

- 1) Un rapporto di ricerca cita una o più pubblicazioni scientifiche di uno o più inventori dell'Università come particolarmente rilevanti per determinare la novità e l'attività inventiva: quali misure può adottare l'Università per prevenire il ripetersi di casi simili?
- 2) What is a trade mark? What can you protect with a trademark and what is the scope of protection?



- 1) Nel caso si voglia proteggere il risultato di una ricerca scientifica in ambito universitario, come è possibile verificare se ci siano già dei brevetti su quell'argomento? Dove e come fare una verifica di questo genere? Quali attenzioni porre?
- 2) How can scouting activities be conducted, and how can innovation and technology transfer be promoted within research projects?



- 1) Un'azienda del territorio contatta l'ufficio di trasferimento tecnologico allo scopo di realizzare un accordo quadro ai fini di accrescere l'interazione e la collaborazione nella ricerca con i diversi dipartimenti e strutture dell'università. Indicare le azioni da intraprendere aiutandosi con un esempio generico
- 2) Could you describe the fundamental steps to perform a prior art search? What types of patent searches can be carried out, and for what purposes?



- 1) L'azienda è interessata ad acquisire un brevetto dell'Università: come si imposta la negoziazione? Come definire la componente economica?
- 2) What is a patent? What can be patented and what are patent requirements? What is the scope of protection?



- 1) Come sviluppare una strategia di trasferimento tecnologico? Come definire il successo in relazione agli sforzi di commercializzazione supportati da un TTO (Ufficio di Trasferimento Tecnologico)? Come misurare e valutare il 'successo' di un TTO ?
- 2) What is a search report? The main information can be derived from it, and what can it be used for.



- 1) L'Ateneo intende massimizzare l'impatto della ricerca e valorizzare i risultati di uno studio su nuovi materiali derivati da scarti di produzione: quali sono le principali azioni che suggerirebbe agli inventori e le metodologie che ritiene idonee per interagire con partner esterni.
- 2) Briefly describe the life cycle of a patent and the critical decisions the University must make to maintain the patent.



- 1) Il ricercatore ha fatto una pubblicazione che distrugge la novità di una eventuale domanda di brevetto: quali altri titoli di proprietà intellettuale potrebbero essere utilizzati per garantire un forma di protezione o trasferimento tecnologico?
- 2) What does a patent look like, and what are its main elements and the information you can gather from the patent document?



- 1) Cosa si intende per technology transfer e in che modo la funzione di Knowledge Transfer Manager potrebbe agevolarlo? Quali sono le principali azioni di knowledge transfer attuabili e in che modo un Knowledge Transfer Manager potrebbe facilitare e avere interazioni con gli stakeholder esterni?
- 2) What types of inventions can be patented? Moreover, what kinds of inventions cannot be patented?



- 1) Un ricercatore di Ca' Foscari si rivolge a lei sostenendo di avere sviluppato una tecnologia che vale potenzialmente milioni di euro. Come condurre un'analisi di mercato per fornire supporto alle fasi di valorizzazione?
- 2) Difference between moral rights and economic rights on a patent?



- 1) Quali sono i principali diritti di proprietà intellettuale che intravede in una automobile?
- 2) What is Freedom to Operate? How does the Freedom to Operate search differ from patent landscape analysis?



- 1) Oltre i brevetti e il trasferimento tecnologico: altre forme di collaborazione tra università e impresa nell'ambito della ricerca e dell'innovazione.
- 2) The functions and characteristics of the Non-Disclosure Agreement (NDA)



Farming

EU to delay new green rule in bid to appease protesting farmers

Delay to rules on setting aside land to encourage biodiversity offered as concession amid continuing protests

Lisa O'Carroll in Brussels and Angelique Chrisafis in Paris

Wed 31 Jan 2024 16.57 CET

Farmers protesting across <u>Europe</u> have won their first concession from Brussels, with the EU announcing a delay in rules that would have forced them to set aside land to encourage biodiversity and soil health.

About 10,000 French farmers stepped up their protests on Wednesday, with at least 100 blockades on major roads across France, as 18 farmers were arrested for blocking traffic as they tried to reach the wholesale food market at Rungis, south-east of Paris and 79 others were detained after they managed to get inside.

Belgian farmers joined protests at the French border and others blocked access roads to the Zeebrugge container port for a second day. Spanish and Italian farmers also demonstrated.



🗅 Farmers drive tractors during a protest at Melegnano toll booth, near Milan, Italy. Photograph: Claudia Greco/Reuters

The European Commission vice-president, Maroš Šefčovič, described Wednesday's decision to delay rules on setting aside land, which is expected to be rubber-stamped by member states within 15 days, as "a helping hand" for the sector at a difficult time.

Citing flooding, wildfires in Greece, heatwaves across southern Europe and drought in Spain which has left reservoirs in Andalucia at 20% normal levels, he said it was important to listen to farmers and "to avoid the polarisation which is making any good conversation and discussion more difficult.

"We feel we are obliged to act under this pressure which the farming community [is feeling]," he said. "We have had a number of extreme meteorological events, droughts, flooding in various parts of Europe, and there was a clear negative effect on the output, on the revenue - and of course, decreased income - for the farmers."

Combined with higher energy prices, the weather-related risks to crops meant farmers were at a "persistent pain point" that was "driving up the cost of production and squeezing revenues", Šefčovič said.

Under the rules, farmers were expected to keep 4% of their arable land free from crop production in an effort to regenerate the health of the soil and increase biodiversity, which is also in crisis.

Alternatively, farmers could have got an exemption from this "set-aside" rule if they had used 7% of their land for "catch crops" such as clover, which provide cover for the soil after the main crop is harvested.

However, under the new proposals, farmers will not be obliged to set aside fallow land, or any portion of land for catch crops, until 2025.

The change comes as farm protests have been intensifying, in the past 24 hours. On Wednesday, French farmers from the southwest of the country managed to get around police barriers south of Paris by taking back-roads or switching from tractors to trucks in order to reach the area near the Rungis food market. The French interior minister, Gérald Darmanin, had warned that while farmers' protests on motorways would be tolerated, police would not allow them to block airports or Rungis, Europe's largest fresh food market.



rench farmers maintain roadblocks on key highways into Paris. Photograph: Emmanuel Dunand/AFP/Getty Images

The Créteil prosecutor's office outside Paris said that 15 of the 18 farmers arrested near Rungis were in custody being questioned by police.

French farmers also blocked roads around Lyon. At a farmers' roadblock in Cavaillon in the south, foreign produce, including Italian kiwifruit and pears, was unloaded from lorries.

Virgile, a farmer demonstrating, told BFMTV: "This is about the anger of country people being treated by fools. We work like dogs. Our message is: Buy French produce, make that effort."

After days spent calling for higher incomes, less red tape and protection from foreign competition, "there are huge expectations" among farmers, said Arnaud Rousseau, the head of France's largest agricultural union, the FNSEA. He added that not all of the demands could be immediately answered "so I'm trying to call for calm and reason".

Until now, farmers have not been impressed with the quick fixes offered by politicians or officials in Brussels. They have concerns about the high cost of land, the pressure from supermarkets to sell crops at near-cost prices, and the plethora of new environment rules coming in the form of EU nature restoration laws.

Their critics say EU farmers are among the most cosseted sectors in the industry, with more than €307bn (£260bn) - 30% of the overall EU budget - earmarked for them between 2023 and 2027.

Asked if Wednesday's concession would be enough to quell the protests, Šefčovič admitted that the EU had to "intensify" the dialogue with farmers to make sure they were listened to. "We have to make sure that Europe will become a continent which will be habitable, also, in the future," he added.

The European Commission will also set up measures to limit market disruption from Ukrainian products entering the EU, after tariffs were lifted in response to Russia's invasion.

France will oppose a trade deal between the <u>European Union</u> and the South American Mercosur bloc - a key grievance for protesters - being signed in its current state.

The French economy minister, Bruno Le Maire, said there would be closer surveillance of European food trading platforms to ensure that "farmers' income is not the first thing to be sacrificed in trade negotiations".



Food

Move to sustainable food systems could bring \$10tn benefits a year, study finds

Existing production destroys more value than it creates due to medical and environmental costs, researchers say

Jonathan Watts Global environment editor

@jonathanwatts

Mon 29 Jan 2024 15.00 CET

A shift towards a more sustainable global food system could create up to \$10tn (£7.9tn) of benefits a year, improve human health and ease the climate crisis, according to the most comprehensive economic study of its type.

It found that existing food systems destroyed more value than they created due to hidden environmental and medical costs, in effect, borrowing from the future to take profits today.

Food systems drive a third of global greenhouse gas emissions, putting the world on course for 2.7C of warming by the end of the century. This creates a vicious cycle, as higher temperatures bring more extreme weather and greater damage to harvests.

Food insecurity also puts a burden on medical systems. The study predicted a business-as-usual approach would leave 640 million people underweight by 2050, while obesity would increase by 70%.

Redirecting the food system would be politically challenging but bring huge economic and welfare benefits, said the international team of authors behind the

study, which aims to be the food equivalent of the Stern review, the 2006 examination of the costs of climate change.

Johan Rockström, of the Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research and one of the study's authors, said: "The global food system holds the future of humanity on Earth in its hand."

The study proposes a shift of subsidies and tax incentives away from destructive large-scale monocultures that rely on fertilisers, pesticides and forest clearance. Instead, financial incentives should be directed towards smallholders who could turn farms into carbon sinks with more space for wildlife.

A change of diet is another key element, along with investment in technologies to enhance efficiency and cut emissions.

With less food insecurity, the report says, undernutrition could be eradicated by 2050, with 174 million fewer premature deaths, and 400 million farm workers able to earn a sufficient income. The proposed transition would help to limit global heating to 1.5C above pre-industrial levels and halve nitrogen run-offs from agriculture.

Overall, they estimate the costs of the transformation at between 0.2% and 0.4% of global GDP per year.

In early research, Rockström and his colleagues found food was the largest sector of the economy breaching planetary boundaries. As well at the climate impact, it is a major driver of land-use change and biodiversity decline, and is responsible for 70% of freshwater drawdown.

The report was produced by the Food System Economics Commission, which has been formed by the Potsdam Institute, the Food and Land Use Coalition, and EAT, a holistic food-system coalition of the Stockholm Resilience Centre, the Wellcome Trust and the Strawberry Foundation. Academic partners include the University of Oxford and the London School of Economics.

It estimated the hidden costs of food, including climate change, human health, nutrition and natural resources, at \$15tn, and created a new model to project how these hidden costs could develop over time, depending on humanity's ability to change. Their calculations were in line with a report last year by the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, which estimated off-books agrifood costs at more than \$10trillion globally in 2020.

Dr Steven Lord, of the University of Oxford's Environmental Change Institute, said in a statement: "This analysis puts a first figure on the regional and global economic opportunity in transforming food systems. While not easy, the transformation is affordable on a global scale and the accumulating costs into the future of doing nothing pose a considerable economic risk."

Numerous other studies have demonstrated the health and climate benefits of a shift towards a plant-based diet. A <u>report last year by the Climate Observatory</u> notes that Brazil's beef industry – and its related deforestation – now has a bigger carbon footprint than all the cars, factories, air conditioners, electric gadgets and other sources of emissions in Japan.

The new study is not prescriptive about vegetarianism, but Rockström said demand for beef and most other meat would fall if hidden health and environmental costs were included in the price.

Nicholas Stern, the chair of the Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the Environment at the London School of Economics, welcomed the study: "The economics of today's food system are, sadly, broken beyond repair. Its so-called 'hidden costs' are harming our health and degrading our planet, while also worsening global inequalities. Changing the ways we produce and consume food will be critical to tackling climate change, protecting biodiversity, and building a better future. It is time for radical change."

The main challenge of the proposed food transition is that costs of food would rise. Rockström said this would have to be handled with political dexterity and support for poor sections of society otherwise the result could be protests, such as the *gilets jaunes* (yellow vests) demonstrations held in France over petrol price hikes.

Christiana Figueres, the former executive secretary of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, emphasised the forward-looking nature of the report: "This research ... proves that a different reality is possible, and shows us what it would take to turn the food system into a net carbon sink by 2040. This opportunity should capture the attention of any policymaker who wants to secure a healthier future for the planet and for people."

Sign in

Support us \rightarrow

News Opinion Sport Culture Lifestyle

Opinion

Norway has made a vital climate leap. This is how Britain can do the same

Tessa Khan

A historic legal victory in Oslo has boosted our campaign against the Rosebank field and other British drilling projects

Tessa Khan is executive director of climate action organisation Uplift

Wed 31 Jan 2024 08.00 CET



There has been a dramatic change in how oil drilling rights are approved on one side of the invisible line that divides the North Sea between the UK and Norway.

On the Norwegian side, after a groundbreaking decision by the Oslo district court on 18 January, the government must now take into account the emissions that come from the burning of oil and gas reserves in addition to the impact of getting the reserves out of the ground, before they approve a new field. The legal win, which applies for the first time the reasoning of a separate case in the Norwegian Supreme Court, was a result of Greenpeace Norway and Young Friends of the Earth Norway challenging the approval of three new oil and gas fields by the government. They argued the government had not been properly vetted for climate harm. The court agreed.

Meanwhile, for UK-based oil and gas projects such as Rosebank, our government only takes into account the damage wreaked by extracting reserves rather than by combusting them. But there is hope among climate campaigners that this position will become untenable. The judgment in Norway has set an example that provides fertile ground for the government's position to be challenged in UK courts.

And, alongside Greenpeace, that is what we at Uplift are doing. In September, the British government gave the Norwegian company Equinor permission to drill at Rosebank - and failed to consider the climate impact from the burning of the nearly 500m barrels expected to be extracted in its lifetime. The burning of these reserves would produce more CO₂ pollution than all of the world's 28 low-income countries emit in a year. We will argue that, alongside other ignored considerations, those emissions should have been central to whether or not Rosebank was approved.



An anti-Rosebank protest in London, 30 September 2023. Photograph: Lucy North/PA

In the coming weeks, the UK supreme court is due to rule on a case that challenges plans to drill for oil at Horse Hill in Surrey on the grounds that only production emissions were taken into account when permission was granted to drill. The impact of this case could be pivotal as it will probably influence the approach that lower courts take to a number of other cases that have been brought on similar grounds, including our challenge to Rosebank and an additional challenge by Greenpeace to Shell's Jackdaw gas field.

What the win in Norway puts beyond doubt is this: the oil and gas industry and its champions in government can no longer assume that courts will overlook the true climate impact of new oil and gas fields. An evolution in the legal approach to drilling is happening even in a major oil-producing country like Norway.

Significantly for the Horse Hill case, Rosebank and other challenges in the UK, the recent Norway decision is clear and emphatic that the EU's environmental impact assessment rules, which have also been implemented in UK law, require decision-makers to take into account what happens when we burn what we drill.

It is beginning to feel like the net is closing in. The reality of the repeated conclusions of the world's climate scientists, the International Energy Agency, the UN secretary-general and many others - that if we want a safe climate, there is no room for new oil and gas projects - is finally being brought to bear on the growth ambitions of oil and gas companies.

The legal win has already had a seismic impact in Norway, where opposition MPs are now calling for any oil and gas development approved after 2020 to be invalidated. This is incredible progress in a country whose population is invested in oil and gas production in a way not seen in the UK, given that its huge national wealth fund is built on oil and gas profits.

If Norway can do it, then so can we. Case by case, field by field, the legitimacy and legality of continuing to drill for oil and gas during the climate crisis is being successfully challenged. And with it the power of the oil and gas industry to undermine a livable climate is showing signs of waning.

Tessa Khan is a lawyer and the executive director of climate action organisation Uplift