
Introduction

Beginning with the 2012 WIPIP, after eight years under the entrepreneurship and guidance of Mike Meurer and Glynn Lunney, the WIPIP Board was created to provide a more formal continuance of WIPIP.

Board membership is currently at five persons, and is “first in, first out.” Thus, as an incoming organizer, expect at least five years on the board (a sixth year is possible if a host school is selected from among the schools currently represented on the board). The board operates informally, but for the year immediately after organizing the event, that board member acts as chair of the board.

Besides the year where the Board member organizes WIPIP at her school, the primary work of the Board is to select/solicit schools to organize future WIPIPs. This might mean deciding among multiple submittals, or perhaps tentatively arranging those submittals into the future (although public announcement of the next WIPIP hosting school will typically happen no earlier than at the prior WIPIP colloquium).

Except for its exhibits, this memo won't cover operational details of a WIPIP colloquium. For an example of the upcoming or most recent WIPIP colloquium showing some of those details, see www.wipip.org.

Separately, www.wipip.info provides: this memo; a historical listing of WIPIP colloquium events; board membership for years in which that applies; and links to the schedules of some past WIPIP events. This memo discusses macro considerations for a WIPIP colloquium from the perspective of the Board and a prospective organizer.

Time of Year Tradition

The 2011 and 2012 WIPIP events were held in February, the weekend after the Super Bowl. With multiplying other works-in-progress events, both general and topic-specific, having a tradition for the time of year helps WIPIP continuity. The other helpful aspect of a time-of-year tradition is to encourage the selection of the next WIPIP location and weekend for announcement at a particular WIPIP.

The first seven WIPIP colloquiums were held in the Fall semester. The switch in 2011 to a Spring semester event was due to several factors, including: spacing from the IP Scholars Conference (www.ipscholars.org); the generally high level of activity in the second half of the Fall semester; and in view of the March journal submittal deadline.

Holding WIPIP early in the Spring semester, such as in early February, facilitates input on an article before submittal to journals. However, late in the Spring, such as April or even early May, often allows for article revisions before first submittals are due to journals for accepted papers. The risk of inclement weather, however, is a factor for some law schools for events early in the Spring semester.

Example Direct Cost Estimates – Exhibit One

A WIPIP colloquium following the traditional pattern of Friday afternoon presentations and presentations all day Saturday will likely have a cost structure that fits within the range of the example estimate scenarios given in Exhibit One. The purpose of the example estimates is to help a prospective organizing school establish its own cost estimate to help evaluate whether to

submit a proposal to host the WIPIP colloquium. The lower cost scenario (Scenario One) is possibly a little high for the cost factors facing some schools, but that estimate gives a per-participant cost of \$270. Participants include presenters, but also include attendees who are law professors or VAPs/Fellows who will participate in the meals and breaks as they attend to watch the presentations.

Estimating Participation – Exhibit Two

Exhibit Two provides information an organizer may find helpful to estimate participation (presenters plus attendees), take registrations, arrange a group block at a hotel, and otherwise run the event. As the IP academy has grown, there is some pressure on WIPIP in terms of providing enough presentation slots for all those desiring to present without going beyond three concurrent sessions. Exhibit Two discusses issues and options in relation to this concern. It also provides some historical information to help a prospective organizing school estimate its participation and whether it will need to offer registrations “first come, first served” with a cap stated upfront on the total number of presentations (a limitation that has not been necessary for any WIPIP event through WIPIP 2012).

Attribution Issues

To the extent host schools use sponsorship (law firms, corporations, private grants, etc.) to fund all or some of a WIPIP event, attribution of that sponsorship can be local, regional or national, fixed or unfixed, and can be effusive, but should stop short of modifying the name of the event. In other words, the WIPIP Board would disfavor a proposal calling the event the “Domino’s Pizza 2018 Works in Progress Intellectual Property (WIPIP) Colloquium” in print or in other presentation.

For consistency, as board members list this service on their CVs, the suggested form is: Organizing Board - Works in Progress Intellectual Property (WIPIP) Colloquium: 2011-2016.

Factors for Organizing School Selection

A non-exclusive factor list for the Board to apply when considering submittals to host future WIPIP colloquiums is:

- Stated financial commitment by the law school for the WIPIP colloquium.
- Location of the law school in terms of geography, access to air transportation, and the location of recent WIPIP events.
- Organizational capacity of the law school for handling the event: this usually means a full-time scholar in the field acts as an organizing influence with administrative support within the law school.
- In relation to where a school is located, consideration of whether the proposal is early or late in the Spring semester.

For law schools interested in hosting a future WIPIP event, please submit a short email to the Board members addressing these factors.

Submittals from two or more schools (presumably in the same city or region) collaborating to host WIPIP are also welcomed.

Exhibit One

Scenario One		<u>Assumptions:</u> no venue rental costs for presentation and/or meal locations; colloquium hotel is sufficiently close to the presentation location so that shuttle bus transport is not necessary			
Estimate of Participation (presenters plus attendees) for this Scenario:		70			
Category	Description	Qty	Cost	Extended Cost	Running Total
WIPIP.ConfFood	Friday lunch	70	\$35	\$2,450	\$2,450
WIPIP.ConfFood	Friday PM break snacks	70	\$15	\$1,050	\$3,500
WIPIP.ConfFood	Friday reception	70	\$35	\$2,450	\$5,950
WIPIP.VenueRental	Friday dinner space rental	0	\$0	\$0	\$5,950
WIPIP.ConfFood	Friday dinner	70	\$70	\$4,900	\$10,850
WIPIP.ConfFood	Saturday breakfast	70	\$25	\$1,750	\$12,600
WIPIP.ConfFood	Saturday AM & PM break snacks	70	\$25	\$1,750	\$14,350
WIPIP.ConfFood	Saturday lunch	70	\$35	\$2,450	\$16,800
WIPIP.ConfXport	Shuttle first day	0	\$0	\$0	\$16,800
WIPIP.ConfXport	Shuttle second day	0	\$0	\$0	\$16,800
WIPIP.ConfGifts	lovely trinkets	70	\$30	\$2,100	\$18,900
Row Labels		Sum of Extended Cost		Per Participant Cost:	
WIPIP.ConfFood		\$16,800			\$270
WIPIP.ConfGifts		\$2,100			
WIPIP.ConfXport		\$0			
WIPIP.VenueRental		\$0			
Grand Total		\$18,900			

Scenario Two		<u>Assumptions:</u> includes a venue rental cost for the Friday evening meal; shuttle bus transport from the hotel to the presentation location is necessary; slightly higher estimates on food costs and trinkets			
Estimate of Participation (presenters plus attendees) for this Scenario:		80			
Category	Description	Qty	Cost	Extended Cost	Running Total
WIPIP.ConfFood	Friday lunch	80	\$40	\$3,200	\$3,200
WIPIP.ConfFood	Friday PM break snacks	80	\$15	\$1,200	\$4,400
WIPIP.ConfFood	Friday reception	80	\$45	\$3,600	\$8,000
WIPIP.VenueRental	Friday dinner space rental	1	\$1,500	\$1,500	\$9,500
WIPIP.ConfFood	Friday dinner	80	\$90	\$7,200	\$16,700
WIPIP.ConfFood	Saturday breakfast	80	\$30	\$2,400	\$19,100
WIPIP.ConfFood	Saturday AM & PM break snacks	80	\$30	\$2,400	\$21,500
WIPIP.ConfFood	Saturday lunch	80	\$40	\$3,200	\$24,700
WIPIP.ConfXport	Shuttle first day	1	\$1,500	\$1,500	\$26,200
WIPIP.ConfXport	Shuttle second day	1	\$1,500	\$1,500	\$27,700
WIPIP.ConfGifts	lovely trinkets	80	\$40	\$3,200	\$30,900
Row Labels		Sum of Extended Cost		Per Participant Cost:	
WIPIP.ConfFood		\$23,200			\$386
WIPIP.ConfGifts		\$3,200			
WIPIP.ConfXport		\$3,000			
WIPIP.VenueRental		\$1,500			
Grand Total		\$30,900			

NOTE: Professor Greg Vetter at the University of Houston Law Center prepared these two estimate scenarios in February of 2012. They are exemplary. No other WIPIP Board members participated in the creation of these estimates. The purpose of the examples is to assist potential WIPIP host schools in evaluating their direct cost factors. For example: some WIPIP host schools in the remote past did not provide a Saturday breakfast; the amount a host school spends on "lovely trinkets" is discretionary. The spreadsheet implementing these estimates is available on request: contact Greg Vetter at gvetter@uh.edu or by telephone at (713) 743-3596.

Exhibit Two

Introduction to Exhibit Two¹

This exhibit hopes to help with an aspect that exhibit one left ambiguous: how many persons will participate in WIPIP? The number of participants is a significant cost factor. Participants include presenters plus attendees.

As WIPIP has grown, there seems to be an increase in the number of “mere attendees.” In particular, when WIPIP is in a city with many law schools, attendees might comprise ten or fifteen percent of total participation for purposes of cost factor estimation. A host school is providing meals for many attendees because those attendees are law professors or VAPs/Fellows. In this exhibit, the term “attendees” does not include persons who watch the presentations but who are not invited to participate in meals. Typically, the largest group of persons that might fit into this category are law students who might be invited to (silently?) attend the presentations. In other words, “attendees” are persons the host school will feed, but who will not present.

Also, as the IP academy has grown, there is some pressure on WIPIP in terms of providing enough presentation slots for all those desiring to present without going beyond three concurrent sessions. That issue is addressed below.

An Estimate of Historical Participation

The table below counts presentation slots and presenters from the historical record of past WIPIP events showing at www.wipip.info. It then estimates attendees to give an overall estimate of participation.

Year	School	Presentation Slots (showing on historical record of schedule)	Presenters	Attendees (estimated)	Participants (presenters + attendees)	Remarks
2012	Houston	68	62	16	78	All 68 slots were filled until 2 days before the event
2011	BU	49	47	12	59	NOTE: attendee estimates are standardized at a dozen for schools in a city with many other law schools, and a half-dozen for schools not so situated; the Houston number is actual.
2009	Seton Hall	51	49	12	61	
2008	Tulane	54	51	6	57	
2007	American	51	50	12	62	
2006	Pittsburgh	36	35	6	41	
2005	St. Louis	37	34	6	40	

¹ Professor Greg Vetter at the University of Houston Law Center prepared this Exhibit Two in February of 2012. No other WIPIP Board members participated in the creation of this exhibit (a statement made only so there is transparency as to the source of the estimates and remarks in this exhibit).

Exhibit Two

Participation and Hotel Room Usage

Historically, as shown in the table above, WIPIP has attracted about 40 to 80 participants.

As an organizer working with hotels for room rate guarantees for group sales, the table below may be helpful. It shows the approximate hotel usage and presenter count from some past WIPIP events.

WIPIP Month, Year	Hosting School	Thursday	Friday	Saturday	Approximate # of Presenters
Feb, 2011	Boston Univ.	20 rms.	35 rms.	15 rms.	50
Feb, 2012	Univ. of Houston	30 rms.	60 rms.	30 rms.	60

How Many Presentation Slots to Offer, and How to Make the Offer?

Historically, the length for a WIPIP presentation slot has ranged from 30 to 40 minutes.

For example, at BU in February 2011, slots were 40 minutes. At Houston in 2012, slots were 30 minutes. Reasonable minds can differ as to optimal slot length, but longer slots reduce the overall pressure on the event to keep timeliness.

Break length is also an important consideration. Fifteen minutes is a common choice for break length, but twenty minutes provides more buffer.

With 40 minute presentations, it is difficult to offer more than about 55 slots with three concurrent sessions. This is the reason that WIPIP 2012 in Houston went to 30 minute slots – that allows (at the maximum) a total number of slots in the high-60s across three concurrent sessions.

To continue to use WIPIP 2012 as an example, the original announcement of that event was somewhat loose as to eligibility/priority for slots.² Whether slots would be 40 or 35 or 30 minutes would be a function of total demand for slots. The difficulty that arose for WIPIP 2012 was that total demand was close to eighty. By the registration deadline, sixty-eight tenure or tenure-track professors at U.S. Law Schools (“regular faculty”) had registered; leading to the design of 68 slots for WIPIP 2012. But that produced a waiting list of about a dozen in the several weeks after the registration deadline as regular faculty attempted to register late, and considering the sizable number of VAPs and Fellows who attempted registration but were put on a waiting list the moment the registration deadline passed.

² The exact language for WIPIP 2012 was: “Faculty members are welcome to present, but presentation is not required. Non-faculty may also get a chance to present if there are sufficient slots available.”

Exhibit Two

If they were to do it over, the organizers for WIPIP 2012 would have designed their pattern of maximum presentation slots in advance and might have rewritten their eligibility/priority statement along the lines of what follows:

WIPIP offers an opportunity for intellectual property law scholars to present their works-in-progress and get early feedback from their colleagues. Faculty members are welcome to present, but presentation is not required. Non-faculty may also get a chance to present if there are sufficient slots available. Presentation slots will be 30 to 40 minutes in length, depending on demand, but with a maximum of 68 slots at 30 minutes. “Non-faculty” are persons not on the tenure-track or tenured at a U.S. Law School. If more registrations from faculty are received than the maximum number of slots, the registrations will be filled first-come-first-served, with a waiting list for the remainder of faculty. All non-faculty will be on a separate waiting list for evaluation during the several weeks after the registration deadline. The faculty waiting list will have priority over the non-faculty waiting list.

In administering the registrations for WIPIP 2012, several non-faculty decided to attend without a guarantee of a presentation slot. In effect, these persons gained top-of-the-list priority for the non-faculty waiting list by their commitment to come to WIPIP. Several of them eventually received slots as registered faculty cancelled. “Non-faculty” who attempted registration were mostly pre-job-market VAPs and Fellows, but there were also submissions by some law professors from schools outside the U.S., as well as by some Ph.D. students.

Conclude with a Plenary Session?

Some WIPIP events, including WIPIP 2012 in Houston, concluded with a plenary session Saturday afternoon. The primary purpose of this, in the view of the Houston organizers, was to bring every participant together to conclude the event contemporaneously. A final plenary session also helps with the problem of a lessening audience late in the afternoon Saturday as participants depart to return home that evening.