

**TECHNOLOGY LICENSING PRACTICES OF SOUTH
AFRICAN MANUFACTURING COMPANIES :
A PROFILE AND THE INFLUENCE OF SOME
ORGANISATIONAL, TRANSACTIONAL AND
CONTEXTUAL FACTORS**

by

Francois Jacobus Janse van Vuuren

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree

**Philosophiae Doctor
(Technology Management)**

in the

Faculty of Engineering, Built Environment and Information
Technology

University of Pretoria

Pretoria

2004

SUMMARY

**TECHNOLOGY LICENSING PRACTICES OF SOUTH AFRICAN
MANUFACTURING COMPANIES:
A PROFILE AND THE INFLUENCE OF SOME ORGANISATIONAL,
TRANSACTIONAL AND CONTEXTUAL FACTORS**

by

FRANCOIS JACOBUS JANSE VAN VUUREN

Supervisor : Professor M. W. Pretorius

Department : Department of Engineering and Technology Management
UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA

Degree : Ph.D.

No comprehensive and systematic information about the multi-disciplinary, multi-functional technology licensing domain in South Africa was available. Yet South Africa was a net in-licensor paying royalties several times that received; its National Innovation Policy had as an important aim increasing technology linkages among firms; and licensing is widely recognized as a tool for technology transfer. Therefore a profile of technology licensing practices and the interaction between them, company and company milieu was obtained from South African manufacturing companies in all industry sectors through a cross-sectional exploratory survey by written questionnaire. Empirically established morphologies of the companies, of select aspects of their management and technology management practices, of their regulatory and enabling environment and of their technology licensing practices and preferences are presented. Attention is drawn to ostensibly disturbing phenomena and recommendations are made towards research to clarify several aspects and to improve licensing.

Learned authors have proposed mechanisms to improve licensing and its management. The question whether the influence of characteristics so postulated as drivers can be measured, confirmed and quantified arose and insights into postulated organisational, transactional and contextual drivers of licensing were simultaneously obtained and are presented for further consideration. These include pioneering and following, risk taking and conservatism, intensity

of use of national innovation funding, involvement in co-development and offset/countertrade, international experience, travel, management education, use of information, awareness of tacit information, attention to technology strategy and forward planning, intellectual property strategy, research and development and awareness of competitors' successes, failures and licensing activities.

Only companies that had or had had at least one patent or application or licence agreement were included to attempt to ensure the presence of some relevant knowledge. Statutory bodies, science councils, universities, merchants, the retail trade, technology brokers and individuals such as inventors were excluded. More than 300 initially selected companies were contacted by telephone to ensure qualification and to elicit cooperation and 188 questionnaires were sent out. In all 93 questionnaires were returned and 81 statistically processed.

Of the sample population 65% of respondents had licences. The sample average was 3,3 licences with the ratio of in- to out-licences at 1,7. Licence density with Europe was highest at 35% and within South Africa 31%. Out-licensing to Africa by the building materials and components, chemicals including paper and textiles and healthcare sectors was evident.

Intellectual property is mostly deployed in deterrence and monopolisation roles. Its planning seems to be neglected and further research into this and technology management strategy aspects within the broader framework of deployment of intellectual property is suggested.

In-licensing is driven by the need to obtain and hold market share through access to future and substitution of direct sales. Fear of revealing own know-how was notable as an inhibitor of out-licensing. Signs that South Africa could be characterised as technology colony were found; together with signs of emancipation. Lack of technology volume could be constraining licensing development and exploitation.

Early indications are that postulated determinant characteristics do have an effect and that this can be measured.

Keywords: Licence, manufacturing, technology, management, engineering, drivers,

intellectual property, patent, strategy.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Sincere thanks are due to -

All the long suffering respondents who made time to complete questionnaires.

The Statistical Consultation Service of the Department of Statistics, University of Pretoria.

Professor Tinus Pretorius for encouragement, excellent guidance and gently extracting the extra mile.

Professor Cetindamar of Sabanci University, Istanbul and Professor Daim of Portland State University, Portland, Oregon for acute insights.

My parents for a solid foundation and my immediate family for long-lasting support.

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. MORPHOLOGICAL DEMARCTION	10
2.1 TECHNOLOGY DEFINED	10
2.2 TECHNOLOGY TRADING BY AN INDUSTRIAL COMPANY.....	13
<i>2.2.1 Definition of licensing.....</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>2.2.2 Positioning the technology trading function.....</i>	<i>15</i>
2.3 TECHNO-ECONOMIC NETWORKS	20
2.4 INNOVATION	22
3. TECHNOLOGY MIGRATION AND TRADE.....	26
3.1 TECHNOLOGY IS VALUABLE	26
3.2 MIGRATION OF TECHNOLOGY IS UNSTOPPABLE.....	28
3.3 TRANSFER OF TECHNOLOGY AND LEARNING	31
3.4 APPROPRIABILITY	35
4. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY STRATEGY.....	40
4.1 INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY PORTFOLIO.....	40
4.2 DEPLOYMENT OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY PORTFOLIO	45
4.3 LICENSING STRATEGY	50
<i>4.3.1 Licensing is a mainstay of managing technology transfer.....</i>	<i>50</i>
<i>4.3.2 Basic function of licensing</i>	<i>54</i>
<i>4.3.3 Some reasons for licensing out</i>	<i>58</i>
<i>4.3.4 Some reasons for licensing in</i>	<i>61</i>
<i>4.3.5 Some reasons for not licensing out</i>	<i>63</i>
<i>4.3.6 Some reasons for not licensing in</i>	<i>64</i>
5. LICENSING MARKET	66
5.1 BACKGROUND	66
5.2 AGREEMENTS	68
<i>5.2.1 Qualitative aspects</i>	<i>68</i>
<i>5.2.2 Quantitative aspects</i>	<i>70</i>
5.3 SOURCES OF TECHNOLOGY	75
5.4 COST AND VALUATION	78
5.5 LICENSING ORGANISATION AND FUNCTIONARIES	84
6. SOUTH AFRICAN INDUSTRIAL COMPANIES IN CONTEXT.....	88
6.1 OVERVIEW	88
6.2 COMPANY ECONOMIC ETHOS.....	88
6.3 COMPANY ACCOUNTING SYSTEM	91
6.4 REGULATORY AND ENABLING ENVIRONMENT	92

<i>6.4.1 WTO, treaties</i>	92
<i>6.4.2 Protectionism; and governmental approval and IP control</i>	93
6.5 SOCIOLOGICAL FACTORS	96
<i>6.5.1 Cultural differences and indigenous practices</i>	96
<i>6.5.2 Organisation, people and qualifications.....</i>	98
6.6 AVAILABILITY AND MANAGEMENT OF INFORMATION	102
6.7 THE FUTURE, TECHNOLOGICAL TRENDS AND FORECASTING	105
7. METHODOLOGY.....	112
7.1 THREE OBJECTIVES OF THIS RESEARCH.....	112
7.2 TYPE OF RESEARCH AND QUESTIONNAIRE	114
7.3 OVERVIEW OF VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY	118
8. RESULTS.....	123
8.1 COMPANY AND INDUSTRY SECTOR DEMOGRAPHICS - 6.1	123
<i>8.1.1 Formation of industry sectors.....</i>	123
<i>8.1.2 Licences per industry sector</i>	124
<i>8.1.3 Company ownership and licences.....</i>	127
<i>8.1.4 Company sales volume and portion derived from in-licences</i>	128
<i>8.1.5 Geographic spread of in- plus out-licences</i>	130
<i>8.1.6 Relationship between various company characteristics and licence intensity</i>	131
<i>8.1.7 Inter-sector characteristics</i>	134
<i>8.1.8 Select other factors influencing licensing</i>	135
8.2 COMPANIES' PHYSICAL AND PERSONNEL ORGANISATION - 6.5.....	136
<i>8.2.1 Physical location and organogram.....</i>	137
<i>8.2.2 Management education and encouragement of innovative activities</i>	138
<i>8.2.3 Not Invented Here syndrome.....</i>	140
8.3 TECHNO-ECONOMIC NETWORKS (TENS) - 2.3	141
8.4 APPROACH TO RISK AND PIONEERING - 6.2.....	145
8.5 ACCOUNTING SYSTEMS - 6.3	147
8.6 REGULATORY ENVIRONMENT - 6.4.....	148
8.7 SENSITIVITY TO THE FUTURE - 6.7	149
8.8 INNOVATION LEVELS - 2.4.....	154
8.9 SENSITIVITY TO LEARNING FROM IN-LICENSING - 3.3	161
8.10 APPROPRIABILITY - 3.4	162
<i>8.10.1 Statutory intellectual property portfolios.....</i>	163
<i>8.10.2 IP management aspects.....</i>	165
8.11 IP PORTFOLIO'S - 4.1	166
8.12 DEPLOYMENT OF IP - 4.2	171
8.13 LICENSING ORGANISATIONS - 5.5	173
8.14 REASONS FOR LICENSING OR NOT – 4.3	177
8.15 CONTENT OF AND ADDED VALUE IN LICENCES - 5.2.2	179
8.16 VALUATION OF LICENSED TECHNOLOGY - 5.4	183
8.17 SOURCES OF TECHNOLOGY - 5.3.....	184
<i>8.17.1 Sources of in-licensable technology.....</i>	185
<i>8.17.2 Sources of technology in general</i>	185
8.18 USE OF INFORMATION AND LICENSING - 6.6	189
9. CONCLUSION.....	192
9.1 SALIENT FINDINGS	192

9.1.1 Demographic aspects	192
9.1.2 Economic orientation, overall and licensing organisation.....	195
9.1.3 Regulatory environment.....	196
9.1.4 Directed future	196
9.1.5 Intellectual property.....	198
9.1.6 Licences and licensing	200
9.1.7 Influence of notionally postulated determinants of licensing	202
9.2 COMPENDIUM OF RECOMMENDATIONS	204
9.3 PERSPECTIVES	207
9.3.1 Signs of a technology colony.....	207
9.3.2 Signs of independence	208
9.3.3 Immature companies with sub-critical licensing mass?	209
9.3.4 Lip service to licensing; licensing impacts uncontrolled and lost?	210
9.3.5 Towards best practice	210
9.3.6 Extendability to other developing countries of results and recommendations	212
9.4 GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS ON RESEARCH.....	214
9.5 FINAL REMARKS	215
LITERATURE CONSULTED	215
Annexure A - Questionnaire	219
Annexure B - Inter-sector characteristics	230
Annexure C - Sources of technology	232
Annexure D - Capability rating	233

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE 1. THE ELEMENTS OF MANAGEMENT OF TECHNOLOGY.....	16
FIGURE 2. DETERMINANTS OF TECHNOLOGY STRATEGY.....	18
FIGURE 3. THE SHAPING OF TECHNOLOGY PORTFOLIO STRATEGY.....	19
FIGURE 4. HEURISTIC PRESENTATION OF FACTORS A TECHNOLOGY LICENSING COMPANY HAS TO CONSIDER.....	20
FIGURE 5. TEXAS INSTRUMENTS ROYALTY AND SEMICONDUCTOR INCOME.....	27
FIGURE 6. TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER STRATEGY FOR SUPPLIERS OF TECHNOLOGY.....	29
FIGURE 7. TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER STRATEGY FOR RECIPIENTS OF TECHNOLOGY.....	30
FIGURE 8. BARRIERS TO ORGANISATIONAL LEARNING IN STRATEGIC ALLIANCES	34
FIGURE 9. FACTORS AFFECTING TECHNOLOGY ACQUISITION DECISIONS.....	52
FIGURE 10. FACTORS AFFECTING TECHNOLOGY EXPLOITATION DECISIONS.....	53
FIGURE 11. OPTIMUM ENTRY STRATEGIES.....	54
FIGURE 12. A MODEL FOR COLLABORATION.....	55
FIGURE 13. ALLOCATION OF LICENSEE'S REVENUES FROM SALES OF LICENSED PRODUCT..	82
FIGURE 14. THE EFFECTS OF CORPORATE GOVERNANCE ON INNOVATIVE ACTIVITIES.....	89
FIGURE 15. COUNTRIES CATCHING UP BY WORKING BACKWARDS UP THE S-CURVE.....	110
FIGURE 16. SIMPLIFIED OVERVIEW OF MORPHOLOGY OF LICENSING FIELD.....	112

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1. ROYALTIES PAID AND RECEIVED.....	28
TABLE 2. APPROPRIABILITY REGIME: KEY DIMENSIONS	36
TABLE 3. JAPANESE FIRMS' PRESENT AND FUTURE PATENT STRATEGIES	49
TABLE 4. A VERTICAL/HORIZONTAL LICENSING TAXONOMY.....	56
TABLE 5. A PRACTICAL TAXONOMY FOR ANALYSING IN- AND OUT-LICENSING.....	57
TABLE 6. INVOLVEMENT IN TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER AREAS	57
TABLE 7. REASONS FOR TECHNOLOGY LICENSING	58
TABLE 8. OVERALL NUMBER AND TYPE OF AGREEMENTS.	71
TABLE 9. RELATIVE USE OF PERCENTAGE AND QUANTITY BASED ROYALTIES.....	71
TABLE 10. ROYALTY BASE.....	72
TABLE 11. ROYALTY BASE.....	72
TABLE 12. FREQUENCY OF USE OF INITIAL AND MINIMUM ROYALTIES.....	72
TABLE 13. TYPE OF ROYALTY USED.....	73
TABLE 14. FACTORS AFFECTING ROYALTY RATES.....	73
TABLE 15. FACTORS AFFECTING ROYALTY RATES.....	74
TABLE 16. RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF TERMS AND CONDITIONS.....	74
TABLE 17. RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF TERMS AND CONDITIONS.....	75
TABLE 18. SUMMARY DATA: RESTRICTIONS SOUGHT IN AGREEMENTS.	75
TABLE 19. OUTSIDE SOURCES OF TECHNICAL KNOWLEDGE FOR LARGE EUROPEAN FIRMS: PERCENTAGE JUDGING THE SOURCE AS VERY IMPORTANT.....	76
TABLE 20. PUBLIC INFORMATION SOURCES ON CORPORATE INNOVATIVE ACTIVITIES.	77
TABLE 21. EFFECTIVENESS OF LEARNING IN LARGE US CORPORATIONS.....	78
TABLE 22. DISCOUNT OF ROYALTY FROM FULLY DEVELOPED TECHNOLOGY RATE	79
TABLE 23. AVERAGE AND MEDIAN RUNNING ROYALTIES.....	80
TABLE 24. FAVoured ROYALTY RATES.....	80
TABLE 25. FINANCIAL MEASURES USED TO DETERMINE APPROPRIATE ROYALTIES.	81
TABLE 26. COST AND RETURN CATEGORIES FOR SUPPLIER FIRMS OVER LIFE OF AN AGREEMENT	81
TABLE 27. FACTORS AFFECTING LICENCE AGREEMENT BARGAINING PROCESS - NORMATIVE.....	83
TABLE 28. CRITERIA AFFECTING LICENCE AGREEMENT BARGAINING PROCESS - ACTUAL. 83	83
TABLE 29. RESPONSIBILITY FOR INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY.....	85
TABLE 30. MANPOWER DEVOTED TO INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY.....	85
TABLE 31. DEPARTMENTS INVOLVED IN LICENSING PROCESS.....	85
TABLE 32. CHARACTERISTICS OF ORGANISATIONAL STRUCTURE.....	101
TABLE 33. COMPETITIVE STRATEGY, PRODUCTION CAPABILITIES AND ORGANISATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF PRODUCTIVE UNIT AT EACH INNOVATION STAGE.....	102
TABLE 34. R & D ACTIVITIES AT SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS.....	104
TABLE 35. LICENCE VARIANCE.	121
TABLE 36. TECHNOLOGY LICENCES PER INDUSTRY SECTOR.....	125
TABLE 37. COMBINATIONS OF LICENSING ACTIVITY PER INDUSTRY SECTOR.	126
TABLE 38. RATIO OF INCIDENCE OF TYPES OF LICENSING RELATIONSHIPS.....	127
TABLE 39. COMPANY OWNERSHIP AND LICENCES.	128
TABLE 40. COMPANY SALES SIZE AND PORTION DERIVED FROM IN-LICENCES.....	129
TABLE 41. COMPANY SALES SIZE AND EXTENT OF PATENT HOLDING.	130
TABLE 42. GEOGRAPHIC SPREAD OF IN- PLUS OUT-LICENCES.....	131

TABLE 43. PREVALENCE OF LICENCES	131
TABLE 44. PROFILE OF PERCEIVED CAPITAL INTENSITY AND AUTOMATION LEVELS.....	132
TABLE 45. PROFILE OF PERCEIVED DEVELOPMENT AND LICENSING CAPABILITIES.	134
TABLE 46. SECTORAL TECHNOLOGY LICENSING AND SELLING ABILITY.	135
TABLE 47. OTHER FACTORS INFLUENCING LICENSING.	136
TABLE 48. COMPANIES' GEOGRAPHIC ORGANISATION AND ORGANOGRAMS.....	138
TABLE 49. MANAGEMENT EDUCATION AND MANPOWER AVAILABILITY.	139
TABLE 50. MANAGEMENT MOTIVATION.....	140
TABLE 51. OCCURRENCE OF NOT INVENTED HERE SYNDROME.	141
TABLE 52. NOT INVENTED HERE SYNDROME IN SECTORS.	141
TABLE 53. AWARENESS OF COMPETITIVE ENVIRONMENT.....	143
TABLE 54. ATTITUDE TO LICENSING AND INTERNATIONAL EXPOSURE.	144
TABLE 55. SECTORAL TOP MANAGEMENTS' ATTITUDE TO LICENSING.....	144
TABLE 56. INCIDENCE OF SECTORAL INTERNATIONAL EXPERIENCE.	145
TABLE 57. INCIDENCE OF SECTORAL INTERNATIONAL TRAVEL.	145
TABLE 58. PROFILE OF COMPANIES' ECONOMIC ORIENTATION.....	146
TABLE 59. SECTORAL APPROACH TO RISK TAKING.....	147
TABLE 60. SECTORAL APPROACH TO PIONEERING.	147
TABLE 61. OVERVIEW OF ACCOUNTING SYSTEMS.	148
TABLE 62. REGULATORY ENVIRONMENT.	149
TABLE 63. SOME COMPETITIVE ATTRIBUTES OF COMPANIES AND THEIR ENVIRONMENT. .	152
TABLE 64. SENSITIVITY TO THE FUTURE.	153
TABLE 65. SECTORAL APPROACH TO THE ENVIRONMENT.....	153
TABLE 66. SECTORAL FORWARD PLANNING – AGGREGATE INDICANT.....	154
TABLE 67. PUBLIC FUNDING USAGE.	156
TABLE 68. SECTORAL USE OF PUBLIC TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT FUNDS – AGGREGATE INDICANT.	157
TABLE 69. INTERNATIONAL INVOLVEMENT AND ASPIRATION TO OWN BRAND.	158
TABLE 70. SECTORAL APPROACH TO ORIGINAL EQUIPMENT MANUFACTURING.	159
TABLE 71. PROFILE OF INNOVATIVE CHARACTERISTICS.	160
TABLE 72. SECTORAL APPROACH TO ENCOURAGING INNOVATIVE ACTIVITIES – AGGREGATE INDICANT.	160
TABLE 73. SECTORAL INCIDENCE OF INTERNATIONAL CO-DEVELOPMENT, OFFSET/COUNTERTRADE AND ASPIRATION TO BECOME OEM – AGGREGATE INDICANT.	161
TABLE 74. PROFILE OF COMPANIES' SENSITIVITY TO LEARNING AS LICENSEES.	162
TABLE 75. PROFILE OF COMPANIES' INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY PORTFOLIOS.	163
TABLE 76. PATENT HOLDING AGAINST SELECT ATTRIBUTE RANKING.....	165
TABLE 77. ORGANISATION OF IP ACTIVITIES.	166
TABLE 78. PROFILE OF INDICANTS OF COMPANIES' AWARENESS OF IP MANAGEMENT....	168
TABLE 79. SECTORAL IP PLANNING – AGGREGATE INDICANT.....	168
TABLE 80. PROFILE OF TECHNOLOGY AND IP PLANNING.	170
TABLE 81. SECTORAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT WITH OBJECTIVE TO LICENSE.....	171
TABLE 82. SECTORAL TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT – AGGREGATE INDICANT.	171
TABLE 83. BROAD IP APPLICATION OBJECTIVES OF MANUFACTURING COMPANIES.....	173
TABLE 84. POSITIONING OF LICENSING FUNCTION.....	174
TABLE 85. PROFILE OF METHODS USED TO IDENTIFY POSSIBLE LICENSEES.....	174
TABLE 86. EXTENT OF INVOLVEMENT OF VARIOUS DEPARTMENTS OR FUNCTIONS IN LICENSING PROCESS.	175

TABLE 87. COMPARISON IN PRINCIPLE OF SOUTH AFRICAN AND WORLDWIDE USE OF FUNCTIONS	176
TABLE 88. METHODS OF APPROACHING POTENTIAL LICENSEES	177
TABLE 89. REASONS FOR LICENSING INWARDS OR OUTWARDS	178
TABLE 90. OBJECTIONS TO LICENSING INWARDS OR OUTWARDS	179
TABLE 91. SOME FACTORS INFLUENCING THE MAGNITUDE OF ROYALTIES	180
TABLE 92. FREQUENCY WITH WHICH RESTRICTIONS ARE SOUGHT	180
TABLE 93. BASE ON WHICH ROYALTY IS CALCULATED	181
TABLE 94. IP CONTENT OF LICENCES	181
TABLE 95. FREQUENCY OF OCCURRENCE OF PAYMENT TYPES	182
TABLE 96. IMPORTANCE OF CONTINGENT FACTORS IN LICENSING	183
TABLE 97. IMPACT OF LICENSED TECHNOLOGY	183
TABLE 98. METHODS USED TO CALCULATE ROYALTIES	184
TABLE 99. INFLUENCE OF STAGE OF DEVELOPMENT OF TECHNOLOGY ON ROYALTY	184
TABLE 100. RELATIVE VALUE OF FORMS OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY	184
TABLE 101. PROPORTION OF IN-LICENSEABLE TECHNOLOGY OBTAINED FROM INDICATED SOURCES	185
TABLE 102. COMPANY SOURCES OF TECHNOLOGY	186
TABLE 103. FREQUENCY OF USE OF TECHNOLOGY SOURCES	187
TABLE 104. TECHNOLOGY SOURCE AND IN-LICENSING ACTIVITY	188
TABLE 105. TECHNOLOGY SOURCE AND OUT-LICENSING ACTIVITY	189
TABLE 106. FREQUENCY OF USE OF INFORMATION SOURCES	190
TABLE 107. SUMMARY OF POSSIBLE EFFECT OF ATTRIBUTES AND CLUSTERS ON LICENSING ACTIVITY	204