

CITY OF LONDON LAW SOCIETY (“CLLS”) IP LAW COMMITTEE
(THE “COMMITTEE”)

Minutes of the Committee Meeting held at 6:00pm on 4 December 2024 at the offices of CMS Cameron McKenna Nabarro Olswang LLP, Cannon Place, 78 Cannon Street, London, EC4N 6AF (the “**Meeting**”) hosted by David Parrish.

Present: David Parrish, CMS (Chair)
Rachel Anderson, CMS (RA) (Secretary)
Jessica Le Gros, Baker McKenzie (JLG)
Adam Rendle, Taylor Wessing (AR)
Beverley Potts, A&O Shearman (BP)
Caroline Young, Charles Russell Speechlys (CY)
Emily Nuttall-Wood, Addleshaw Goddard (ENW)
Jonathan Turnbull, Herbert Smith Freehills (JT)
Oliver Fairhurst, Lewis Silkin (OF)
Priya Nagpal, Simmons & Simmons (PN)

In attendance: Kevin Hart, CLLS (KH)
George Kyrke-Smith, Panterra (GKS),

Apologies: Mike Knapper, Norton Rose Fulbright (MK)
Morag Macdonald, Bird & Bird (MM)
Emily Nuttall-Wood, Addleshaw Goddard (ENW)
Huw Evans, Gowling (HW)

together, the “**Members**”.

1. Welcome from the Chair and introductions

The Chair opened the inaugural Meeting of the Committee and welcomed all Members, thanking them for their attendance. The Members gave introductions to the Committee. The CLLS Rep introduced himself as a representative of the CLLS and as the manager of 21 other pre-existing CLLS committees. This Committee was to be the 22nd Specialist Committee.

2. Apologies

Apologies from the individuals listed above were received.

3. Secretary

The Chair consulted KH for the title of the role that will support him in his role as Chairman to the Committee, and it was agreed that RA should be appointed as Secretary to the Committee.

4. Objectives of the Committee

4.1 The Chair outlined that the main objective for the Meeting was to make introductions and for Members to consider the key priorities for the Committee going forward.

4.2 The Chair referred to his interview in “Managing IP” (dated 13 November 2024) in which he discussed what he expected to be the key concerns for the Committee in promoting the interests of London-based IP practitioners, firms, and their clients. The Chair had emailed the Members prior to the Meeting to ask them to consider what they think these objectives should be. MK,

who had sent his apologies for his absence, had emailed ahead of the Meeting to express his agreement with the Chair that AI would be a key discussion point for the Committee.

4.3 The Chair opened the floor to Members for them to share their thoughts on the Committee's objectives and the following points were discussed:

- 4.3.1 the creation of a sense of community within IP City law firms, across the entire IP profession. A number of other CLLS committees had already expressed an interest in working directly with the IP Committee – for example the data and AI committees.
- 4.3.2 it was noted that there are a number of existing IP specialist committees who already carry out substantial work, so we should make a conscious effort not to simply rehash this work, but to focus on issues that are particularly relevant to city law firms and the kind of clients these firms have. It was agreed that as the Committee was not the only IP committee in existence, we would want to avoid duplication of work.
- 4.3.3 the importance of achieving tangible results was emphasised, and real achievement that goes beyond just talking points. It will be imperative that the Committee sets and meets deadlines for itself.
- 4.3.4 it was added that the internationalism of the City of London is something that should be leveraged in order for the Committee to reach its goals.
- 4.3.5 Members also suggested that we would need to consider how the “community” would sit alongside IPSoc, to avoid overlapping.
- 4.3.6 it was highlighted that in relation to creator remuneration, and creators in the music industry, the UK is shortly about to have a broad exception that will take away from rightsholders. There has been no consideration by policymakers of the bigger picture and how this sits in with the existing regime. This may be an area in which the Committee can input.
- 4.3.7 it was suggested that in terms of Committee objectives, clients will want us to be thought leaders in the space. Anything we can do in terms of horizon scanning is always highly valuable. It will be useful to share our own experiences and connections and leverage these.

5. Intersection with AI

In terms of copyright specialists, there was only one major topic of discussion in copyright at the moment – AI. The UK IPO is set to publish guidance on the relationship between copyright and AI before Christmas 2024. It would be sensible for the Committee to contribute to a UK IPO consultation like this. There is a considerable number of rightsholders that need to be taken into account, and the Committee (due to its clients) is well-placed to inform the UK IPO of their particular concerns.

6. Press and media:

GKS said that the Committee could use him as a resource to promote the Committee in newspapers and social media. There is a great network of mainstream press that is very interested in the CLLS. GKS referred to a recent example where a CLLS response to the SRA's fining powers proposal got a high level of media traction.

7. Training junior lawyers:

- 7.1 It was recommended that the Committee should make a conscious effort to train junior lawyers, particularly alongside the accelerated growth of AI.
- 7.2 Where some junior associates trained during the pandemic, there has been less opportunity for them to develop soft skills at client events. We need to ensure that the junior cohort is able to achieve as much as it has the potential to.
- 7.3 Members pointed out that Harvey is being rolled out across firms. As a result of such AI tools, it is necessary to train junior lawyers at a much greater speed.
- 7.4 The growth of AI means that human additives such as strategic thinking will become more important earlier on. This emphasises the need to give junior lawyers the resources that are needed to help them improve soft skills such as strategic and technical training. This is especially true where grunt work is being hollowed out.
- 7.5 In addition, it was added that junior lawyers often become an expert in a narrow area of IP very early on. Partners may be doing a broader range of IP work, and this increases the value of a pan-IP Committee. It will therefore be important for the IP Committee to represent all types of IP rights. Although junior IP practitioners will often meet each other on the IP diploma and INTA as they get more senior, we generally leave them to themselves when it comes to skills training.
- 7.6 BP added that she can provide a lot of help when it comes to training junior lawyers (as this is a big part of her current role).

8. Relationship with other Committees

- 8.1 It was asked whether we want to use our position to lobby IP courts. A Member responded that some of the Committee's work would plainly be reactive, but it will also be necessary for the Committee to be proactive.
- 8.2 It was concluded that if a UK IPO consultation is being run, the Committee should submit feedback (although other committees and networks may contribute to consultations, this does not mean that we should not also contribute, as there will inevitably be overlap with other committees).
- 8.3 It was highlighted that connections with other CLLS committees will help with lobbying government. Tomorrow, there is a meeting of all the CLLS committees that the Chair will attend. This network will give increased traction to any recommendations that we want to persuade the government to take.

9. Covering off all IP rights

The Chair explained that he had wanted to ensure that every single IP right was covered off in the make-up of the Committee. The Members had been successful in achieving this.

10. Collaboration with the UK government

- 10.1 Similarly to the Arbitration Committee that made it an objective to sell London as an arbitration forum, the Committee can try to sell London as a location for big ticket disputes like patent litigation. GKS added that a publicity strategy and targeting press really helped the Arbitration Committee to realise its goal of promoting London.

- 10.2 **Action** – KH to contact the Arbitration Committee to find out more about their role in selling London as an arbitration forum and to revert to the committee at its next meeting.
- 10.3 There is also an opportunity to promote London as a legal destination, as the government looks to promote the growth that the legal profession brings in to the UK. Alignment with EU law is another issue that was raised, following the friction caused by Brexit.
- 10.4 It was pointed out that the CLLS is made up of 67 impressive firms, which gives the CLLS a lot of heft when it comes to promoting committees in the media.

11. What distinguishes the practice of IP in the City of London?

The spend that clients are willing to make is a distinguishing factor. We also have clients that are willing to push the boundaries and try and make a change in the law, for example on the regime concerning the exhaustion of IP rights.

12. Collaboration with CITMA

- 12.1 The Chair had mentioned representation at the UK IPO in his article. The Committee discussed whether this should be a key objective, given that CITMA were already doing a lot of work in this area. It was decided that CITMA would probably appreciate another voice supporting its position. The Chair added that the President of CITMA (Kelly Saliger) is a partner in the IP team in his firm.
- 12.2 **Action** – the Chair to discuss this with Kelly.

13. Housekeeping for CLLS Committees

- 13.1 KH explained the necessary housekeeping for CLLS committees, which were:
- 13.1.1 committees should meet a minimum of 4 times a year;
 - 13.1.2 CLLS encourages in-person meetings, as it better enables collaboration;
 - 13.1.3 CLLS have their own LinkedIn page and each committee has its own sub-page (the Members will be invited to this);
 - 13.1.4 **Action:** 1 Member volunteer will be needed to manage the LinkedIn page to moderate comments (the aim of the page is to be relatively conversational, and is a way for informing the community of what matters have come across Members' desks without breaching client confidentiality);
 - 13.1.5 meeting minutes will be taken and be publicly available on the CLLS website (the minutes will take a relatively high-level and anonymised form);
 - 13.1.6 **Action:** All Committee Members to connect with each other on LinkedIn to enable them to promote the Committee;
 - 13.1.7 after the next meeting (which will be at the CMS offices) the idea is that there is a rotation of firms hosting the meeting; and
 - 13.1.8 one meeting a year will be "*outward-facing*". This could be a drinks reception or a guest speaker. This will likely take place towards the end of 2025. KH added that he is keen to promote the human and pastoral element of CLLS.

- 13.2 It was encouraged that everyone promote the Committee on LinkedIn to publicise that the Committee is up and running.

14. Bridges programme

The CLLS operates as a programme of “*bridges*”. The CEO of CLLS (Matthew Rous) has volunteered to be a bridge between the IP Committee and the main specialist committee. He will drop into committee meetings occasionally in order to report developments back to the main committee.

15. Next meeting

Subject to the agreement of those in absentia, the following meeting dates were suggested:

- Wednesday 12 February 2025 – 6pm – Hosted by the Chair @ CMS.
- Wednesday 7 May 2025 – 6pm – Host to be confirmed.

The Chair will ask the Members who sent their apologies to share their ideas for Committee objectives at the next meeting.

16. AOB

No other areas of business were raised. The Chair thanked all attendees for a successful inaugural meeting.