

structure of the typology and I list the various categories of intermediaries (for the full typology, see this [powerpoint presentation](#)).

INTERMEDIARIES FOR “PRE-PATENT” IDEAS: (1) Innovation portals

INTERMEDIARIES FOR PATENTED IP

* *Patent intermediaries*

-> **Transaction facilitators**: (2) Online IP platforms, (3) IP auction houses, (4) IP (patent) brokers / Licensing agents, (5) IP transaction exchanges & trading platforms

-> **Merchants**

Aggressive attitude: (6) Patent Licensing and Enforcement Companies (PLECs), (7) IP acquisition funds, (8) Litigation finance/investment firms

Defensive attitude: (9) Defensive patent aggregators, (10) Privateers, (11) Super-aggregators

* *IP management & support services*: (12) IP-based M&A advisory firms, (13) IP-backed lending firms, (14) Royalty stream securitization firms, (15) Analytics software and services firms, (16) Technology/IP spinout financing, (17) IP insurance carriers, (18) University technology transfer intermediaries.



Source: www.elushika.com

Researchers at [Fraunhofer MOEZ](#) have done a very similar work (but in a much more exhaustive way): they have built a typology for all services that are provided by IP practitioners (the current version can be consulted [here](#)). When you click on the headlines of the several service descriptions, you will find a larger number of companies that are already providing the corresponding service.

An important research question that these typologies may help addressing is the following: *How much social value, if any, do these various types of intermediaries contribute?*

On this blog (see [here](#) and [here](#)), we have already questioned the social contribution of some of these intermediaries, namely the so-called “patent trolls” (which belong to the category of ‘Patent Licensing and Enforcement Companies (PLECs)’ in my typology).

What I ask you to do is to carry out the same analysis for other types of intermediaries. What kind

of social value do they bring?