INVENTORSATTHEDAW NOFTHENEWMILLENN IUM: WIPO-IFIAINTERNATIO NALSYMPOSIUM

organizedby theWorldIntellectualPropertyOrganization(WIPO)

and

theInternationalFederationofInventors'Associations(IFIA)

incooper ationwith theGovernmentofArgentina

and the Argentine Association of Inventors (AAI)

BuenosAires,September5to8,2000

EMPLOYEDINVENTORS -ANIMPORTANTASSET OFENTERPRISESAND NATIONS:HOWTOPRO TECTTHEIRRIGHTSAN DINTERESTS

Supportdocument toWIPO/IFIA/BUE/00/10 extractfromapublicationentitled: WorkplaceInnovations –AWayOfPromotingCompetitiveness,Welfare and Employment in Finland(Helsinki1997)

STARTINGPREMISESOF THEPROGRAMME

1. Inthe1990sFinlandhadtooverco medifficultsocialproblemssuchasmass unemploymentandarapidincreaseinthegovernmentdebt. Theroof of such problems lay notineconomicfluctuationsbutinstructural factors. Finland'ssituation in this respectively nomeansuniqueamongthe EUMemberStates.Therearetwomainapproachestothereason forstructuralproblemsintheEUMemberStates(cf.Naschold1996,205 -206).Thefirst identifiesprimarilycostproblems,causedbyhighdirectandindirectlaborcosts,punitive taxationan dexcessivesocialregulation, with the ensuing "regulation costs" (such as rigid employmentcontractterms). The suggested solution is an "adjustment of level", that is, costs should belowered and regulation dismantled. The other approach considers that ttheproblems derive primarily from in a dequate promotion of productivity and innovation, which are excessivelyslowcompared with the United States, Japan and the "economic tigers" of SoutheastAsia.Inthislight,an"adjustmentoflevel"isnotenough; rather, the solution must besoughtinimprovementoftheentirenationalinnovationsystem.

2. SeveralFinnishauthorshavesuggestedthatthemostsustainablesolutiontostructural problemsliesindevelopingthenationalinnovationsystem, andhereinnovationinthe workplaceshouldbeconsideredanessentialpart.Thusthemainemphasisfallsonfinding waysofensuringsustainablelong -termeconomicandemploymentgrowth.

MODESOFOPERATIONO FWORKORGANIZATIONS AND THE COMPETITIVENESSOFWORKINGLIFE

3. Governmentsupportforthedevelopmentofnewproductandproductiontechnologies andforboththegeneralandvocationaleducationofthepopulationaregenerallyacceptedas basicprinciplesofpublicpolicyinallWestern marketeconomies.Theyarealsoconsidered importantinvestmentsinfutureeconomicgrowth.

4. Nevertheless,Naschold(1991,243)hasaptlypointedoutthatcompaniesarenotmere "blackboxes"wheretheefficiencyandqualityofoperationsare mechanicallydeterminedby thetechnologytheyemploy,theskillsleveloftheirstafforotherinputfactors.Theprocess inwhichinputs(investments)areturnedintooutputs(goodsandservices)canbe implementedinmanydifferentways.Factorssuch asmanagementtechniques,the organizationofworkandproduction,co -operationbetweenmanagementandstaff,andthe workingenvironmentareallimportantinfluenceswhichdeterminehowwellacompanycan utilizeanddevelopthetechnologiesitusesand theskillsofitsstaff.

WORKPLACEINNOVATION S - PARTOFTHENATI ONALINNOVATIONSYST EM

5. Infuture, growthof acountry's economy and, consequently, employment trends, will increasingly be based on an accumulation of knowledge and skills, ju stlike productivity and quality of operations in individual companies. Organizations and networks which promote the generation and dissemination of new knowledge and skills and their use in society will hold a key position in this process. In recent deb at eone conomics, this concept has been

referred to as an ational innovation system (Lundavall[ed.] 1992; Vuori & Vuorinen [eds.] 1994). It could just be said that internal organization of firms, interfirm relationships, therole of the public sector , institutional set -up of the financial sector, education and training systems, and the size and organization of investments in R & Daretaken to be the key factors which influence innovation.

6. Totalkaboutanationalinnovationsystemalsoepressesacriticalattitudetothe presumedexistenceofinternationallyapplicable"globalbestpractices". These, infact, vary fromonesituationtothenext, depending on the unique characteristics of each innovation system. An individual company'ss cope for applying new practices is greatly influenced by the environment in which it operates. At best, the application of new practices derives from an extensive social consensus, with different institutions supporting companies in bringing about change, also ensuring that an adequate social security safetynet is created to cush ion the impact.

7. ResearcherslikeLundvall(1992), whouse the concept of an ational innovation system inits "strong" sense, claim that the national level is of consistent of the atom in the result of the atom is sense, claim that the national level is of consistent of the atom is sense, claim that the national level is of consistent of the atom is sense, claim that the national level is of consistent of the atom is sense, claim that the national level is of consistent of the atom is sense, claim that the national level is of consistent of the atom is sense. The atom is sense of the atom is sense, claim that the national level is of consistent of the atom is sense. The atom is sense of the atom is sense of the atom is sense of the atom is sense. The atom is sense of the atom is sense of the atom is sense of the atom is sense. The atom is sense of the atom is sense of the atom is sense of the atom is sense. The atom is sense of the atom is sense of the atom is sense of the atom is sense. The atom is sense of the atom is sense. The atom is sense of the atom is atom is sense of the atom is sense of the atom is atom is sense o

8. Theimportance of the national level does, however, depend on the type of innovation beingstudied:productinnovation(newgoodsorservices),technologicalprocessinnovation, ororganizationalpr ocessinnovation.Mostdiscussionofnationalinnovationsystemshas focused on the first two. Consequently, there has been some criticism about the adequacy of thenationallevelinanenvironmentwherethedevelopmentofnewtechnologiesoften demands extensivescientificknowledge(Miettinen1996).Itcouldbeassumedthatthe nationallevelwillcontinuetoholdconsiderableimportanceindiscussiononorganizational processinnovations. These innovations -or, in an even wider sense, work place in no vations. includingnewwaysoforganizingworkorofworking, newworkinghoursandwage arrangements, and newsystems of participation and negotiation -aremoredifficultto transplant from one country to another than a retechnological innovations, as th eir implementation of ten requires more profound social change and alterations in work cultures.

Developmentofanationalinnovationsystemisusuallyregardedmainlyasthe 9. developmentofpolicies for industry, technology, science and educat ion, without any links withworkplacedevelopment.Astrongfaithineconomicgrowthwhichreliesonproductand production technology innovations and investments in training has prevailed in many Westernmarketeconomies.Meanwhile,thisapproachhasno tattributedasmuchimportanceto workplaceinnovationsinproductionorservicechainsorinnovationswhichimprovethe modesofoperationoftheworkorganizations within these chains. A wareness that this approachhasshortcomingsisbecomingincreasin glywidespread.TheEUCommission's GreenPaperonInnovation(1995)andonInformationSociety(1996),forinstance,statethat thescarcityoforganizationalinnovationsisaparticularweaknessofEuropeaninnovation systems(forthedebateonthesign ificanceofworkplaceinnovations, see also Andreasenet al.[eds.]1995;Appelbaum&Batt1994;Braczyk&Schienstgock[eds.]1996;Gustavsenet al.1996;Levine1995;Mathews1994).

THENEEDFORWORKPLA CEDEVELOPMENTINFI NLAND

10. WorkinglifeinFinlandissubjecttothesamepressureforchangeasinotherWestern marketeconomies.Initsreport,thegroupwhichpreparedthedevelopmentprogram identifiedthekeypressuresasfollows(NationalWorkplaceDevelopment Programme 1996, 1-2):

- MakingproductandservicemarketsincreasinglyinternationalrequiresFinnish companiestoadoptmoreadvancedmodesofoperationallowingthemtoincrease productivityandimprovequalityoftheiractivitiesandflexibilitytomeetcustomer needs. Inthelongterm,customer -orientedmodesofoperationencouragingin -company learningwillbeinakeyposition:innovationsconcerningproducts,servicesand processesandtheircontinuousimprovement.
- Thedevelopmentofnewproductsandtechnologiesi schangingthecompetitive situationondifferentproductandservicemarkets. Thisisgivingrisetonewmarkets, creatingfreshsourcesofcompetitiveedgeforcompaniesoperatingonexistingmarkets andalsoleadingtoareductiononsomeproductands ervicemarkets. Companiesare alsousingnewtechnologiestodeveloptheiroperationsbyautomatizingprocesses and implementingradicalprocessinnovations. Thewidestpossibleexploitationof the potential offered by new technologies calls for input in developing new skills.
- Environmentalissueswillbeofgrowingimportanceforcompanieswhentheyplannew products, services and processes. On the one hand, they place restrictions on things like use of raw materials, the properties of products and emis sions from processes. On the other hand, they give companies new sources of competitive edge.
- Alltheseabove -mentionedfactorsmakenewdemandsalsoonthemodesofoperation ofpublicsectororganizations.PublicmanagementinFinlandalsohastooper ateinan environmentwhereitmustbothmeetrisingqualityrequirementsconcerningservices andatthesametimeadjusttocutbacksinpublicexpenditure.

11. Finnishcompanies and public -sector organizations have tried to cope with these pressures in different ways, and they can show some impressive results:

- Inbusinessoperations, laborproductivity and total factor productivity have gone up much more rapidly in Finland during the 1980 s and 1990 s than in other OECD countries on average (Engla nder & Gurney 1994). The rise in productivity in the public sector, including the municipal sector in recent years;
- FinlandistheonlyOECDcountryspecializinginresource -basedproductionand exportsinthe1980swhichhassincemanagedtobreakfree ofthisrole.The contributionmadetoexportsbyhigh -technologyproductswentupfrom 4% to 17.7% in 1981-95, i.e. reaching the same level as Germany and leaving Sweden and the other NordicCountries farbehind (Production and foreign tradeof high -technology products in Finland 1996);

• Averyrapidchangehastakenplaceintheuseofinformationtechnology.While only 16%ofFinnishemployeesusedinformationtechnologyintheirworkin1984,the numberhadgoneupto54%by1995(HelsinginSanomat, November9,1995),a percentagewhichmustbeamongthehighestintheworld.

12. Sofar,fewFinnishcompanieshaveachievedinternationalfamewithworkplace innovationsin,forinstance,teamworkorbusiness -to-businessnetworks.Certain intenationalcomparisonsconcerningqualitymanagementandinitiativesevenindicatethat staffparticipationintheirownworkplacedevelopmentislesscommoninFinlandthanin competingcountries(Haonukainen1992;Toikkaetal.1995;cf.HoweverFröhlic h& Pekrubl1996,188 -192).Co -operationbetweencompaniesandresearchinstitutionsin developingcorporatemodesofoperationisalsolesscommoninFinlandthaninmayother Westernmarketeconomies.TheclaimputforwardintheEUCommission'sGreen Paperon InnovationandonInformationSociety,thatEuropeaninnovationsystemssufferfrom shortcomingsasfarasorganizationalinnovationsareconcerned,isclearlyveryappositefor Finland,too.

[Endofdocument]