

----- Original Message -----

**From :** yippyb@dwx.com

**Sent :** 11/3/2016 9:38:59 AM

**To :** ExternalExaminationTimeStudy@USPTO.gov.

**Cc :**

**Subject :** FW: USPTO Request for Comments on Examination Time Goals

*Comments on Patent Examination Time 11/3/2016*

*Greetings,*

*Earlier I sent the USPTO comments relating to patent quality, but feel they also pertain to reducing time for patent examination, or to anyone reviewing patents, for that matter. Although I am not a patent attorney, agent, or legal authority, I am a listed inventor on 15 patents and am quite familiar with the process. Here are a few comments.*

*I have always been, and continue to be, concerned about the redundancy of text in patents. I realize there are probably reasons this style of repeating phrases has developed over time, but perhaps now that many long held traditions are being reexamined in terms of our current and future use of the system, it may be time to consider "always was does not imply forever must".*

*It seems to me it would be \*far\* more efficient if things had to be said \*once\*, and only once, in a patent or application. Most patents I have read have similar or identical statements made two to three times or more. Just consider the multiplier affect this has on the sheer volume of text in our patent literature and storage. Also consider how much less would be composed, stored, examined, reviewed and searched later if this was "streamlined". Certainly we would want to retain that which serves critical functions, but I believe we need to reduce/eliminate redundancy that loads us down and adds no real value. It would make the whole process and repository of patent literature more compact, more efficient. Putting all this text on a lean diet would benefit us now and generations to come.*

*Yes, I realize systems develop a certain way for reasons, some of them good, and to make changes could have unintended consequences. However, one should not hang on to obsolete methods out of fear, as is said, those who fear the future tend to fumble the present. One must also consider where changes would be improvements, when time has come to part with traditions and approaches that grew up for reasons that are no longer relevant to current or future needs, and need to be adapted to emerging needs that did not exist "back then".*

*I ask that you please consider this initiative and reflect on, what looks to me, like something that could have an enormous impact on us going forward. I believe it will lighten the load that we currently keep piling on as time goes on. It is long overdue to examine and improve this process, rather than add more and more*

*and more quantity that does not serve us well and I believe actually interferes with our greater need to better support innovation.*

*Many thanks  
Dan Goldman  
515 299 2396*

[ExternalExaminationTimeStudy@USPTO.gov](mailto:ExternalExaminationTimeStudy@USPTO.gov)

[https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2016-10-25/pdf/2016-25758.pdf?utm\\_campaign=subscriptioncenter&utm\\_content=&utm\\_medium=email&utm\\_name=&utm\\_source=govdelivery&utm\\_term=](https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2016-10-25/pdf/2016-25758.pdf?utm_campaign=subscriptioncenter&utm_content=&utm_medium=email&utm_name=&utm_source=govdelivery&utm_term=)

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**Patent and Trademark Office**  
**[Docket No. PTO-P-2016-0040]**  
**Request for Comments on**  
**Examination Time Goals**  
**AGENCY:** *United States Patent and*  
*Trademark Office, Commerce.*

**ACTION:** *Request for comments.*