



The Importance of Trade Secrets: New Directions in International Trade Policy Making and Empirical Research

Katherine Linton

Abstract

This article discusses the importance of trade secrets to small and large firms in many industry sectors. It also highlights their centrality in domestic and international policymaking. Given the practical and policy importance of trade secrets, the article describes gaps in the literature on the effects of trade secret protection on innovation, trade, and investment that warrant research attention.

Suggested citation: Linton, Katherine. "The Importance of Trade Secrets: New Directions in International Trade Policy Making and Empirical Research." *Journal of International Commerce and Economics*. Published electronically September 2016. <http://www.usitc.gov/journals>.

This article is the result of ongoing research of U.S. International Trade Commission (USITC) staff and is solely meant to represent the opinions and research of the authors. It is not meant to represent in any way the views of the USITC or any of its individual Commissioners. Please direct all correspondence to Katherine Linton, Office of Industries, USITC, 500 E Street, SW, Washington, DC 20436, or by email to Katherine.Linton@usitc.gov.

Introduction

What type of intellectual property (IP) do U.S. businesses care about most? Given all the news about software patent “trolls” or drug patent headaches, an educated observer might guess patents, at least for certain high-tech industries. Or, given the incidence of piracy and counterfeiting in the digital environment, one might guess copyrights or trademarks, particularly in the information sector. But the answer appears to be trade secrets—what some commentators call “the other IP right.”¹ Precisely because they are secret in nature, empirical research on trade secrets has been difficult to conduct. International trade policy making, which often relies on supporting empirical research, is in early stages as well.

Firms are keenly aware of trade secrets’ importance. According to survey evidence from the United States and other developed countries, large and small firms in a wide variety of industry sectors are more likely to rate trade secrets as “very important” than all other types of IP protection. In practice, trade secrets have several identified advantages over other types of IP protection. First, they are broad in scope, covering virtually any type of commercially valuable information that has been subject to reasonable measures to protect secrecy. They are also a “do-it-yourself” IP right; firms can use internal measures (such as contracts and security procedures) to maintain protections from inception rather than waiting for the government review and approval required for patents and trademarks. Trade secret protections are flexible as well—for example, firms need not file a new application to cover modifications to a trade secret, they simply incorporate them into their existing protections.

From a societal standpoint, trade secrets also can be considered “innovation friendly.” They can be shared with employees and commercial partners, so long as firms protect their trade secrets with contracts or other reasonable measures. Moreover, U.S. trade secret laws generally permit independent discovery, reverse engineering, and other fair practices considered critical to innovation. Liability for trade secret misappropriation is generally limited to cases of wrongful conduct or violation of honest commercial practices. For these reasons and others, a large portion of U.S. IP exports consist of trade-secret-reliant industrial processes and software licensed to affiliates and third parties abroad.

As the importance of trade secrets becomes better understood, they have become the subject of increased domestic and international policy making. Trade secret laws simultaneously are being strengthened in Europe and the United States. The Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement (TPP), which is under consideration, includes protections that are stronger than the minimum set by the World Trade Organization’s Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Agreement (TRIPS) and bilateral trade agreements. The TPP requires that the parties provide protections from misappropriation, including by state-owned entities, as well as criminal procedures and penalties

¹ Pooley, James, “Trade Secrets: the Other IP Right.” June 2013.

in certain circumstances.² These requirements are likely to spur TPP countries to strengthen their domestic trade secret laws.

Notwithstanding these policy initiatives, the empirical work on trade secrets to date is relatively scarce. Survey evidence on firms' IP and innovation strategies is largely limited to developed countries. There is little research addressing whether and under what conditions domestic and multinational firms in developing countries use trade secrets. Similarly, research on the effects of changes in legal protections for trade secrets on innovation and international technology transfer is in the early stages. To address these gaps, this paper reviews the existing trade secret literature and describes areas where additional research could inform the policy debate on the important connections between trade secrets, technology transfer, and innovation.

Trade Secrets Explained

International definitions of trade secrets have converged around the requirements in TRIPS. Member countries must protect trade secrets or “undisclosed information” that is secret; has commercial value because it is secret; and has been subject to reasonable steps to keep it secret.³ The information must be protected from disclosure, acquisition, or use by others in a manner that is contrary to honest commercial practices.⁴ TRIPS does not specify a particular way of protecting trade secrets; in practice, member countries have stand-alone trade secret statutes, incorporate trade secret protections in their unfair competition or contract laws, and/or rely on the common law.⁵

According to TRIPS standards, the range of intellectual materials that may be considered “trade secrets” is broad. It may include confidential business information, such as a firm's customer lists, price lists, or marketing strategies; know-how, such as facts about manufacturing methods or processes for achieving certain results; and technical information, such as blueprints, algorithms, and chemical formulae.⁶ Trade secrets may be particularly valuable when a work that has potential commercial value is at an early stage of research and development (R&D)—and thus does not meet requirements for obtaining a patent—or when changing legal standards make the availability of a patent unclear. For example, uncertainty about the patent eligibility of

² USTR, “TPP Full Text,” art. 18.78,

<https://ustr.gov/trade-agreements/free-trade-agreements/trans-pacific-partnership/tpp-full-text>.

³ TRIPS, arts. 39.1 and 39.2.

⁴ “Contrary to honest commercial practices” includes “practices such as breach of contract, breach of confidence or inducement to breach, and includes the acquisition of undisclosed information by third parties who knew, or were grossly negligent in failing to know that such practices were involved in the acquisition.” WTO, TRIPS, Article 39.2 note 10.

⁵ Schultz and Lippoldt, “Approaches to Protection,” January 22, 2014, 7-8.

⁶ Schultz and Lippoldt, “Approaches to Protection,” January 22, 2014, 8, 12-13.

certain biotechnology, business process, and/or software inventions under U.S. law may induce firms to rely more on trade secrets.⁷

Trade Secrets and Patents Compared

Despite the potential overlap between trade secrets and patents, the protections provided by each are substantially different (see table 1). Not only do trade secrets typically cover broader subject matter, they also tend to last longer. For example, while patent terms are generally limited to 20 years, trade secret protections may last as long as secrecy is maintained. Moreover, trade secrets do not have to be filed with or reviewed by an administrative agency before they become effective. Whether the information meets the requirements for legal protection is not determined by a patent examiner ahead of time but typically by a judge afterwards in a lawsuit. A firm protects its secrets by carrying out reasonable protection measures—for example, by giving only limited access to the information, and only to employees who “need to know” it.

On the other hand, trade secret protections are narrower than those associated with patents in important ways. Trade secret laws generally do not protect against a firm obtaining the subject information through fair and honest means. Instead, violation of the law requires misappropriation—a breach of a duty of confidence (such as the employment relationship), a breach of contract, or other dishonest or wrongful action. Thus, inventions that can be discovered through reverse engineering—for example, some medicine-related inventions—cannot be effectively protected by trade secrets.⁸ Moreover, unlike patents, once a trade secret is disclosed, protection is often lost forever. A firm may bring suit, but “putting the genie back in the bottle” or proving damages (which in theory may be perpetual) is often difficult. Courts may issue injunctions to attempt to limit the damage.⁹

In patent law, by contrast, an inventor who develops an already patented technology without knowledge of the patent generally is liable if the invention falls within the scope of the patent’s claims. The first-inventor-to-file a successful application is granted the right to exclude others from making, using, selling or importing the invention during the life of the patent. This exclusive right generally makes the infringer’s innocent intent or fair commercial practices irrelevant to the determination of infringement.¹⁰ Moreover, the ability to enforce exclusive rights continues regardless of whether the patent is infringed by others.

⁷ See, e.g., Aquino, “Attorneys Tell PTO,” September 15, 2015 (representatives of innovators in the field of biopharmaceutical diagnostics state that currently inventors are more likely to rely on trade secrets because of uncertainty about patent eligibility for inventions in the fields of diagnostics and personalized medicine due to court decisions and patent office guidelines); Barnhard and Klann, “Navigating the Sea Changes,” 2015, 14-30 (describing changes to U.S. patent law that may spur changes in IP protection strategies).

⁸ WIPO, “Patents or Trade Secrets?” n.d. (accessed June 17, 2016); Novartis AG, “Brief of Novartis AG as *Amicus Curiae*,” April 20, 2016, 21 (the robust generic pharmaceutical industry and growing biosimilars field demonstrate that few medicines are beyond the reach of reverse engineering).

⁹ Thomas, John R, “The Role of Trade Secrets,” January 15, 2014, 6.

¹⁰ Cotropia and Lemley, “Copying in Patent Law,” 2009, 1421-66.

Table 1: Characteristics of Trade Secret and Patent Protections Compared

Element	Trade Secrets	Patents
Subject matter must be patentable, novel, non-obvious and useful	No	Yes
Prior registration and examination by government agency is required	No	Yes
Public disclosure is required	No	Yes
Process of acquiring the right may take years	No	Yes
Has only a defined term of protection	No	Yes
Only dishonest or wrongful conduct is prohibited	Yes	No
Internal controls are required to establish the right	Yes	No

Source: Compiled by author; see also Hall, Helmers, Rogers, and Sena, “The Choice between Formal and Informal,” 2014, 16.

To obtain these exclusive rights, however, the patent applicant must disclose the invention in “clear, concise, and exact terms” and set forth the best mode of carrying out the invention.”¹¹ These disclosures are intended to have beneficial societal effects including increasing the public storehouse of knowledge and promoting incremental innovation; facilitating efficient bargaining by clarifying property rights; and limiting the scope of patents by preventing over-claiming.¹² While there is debate about the extent to which disclosures have these positive effects,¹³ trade secrets do not permit public disclosures at all. Instead, by increasing the likelihood that investments in R&D and employee training will not be disclosed to the public, trade secret protections are intended to incentivize firms to make the investments in the first place. Patents and trade secrets thus take different approaches to incentivizing innovation.¹⁴

Trade Secrets and Regulatory Test Data

TRIPS provisions on trade secrets also address the more controversial issue of protections for regulatory test data. Under Article 39.3 of TRIPS, if a country requires the submission of undisclosed data that requires considerable effort to originate as a condition for the marketing of a new pharmaceutical or agricultural chemical product, then it must protect such data against unfair commercial use or disclosure, except where necessary to protect the public. Moreover, regulatory test data provisions have been strengthened beyond the minimum required by TRIPS via provisions of U.S. and EU free trade agreements (FTAs).¹⁵ U.S. FTAs generally mandate the protection of regulatory test data for specific lengths of time (5 years for new pharmaceuticals and 10 years for new agricultural chemicals). During these time periods, the firm originating the

¹¹ See 35 U.S.C. § 112.

¹² See, e.g., Devlin, “The Misunderstood Function,” 2010, 402; and Hall, Helmers, Rogers, and Sena, “The Choice between Formal and Informal,” 2014, 16 (the role of disclosure is to prevent duplication and allow rapid diffusion once the patent has expired).

¹³ See, e.g., Devlin, “The Misunderstood Function,” 2010, 403-04 (patent disclosures often are ineffective at transmitting knowledge to others because the information disclosed is quite limited, search costs often outweigh likely gains, and because the fact of searching may be used to support a claim for willful infringement); and Hall, Helmers, Rogers, and Sena, “The Choice between Formal and Informal,” 2014, 42-43 (describing survey data showing that most firms do not conduct a prior art search before starting new R&D or product development).

¹⁴ Thomas, “The Role of Trade Secrets,” January 15, 2014, 4.

¹⁵ Roffe and Spennemann. “The Impact of FTAs,” 2006, 75-93.

data has the exclusive right to rely on it.¹⁶ Most recently, the TPP has extended additional protections to the test data supporting biologics, requiring that each TPP party provide at least 8 years of protection or 5 years plus “other measures” to deliver a “comparable outcome.”¹⁷ Trade policy discussions have tended to concentrate on the exclusive rights provided to firms that originate regulatory test data. This focus has eclipsed recognition of the importance of ensuring standard trade secret protections to firms in a wide range of industry sectors, as set forth below.

Firms’ Preferences for Trade Secrets

U.S. government surveys consistently show that firms are more likely to identify trade secrets as “very important” to their operations than other types of IP. In 2014, for example, the U.S. International Trade Commission (USITC) surveyed more than 7,000 U.S. firms to study the economic effects of India’s trade and industrial policies on their business operations. Based on the survey responses, 56 percent of internationally-engaged firms considered trade secrets “very important,” compared to 48 percent for trademarks, 37 percent for patents, and 31 percent for copyrights. Moreover, even in sectors generally considered patent intensive, such as chemicals and information and communications technology (ICT), firms were more likely to consider trade secrets “very important” than patents.¹⁸ The importance of trade secrets was also identified in an earlier survey the USITC conducted of approximately 5,000 U.S. firms regarding their IP experiences in China. There, firms listed their top IP concern as stolen trade secrets, ahead of lost sales, damage to their brands, and the costs of IP enforcement.¹⁹

These results are not unique to the surveys the USITC conducts in response to requests from Congress or the U.S. Trade Representative. Similar results are reported in the primary government survey of the research and development (R&D) activities of U.S. firms, the Business R&D and Innovation Survey (BRDIS) undertaken by the National Science Foundation (NSF) and the Census Bureau.²⁰ According to the 2012 BRDIS, 58.3 percent of U.S.-based firms considered trade secrets “very important,” compared to lower shares for patents, trademarks and copyrights (see table 2). For example, in the manufacturing sector, U.S. firms in the chemical, computer and electronic products, machinery, and transportation equipment industries were more apt to consider trade secrets “very important” than they were patents, trademarks, or copyrights. Similarly, in the non-manufacturing sector, U.S. firms in the information industry (including publishing and software) and the professional, scientific, and technical services industries also

¹⁶ Akhtar and Fergusson. “Intellectual Property Rights” April 2014, 23.

¹⁷ Biologics are defined as, at a minimum, products that are or contain proteins produced using biotechnology processes for use in human beings for the prevention, treatment, or cure of a disease or condition. TPP, arts. 18.50 and 18.52.

¹⁸ USITC, *Trade, Investment, and Industrial Policies in India*, 2014, 140, 145.

¹⁹ USITC, *China: Effects of Intellectual Property Infringement*, 2011, 3-21.

²⁰ The target population for the BRDIS consists of for-profit corporations with five or more paid employees in the United States that have at least one U.S. establishment in business during the survey year, and are classified within a specific set of industry sectors, with a particular focus on those companies that perform R&D in the United States. Detailed information on the sampling methodology and responses are available in the 2012 BRDIS technical notes. NSF and National Center for Science and Engineering Statistics (NCSES), *BRDIS: 2012*, October 29, 2015.

avored trade secrets. Moreover, it's not just large firms that care about trade secrets; 56.2 percent of U.S. firms with less than 500 employees considered trade secrets “very important,” compared to 45.4 percent for patents, 37.8 percent for trademarks, and 25.6 percent for copyrights.²¹

Table 2: Percentage of U.S. firms that consider different IP types “very important,” selected industry sectors

Industry	Trade secrets	Patents	Trademarks	Copyrights
All industries	58.3	48.3	43.5	27.4
<i>Manufacturing</i>	62.1	55.9	50.1	26.1
Chemicals	69.7	67.6	54.4	26.1
Machinery	53.0	48.2	41.5	21.9
Computer and electronic Products	70.6	64.3	49.9	34.4
Transportation Equipment	47.8	42.8	38.5	22.1
<i>Nonmanufacturing</i>	54.3	40.1	36.5	28.7
Information	63.6	44.1	57.2	50.9
Professional, scientific and technical services	49.9	42.1	20.3	20.3

Source: NSF and NCSSES, *BRDIS: 2012*, October 2015, Tables 53-57.

Academic research, including the 1994 Carnegie Mellon Survey on Industrial R&D in the U.S. manufacturing sector, has similarly found that firms consider trade secrets and other informal mechanisms, such as lead time and first-mover advantages, to be the most effective means for protecting returns on innovative products and processes. This is particularly true for small U.S. firms, who are more likely than large firms to forgo the use of patents because of their cost.²²

To shed additional light on the experiences of small firms, the 2008 Berkeley Patent Survey targeted small high-tech start-up companies in the United States.²³ The cost of getting and enforcing patents was the most common reason cited by all survey respondents for not patenting major technologies. Other reasons included the belief that particular innovations were not patentable, that trade secret protection was adequate, or a reluctance to disclose commercially valuable information. Reasons for not patenting varied by industry sector—for example reluctance to disclose and the sense that trade secret protections were sufficient were top reasons for small firms in the biotechnology sector, while cost concerns dominated in the software sector.²⁴

The fact that trade secrets may be protected without governmental help, as well as their attractiveness to resource-constrained firms, suggest that they may play an important role in the innovation strategies of developing-country firms. However, while there is a substantial body of survey evidence on the use of trade secrets in developed countries, there is little survey

²¹ National Science Foundation (NSF), National Center for Science and Engineering Statistics (NCSES). *Business Research and Development and Innovation: 2012, 2015*, tables 53-57.

²² These results have been reported even for firms in the pharmaceutical industry, often considered the most patent-reliant. Cohen, Nelson and Walsh, “Protecting their Intellectual Assets,” 2000, 25 and tables 1 and 2.

²³ Graham, Merges, Samuelson, and Sichelman, “High Technology Entrepreneurs,” 2009, 1260.

²⁴ Graham, Merges, Samuelson, and Sichelman, “High Technology Entrepreneurs,” 2009, 1310-1314.

information from developing countries.²⁵ While information on how developing-country firms use trade secrets generally is limited to case studies, these cover numerous industry sectors (including food and drinks, household products, clothing, software and biotechnology) and countries (including Trinidad and Tobago, Thailand, China, Myanmar, Brazil, the Philippines and Colombia).²⁶ This qualitative evidence suggests that there may be demand for strengthening trade secret protections in developing countries.

New Trade Secret Protections in the United States and Europe

The United States and Europe enacted new trade secrets legislation in May of 2016 (only 15 days apart). The U.S. Defend Trade Secrets Act of 2016 (DTSA)²⁷ and the EU's "Directive on the protection of undisclosed know-how and business information (trade secrets) against their unlawful acquisition, use and disclosure" (the EU Directive)²⁸ should make protections within and across the two markets more uniform.²⁹ U.S. and EU government representatives have cited the ongoing Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) negotiations as one impetus for harmonizing and strengthening trade secret protections at home.³⁰

The DTSA creates a federal civil cause of action for trade secret misappropriation. Before this, civil trade secret protections generally were governed by state law, with almost every state (excepting New York and Massachusetts) relying on a version of the Uniform Trade Secrets Act.³¹ The DTSA seeks to make the standards for trade secret misappropriation more consistent and to provide uniform remedies similar to those for other IPR violations (including injunctive relief, seizure of misappropriated information, compensatory damages, and punitive damages and attorneys' fees in cases of willful misappropriation).³² In recognition of the international dimensions of the problem, the DTSA also requires the Attorney General to prepare biannual reports on the size and scope of theft of U.S. trade secrets abroad; the involvement of foreign

²⁵ Hall, Helmers, Rogers, and Sena, "The Choice between Formal and Informal," 2014, 6-13; Baker & McKenzie, "Study on Trade Secrets," April 2011, 101-102.

²⁶ See, e.g., World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), IP Advantage database, http://www.wipo.int/ipadvantage/en/search.jsp?ins_protection_id=537&focus_id= (accessed June 15, 2016).

²⁷ See DTSA, Public L. No. 114-153, May 11, 2016.

²⁸ European Commission, "Trade Secrets," n.d. (accessed June 16, 2016).

²⁹ In the United States, the new law already is in effect and lawsuits have been brought based on its provisions. By contrast, in Europe, the member states will have two years from publication of the Directive to implement it into their national legislation. See Molinski and Heath, "Early Returns," June 22, 2016, and European Commission, "Trade Secrets," n.d. (accessed June 16, 2016).

³⁰ Akhtar and Jones, "Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) Negotiations," February 4, 2014, 34.

³¹ The Uniform Trade Secrets Act is a model law published by the Uniform Law Commission to harmonize common law standards and remedies for trade secret misappropriation. See National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws, "Uniform Trade Secrets Act with 1985 Amendments," August 1985, http://www.uniformlaws.org/shared/docs/trade%20secrets/utsa_final_85.pdf, and Bombard, "Three Key Distinctions," 2016, 23.

³² DTSA, Public L. No. 114-153, May 11, 2016, <https://www.congress.gov/bill/114th-congress/senate-bill/1890> (accessed June 16, 2016); see also Hatch, "Senators Hatch, Coons Urge Passage," October 8, 2015 (listing numerous associations and firms supporting the DTSA).

governments; the legal and enforcement protections available abroad; and a list of the countries where problems are significant.³³

The U.S. and EU legislation harmonize approaches to trade secret protections by similarly defining trade secrets and the requirements for a finding of misappropriation. They also take similar approaches to civil remedies and the protection of trade secrets during litigation. An important difference, however, is the availability of criminal liability.³⁴ The DTSA amends the Economic Espionage Act of 1996, which criminalizes: theft for the benefit of a foreign entity (economic espionage) and the intentional theft of a secret placed in interstate commerce with the intent to convert the trade secret and injure the owner.³⁵ By contrast, criminal liability is a matter for the EU Member States, and there is a lack of uniformity in their approaches.³⁶

A New Focus in Trade Policy Making

Notwithstanding some differences in domestic laws, the pending TPP suggests that trade agreements involving the United States may be more focused on trade secret protections than they have been in the past. The TPP's trade secrets provision begins by reiterating the requirements of TRIPS Article 39.2 that countries provide a legal means for protecting "undisclosed information" or trade secrets. It further requires that countries provide protections against the disclosure, acquisition, or use of trade secrets by others, explicitly including state-owned entities, in a manner contrary to honest commercial practices.³⁷ Additionally, for the first time in a trade agreement, the TPP requires that criminal procedures and penalties be available for trade secret misappropriation under certain circumstances.³⁸ While U.S. industry representatives have praised the enhancement of trade secret protections in the TPP, they have urged even stronger protections and greater harmonization in future agreements.³⁹

U.S. trade policy vis-à-vis important trade partners, such as China and India, also reflects the growing recognition and importance of trade secret protection for U.S. firms doing business internationally. Recent meetings of the U.S.-China Joint Commission on Commerce and Trade, for example, have resulted in outcomes that focus on upgrading substantive and procedural protections for owners of trade secrets in China.⁴⁰ In India, bilateral discussions have focused on enhancing trade secrets protections, which is particularly important given the absence of a standalone trade secret law in India. These efforts are buttressed by a shared understanding that

³³ DTSA, Public L. No. 114-153, May 11, 2016.

³⁴ Patel, Pade, Cundiff and Newman, "A Quick Guide," June 2016.

³⁵ The law was revised in 2012 to expand the jurisdictional element of the trade secret provision and to increase available penalties. See Theft of Trade Secrets Clarification Act of 2012, Pub. L. No. 112-236, amending 18 U.S.C. §1832(a) and Foreign and Economic Espionage Penalty Enhancement Act of 2012, Pub. L. No. 112-269, amending 18 U.S.C. §1831(a), (b).

³⁶ Baker & McKenzie. "Study on Trade Secrets," April 2011, 61-66.

³⁷ TPP, art. 18.78.

³⁸ TPP, art. 18.78.

³⁹ Intellectual Property Rights Industry-Trade Advisory Committee (ITAC-15), "Report on the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement," December 3, 2015, 25-26.

⁴⁰ USTR, "U.S. Fact Sheet," November 2015.

improved trade secret protections are mutually beneficial.⁴¹ Empirical research on the potential economic effects of strengthening trade secrets protections could guide these and future efforts.

Emerging Research on the Effects of Strengthening Trade Secret Protections

A major argument made in favor of TRIPS by the governments of the United States and other developed countries was that a stronger and better-harmonized global IP system would improve incentives for technology transfer and contribute to economic development through trade in high-technology goods, foreign direct investment (FDI), and licensing.⁴² Based on recent economic studies, strengthening IP protection—in particular, patent reforms—has had positive effects on high-tech trade, FDI, and licensing.⁴³ While many of the studies involve IP reforms in larger and middle-income countries, benefits also have been shown in poorer countries when governments undertake complementary reforms to improve education and the business and innovation climate.⁴⁴

Many empirical studies rely on the Ginarte and Park Index (GP Index), which measures the strength of patent protection in a large sample of countries over time.⁴⁵ One potential limitation of the GP Index, however, is that it measures the absence or presence of particular aspects of a country's patent law but does not take into account whether laws are effectively enforced. This limitation may be particularly salient as the legal reforms required by TRIPS are completed but concerns about effective enforcement persist.⁴⁶ Some researchers address this limitation by combining the GP Index with measures of the effectiveness of legal institutions, such as the legal system and property rights index published by the Fraser Institute.⁴⁷

Until recently, there was no index measuring the potential effects of changes in trade secret protections over time and for a broad sample of countries. Pioneering work published by Lippoldt and Schultz in 2014 addresses this gap. Their Trade Secret Protection Index (TSPI) includes five elements that reflect the scope of trade secret protections and remedies, and that correspond well with TRIPS and TPP requirements. The elements are: (1) definitions and coverage; (2) specific duties and misappropriation; (3) remedies and restrictions on liability; (4) enforcement, investigation and discovery, and test data exclusivity; and (5) system functioning and related regulation. Like the GP Index, it is structured to enable scoring based primarily on

⁴¹ USTR, "United States and India Joint Statement," October 2015.

⁴² Maskus, "The New Globalisation," 2014, 276.

⁴³ See, e.g., Maskus, "The New Globalisation," 2014, 276 (more than 15 recent economic studies establish the positive effects of patent strengthening on inward trade in high-tech goods, FDI, and licensing); Maskus, *Private Rights and Public Problems*, 2012, 73-81 (summarizing the literature).

⁴⁴ Cepeda, Lippoldt, and Senft, "Policy Complements," 2010; and Zhang, Du, and Park, 2015, 26.

⁴⁵ See Ginarte and Park, "Determinants of Patent Rights," 1997, 283; and Park, "International Patent Protection," 2008, 761.

⁴⁶ See, e.g., USTR, *2016 Special 301 Report*, April 2016, 29-63 (noting ongoing enforcement challenges in countries identified as having substantial IP problems).

⁴⁷ See, e.g., Zhang, Du, and Park, "How Private Property Protection," 2015, 4-5; Maskus and Yang, "The Impacts of Post-TRIPS Patent Reforms," April 2013.

objective criteria; however, it also specifically includes measures of enforcement and the effectiveness of legal institutions.⁴⁸

Lippoldt and Schultz test the hypothesis that increasing the protection of trade secrets promotes (1) expanded domestic innovative activities, as measured by R&D expenditures and intensity, and (2) expanded international activities, including more goods and services imports, imports of IP services, and FDI inflows. They find a positive relationship between the stringency of trade secret protection and domestic and international innovation indicators, particularly FDI inflows and imports of IP services.⁴⁹ Their research offers an important basis for further analysis of the relationship between trade secrets protection and innovation.

New Areas for Research

There is substantial room to improve understanding of the links between trade secrets and indicators of innovation, trade, and investment to support best practices in trade policymaking. Below are unanswered questions that warrant further research.

Who uses trade secrets?

Substantial survey evidence from developed countries confirms the central importance of trade secrets to large and small firms in a range of industry sectors. However, there is little evidence about the IP strategies of firms in developing countries and, in particular, their use (or not) of trade secrets. These strategies may differ, for example, based on firm characteristics including size, industry sector, whether the firm is involved in creating new products and/or processes, and whether the firm is internationally engaged through trade, investment, and/or licensing.

Moreover, survey evidence from the United States and other developed countries points to the relative importance of trade secrets when compared to other types of IP. The reasons for this preference—including potential cost advantages and the broad scope and subject matter of trade secrets—suggest that they may play an important role in developing countries as well. Although there is case study evidence on developing country firms' use of trade secrets in certain circumstances, survey information could provide a more robust basis for trade secret policymaking.

Under what circumstances do firms rely on trade secrets in addition to or instead of patents or other types of IP protections?

Much of the research on IP and innovation has focused on patents because they are more visible through data on applications and grants and thus more readily lend themselves to measurement. Moreover, the economic literature often assumes that patents and trade secrets are substitutes; that is, a firm can choose one or the other but not both.⁵⁰ In practice, however, there are many

⁴⁸ Lippoldt and Schultz, "Uncovering Trade Secrets," 2014, 11-12, 23.

⁴⁹ Lippoldt and Schultz, "Uncovering Trade Secrets," 2014, 16.

⁵⁰ Hall, Helmers, Rogers, and Sena, "The Choice between Formal and Informal," 2014, 14.

examples of firms using both strategies. For example, trade secrets may be used to protect the know-how needed to implement a patented invention, acting as complements rather than substitutes.

From an innovation policy perspective, understanding the relationship between trade secrets and patents (as well as other types of IP) is critical to predicting how changes in one policy domain may affect others. In cases in which patents and trade secrets are substitutes, changes that make patents more difficult to obtain (for example for biotechnology or software inventions) may make trade secrets more desirable. Strengthening trade secret laws could similarly be expected to discourage patenting. By contrast, when patents and trade secrets are used as complements, they may be expected to respond similarly to policy changes.

One limitation of surveys in this regard is that they typically provide aggregated firm-level data rather than data at the level of a particular product or process innovation.⁵¹ Aggregated data can obscure the fact that a single invention may be protected differently at different stages of the product life cycle. For example, different aspects of a software program may be protected initially by trade secrets; further on, by patents or copyrights; and at later commercialization stages, trademarks may be added to the mix. Collecting survey data at the product level—for example, seeking identification of all IP strategies used in connection with a particular innovation—could shed light on how different IP mechanisms complement and/or substitute for each other. Case studies also could be useful to illustrate the use of different IP strategies throughout the life cycle of an innovation.

What relationships are visible between trade secrets and trade and investment indicators?

The empirical evidence reviewed here provides an untested basis for understanding the international activities of trade-secret-intensive industries. For example, using the NSF survey data, U.S. industry sectors could be categorized according to whether or not they are trade-secret-intensive. Goods trade data for these sectors could be used to explore and compare trade patterns and trends in trade-secret and non-trade-secret -intensive industries, and the potential relationship of these patterns to the strength of trade secret protection as measured by the TSPI.

On the services side, a large portion of trade in IP services is for industrial processes and software—two categories that are believed to substantially rely on trade secrets (although more research is needed here as well). Currently, IP services trade involves mainly high-income countries; however, receipts and payments for IP services in middle-income countries, particularly China, are growing rapidly.⁵² Trade trends in IP services could be compared to those in non-IP services, including the potential relationship to trade secret protection levels.

⁵¹ Hall, Helmers, Rogers, and Sena, “The Choice between Formal and Informal,” 2014, 41.

⁵² The World Bank, “World Bank Open Data” (charges for the use of intellectual property reported for high, middle, and low income countries, 2006-14) (accessed June 19, 2016).

With regard to FDI, further study of how the size, scope, and location of FDI are affected by trade secret protection levels is warranted. For example, the availability of trade secret protections may influence the way in which relationships are structured in global value chains. When trade secret laws are lax, a multinational corporation may rely on a wholly-owned affiliate rather than a non-affiliated entity because it can exert greater control over sensitive information. By contrast, joint venture partnerships, which generally rely on enforceable contractual relationships, may be facilitated by robust trade secret protections. The role that trade secret protections may play in the composition of FDI (for example, whether it is in manufacturing and R&D rather than simply distribution) also warrants further study.

Are legal institutions effectively protecting trade secrets?

Unlike patents, trade secrets do not necessarily require strong institutions *ex-ante*; firms protect their trade secrets themselves through internal measures. They do, however, require strong institutions *ex-post* in the event of a misappropriation. A judge must be able to identify the trade secret (without improperly disclosing it to third parties); order appropriate discovery, subject to confidentiality restrictions; determine if there has been a misappropriation; and, if there has, must be able to impose and enforce appropriate remedies.

Research on whether countries' legal institutions are meeting the challenge of protecting trade secret is in early stages. However, there is anecdotal evidence of inadequate and non-deterrent remedies; a lack of injunctive relief; difficulties protecting trade secrets during legal proceedings; and insufficient mechanism for participation between courts and government agencies within and across countries. These concerns have been noted with regard to China, India, and other markets.⁵³

To take into account the relationship between effective legal institutions and trade and investment, it may be appropriate to modify the TSPI to capture more information about the effectiveness of trade secret protections "on the ground." Moreover, further research can shed light on how firms' evaluations of countries' legal environments affect decision making, including choices between serving the market through exports, FDI, and/or licensing. Given the documented importance of trade secrets to firms and new domestic and international policy making in this domain, there is a substantial need for further research on the relationships between trade secrets, innovation, trade and investment.

⁵³ See, e.g., U.S. Chamber of Commerce. "The Case for Enhanced Protection," 2014, 13-18; Bai and Da, "Strategies for Trade Secret Protection, 2011, 351; Brant and Lohse, "Trade Secrets," 2014, 17-18; USTR, 2016 Special 301 Report, April 2016, 20.

Bibliography

Akhtar, Shayerah Ilias and Ian F. Fergusson. "Intellectual Property Rights and International Trade." http://digital.library.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metadc287919/m1/1/high_res_d/RL34292_2014_Apr04.pdf.

Akhtar, Shayerah Ilias and Vivian C. Jones. "Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) Negotiations." Congressional Research Service Report, R43387, February 4, 2014. <https://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/R43387.pdf>.

Aquino, John T. "Attorneys Tell PTO of Patent Eligibility Uncertainty." *Bloomberg Life Sciences Law & Industry Report*. September 15, 2015. <http://www.bna.com/attorneys-tell-pto-n17179936061/>.

Bai, Benjamin J. and Guoping Da. "Strategies for Trade Secrets Protection in China." *Northwestern Journal of Technology and Intellectual Property* 9, no. 7 (2011): 351-375.

Baker & McKenzie. "Study on Trade Secrets and Confidential Business Information in the Internal Market." Final Study prepared for the European Commission. April 2013. http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/iprenforcement/docs/trade-secrets/130711_final-study_en.pdf.

Barnhard, Elizabeth M. and Amy Gallup Klann, "Navigating the Sea Changes in Patent Law to Successfully Build Value." *Technology Transfer and Entrepreneurship* 2 (2015): 14-30.

Bombard, Gregory S. "Three Key Distinctions between the Uniform Trade Secrets Act and the Common Law." *Commercial & Business Litigation* 17, no.2 (2016): 23-27. http://www.duanemorris.com/articles/static/bombard_abacommbuslit_winter2016.pdf.

Brant, Jennifer and Sebastian Lohse. "Trade Secrets: Tools for Innovation and Collaboration." International Chamber of Commerce Innovation and Intellectual Property Research Paper No. 3. 2014. http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2501262&download=yes.

Cepeda, Ricardo Cavazos, Douglas C. Lippoldt, and Jonathan Senft. "Policy Complements to the Strengthening of IPRs in Developing Countries." OECD Trade Policy Working Paper 104, 2010. http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/trade/policy-complements-to-the-strengthening-of-iprs-in-developing-countries_5km7fmwz85d4-en?crawler=true.

Cohen, Wesley M., Richard R. Nelson and John P. Walsh. "Protecting their Intellectual Assets: Appropriability Conditions and Why U.S. Manufacturing Firms Patent (or Not)." NBER Working Paper No. 7552. February 2000. <http://www.nber.org/papers/w7552>.

Cotropia, Christopher Anthony and Mark Lemley. "Copying in Patent Law." *North Carolina Law Review* 87 (2009): 1421-66.

CREATE. “Trade Secret Theft – Managing the Growing Threat in Supply Chains.” White paper. Washington, DC, 2012.

<https://create.org/resource/trade-secret-theft-managing-the-growing-threat-in-supply-chains/>.

Devlin, Alan. “The Misunderstood Function of Disclosure in Patent Law.” *Harvard Journal of Law & Technology* 23, no.2 (2010): 402-446.

European Commission. Directorate-General for Internal Market, Industry, Entrepreneurship and SMEs. “Trade Secrets.” n.d.

http://ec.europa.eu/growth/industry/intellectual-property/trade-secrets/index_en.htm (accessed February 9, 2016).

Ginarte, J.C. and Walter Park. “Determinants of Patent Rights: A Cross-National Study.” *Research Policy* 26 (1997): 283-301.

Graham, Stuart J.H., Robert P. Merges, Pam Samuelson, and Ted Sichelman. “High Technology Entrepreneurs and the Patent System: Results of the 2008 Berkeley Patent Survey.” *Berkeley Tech. L.J.* 24, no. 4 (2009): 1255-1328.

Hall, Bronwyn, Christian Helmers, Mark Rogers, and Vania Sena. “The Choice between Formal and Informal Intellectual Property: A Review.” *Journal of Economic Literature* 52(2) (2014): 1-50.

Hatch, Orrin. “Senators Hatch, Coons Urge Passage of Trade Secrets Bill,” Press Release, October 8, 2015.

<http://www.hatch.senate.gov/public/index.cfm/releases?ID=65ec75b0-abdd-48f5-b943-d4ce18acefa9>.

Intellectual Property Rights Industry-Trade Advisory Committee (ITAC-15). “Report on the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement.” December 3, 2015. <https://ustr.gov/sites/default/files/ITAC-15-Intellectual-Property.pdf>.

Levine, Dave. “New Professors’ letter Opposing the Defend Trade Secrets Act of 2015.” November 17, 2015.

<https://freedom-to-tinker.com/blog/davelevine/new-professors-letter-opposing-the-defend-trade-secrets-act-of-2015/>.

Lippoldt, Douglas C. and Mark F. Schultz. “Uncovering Trade Secrets—An Empirical Assessment of Economic Implications of Protection for Undisclosed Data.” OECD Trade Policy Papers, No. 167, 2014.

http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/trade/uncovering-trade-secrets-an-empirical-assessment-of-economic-implications-of-protection-for-undisclosed-data_5jxzl5w3j3s6-en?crawler=true.

Maskus, Keith E. “The New Globalisation of Intellectual Property Rights: What’s New this Time?” *Australian Economic History Review*, Vol. 54, No. 3 (2014): 262-284.

Maskus, Keith E. and Lei Yang. “The Impacts of Post-TRIPS Patent Reforms on the Structure of Exports.” RIETI Discussion Paper Series 13-E-030, April 2013. <http://www.rieti.go.jp/jp/publications/dp/13e030.pdf>.

Molinski, William and Jacob M. Heath. “Early Returns (Part 1 of 3): 3D Printing Company Sues under New Defend Trade Secrets Act.” Orrick Trade Secrets Watch. June 22, 2016. <http://blogs.orrick.com/trade-secrets-watch/2016/06/22/early-returns-part-1-of-2-3d-printing-company-sues-under-new-defend-trade-secrets-act/>.

National Science Foundation (NSF), National Center for Science and Engineering Statistics (NCSES). *Business Research and Development and Innovation: 2012*. Arlington, VA: NSF, NCSES, 2015.

Novartis AG. “Brief of Novartis AG as Amicus Curie in Support of Petitioner.” *Sequenom, Inc. v. Ariosa Diagnostics, Inc., et al.*, U.S. Supreme Court No. 15-1182. April 20, 2016. <http://www.biologicsblog.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/Novartis.pdf>.

Park, Walter G. “International Patent Protection.” *Research Policy* 38, no. 4 (2008): 761-766.

Patel, Anand B., Jeff Pade, Victoria Cundiff and Bradford Newman. “A Quick Guide Comparing the Defend Trade Secrets Act and the EU Trade Secrets Directive.” Paul Hastings. June 2016. <http://www.paulhastings.com/publications-items/details/?id=4071e969-2334-6428-811c-ff00004cbded>.

Pooley, James. “Trade Secrets: the Other IP Right.” *WIPO Magazine* June 2013. http://www.wipo.int/wipo_magazine/en/2013/03/article_0001.html.

Roffe, Pedro and Christoph Spennemann. “The Impact of FTAs on Public Health Policies and TRIPS Flexibilities.” *Int. J. Intellectual Property Management* 1, no. 1/2 (2006): 75-93.

The World Bank. “World Development Indicators.” <http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/BM.GSR.ROYL.CD> (accessed December 15, 2015).

Thomas, John R. “The Role of Trade Secrets in Innovation Policy.” Congressional Research Service Report R41391, January 15, 2014. <https://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/secretcy/R41391.pdf>.

U.S. Chamber of Commerce. “The Case for Enhanced Protection of Trade Secrets in the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement,” 2014. https://www.uschamber.com/sites/default/files/legacy/international/files/Final%20TPP%20Trade%20Secrets%208_0.pdf.

U.S. International Trade Commission (USITC). *China: Effects of Intellectual Property Infringement and Indigenous Innovation Policies on the U.S. Economy*. Publication 4226. Washington, DC: USITC, 2011.

The Importance of Trade Secrets

USITC. *Trade, Investment, and Industrial Policies in India: Effects on the U.S. Economy*. Publication 4501. Washington, DC: USITC, 2014.

U.S. Trade Representative (USTR). *2016 Special 301 Report*. April 2016. <https://ustr.gov/sites/default/files/USTR-2016-Special-301-Report.pdf>.

USTR. “U.S. Fact Sheet: 26th U.S.-China Joint Commission on Commerce and Trade.” November 2015. <https://ustr.gov/about-us/policy-offices/press-office/fact-sheets/2015/november/us-fact-sheet-26th-us-china-joint>.

USTR. “United States and India Joint Statement on the Trade Policy Forum.” October 2015. <https://ustr.gov/about-us/policy-offices/press-office/press-releases/2015/october/united-states-and-india-joint>.

World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO). Case Studies on Intellectual Property (IP Advantage) Database. <http://www.wipo.int/ipadvantage/en/> (accessed June 15, 2016).

WIPO. “Patents or Trade Secrets?” http://www.wipo.int/sme/en/ip_business/trade_secrets/patent_trade.htm (accessed June 17, 2016).

Zhang, Jihong, Ding Du, and Walter G. Park. “How Private Property Protection Influences the Impact of Intellectual Property Rights on Economic Growth?” *Global Economic Review* 44, no.1 (2015): 1-30.