Message From The Chair

by Susanne Hantos, PIUG Chair 2012-2014

One of the most valuable benefits of joining the PIUG is the opportunity to meet others in our profession and share information about best practices and the new developments impacting on patent information. Judging from the positive responses received about this year’s annual conference, the event proved to be an enriching forum of information. Delegates from industry, patent offices and patent information aggregators presented valuable information about the steady progress being made to improve access to patent data as well as the different approaches taken in working with patent information. We also learned from the insightful presentations and workshops on the recent monumental changes to US patent law, the implementation of the new CPC patent classification system and even a workshop on Personal Branding for PIUG members to help them with their professional development. All of these workshops were very well received.

The conference was also highly memorable as it marked the 25th anniversary of the PIUG. As part of the festivities for celebrating this important milestone, I had the privilege of presenting Ms Carol Bachmann of 3M the inaugural Stu Kaback Business Impact Award. The PIUG Board established this prestigious international award in January 2013 in order to recognize the important contribution and impact that patent information professionals make on their respective organizations. Carol was selected as this year’s recipient for her immense skill and passion in creating a robust current awareness patent tool and database that is used by 3M personnel worldwide to aid in strategic decision making. Congratulations Carol on creating such a legacy! Further information about the Stu Kaback Business Impact Award, including the criteria for nomination, can be found at http://wiki.piug.org/x/HwDkAQ.

We also honoured the remarkable career and achievements of Dr Sandra Unger who is this year’s IPI Award recipient. As a former PIUG Chair, it was Sandra’s exceptional vision and leadership that enabled the international recognition that PIUG enjoys today. Her steadfast dedication to improving the professional development of patent information professionals is evident in the thousands of hours she whole-heartedly gave and the personal risk she took on in helping to create the international community that is the PIUG today. It is only befitting that her international peers recognize Sandra’s amazing achievements with this prestigious award. Congratulations Sandra!

Continued next page.
In addition to the remarkable accomplishments of these two awe-inspiring colleagues, the past year has also proven to be a remarkable year for the PIUG Board. During the PIUG 2013 Business Meeting that was held on April 28, 2013, I informed the members that the PIUG and its former association management company signed a Mutual Release & Termination Agreement on April 2, 2013. This agreement effectively ended our relationship, enabled the return of all PIUG property and eliminated the risk of a lawsuit being brought by either organization in connection with the terminated contract. This was an absolutely critical step in resolving the contractual matter that arose last year. For further details, please see my membership communication posts on the PIUG wiki discussion forum dated July 9, 2012 (http://wiki.piug.org/x/pQORAQ), October 11, 2012 (http://wiki.piug.org/x/fADGAQ), January 30, 2013 (http://wiki.piug.org/x/oAXZAQ) and April 3, 2013 (http://wiki.piug.org/x/WgnZAQ).

The PIUG Treasurer, Ken Koubek, also informed the members at the 2013 Business Meeting that the PIUG Board managed to restore the organization’s cash flow in under one year, despite the deficit that the current Board inherited when it took office in June 2012 following last year’s annual conference. I am also pleased to advise that we cleared a modest amount of revenue after having paid all of the costs associated with the 2013 Annual Conference. PIUG is thus once again on solid financial footing thanks to controlled spending and various cost cutting measures implemented by the Board. For further financial details, please see the Treasurer’s 2013 Report at slides 40-48 of the 2013 PIUG Business Meeting presentation at http://wiki.piug.org/x/hgrZAQ.

Of course, the main reason for the positive financial outcome from this year’s annual conference is that the PIUG is no longer paying thousands of dollars per month for association management. The realistic outcome, however, of not having some form of paid management is that the daily tasks of running the organization falls entirely on the shoulders of the Board. This in turn takes away precious time that should be devoted to developing the organization. During the 2013 Business Meeting, the Strategic Committee unveiled to the members its five year strategic plan for the organization. In its plan, the Strategic Committee made a number of recommendations to the PIUG Board including:

- retaining a recruitment agency in order to hire an Executive Director (ED) to manage the day-to-day needs of the organization;
- retaining the services of a national marketing agency to promote the PIUG and its events and offerings;
- hiring a book-keeper on at least a quarterly basis (in addition to the annual financial review already being conducted by the professional accountant);
- forming a Revenue Development Committee (to focus on revenue generation from activities unrelated to the PIUG conferences);
- developing written Standard Operating Procedures for the Board and for every committee; and
- creating an annual plan to raise funds, hold meetings, train patent users, market the organization to the patent community worldwide and maintain and increase the relevance of PIUG for existing and future members and sponsors.

A copy of the Strategic Committee’s full report can be found attached to my June 24, 2013 post on the discussion forum of the PIUG wiki at: http://wiki.piug.org/x/yADkAQ. In order to implement these recommendations, the PIUG will not only need to draw on the revenue generated to date, but it will likely also need to rely on at least a portion of its $239K reserve (see the Treasurer’s 2013 Report referenced above). It is also anticipated by the Strategic Committee at page 8 of its 2013-2017 Strategic Plan, that membership dues may need to be increased by a few hundred dollars in order to help pay for the hired services that have been proposed. In addition, it has also been suggested that the PIUG Board arrange a line of credit with the bank as a fall back mechanism in the event the organization falls short of its financial obligations.

“I invite all PIUG members to ask questions, provide comments and suggestions in response to my June 24, 2013 post concerning the Strategic Committee’s five year plan.”

I invite all PIUG members to ask questions, provide comments and suggestions in response to my June 24, 2013 post concerning the Strategic Committee’s five year plan. Please let us have your comments by July 25, 2013 if at all possible. Should you wish to post your comments, questions or suggestions anonymously, please use one of the generic login profiles available at: http://wiki.piug.org/x/SwGRAQ. By having an open and constructive dialogue and debate, it is hoped that the best outcome for the PIUG can be achieved.
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Note From the Editor

By Martha Yates

This newsletter marks a change in the PIUG newsletter. I have shifted the publication schedule to better serve the members. What I hope to accomplish is to provide more timely reporting of the meetings. Therefore, there will be a newsletter in June after the Annual meeting and including the Biotech meeting and a newsletter in November after the North East meeting. I have considered a third newsletter for March after the Biotech meeting and welcome feedback on that idea. Because of the delay this spring, this newsletter is packed to the gills with information. We have a write-up on the North East meeting from Kim Miller. There is a report on the Biotech meeting from Gin-Yun Giggerichs. We have several items from the Annual meeting including the IPI Award and the inaugural Stu Kaback award. I hope going forward that I can convince many of you to contribute meeting reports. We are also lucky to have yet another installment from Ron Kaminecki.

A big thank you goes to our photographers Sandra Unger, Jim Brown, Tom Wolff, and John Marlin. Sandra has been our photo and video guru for many years and maintains our photo and video archives. Thank you Sandra for all the wonderful pictures!

Please let me know what would make the newsletter more relevant and interesting for you. And I would love any contributions that you care to make.

Martha Yates, editor
martha.j.yates@monsanto.com
636-737-5830
Contributors to this Issue

KIM MILLER
Kim Miller has a degree in chemistry from Western New England University. She began her chemistry searching career in 1997 and has been with Novartis since 2007. She has performed numerous patentability, FTO and (in)validity searches for patent attorneys and research scientists as well as lead project teams. In addition to these duties, Kim is currently involved in development and presentation of patent information classes and workshops for chemical scientist.

RON KAMINECKI
Ron Kaminecki is a U.S. Patent Attorney. Ron has worked in a variety of jobs, including as an Associate Information Specialist at the IIT Research Institute and Manager of Patent Information Resources at Abbott Laboratories, but has spent most of his career at Dialog under all five of its owners, starting with Lockheed Missiles and Space and ending with Proquest, Inc., and has always worked with intellectual property information. He has published in many journals, has presented many technical sessions at PIUG, American Chemical Society, Special Libraries, and other professional meetings. He is a co-author of NISO Standard Z-39.58 (“Common Command Language”) and has patents pending on a patent filing system using metadata. Ron has a BS in Chemistry, an MS in Computer Science and Information Systems, and a JD with a Certificate in Patent Law. He was a Patent Agent and is now a Patent Attorney and is a member of the Bar of the State of Illinois and the Northern District Court of Illinois.

GIN-YUN EGERICHs
Gin Eggerichs has a B.A. in Molecular Genetics and a Ph.D. in Molecular, Cellular, and Developmental Biology from The Ohio State University. After graduation, Gin worked as an Applications Specialist for Chemical Abstracts Service (CAS) for almost 6 years. As an Applications Specialist, she trained searchers at several pharmaceutical and chemical companies on search techniques such as text, patent search, and sequence searching using STN. In addition to her responsibilities to commercial customers, she also worked with the USPTO Patent Academy and Chinese Patent Academy (SIPO) and trained the newly enrolled examiners on STN searching. Gin joined the Abbott Legal Search team in 2012 and in 2013 moved to AbbVie Legal Search team after the company split. Gin's primary focus at AbbVie is to conduct patent/legal/literature searches in the biological area.
The PIUG Northeast conference held October 22-26, 2012, had a bit of a new look to it this year. The new venue was the Heldrich Hotel in New Brunswick, NJ. The New Brunswick location and wonderful program, was an obvious success as 110 people attended the plenary sessions and the workshops were well attended. Feedback showed 93% of respondents considered the meeting worthwhile and 84 % of respondents considered the workshop topics of interest.

Topping the list of presentations of interest were those discussing the impact of the America Invents Act (AIA) on searchers and the new Cooperative Patent Classification (CPC) codes. PIUG was happy to have BMS patent attorney Brian Walsh and Christopher Kim from the USPTO to discuss these important topics. The other top presentation was given by Hal Murray of ExxonMobil who showed us how to search for US government funded (e.g.: DOD and DOE) publications. A big thank you goes out to the program committee, Lucy Akers, Suzanne Robins, Don Walter and Rick Williams for your work creating the successful program.

The popular round table discussions were held again this year. Topics included:

- AIA and CPC and their impact on searching
- Analysis and visualization of patent (meta)data
- How do you manage alerts?
- Markush Structure Searching - Tools and Techniques
- PIUG Strategic Plan
- Semantic analysis of patent literature
- Training and Certification

Thank you to all the speakers and sponsors for your help in making this such a successful conference! I’d like to thank Shelley Pavlek, my co-chair, for “showing me the ropes” of conference chairing.

The PIUG Northeast conference 2013 will be held again at the Heldrich Hotel September 30 – October 2, 2013. Concerns over the small plenary session room have been addressed and we will be in the Heldrich’s Amphitheater - Save the date and join us! •
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PIUG-2013 Biotechnology Meeting Overview

By Gin Eggerichs

The 2013 PIUG Biotechnology Meeting was held on February 26, 2013 at Amgen, Inc. (Cambridge Massachusetts) with 64 registered participants, representing 42 organizations, 8 sponsors, and 19 volunteers. The 2013 meeting was titled, “Meeting Challenges in Biotechnology Patent Searching” with 11 speaker presentations. As a new searcher, this meeting addressed several challenges that I have encountered and will encounter as I progress in the patent searching world. In this overview, I am providing (non-vendor) speaker highlights from the meeting. Presentations from the meeting are available, for members only, on the PIUG Web page.

David Nguyen, from the USPTO, was the first speaker of the day and the title of his presentation was “Update on Sequence Listings in Patent Applications”. David discussed several guidelines including strictly enforced formatting for sequence listings when submitting to the USPTO. For instance, when submitting a sequence, the 3-letter amino acid abbreviations must have the first letter in upper case and the remaining letters in lower case. If you submit a nucleic acid sequence, then the nucleotide abbreviations must be in lower case.

David then provided a brief overview diagram on the examiner’s examination steps (either self-help-electronic or solicit help-human) after the application gets docketed. He gave a high-level example of an examiner’s thought process when examining a sequence submitted in an application.

Finally, David spent some time describing the revision of WIPO ST.25 to ST.26. The Committee on WIPO Standards (CWS) established a Task Force in October 2010 to revise ST.25 and expects to adopt the new standard in 2014. A couple of ST. 26 revisions are 1) the format is XML rather than text format, and 2) the inclusion of modified nucleic acids and amino acids not previously provided for (e.g., D-amino acids, PNAIs, morpholinolos).

Anita Varma, cohead of Ropes & Gray’s Intellectual Property Rights Management Practice Group, was the 2nd speaker of the morning, and her presentation was titled, “An Attorney’s Perspective on Biotech-Related International FTO Searches”.

Anita first spent some time discussing what FTO search means and the reasons for conducting this type of search. Depending on the goal of the attorney and/or company, an FTO may be (1) a simple undertaking to understand the competitive patent landscape; or (2) a comprehensive undertaking to determine potential legal liability that could arise from 3rd party patent rights. The drive for an FTO

Continued next page.
search/analysis, according to Anita, is based on “Cost (Risk)/Benefit”. 

Next, Anita discussed some of the guidelines for developing an FTO search. One of the key points is that an FTO search is not one search query; rather, it will require a combination of different search strategies, using various databases (both free and commercial) in order to obtain the complete information. For instance, the FTO search may require a text search, a patent assignee search, a sequence search, and/or a structure search. Anita also suggested that when conducting an international FTO search, work with local agents in that country to help gather additional information. For instance, in Brazil, the patent process is complex and slow. The granted Brazilian patents are shipped to another location before they are made publicly available. However, the timing of the shipment may be 3-4 months. Using a local agent, he/she will be able to determine whether a patent has been granted or not.

**Tobias Pawliczek**, a Patent & Scientific Analyst at Novartis Pharma in Basel, Switzerland, was the third speaker for the morning. His presentation was titled, “Getting the Right Message: Following Real-time Translation of Patent Information by Partnering with Patent Attorneys”.

In Tobias’s presentation, he cleverly used protein synthesis as a comparison to describe the process of patent searching and analysis. For instance, he described global information as genomic information – because of the massive information available. To find and understand the relevant information, searchers (a.k.a. RNA polymerase) conducts patent and scientific literature search (a.k.a. transcription) in several databases to obtain results (a.k.a. mRNA). After obtaining the results, searchers need to work with attorneys (a.k.a. ribosomes) to analyze/discuss (a.k.a. translation) the results. Finally, the attorneys can then form legal opinions (a.k.a. proteins) about the project.

Tobias then focused on the wording evolution of claims during the patent filing progression. A claimed compound was described to treat or prevent “CNS disorders” in the PCT Application. Then, when the applicant filed for a US application, the term “CNS disorders” is written as “Central Nervous System (“CNS”) disorders”. However, when the same applicant filed for an EP patent, “CNS disorders” is described as “for use in therapy”. Just like amino acid codons, each amino acid (with the exception of one – MET) can be translated from several codons.

**Kristine Atkinson**, from Boston Scientific, was the first speaker for the afternoon session. The title of her presentation was “Lossy Data Compression in Patent Informatics”.

In Kristine’s presentation, she discussed data compression, what is it and why use it. There are several types of data compression – audio, video, image, text, etc. Virtually all patent authorities use OCR (Optical Character Recognition) as way to capture large amount of patent data for electronic compression. However, OCR is an image capture and not a text capture. So that translates to low percentage in accuracy, about 75% in 1999. With the advancement of technology, the OCR accuracy has improved to about 99.99% (2012) which allows for increased data compression. She continued the session with guidelines to improve OCR, such as pixilation, saturation, and color.

**Seth Mendelson**, from Novartis Institute of Biomedical Research, was the second speaker for the afternoon session. His presentation was titled, “DIY Searching”. Seth cleverly used everyday projects such as DIY (Do It Yourself) tiling projects as a way to describe how to prepare the search and tie everything together for the final report. To help us picture
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searching as a DIY project, Seth appeared in a handyman’s outfit.

Seth started the presentation by showing us a picture of a badly tiled floor. He commented that in order to tile the floor correctly, there are a few things that one has to do, such as preparation – getting the right tools, and interviewing with the attorneys (a.k.a. homework) – understand additional details of the search request. Seth shared with us several external resources that he uses when looking for sequence synonyms, resources such as GeneCard (http://www.genecards.org/), Harvestor Portal (http://harvester.kit.edu/HarvesterPortal), and STN (http://www.cas.org/). He also suggested that Patent Offices such as EPO Register (https://register.epo.org/espacenet/regviewer) and USPTO Public Pair (http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair/) are great resources for legal status, search reports, and file history.

Seth concluded that in his report to the attorneys, he provided supplemental information such as “literature of interest because… this is key paper” or “patent families that are of interest because… SEQ ID 15 has 95% identity over 100% of the length of the reference sequence” as part of his analysis. Seth commented that he spent most of his time analyzing the information and the least amount of his time searching.

The last sets of speakers were on a panel: Denis Bayada (GenomeQuest), Jim Brown (FIZ Karlsruhe), Diane Webb (BizInt Solutions), Alice Humel-Denton (Chemical Abstracts Service), Caroline Peel (Thomson Reuters). The panelists were asked a list of prepared questions and shared their expertise in patent searching, post processing, and database content. The questions provided to them ahead of time were:

1. What common difficult biotechnology/biosequence questions do you receive and how do you resolve them?
2. Do you have an interesting story from your experiences?
3. How do you see your role changing in the next five years?

A few interesting points that were discussed during the panel sessions:

- Thomson Reuters and Chemical Abstracts- Individual records created for mutated sequences
- GenomeQuest – sequence information provided as is by the applicant.
- Thomson Reuters - Individual records are created for claimed SEQ ID fragments where the whole sequence has not been claimed.
- CAS – sequences with less than 252 non-hydrogen atoms will have a structure associated with it.
- BLAST can be programmed to search for short sequences, although it is not optimized.
- GenomeQuest provides GenePast algorithm to search for short sequences.
- BizInt Smart Charts v. 3.5 now has the ability to include bibliographic data and sequence data.
- BizInt Reference row has the ability to create a sequence summary table.
- Text Fixed Width option in BizInt Smart Charts is now optimized for sequence alignment.

This year, the PIUG Biotech meeting was extremely helpful for me in my new role as a patent searcher. People always say that you never fully understand something unless you are “knee deep in the mud” with it, which is true in my case – going from a database vendor to a patent searcher. There were so many things that I learned from this meeting. Mastering searching comes from understanding the mechanics. The real challenge lies in the steps leading up to the search and the steps after the search – i.e., communication with the client/attorneys, analyzing the retrieved information, and the post processing of the information. This meeting addressed all those challenges, and as a new searcher, hearing others having the same issues as me makes me realize that I am not alone in spending a majority of my time on analyzing or post processing. Additionally, I picked up many tips and tricks that will allow me to do my job in a more efficient way. Overall, this year’s meeting was extremely helpful for me, both in the instruction from the topics and the discussions among the attendees. I look forward to next year’s meeting.

•
The International Patent Information Award was created to acknowledge the significant achievements of individuals and their service towards the advancement of patent information. This Award is sponsored by Technology & Patent Research International.

We are here tonight to honor the contributions of Dr. Sandra Unger and to present her with the Award.

Tonight we are gathered here to recognize one of the great pioneers in the patent information community. Every organization, especially when it is a volunteer group, depends on the dedication of its volunteers. Growth and survival often falls upon the shoulders of a few individuals who, through their leadership and hard work, direct the organization from strength to strength. The Patent Information Users Group (PIUG) owes much of its success today to the vision and determination of Dr. Sandra Unger, who has contributed her talents and energy to the PIUG for well over a decade.

Starting in 1995, Sandra served as the PIUG Discussion List System Operator, facilitating electronic communications in the pre-email days. By 1996, she had become the organization’s Vice Chair, and afterwards held the position of Chair. From 1998 to 2000, Sandra ran the PIUG Annual Meetings and ushered in a time of unprecedented growth. The organization experienced a surge in membership and participation, including expansion to the international community, which facilitated learning and development on the latest patent information topics and techniques in a rapidly-changing technological environment. Sandra also served on the PIUG Board of Directors until 2008 and she served as a member of the organization’s first Strategic Planning Committee.

Sandra Unger holds a Ph.D. in organometallic chemistry from Michigan State University under the direction of Dr. Robert Grubbs (a Nobel Prize winner) and a Masters of Computer Science from the New Jersey Institute of Technology. Sandra joined Exxon in 1979 and trained under the late Dr. Stuart Kaback to learn the subtle art of patent searching. In Sandra’s nearly 34 years at ExxonMobil Research and Engineering, her primary responsibilities have been patent searching and designing databases to store, analyze, and distribute the results of patent searches. Sandra also received a US patent (US5721910) on a database design for organizing patents and technical documents.

The Selection Board mainly recognizes Sandra’s service to the Patent Information Users Group, Inc. Her efforts provided a critical driving force which began to steer PIUG into the international domain. She was involved in the incorporation of PIUG, Inc. which ensured the organization was able to grow both smoothly and quickly. The importance of such an organization within the global patent information community cannot be understated; it gives a forum for each voice and a community within which to learn and share information. The Board recognizes that she took a personal risk to enable such a forum to become a reality. Her belief in the patent information community’s need for such a forum showed incredible dedication to the patent information industry. Also, her energy, enthusiasm, and dedication to the patent information profession provide a very high standard we may all strive to reach.

The nomination of Sandra Unger was proposed by Dr. Martin Goffman with seconding nominations from Dr. AJ D’Ambra, Dr. Pat Dedert, Dr. Stu Kaback, Nancy Lambert, Elliot Linder, Dr. Pat Lorenz, and Adrienne Shanler. •
IPI Award Speech

By Sandra Unger

“I must have been crazy. How could I think that a small group of volunteers could run a major professional conference. But look, we’ve done it! We’ve run major conferences since 1998. Let’s go back and see how this all happened...”

“Patent searching is a small profession. We are scattered, with one or two per company. I had the luxury of working in one of the larger groups of up to 11 searchers with Stu Kaback as my mentor.

Before PIUG, patent searchers gathered at user meetings organized by vendors with vendor agendas. In 1988 a small group of users got together and decided to form their own organization and set their own agenda.

Of course this took a while. For the first ten years, the PIUG meetings were a few hours long and tagged after one of the vendor meetings, like the IFI meeting at Airlie, the Derwent user meeting, or an ACS meeting.

At my first PIUG meeting, Edlyn was chair and the main topic of discussion was whether to allow vendors to attend our meetings. My how times have changed, now vendors can run for Chair. As Vice Chair, I organized the 1998 meetings as the first all day conference. I became Chair at that meeting and my first act as Chair was to give out the first PIUG service awards to Nancy Lambert and Pat Dorler.

This was the first PIUG meeting with an organized theme. The entire conference was focused on legal status. Alan Engel spoke about the arcane complexities of Japanese legal status.

I don’t recall what Steve Adams spoke on, but I do recall that his talk was interrupted by a loud HHHRRRUUUMMP that turned out to be Hawaiian dancers performing at the travel agent conference in the next room.

In 1999 both the IFI Airlie meeting and the Derwent user meeting were canceled. So I did the only possible thing. I organized a 5 day meeting. The focus was on European patents, and included full day workshops and a full exhibitors room.

By happy coincidence, I had gone to the European EPIDOS meeting in Jena, Germany in the fall of 1998. At Epidos, I saw what PIUG could be and spoke directly to Girard Giroud. I told Girard I was organizing a conference for professional patent searchers and that he was going to provide me with speakers on the European patent system. Girard looked at me and said something like WHO ARE YOU and WHAT are you talking about?

It could have been a spectacular failure and the financial ruin of PIUG. Instead it was a resounding success and we had the highest attendance and largest profit ever up to that point.

“I had three key conspirators in this revolution... Stephen Adams... Lucy Akers... And of course, Stu Kaback...”

I had three key conspirators in this revolution. Stephen Adams was always the favorite speaker. I gave Steve workshop space and just let him work his magic. I always put Stephen as the last speaker because I knew people would rearrange their travel plans just to hear Steve’s presentations.

Lucy Akers was my right hand woman, organizing speakers, and doing a thousand invisible tasks. Later, Lucy was the driving force behind the first PIUG annual conference in California with a theme of Asian patents.

And of course, Stu Kaback, was my mentor, and my Ace in the hole. In 1999 when Girard Giroud had not yet agreed to send the European speakers, I had Stu call anyone and everyone he knew to pull strings.

I really was totally insane because the first few meetings went on my personal credit cards. Even after PIUG was legally incorporated in late 1999, we still could not get any credit card company to give us a credit card. Credit Card companies want to be repaid and don’t give credit to random groups of people. Again I went to Stu and he called an old buddy from Columbia University who happened to be a Vice President at MBNA. We were able to get the first PIUG credit card.

Astonishingly, it all worked. I took enormous risks and worked my butt off because failure was simply not an option.

Fifteen years later the PIUG conference has just gotten bigger and better and it takes crazy volunteers like me to make it all work.” —Sandra Unger, 2013 IPI Award Speech.
2013 Stu Kaback Business Impact Award

By Susanne Hantos, PIUG Chair

It is with great pleasure that I share with you the exciting and wonderful news that the inaugural Stu Kaback Business Impact Award has been awarded to Ms Carol E. Bachmann who is an Advanced Technical Specialist at the Information Research & Solution division of 3M. The award was presented at the PIUG 25th anniversary gala dinner that was held on Monday, April 29th during the PIUG 2013 annual conference in Alexandria, Virginia.

The Award recognizes the achievements of an individual or a team of individuals who, in performing as a patent information professional, has made a distinct impact on his or her organization. Carol was selected as the recipient of the Award for her passion and dedication in creating a current awareness patent tool and database that supports 3M in its business decisions.

In recognizing such an achievement, the Award highlights the importance of patent information professionals to their respective organizations and encourages the growth of our profession. The PIUG established the Award earlier this year in Honorable Memory of Dr Stuart Kaback for his many outstanding accomplishments during his stellar 42 year career at ExxonMobil. Nominations for the award are received from the global patent information community. For further information about the Award, please visit: http://www.piug.org/an13kaback_award

Please join me in congratulating Carol on being the inaugural recipient of this prestigious award! •

Susanne Hantos presents the Stu Kaback Business Impact Award to Ms. Carol E. Bachmann (right).
Play actors.

Orbit Training Sunday.

PIUG Service awards went to Suzanne Robbins, Monica Weiss-Nolen, and Christine Geluk (not shown) and presented by Jim Brown, Tony Trippe, Susanne Hantos, and Cynthia Yang.
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David Weber, Richard Williams and Mark Stignani.

Carol Bachmann, Martha Yates, Terri Docter, Kristine Atkinson, Phil Ostenok, and Cynthia Murphy.

Cynthia Yang, Edlyn Simmons, Suzanne Hantos and Stephen Adams.

Yali Friedman, Kimberly Miller, Lucy Akers, and Yun Yun Yang.

Reception at annual meeting.

Edward Badger, Kristine Atkinson and Paul Kienitz.
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PatBase has been developed in partnership with RWS Group
news highlights

Co-operative Patent Classification now fully searchable
• Now fully loaded and searchable in PatBase
• Use the Classification Finder tool to navigate the new class - retrieve the relevant CPC classification by searching the class definitions using keywords
• Statistical Analysis capability for the CPC will be introduced later this year

Global Coverage Enhancements
• Significant new additions include Russia, Japan, Taiwan, Vietnam and Canada
• Russian patents can be searched in original language from non-Latin search form; side-by-side English machine translations of Russian full-text facilitate review
• Full-text of Japanese applications now available from 1993, and registered utility models from 1994 to 2010. Other recent additions include bibliographic data from Hong Kong, and Vietnamese patent data from 1986
• Ongoing project to translate assignee names from non-Latin into English for the top patent filers in China, Japan, Korea and Thailand. Over 12,000 translated names added so far. Advantage is that records which only have non-Latin members will have a searchable Latin (English) assignee name well in advance of the original language bibliographic details being made available
• Many other new enhancements have been added to PatBase, and details can be found in the latest ‘What’s New’ document available from the login or welcome pages. PatBase is co-produced by Minesoft and RWS Group

orangeBase data in PatBase
• Incorporation of FDA Orangebook data into PatBase records adds value to review process for researchers working in pharmaceutical fields. Relevant FDA data associated with the retrieved patents is displayed on the PatBase record
• Links out to a more detailed record on Minesoft’s Orangebook, a powerful and user-friendly web interface for searching the FDA’s authoritative approved drug database.

PatentOrder Web improvements
• Fresh new interface design as well as new functionality.
• New option to verify your order before you send it – preview the different document types available first. You will also be able to see if there is a Machine Translation available to order (currently for Chinese, Japanese and Korean documents)
• New Application Number column in the INPADOC legal status report, plus a new, clearer layout for the report.

If you are not already a PatentOrder customer, you can register for a Free Trial at http://www.patentorder.com/live/register.asp

You can contact Minesoft on info@minesoft.com or
Tel: +1 703 931 1597 / Tel (toll free): +1 866 745 3621
Annual Meeting Summary

by Martha Yates

Hard to believe another PIUG Annual Meeting has come and gone. Ron Kaminecki and Andrea Davis did a wonderful job of chairing the program committee. I really think it was one of the best programs ever. It was a nice pace with lots of great information. We started the weekend off with the usual assortment of paid workshops and vendor workshops, including the addition this year of a personal branding workshop.

Monday we began with an excellent presentation by Teresa Stanek Rea the acting director of the USPTO. She discussed the ongoing projects at the office. The morning session was on case studies and included a great talk by Carol Bachmann on the difficulties of determining legal status of family members around the world. Definitely was a cautionary tale. Kristine Atkinson introduced us to duckduckgo.com. Cynthia Murphy talked about how to distill our search results into actionable information.

The afternoon included talks about translations and more case studies. John Tinsley gave a really nice talk about things that go into machine translation and how the technology works. Mark Stignani talked about using patent analysis in your portfolio processes. Their firm does a lot of claim and prior art mapping to help identify valuable and less valuable patents. David Weber talked about implementing new tools across the company. The process takes time and a cross-functional selection team is essential.

The gala dinner was particularly memorable because of the inaugural Stu Kaback Business Impact Award and the IPI Award (both written up separately). It was also the 25th anniversary of PIUG. What a great occasion and of course lots of fun.

Tuesday began with a session on chemical patent information. We had a historical talk by Matt McBride. Natalie Pilote gave a detailed talk on locating extended patent terms for pharmaceuticals. In short, it is very complicated and differs from country to country. Then we followed with more case studies. The most memorable to me was Kim Miller who talked about searching peptides as both chemicals and sequences and the importance of doing both. The afternoon session was on specialized patent information. Matthew Luby talked about data cleaning, which is a topic sure to strike fear into the heart of searchers everywhere. Tony Trippe gave a talk on public PAIR, and Dave Abbott talked about their new agreement to host the US patent and trademark data.

Wednesday started with a session on CPC with talks by KIPO and Nigel Clark and Christopher Kim on the CPC browser in Espacenet. The central place is cpcinfo.org. The applied technology session had talks by Bizint, Minesoft, Questel and STN on new projects that they are involved in. There was an interesting talk in the afternoon about WIPO’s patent landscape project. If you go to the WIPO site you can find the patent landscape reports that have been completed. Dominic DeMarco told us how game theory relates to patent searching. Rick Neifeld gave the annual update on US patent law and practice. Ron Kaminecki finished with the usual panache, discussing all the interesting sources of prior art, including associations, press releases, transcripts, the internet, and even movies.

Thursday finished off the conference with the STN Patent Forum and two excellent workshops from the USPTO on the AIA and the USPTO and EPO on the CPC. I highly recommend having a look at the CPC search on espacenet. The presentations from these workshops are available in the members-only section of the wiki and can be shared.

There was as usual too much food, lots of networking, and lots of fun (I still say PIUG members are way more fun than we sound like we would be). A big thank you goes to all the volunteers. It takes a lot of work to put on a meeting of this caliber and we are fortunate to have a great group. I encourage everyone to have a look at all the presentations in the members-only section of the wiki. I also would appreciate any suggestions as to how best to cover the meetings in the newsletter in the future.
All in all, this year’s conference was an absolute resounding success. A total of 244 patent information professionals attended the conference from all over the world including Australia, Canada, China, France, Germany, India, Ireland, Japan, Republic of Korea, Spain, Switzerland, Taiwan, the United Kingdom and the United States. We were also honored to have distinguished delegates from the EPO, WIPO, KIPO and the USPTO present at the conference. A heartfelt thanks also goes out to our 20 sponsors and exhibitors for their generous support and for helping to making the conference such a success.

Our Program co-Chairs, Ron Kaminecki and Andrea Davis, did a fantastic job of putting together an insightful and thought provoking program that really resonated with the audience. Some of the comments received included:

“Excellent conference. Great networking. Great speakers and topics.”

“…this year’s talks were of higher quality than prior years!”

“…excellent timekeeping, talks were always on time”

“…excellent balance of presentations and networking/breaks”; and

“…very good and balanced mixture of talks from Patent Offices, corporations and vendors about searches & databases”

A total of 120/244 (49%) of the attendees responded to the evaluation survey in full or in part. An impressive 85% of the respondents (102/120) stated that the conference was worthwhile. The most favored presentation was the keynote address given by Ms Teresa Stanek Rea, the Acting Director of the USPTO. Ms Rea gave an informative and timely presentation on the many initiatives the USPTO has implemented including the third party submissions and supplemental examination provisions of the AIA as well as an update on the implementation of the CPC. She also discussed initiatives that the USPTO is currently working on such as the Global Dossier initiative. A copy of Ms Rea’s presentation as well the conference presentations of other plenary speakers are available for viewing and downloading in the members-only section of the PIUG wiki at: http://wiki.piug.org/x/hgrZAU.

In addition to the positive comments received about the program and the helpful suggestions for future programs, the attendees appeared to be quite satisfied with the caliber and relevance of the workshops that were held during the conference. A whopping 93% (62/66) of respondents thought the first ever PIUG sponsored career training workshop on Personal Branding was a good idea with calls for training opportunities at future conferences and/or in a webinar format. The USPTO tour was also very well received and the only negative comment was that it was a shame that more people could not participate as the number of participants had to be restricted.

To encourage attendees to complete this year’s conference evaluation survey, the PIUG Board decided to conduct a draw for one free early bird registration for the PIUG 2014 Annual Conference that will be held at the Hyatt Regency in Orange County, Garden Grove, California which is just 10 minutes down the road from Disneyland in Anaheim. The conference will be held the week after Easter from April 26-May 1, 2014. Congratulations to Sudha Kannan of Aditya Birla Science & Technology Co. Ltd. in India who is the winner of our draw.

We look forward to seeing Sudha and all of you in California in April of next year! •
By Edlyn Simmons

The winner of the 2013 Brian Stockdale Memorial Award is Justin Foley, a graduate student in the Applied Physics Program at the University of Michigan, and a fellow with the UM Office of technology transfer (OTT). The award was announced at the PIUG Annual Conference in Alexandria, VA, on April 29, 2013.

Justin's doctoral research focuses on infrared imaging technologies. His work in OTT includes performing initial marketability analyses of new technologies developed by research groups at the university, performing market analysis, prior-art searching, identification of potential licensees, search engine optimization and non-proprietary disclosure writing. His application essay states that his goal is to pursue a career in Intellectual property and technology commercialization.

BACKGROUND
This award is dedicated to the memory of Dr. Brian Stockdale who traveled extensively throughout the world imparting his knowledge of patent searching. Brian’s career included positions with Derwent, SmithKline Beecham, and Technology and Patent Research International. Brian always relished each new search as a challenge and loved working with the people in this industry. He is dearly remembered by his friends and colleagues most of all for his dry wit, keen intellect, and ease of meeting people and socializing wherever he went. As one of the world’s most talented patent information search professionals, he is sorely missed. This is our tribute to his personal dedication in training colleagues, particularly those new to the field of chemical patent searching.

AWARD PACKAGE
The award covers standard travel expenses and conference registration fees to assist the award recipient in attending one PIUG Annual Meeting, An International Conference for Patent Information Professionals. Membership in PIUG for the following year and complementary registration in fee-based conference workshops were also included in the award. This year’s award was generously underwritten by PIUG, Thomson Reuters, Technology and Patent Research International, Simmons Patent Information Service, LLC, and Magister Ltd.

“This award is our tribute to Brian Stockdale’s personal dedication in training colleagues, particularly those new to the field of chemical patent searching.”

PIUG is planning to present the award again in 2014. An announcement will be made on the PIUG wiki. Anyone who will be a student or will have had less than 3 years professional experience in patent information is invited to submit an application.
As reported from a cognizant person on the floor of the bar...

As I was walking past the lobby bar at the recent PIUG meeting last month I heard someone order a, “US porter in a can,” and the bartender replied, “One USPC coming up.” So, I stopped. Another person ordered an, “International porter in a can,” and the bartender said, “One IPC for you.” At this point, I got closer as another person asked for an, “Ecclesiastical porter in a can.” The bartender replied, “An ECLA? Sorry, the European brewery that made it no longer does so. However, they did get together with an American brewery and they now have created something they call, “Classic porter in a can.” So, the person said, “Okay, I’ll have a CPC.”

At this point I thought I should ask the bartender what was going on, when I was pushed to the side by someone in a hurry who asked the bartender, “Could you tell me where the bathroom is? I really have to MPEP.” And the bartender said, “Down the hall, room 102(b).”

Then, I woke up.

A PLETHORA OF ACRONYMS (APOA)

A major topic at the PIUG meeting was the new Cooperative Patent Classification (CPC) code; I guess it was on my mind that night. It all started with Acting Director Teresa Rea who opened the meeting with a very interesting keynote presentation on the USPTO in which she talked of the cooperation necessary for the timely implementation of the CPC. Many in the audience were impressed by her open attitude as she invited questions by not only telling the audience her email address, she spelled it out for us patent jockeys who have lost our hearing due to the sound of stacks of paper plopping down on our desks or the constant clacking noise of assembled keyboards.

The CPC now replaces the European Classification (ECLA) codes, though the former looks a lot like the latter, mostly because CPC is an improvement on the heralded ECLA codes. Indeed, CPC incorporates over 260,000 symbols, while ECLA had about 140,000. The USPC runs about 150,000, so the newly-introduced CPC codes at the USPTO will give a lot more depth to the hierarchies needed for in-depth searching.

Within a month of the meeting, both the Korean Intellectual Property Office (KIPO) and the State Intellectual Property Office (SIPO) of the People's Republic of China announced that they will be using CPC to index some of their patent documents. Could the Japanese office be next?

It looks like the CPC may be here to stay. Indeed, already there are reports that adoption of the CPC will make patent searching so efficient that prior art will be very easy to find, thus lowering the number of patents issued. This is due to the accomplishments of two independent, very large patent authorities in creating a new classification coding system that would create a lot of work for both of them, but really help both the Offices and patent practitioners in the long

Continued next page.
run. More important is that both the EPO and the USPTO made an aggressive goal of January, 2013 to implement the new code and they actually hit it! These changes are obviously important to both offices, and thus, are important to searchers. Who knows, this new code may actually make our jobs easier, if you consider that you have four coding systems being boiled down to three, with two of the finalists looking very similar to each other and the third looking like none of the others. Toss in the fact that these systems will be introduced over time and will now incorporate other authorities which will also introduce them over their own schedule, and you have job security for several generations of patent searchers.

As for me, I cannot wait for the creation of apps that will incorporate these changes into various search engines such that the results of searches will be better, even if the way that they got better isn’t shown. Maybe the single term searches that inventors use in Internet search engines will yield better output. But, a lot of free search engines never shows how the results were found, so it is difficult to tell how thorough a search may be. The government and vendor databases for the most part have already incorporated the various coding systems into their search engines, so professional searches will still be needed to make sure that every aspect of an invention is covered...and with reproducible results.

I was always amused that the very first code of the very first level of the International Patent Classification (IPC) code is designated as “A” is “Human Necessities,” but go down just one level and you find amongst items like “Health” and “Food,” the designation “Tobacco” and “Amusements.” I guess we cannot live without cigars and bowling alleys. This general hierarchy worked its way into ECLA and eventually into the new CPC, so our priorities have not changed that much, though the CPC has included many more subsections and even changes to the earlier codes to reflect more granularity. The IPC, at 71,000 symbols, is less than half the size of the CPC. However, most countries will still use the IPC codes well into the future. And, the USPTO will continue to use the USPC at least for the near future.

Still can’t even spell CPC? Get some help here (GSHH)

The EPO and USPTO have very good information resources available on the CPC (see: http://www.cooperativepatentclassification.org/index.html;jsessionid=14wv4emqcu5s0

Or

http://www.uspto.gov/patents/resources/classification/index.jsp)

As much as I would love to go into more detail on the CPC, I really have to go to an emergency meeting in room 102(b).