**BIO 2019 – Session Details and Outline**

**Details**

**Title:** Navigating Translation: Leveraging Public Private Partnerships to Turn Academic Discoveries into Health

**Track:** Translational Research

**Session ID:** 503572

**Time and Date:** Tuesday, June 4th, 11am-12:15pm

**Location:** 112AB, Level 100

**Outline**

* Session and panelist introductions
	+ Session Introduction (5 min, Kathleen) – brief intro of session purpose, etc.
	+ Individual Panelists Introductions/Tee Up Problems –panelists will introduce themselves and briefly describe biggest challenges faced in advancing academic technologies from (1) institutional, (2) industry, and (3) innovator perspectives
		- Suguna (5 min)
		- Chris (5min)
		- Joe (5min)
* Government programs designed and available to address translational challenges
	+ NIH NCAI/REACH/Catalyze – KR (5-8min)
	+ NSF PFI - Jesus (5-8 min)
* Moderator prompted discussion from set questions (25 min, all panelists)
* Audience discussion Q&A (15-20 min)

Anticipated Audience for Panel:

TTO

Technology Scouts

Entrepreneurial scientists

BioPharma In-Licensing/Partnering Execs

Early spinouts

**PANEL PURPOSE AND QUESTIONS FOR CONSIDERATION**

**Purpose – Take home messages for the audience so that innovative technologies don’t get lost in the academic institutions:**

* Successful ways in which technologies arising in federal and academic settings can be developed successfully?
	+ How federal and academic technologies need to be developed to attract industry interest
* How federal and academic innovation programs should be structured or modified to address some of the problems of successful lab to market transitions
	+ How industry development partners view these programs

**Panel Questions for Consideration:**

* CASE STUDY: (provide a case study example that includes methods of stakeholder engagement and management and what makes technology ready for a partner)
	+ Can you provide a specific example or case study of the process through which the academic or federal technology developers successfully engaged industry? This can focus on whether it is a ”push” or a “pull” method.
		- How did you go about reaching out to industry or did industry come to you? – Do institutions have formal partnering strategies or does an innovator figure points of engagement out alone?
		- What are the most successful strategies for engagement or for making potential partners aware of your technology?
		- What are successful practices for keeping prospective partners engaged throughout the technology development process (which can be long and suffer multiple pitfalls and false turns)?
		- What does an innovator need to do to prepare a technology to be at the appropriate stage for partner interest?
* What does industry focus on for translational technologies?
	+ Industry Interest
		- What is early stage vs too early stage in the eyes of industry. When should academics engage industry partners and what are some strategies to do so? Does the strategy depend on the stage?
			* **For Chris** - you have worked at both midsize and small companies – are there differences in what these companies are looking for? Are there differences in large vs. midsize?
			* Who should pitch the technology to a potential industry collaborator/partner—the investigator/developer or the folks from TTO office or a combined effort?
			* Do companies post where their licensing/partnering interests do and don’t lie?
			* How often do these interests change and what are the engagement points for innovators?
				+ How best to engage with industry – is there an innovation department, areas of interest, etc? Are sponsored research agreements typically common for most industry partnerships?
			* What does it take for the company’s diligence team to give constructive feedback on why a technology/asset from academia has not moved forward—other than it is too early, not a strategic fit etc? Does every asset that comes through your pipeline gets evaluated?
		- Innovator considerations:
			* For innovators that have a promising technology, what are the TO Dos and Not to Dos, from the industry perspective?
			* What data are needed to be sufficiently attractive from a commercial perspective?
				+ How do /What should innovators do to address differentiation, risk mitigation, clinical validation parameters?
			* **For Joe**, his team struggled with not knowing exactly what an acceptable ROI would be. Can you speak to what is a big enough opportunity to get a potential partner’s attention? How profitable is profitable enough? And how risky is too risky?
			* What is the best way for an innovator to understand what the next steps in terms of both product development and technology valuation are is and how to get there? What are some key differences between industry partnerships vs angel or venture investments?
		- Institutional considerations:
			* How important to the development process is having the buy-in or support of the TTO and institution? What have they invested to de-risk the technology? Do they have skin-in-the-game?
			* In most institutions, faculty evaluation/advancement does not depend on product development milestones. What advice do you have for faculty who want to develop products? How should their frame their decision to balance or stay/leave an academic post versus working in industry?
			* For successful technologies, what are the primary ways in which your program or industry helped the technology move forward in a way that might not have been possible for an isolated innovator?
* Program level questions
	+ What are the attributes of a program to make technology attractive? What type of support should be available or what would you like to help to make a technology more attractive to investors?
	+ How do programs like this help innovators decide the best path forward for their technology. whether to license, start a company, etc.
	+ Many innovators and technologies that have gone through an entrepreneurial education programs, such as I-Corps, have had exhibited successful outcomes. What aspects of these programs are most critical?
		- For programs such as the NCAI and REACH, technologies go through industry rigor for review and milestone-driven processes with tranched funding. How important is this aspect of the development to engage industry interest?