TRIPS at 20: Evidence on Innovation, Use, and International Technology Flows

Keith E. Maskus 1 October 2015 WTO Public Forum, Geneva

Globalization of the IP system

- TRIPS, WIPO efforts, RTAs, BITs, and unilateral reforms have had large impacts on measured levels of patent strength.
- There have also been large changes in copyrights, trademarks and plant variety legal protection.
- More recently we've seen significant legislative reforms in geographical indications.
- By some measures patent reforms were stronger than trade liberalization since 1995.

What is this reformed system supposed to accomplish?

- Reduce apparent distortions to trade arising from highly variable IP systems.
- Expand trade in high-technology goods.
- Support markets for international knowledge transfer and diffusion.
- Improve global and national innovation incentives.
- Encourage R&D in technologies for the needs of poor countries.
- Improve consumer guarantees of product origin, thereby raising safety and investments in quality.
- Build and support global markets for creative activities.
- Facilitate price differentiation across markets.

Technology transfer and innovation: indirect evidence

- The period since TRIPS has seen growth in technology exports of major emerging economies (Table 1).
- Also have observed large increases in the participation of developing countries in global IP registrations:
 - DC patent apps abroad: 11,459(1995) to 95,168(2010)
 - DC TM apps abroad: 275,647(1995) to 478,718(2010)
 - DC PVP apps total: 671(1995) to 5,119(2010)
- And relatively fast growth in weighted R&D/GDP ratios (2000-2010):
 - 26 developing countries: 3.7% per year;
 - 35 emerging countries without China: 2.8% per year;
 - China: 9.5% per year;
 - 28 developed countries: 1.3% per year.

Table 1 Indicators of Technology Transfer to Selected Countries														
	High-Technology Imports					High-Technology Exports				Inward FDI Stock			Outward FDI Stock	
	\$b	% mfg	\$b	% mfg	\$b	% mfg	\$b	% mfg	\$b	\$b		\$b	\$b	
					199									
	1995	1995	2005	2005	5	1995	2005	2005	2000	2008		2000	2008	
Brazil	8.7	22.3	16.3	29.1	2.4	8.9	8.4	13.1	122.3	287.7		51.9	162.2	
Mexico	18.9	31.9	59.6	31.5	22.9	36.4	63.8	38.2	97.2	294.7		8.3	45.4	
Rep. of Korea	24.3	25.7	56.2	33.8	44.4	13.7	98.5	21.1	38.1	90.7		26.8	96.5	
China	21.9	20.7	209.4	41.1	24.4	19.2	284.8	40.1	193.3	378.1		27.8	147.9	
India	2.9	13.9	20.1	26.8	1.5	6.5	5.5	7.4	17.5	123.3		1.9	61.8	
	Technology Balance of Payments													
	payments	receipts	payments	receipts										
	\$m	\$m	\$m	\$m										
	1995	1995	2005	2005										
Brazil	529	32	1,404	102										
Mexico	484	114	654	171										
Rep. of Korea	2,385	299	4,561	1,908										
China	1,281ª	80ª	5,321	157										
India	90	1	672	206										
Source: UN Comtrade, UNCTAD World Investment Report, World Development Indicators														
High-technology	trade includes	pharmace	uticals, electr	onic machin	ery and a	nerospace e	quipment							
^a data for 2000														

Caveats

- These changes are concentrated in a few countries and industries.
- There is little evidence of such changes among the poorest developing economies.
- Patent and TM statistics are imperfect measures.
- We need more systematic evidence based on extensive data and statistical analysis.
- Following is a brief review of recent econometric evidence. Qualifications:
 - Research is difficult due to data scarcity, measurement problems, causation issues, and confounding factors.
 - Relatively little research focuses on TRIPS itself.
 - Conclusions are already somewhat dated.

Patent reforms and innovation: mixed messages

- It is remarkable how little is known about this basic question.
- Early studies were pessimistic about impacts in DCs:
 - Reforms raise patenting in the US by developed countries (MCs) but reduce it by developing countries (DCs) (Schneider JDE 2005).
 - Multinational firms expand R&D and local patenting in MCs, no impact in DCs (Allred-Park JIBS 2007).
 - Non-resident patenting rises after reforms in middleincome countries; resident patenting rises does not (Branstetter et al QJE 2006).
 - Patent applications in US rose from middle-income economies with high secondary education (Chen-Puttitanun JDE 2005).

Patent reforms and innovation: mixed messages

- Later studies are more optimistic:
 - Pharma patent applications in US rose from middle-income DCs with higher skills and economic freedom (Qian REStat 2007).
 - US MNEs expand technological economic activities of local affiliates in larger developing countries after reforms (Branstetter, et al JIE 2011).
 - R&D/Sales for largest Indian pharma firms quadrupled 2000-05 in anticipation of patent reforms (Arora et al 2011).
- Exception: there is little evidence that reforms have raised private R&D aimed at needs of poor countries (Kyle and McGahan REStat 2014).
- Patent rights do play a positive role in such work in universities, foundations, and international organizations.

IPR reforms and international technology transfer

- This is the primary area of inquiry for international trade economists.
- Development economists largely expected negative impacts.
- But IPRs should address market-information problems in ITT via:
 - raising appropriability where imitation costs are low;
 - reducing contracting costs and raising legal certainty;
 - reducing opportunism through lower transactions costs;
 - Supporting markets for technology brokers.
- What are the channels of ITT?
 - High-technology input trade;
 - Foreign direct investment (FDI);
 - Technology licensing;
 - Skilled-labor mobility;
 - Information flows within production and research networks.

IPR reforms and ITT

- Casual evidence (ignoring great recession years):
 - N-S Trade in high-tech, intra-firm inputs continues to rise faster than total trade (vertical production).
 - N-S FDI and licensing volumes also rise relatively rapidly.
 - Rapid emergence of global innovation networks.
 - Little evidence of growth in ITT to poorest countries.

IPR reforms and ITT

- Econometric studies with recent data:
 - Patent laws matter to OECD firms in IPR-sensitive sectors in choosing production locations in Eastern Europe (Javorcik EER 2004).
 - OECD exports of high-technology goods rose faster to DCs with larger patent reforms post-TRIPS (Ivus JIE 2010).
 - Manufacturing exports from middle-income economies rose significantly over time in TRIPS period (Maskus-Yang working paper 2015).
 - This study also finds that inward patent applications seem to support export growth.

IPR reforms and ITT

- Affiliate licensing, value added, sales, employment, and exports of US MNEs rose post-reforms (Branstetter et al JIE 2011).
- Licensing by Japanese firms to affiliates and unaffiliated partners rise with patent strength (Wakasugi-Ito JTT 2009).
- IPRs positively offset the costs of distance in monitoring affiliate sales, so high-tech sales rise with patent rights (Keller and Yeaple AER 2013).
- IPR reforms above a threshold income level shift ITT from exports to FDI then to licensing (composition effect); (several studies).

Reasonably robust conclusions about ITT

- There does seem to be a positive and strong causal impact of IPR reforms on inward ITT.
- But not yet in the poorest countries.
- And in middle-income and emerging economies there are threshold and complementarity effects:
 - Education and human capital;
 - Effective domestic competition;
 - Adequate governance and infrastructure.
- All of this suggests that reforms are strongly supporting technology diffusion, if not fully across countries.
- And countries need to invest in complementary supports to maximize this access to information.

Brief concluding observations

- The data and evidence suggest that WTO members have seen:
 - Substantial legal reforms in IPRs;
 - Increasing engagement with the utilization of IPRs;
 - Growing market transactions in technological information protected by IPRs.
- The extent of this engagement varies by income grouping.
- But there are many more issues to study, such as
 - Copyrights and creativity in developing economies;
 - How should we measure trade in intangibles?
 - How have patent reforms affected competition and pricing in pharmaceuticals and other goods?
 - Have IP reforms supported price segmentation and how has this affected product availability?