

28 February 2011

NeuroLeadership Institute Announcement

Dear members, stakeholders and friends of the NeuroLeadership Institute,

We are aware that we are somewhat overdue on a written announcement of what was discussed verbally on some telecalls late in 2010 around use of the terms NeuroLeadership and SCARF.

We apologize for the delay. Some of this is due to reflecting more so we can make a decision in the best interests of all.

Re use of the term NEUROLEADERSHIP

We are not intending to trademark the term '*NeuroLeadership*' itself. If people want to write about, talk about or research within the NeuroLeadership field, they are free to do so.

However, the NeuroLeadership Institute is in the process of trademarking the term *NeuroLeadership Institute* to protect the significant investment that has been made in building awareness of this brand.

This is occurring in all the big global markets. We have realized that it will disadvantage the NLI and our members if we do not take this action now, as many people will attempt to set up educational initiatives that may confuse the field.

The NLI's trademarks will inhibit people from setting up another trademark, brand name, product name or company name without permission, that appears close to the term *NeuroLeadership Institute*, within the fields of consulting, training and education.

For people who want to get involved in commercializing what they learn through the NLI, there are hundreds of other terms that can be used as company names or brands, that do not infringe on the significant investment that the NLI has made in the term *NeuroLeadership Institute*.

For example, *brain based leadership, brainleadership, neuroinsight, synaptic leadership, cortical leadership, Leadership brain, leaderbrain, etc.* The NLI's trademarks only stop people from setting up a company, brand or product name that creates a perception of a link to the NLI when there is none, it will not slow down growth of the overall field, or inhibit people using the research fairly.

With this in mind, the following kinds of terms would not be advisable as company or brand names: *NeuroLeadership Consulting, NeuroLeadership Education, NeuroLeadership Training, NeuroLeadership Learning, The Center for NeuroLeadership, The Association for NeuroLeadership, etc.*

FAQ's re NeuroLeadership:

What will this mean for the development of the field?

This action will in no way stop people from discussing, researching and sharing the knowledge coming out of the field. It will only inhibit people setting up company, brand or product names using the term *NeuroLeadership* in the title. Given the NLI's intensive investment in building awareness of this term, we feel this is only fair.

On the upside, this means the field will have one major body representing the research.

Does this mean I can't mention the term NeuroLeadership?

NeuroLeadership is a field of study, and we expect many people to get involved in the field. Anyone can mention the NeuroLeadership field and the research emerging from it.

This decision will only affect people who want to set up company, brand or product names that compete with the term *NeuroLeadership Institute*.

What does this mean if I planned to start a company with the term NeuroLeadership in the title?

We will indeed take polite action initially to let people know of our stance, and if consensus is not reached through discussions, we will take legal action. We are already in discussion with parties who have at this point set up company names that breach the NLI trademarks and are expecting a friendly resolution to this matter.

The NLI Post Graduate program says it will help me 'teach neuroleadership'. What does that mean exactly?

The post graduate and masters programs provide people with a framework to understand the links between neuroscience and leadership. There is no implied license or permission to use the specific course outline or intellectual property owned by the NLI.

People are free to develop their own training programs and other uses of the research that do not infringe on the IP of the NLI.

Most people have worked this out and are doing great things with the research, incorporating the research into a range of initiatives, without directly using the specific syllabus the NLI teaches.

There are varying laws in each country governing the use of the intellectual property of a company without permission.

How do you see the growth of the field happening, given that you are trademarking a key term?

We do not expect the trademarking to stop people using the brain research in many useful ways. Only to inhibit people from setting up brand names too close to the NLI that create confusion in the market. Again, it's the branding that is the big issue.

We expect to establish formal licensing arrangements for the use of the NLI programs and name. These will generally be with respected universities, and discussions along these lines are already under way. It is important for the integrity of the field that the NLI collaborates closely with a wide range of universities.

Please direct any further questions about the issue of the use of the term NeuroLeadership to Lee Hull, leehull@neuroleadership.org. If there are further questions that need addressing we will do a further group communication to stakeholders.

Re use of the term SCARF

The SCARF model was first put into the public domain within Your Brain at Work in 2009. SCARF is covered by the copyright of that book. SCARF is also in the process of being trademarked as a model, by David Rock personally.

People are free to discuss, research, share or talk about the SCARF model, like any idea in any book.

Any reference to the model should be attributed back to David Rock, linking back to that book.

However, if anyone wants to *commercialize* the SCARF model, that's where they would need to seek permission from David Rock directly, as SCARF is intellectual property he developed (which took over 5 years of work to create).

Commercializing means including the model in a training program that people pay to attend, or creating a commercial assessment or other tool based on the SCARF framework. Or including the idea in a book. Or anything where SCARF is explained and someone is attempting to claim copyright over SCARF.

David Rock has been giving permission to people to use SCARF in books and commercial training programs where it makes sense to.

Once again - it is the commercial usage of the model that is the issue here, not discussing it, studying it, researching it etc. You can buy, drink, research and talk about Coca Cola, but don't try to create or sell a product with that name or that alludes to contain it without permission. The same applies here.

FAQ's re SCARF:

How do I properly reference the model if sharing it non commercially?

Referencing in Harvard Style would be:

Rock, D. (2009) Your Brain at Work, Collins, New York.

Where has David been giving permission to use SCARF?

David has given permission for use in schools, educational settings, and in situations that are non competitive to the work David is involved in. However you should seek permission directly from David Rock if planning to discuss SCARF in any commercial product.

How do I gain permission to use the SCARF model commercially?

Email DavidRock@ResultsCoaches.com

What if I want to run a workshop based on SCARF inside my organization?

David's consulting firm, Results Coaching Systems, has a range of products including assessments and workshops based on SCARF.

Email DavidRock@ResultsCoaches.com

Any further questions about the use of SCARF please contact David Rock directly, on DavidRock@ResultsCoaches.com.

Thank you for your interest and involvement in the NeuroLeadership Institute. We trust this provides more certainty around the use of these terms and outlines a framework to ensure the future integrity and success of the work of the NeuroLeadership Institute and the advancement of the NeuroLeadership field.

Kind regards

Leonie Hull

General Manager

NeuroLeadership Institute

E: leehull@neuroleadership.org