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Update on the Enhanced Patent Quality Initiative (EPQI)

Sandie Spyrou
Senior Advisor
Office of the Deputy Commissioner for Patent Quality, USPTO

World-Class Patent Quality System

The Right Time for a Greater Focus on Quality

• America Invents Act (AIA) provides a stable budget to pursue quality initiatives
• USPTO continues to reduce patent application inventory and pendency
• IT and other resource improvement initiatives support our employees
• Enhancing patent quality is a priority
World-Class Patent Quality System (con’t)

The Right Time for a Greater Focus on Quality

- With AIA Post-Grant Reviews by the Patent Trial and Appeal Board (PTAB), issued patents can be under greater scrutiny
- Non-practicing entities continue to be a concern to the public; frivolous lawsuits hurt the IP system as well as the economy
- With clarity of patent rights comes certainty in patent rights making IP-intensive industries stronger
- USPTO has always made patent quality a priority

http://www.uspto.gov/patent/initiatives/enhanced-patent-quality-initiative
Enhanced Patent Quality Initiative

- In February, USPTO announced an Enhanced Patent Quality Initiative (see 80 Fed. Reg. 6475 (Feb. 5, 2015))
- This initiative was built around three patent quality pillars
  - Excellence in Work Products
  - Excellence in Measuring Patent Quality
  - Excellence in Customer Service
- USPTO presented six proposals to stimulate the public’s thinking on patent quality

Federal Register Quality Proposals

I. Excellence in work products
   1. Applicant requests prosecution review of selected applications
   2. Automated pre-examination search
   3. Clarity of the record

II. Excellence in measuring patent quality
   4. Review/improvements to quality metrics

III. Excellence in customer service
   5. Review of current compact prosecution model and effect on quality
   6. In-person interview capability with all examiners
Comment Sources

- Examiner Forums/Feedback
- Patent Quality Summit
- World Class Patent Quality Mailbox (WCPQ)
  - Internal
  - External*
- Roadshows/Roundtables

EPQI Comments

1206 Comments*

- Internal: 235
- Patent Quality Summit: 225
- WCPQ - External: 746

* Response/emails were broken into comments based on proposal categories. Each email/response, therefore, may map to more than one submission.
Enhanced Patent Quality Initiative

**Evolving Programs**

Focusing on three implementation areas:

- **Data Analysis**
  - **Pillar 1**
    - Topic Submission for Case Studies
  - **Pillar 2**
    - Clarity and Correctness Data Capture (Master Review Form or MRF)
    - Quality Metrics

- **Examiners’ Resources, Tools & Training**
  - **Pillar 1**
    - Automated Pre-Examination Search Pilot
    - STIC Awareness Campaign
    - Clarity of the Record Training
    - Post Grant Outcomes
  - **Pillar 3**
    - Interview Specialist

- **Changes to Process/Product**
  - **Pillar 1**
    - Clarity of the Record Pilot
  - **Pillar 3**
    - Reevaluate AFCP2.0, Pre-Appeal Conferences & QPIDS
    - Design Patent Publication Quality
Next Steps

• We will continue to discuss these programs as they evolve and collect feedback through:
  − WorldClassPatentQuality@uspto.gov email box
  − Patent Quality Chat Webinar Series
  − Patent Quality Roadshows/Roundtables
• We will use all feedback in the development of the evolving programs or for new programs
• We encourage all stakeholders to be involved by providing feedback, attending outreach events, or participating in pilot programs

Questions

Sandie Spyrou
Cassandra.spyrou@uspto.gov
Senior Advisor to the Deputy Commissioner for Patent Quality, USPTO
Clarity of the Record

Daniel Ryman
Senior Advisor to the Deputy Commissioner for Patent Quality, USPTO

Agenda

• Clarity of the Record Pilot
  – Background
  – Structure of the Pilot
  – Goals of the Pilot

• Master Review Form (MRF)
  – Background
  – Goals of the MRF
  – Current Structure of the MRF
  – Implementation Plan
Clarity of the Record Proposal

- Proposal 3 of the February Federal Register Notice sought comments on how to improve the clarity of the record

- It provided three exemplary procedures for comment:
  1. Making claim construction explicit on the record
  2. Recording interviews (and other oral conferences, such as appeal conferences) in further detail
  3. Providing a more detailed summary of the reasons for allowing a claim when a statement of the reasons for allowance is necessary
General Takeaways from the Comments

• Building a complete and clear record through prosecution is important
  – Applicants recognize that patent examination is not an exact science
  – Clearly articulated rejections are critical to allow applicants to rebut on the record

• Examiners need additional training and examining time per case

Takeaways from the Comments on Proposed Procedures

• Claim construction is best done through the give-and-take of prosecution

• Interview summaries should allow the public to understand what was agreed upon and why, but requiring too much information can have a chilling effect on the interview

• Detailed reasons for allowance should be provided for every indication of allowable subject matter
Goals of the Clarity of Record Pilot

• Determine what resources are needed to implement the best practices for clarity of the record
  – Training
  – Examining time per case

• Determine the impact of these best practices
  – Prosecution
  – Post-grant outcomes

Master Review Form (MRF)
Internal Quality Reviews - Background

- The Office of Patent Quality Assurance (OPQA) collects data for data mining through four types of reviews:
  - Final Disposition Compliance
  - In-Process Compliance
  - First Action on the Merits Review
  - Search Review

- SPEs in the Technology Centers also conduct a number of reviews, but the data from these reviews has not been retained for data mining:
  - Signatory Panels
  - Performance Appraisal Plan (PAP) Reviews

Internal Quality Reviews – Background (con’t)

- These reviews focus on **correctness** of an examiner’s decision

- Data on **clarity** has not been routinely collected as part of these reviews
Master Review Form - Goals

• To create a **single, comprehensive** form that may be used by all areas of the Office when reviewing the quality of previously signed work

• To collect information on the **clarity** and **correctness** of Office actions

---

Master Review Form – Design

• The MRF will allow reviewers to record information on:
  – Search
  – Omitted Rejections
  – Rejections Made (both correctness and clarity)
  – Reply to Applicant
  – Final Rejection
  – Reply to After-Final Response
  – Other Quality Related Items (such as allowable subject matter and restrictions)
Master Review Form – Implementation

• To be piloted by OPQA reviewers and select SPEs in the Technology Centers

• To be rolled out to all SPEs in the Technology Centers at a to-be-determined date

Questions

Daniel Ryman
Daniel.ryman@uspto.gov
Senior Advisor to the Deputy Commissioner for Patent Quality, USPTO
PANEL DISCUSSION
Clarity of the Record

Moderator:
Alford Kindred, Regional Manager, Detroit Satellite Office, USPTO

Panelists:
Sandie Spyrou, Senior Advisor, Office of Patent Quality, USPTO
Dan Ryman, Senior Advisor, Office of Patent Quality, USPTO
Deborah Saybolt, Saybolt IP
William R. Bourdreaux, Brinks, Gilson & Lione

Leading in Quality Excellence – Every Interaction Counts
Improving Global Patent Prosecution

Maria Holtmann
Director of International Patent Cooperation
Office of International Patent Cooperation, USPTO

Office of International Patent Cooperation (OIPC)

Improve the quality, efficiency and predictability of patent family prosecution, thereby improving the certainty of global patent rights.

- Develop office processes to assist in global work sharing
- Increase efficiency of applicant processes to improve global work sharing
- Resolve legal issues hindering global work sharing
- Provide IT solutions to enhance global work sharing
Collaborative Search Pilot Program (CSP)

Daniel Hunter
Director of International Work Sharing Planning & Implementation Division
Office of International Patent Cooperation, USPTO

Work Sharing Programs

Patent Prosecution Highway (PPH) – Serial Interoffice Prosecution
  – Second Office acts on application after First Office Completes examination
New Collaborative Search Pilots

- Pilots with JPO and KIPO
- Parallel Pilots testing prosecution efficiencies taking different approaches to initial search and examination
  - JPO – **Serial search** on substantially similar claims prior to Pre Interview Communication
  - KIPO – **Parallel search** on substantially similar claims
    - Both office's searches sent to applicant for consideration in response to Pre Interview Communication

New Pilot Comparisons

**JPO Pilot – Serial Search and Evaluation Prior to Examination**

**KIPO Pilot – Parallel Search and Evaluation Prior to Examination**

Corresponding applications must be filed in both the JPO and the USPTO no earlier than 3/16/15 and have not yet been examined.
Collaborative Search Pilots

- Applications made special for first action
- Based on First Action Interview (FAI) Program
  - Claim Limits – 3 Independent/20 Total
  - Claim Matching – claims must correspond (slight difference between JPO and KIPO)
- Applicant Requirements:
  - Petition in both offices
    - Applicant consents to permit the USPTO and its partner offices to share information with partner offices under portions of 35 USC 122
      - (a) for sending to KIPO search results from unpublished US Applications
      - (c) & (e) for receiving KIPO/JPO search results and commentary in published US applications
- Pilot Duration is Two Years
  - JPO Pilot started August 1, 2015
    - 200 applications per year per office of first search
  - KIPO Pilot started September 1, 2015
    - 200 applications for each office of earliest priority

CSP Statistics
as of 10/14/15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>JPO</th>
<th>USPTO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JPO - USPTO 8/1/15 - 7/31/17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Office - Number of Petitions Received</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Office - Number of Petitions Received</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granted Petitions</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Goal Obtained</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIPO - USPTO 5/1/15 - 8/1/17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Priority - Number of Petitions Received</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Priority - Number of Petitions Received</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granted Petitions</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Goal Obtained</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CSP Benefits

Greater consistency in examination = More certainty of IP rights

Applications taken out of turn = Expedited search results and final disposition

It’s FREE to file Petition!

More Information Needed?

CSP@USPTO.GOV

Dan Hunter
Director, International Work Sharing Planning & Implementation, USPTO
(571) 272-8050

Amber Ostrup
Program Manager, International Work Sharing Planning & Implementation, USPTO
(571) 272-7984
Global Dossier

Global Dossier is a set of business services modernizing the global patent system and delivering benefits to all stakeholders.
Global Dossier Task Force

Members:

- **IP5 Offices**
  - United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO)
  - European Patent Office (EPO)
  - Japan Patent Office (JPO)
  - Korean Intellectual Property Office (KIPO)
  - State Intellectual Property Office of the People's Republic of China (SIPO)

- **Industry IP5 Members**
  - American Intellectual Property Law Association (AIPLA)
  - Intellectual Property Owners Association (IPO)
  - Japan Intellectual Property Association (JIPA)
  - Korea Intellectual Property Association (KINPA)
  - Patent Protection Association of China (PPAC)
  - BUSINESSEUROPE

- **World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO)**

---

**IP5 Priorities for Global Dossier**

- **USPTO** – “Proof-of-Concept for Inter-Office Exchange”
  - Sharing documents between offices including for example, prior art exchanges, bib data updates, and supporting documents. Viewed as a first step towards cross-filing

- **EPO** – “Alerting”
  - Automated mechanism whereby each office alerts all the other offices, applicants, and representatives of changes in status to an application

- **JPO** – “XML”
  - Enabling each office, and possibly applicants and representatives, to download all application-related data from applications pending in other offices in XML format

- **KIPO** – “Applicant Name Standardization”
  - An automated mechanism that will assign a single, unique name to entities with applications pending in multiple office, including in instances where those entities may have used multiple names, or variations of a single name, to identify themselves

- **SIPO** – “Legal Status”
  - A mechanism to allow users to view the legal status of an application in another office
Global Dossier – Why Use it?

**Coming November 2015:**
- Access to all available information about applications and patents in the participating offices with the first service – Dossier access
- Applicants can efficiently track and manage related applications across jurisdictions
- Easier and less costly to perform functions associated with due diligence, technology transfer, and litigation and appeal processes.

**Example of Future Services:**
- Document exchange functionality
- Alerts
- XML functionality
- Linkage to WIPO CASE

---

**Benefits of Global Dossier**

**Cost savings - exploit more IP!**

Improved patent quality

Higher value patents

Decreased time to file internationally

Increased ease of international filing
Global Dossier First Release Demo

Nelson Yang
Patent Business Analyst
Office of International Patent Cooperation, USPTO

Leading in Quality Excellence – Every Interaction Counts

Global Dossier Landing Page
Global Dossier Family List

- Enter number
- Filtering
- Sorting indicator
- Office Action Indicator
Global Dossier Classification Data

Classification Description

Global Dossier Citations

View Full Patent Family
View Application Dossier
View Publication
Future Plans (post-2015)

- Timeline view for applications
- Providing access to foreign publications
- Enhanced OA indicator
- Legal Status
- Providing XML data
- Linking to WIPO CASE

OIPC Website
OIPC Website

http://www.uspto.gov/patents-getting-started/international-patent-cooperation

Global Dossier Contacts

E-mail: GlobalDossier@USPTO.gov

Don Levin
Director, International Patent Business Solutions
571-272-3785
Don.Levin@USPTO.gov

Nelson Yang
571-272-0826
Nelson.Yang@USPTO.gov

Jessica Patterson
Program Manager, Program Management Office
571-272-8828
Jessica.Patterson@USPTO.gov
Questions

Maria Holtmann
Maria.holtmann@uspto.gov

Daniel Hunter
Daniel.hunter@uspto.gov

Jessica Patterson
Jessica.patterson@uspto.gov

Nelson Yang
Nelson.yang@uspto.gov

Measuring Patent Quality

Anthony Caputa
Director of the Office of Patent Quality Assurance (OPQA), USPTO

Marty Rater
Chief Statistician, OPQA, USPTO
Overview

- OPQA Structure
- Work Product Reviews
- Surveys
- Examiner Transactional Data
- Quality Composite
- Master Review Form
- Next Steps

Office of Patent Quality Assurance (OPQA)

- OPQA is responsible for the overall assessment and measurement of patent examination quality at the USPTO
- Measurement accomplished through:
  - Work product reviews
  - Administration of satisfaction-based surveys
  - Analysis of examiner transactional data
Office of Patent Quality Assurance – Make-Up

• 55 Review Quality Assurance Specialists (RQAS)
  – Former primary examiners with demonstrated skills in examination quality, productivity, efficiency, mentoring and training
    • Avg. 22 years patent examination experience
  – Tasks include review of examiner work product, training, mentoring, and serving as subject matter experts
    • Assigned to specific technology in which they have examination experience

Office of Patent Quality Assurance - Duties

• RQAS Duties:
  – 75% of time dedicated to review of work product
  – 25% of time providing Technology Center training and assistance
• 8 Supervisory RQASs (SRQAS) oversee the RQASs
  – Ensure consistency among reviewers
  – Validate issues raised and interact with Patent Corps
• Statisticians and program analysts
Work Product Reviews

- Randomly selected Office Actions to ensure that any metric we generate represents a true picture of all patent corps work product.

Work Product Reviews (con’t)

- Key metrics derived from work product reviews:
  - Final Disposition Compliance Rate
    - Measures correctness of the final determination made by an examiner – either the decision to allow a patent or finally reject it
    - Review for improper or omitted rejections, improper finality, failure to treat arguments
  - In-Process Compliance Rate
    - Measures correctness and reasonableness of Office Actions during prosecution (non-final actions)
    - Review for improper or omitted rejections, improper restriction practice, failure to treat arguments, and other issues that may significantly inhibit the advancement of prosecution
Other Work Product Reviews

- First Action on the Merits (FAOM) and Search:
  - Implemented in 2011 to better capture quality at initial stages of prosecution
  - Provides more insight into clarity issues than normal compliance reviews
    - Key focus of current quality initiative

- Targeted Reviews
  - Ad hoc reviews to assist in evaluating the effectiveness of training and the impact of programs on quality
    - e.g., 101 rejections, use of 3rd party art submissions, restriction practice

Internal Quality Survey

- Conducted semi-annually
- Measures patent examiner satisfaction with various factors that lead to the ability to perform high quality patent examination
  - Evaluates overall examiner experience in past 3 months with respect to:
    - Office-related factors: tools, training, etc.
    - Applicant-related factors: incoming patent applications, applicant responses, etc.
External Quality Survey

• Conducted semi-annually
• Measures applicant and practitioner satisfaction with patent examination quality
  – Evaluates overall applicant experience in past 3 months with respect to:
    – Consistency
    – Reasonableness of rejections
    – Adhering to rules and procedures

Quality Index Reporting (QIR)

• Statistical analysis of data representing examination events (examiner trends) occurring during prosecution
  – Data taken from the USPTO internal database
• Statistical analysis identifies outlier populations that can signal the presence of quality or procedural issues that represent best practices or opportunities for improvement
• Typically a process-based evaluation of quality rather than an end-product inspection
Uses of Quality Data

- In addition to generating metrics of quality to gauge performance, USPTO uses OPQA data to:
  - Develop training
  - Measure effectiveness of training
  - Determine the impact of USPTO programs on quality
  - Telework programs, etc.

Quality Composite

- In 2011, USPTO implemented a Quality Composite in an attempt to consolidate the wide variety of quality metrics and generate a single index that could be used to quickly assess progress towards Office goals through 2015
Moving Forward

• Implement Master Review Form
  – Establish Clarity Metric(s)
• Eliminate Roll Up Metrics to Composite
• Update Metrics in response to User Feedback

Master Review Form - Goals

• To create a single, comprehensive form that is used by all areas of the Office when reviewing the quality of previously signed work
  – This will allow uniform standards to be applied to all such reviews
  – This will allow more reviews to be captured for data collection purposes
• To collect information on the clarity of Office actions
Quality Metric Data Sources

FY11-FY15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Composite</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final Disposition Compliance</td>
<td>Master Review Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Process Compliance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAOM Review</td>
<td>QIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search Review</td>
<td>External Quality Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QIR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Quality Survey</td>
<td>Internal Quality Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Quality Survey</td>
<td>Discontinued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite Score</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY16

Master Review Form

- Wide range of available metrics related to:
  - Correctness
  - Clarity
  - Search effectiveness
  - Claim construction
- Ability to report metrics by:
  - Statute
  - Action Type
  - Quarter
  - Technology Center
  - Nested variables, e.g. Action Type > Quarter
  - Other MRF demographic indicators
- "Correctness" metrics can be tracked against historic compliance rate metrics
Other Data Sources

- **Quality Index Reporting (QIR)**
  - Survey of SPEs driving metrics to be reported
  - Report variables individually rather than as an average of a few selected variables
  - Expanding items reported avoids one-size-fits-all approach employed since FY10 where reported metrics may not have adequately represented quality for specific technologies and/or changes in priorities and initiatives
  - Ability to compare to pre-FY16 levels

- **External Quality Survey**
  - Continued semi-annual administration of survey
  - Key metric remains “overall quality” rating
  - Expand metrics that can be reported from survey since not bound by single metric being used for composite. Currently gather perceptions related to:
    - Soundness of rejections, by statute
    - Consistency of examination among examiners

- **Internal Quality Survey**
  - Continued semi-annual administration of survey
  - Key metric remains “overall quality environment” rating

Questions

Anthony Caputa  
[Anthony.caputa@uspto.gov](mailto:Anthony.caputa@uspto.gov)  
Director of the Office of Patent Quality Assurance (OPQA), USPTO

Marty Rater  
[Martin.rater@uspto.gov](mailto:Martin.rater@uspto.gov)  
Chief Statistician, OPQA, USPTO
Enhancing Patent Quality through Remote Examiner Interviews

Tariq Hafiz
Director of Technology Center 2600, USPTO

Overview

• Interview Survey Results
• WebEx Interviews
• Authorization Policy
• Interview Resources
  ➢ Interview Specialist
  ➢ Public Interview Rooms
  ➢ Website & Email box
Interview Surveys

- Surveys on interviews for both Examiners and Applicants were conducted in 2014
- Learn more about interview practice during prosecution
- Identify training opportunities

Interview Survey Results

- For advancing prosecution, Applicants were very positive.

How effective do you feel an interview is in advancing prosecution?

- Not useful at all: 2.0%
- Somewhat useful: 30.8%
- Very useful: 28.8%
- Extremely useful: 38.4%
Interview Survey Summary

• Most interviews are initiated by Applicants according to both surveys
• 99% of Applicants indicated that request for interviews are usually granted.

Training Opportunities

If you have never held a WebEx interview what is the primary reason? Check all that apply.

- I don't know how to conduct an interview in WebEx. 21.9%
- I don't think WebEx is an effective tool. 6.9%
- I didn't know that we are able to conduct an interview using WebEx. 42.0%
- I have never been asked to conduct an interview using WebEx. 60.6%
- Other (please specify) 15.6%
Verbal Authorization for Video Conferencing

Change to Internet Usage Policy to Permit Oral Authorization for Video Conferencing Tools

• Policy has been updated to make it easier for Applicants to authorize the use of video conferencing tools to conduct examiner interviews.
• MPEP § 502.03 now allows a verbal request to authorize a WebEx interview, instead of submitting a written request.
• The verbal authorization is limited to the video conference interview and does not extend to other communications regarding the application.

Automated Interview Request (AIR) Form

• New web-based tool that allows Applicants to schedule an interview with an Examiner for their pending patent application.
• Enables an Applicant to submit a request for an interview from our Interview Practice website (http://www.uspto.gov/patent/laws-and-regulations/interview-practice) by simply filling out the AIR form. The request will then be sent directly to the Examiner’s E-mail box.
Automated Interview Request (AIR) Form (con’t)

- The submitted AIR form will provide the authorization (MPEP §502.03) needed for internet communication between the Applicant and the Examiner and will be in effect until the Applicant provides a written withdrawal of authorization to the Examiner of record.

- The proposed interview date/time must be at least one week from the date of the request.

- Applicant should receive a communication from the Examiner within 2 business days via either the telephone or E-mail.

USPTO Automated Interview Request (AIR) Form

Recognizing that Internet communications are not secure, I hereby authorize the USPTO to communicate with the undersigned and any practitioner of record or acting in a representative capacity in accordance with 37 CFR 1.33 and 37 CFR 1.34 concerning a subject matter of this application via video conference or electronic mail. I understand that a copy of these communications will be made of record in the application file.

* [] I acknowledge that this communication will be recorded as part of the application file.

* Name: 

* Registration Number: (5 Digit Numeric Only: 12345)

* U.S. Serial Number: (8 Digit Numeric Only: 12345678)

* Confirmation Number: (4 Digit Numeric Only: 1234)

* E-mail Address: 

* Phone Number: (10 Digit Numeric Only: 0123456789)

* Proposed Date and Time of Requested Interview must be at least one (1) week later than current date.

(Note: Confirmation of actual interview date and time will be arranged between examiner and requester)

* Proposed Type of Interview: [ ] Please select a Interview (Examiners working remotely will offer Video Conference or Telephonic Interviews)

* [] I am the applicant or applicant’s representative for this application.

Submit
WebEx Basics

- You need a computer and a high-speed Internet connection is recommended.
- WebEx is a web-based service, so you can use it from any computer (Windows, Mac, Linux, or Solaris).
- No software needs to be downloaded or purchased.
- A telephone will be used to join the audio component of the meeting while a video camera may be used as part of the visual component.

Click Link for Examiner

Open the email containing the WebEx online meeting invitation and click on the link to join the visual component of the online meeting.

To join the online meeting (Now from mobile devices!)

1. Click the following link: Join the meeting
2. If requested, enter your name and email address.
3. If a password is required, enter the meeting password:
4. Click “Join”.

uspto
WebEx Demo

Leading in Quality Excellence – Every Interaction Counts

Resources & Assistance

Leading in Quality Excellence – Every Interaction Counts
Interview Specialist

- Subject matter expert on interview practice and policy in each Technology Center
- To assist Examiners and Applicants in facilitating effective interviews
- The list of TC Specialists can be found here: http://www.uspto.gov/patent/laws-and-regulations/interview-practice/interview-specialist

WebEx Training & Assistance

- Applicants who are interested in more detailed WebEx training may request a one-on-one WebEx training session with an interview specialist.
- Please email your request to ExaminerInterviewPractice@USPTO.gov
  - Include preferred dates and times
  - Please give at least one week notice
Public Interview Rooms

- A Public Interview Room is a video conference room on each USPTO campus designated for Applicants to use to connect and collaborate with examiners that are working remotely or at a different USPTO campus
- Currently in Alexandria, Detroit & Denver
- Coming soon to San Jose & Dallas

Public Interview Rooms

- Must be reserved by Examiner at least two business days prior to interview.

- Written or verbal authorization to communicate electronically is required prior to reserving a public interview room (see MPEP §§ 502.03 and 713.01, and 80 Fed. Reg. 23787, April 2015).
Website
http://www.uspto.gov/patent/laws-and-regulations/interview-practice

• USPTO.GOV
  – Policies
  – Training
  – FAQs
  – Contacts
• Comments & Questions
  ExaminerInterviewPractice@USPTO.gov

Questions
Tariq Hafiz
Tariq.hafiz@uspto.gov
Director of Technology Center 2600, USPTO
Leading in Quality Excellence – Every Interaction Counts

Current Patent Automation Initiatives

Deborah Stephens
Acting Deputy Commissioner for Patent Administration, USPTO

PE2E Functionality / Timeline

PE2E Tools

1. Incident Application Workflow (IW)
   - Streamline application process, reducing PTO and applicant time.

2. Search (SC)
   - Enhance search through expanded access to examiner databases, enabling quicker and more accurate searches.

3. Office Automation (OA)
   - Streamline office processes, improving productivity and reducing turnaround times.

4. Cooperative Patent Classification (CPC)
   - Facilitate the classification system that ensures consistency and efficiency in the PTO and applicants' processes.

Patents-End-to-End will provide a single integrated toolset that will streamline examining processes, modernize technology, and reduce time needed to deploy product enhancements.
## Major PE2E Examination Products

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effort</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Release Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Docket &amp; Application Viewer (DAV)</strong> (replaces eDan)</td>
<td>Case management tool: docket with multiple views; planner to prioritize work; document, claims, application management; IDS viewer, electronic notes</td>
<td>Released Mar 2015 training underway (key dates on next slide)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Official Correspondence</strong> (Office Actions/replaces OACS)</td>
<td>Authoring &amp; workflow solution; integrates with DAV by leveraging notes, references, &amp; dispositions</td>
<td>Production release target Dec 2016 Pilot release December 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Examiner Search</strong> (replaces EAST/WEST)</td>
<td>Modern, scalable enterprise search for Patent Examiners</td>
<td>Production release target Dec 2016 Pilot release December 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cooperative Patent Classification (CPC)</strong></td>
<td>Harmonization &amp; modernization of classification jointly managed between USPTO &amp; EPO. Facilitates collaborative maintenance of classification system</td>
<td>Released Jan 2013 Enhancements release July 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central Enterprise Data Repository (CEDR)</strong></td>
<td>Create new operational database to replace PALM that supports PE2E</td>
<td>Incremental releases for critical path items from above efforts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Docket & Application Viewer is the product created by the Examiner Tools & Infrastructure project
* eCommerce Modernization encompasses USPTO’s efforts to modernize Patent application systems; started Q3 FY15
* Public dissemination (e.g., bulk download & Patent assignment search) is being modernized in a separate portfolio 107

## Major PE2E External User Products

- **Patent Center**
  - Patent application filing, viewing and management
  - New, streamlined, and secure
  - Replaces EFS-Web, Public PAIR, and Private PAIR
  - Developed under the eMod Project, which aims to improve the electronic patent application process by modernizing its filing and viewing systems
    - **Recent Features Released:**
      - EFS-Web 85b
      - PAIR Self-Administration Tools
EFS-Web 85b

- Web 85b (Web Based Issue Fee Transmittal) allows filers with Power of Attorney to complete and submit a streamlined, highly automated web form
  - Replaces the traditional PTOL-85 Part B form which is required in every issued application (a paper form, or a flat PDF file submitted through EFS-web)
- Benefits:
  - Automated generation of the 85b Issue Fee Transmittal based on user input or data retrieved from USPTO official records
  - Automated processing of the following:
    - Change of Entity Status
    - Change of Correspondence Address
    - Change of Fee Address

DEMO

EFS-Web 85b

Office of Patent Information Management
United States Patent and Trademark Office
PAIR Administration

• PAIR Administration is a new set of functionality in Private PAIR that enable users to self-administer a number of routine tasks that previously required submitting a form which then was manually processed
• New PAIR Administration functionality:
  – Create New Customer Numbers
  – Change Entity Status
  – Update Application Correspondence and/or Maintenance Fee Address
  – View Saved and Completed Requests

DEMO
PAIR Administration

Office of Patent Information Management
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Questions

Deborah Stephens
Deborah.stephens@uspto.gov
Acting Deputy Commissioner for Patent Administration, USPTO