

Workshop Evaluation Results

About the workshop:

Workshop title	Nanotechnology: Making the leap to commercialization
Dates	7, 8, 9 January 2008

Ratings (Rate on a 1-10 scale; 10 - Outstanding, 8- Very good, 5- Satisfactory, 3 – Average, 1- poor; NA – Not applicable/Cannot judge) Results are presented as **Average (Std Dev) Count (Min-Max)**

Parameter	Rating	Parameter	Rating
Structure and design of workshop. Breadth vs focus balance. Coverage of topics. Logical sequence.	8.1 (1.4) 28(3-10)	Pace of workshop (Indicate whether it was fast, slow or just right)	Mostly, just right
Content – had sufficient breadth and depth, highlighted insights and experiences	8.1 (2.0) 28 (3-10)	Time management	7.2 (2.2) 29 (2-10)
Speakers	7.8 (1.5) 27 (4-10)	Workshop venue	8.3 (1.7) 29 (3-10)
Group sessions and exercises	7.6 (2.2) 27 (4-10)	Accommodation	9.0 (1.6) 18 (5-10)
Audio-visuals/ movies etc	7.3 (2.0) 28 (3-10)	Food, water and beverages	8.6 (1.7) 28 (4-10)
Reading materials and handouts	7.8 (1.7) 24 (5-10)	Transport	8.9 (1.7) 22 (4-10)
Group session facilitators	7.2 (1.8) 24 (3-10)	Travel information and assistance	8.8 (1.7) 20 (4-10)

British Council evaluation form

Parameter	Rating	Parameter	Rating
How would you rate the above workshop? (5-Excellent; 4- Good; 3- Neither good or bad; 2- Bad; 1 –very bad)	4.8 (0.4) 6 (3-10)	To what extent do you agree or disagree with the statement: Initiatives like this help bring India and UK together to work on Nanotechnology commercialization (5- Agree strongly; 4- Agree in general; 3- Neither agree nor disagree; 2- Disagree in general; 1- Disagree strongly)	4.0 (0.6) 6 (3-5)
To what extent do you agree or disagree with the statement: The workshop improved my awareness about the significance of commercialization (5- Agree strongly; 4- Agree in general; 3- Neither agree nor disagree; 2- Disagree in general; 1- Disagree strongly)	4.3 (0.4) 6 (4-5)	To what extent do you agree or disagree with the statement: UK has a creative approach to addressing commercialization issues (5-Agree strongly; 4- Agree in general; 3- Neither agree nor disagree; 2- Disagree in general; 1- Disagree strongly)	4.2 (1.0) 6 (3-5)

British Council form > Comments:

- Future follow-up: Indian vs UK situation on a) Team building for start-ups, b) Early stage funding

Comments and suggestions:

What did you find most useful in the workshop? What aspect of the workshop interested you the most? What were the high points of the workshop?

- High points → no specific high point but good overall. The critical “a-ha” for me was the realization of the uncertainty involved with the process of commercialization. This was brought out nicely by several of the speakers.
- How small companies evolved, performed – with roots in ‘nano’ was very interesting to know.
- We should have had more entrepreneurs to be speaking on how to raise money (especially in the Indian context)
- 3rd morning talks were the best. The invention to product leap. All other talks were relevant and needed. Videos were good --- more would have been nice.
- Obtained a perspective about the series of steps (processes) and the time required for each step in the chain from invention to commercialization. Personal experiences of people who have done it was invaluable.
- Speakers who had real time experience in technology transfer sharing their experiences. Meticulous details of the process involved in tech transfer by Surya Raghu; Hasit Seth's talk; Gerry George, Tim Harper and Prof Dobson's talks were great. Great opportunity to interact informally with the speakers has been invaluable.
- Excellent presentation. Particularly how one can take their own research work from lab to market.
- The sections on patenting and process to product from invention on 3rd day were most useful.
- The self experience of the scientists in the field of research and development till the commercialization of their product inspired more and will help in future development of my own work.

- Overall the speakers were very good and the discussion was educational. I found this openness to discuss very useful. I found the talks that outlined details of strategies of patenting, licensing, patent writing etc. The high points of the workshop were the sessions on 9 January.
- Group sessions and exercises, reading materials and handouts.
- The experience and presentations of the speakers. The course material and the group exercise were very useful.
- Group session and exercise
- Bring the importance of IP protection very useful. Planning to move the technology invention to product was most interesting.
- What are the pathways and mechanisms to go from a laboratory/ result/ process to an industrially applicable situation. First and third days. Overall excellent job done with right balance of topics and examples.
- The importance of generating and commercialization of IP is highlighted & really interesting. The workshop involved case studies of actual commercialization of nanotechnology was the best for getting confidence of commercialization. Generating funds knowledge also received.
- Taking science to industry. Good speakers.
- Interaction with speakers and delegates. Meeting with Indian company doing something in nano.
- Talks from various experts and international perspective
- The presentation of Surya Raghu outlining the journey from invention to product development was most relevant. I think the workshop sessions covered all the objectives and provided an insight into the processes.
- A very good mix of presentations, videos and group activities. High quality content in most of the presentations. Active participation from most participants.
- I think that in an Indian context real life examples are important.
- Great to meet other entrepreneurs, see the enthusiasm of the other participants.
- Opportunity to see current status of technology transfer in India. Real life entrepreneurs. Meeting very enthusiastic student club.

Where did the workshop not meet your expectations? What could have been done better?

- Section on patenting was weak. Would have been nice to have had a section from investor perspective.
- Involve speakers from large companies to share their experiences in nanotechnology.
- More people from India (from business side) to speak on their experiences. I really appreciate that it made me aware of several issues of taking the knowledge to business.
- Local venture/ angel funding representation would have been nice. CD containing all the talks should have been given. Printouts given earlier would have been nice. I know it is difficult. Overall, great show!
- More Indian perspectives in finance.
- Would have liked to hear from entrepreneurs, start-ups, innovation cos from India. Identification of "ideas" in the workshop session took a lot of time on day 1. Instead, I suggest the topics be assigned to groups.
- Presenting the thought process of some "tech transfer rebels" like folks from CIPLA would be a good idea for the future.
- Some of the lectures on IP, would have arranged in the beginning of the workshop.
- The focus on finances and accounting were not adequate. Would have preferred more details. Would have liked a elementary accounting session. Did not like video clips of people saying things; live speakers preferable. Would like India specific cases.
- More technical and research details of the product would have been of more interest as a researcher.
- I think the group sessions had to be done better, may be the time given to it or a bit more education about the things that go into doing this exercise. Also while overall the talks were comprehensive and well done, may be it would have helped if the case studies and individual cases were also done after day 2 and day 3 sessions.
- More discussion (group) would have been good though there was a lot of time available for 1-2-1 discussion and networking. Announcements should be made that the mobile phones should be set on silent/ vibrate. Better time keeping. More interactive discussions and fewer video clips.
- There could have been a time slot allocated for (free platform) group discussion between panel of speakers and participants. There could have been more participants and young scientists invited or participation from small local companies would have been a good idea. Time keeping. You could have had two chairs per day to introduce speakers etc (1 – morning session; 1 – evening session). Too many video clips.
- Since it was my first opportunity to participate in such activities, it was quite upto my satisfaction.
- More case studies can be discussed. Cases from Indian R&D scenario should be included as well.
- Identify at least one case for start-up of a new company/ venture.
- Still not clear how we can find the right source of financing.
- I would have liked the 3rd day morning talks on patents, IPs and invention to product timeline. To be discussed on the first day. Also some more case studies from India would have been nice to be added if possible.
- The flow of lectures could have been arranged in more better manner.
- Should have invited more PhDs and graduates from all over India. Would have been great experience for them at start of their career.
- Should have focused more on India scenario to make it relevant.
- This workshop was probably the first of its kind and the experience has been satisfying. The workshop has opened doors to more work which probably BC would be interested to get into. I think the only weak point was the participants slipped out of some sessions and it becomes difficult to get everybody in throughout. May be the length of the workshop could be looked into.
- Speakers with real life experiences of setting up their own ventures in the industry could have been useful.
- I think that presenting the spectrum of commercialization options more upfront (not just spinouts) would have allowed people to put the whole thing into a better context.
- Pity that competition of other events meant that the number of delegates from outside Pune reduced.

Any other suggestions/ requests/ comments:

- Participation by venture capitalists/ investors their expectations were not clear. We did not get to hear from them on what

they would like to see in our technology to fund.

- PS: Please put coat hanger hooks in the toilets.
- Premnath, Manjula and the support staff did a terrific job.
- Create a networking of participants and possible technology transfer groups to and their invention to product endeavors.
- Good job overall! I enjoyed it a lot!
- Such workshop can be arranged may be thrice a year at different venues.
- It is really important to use the IP/ Patents information for commercialization & emerging new businesses.
- Perhaps one of the best experiences.
- I would like to suggest that the venue of the workshop be close to the place where we stay → This way we will save time. Simpler food and less food. I would suggest a slightly larger number of participants → about 40. May be some teaming up activity – a sport?

Selected comments from group discussion on 9th Jan afternoon:

- Ashish –gave a perspective of processes and timescales taking technology to commercialization which was very useful.
- Rajdip – Found the framework and case studies useful. Workshop was an eye-opener. Would like to see more case studies.
- Khanna – Workshop should include participants who are potential entrepreneurs who can interact with technology providers. Match making. There is a need for a forum that will showcase technology and bring scientists closer to entrepreneurs.
- Rinti – Need for a email/ web network or forum
- Dharmadhikari – Realization that patent writing is different from writing papers. He would like more inputs so that new patents can be created.
- Sanjay – mental block removed.
- Dipali – No intention to convert scientists to entrepreneurs but to make aware.
- Khanna --- workshop should include potential takers of technology
- Ashish – Need enablers to take idea ahead through all steps.
- Sandeep – Need to have industry mentors for specific areas (mentor network)
- Gerry – i2india of Imperial College is going to run road shows starting with June. Also thinking about mechanisms to incentivize/ motivate people to do this.
- David – Need to build professional networks and training networks within India relating to tech transfer
- Guru Gujral – One can focus on this group of participants and see how we can help them take tech ahead.
- Khanna – Venture Center can take upon that role and help scientists with assistance/ mentoring etc
- Khanna- Need to create a database / listing of technologies
- Venkat – One can consider having a forum for product opportunities in social sector.
- Dipali – One of the Sri Lanka participants from the Trieste workshop got a module on tech commercialization included in their college curriculum after attending the workshop. Participants can consider similar idea.