for further stakeholder consultation at every opportunity.

8.3 The overall picture

The “bigger picture” points that we can draw out from the survey results are these:

- Respondents were generally comfortable with the proposal to register IP Inclusive as a CIC.
- Their preferred funding model for the CIC was through Charter signatory subscriptions.
 - Most agreed that subscriptions should depend on organisation size, possibly with exemptions for some entities (eg sole practitioners and in-house departments) and/or an appropriate upper ceiling.
 - Acceptable subscription levels ranged from about £100 pa for small organisations up to about £500 pa for larger ones; some appeared willing to contribute significantly more.

- We would need to articulate the scope and value of the “subscription package”, which might need to be tailored for different types and sizes of signatory.
- A subscription scheme would not necessarily rule out additional contributions, of both financial and other forms of support (for example event hosting).
 - However, IP Inclusive should remain open to involvement by all IP professionals and organisations, whether or not formally connected through the Charter scheme.
- Respondents also wanted us to consider raising funds through sponsorships, fund-raising campaigns for specific projects, and applying for external grants.
- Signatory respondents value most of the things we currently offer, to differing extents depending on their type and size.
 - We could therefore tailor our offering and the way we promote it.
- This value has been largely retained through the Covid-19 restrictions; the pandemic should not therefore discourage us from taking steps in 2021 to secure IP Inclusive’s future.
- The bulk of our funding, through subscriptions and/or sponsorship for individual projects, would be likely to come from the “large” (as defined in survey Question 7) private sector organisations.
 - Additional funding could be sought via the IP sector membership organisations, a model which several respondents seemed comfortable with and in the case of the in-house signatories might be the only feasible route.
- Responses to the individuals’ survey suggested it would be inappropriate for us to seek funding from individual IP professionals as opposed to their employer organisations and/or membership bodies. Individuals are better placed to contribute time and expertise.

Many respondents quite rightly said they would need to know more about a proposed CIC and subscription scheme before committing their support. Therefore, the most appropriate step from here would be to prepare more detailed proposals based on the survey responses, and secure more informed support before pressing ahead with any changes to the IP Inclusive structure.

8.4 The detail

Survey respondents’ feedback made clear the importance of getting the details right for any proposed new IP Inclusive structure. The two most crucial aspects will be its governance and its funding.

8.4.1 Governance

The structure, leadership and management of an incorporated IP Inclusive will be a particular concern for the founding membership organisations (CIPA, CITMA, FICPI-UK and IP Federation), external bodies such as the IPO and IPReg, and larger signatories that need to do due diligence before committing corporate support. We will not be able to count on their backing unless we establish a structure that is robust, sustainable, transparent and accountable, without being unnecessarily bureaucratic.

This survey has provided valuable insight into our stakeholders' expectations of IP Inclusive. Above all, we should satisfy ourselves that a CIC is indeed the best vehicle to deliver on those expectations.

8.4.2 Funding

We also need to answer a fundamental question about funding: based on the likely levels of financial support (eg as indicated in response to Question 14), would a CIC be financially viable?

Charter signatory subscriptions appear to be the preferred funding option for most of the survey respondents. Not surprisingly, however, opinions vary with signatory size and type. We therefore need to look at the make-up of our current community of signatories and the expected contributions from each group as suggested by the survey responses. Although the filters reveal that the cohort most likely to contribute is the "large" private sector organisations (those with more than 80 staff including partners/members/directors), the small and medium-sized organisations are actually more numerous among our signatories. Likely contributions will need to be weighted accordingly when considering their impact on the proposed CIC budget. Nor should we ignore the views of the other categories, and in particular we must ensure that we keep individual professionals involved without cost burden. It is important to our mission that *all* IP professionals feel they are welcome in the IP Inclusive community; no one should be obliged to contribute other than voluntarily and within their individual means.

A subscription scheme might lose us some Charter signatories initially, but on the plus side it would be relatively easy to administer, facilitate budgeting and cash flow management (for both IP Inclusive and its contributors), and provide an additional way for us to engage with signatory organisations. Pragmatically speaking, if IP Inclusive is to continue to offer valuable support to the IP professions, it cannot do so without funding, and the survey results suggest it would not be unreasonable to ask people to pay an affordable amount for access to things which they clearly value.

However, signatory subscriptions may not on their own generate sufficient revenue. A blended model may be better, allowing us to source additional funding through sponsorship or donations for specific projects, as well as from appropriate external grants. The advantage of a blended model is that it allows different types of organisation to contribute in different ways according to their preferences and constraints. Some might prefer the certainty of a regular subscription for a defined "product", whilst others need more flexibility to accommodate their cash flow. Some might be put off by the commercial feel of sponsorships; others might be grateful for a mechanism by which they could support specific aspects of IP Inclusive's work to align with their own priorities. Independent bodies such as IPReg and the IPO might not be able to pay subscriptions – depending on the scope of the subscription package – but might still be willing to contribute to IP Inclusive through other mechanisms, for instance to cover specific projects.

We also need to take account of potential contributions from membership bodies such as CIPA, CITMA, FICPI-UK and IP Federation, which will depend to an extent on how their individual members interact with IP Inclusive; we hope that the current survey responses will inform their views on that.

Whatever the chosen funding model, it needs to cover the operating costs of the restructured IP Inclusive, including those associated with sourcing the funding itself, for example administering a subscription scheme, seeking sponsorship and/or applying for grants. Sourcing sponsorship or grants could require involvement from reasonably high-level personnel and inevitably introduce uncertainty and delay for IP Inclusive’s plans.

8.4.3 The specifics of a subscription scheme

We can learn a great deal from these survey results about how a subscription scheme should be shaped:

- The basic fee must be right
 - It should depend on signatory size and type, although not be directly proportional to staff numbers
 - There should probably be exemptions for certain categories, for example in-house departments, sole practitioners and/or others who feel unable to contribute for some reason (eg financial hardship)
 - It should be sufficient to cover IP Inclusive’s basic operating costs, there being less certainty around the acquisition of further funds
 - However it should not be so high as to discourage signatories from contributing to additional projects now and then
- There must be clarity over the scope of the “subscription package”
 - For example, some organisations would need to separate lobbying activities from their financial contributions
- The subscription package must provide value for money
 - Different aspects of IP Inclusive’s work are valued by different types of supporters (see the responses to Question 12 at 5.1 above). We may therefore need to articulate the value proposition differently to different audiences if we are to secure their ongoing support.
- The scheme must allow people to contribute more if they want to, and we must make it clear that such additional contributions are welcome
- It must not compromise the inclusivity of the IP Inclusive community (and in turn its value to everyone)
 - Involvement in, the benefits of and contributions to IP Inclusive should remain open to all IP professionals and their organisations, whether or not within the formal Charter scheme, and this should be well publicised
 - The subscription fee should not “price people out”
 - Subscription levels, and indeed the provision of additional funding, should not create a “hierarchy” of Charter signatories; all should have equal status so long as they comply with the Charter commitments

8.5 Other things we can learn from the responses

The free text responses (including those provided under “other” headings) provided useful information about what IP professionals value from IP Inclusive, and suggestions for things they would like IP Inclusive to do, do more of or do better. We can learn from this in developing our future plans, whatever structure we ultimately adopt. The Question 12 responses (see 5.1 above) will be particularly useful in targeting our work more effectively, increasing support for certain types of signatories in the areas they are most likely to benefit from.

Notable perspectives included the following.

- A not insignificant proportion of the Charter signatory respondents felt that IP Inclusive should remain as it is rather than grow, or were unsure or did not have a view about this. Thus, whilst IP Inclusive’s development would likely receive support from its stakeholders, we should make an effort to determine the reasons why some would prefer otherwise, and to focus its growth on the areas most likely to be valued.
- The aspect of IP Inclusive that respondents apparently valued the least was “PR opportunities”. If genuine this suggests, encouragingly, that organisations value our work in its own right rather than for any associated individual gain. It would fit with our own observations that signatories are willing to work together, and to share, in pursuit of IP Inclusive’s objectives. This in turn probably has value for the IP sector as a whole.
- Additional funding (on top of a signatory subscription) would be best sought for specific, high profile projects that clearly added value to the basic subscription package – and might be available from individual supporters as well as organisations.

As a general point, the survey participation levels, the number and nature of the survey responses suggest we could do more to engage with our Charter signatories. This will be even more important if we become reliant on their financial support. It is possible our communications are not reaching the right people and/or are not being read. We should strengthen our relationships with key personnel within our signatory organisations, making sure they are more actively involved. An annual requirement to reconfirm the Charter commitments and update contact details might be a good idea: it would require resources to administer, and again might lose us some signatories, but it would make the Charter system as a whole more meaningful, ensuring that those who remained signatories were serious about it and likely to be supportive. Such a process might usefully begin at the stage when we consult again with stakeholders about our more detailed plans for IP Inclusive’s future (see 9.1 below).

9 Suggested next steps

The survey results appear to support the incorporation of IP Inclusive as a CIC and the introduction of Charter signatory subscriptions. We should now move to preparing more detailed proposals for IP Inclusive’s development during 2021, as a basis for further consultations.

We suggest this process involves the following steps.

1. Satisfy ourselves that the CIC model is (a) financially viable (see 8.4.2 above) and (b) an appropriate vehicle by which to deliver on our stakeholders' current expectations.

If yes, then, taking account of the survey responses, proceed to:

2. Draft outline plans for the structure and governance of the proposed CIC.
3. Draft outline plans for its funding, including through Charter signatory subscriptions.

If no, proceed to:

4. Create an alternative plan for IP Inclusive's future in 2021 and beyond, for example scaling down or winding up the current initiative, or continuing but with funding from other sources.

In either case:

5. Publish the plans and consult again with stakeholders, including at IP Inclusive's 2021 annual meeting, aiming to reach as wide as possible a range of Charter signatories, individual IP professionals and other actual or potential supporters.

And in the meantime:

6. Consider ways to improve engagement with our Charter signatories.

It is probably sensible, whatever the outcome of these six steps, to proceed with care with any agreed changes to IP Inclusive's structure and activities. We must have confidence that the changes will be supported, will not erode the inclusivity of the initiative or the goodwill it currently enjoys within the IP professions, and will yield sufficient guaranteed funds to sustain it.

During the next consultation period, we should attempt to reach a wider audience of individual IP professionals, for instance through the annual meeting, surveys, and/or their involvement in our communities or regional networks. It will be important that these people do not feel disenfranchised by a funding scheme based primarily on Charter signatory status.

Ideally we should have at least some actual or pledged finance available before embarking on permanent alterations, but the detailed timings can of course be established following the second consultation period. That period should also be used to notify Charter signatories that subscriptions may be brought in during the second half of 2021; if responses to that notification are discouraging, we will still be able to pull back from irreversible changes.

Annex I

Explanatory text from website

The following text appears on the IP Inclusive website at <https://ipinclusive.org.uk/to-diversity-and-beyond-developing-ip-inclusive/>, providing some background to and context for the survey. It was signposted to potential respondents.

The plan

We want to put IP Inclusive onto a more sustainable footing for the future, to allow it to grow whilst maintaining the goodwill of its many supporters.

In order to do this, we are proposing to formalise the initiative’s structure, incorporating it as a “Community Interest Company” (CIC). A CIC is a limited liability company, with certain safeguards to ensure it acts in the interests of the community it serves: see [here](#). It is less onerous to constitute than a registered charity, and has more flexibility in terms of the commercial activities it can engage in, whilst nevertheless providing the transparency, accountability and governance safeguards of a regulated legal entity.

The CIC’s objectives would be to promote and improve equality, diversity, inclusivity and wellbeing among UK-based IP professionals. The “community” it served would likely be defined as “UK-based IP professionals and those wishing to become one”.

We envisage a corporate structure similar to the current IP Inclusive, with a paid executive to manage day-to-day operations and a steering board to provide oversight and guidance. The board would, we hope, carry representatives from across the IP professions, including from the founding organisations (CIPA, CITMA, FICPI-UK and IP Federation) and the IPO. The volunteers who are the life-blood of the initiative would, as now, sit outside the formal structure, but be protected and supported by its existence.

Importantly, the CIC would be independent of its founding organisations – although it would still welcome their involvement and support.

A CIC would incur certain basic operating costs, including remuneration of its executive. In the current set-up, such costs are being temporarily met by CIPA, CITMA, IP Federation and IPReg. We are therefore consulting with our stakeholders – our volunteers, sponsors, Charter signatories and other supporters – about the feasibility of the proposed CIC model. We want to know, essentially, whether you agree with what we are planning and whether you would be willing to help us fund it.

The outcomes

Once we've collected survey responses and other input from our supporters, we plan to report the results on our website [News and Features](#) and [IP Inclusive Management](#) pages, and there will be further consultation during and after our next annual meeting in early 2021.

If the proposed new CIC structure appears to be feasible, and to be broadly supported, we would hope to press ahead with its creation in the late spring or early summer of 2021.

Annex II Tables

In reporting the survey responses, all tabulated figures are percentages of the respondents who answered the relevant question, unless otherwise indicated. Percentages are quoted to one decimal place.

The “%IS” figures relate to the results of the individual professionals’ survey.

Where useful, data from the signatories’ survey has been cross-linked between questions, to establish relationships between on the one hand organisation type or size and on the other the aspects of IP Inclusive regarded as most valuable, and the level of support likely to be available. In these cases, the following filters have been applied based on the answers to Question 7 (see 3.6 above) and the figures included in the results tables. The “filtered” percentages are based on the number of respondents in the filtered group, not the whole survey.

- %SP – only the 10 respondents who answered “small private sector organisation”
- %LP – only the 21 who answered “large private sector organisation”
- %VP – only the 4 who answered “very large private sector organisation”

No filters have been used for in-house categories, as the numbers of valid responses were too small to draw meaningful conclusions (see 3.5 above and also Annex III on anomalous responses).

Question 5: sector of operation

Table 1: Q5 responses

Response	%	%IS
(No of respondents)	(50/54)	(14/14)
Academia	0	0
Charity	0	0
Civil service	4.0	0
Industry	16.0	21.4
Media	0	0
Private practice	72.0	71.4
Other	8.0	7.1

Question 6: type of organisation

Table 2: Q6 responses

Response	%	%IS
(No of respondents)	(50/54)	(14/14)
Academic department or organisation	0	0
Barristers' chambers	2.0	0
Business support service (eg IT systems, marketing)	4.0	14.3
Charity	0	0
Government agency or department	4.0	0
In-house IP department	8.0	28.6
Membership body	2.0	0
Private sector IP-specific legal advisers (mainly patent &/or trade mark attorneys)	60.0	71.4
Private sector IP-specific legal advisers (mainly solicitors)	8.0	7.1
Private sector wider law firm	12.0	7.1
Provider of IP management services or strategic advice (including tech transfer)	12.0	7.1
Publisher (including of databases & information)	0	0
Recruitment consultancy	4.0	0
Searching/information science provider	4.0	0
Training provider	4.0	0
"Virtual" professional services network	0	0
None of the above	2.0	7.1

Question 7: size of organisation

Table 3: Q7 responses

Response	%	%IS
(No of respondents)	(51/54)	(14/14)
Sole practitioner	5.9	7.1
Small private sector organisation (1-20 staff including partners/members/directors)	19.6	0
Medium private sector organisation (21-80 staff including partners/members/directors)	11.8	21.4
Large private sector organisation (more than 80 staff including partners/members/directors)	41.2	42.9

Response	%	%IS
Very large private sector organisation (more than 500 staff including partners/members/directors)	7.8	0
Small in-house department (1-10 staff)	3.9	7.1
Medium in-house department (11-50 staff)	5.9	7.1
Large in-house department (more than 50 staff)	0	14.3
Other	3.9	0

Question 8: membership body affiliations

Table 4: Q8 responses

Response	%	%IS
(No of respondents)	(48/54)	(13/14)
AIPPI UK	45.8	38.5
ATTP/AUTM/PraxisAuril/PraxisUnico or similar	8.3	0
CIPA	79.2	100
CITMA	77.1	69.2
FICPI-UK	35.4	23.1
IP Bar Association	6.3	7.7
IP Federation	10.4	7.7
IPLA	27.1	7.7
LES B&I	20.8	0
None of the above	4.2	0

Question 9: in-principle agreement to the CIC proposal

Table 5: Q9 responses

Response	%	%IS
(No of respondents)	(45/54)	(14/14)
Yes	62.2	42.9
No	6.7	0
Not sure	13.3	35.7
Don't have a view either way	17.8	21.4

Question 10: preferences for IP Inclusive's development

Table 6: Q10 responses

Response	%	%IS
(No of respondents)	(45/54)	(14/14)
To increase the support it provides for IP professionals in the D&I context	58.7	92.9
To stay as it is	21.7	0
To finish – its work is done	0	0
Not sure	8.7	7.1
Don't have a view either way	6.5	0
Other	4.4	0

Question 12: the value of IP Inclusive's work

Table 7: Q12 responses

Response	%	%IS
(No of respondents)	(45/54)	(13/14)
Training	46.7	61.5
Resources (eg guidance, toolkits, template documents)	64.4	76.9
Access to support networks (eg IP & ME, IP Ability, IP Futures, IP Out, Women in IP, regional networks)	80.0	69.2
Sector-wide networking and business development opportunities	57.8	53.9
PR opportunities	22.2	15.4
Helping to demonstrate your D&I and/or CSR commitments	60.0	23.1
Sense of community	57.8	53.9
Other	15.6	15.4

Table 8: Q12 filtered responses

Response	%	%SP	%LP	%VP
(No of respondents)	(45)	(10)	(18)	(4)
Training	46.7	50.0	50.0	25.0
Resources	64.4	50.0	72.2	25.0
Access to support networks	80.0	60.0	100	50.0
Networking & BD opportunities	57.8	50.0	66.7	100
PR opportunities	22.2	10.0	27.8	25.0
Demonstrating D&I and/or CSR	60.0	40.0	83.3	25.0
Sense of community	57.8	50.0	61.1	50.0
Other	15.6	0	11.1	0

Question 14: likely financial contributions

Table 9: Q14 responses

Response	%
(No of respondents)	(41/54)
Nothing	4.9
Up to about £100 pa	19.5
Up to about £500 pa	22.0
Up to about £1000 pa	12.2
Up to about £2000 pa	9.8
Other	31.7

Table 10: Q14 filtered responses

Response	%	%SP	%LP	%VP
(No of respondents)	(41)	(9)	(16)	(3)
Nothing	4.9	0	0	0
Up to about £100 pa	19.5	66.7	0	0
Up to about £500 pa	22.0	11.1	25.0	100
Up to about £1000 pa	12.2	0	18.8	0
Up to about £2000 pa	9.8	0	18.8	0
Other	31.7	22.2	37.5	0

Question 15: preferred funding models

Table 11: Q15 responses

Response	%	%IS
(No of respondents)	(40/54)	(12/13)
Annual subscriptions for Charter signatories	75.0	75.0
Sponsorship packages (all types)	42.5	N/A
Sponsorship packages (fixed-term)	N/A	33.3
Sponsorship packages (individual projects)	N/A	58.3
Charges for events	30.0	8.3
Charges for access to resources (eg guidance, toolkits, template documents)	15.0	0
Fund-raising campaigns, whether regular or for individual projects	32.5	33.3
Chargeable directory and/or jobs board listings	7.5	33.3
Applying for relevant grants	37.5	83.3
Other	27.5	25.0

Table 12: Q15 filtered responses

Response	%	%SP	%LP	%VP
(No of respondents)	(40)	(8)	(16)	(3)
Annual subscriptions for Charter signatories	75.0	62.5	93.8	33.3
Sponsorship packages	42.5	25.0	25.0	66.7
Charges for events	30.0	25.0	31.3	66.7
Charges for access to resources	15.0	12.5	18.8	0
Fund-raising campaigns	32.5	50.0	18.8	33.3
Chargeable directory and/or jobs board	7.5	0	6.3	0
Applying for relevant grants	37.5	50.0	25.0	0
Other	27.5	25.0	31.3	0

Question 16: preferred ways of contributing

Table 13: Q16 responses

Response	%
(No of respondents)	(39/54)
Annual Charter signatory subscription	69.2
Fixed-term sponsorship package	5.1

Response	%
Ad hoc sponsorship of individual project(s) (eg website upgrades, annual conference)	23.1
Charges for access to events	23.1
Charges for access to resources (eg guidance, toolkits, template documents)	5.1
Other	23.1

Table 14: Q16 filtered responses

Response	%	%SP	%LP	%VP
(No of respondents)	(39)	(9)	(16)	(2)
Annual Charter signatory subscription	69.2	66.7	87.5	50.0
Fixed-term sponsorship package	5.1	0	0	0
Ad hoc sponsorship	23.1	33.3	18.8	0
Charges for access to events	23.1	33.3	12.5	50.0
Charges for access to resources	5.1	11.1	6.3	0
Other	23.1	11.1	25.0	0

Question 17: contributions depending on organisation size

Table 15: Q17 responses

Response	%	%IS
(No of respondents)	(41/54)	(12/14)
Yes	75.6	66.7
No	7.3	0
Not sure	7.3	33.3
Wouldn't mind either way	2.4	0
Other	7.3	0

Table 16: Q17 filtered responses

Response	%	%SP	%LP	%VP
(No of respondents)	(41)	(9)	(16)	(3)
Yes	75.6	100	68.8	33.3
No	7.3	0	6.3	0
Not sure	7.3	0	12.5	33.3
Wouldn't mind either way	2.4	0	6.3	0

Response	%	%SP	%LP	%VP
Other	7.3	0	6.3	33.3

Question 18: lower limit + discretionary contributions

Table 17: Q18 responses

Response	%
(No of respondents)	(41/54)
Yes	24.4
No	22.0
Not sure	34.2
Wouldn't mind either way	9.8
Other	9.8

Question 19: further support as well as signatory subscriptions

Table 18: Q19 responses

Response	%	%IS
(No of respondents)	(41/54)	(13/14)
Yes	61.0	61.5
Maybe	17.1	23.1
Unlikely	2.4	0
No	2.4	0
Not sure	9.8	0
Don't have a view either way	0	15.4
Other	7.3	0

Question 20: further financial support as well as subscriptions

Table 19: Q20 responses

Response	%
(No of respondents)	(41/54)
Yes	26.8
Maybe	22.0
Unlikely	12.2
No	12.2
Not sure	17.1
Don't have a view either way	0
Other	9.8

Table 20: Q20 filtered responses

Response	%	%SP	%LP	%VP
(No of respondents)	(41)	(9)	(16)	(3)
Yes	26.8	22.2	37.5	33.3
Maybe	22.0	22.2	25.0	33.3
Unlikely	12.2	22.2	0	0
No	12.2	11.1	12.5	0
Not sure	17.1	22.2	12.5	33.3
Don't have a view either way	0	0	0	0
Other	9.8	0	12.5	0

Individuals' question on financial contributions

Table 21: responses re individual contributions

Response	%IS
(No of respondents)	(13/14)
Yes	38.5
Maybe	23.1
Probably not	38.5
No	0
Not sure	0
Other	0

Annex III

Anomalous survey responses

The Charter signatories' survey yielded the following anomalous responses, which affect the way the results should be interpreted.

- a. Two of the responses named CIPA as the Charter signatory, but in practice appeared to come from individual IP professionals from in-house IP departments (one identified as medium-sized, the other as small), whose employers were not themselves Charter signatories. Neither of these respondents answered the remaining substantive questions.
- b. Three other respondents provided only their basic details (survey page 1) but did not answer the substantive questions.
- c. Two organisations submitted a pair of separate responses. In each case only one of the two responses addressed the substantive questions from page 2 onwards.

We have not removed these responses from the data we collected, since response figures for individual questions are in any case calculated as percentages of the respondents who answered the relevant question, not of the entire survey cohort.

- d. Two organisations submitted a pair of separate responses. Both identified as large private sector organisations. In both cases, the two responses were aligned in agreeing in principle with the CIC model. In both cases, one of the respondents completed Question 14 about the amount their organisation might be willing to contribute to IP Inclusive, whilst the other said they were not able to respond.

Again we have not removed these responses, since they may provide additional insight through the free text comments. This will have skewed the quantitative results although not hugely; we believe the survey still provides a valuable steer on the key issues.

- e. Two signatories failed to identify themselves, one of them not even identifying its size, type or sector, but did answer the substantive questions.
- f. One failed to identify itself and only subsequently answered Question 15 ("Which type(s) of funding model do you think we should adopt?"), selecting the "Annual subscriptions for Charter signatories" option.

In theory it is possible that these respondents are not Charter signatories at all. In practice this is unlikely, partly because the survey link was only sent to signatory contacts and partly because of the nature of the responses and the level of engagement they demonstrate.

- g. One respondent said they represented a "small in-house IP department" but their employer was not actually a Charter signatory.

We have not removed this response, since again it may provide insight through the free text comments, but it may skew the quantitative results a little.