

Exhibit B

Tagging /QC Assessment August 2001

We were asked to do an assessment of the Tagging of new applications by contractors and the corresponding QC by government employees. We took 2 batches of 25 applications tagged by a contractor, noted any errors or omissions and then reviewed the file after it was uploaded by a government employee. This represents approximately a day's production. When we did this task in April we did only one batch per contractor.

The results in our opinion, repeat our earlier findings which indicate that the 100 percent QC is necessary and that 100 percent QC is not happening or is failing to catch and correct the errors. On some batches QC did not seem to have occurred on others the QC effort introduced errors into the uploaded file.

There were 20 batches tagged by 10 contractors and Qced by 9 different Qcers some of whom did more than 1 batch. Of the 500 applications 266 were correctly tagged and uploaded, 3 were informals and 231 had errors but only 54 had those errors corrected before they were uploaded. There was more than one error per application in a number of cases and not all errors were corrected on a given application.

A summary by contractor follows;

Contractor A had 1 error in word mark and omitted a pseudo mark and the QCer corrected it. In the same application the tagger omitted the 44e claim, the docket number and tagged the street address on the same line as city. The QCer did not correct. The tagger, tagged the entire disclaimer statement, the wrong state for citizenship, 2 incorrect prior registrations, omitted 1 prior registration and included the addresses of the people in a partnership composed of statement, and omitted a 2F claim. The QCers did not correct these errors.

Contractor B tagged entire disclaimer statement on 4 applications, split the street address into street and city/ state lines and omitted the city/state line, omitted 1 pseudo mark 2 attorney phone numbers, 1 correspondence email address, and failed to enter a pseudo mark, 1 word mark error, failed to check authorized on 2 email addresses, omitted 1 docket number and the QCers did not correct any.

Contractor C omitted 1 docket number, omitted 1 domestic representative, 1 domestic representative tagged on domestic application, mark description tagged as lining and stippling, Joint Owners tagged as single owner, Montana tagged for Missouri in state

country code, failed to pick up attorney and attorney address from transmittal letter, 1 goods and services picked up from drawing page rather than application. Qcers did not correct

Contractor D tagged the entire disclaimer statement on 4 different applications, tagged unknown for entity and not provided for citizenship on 1 application, omitted 1 translation statement and failed to check email authorized on 5 different entries. The Qcer did not correct any of these On the 2nd batch Qced by a different person the tagger omitted 1 prior registration, and omitted 4 email authorizations none were corrected by the Qcer. Tagger omitted a mark description which the Qcer entered. The Qcer deleted 3 erroneous pseudo marks but deleted 1 correct pseudo mark (PROFIT MD for PROFITMD). Qcer changed entity joint applicant to joint venture in error.

Contractor E omitted a 2F claim, omitted a translation statement and 2 docket numbers which were not corrected by the Qcer. The Qcer did correct 1 owner address error, 1 docket number and one missing mark description. On the 2nd batch Qced by a different person, the QCER changed 17 design search codes, deleted 3 pseudo marks, added 7 omitted docket numbers, corrected 2 owner addresses, corrected 2 owner names, but failed to correct 1 owner name, 1 goods and services statement and 1 use in commerce date.

Contractor F had 9 use based applications in 2 batches and in all cases flagged specimens filed as no and 14 incorrect pseudo marks between the 2 batches. The Qcers corrected the pseudo marks. The Qcer of one batch tagged 2 omitted disclaimers correctly, added an omitted translation statement, an omitted foreign country, an omitted mark description, an omitted owner phone number, and corrected a goods and services statement but failed to correct a word mark. The Qcer of the second batch failed to correct 1 word mark, 1 goods and services statement, 3 email authorizations, and an omitted owner phone, fax and email entry.

Contractor G tagged the 31 members of a trust as 31 separate owners and set tagged them as a composed of statement, the Qcer corrected this but did not add 2 missing docket numbers, 4 missing email authorizations, 4 needed pseudo marks and failed to correct 1 word mark. A 2nd batch with a different Qcer had an omitted filing basis 1a added and 2 word marks corrected. The tagger had omitted 1 of two foreign application numbers, date and country and the 44d claim. The Qcer deleted the foreign application 44d basis that the tagger correctly tagged. The tagger omitted 1 class from a three class application, omitted 2 translation statements, omitted 3 prior registrations, omitted 3 email authorizations, omitted a 2F, omitted a mark description, tagged an entity incorrectly, omitted the Inc. from an owner name, coded a translation statement as a mark description, misspelled two names in a firm name entry, error in the word mark. The Qcer corrected none of the preceding errors.

Contractor H omitted 2 sets of foreign information, 2 country codes, 1 domestic representative, had errors in 2 goods statements, 2 composed of statements, 1 set of attorney data and 3 pseudo marks, all were corrected by Qcer 1. 1 error in goods and 1

email authorization, 1 prior registration were not corrected. The 2 Qcer corrected 1 use in commerce date, 1 docket number, 1 prior registration , 2 domestic representatives, 3 pseudo marks. Contractor tagged 1 word mark in error, omitted 4 email authorizations, 3 errors in owner name, 1 entity, 1 citizenship, 1 attorney, 1 docket number. None of these errors were corrected and 2 email addresses were entered erroneously by the Qcer.

Contractor I tagged 5 sets of goods with errors, 2 dbas, 1 mark drawing code, omitted 1 email authorization, 1 attorney phone, 1 pseudo mark and 1 disclaimer, Qcer corrected 1 missing docket number. In the second batch with a second Qcer , the tagger had 2 errors in word mark only 1 was corrected by the Qcer, 6 email authorizations were not coded, omitted 1 prior registration, omitted 1 translation statement , omitted 1 disclaimer, 1 email was not coded, a specimen description was coded as a mark description, none of these were corrected. 1 pseudo mark and 1 docket number were corrected.

Contractor J tagged 2 incorrect mark drawing codes, 2 errors in goods, omitted 16 docket numbers, omitted 1 domestic representative, had errors in 2 owner names, 1 citizenship, 1 entity, 1 mark description, omitted 8 attorney phone numbers , omitted 3 attorney fax numbers and 2 zip codes. None of these were corrected. 1 pseudo mark was corrected. The second batch with a different Qcer had 2 use basis errors, 1 itu basis error, 1 use in commerce date error, omitted 4 foreign application 44ds and associated data, 1 mark drawing code error, 1 citizenship, 1 owner name, 1 entity, 6 attorney name, 1 domestic representative, 1 disclaimer, 5 docket numbers, 2 attorney phone numbers. None of these were corrected but 1 pseudo mark was deleted.