UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

TRADEMARK PUBLIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

Alexandria, Virginia
Tuesday, October 21, 2008

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

| 1 | PROCEEDINGS |
|----|--|
| 2 | (9:00 a.m.) |
| 3 | MR. FARMER: Let's get started, |
| 4 | everybody, unless there is any objection. My name |
| 5 | is John Farmer and I am the Chair of the Trademark |
| 6 | Public Advisory Committee, and I welcome each of |
| 7 | you. We have a stout attendance today. This is |
| 8 | the first time I'd chaired a TPAC meeting so I |
| 9 | didn't know how many faces I would be able to look |
| 10 | forward to seeing aside from the members of TPAC |
| 11 | and the USPTO leadership. There appears to be a |
| 12 | lot of interest, so I hope that we are interesting |
| 13 | for you today. |
| 14 | Aside from that, I really don't have any |
| 15 | comments other than to thank all the folks who |
| 16 | made this meeting possible, not just to the TPAC |
| 17 | members who came, but the tremendous support from |
| 18 | the USPTO leadership in digging up documents and |
| 19 | pulling together information and making a lot of |
| 20 | time available so that in TPAC can do our job. |
| 21 | I've discovered that a lot of times we have to |
| 22 | call folks, such as I have to call Lynne Beresford |
| | ANDERSON COURT REPORTING |
| | 706 Duke Street, Suite 100 |
| | Alexandria, VA 22314 |
| | Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190 |

- 1 to talk about stuff, and folks have been
- 2 incredibly available and we really appreciate
- 3 that.
- 4 Aside from that, I have nothing to day,
- 5 and so I will turn things over to the USPTO
- 6 leadership. I don't know in which order they will
- 7 wish to speak to make any opening remarks that
- 8 they have.
- 9 MR. DUDAS: I just want to thank
- 10 everybody for being here. There are a lot of new
- 11 faces on TPAC and I had the pleasure and honor of
- swearing in three new members of TPAC yesterday
- and I want to welcome them again to TPAC. I think
- 14 everybody who has been working on TPAC. Howard,
- 15 thank you. This is my first chance to officially
- 16 welcome John Farmer as the new Chairman of TPAC,
- 17 principal attorney for the Leading Edge Law Group
- in Richmond and listed for the second time in 2008
- 19 as one of the best lawyers in America in the field
- of intellectual property. I have a whole bio on
- 21 you. I also want to again acknowledge this is the
- first time I'd had the chance to welcome you

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

officially, Professor Conley, so thank you for

- 2 being on TPAC. Gary, thank you again. I had the
- 3 opportunity to swear you in, and Tim.
- 4 I just wanted to talk a little bit about
- 5 what's happening in Trademarks, what's happening
- 6 across the board, and then I'm certainly happy to
- 7 answer any questions that you have. I'll give
- 8 some legislative updates, and again just make
- 9 myself available for what's happening from my
- 10 perspective as Director in the trademarks world,
- 11 what's happening here at the USPTO, and across the
- 12 board.
- 13 You're here at a time, if you came in
- 14 the main building and if you looked up at the far
- 15 end you see Welcome to the USPTO and a banner that
- 16 says Our Record- Breaking Year. So it's actually
- 17 an excellent time particularly for trademarks, but
- 18 for our office as a whole. The Government
- 19 Performance and Results Act is a statute that went
- 20 into place in 1993 that says you have to state
- 21 publicly to the administration and to the Congress
- and most importantly to the customers and to the

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 American people what your goals will be. We've

- been on a path to improving. Several years ago,
- in the year 2000, we had only met about an average
- 4 of 25 percent of our goals under the Government
- 5 Performance and Results Act. It was a statute
- 6 that was less than 10 years old. People were
- 7 getting comfortable with how to do that. But we
- 8 didn't find that to be acceptable at all and we
- 9 went on path to make certain that we helped
- 10 educate the Congress about bringing all the money
- into the Patent and Trademark Office, that user
- 12 fees need to be spent here, an aggressive
- 13 strategic plan, and setting forth our goals.
- 14 Trademarks met 100 percent of their key goals.
- 15 They beat by a large margin the vast majority of
- their goals. They're aggressive goals. They're
- 17 stretch goals. And we actually have I think
- 18 realistic goals, but this really goes down to what
- 19 the examiners are doing, what people are doing. I
- 20 will tell you what Lynne Beresford is doing
- 21 because essentially when I first came to the
- office we missed about 75 percent of our goals

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 that year and the year before for a variety

- 2 reasons and now we're meeting 100 percent of our
- 3 goals.
- 4 Trademark applications, first action
- 5 pendency was 3.0 months which is right on our
- 6 target. We're actually examining largely to what
- 7 we think pendency should be. We've talked a lot
- 8 about an accelerated trademark examination
- 9 procedure. But by and large an area that we're
- 10 trying to address we're getting to. Quality of
- 11 searching and examination has gone up. The actual
- 12 percentages attained were 97.2 percent compliance
- for final action and 95.8 percent compliance for
- 14 first action. I like numbers. I don't
- 15 necessarily have to throw out all these numbers.
- 16 We're still getting national awards not for
- government but just for being an entity that has
- 18 teleworking that's leading the world, leading the
- 19 United States, and we have 80 percent of our
- 20 trademark examiners teleworking from home who are
- 21 eligible to work from home. We have more people
- 22 who are working in more states. We have 20

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 examiners working in 12 different states and we're

- 2 talking about doing a whole lot more.
- 3 One of the things I wanted to emphasize
- 4 because I think everyone here on TPAC by
- 5 definition has been less than 3 years is that it
- 6 wasn't always this way. I've been here about 7
- 7 years, and as I mentioned, when I came into the
- 8 office we were missing about 75 of our goals. We
- 9 didn't have the strategic planning in place that
- 10 we wanted to have in place. There were a variety
- of reasons. The money that we wanted from
- 12 Congress that you paid for wasn't coming in the
- door. But we also had a situation where there was
- a time with the dot-com boom we had a 33 percent
- increase in applications and then the dot-com
- bust, a 33 percent decrease in applications. At
- 17 that time things weren't great. We had I think
- 18 almost 100 examiners when I talked in the door,
- 19 trademark examiners, were spread throughout the
- 20 rest of the office because we simply couldn't take
- in the fees to support what Trademarks was trying
- to do. So we had people working in other areas of

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 the agency on details. I think as recently as

- 2 2005 we were having to bring money in from other
- 3 areas of the office to support Trademarks because
- 4 of what was happening at that time.
- I think really that's one of the things
- 6 I'm concerned about as we look at the economic
- 7 times today, that the bottom line is with the
- 8 strategic planning, with Lynne in place, with
- 9 Howard working closely with everybody, with our
- 10 examiners really being very open to change, what
- 11 we've seen is a real turnaround. So as I
- mentioned, as recently as 5 years ago we had a
- RIF, a reduction in force, which is almost unheard
- of in government. And so we went from very tough
- 15 times where we didn't have the funding that we
- 16 needed, we didn't have people working the way they
- 17 needed to work, to right now I would say it's as
- stable a time as we can possibly imagine. That's
- 19 a real credit for Lynne, that's a real credit for
- 20 primarily our examiners and for the office as a
- 21 whole. Again, to go from meeting 25 percent of
- the goals to meeting 100 percent of the goals and

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

| 1 | <u> </u> | 1- | | | _ 1 | | |
|---|----------|------|------|------------|-------|-------|------|
| 1 | then | eacn | vear | stretching | tnose | goals | out. |
| | | | | | | | |

- 2 On the other front, that's also given us
- 3 an opportunity to do more strategic planning.
- It's given us an opportunity to think about things
- 5 like accelerated trademark examination, to think
- more about what we're doing internationally. For
- 7 the first time in 10 years, the National Trademark
- 8 Expo came to the office again and it was a great
- 9 success, just an opportunity to let people know
- about the brands that are out there, how important
- 11 they are. We see "Business Week" magazine talk
- 12 about the 100 top brands. I think we had over
- 7,000 people attend, whole school busloads of kids
- 14 coming in learning more about this. That's not
- only critical so that people understand what
- happens at the USPTO, but obviously people
- 17 understand what brands are and they can respect
- 18 that. This goes directly to counterfeiting and
- 19 respect for brands and some of the types of things
- that we're trying to do outside of just
- 21 examination.
- 22 I wanted to give you a little bit of an

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 update on legislation. As you know, the patent

- 2 reform debate is raging. What people don't
- 3 necessarily know is there are a couple provisions
- 4 in that patent reform debate as it ended up at the
- 5 end of the Congress that may affect trademarks.
- 6 One of them affects directly the Trademark
- 7 Advisory Committee, and one is the clarification
- 8 of fee-setting authority. There is a provision
- 9 that was in the Senate bill that talks about
- 10 clarifying fee-setting authority and it proposed
- 11 to give the office more authority over authority
- 12 over setting of fees, but that scheme they had
- 13 come up with, there's recognition that the office
- 14 might be in a better position to set fees than
- 15 Congress generally particularly at a time when
- there are bills that are being held up for years
- 17 and years on end. The scheme that was thought of,
- and I don't mean scheme in a negative way, but the
- 19 format was essentially to have the office come up
- 20 with proposals for fee setting, do a study on
- 21 that. Go through the TPAC and have the TPAC
- 22 evaluate that, and then have a certain time period

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

where Congress could reject the new fees, they

- 2 could be raising or lowering fees, and then if
- 3 there is no objection from Congress, the fees
- 4 would go forward. So that's an important point.
- 5 If that continues, that's something that TPAC will
- 6 be directly involved in. Then there's great
- 7 authority in accepting late filings. There's a
- 8 provision in there that talks about that that I
- 9 think could nominally affect what happens in the
- 10 trademark area.
- 11 But otherwise, one of the more exciting
- things that's happening on the Hill is the issue
- of teleworking and the Telework Enhancement Act of
- 14 2007 which is S-1000. That's a bill that talks
- 15 more about teleworking. The USPTO, Trademarks --
- 16 actually I wouldn't even say Trademarks in
- 17 particular, following Trademarks' lead, Patents
- has had a huge up-tick, almost more than 1,500,
- between 1,500 and 2,000, patent examiners working
- 20 from home. With such an established teleworking
- 21 program in Trademarks, we know that as I mentioned
- 22 before, 20 people working in 12 different states,

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

- 1 our program is more advanced than where the
- 2 government is and our program is more advanced
- 3 than where government regulations are. So there's
- 4 been a recognition in that bill or at least a
- 5 discussion among members of Congress, how can we
- 6 make certain that we push other agencies into
- 7 teleworking or help guide them or encourage them
- 8 is a better way to say it in teleworking. And how
- 9 do we also take the areas where teleworking is
- 10 advanced and give them the opportunities to go and
- 11 work elsewhere.
- 12 Our theory on teleworking is essentially
- more flexibility and more opportunity. Let's give
- 14 people the choice to work from where they want to.
- One of the issues that we've had with our Patent
- 16 Public Advisory Committee is some folks there have
- 17 said we want you to have examiners in California,
- 18 we want them in Denver, we want them here. The
- office's position has not been that we want to
- 20 tell people you must leave and go to Denver, if
- 21 you're comfortable in Washington, D.C., pick up
- and go to California because you know Silicon

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 Valley types of applications. We think that can

- 2 be done remotely, we think that it can be done if
- 3 this system works well.
- 4 What we do want to do is exactly what
- 5 we're doing right now which is tell examiners if
- 6 you want to work in California, you should have
- 7 that opportunity. If you want to work in Kansas
- 8 for whatever reason, you should have that
- 9 opportunity. We don't want the office meddling
- 10 with whether or not people make that decision. So
- our theory really has been what the office should
- do is say if you want to go somewhere else, that's
- 13 fine. We can make your duty station there. And
- 14 then after you move there, you should have the
- 15 responsibility, however many times you needed to
- 16 come back to that office, that responsibility
- would lie with that examiner to pay for the trips
- 18 back to the office, but we should give that
- 19 examiner a limit. The office has proposed we
- 20 should have a limit of four times and only for
- 21 certain circumstances so that people can make
- reasonable choices about where they may go and why

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

- 1 they may go there.
- 2 But I just want to be clear that the
- 3 theory that we have for teleworking so that people
- 4 don't get concerned is not to tell examiners or
- 5 other colleagues we have here you must go
- somewhere else. It's if you want to go somewhere
- 7 else, you should have that opportunity and then
- 8 you can make that decision for yourselves. We
- 9 don't want to get in the position of saying, yes,
- 10 you can move to Philadelphia but, no, you can't
- 11 move to Montana because that's not cost effective.
- We want to give the examiner and other employees
- 13 the chance to make that decision for themselves.
- 14 On the international front, I can talk a
- 15 little bit about ACTA, the Anti-Counterfeiting
- 16 Trade Agreement. There is a lot of progress along
- 17 those lines. For those of you who are following
- that, you can see that there's also litigation
- involved and what discussions are underway, the
- 20 Freedom of Information Act requests, et cetera. I
- 21 think the great news is Australia, Canada, the
- 22 European Commission, Japan, Korea, Mexico,

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 Morocco, Switzerland, the United States, and

- 2 Uruguay are all involved in this Anti-
- 3 Counterfeiting Trade Agreement and are having
- discussions. There was a time when it was thought
- 5 it would only be the Northern Hemisphere, it would
- 6 only be developed nations, and we're not seeing
- 7 that. We're seeing a good number of nations that
- 8 are interested in anti-counterfeiting. This is a
- 9 good sign for all of us and we are looking forward
- 10 to looking at possibly conclusion in negotiations
- 11 at the end of this year is what we had hoped for
- 12 and it looks like they might spill over into next
- 13 year, but those discussions are actively underway.
- The Pro-IP Act of 2008 was just signed
- into law by President Bush. Lynne can speak very
- 16 personally about the Singapore Treaty on the law
- of trademarks. She's been a part of it from
- 18 really the very beginning including the conception
- in a lot of ways and has taken it all the way to
- 20 the end. Signing it was the first official act I
- 21 think of the new Director General of WIPO Frances
- 22 Curry. The treaty needs 10 accessions or

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 ratifications to enter into force, and with United

- 2 States there are eight instruments deposited so
- 3 far.
- 4 So again I'm trying to give just a very
- 5 brief overview of what I see happening at the
- 6 USPTO, and it's really a sense of pride and sense
- 7 of success and it goes directly to the employees
- 8 in the Trademarks area. Our examiners have seen a
- 9 lot of change, they've accepted a lot of change,
- 10 even at times where it's very difficult. That
- 11 change came off of a very uncertain time as I
- mentioned before where we didn't even have the
- 13 collections we needed, where we didn't have
- 14 necessarily the work that was needed. But I think
- there's a sense that it's both stabilized, that
- it's not only stabilized, that this has been 3
- 17 years in a row of record-level growth in terms of
- 18 production, et cetera. I don't know if you talked
- 19 about it yesterday, filings are down, but I don't
- think that's going to have a dramatic effect. Do
- 21 you know how far down they are?
- MS. BERESFORD: I think we got about a 2

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 percent increase this year and we were expecting

- 2 about 6 percent.
- 3 MR. DUDAS: Filings aren't done.
- 4 MS. BERESFORD: They're down from our
- 5 predictions. Lower than last year.
- 6 MR. DUDAS: People have asked both on
- 7 the Patent side and on the Trademark side with
- 8 economics do you see this dramatic downturn in
- 9 terms of filings. We have not. Trademarks,
- obviously if there's 2 percent growth, it's not
- 11 what was expected, but we haven't seen the kind of
- drops we saw with the dot-com boom and the dot-com
- bust. And in Patents we've seen about a 5 percent
- growth rate, but that growth rate is largely
- 15 requests for continuing examinations which is not
- 16 the same as growth in terms of original
- 17 applications in which that growth was largely
- 18 flat.
- I am happy to answer any questions you
- 20 have to discuss more deeply, or otherwise just
- 21 thank you again for being here. It's a great time
- 22 to be here on TPAC I think and there are a lot of

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 really important issues where if I could ask you

- do one thing, just bring in all your experience
- 3 that you have outside, be constructively critical
- 4 of course, but please be critical. Help us figure
- 5 out where we can do more and what we can be doing
- 6 better. And let us be as open and as accessible
- 7 as we can possibly be.
- 8 MR. FARMER: Thank you, Jon. Are there
- 9 any questions from the TPAC members for Mr. Dudas?
- 10 Hearing none, I think that takes us into our
- 11 budget presentation unless there are any other
- 12 presentations from the executive leadership of the
- 13 PTO.
- 14 Before we start of under Article III of
- 15 agenda where it says budget matters, we're going
- to reverse the order. So we're going to go C, B,
- 17 A, instead of A, B, C, because when I was chatting
- 18 with Ms. Garber before we started she said that
- 19 would be a logical flow of information and it
- 20 would build on itself better. So in that case
- 21 I'll turn things over to you, Wendy, and to your
- 22 colleagues, and you can start things off.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

| MS. GARBER: Ce | ertainly. Thank you very |
|----------------|--------------------------|
|----------------|--------------------------|

- 2 much, John, especially with the flexibility with
- 3 the schedule. I realize we got the information to
- 4 the members late yesterday so I do intend to walk
- 5 fairly slowly through these presentations.
- 6 To tell you a little bit about myself,
- 7 I'm currently the Acting CIO. My background is
- 8 actually as a patents -- director so I've been in
- 9 patents for about 17 years. I was asked about 6,
- 7, to 8 months ago to work with Under Secretary
- 11 Dudas and Deputy Under Secretary Peterlin in the
- 12 front office. They wanted me to look into two
- 13 different things. I tell you my background
- 14 because I think it puts me in a unique position to
- ask some questions that you may have.
- One of the questions they asked me to
- 17 look into in which our CFO will be discussing
- 18 later today is the split between Trademark and
- 19 Patents' costs. So they asked me to spend some
- 20 time looking into those issues. So when Mark
- 21 Olechowski is speaking with you later I will
- 22 gladly share with you the things that I found

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

- during my inquiry into those issues.
- 2 The other thing they asked me to look
- 3 into was the health if you will of our IT
- 4 infrastructure, and so that was the second area
- 5 where I spent some time. While I was working with
- 6 them, an opening in the CIO position opened and I
- 7 was in a position where I could fill the position
- 8 until we found a permanent replacement. So that's
- 9 where I have been for the last 4 or 5 months.
- I was asked to look into those two
- issues because at the time didn't have a
- 12 background in the CIO, I didn't have a background
- in trademarks, and I didn't have a background in
- 14 finance. I didn't have a dog in the race so I was
- an objective person who could look into many of
- 16 these issues.
- 17 So what I'm going to walk through with
- 18 you now is this presentation. It looks like this.
- 19 I had the opportunity to brief PPAC on the same
- 20 subject matter a couple weeks ago so I would
- 21 gladly tell you their response and any impressions
- 22 that they may have had. They have heard this as

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

well, but because this is I think a very crucial

- 2 subject to have both patents and trademarks
- 3 knowledgeable of because neither patents nor
- trademarks will be able to meet their goals and
- 5 you're going to be discussing today goals and
- strategic plans looking forward to trademarks and
- 7 without a healthy IT system, none of those goals
- 8 -- attaining them will be possible. So I want to
- 9 thank you for putting this on the agenda. I think
- 10 it is a very important issue for everyone.
- I would like in our current situation,
- owning a house where your roof is showing signs of
- wear and tear and you want to address the problems
- 14 before you get your next rainstorm. The first
- page on the slide there you will see some of our
- 16 current situation. It is the IT infrastructure
- issue in which I found myself several months ago.
- 18 I do want to point out as any successful leader
- 19 will tell you, they surround themselves with
- 20 people more intelligent than themselves. So to my
- 21 left I have the Acting Chief of Staff John Owens,
- 22 and to my right I have the Director of our Budget

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

and Finance area Keith Vanderbrink. I will ask

- 2 them to speak and help me if at any time they
- 3 think I could use the assistance.
- But to tell you of the situation that we
- 5 found ourselves in, and I think it took us about 5
- 6 to 8 years to get in this situation, so what we've
- 7 come up with is about a 5 year plan to help
- 8 improve our situation or to get back on the right
- 9 track in terms of our IT infrastructure. Our
- 10 intermittent system failures have been rising and
- 11 so again I would analogize it to your roof that is
- 12 showing signs of wear and tear. In particular we
- 13 had an outage of patent systems that lasted for
- 14 about a day and a half not too long ago, several
- 15 months ago and we also had a power outage that
- 16 affected all of our employees. So with these
- 17 intermittent system outages rising it is time for
- us to stabilize all of our IT infrastructure
- 19 before these system failures rise anymore.
- We have right now 2,300 unique server
- 21 configurations and 5,700 desktop configurations.
- 22 I don't want to patronize anyone in the room but I

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 also don't want to presume that you have an

- 2 understanding of what that means. What that means
- is all of us in our offices, all employees, have
- their own desktop work stations. If we in the
- OCIO want to manage, for example, we have to send
- out a security patch or we have to send out a
- 7 software upgrade, or somebody calls from the help
- 8 desk and we need to triage what their problem is,
- 9 it is most helpful to us in the OCIO if
- 10 everybody's computers look exactly the same. So
- 11 they all have the same exact software on them,
- they all have the same exact versions of the
- software on them, and that way when somebody calls
- 14 with an issue we can tell them how to fix their
- problem because we've seen the problem before and
- 16 we know how everybody's computers will react to
- 17 the fix.
- What we have instead is we have 5,700
- 19 different computer configurations that have been
- 20 deployed. What that does is it makes it
- 21 exceptionally challenging for us to send out for
- 22 example a security patch. So system vulnerability

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

| 4 | - | 1 | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|------|-------------|----|------|----|------|-----|---|
| 1 | nas | been | recognized, | we | need | to | send | out | а |

- 2 security patch. When you have this many different
- 3 desktop configurations, different ones respond
- differently. Some of them may not recognize the
- 5 patch at all, thus they don't get upgraded. The
- 6 security patch may actually break some of them and
- 7 so now we're getting help desk calls because of
- 8 the security patch my computer is not working. So
- 9 having this many desktop configurations is
- 10 extremely problematic for us and so this is again
- one of the environments in which we find ourselves
- and it's important to move to industry standards
- 13 so we can start to fix these issues.
- 14 Out network which obviously is the
- 15 communication cables that allow all of our
- 16 computers to interconnect is well beyond the
- 17 maximum industry lifespan and most of our switches
- 18 and most of our network hardware was last
- 19 purchased in 2000 and 2001. I would analogize it
- for those of you who have a home computer, imagine
- 21 the home computer you had in the year 2000 with
- 22 your dialup modem, et cetera. So you can see how

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 when you don't update your own computer systems,

- 2 you're unable to take advantage of things as they
- 3 modernize. And especially in an area such as
- 4 trademarks that relies very heavily on telework
- 5 opportunities, we have got to have a robust,
- 6 modern network or we won't be able to take
- 7 advantage of the full telework opportunities. So
- 8 this is actually one of our top priorities to
- 9 replace the network.
- 10 You can see in the fourth bullet there
- 11 that our network capacity is often times at or
- 12 above 80 percent at peak and what means is it
- starts to impact the availability and the speed
- 14 and efficiency of our own software systems to our
- 15 employees. So it makes our systems work more
- 16 slowly. The public has the demand to get some of
- our information and we respond more slowly to
- 18 public demands simply because our network is
- 19 reaching its capacity. It happens particularly
- 20 near the end of the fiscal year because that's
- 21 where employees' demands on our network are
- 22 greatest. So now we are past the fiscal year and

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

| 1 | that | gives | us | а | little | bit | of | а | slowdown | in | ou: |
|---|------|-------|----|---|--------|-----|----|---|----------|----|-----|
| | | | | | | | | | | | |

- 2 network capacity or at least the demands being
- 3 made on it by our own employees. But again the
- 4 replacement of our network will help get this
- 5 issue under control before it becomes a crisis.
- 6 Much of our data center hardware is
- 7 beyond its maximum industry lifespan. Industry
- 8 standards say that hardware and software are
- 9 typically replaced on a 5 to 7 year cycle, and
- 10 many of ours have not been replaced within that
- 11 time period. So when you have something that is
- that old, it becomes more costly to maintain to it
- drives IT operations and maintenance fees up. It
- 14 becomes more fragile so you need more people who
- 15 are at hand so they can fix and in so many words
- 16 apply Band-Aids or duct tape to these machines so
- 17 that we don't show reduction in services to our
- 18 employees or our customers.
- I just thought of the idea right now so
- 20 I'm throwing it off the cuff, John, and I
- 21 apologize. I think if any of you would like maybe
- this afternoon if the agenda goes more quickly

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

than we think it may, if anybody would like a tour

- of our data center later today, we will gladly
- 3 give that to you because I think it will be very
- 4 instructive. At least for me I had never seen a
- 5 data center coming from Patents and so for me it
- 6 was very helpful, so I think we can make that
- 7 available to the group later today.
- 8 The next to the last bullet there is
- 9 very important. Right now we lack an offsite
- 10 disaster recovery capability. In the most perfect
- 11 situation you want a complete replication of all
- of your data center and all of your capabilities
- at a remote site so if something were to happen to
- 14 this site we could start back up immediately with
- 15 the other site, all of our data is there and we
- don't lose much time and our employees can get
- 17 back to work. We however do not at this time have
- 18 such capability. As a matter of fact, we don't
- 19 even have all of our data stored somewhere
- 20 remotely let alone a complete replication of our
- 21 systems. So what that does is I feel like I'm
- 22 Chicken Little a lot of the times, the sky is

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

falling, but you want to be prepared for the

- disaster before it happens, not after it happens.
- 3 So this is a part of our modernization roadmap too
- 4 to make sure we have not only all of our data and
- our systems stored remotely, but the ability to
- fail over to it in the case we have some kind of
- 7 system failure here and today we don't have that
- 8 capability.
- 9 Many of our processes, and coming from
- 10 Patents I'm a customer, I've always been a
- 11 customer of the OCIO, so there's been a source of
- 12 frustration working many times with the OCIO. I
- think in the past it was due to many of the
- 14 processes were done ad hoc or not according to
- industry standards so they weren't repeatable.
- 16 What happens when you're a customer is it can
- frustrate you because it lengthens the process, it
- 18 makes the outcome somewhat indeterminate. It can
- 19 be a random output so you can't necessarily see
- where things are going. What it does is it causes
- 21 work-arounds. So for example, since OCIO did not
- 22 always have a robust process to buy new hardware,

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

think of Blackberry, didn't have a robust system

- 2 for doing that. So our customers who have a need
- 3 for a Blackberry know if they contact the OCIO not
- only does it take too long, by the time I get it
- 5 my need for it is gone, but I don't know whether
- 6 I'll ever get one and I don't know who's going to
- 7 pay for it. So what you do instead is you say I'm
- 8 in Patents, I have money, I'll go buy Blackberrys
- 9 because I can go to Best Buy and I can buy it
- 10 tomorrow. But the problem that those things cause
- 11 the OCIO is when that thing stops working or when
- 12 you need assistance for it, that's when you give
- it to OCIO and you say help me. It's IT, it's
- 14 electrical, I need you guys to maintain it. So
- what has happened is we've ended up with a list of
- 16 approximately 50 some different versions of
- 17 laptops we have out there. Fifty versions of
- laptops. So instead of having only two, three, or
- 19 four versions of laptops that OCIO knows how to
- 20 fix and knows how to support, we end up with 50
- 21 and it drives up our IT costs. I think there's
- 22 enough, I don't want to call it blame, but for

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

lack of a better word, there's enough blame to go

- 2 around where all the different business
- 3 organizations have been a part of creating this
- 4 problem, but I think it's OCIO's responsibility to
- 5 fix it. So what we've come up with and what we're
- 6 labeling our roadmap is our 5 year plan to fix it
- 7 and then make sure we stay on track after that.
- 8 On the next page again as kind of a
- 9 background, as I've already mentioned, I think our
- 10 current environment or our current state evolved
- 11 over time. I don't think anybody wakes up in the
- morning and says I'm going to go to work and I
- wonder what bad decisions I can make today. So I
- 14 think our current state evolved over time with
- 15 people making ad hoc decisions at the time without
- 16 really taking an enterprise or a holistic approach
- 17 to IT and what we ended up with is a house with a
- bunch of additions and a bunch of upgrades and
- 19 none of it communicates with the others and,
- again, it drive up the cost for everyone.
- 21 Technology, as you know, anybody who
- owns technology, technology changes very rapidly

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

| - | - 1 | ٠ . | | | 1.1. | | | 1 . | | 1.1. |
|---|-----|-----|----|------|------|------|--------|--------|--------|------|
| 1 | ana | lI | we | want | tne | most | agile, | robust | system | tnen |

- we need to cyclically replace our hardware and
- 3 software to stay on top of the modernization and
- we haven't always done that. What we intend to do
- 5 with this roadmap is to modernize according to
- 6 today's standards and then get on a cycle where we
- 7 are constantly upgrading. So in the future we
- 8 don't intend to have oh my gosh, let's modernize,
- 9 it will just become a part of our standard
- 10 operations where no one will see that modernizing
- is taking place and we won't have to draw this
- 12 kind of attention to this kind of effort because
- it will just be built into the standard operation.
- 14 At the bottom of slide number 3 you see
- that there are many parts of our IT infrastructure
- 16 that all the different business organizations
- share. For example, email. Patents' employees,
- 18 Trademark's employees, CFO employees, HR
- 19 employees, everybody shares our email system today
- and that's just one example. So there are many,
- 21 many parts of our IT infrastructure that people
- 22 share, and John Owens will be talking a little bit

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 more about that because I know that is one of your

- 2 questions, Trademark's IT versus the rest of IT,
- and so we will be addressing that. The bottom of
- 4 slide three just gives you an example of some of
- 5 the things that we all share.
- 6 The top of slide four as I've mentioned
- 7 already, what we expect what we're terming our
- 8 roadmap to do is to stabilize and simplify our
- 9 current environment. Again we need to make an
- 10 enterprise or holistic approach to this
- 11 modernization as opposed to ad hoc business
- decisions being made in order to please our
- 13 customers. You're trying to make an individual
- 14 happy, but it's hurting the whole, if you will,
- and so we need to take a more holistic approach.
- 16 What I've done in the middle there,
- 17 these are Trademark systems that are specifically
- 18 called out in our roadmap for 2009 that will have
- 19 efforts being placed toward them, and they're
- 20 FAST, TEAS, TRAM, TICRS, and X-Search, and if you
- 21 have any questions, I can certainly address these
- 22 at the end. Some of these systems are some of our

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 more older systems that have not been modernized

- 2 recently and it kills two birds with one stone if
- 3 while working on these systems not only gives you
- 4 or gives Trademark additional functionality and
- 5 additional stability, but it also helps the whole
- 6 of our roadmap and modernizing our IT
- 7 infrastructure at the same time. So by working on
- 8 these systems, and there are some Patent systems
- 9 as well we intend to do this with, it helps both.
- 10 It helps Trademarks as an individual business unit
- and it also helps the whole of our infrastructure
- 12 become more modern.
- 13 What I've done on slide five, our IT
- 14 roadmap is actually this very long document here.
- I can make this available. I made it available to
- the PPAC members. What I'd done in slide number 5
- is summarize it for you. It has nine
- 18 interdependent initiatives. In no particular
- 19 order they are organizational strengthening. In a
- 20 nutshell what that means is we need to work on our
- 21 workforce as well. Some decisions were made in
- 22 the past to take money away from employee training

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

for example. As IT changes we need to keep our

- 2 employees knowledgeable about the most modern --
- 3 I'm an electrical engineer myself. When I went to
- 4 school I learned BASIC and FORTRAN. I'm not very
- 5 helpful today. So the same is true for our
- employees. We need to keep them trained. And if
- 7 we don't do that, what we do is we have to rely
- 8 more and more on contractors which drives up
- 9 costs. So what we've done in this 5 year plan is
- 10 we've front-loaded with contractors because we
- 11 realize we don't have a lot of the knowledge in
- 12 house that we need, but while we are training our
- 13 employees up, our reliance on contractors will go
- down. So in a nutshell, that's what the
- organizational strengthening pillar means. It has
- other components as well including some of the
- 17 budget and finance systems that Keith Vanderbrink
- 18 will be talking about.
- 19 Process standardization. As I mentioned
- 20 before, we want to get away from ad hoc decision
- 21 making and ad hoc processes and move to industry
- 22 standards. So we've recently created an SDLC

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

which is our system or our process through which

- we receive project requests and move all the way
- 3 through the project, design, deployment, et
- 4 cetera. So we've recently done that and moved it
- 5 toward industry standards, away from ad hoc
- 6 because ad hoc decision making has got us to where
- 7 we are today. So in a nutshell, that's the
- 8 process standardization.
- 9 Data center stabilization is to upgrade,
- 10 modernize, and update our entire data center. As
- 11 I mentioned, we'll gladly give you a tour and show
- 12 you. It's interesting because we can show you
- some of our older equipment and we can show you
- 14 some of the issues that our data center has
- including such things as heating and air
- 16 conditioning issues. As simple as that sounds,
- these machines need cooling. They don't always
- get the cooling that they need. We actually have
- 19 portable fans that we use to cool some of our
- 20 equipment.
- 21 AIS stabilization. That in so many
- words is our software. So we need to upgrade all

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

of our software. Some of our software systems are

- very old and they require a lot of people to sit.
- 3 PALM is one of them, for example. I don't know if
- 4 you guys are familiar with PALM. PALM is used by
- 5 Trademarks, but it's used a lot by Patents. So
- for example if I'm an employee of the Patent
- 7 Office and I want to look up where Debbie Cohn's
- 8 office is, I can type her name in and PALM tells
- 9 me where her office is and what her phone number
- is. PALM is a system that is so fragile, it has
- 11 approximately 12 people working full time just to
- 12 keep it up and running and that makes it very,
- 13 very expensive. What these 12 people is they sit
- in a room, and trust me, they're staying busy, and
- 15 wait for PALM to break because it breaks all the
- 16 time. So that's just one of the systems that we
- intend to modernize. Trademarks, I think it is
- 18 TRAM. TRAM is running its system on a very old
- 19 machine using COBOL language. COBOL wasn't taught
- 20 when I was in school. It was already outdated
- 21 when I was in school. Finding people now to
- 22 maintain and keep COBOL running is exceptionally

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

- 1 expensive, so one of our intentions is to
- 2 modernize those types of systems which decreases
- 3 the costs for everyone because we can't afford to
- 4 have systems that are so fragile that they keep
- 5 breaking and raise costs.
- 6 MS. BERESFORD: Wendy, may I just
- 7 interject that although TRAM isn't COBOL, it's not
- 8 fragile, it's one of the most sturdy systems in
- 9 the office, so Trademark folks, don't be worried
- 10 about TRAM. It's chugging right along.
- 11 MS. GARBER: I don't think that's
- 12 completely accurate.
- 13 MR. OWENS: It does cost an exceptional
- 14 amount of money. We have over 20 people who
- 15 constantly work on that system full time and
- 16 that's just contractor staff.
- MR. GARBER: It's robust only because so
- many people work on it all the time.
- 19 MR. OWENS: People work on it to keep it
- 20 up and available and add functionality to it
- 21 constantly.
- MS. GARBER: Moving to our desktop

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

- 1 stabilization, and I'll tell you that's not
- 2 unexpected. When I was telling John Doll, the
- 3 Commissioner for Patents, about our PALM system,
- he had a very similar reaction. He said, What do
- 5 you mean? PALM works. PALM's great. Every time
- 6 I go onto my computer PALM works. And he didn't
- 7 know what was going on behind the scenes. And,
- 8 frankly, business heads shouldn't have to be
- 9 involved with what's going on behind the scenes.
- 10 Our desktop stabilization I mentioned to
- 11 you already. It has to do with the number of
- independent desktops and images that we have out
- there, so we intend to standardize. What I met
- 14 with the EPO I was telling them about the number
- of desktop images we had. Do you know how many
- they have for all their employees? One. Every
- 17 employee in the European Patent Office has the
- 18 same exact computer configuration. When I told
- 19 them we had over 5,000, they were astonished we do
- 20 as well as we do because that's just a vast
- 21 number. So that is one of the elements that we
- 22 intend to do.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

| 1 | Our service desk is one of our |
|----|--|
| 2 | priorities. That's our help desk. We want to |
| 3 | make that process quicker for our employees and |
| 4 | our customers, being able to triage incidents more |
| 5 | rapidly. |
| 6 | Disaster recovery I mentioned to you |
| 7 | already. We do need to bunker all of our data and |
| 8 | ultimately get to where we can have a fail over in |
| 9 | case of a problem so that our employees don't lose |
| 10 | any examination time in the incidence of any kind |
| 11 | of disaster at all. |
| 12 | Network and telecom I mentioned as well. |
| 13 | We intend to replace our network with a new |
| 14 | network that will make our system able because |
| 15 | I think both Patents and Trademarks have strategic |
| 16 | visions for how they want for example telework to |
| 17 | look in the future or electronic processing of |
| 18 | applications or electronic examination, and we |
| 19 | have to have a better network in order to meet |
| 20 | those demands. Our network as it is today is able |
| 21 | to meet the demands of our customers and the |
| 22 | demands of our workforce, and as you know, Patents |

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

is vastly increasing every year in workforce and

- 2 that puts additional stress on our network. So we
- 3 have made a commitment to Patents that we will be
- 4 able to meet the 1,200 hires for this year with
- 5 the network we have, but at the same time we
- 6 needed to start getting the funding and the
- 7 prioritization to fixing it so they can happen in
- 8 parallel, the upgrading of our network so that we
- 9 never have to see an impact to our customers and
- 10 our employees.
- 11 Enterprise architecture is so small it's
- 12 a federal mandate for us to do and it sets forth
- industry standards for how you architect and
- 14 create an IT system for an agency as large as
- ours.
- If you look on the next page, we had to
- 17 approach the business heads for this because it
- 18 was such a large initiative for us that it
- 19 required the approval of our Change Review Board
- 20 and our IT Investment Review Board. It was
- 21 interesting. I saw three responses. I think I
- 22 can categorize the responses of both the business

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

and the deputies into three different ones. There

- was a very small minority who said problem, what
- 3 problem? We have IT problems? Because again when
- 4 you come in in the morning and your computer turns
- 5 on and you're able to do our email and you're able
- 6 to do our word processing, you don't realize that
- 7 your -- is showing signs of wear. So I think we
- 8 were quickly able to educate that group into
- 9 seeing that, yes indeed we have an issue that
- 10 needs to be addressed.
- 11 There was a second minority who I would
- say when you're faced with an issue this large in
- scope, it's easy to seize up. As John would say,
- 14 it's you work to get yourself toward Mount Everest
- and now when you're at the base of it you look up
- and say what a big mountain and it's easy to stop
- 17 there and not start tackling it. So I think we
- 18 also had a minority of people -- we had an OCIO
- organization, granted it was none of the three
- 20 here, but we had an OCIO organization that for
- 21 many years was saying things are fine. For sure,
- 22 Patents you want a new development project? Sure,

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 I'll do that. I think as I mentioned they were

- 2 making ad hoc decisions with the best facts they
- 3 had in front of them at the time, but the business
- 4 heads were never really told until recently that
- 5 IT infrastructure needs to be modernized. It was
- 6 more of an education really than anything else.
- 7 And I think the majority of people felt in so many
- 8 words it doesn't matter how we got here, here we
- 9 are, we have an agency need to fix it so we can
- 10 become more agile, so what do we need to do to
- 11 move forward?
- 12 So what we did, if you look on slide
- number 6, for people who were in the second group
- 14 and had a tendency maybe to seize up, what we did
- is create for them a series of help checks
- 16 throughout the process. We certainly couldn't
- afford to let this be an invisible process where
- we say thank you, give us lots of money and we'll
- 19 come back to you in 5 years and tell you how it
- 20 went because there was a certain lack of
- 21 confidence in our ability to do that where you
- 22 come to them and say we maybe didn't give you the

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

whole picture all along so we're having an issue,

- they can use confidence in the OCIO's abilities
- 3 because they hadn't told them up to then. Nobody
- 4 wants to just give us a pot full of money and tell
- 5 us to come back in 5 years. So what we tried to
- do to mitigate any of those concerns, because we
- 7 can't afford to let this turn into an endless
- 8 planning exercise until everybody has the full
- 9 confidence in our plan. So what we did instead is
- 10 we told them your roof is showing signs of wear,
- 11 we need to get started, and so as to help you
- 12 overcome your lack of confidence based upon past
- OCIO performance, we have a series of health
- 14 checks. This is just an example of what we've
- done and we will be reporting back to the IT
- liaisons, we'll be reporting back to the deputy
- 17 business heads and the business heads as well as
- we are spending their money because they deserve
- to know how we're making progress and whether
- we're making progress.
- 21 I would draw your attention to the
- left-hand column where again we go through the

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

nine initiatives. What you'll see there are the

- 2 2009 dollar estimates for the nine initiatives. I
- 3 would point out to you network and telecom is the
- 4 largest portion of it because as I mentioned to
- 5 you, that is our top priority. So while we
- consider this to be a 5 year plan, our network is
- 7 our top priority and that's why you see more money
- 8 devoted to it in the first year. The same is true
- 9 for disaster recovery and the software or the AIS
- 10 stabilization. We believe all nine of these
- 11 initiatives must be undertaken at once. For
- 12 example, you don't replace hardware without
- replacing software and vice versa. It doesn't
- 14 make any sense. So we believe all nine of these
- initiatives must be attacked at once. However, we
- 16 have prioritized the nine against each other
- 17 chronologically. We realize that network and
- increasing the scope and stability of our network
- is our most important priority in the short run,
- 20 therefore we have focused more money at it
- 21 initially. Some of the other items such as the
- 22 help desk response for example will get more money

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

- 1 devoted to it later. So there was a
- 2 prioritization although it was a chronological
- 3 one.
- 4 Moving on to page 7, it doesn't flow
- 5 real well from the subject of the roadmap, but
- 6 what you'll see in slide number 7 is an answer to
- 7 one of your questions. It is as you'll see at the
- 8 top, the 2009 estimated cost of the roadmap is
- 9 \$38.9 million. We have received the approval of
- 10 all the necessary bodies to move forward with this
- 11 investment cost. What you see is the split
- 12 between Patent and Trademark's percentages at the
- end is based upon the results of 2008 -- Mark will
- 14 talk more about this later, but what we use is the
- 15 2008 final split as a budgeting tool to guess the
- 16 future and it's only after actual costs are done
- 17 that we get back with the actual split, but I
- 18 believe in the past, Mark can answer this better
- during his presentation, but our budgeting tool
- and our actual costs have only been off by 1 to 2
- 21 percent at most. So what this split gives you is
- 22 our best estimate based upon 2008 information of

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 what the Patent and Trademark split will be

- 2 between our roadmap.
- 3 One of the questions, if I can feel free
- 4 to anticipate what one of your questions may be,
- 5 I've heard questions as to why would the Trademark
- 6 share of the total be greater than its FTE
- 7 percentage or the percent of its employees versus
- 8 Patent's employees. Is that a question? What you
- 9 see there is a 78/22 split. The way I would
- 10 phrase it is that a computer doesn't care how many
- 11 people use it or software doesn't care how many
- 12 people use it. So to make a simplified example,
- let's say USPTO has 100 employees, 90 of them are
- 14 Patent's, 10 of them are Trademark's. So 90
- percent of the USPTO is Patent's, 10 percent is
- 16 Trademark's. If Patents were to come to the OCIO
- and say we need a system that does A, B, and C, we
- 18 have to design the system to have those
- 19 capabilities, we need to procure the hardware, buy
- 20 the hardware that needs to be able to do those
- 21 things, and need to architect the hardware so it
- 22 fits into our overall data center and is able to

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

- 1 communicate back and forth. We have federal
- 2 regulations related to security so we have to work
- out all the security costs, et cetera. So we have
- 4 to do all of those things all the way through to
- 5 deployment. Let's say it costs \$1,000. So
- 6 Patents comes and they ask us for a system and it
- 7 costs \$1,000. Later the same year, and I am
- 8 simplifying things, Trademarks comes to us and
- 9 they want a system that does X, Y, and Z. We have
- 10 to go through all the same things. We have to
- 11 design the system so it meets the capabilities, we
- 12 have to architect and procure the hardware so it
- 13 fits overall, we have to do the same security, go
- through all of our federal mandates to make sure
- our vulnerabilities are covered, and it too costs
- 16 \$1,000. If that's all that we were to do that
- 17 year, the split between Patents and Trademarks
- 18 would be fifty-fifty. We did \$1,000 for Patents,
- 19 we did \$1,000 for Trademarks even though the split
- of employees is 90/10 because a computer system
- 21 doesn't care how many people use it and it doesn't
- 22 necessarily add to our cost. So Mark and Keith

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

can both talk more about this later, but at least

- for me that's a good explanation as to why IT
- 3 costs -- it would be more surprising if they did
- fall in a straight FTE percentage at least for me.
- What I'd like to do before taking your
- 6 questions is to move on to John Owens. One of the
- 7 questions that is on the agenda, to answer your
- 8 question number one under C, I've told you our
- 9 2009 costs. We can't until the executive session
- 10 talk more about 2010 and beyond costs. But I can
- tell you that overall it's a 5 year, \$200 million
- 12 plan approximately. What I'll have John talk
- about is this is an opportunity since we say we're
- 14 modernizing our IT infrastructure, it presents an
- opportunity for you guys to ask the question is
- this a good time to create separate IT systems.
- 17 So that's something that I'd like John to speak
- about for you and then I'd happily take your
- 19 questions.
- MR. FARMER: Thank you.
- 21 MR. OWENS: This is a simplified
- 22 diagram. I want to say one thing, just because

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 something looks complicated doesn't necessarily

- 2 mean that it's wrong. If you've ever looked at
- 3 the back of your television or your AV equipment
- or your computer you see a lot of wires hanging
- 5 there and they're connected every which way and
- 6 many of us don't understand how they're all
- 7 interconnected or why, just the fact that it
- 8 works. Technology doesn't have to look simple on
- 9 a piece of paper to actually be correct. So
- 10 please don't draw the conclusion that just because
- 11 something looks complicated that it was built
- improperly.
- We do have many systems here that could
- 14 certainly use an overhaul. As Wendy said, over
- the last 10 years much has changed with
- 16 technology. I've been here for about 8 months now
- and I came from a company who did nothing but
- 18 technology for 13 years. I was the technical
- 19 director there. In the late 1990s and early 2000s
- that organization went through a complete reform
- and we modernized all of our systems to build on
- 22 efficiency and reduce the cost of maintenance. So

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 I'm going to go over here and tell you we're in

- 2 much the same place. These are Trademark AISes.
- 3 AIS stands for automated information system.
- 4 Those are the actual applications that run. These
- 5 are the servers that thee applications run on.
- 6 Some of the lines have been removed, particularly
- 7 the lines -- we have other business unit AISes.
- 8 For example, you heard about PALM. PALM is more
- 9 than just looking up someone in the directory.
- 10 PALM is our single sign on authentication
- 11 authority. So when you log in we know who you,
- 12 what your rights are and so on and so forth due to
- the information in PALM. It's what allows all of
- 14 these systems to connect to the user and to know
- that the user has the authority to do what they're
- doing.
- 17 RAM is our billing system. It's how
- 18 credit card information is processed right down to
- 19 who was charged for what and it stores all the
- 20 information of who's paid fees. So all of these
- 21 systems are shared across business areas. I was
- 22 mistaken the last time I gave this presentation.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 You all do pay for part of these systems. The

- 2 network zones, these are the different networks.
- 3 All the data transfers over. These are shared
- 4 resources as well. You have external trademark
- 5 interfaces. These are things like FAST and TDR.
- 6 And these are the databases. Again, we removed
- 7 all the lines because we just couldn't see
- 8 anything. These databases actually store all of
- 9 the trademark data. These are the servers and
- 10 these are the --
- 11 This type of architecture is more
- 12 monolithic. It grew over time. Business needs
- 13 were met. I can tell you from my examination over
- 14 the last 8 months it looks like more of the
- 15 trademark system is automated end to end than the
- 16 trademark system is today. In fact, trademark
- 17 systems have been around much longer and they have
- 18 always been on the cutting edge far above and
- 19 beyond where I think patents have been. PFW which
- 20 is being done for patents is going to catch them
- 21 up significantly, but more -- for trademark over
- 22 time. Any questions on this? Feel free to ask

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 anything. If I didn't explain something well

- enough, I'm happy to go back. It's hard to gauge
- 3 sometimes where everyone is.
- 4 MS. GARBER: Why I asked OCIO to create
- 5 a chart like this was to show that -- and if you
- 6 recall from my presentation, on the bottom of page
- 7 3 we do share all of the business organizations,
- 8 not just patents and trademarks, but we do share
- 9 much of our IT infrastructure and it's not as easy
- 10 -- what this chart is meant to show is to a lay
- 11 person it may sound very simple to separate, we're
- going to separate, finance will have their IT area
- over here, our CAO and HR will have their IT
- 14 system over here, trademarks here, patents here.
- 15 It sounds very simple possibly to a lay person to
- 16 make that separation. But in reality we don't
- 17 believe it's cost effective nor very easy. So
- 18 what this chart is meant to show is just how many
- 19 resources we share.
- You have a couple of options. One is to
- 21 completely duplicate all systems so that
- 22 trademarks has a RAM system that only trademarks

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

- 1 uses and patents has a RAM system that only
- 2 patents uses, and I think all of us would agree
- 3 that a complete duplication of systems leads to
- 4 increased costs for everybody so it's not
- 5 necessarily cost effective to do that. Then the
- 6 other option that you have is to share all those
- 7 things that can be shared and that's where we are
- 8 today. What this is showing is that there are
- 9 some trademarks -- for example, if we show you the
- 10 data center, John can show you, these are
- 11 trademark servers and so there are some things
- 12 that are separate today and they are things that
- only trademarks spends money for, but the things
- 14 that are separate today are the things that will
- 15 be separate tomorrow. So the things that are much
- 16 more difficult and increase costs to separate are
- things that we don't recommend separating.
- 18 MR. OWENS: What we are going to do
- 19 during the roadmap is we are going to put industry
- 20 standard architecture to work for us, things that
- 21 have been proven in other organizations including
- 22 public and private industry. That is first we're

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

going to stabilize our environment. We're going

- 2 to go to each one of the systems and we're going
- 3 to document its interfaces, we're going to apply
- 4 those standards, we're going to review what we
- 5 currently have and we need to stop problems that
- 6 cause the crashes today.
- 7 While that is going on, we are going to
- 8 document those systems. Much of our documentation
- 9 has not been kept up to date. Then we are going
- 10 to remove the weakest links in those chains, all
- of those arrows on there. Some of them are not
- 12 necessary. And the bigger piece of chain, you
- only need one weak link to break the whole. So
- 14 when we talk about an end-to-end automated system,
- it's a gigantic chain of links and as soon as one
- 16 breaks, the whole system does. So we shorten the
- 17 chains. That's the way modern IT works. We
- shorten the chains and we make clean interfaces.
- 19 The shorter chains act independently. So it's
- 20 like instead of having one chain to pull your car
- out of the mud, you attack six shorter chains.
- You can still pull the same load, but with the

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

shorter ones, if one breaks you can keep going.

- 2 That's the type of modern architecture
- 3 principle that we will be applying to this effort.
- 4 Over time we will simplify our systems to make
- 5 them robust. We will make them redundant. We
- will have duplicative systems, one hot, hot spurs
- 7 they call it. If one of them goes down, the other
- 8 one is taken over. We have three systems that do
- 9 that today, mail, patent search, hopefully soon
- 10 X-search which rides on very much the same system,
- and the third one escapes me at the moment. These
- things that we talked about on page 4 answer your
- 13 question that you asked us, is this the right time
- 14 to do this work. Yes, it is. The roadmap states
- it, the presentation states it, this was planned.
- I think the question is how fast can it
- 17 happen. I equate this to what happened at AOL in
- the middle to late 1990s with the connectivity
- 19 crisis that we had where people couldn't get on or
- get connected and it was very publicly known that
- 21 that was a bad time. It's like crawling out in an
- 22 airplane in flight and replacing an engine. You

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

can't stop. We have to continue to search and

- 2 produce work product. So we are going to be
- 3 replacing all of this infrastructure and
- 4 modernizing all of these systems while in flight
- 5 and that takes a lot of planning and a lot of
- 6 coordination. It's a huge choreographed effort.
- 7 Much harder than it might seem on the outside.
- 8 MS. GARBER: The last point I'd like to
- 9 get across is I likened myself to Chicken Little
- 10 before and I did have to run in the last 3 or 4
- 11 months and tell everybody the sky is falling, the
- 12 sky is falling. We continue to meet our employee
- and customer demands so we don't have an immediate
- 14 crisis where we believe we will stop being able to
- do that. Our crisis however is that we need to
- get started on the plan to modernize. Anybody who
- 17 knows anything about IT knows that not only do you
- 18 first have to get the money which takes time, then
- 19 we have to go through the procurement effort which
- 20 takes time, and then we have to architect and
- 21 design everything which takes time. So my job in
- 22 the last several months has been going around and

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

gathering support for us to get the money and get

- 2 started on the implementing so that we never have
- 3 to lose any of our abilities of our systems to
- 4 meet customers' both internal and external
- 5 demands.
- 6 So with that I'll gladly take any of
- 7 your questions. As I mentioned, I gave the same
- 8 presentation to PPAC probably several weeks ago,
- 9 so I can share any information with you. I know
- 10 it's a lot to digest.
- MR. FARMER: Wendy, as far as the
- 12 possibility of separation of systems, I understand
- the comment that there are certain systems that
- 14 are shared and thus it may be the case that it's
- 15 cheaper to maintain one than two although I don't
- 16 know if both systems are really if that's the case
- or not, but assuming that that is, are there not
- 18 also systems that are not shared that are unique
- 19 to patents or unique to trademarks and those could
- 20 potentially be separately administered on the
- 21 trademark side of the house in the case of
- 22 trademark systems?

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 MS. GARBER: I'll let John go ahead and

- 2 answer that. He's more familiar.
- 3 MR. OWENS: What do you mean by
- 4 separately administered?
- 5 MR. FARMER: As opposed to those
- 6 trademark systems being covered in a central CIO
- 7 function, they could be covered on a CIO function
- 8 that falls on the trademark side of the house.
- 9 MR. OWENS: To what benefit?
- 10 MR. FARMER: So that the trademark side
- of the house would have greater control over its
- 12 budget.
- MR. OWENS: I don't believe that one
- 14 would lead to the other. If you're saying that in
- our data center you would like different system
- 16 administrators to work on those systems, maintain
- them, work in the centralized space, that
- 18 coordination effort alone, the duplication of help
- desks, the duplication of monitoring, the
- 20 duplication of all of those shared resources that
- 21 are above and beyond here, would cost a
- 22 significant amount of money, not to mention we

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 wouldn't have the space or opportunity to do it

- 2 here. So I don't know exactly how to answer your
- 3 question.
- If you wanted to take everything ad hoc
- 5 and move it somewhere else, that would be even
- more. I'd have to work on all of those shared
- 7 systems and either duplicate them or build cleaner
- 8 interfaces that would work over a long connection
- 9 pipe depending on what area of the country you
- wanted to be in and that's even more complicated
- 11 particularly for security. So could you narrow it
- down a little bit for me?
- 13 MR. FARMER: It's really not any more
- 14 specific then item number 3 on the agenda, and the
- question is not presuppose an answer, it's simply
- 16 that we see that there is going to be a tremendous
- 17 expense incurred for a tremendous overhaul that
- 18 appears to be very needed and this seems like an
- 19 opportunity to examine all of the options as to
- whether the system should remain unitary or
- 21 partially unitary and partially separate by patent
- and trademark sides of the house or entirely

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 separate which I understand you all say really

- doesn't work, and thus we're just trying to fully
- 3 understand all three of those options.
- 4 MS. GRABER: It's important to point out
- 5 that we talk a lot about the roadmap. It answers
- 6 part of your question because I don't want to
- 7 exaggerate or overstate how much this is going to
- 8 cost for us, because while it is a very important
- 9 initiative and a costly initiative, it is less
- than 2 percent of our annual budget, so to think
- 11 that you're modernizing your IT infrastructure for
- less than 2 percent of your total budget. I don't
- want to get out of control with how much money we
- 14 talk about this costing because relatively it's
- not very much money. It's one of our goals to
- 16 keep this modernization effort very cost effective
- for everyone. So that's part of your question
- 18 because you did mention how costly this effort
- 19 would be.
- 20 MR. FARMER: To my fellow members of
- 21 TPAC, I have various questions I've written down,
- but I'm not hogging the floor, so jump in when you

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 feel that you wish to. How much overall risk do

- 2 you think the computer system is at for a major
- failure in that that the system could go down, be
- down 2 or 3 days consecutively or even longer?
- 5 MR. OWENS: I believe we had two outages
- 6 of that scale last year.
- 7 MS. GARBER: I'll let John talk more to
- 8 your technical questions, but for example, the
- 9 software stabilization effort we're looking at,
- 10 we're not doing it randomly and we're not doing it
- 11 alphabetically. What we're looking at is this
- 12 systems that we currently believe we have the
- highest risk of outage and we're addressing those
- 14 first. So that's one of the efforts we're going
- 15 through. John knows what the five systems are
- that we're looking at for this year more so than
- 17 I, but we are trying to do it in the area that
- 18 mitigates the most amount of risk.
- 19 Anytime you have a computer system,
- there is some risk of outage no matter how great.
- 21 Even if everything worked perfect, there is a risk
- of an outage. So, yes, we believe there is a risk

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

of outage and what we've tried to do is get this

- 2 roadmap underway before the risk gets any greater.
- 3 The important thing to note is, yes, there is a
- 4 risk but, yes, we have a plan to mitigate it.
- 5 MR. OWENS: I think the answer to your
- 6 question where I started saying that we had two
- 7 last year one of which I was here for and was it
- 8 related to power, it knocked out every system, was
- 9 to set the stage for what I'm about to say which
- is very much what Wendy said. There is always
- 11 risk. That risk in modern systems is lowered by
- 12 having redundant and resilient systems, which
- obviously you see the state of our systems that
- 14 we've just told you we haven't modernized. That
- 15 type of modern architecture didn't come about
- until the mid to late 1990s for the most part. We
- are prioritizing the work here and instilling --
- the roadmap is our modernization effort to avoid
- 19 system-level crashes, but there is always going
- 20 to be risk.
- 21 MR. FARMER: I understand that with
- 22 computer systems there are always risks. I ran a

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

```
1 small business. I know how that is. But
```

- obviously from your testimony, we're at an
- 3 elevated risk right now of the systems going down
- 4 because of the problems that you've described.
- 5 MR. OWENS: It's watching the problems
- 6 slowly increase which I think back in late 2007
- 7 before I was here, many good folks at CIO said
- 8 things don't seem to be going very well. We are
- 9 going to do a much of independent assessments or
- 10 what we call IVVs, independent verification and
- 11 validation. And we did several which resulted in
- showing us many of the cumulative issues that we
- 13 experienced. That in turn led to self-analysis
- 14 which led to the roadmap which led to a 5 year
- plan to resolve the problem. We're being very
- 16 proactive. It may not seem it, but over the last
- 2 years we have taken huge steps, whereas in
- 18 previous years I'd say like Wendy said between the
- 19 last 5 and 8 years, very little had been done.
- 20 MR. FARMER: I'm not trying to look
- 21 backwards and assign blame to anybody, I'm just
- trying to see how much risk there is. Are we

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 under any material risk that the system would go

- down and stay down? In other words, it wouldn't
- 3 be a day or two or 3 days, but it would just be
- down for the count until it's replaced or are we
- 5 not under that kind of risk right now?
- 6 MR. OWENS: A disaster that took out
- 7 this building and the data center?
- 8 MR. FARMER: Sure. I'm just talking
- 9 about a failure within the computer system.
- 10 MR. OWENS: Barring that level of
- 11 disaster, down for an extended period, it is hard
- to tell you how long things -- if we had a fire,
- 13 some massive flood, some disaster --
- 14 MR. FARMER: I'm not talking about
- outside of the system, I'm just talking about a
- 16 system failure. I was just asking if you see any
- 17 material risk that the system itself would fail
- and just stay down, that you wouldn't be able to
- 19 bring it back up in a day or two or three.
- 20 MR. OWENS: No, I don't believe so. In
- 21 the last year or so we've made sure that the bulk
- of our systems and all of the trademark systems to

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 my knowledge are all backed up and stored in a

- 2 configuration management system. We're about to
- duplicate that within the next 6 months in Boyers,
- 4 Pennsylvania, at our data facility.
- 5 MR. FARMER: Thanks for that answer.
- 6 Based upon this timeline, when do you anticipate
- 7 that we will have offsite data recovery that will
- 8 have an offsite system that we can turn to if
- 9 something happens here like a fire or something
- 10 like that?
- MR. OWENS: The current schedule shows
- that the data itself plus the configuration
- management is going to be done by I believe the
- 14 end of Q2.
- MR. FARMER: Excuse me?
- MS. GARBER: The second quarter.
- MR. OWENS: Fiscal Q2 of this year.
- MS. GARBER: So soon, which is
- 19 approximately March.
- 20 MR. FARMER: I don't know if I'm asking
- 21 the right folks this question. If so, please tell
- 22 me ask somebody else. But when the system is down

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 entirely, what does the PTO do to get its work

- 2 done? Do we just have to hang out until the
- 3 system comes back up or are there other work-
- 4 arounds that are in place?
- 5 MS. GARBER: It depends very much on the
- 6 system, and I'm talking to you from a patents
- 7 perspective and I trademarks is analogous from the
- 8 examining attorneys sitting in their offices
- 9 trying to do work. It depends on what the system
- 10 is. Some systems were they to go down are merely
- 11 inconvenient to not have. Some systems are more
- 12 short-term loss of work concerns. Again I'm
- talking from patents so I'll let a trademarks
- 14 person speak up about the examining attorney. But
- for patents, the average examiner uses a number of
- different systems so usually if one of them isn't
- working, there are other things you can do. For
- 18 example, instead of writing an office action,
- 19 maybe that system is down, the one that allows you
- 20 to write correspondences. So you have to put that
- 21 work aside and maybe start on a new application
- and perform the search because the searching

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 application is still available. So often times

- 2 it's a matter of convenience as opposed to
- 3 everybody go home for 2 days and we'll pick back
- 4 up work later. So at least for us on the patents
- 5 side that's what our failures have been like.
- 6 MR. FARMER: What I take from that is
- 7 whatever is down, that function in the office that
- 8 needs that computer system just can't go forward.
- 9 MS. GRABER: In many cases that's true,
- 10 but we've only had two in the last year outages
- 11 that lasted more than an hour or so.
- MR. FARMER: Is the PTO under any threat
- due to its computer system issues right now of
- 14 data loss where the data would not be retrievable
- or are we in a pretty good situation there?
- MR. OWENS: I think we're in a much
- 17 better situation there only because all of the
- data is stored in RATA (?) databases which in
- 19 English means that it's self-backed up here on
- 20 site. What we are not prevented against is
- 21 disaster.
- MR. FARMER: This may be a question that

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 you tell me that I'm either not asking the right

- folks or that we should take it up in executive
- 3 session, but do we have any sort of timeline on
- 4 when someone would be again in an appropriate
- 5 position in the CIO position? Because I think
- 6 Wendy you're acting right now. Correct?
- 7 MS. GRABER: I am. We actually have a
- 8 timeline that will be next Monday.
- 9 MR. FARMER: That's pretty doggone
- 10 quick.
- MS. GRABER: I'm glad you asked.
- MR. FARMER: Congratulations perhaps.
- MS. GRABER: Not to me. John Owens will
- 14 be our next CIO.
- MR. FARMER: Congratulations.
- MR. OWENS: Thank you. A question on
- 17 the division. I just want to see if I have my
- 18 mind around the money side of this correct. And
- 19 this to my fellow TPACers this is the last
- 20 question I had on my list. That is, looking at
- 21 the full-time equivalence in the office in terms
- 22 of employees, it looks like about 65 percent of

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

the people are on the patent side, 5 percent are

- on the trademark side, and 65 plus 5 is 70, so
- 3 that would leave 30 percent of the FTEs being in
- 4 overhead so speak, they're neither on the patent
- or the trademark side. Then when I look at the
- 6 division of cost, it's not quite 82/20. It's
- 7 close to that, but not quite 80/20. So if I'm
- 8 doing my math right, it looks like what that
- 9 really means is that for the 30 percent of the
- 10 FTEs who are in overhead, they're pretty much
- 11 being split fifty-fifty between the patent and the
- 12 trademark side, not quite because it's not quite
- 80/20, but it's pretty close to that. Do I have
- 14 my rough back-of-the- envelope calculation right
- 15 there?
- MS. GRABER: I think what I'd prefer to
- do is turn that over to Mark, and I don't know
- 18 whether he intends to cover that. That may be a
- 19 question that very much deserves an answer, but I
- 20 don't know if it should wait.
- 21 MR. FARMER: If that's something that
- 22 we'll address there, then we can defer until we

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

- 1 get there.
- 2 MR. OLECHOWSKI: It will come up in the
- 3 context of what I want to talk about, but if we
- 4 don't answer the specific question, absolutely we
- 5 can leave it.
- 6 MR. FARMER: I'll hold it until then. I
- 7 didn't mean to hog the floor from fellow members
- 8 of TPAC. What questions or comments if any do you
- 9 have?
- 10 MR. STORIE: When you're working on --
- 11 sometimes it's hard to know what you don't know.
- 12 We have people still around who know what it's
- going to take deal with the pieces that have been
- layered on top of each other over time. I realize
- this is a challenge, but this system has been
- 16 built more like a living organism and has
- 17 continued to grow and it's grown based upon need
- 18 rather than being a central plan to actually build
- 19 it from scratch. Do we have folks in house still
- 20 who have the knowledge of how we got to where we
- 21 are?
- MR. OWENS: Some. Not in every

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

| 1 | | mla | | ~ ~ ~ ~ | | 10 | 1 | la |
|---|-----------|------|-----|---------|--------|------|------|------|
| 1 | instance. | mere | are | some | people | nere | MIIO | nave |

- 2 been here a very long time where we're trying to
- 3 capture that institutional knowledge. In some
- instances we are going to have to pay people to
- 5 come in as well as hire people to come in to work
- on this. Just to let you know, the CIO here has
- 7 not had developers in years, actual people who
- 8 write software. We are going through an effort
- 9 right now. There are approximately 14 openings --
- in fact, I'd like to say that Gary Cannon from
- 11 trademarks helped this panel many of those people.
- We're trying to bring in developers of our own as
- well as hire solid contractor developers to
- 14 reverse engineer much of the systems that we have
- 15 lost that institutional knowledge on,
- 16 requirements, documents, standard operating
- 17 procedures, those things that modern computer
- organizations would have in many instances because
- 19 we have grown organically or ad hoc we do not, but
- 20 we working very hard through the stabilization
- 21 effort to do that for our systems.
- 22 Again that effort is taking the current

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 computer systems and stabilizing them when we can,

- 2 documenting them, and then actually planning for
- 3 their rearchitecture, engineering, and development
- 4 based on modern standards, modern interfaces.
- 5 MR. STORIE: Does that have an
- 6 significant on the budget, this first leg of the
- 7 process?
- 8 MR. OWENS: I would say yes to be up
- 9 front, but not totally for that reason but, yes,
- 10 because we have up fronted many contractors. If
- 11 you look at the scale, we've up fronted
- 12 contractors that trail off over the 5 years to
- lower than today just because we have to buy
- 14 expertise in areas, the particular type of
- operating systems, some of the software that we
- 16 need to get rid of.
- MR. STORIE: The challenges you have,
- 18 you're in an environment where the architecture
- we're using now will be obsolete in 4 months.
- 20 MR. OWENS: Many times.
- 21 MR. STORIE: So you're at the spot where
- 22 you're having to now anticipate what the systems

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

| 1 | should | look | like | 5 | years | from | now | because | what | you |
|---|--------|------|------|---|-------|------|-----|---------|------|-----|
|---|--------|------|------|---|-------|------|-----|---------|------|-----|

- 2 can build today will be long since obsolete. Have
- 3 we been able to craft the target where we think we
- 4 want to be structurally 5 years from now?
- 5 MR. OWENS: At a very high level, and I
- know these terms are industry standards certainly
- 7 I'm used to, but if you pay attention to the
- 8 technology you'll hear terms called service
- 9 oriented architecture or SOA. AOL had many
- 10 instances of SOA applications. What it does is it
- 11 breaks down a computer system into a list of
- 12 services with very clean interfaces and systems
- 13 can talk to one another not through very low level
- 14 protocols, bits and bytes that were of the past,
- but messages, please provide me a list of people,
- 16 please provide me this docket, more friendly
- 17 language in between systems. We would like to get
- them. Unfortunately our systems -- they're all
- 19 protocol level old style connected. That's like
- 20 wires instead of wireless. There's still a
- 21 connection but it's not the same.
- MS. GRABER: And I think it's important

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

to point out too that we don't intend this 5 year

- 2 plan to be 5 years and then we refer to how we did
- 3 it before. So this actually dovetails very nicely
- 4 into the industry standard of doing a capital
- 5 replacement every 5 to 7 years and it just becomes
- 6 part of your doing business. I appreciate very
- 7 much what John said earlier about I don't want to
- 8 turn this into a finger pointing or a blame
- 9 placing how did Susie Smith ever make this
- 10 decision, how did we come to this, because I do
- 11 think this is an opportunity and where we are is
- where we are and we need to move forward and fix
- it as an agency. Part of the lessons learned here
- is this is not a 5 year plan and then we all just
- 15 sit on your hands and watch that organic thing
- 16 grow again. So the fact that this is 5 years is
- 17 no mistake because it dovetails into the capital
- 18 replacement plan of 5 year cycles.
- 19 MR. STORIE: In terms of the overall
- 20 structure, when you look at the size of the
- 21 particular systems, if you're looking at it from
- 22 the standpoint of total operational size of the

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 system and what it takes to keep it running, what

- 2 portion of that system would you say is shared
- 3 versus what are the portions that are dedicated?
- 4 MR. OWENS: Shared with?
- 5 MR. STORIE: Shared between the
- 6 trademark side and the patent side.
- 7 MR. OWENS: I'd say the bulk is just
- 8 trademarks because of the fence, the servers that
- 9 we have that you pay for, the AISes that only
- serve you all the stuff on the top. The very top
- 11 box, there are many more than this, but these are
- 12 all dedicated trademark AISes that run on these
- 13 dedicated trademark -- serve as hardware. These
- 14 are systems in and of themselves that are shared,
- but as far as trademark goes if you're looking for
- 16 percentage I'd say the bulk is definitely up here.
- I don't want to give you a percentage because I
- haven't counted them. I know that this is much
- 19 greater than this whole, but these are fundamental
- 20 systems. This is website hosting. TR runs on
- 21 that. PALM which we already talked about RAM,
- these systems are shared for a reason, and it's

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 not just trademarks and patents. Our business

- 2 systems rely on -- as well.
- MR. STORIE: So to make sure that I
- 4 understand the implications of what you said, the
- 5 systems that apply to trademarks, the system
- 6 itself and the hardware assets, it's largely
- 7 dedicated, a large portion of what we're using --
- 8 dedicated to the trademark side of the house, the
- 9 critical operations that ties this together and
- 10 allows it to run may be a smaller portion of the
- 11 overall operations and it's critical because
- 12 everything relies on the foundation.
- 13 MR. OWENS: Yes. Getting back to the
- 14 earlier question which was related to cost, if you
- just think about the network, we have one network
- and we're about to put in a new redundant network
- here with dual paths which means that if one path
- 18 goes down it's like hydraulics in an airplane, if
- one goes down you have a backup. We don't have
- 20 that today. We're going to work on that. It's
- 21 part of the plan. It's part of the network
- 22 replacement. I couldn't put in a third and fourth

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 redundant network in the buildings. There's just

- 2 not enough physical wire, fiber actually. We're
- actually going to use the fiber that's here. But
- 4 everything from power, cooling, floor space, I
- 5 couldn't possibly duplicate all of the overlapping
- 6 infrastructure in this building to support a
- 7 completely separate system. Physically it is not
- 8 possible. It's just not.
- 9 MR. FARMER: Unless there are any other
- 10 questions, so that we can keep the trains running
- on time, I would now move over to item 3-B which
- is the report on the review of the OCIO finances.
- MS. GRABER: What I'd like to do to
- 14 introduce Keith to all of you is one of the
- 15 elements when I first took over that I asked for
- was a complete audit of the OCIO's financial
- 17 resource management. How is it that OCIO manages
- 18 its own financial resources? So Keith and
- 19 Michelle Picard back here both helped. I used
- them because they were outside OCIO so they didn't
- 21 have a dog in the race, so they just did an
- 22 objective look at how OCIO manages its financial

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 resources. I've asked Keith to be here today to

- tell you a little bit about what he found. Again
- 3 this is part of one of our roadmap exercises, our
- 4 organizational strengthening. I won't take away
- 5 his thunder, but I think a lot of what he found
- 6 had to do with how we plan for our IT expenses for
- 7 upcoming years. So I'll let him address it, and
- 8 I'm sure you'll have questions for him.
- 9 MR. VANDERBRINK: Thank you, Wendy.
- 10 Again my name is Keith Vanderbrink. I'm the
- 11 Director of Budget and Finance Division. I took
- 12 over about 6 weeks ago.
- MS. GRABER: When he was finished with
- 14 the audit he did so well I put him in charge.
- MR. VANDERBRINK: I don't know if that
- 16 was a job well done or what the deal was on that.
- 17 But it is important I suspect for you to know that
- between 1998 and 2001 I served in the same
- 19 position, it was a different title and a different
- office, but it was resource management for the
- OCIO operation. Then I like to think I left and
- things started to fall apart so now I'm back. I

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

- offer that by way of some background.
- 2 The other thing that I think is
- 3 important at least for me and so I'll share it
- 4 with you is that while Michelle and I were doing
- 5 this review, to some degree unbeknownst to us the
- 6 roadmap effort had been launched at the same time.
- 7 So whether Wendy had decided that that was going
- 8 to be her plan of attack or not, I don't know, but
- 9 you're going to see very quickly that one of the
- 10 first things Michelle and I found in this review
- 11 was that needs to get done and it needs to get
- done soon which is a plan to move away from this
- organic approach to actually determining our
- 14 future and something that's more structured.
- The last thing I'll say before I go to
- 16 the first slide is when I can I kind of kick Wendy
- 17 under the table. It was not an audit. Audit is a
- 18 very specific term. It means very specific
- 19 protocols, very specific, and that was not the
- 20 case. It was quite clear to us that given the
- 21 timeframe that we had, the need to come up with
- 22 actionable information as soon as possible, not

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

we'll get back to you in 8 months and we'll go

- 2 through every transaction ad nausea, it was a
- 3 review, and it was a review that resulted in
- 4 observations which clearly could then turn into
- 5 next steps and you're going to see that as we go
- 6 on here.
- 7 The first slide is as it indicates, and
- 8 by the way, I'll do what Wendy did, you should all
- 9 be looking at the slide presentation that has
- green on the top that says the OCIO Financial
- 11 Resources Review. The observation summary was
- 12 that OCIO needed very quickly to return to some
- 13 fundamentals of resource management, and of course
- 14 the standing joke that I've gotten since I've
- 15 returned is you're the guy who's going to take us
- back to the 20th century, and to some extent I'm
- going to take us back to fundamentals, and that is
- where IT plans are driving IT budget formulations.
- 19 What is it you want to do? What do we think it's
- 20 going to cost to do it? And then let's secure the
- 21 funds. As opposed to securing funds and then
- through either an attempt to be very customer

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 service oriented delivering when we can where we

- 2 can, trying to promise to deliver, not deliver
- 3 because of some process problems that Wendy
- mentioned, but again, here's the plan, everyone
- 5 knows about it, we know about it well enough in
- 6 advance, here's the estimates, and then executing
- 7 against that. That's the what, if you will.
- 8 The how is just as important as the what
- 9 which was the sound IT estimating controls.
- 10 Having a guesstimate is obviously useful, having a
- 11 rough order of magnitude is useful, but then as
- 12 you get closer to executing that project, having
- 13 some sound IT estimating controls so that you get
- 14 as it says here a reliable IT budget and not
- something that you're going to execute where
- 16 everybody is standing around going I wish they
- hadn't approved this because I'm not sure we're
- all kind of on the same page relative to the
- 19 estimates and costs.
- Then finally the who. What drives the
- 21 presentation? I believe it's the investors. It's
- the folks who are actually going to pony up

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

whatever the dollars are, whether it be patent

- 2 fees on the patent side, trademark fees on the
- 3 trademark side. I think it's important for the
- 4 budget to be presented in a format that's
- 5 meaningful to the individual who again is parting
- 6 with those dollars in making that investment, not
- 7 presented in an organizational structure for OCIO,
- 8 and obviously the folks doing the work need to
- 9 know where their money is, but we've sort of found
- 10 that most of the budget presentations in the past
- 11 were more organizationally driven, we're going to
- give this to this office, this to this office.
- 13 You get a sense we're big on analogies at least
- 14 this current group. It's like when you bring the
- 15 general contractor in and you show them I'd like
- my kitchen redone, my den redone, and my bathroom
- 17 redone. You have a conversation. He brings back
- an estimate to you that says my carpenters will
- 19 need this much money, my electricians will need
- this much money, my plumbers, that's not helpful
- 21 to you. You want to know I need this much for
- 22 your kitchen, this much for your bathroom, this

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 much for your den, so that if an estimate looks

- like it's not what you had in mind, you can begin
- 3 to have a conversation about the kitchen. Why is
- 4 the estimate as high as that? Because your plan
- 5 was to use marble as opposed to laminate or
- 6 something. So again it's that planning really
- 7 driving the budget formulation, feeling confident
- 8 about the estimates, presenting in a way that
- 9 makes for a far more meaningful resource
- 10 management process. Before I get off of this
- 11 slide, you guys can probably get a sense that I'm
- 12 more analytically driven. This side was answering
- the who, what, when, where, why, how. That's
- 14 another aspect for me of the fundamentals of
- 15 resource management. While there may be multiple
- 16 ways to mow a lawn, at the end of the day there
- 17 really are only like two or three ways, up and
- down, left and right, that kind of deal. So for
- me, resource management is not the area where you
- 20 practice your creativity, it's where you say these
- 21 are the fundamentals, everyone understands them
- and we just proceed with them.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

| 1 | On the next slide it gets into a little |
|----|--|
| 2 | more of what Michelle and I observed and our |
| 3 | improvement plan and begins to give you a sense of |
| 4 | where we are today, where I believe resource |
| 5 | management should be is CIO in agreement and |
| 6 | the presentation has been given to the USPTO |
| 7 | Management Council. One of the first observations |
| 8 | was IT plans are not driving budget formulation. |
| 9 | You heard a timeframe from Wendy and John, that it |
| 10 | took 5 to 8 years to get us to this point. We |
| 11 | found that beginning in 2003 the IT plans that had |
| 12 | been published and produced began to abandon |
| 13 | milestones with dates. Obviously a plan needs to |
| 14 | be meaningful. The folks who have to execute it |
| 15 | need to be like it's very clear this is what we're |
| 16 | supposed to do when we're supposed to do it, not |
| 17 | something that's at a 70,000 foot level that's |
| 18 | just sort of a vision if you will. |
| 19 | The new process is working with our |
| 20 | quality management group, BFD is working with the |
| 21 | quality management group, to produce in the second |
| 22 | quarter an IT plan that looks like what the IT |

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 plan used to look like at the turn of the century

- 2 around 2000. It had very specific chapters in it,
- 3 two that most folks know about, Chapter 5 and
- Chapter 6. Chapter 5 talked about the plans for
- 5 the infrastructure. We've got that for the most
- 6 part. That's our roadmap. Chapter 6 was what are
- 7 the plans for individual AISes. That's where
- 8 meeting with Lynne and her staff to talk about
- 9 trademark systems, meeting with John and the
- 10 patent folks to talk about patent systems, so that
- it's clear to everyone that over a 5 year horizon
- 12 which is typically what the strategic plan is what
- it will be, forget typically, this is what we're
- 14 planning on doing for the infrastructure, this is
- what we're planning on doing for the AISes that
- 16 are going to ride on that infrastructure. You had
- 17 brought up a question about what do we anticipate
- 18 the end game to be. In looking at a plan like
- 19 this it's going to be clear for you to see the end
- 20 game out of the Chapter 5 work and the end game
- out of the Chapter 6 work. It's not magic. It's
- obviously a commitment. And it's necessary, and

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

that's just simply what we're going to do, turn

- 2 back to that commitment and it's necessary.
- Plans are great, and as I said, you put
- 4 some resource estimates to it. That's the second
- 5 one. The resource estimates need to be
- 6 consistent, they need to be following some
- 7 standard operating procedures. I don't think it's
- 8 terribly helpful to the resource management
- 9 process if when Mark is asked to give resource
- 10 estimates he follows what he believes to be best
- 11 practices, John follows what he believes to be
- 12 best practices, and down the line. We want folks
- 13 to be following some standard procedures by which
- 14 we come up with estimates. And then as the
- 15 actuals are coming in, we have the ability to
- 16 refine those estimates because it's in a process
- 17 that makes sense. It's not just take all your
- 18 estimates to Mark because Mark just seems to be
- 19 lucky and stay away from John because John will
- just end up giving you numbers that are -- we want
- 21 to get away from that sort of situation. And we
- 22 want again very much for there to be some

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 structure, that there be some processes, and also

- for whatever tools are used, they're consistent
- across the board, there isn't some data that one
- 4 is using that another is not using.
- The third one that you see there is the
- 6 budget presentation is not intuitive for
- 7 investors. My goal in the second quarter of FY
- 8 2009 is to create a transparent budget both in
- 9 terms of execution, as well as in terms of
- 10 formulation so that it's quite clear when you look
- 11 at that budget you don't need a decoder ring, you
- don't need me to explain it to you, you can look
- 13 at it, and to a certain degree you want a budget
- that you can drill down to and when you get into
- the weeds and you're like I need somebody here
- 16 with me, I should be able to at least at a high
- 17 level understand it, at mid level understand it.
- 18 Wendy will often say if you can explain it to me,
- 19 then it's good. If I still don't understand it,
- 20 go back and keep working on it.
- 21 This might be a useful time for me to
- 22 pause, and we'll talk a little about this, but my

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 plan for the Budget and Finance Division in the

- 2 short term, and for me short term is usually
- 3 something that's about 18 months, 12 to 18 months,
- long term is beyond that, is to structure the
- 5 Budget and Finance Division where it's focusing on
- 6 budget formulation, budget execution, and cost
- 7 accounting which is obviously something that's
- 8 very key here, and then also project funding, and
- 9 those three areas for me that's where I think the
- 10 resource management fundamentals need to be
- 11 practiced with connections among them and I can
- 12 discuss in more detail later on that
- organizational structure and that sort of thing
- 14 for those of you who like organizational behavior
- 15 and development.
- The process by which I will be reporting
- 17 and tracking against this work is not by launching
- 18 some separate organic -- it's the roadmap.
- 19 There's an organizational strengthening initiative
- 20 within the roadmap. This work is required for
- 21 that organization to be strengthened, for those
- 22 employees to be set up to succeed, I know what I'm

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 supposed to do, I know the resources I have, now

- let me execute the plan. So you see at the bottom
- 3 there that that's what I'll be tracking against is
- 4 organizational strengthening.
- 5 The last slide attempts to try to take
- again being the analyst a timeframe across the top
- 7 to give you a feel. You heard me talk about short
- 8 term, long term. This is mainly a focus on the
- 9 short term actionable items, hit the ground
- 10 running, where do we expect to be at the end of FY
- 11 2009 heading into FY 2010. And down the left-hand
- 12 side you see three areas that actually came up
- 13 when Michelle and I were doing our presentation
- 14 because we were not setting out to do an audit and
- 15 look at every single invoice for the last 10 years
- or what not, we were focusing on processes,
- staffing, and tools, because again the resource
- 18 management process that OCIO has that USPTO enjoys
- 19 fundamentally rests with the processes, the
- 20 staffs, and the tools.
- On the processes side, we've already put
- in place a budget execution process that folks

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

| 1 | within | OCIO | are | following. | It's | following |
|---|--------|------|-----|------------|------|-----------|
| | | | | | | |

- 2 internal controls, recognizes the work that's
- 3 expected of us, recognizes the dollars associated
- 4 with the roadmap, making sure that money is not
- 5 spent -- the story at the end of the year was an E
- for effort, but this project was supposed to
- 7 perform this work, it was allocated these dollars,
- 8 and as the project proceeds how is it doing. The
- 9 IT plan that you see up there in the second
- 10 quarter, that's very important for me particularly
- 11 as we have to embark on producing the 2010
- 12 president's budget, revalidating, I'm sorry, the
- 13 2010 budget, and then also getting ready for the
- 14 OMB budget submission which you'll see there for
- 15 budget formulation. In that same process vein,
- 16 assessing IT budget estimating in the project
- funding area project funding area, making sure
- that again we've got some consistency across
- 19 projects, we don't have a situation where we're
- 20 overstating costs for our trademark system,
- 21 understanding for patents, again, there's a
- 22 standard if you will. That's what you would

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

- 1 expect, that's what I would expect.
- 2 On the staffing side of it, Jon Dudas
- 3 mentioned that a lot of change had been thrown at
- 4 trademark examiners in the last several years.
- 5 You can probably imagine in the last 6 weeks a
- 6 great deal of change has been thrown at the Budget
- 7 and Finance Division staff and assessing skills
- 8 with them and working with them. I'm pleased to
- 9 say that I have the utmost confidence in the staff
- 10 that's there in terms of getting us, me, Jon,
- 11 trademarks, USPTO, from where we are to where we
- need to be. There's going to be some coaching and
- mentoring and that kind of deal. This also looks
- 14 at skills across OCIO because of the estimating.
- 15 Obviously estimating for systems, the engineering
- work, the hardware work, software development
- work, it's not happening by 5, 6, 7 people in the
- 18 Budget and Finance Division, it's happening by the
- 19 software folks and engineering folks, bringing
- them up to speed and making sure that they're
- 21 aware of what the expectations are and that kind
- of deal.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

| 1 | Then finally the tools. For quite some |
|----|--|
| 2 | time now USPTO has kept a checkbook where it keeps |
| 3 | track of the obligations and so on and so forth. |
| 4 | The core financial system is the official record, |
| 5 | but because of this need to slice and dice to some |
| 6 | extent we had been keeping a system and we're |
| 7 | going to continue with that short term one, but |
| 8 | our long term as you can see down there is to |
| 9 | participate in the system, the corporate planning |
| 10 | tool, that the CFO's organization is going to be |
| 11 | launching this fiscal year and move into that |
| 12 | along with the rest of USPTO and not maintain |
| 13 | anything that is as I said separate as has been |
| 14 | the case. |
| 15 | At the very end of this slide you see a |
| 16 | vertical block that says continuous improvement |
| 17 | with the lines. Obviously you've heard Wendy say |
| 18 | the roadmap doesn't just end and then someone else |
| 19 | comes along and says I'd like to now start the |
| 20 | next 5 year. The same deal here is to |
| 21 | continuously improve in areas of cost accounting, |
| 22 | in areas of budget formulation, budget execution, |

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 project funding and that kind of deal to truly get

- 2 a sense as we're moving through this of the things
- 3 that are working and not working. I mentioned to
- 4 you that I have a fairly good idea from 10 years
- 5 ago of what was working then and some of the stuff
- 6 doesn't change. The environment has changed.
- 7 Things are far more complicated now, whether it be
- 8 that, or whether it be some of the financial
- 9 requirements. Make no mistake, OMB does require a
- 10 lot more from a federal agency for IT reporting
- 11 than it did 10 years ago, but again just being
- 12 prepared for that. And I believe that what I've
- just presented to you certainly does set us up to
- 14 succeed in that vein and to be able to prepare
- 15 that stuff. Mr. Farmer, I'll take questions at
- 16 this point.
- 17 MS. BERESFORD: I have a comment, Keith.
- 18 When you gave this presentation to Management
- 19 Council, the thing that certainly got my attention
- 20 at the beginning of your presentation was the
- 21 statement that looking at the OCIO financial
- 22 records was like digging through bad concrete and

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 you had to keep digging and digging and digging

- 2 until you found something that was solid and that
- 3 meant going back to 2000 I think was the year you
- 4 mentioned.
- 5 MR. VANDERBRINK: If I say, you were the
- one who as I gave it had indicated that what I was
- 7 presenting, you were like this sounds like how
- 8 things used to run about 10 years ago.
- 9 MS. BERESFORD: Absolutely.
- 10 MR. VANDERBRINK: And I mentioned to you
- 11 when Michelle and I started our review we thought
- 5 years. You got to start somewhere. Someone
- hands you a task of a review.
- MS. BERESFORD: Right.
- MR. VANDERBRINK: And we were like we
- need to probably let's look at 6, 7, we needed to
- go to a point where we were able to say here is
- going to be our jumping off point. So you're
- 19 absolutely right, Lynne. You had identified that.
- MS. BERESFORD: I'm not looking for --
- 21 identified the problem early on, what I really am
- looking at, I'm thinking about -- do we have --

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

just I'm curious, how much money got spent in that

- 2 period? I mean, what was OCIO spending in that 8
- 3 year period or 7 year period?
- 4 MR. VANDERBRINK: That was one of the --
- 5 we certainly did look at those numbers. I don't
- 6 have that specific number in front of me over that
- 7 10 year period but I can certainly get you that
- 8 number.
- 9 MS. BERESFORD: I'm just curious because
- 10 it really shocked me when you said that. It
- 11 really shocked me.
- MR. VANDERBRINK: The other thing that I
- 13 should mention is one of the reasons -- and if I'm
- 14 overemphasizing this then guilty as charged, we
- had to go back as far as we did to find an
- instance where there were solid plans where
- 17 everyone inside USPTO and even externally because
- 18 we used to publish the IT plan, it was clear here
- is what we said we would do, here is what we said
- we would spend, here's what we did, here's what we
- 21 spent, that kind of deal, and then kind of work
- our way up to the present on that.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

| 1 | MS. | PICARD: | Lynne, | Ι | guess | there | was |
|---|-----|---------|--------|---|-------|-------|-----|
|---|-----|---------|--------|---|-------|-------|-----|

- 2 never any question about the financial records.
- 3 Keith had mentioned that the core financial system
- 4 is still the system of record and there were never
- 5 questions about that. It was the plans.
- 6 MR. VANDERBRINK: I can say we didn't
- 7 find any hanky-panky that is helpful. Michelle
- 8 and I weren't tasked to find the smoking gun, find
- 9 the evidence against a person or that kind of
- 10 deal, help us -- but by the same token, one of the
- 11 reasons why Michelle and I were asked was because
- of our reputation. So it was clear that we were
- going to look at stuff. We did not find anything
- that drew a red flag to us in terms of speculative
- obligations or unusual activity or that kind of
- 16 deal.
- MS. BERESFORD: I wasn't implying we had
- anybody that bought an island in the Caribbean and
- 19 retired there.
- 20 MR. VANDERBRINK: I didn't think you
- 21 were.
- 22 MS. BERESFORD: It was just a concern to

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 me that the level of the lack of records and other

- 2 things that I think are important.
- 3 MR. FARMER: Keith, thanks for your
- 4 presentation. A couple of questions.
- 5 MR. VANDERBRINK: I'm sorry. I was
- 6 asked by my colleague here, you had mentioned,
- 7 Lynne, lack of records, and there was certainly no
- 8 shortage of financial records for us to pour
- 9 through, it was the lack of plans that indicated
- 10 to us that this was what we had set out. I
- 11 apologize, John, for interrupting.
- MR. FARMER: No apology necessary. Just
- for the purposes of looking forward and not
- looking back, I want to see if I've got a grip on
- things, and that is it sounds like we'll be seeing
- improvements going forward in the transparency of
- 17 all of the budgeting process for CIO so that going
- 18 forward we on TPAC who are charged with looking
- 19 after the trademark interests will be able to get
- 20 an easier feel as to this is how money was
- 21 budgeted and how the cost was allocated between
- the trademark and the patent side of the house

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 because of the improvements that you're going to

- 2 be working on.
- 3 MR. OWENS: And what money was actually
- 4 spent.
- 5 MR. FARMER: Right.
- 6 MR. OWENS: It's our intention to bring
- 7 to our customers, Lynne being the representative
- 8 of trademarks --
- 9 MR. FARMER: Did my rhetorical question
- 10 make sense?
- 11 MR. VANDERBRINK: The word I liked in
- that rhetorical question was the transparency. It
- shouldn't be a mystery to Lynne when I come to her
- 14 and say next year I'm going to need this much of
- 15 trademark fees for her to have to know where it's
- 16 going to. So definitely that transparency, that
- 17 understandability, that clarity, is where I'm
- 18 headed. You had asked specifically to the extent
- 19 that the information would then be shared with
- 20 TPAC and whatever the rules are that govern
- 21 sharing that information with you I'm not that
- 22 familiar with, but certainly if the rules say,

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

- 1 yes, it's appropriate, this time frame or
- whatever, executive session, the material will be
- 3 available, but I don't know specifically.
- 4 MR. FARMER: I probably didn't ask my
- 5 question very clearly which is a problem, and that
- 6 is one of the things we feel charged with doing on
- 7 the trademark side of the house is we're one of
- 8 two roommates living in the house. We're the
- 9 trademark roommate and there's the patent roommate
- 10 and we realize that the PTO has to do its overall
- mission well, but also as one of the two roommates
- 12 we want to make certain that the split of the
- overhead costs is fair to both sides, and of
- 14 course it's a challenge when you can't always
- understand the overhead accounting, so to speak,
- and it's sounding to me like that accounting
- should become clearer in the future so that it'll
- 18 be easier for both sides of the house to look at
- 19 it and say, yes, that division looks fair or that
- 20 division may not, but I can now point more clearly
- 21 as to what about this or what about that. Is that
- 22 a fair statement where we can get to a point where

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 we can now on each side of the house, the

- 2 trademark and patent side of the house, look at it
- 3 and assess it more easily?
- 4 MR. VANDERBRINK: I appreciate your
- 5 restating it because what I heard in that one was
- 6 more akin towards the cost accounting, the ABI
- 7 model, the division if you will of what are called
- 8 allocated costs. For me there is clarity there.
- 9 What I'm going to be doing in 2009 and 2010
- 10 through my participation on the ABI Steering
- 11 Committee is to continue to see what can be done
- to improve, to refine. I've never gotten the
- impression that the model is the way it is and you
- 14 have to move heaven and heck to make a change to
- it. There is a trademark representative, Karen
- 16 Strohecker, who is on it. I have a good working
- 17 relationship with her. So, yes, in those senses
- if there are ways to be more specific to determine
- 19 using the roommate analogy that if the half gallon
- of milk can perhaps be more refined. But at this
- 21 point for me there is clarity in the ABI model and
- 22 I do have confidence in it. It's a question of

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 continuous improvement and moving forward on it is

- where I'm coming from going into 2009.
- 3 MS. GRABER: Right. I wanted to clarify
- 4 that it's easy to confuse the issues between
- 5 budget formulation and planning along with cost
- 6 accounting. One's the front end and the other is
- 7 the back end. Keith's job and the OCI's job in
- 8 terms of improving is on the front end so your
- 9 customers know what our budget formulation is. We
- 10 have greater insight into our budget formulation
- 11 which allows us to give better estimates for how
- much different development projects will cost. So
- 13 Keith does the front end.
- 14 The back end in terms of the allocation
- and the split is something too that I mentioned to
- 16 you that in the front office I was asked to
- inquire into. I too am confident in the model
- that we currently have, but that's not what this
- 19 is. This does not determine the split. What this
- 20 does is give transparency into our budget
- 21 formulation and estimation, so I don't want to mix
- those two things up.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

| | Τ | | MR. | FARMER: | Thanks | ior | clarifying | that |
|--|---|--|-----|---------|--------|-----|------------|------|
|--|---|--|-----|---------|--------|-----|------------|------|

- 2 Turning a bit back to what we were talking about a
- 3 few minutes ago, if TPAC wanted to be able to come
- in at just the right time of the year in a budget
- 5 cycle for a budget that's still being formulated,
- 6 I guess maybe now we're talking about 2001
- 7 perhaps, what's the right time of the year for us
- 8 to be briefed as to what a budget looks like when
- 9 it's still malleable so that if we had feedback
- 10 and you were interested in our feedback in
- 11 assessing your budget, that it would be coming to
- 12 you at the right time?
- 13 MR. VANDERBRINK: I think that's a fair
- 14 question but Mark and the CFO determined the
- 15 budget formulation schedule at a high level for
- 16 USPTO and obviously it's my job to lead OCIO in a
- 17 coordinated way to meet those requirements and
- deliverables that Mark has. So Mark's probably in
- 19 a better position to answer that question in terms
- of factoring in what input if any would come from
- the TPAC.
- MR. OLECHOWSKI: Keith, I appreciate you

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

- giving me all the credit for setting the schedule,
- 2 but actually our schedule is set by the Office of
- 3 the President so we follow the normal federal
- 4 guidelines. We do enjoy the opportunity here
- 5 because it's an election year to delay the
- development of the FY 2010 budget because there's
- 7 going to be an administration transition no matter
- 8 who wins. So our direction from the Office of
- 9 Management and Budget at the Executive Office of
- 10 the President is to submit a new 2010 budget in
- 11 the early winter timeframe, January, February time
- 12 frame. So our schedule which I will publish
- actually at Thursday's deputies' meeting will
- 14 allow us to generate a draft 2010 budget by
- 15 December 15 for ultimate submission in accordance
- 16 with the plan that's yet to be published by the
- 17 new administration, but sometime in the spring.
- 18 Normally the president submits a budget to
- 19 Congress the first Monday of February. That's not
- 20 going to happen this year since a new president
- 21 won't take office until January 20, so normally
- it's in the March/April sometimes even May

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 timeframe. So while we have a little respite this

- 2 year to develop our 2010 budget, normally the
- 3 process would be in the summer timeframe of the
- 4 year before is when we're doing the budget
- formulation process because we do owe our draft
- 6 budget to OMB in the September time frame. I can
- 7 certainly publish actually a slide that looks
- 8 similar to Keith's last one that will list several
- 9 different budget years and when you're executing
- and when you're formulating and when you're doing
- 11 some strategic planning.
- MR. VANDERBRINK: But normally, John, as
- 13 you see on the slide, our OMB budget submission
- 14 like in this case for 2011 goes to OMB in the
- fourth quarter of the fiscal year which is your
- July/August/September. It's usually in the month
- of September. So all T's are getting crossed, I's
- 18 are getting dotted, all countries being heard from
- so to speak in that sort of summer timeframe
- 20 moving towards the September.
- 21 MR. FARMER: I got it maybe in my own
- 22 slowness, but if you could just point me toward

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 specific months and years in which the budget

- 2 internally within the PTO would still be fairly
- 3 malleable so that we could have our input. Like
- 4 you might say, TPAC, if you wanted to comment on
- 5 the 2010 budget that will be revised, a good time
- for us to chat would be February, or the 2011
- 7 budget, a good time to chat would be July. Part
- 8 of that's because we have to schedule our own
- 9 public meetings and there may be an opportunity to
- 10 try to match those up with those malleable spots
- in the budget so that we can stick our nose into
- 12 your business.
- MR. OLECHOWSKI: I can do that. That
- would be easy.
- 15 MR. FARMER: Thanks. I appreciate it.
- 16 Any questions from other members of TPAC? Hearing
- 17 none then I think we can go as we continue to work
- 18 up our agenda to item 3-A, the report from the
- 19 CFO.
- 20 MR. OLECHOWSKI: I wanted to take a few
- 21 minutes of your time to introduce myself and also
- 22 members of my staff. We had mentioned Michelle's

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 name several times. I think it would give credit

- 2 to Michelle and the expertise she brings.
- 3 Michelle works for Barry and I in the Office of
- 4 the CFO as our senior adviser for the past year.
- 5 However, prior to that she was our Director of
- 6 Finance for the past 7 or 8 years, and she's been
- 7 a PTO I'm guessing 10 or 12 years, so she
- 8 certainly has been around the block several times
- 9 and comes to us with great both private sector and
- 10 public sector service. I also have people from my
- 11 Office of Corporate Planning. Brendan Horrigan is
- a new employee of ours who came from TSA and prior
- 13 to that Treasury, and Jonathan Frupp is our
- 14 trademark budget analyst. Steve Porter, maybe you
- 15 have seen Steve before in these meetings. Steven
- 16 runs out of the Office of Finance our ABI Section.
- 17 And then Mark Krieger is our new Director of
- 18 Finance and has been in that position for about
- 19 the last year, maybe 11 months, and prior to that
- 20 he worked in the ABI division in finance and prior
- 21 to that was CFO of a small business. So I think
- 22 we can answer any of your questions that you may

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 have. There always seems to be an abundance of

- them for the CFO so we enjoy the opportunity to
- 3 participate again.
- 4 Let's just get right into the slides.
- 5 Again I'd ask that you ask any questions along the
- 6 way if we're either not being clear or we're
- 7 certainly generating more questions than we're
- 8 trying to answer. I'm going to make sure we do
- 9 that to your satisfaction. The first slide, I
- 10 guess it's slide 2, I'd really just like to read
- 11 because it seems to be the question of the day
- 12 about how we allocate costs to not only patent and
- 13 trademarks but across all of PTO. And I'm sure
- 14 you're all familiar with the language of the
- 15 trademark fence, but the -- section seems to be
- the most applicable part, that all fees available
- 17 to the director under Section 31 of the Trademark
- 18 Act of 1946 shall be used only for the processing
- of trademark registrations and further activity,
- 20 services, and materials related to the trademark
- and cover a proportionate share of the
- 22 administrative costs of the Patent and Trademark

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

- Office, and certainly the key word there is a
- 2 proportionate share. This language certainly is
- 3 not lost on anybody who works at the USPTO. We
- 4 generate along with the Office of Finance what we
- 5 call a daily fence report. It gives us an
- accounting on a daily basis of the fees taken in
- 7 all the way up to the day before as well as all
- 8 the obligations and commitments that are on the
- 9 books so that any particular requisition that
- 10 comes through the system, we have a checkbook that
- 11 we can check to make sure that there are adequate
- 12 fees to cover the requisition that's in our hands.
- 13 And that may be a requisition as small as buying
- 14 supplies or a large CIO contract that's been
- 15 negotiated.
- 16 Slide 3 is certainly what we consider to
- 17 be the issue at hand based on the agenda that Mr.
- 18 Farmer, the Chairman, sent to us. That is if the
- 19 revenue streams for patent and trademarks is at
- 20 typically has been over the past several years at
- 21 the 11 to 12 to 89 to 88 percent rate, how come
- the costs associated within each individual

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 business unit may be larger than the revenue share

- 2 that is generated by the office between patents
- and trademarks? I just bring your attention to
- 4 we've looked at a number before. If you look at
- 5 the OCIO split, the patent share is 78.1 percent,
- the system share is 21 percent. So hopefully at
- 7 the end of this we'll be able to answer and at
- 8 least put to rest anybody's concern that there are
- 9 questions about how we do the splits and how we
- 10 assign costs and allocate costs across the PTO.
- 11 Slide 4. The costs are not always
- 12 dependent on revenue organizational size. I think
- 13 you'll see when Mark starts to talk about the
- 14 model itself. There's not an input into the model
- 15 that is determined on what the revenue size is or
- 16 how much money either the Patent and Trademark
- organization brings in. Wendy gave an example and
- 18 I'd like to actually have a slightly different
- 19 example to show you, that just because you're
- 20 procuring goods and services, it's not really not
- 21 a factor in how much your revenue is. If Mark and
- I live next to each other and we're going to go to

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 Best Buy and buy a computer and it's my wife and I

- 2 and eight kids and just Mark and his wife, we go
- 3 to Best Buy and we procure a system, the geek
- 4 squad comes in and sets it all up, it's wireless,
- 5 it's great, my kids are doing homework, Mark and
- 6 his wife are working on their master's degrees,
- 7 the cost of the system to each one of us was
- 8 \$4,000. On my \$100,000 salary for instance,
- 9 that's only a 4 percent investment on my part to
- 10 procure that computer system, whereas Mark is only
- making \$40,000 and that \$4,000 to Mark costs him
- 12 10 percent of his salary. Best Buy certainly
- doesn't ask us what my annual salary is to
- 14 determine what the cost of that system I'm
- 15 procuring it. It's more what system did I
- 16 procure, what goods and services did I procure,
- 17 not what the revenue stream is that's going to
- 18 ultimately pay for those services.
- 19 I think another example might be if
- 20 you're looking to associate why a proportion of
- 21 trademark dollars a larger percentage of a
- 22 function than patent's would be, another example I

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

think that would be very close to everybody who's

- 2 in this room is that we have two public advisory
- 3 committees as we've mentioned before, patent's and
- 4 trademark's. They are of the same size. They
- 5 have an equal number of members. And we do pay
- 6 your salaries, we pay your travel, we pay your per
- 7 diem, and we pay all of your expenses related to
- 8 you participating and help out this agency. And
- 9 those costs over a year are about the same for
- 10 both patents and systems, yet the TPAC is a
- 11 greater percentage of trademark dollars than the
- 12 PPAC is for patents. If we wanted to have an
- 13 equality in the percentage of dollars spent
- 14 relative to the income stream, TPAC would have to
- be maybe one and a half or two members and PPAC
- 16 could be 12 members. So it's not always easy to
- say that because revenue streams are greater or
- less than that the split between business units
- should be relative to those incomes, it really has
- 20 to do with costs and services procured. So the
- 21 question is how can we accurately and reasonably
- account for those costs of goods and services.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

| 1 | Page 5. This is a chronology and I |
|----|--|
| 2 | really don't want to spend a great deal of time |
| 3 | going over each and every line on it, but the |
| 4 | purpose of the slide is to try to explain the |
| 5 | activities that the USPTO has gone through over |
| 6 | the past year and a half to 2 years as some of |
| 7 | these issues about cost allocation methodology and |
| 8 | the model has been raised, and to the extent that |
| 9 | we have engaged with not only trademark's |
| 10 | organization and patent's organization, but all |
| 11 | the business units to explain and have |
| 12 | transparency in our processes. So the first block |
| 13 | between January and May, we spent a great deal of |
| 14 | time with not only the trademark executives but |
| 15 | also all of the other business units explaining |
| 16 | the model and I think in very excruciating detail. |
| 17 | We have documented all of those presentations. I |
| 18 | think it was Wendy had mentioned and Keith had |
| 19 | mentioned what the CIO model is. We have models |
| 20 | for each and every business unit that drives those |
| 21 | costs and how we split the allocation of those |
| 22 | goods and services down into the patent and |
| | ANDERSON COURT REPORTING |
| | 706 Duke Street, Suite 100 |

Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 trademark. So we went through each and every

- 2 model with not only the trademark organization but
- 3 the individual business units, took notes, took
- 4 action items, brought those issues. If we
- 5 couldn't resolve them there, made sure we took
- 6 action items to resolve those issues at that time.
- 7 I mentioned in the June and August
- 8 timeframe we expanded from not only the CIO model
- 9 but to each and every business unit. We reviewed
- 10 each and every business unit's ABI model down to
- 11 really the individual people and the individual
- 12 activities that they were doing to try to explain
- and get some transparency to the business units
- 14 about the model and how it was developed. Once
- 15 again, those issues that were raised that we could
- not resolve at the table, we reconstituted an
- organization called the ABI Steering Committee.
- 18 The ABI Steering Committee had existed several
- 19 years ago to address the same sort of concerns.
- 20 We reconstituted that. We wrote a charter. We
- 21 know what our roles and responsibilities are. And
- 22 that ABI Steering Committee has addressed each and

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

| 1 | everv | 1 99116 | that | came | un | in | the | months | prior | ag |
|---|-------|---------|-------|--------|----|-----|------|------------|-------|----|
| _ | CACTA | TSSUC | LIIaL | Callie | uρ | T11 | CIIC | IIIOIICIIS | DITOI | as |

- 2 well as any issues that a business unit may have
- with cost accounting, with budgeting, with the
- financials and everything else. And we have a
- team room which documents all of the issues, all
- of the resolutions, and every business unit has a
- 7 voting member on the committee. So that if a
- 8 particular business unit brings an issue,
- 9 consensus has to be gained prior to us either
- 10 implementing the change or evolving into a new
- portion of the model. And every issue that's been
- 12 brought to the ABI Steering Committee -- our
- documentation which actually most of this has been
- 14 sent to our professor member of the committee so
- 15 that we can have an engaging conversation. We
- 16 enjoy the opportunity for him to review the model.
- 17 My point is in bringing this up is there's been a
- 18 great amount of interaction between all the
- 19 business units to answer all of the questions and
- 20 to get the issues out to have an openness and
- 21 transparency in the process. I think the end
- 22 result of the ABI Steering Committee is that over

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

the past year since it's been reconstituted there

- 2 has not been an issue that's been brought to the
- 3 table that has not been unanimously agreed to.
- 4 While some of those issues have been very
- 5 difficult to work through, we've always managed to
- 6 gain unanimous consent on all of the items.
- 7 Slide 6. There has been a times over
- 8 the past at least year or two since I've been here
- 9 a question about validity of the system for
- 10 allocating costs here at PTO. We're quite proud
- of the fact that we believe that our ABC or ABI
- 12 system or ABM, there's lots of different
- terminology for it, whether you call it activity
- 14 based costing or activity based information or
- activity based methodology, but it is the system
- of choice and it's actually encouraged by several
- 17 financial management standards that are imposed on
- 18 the government for managing costs, managing
- 19 financial information. It is the system of choice
- and there are many, many agencies that are using
- 21 it already. I mentioned the GAO study here on
- 22 which agencies are and are not using it and you

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 can see that across the board there are many

- 2 agencies that do use some form of ABC to not only
- 3 track their costs but allocate them to their
- 4 various business units.
- 5 The next three slides I'd actually like
- 6 Mark give an overview of. And please just like
- Wendy mentioned, if we're insulting anybody's
- 8 intelligence because we're all very, very smart
- 9 people here and we're at too high a level, please
- 10 let us know. We'd be able to dive into any amount
- 11 of detail on the model. If you've been at TPAC
- for the past year or two, you've certainly been
- able to formulate your questions and your
- 14 concerns, so we can take those from new members
- where we can provide an education to answer any
- detailed questions that you may have.
- 17 MR. KRIEGER: Thank you, Mark. I would
- 18 like to piggyback on your request if in February
- 19 TPAC members would like to come and look at our
- 20 ABI system and look at how we do these models I
- 21 would encourage that. We could do it at the same
- time in February at any time at your convenience.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

| 1 MR. OLECHO | NSKI: I would even go a step |
|--------------|------------------------------|
|--------------|------------------------------|

- 2 further. We'll travel to you. If you truly have
- 3 a concern of learning the system and everything
- 4 else, I'll send my people to you whether it's at
- 5 your lunchtime because I know we're all busy
- 6 people or after your normal working hours, we'd be
- 7 glad to come and visit and have a sit down with
- 8 you. We're certainly willing to learn. I know
- 9 Mr. Conley has a great deal to offer from his
- 10 background. We're absolutely willing to learn and
- 11 make changes if people have concerns and
- improvements. We'd love the opportunity.
- 13 MR. KRIEGER: This is our basic
- 14 waterfall methodology and what we do here is we
- 15 take the costs in each bucket and we split them
- and we go down through different activity drivers.
- 17 For example, if you look at the top you see MGE
- which is general expenses for the entire agency
- and we drive those costs to patents, trademarks,
- 20 policy, resource management with CFO and CIO, and
- 21 then we keep going down a step until we drive it
- 22 to the ultimate two way split which is patents and

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 trademarks. A good example is OPM payment. We

- 2 have to make an OPM payment which is all future
- 3 pension benefits, life insurance benefits for
- anybody that's an FTE or full time fed. What we
- 5 do is we go through painstaking detail. We get
- 6 every employee data download and we split those
- 7 costs based on that actual information so that we
- 8 know we're doing it accurately because some
- 9 organizations are inherently higher salaries than
- 10 others and that's just the way it is. And that's
- 11 a good example to take. That then gets driven to
- 12 CIO where it -- the activities in CIO and we take
- it down to the two way split.
- 14 The next slide is also a good
- 15 methodology or a good picture view of our
- 16 methodology where we talk about what was spent,
- how was it spent, and what was produced. So you
- 18 see that column that says resources. That column
- 19 will agree in total to the activity column that
- 20 will agree to the cost object. There's no
- 21 different in dollars, they're all the same, it's
- 22 just the different slice or a different view of

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 the information. A good example for this is the

- 2 help desk where we have salaries and we have
- 3 contract costs for the help desk. That is driven
- 4 by a PPA code or a program project and activity
- 5 code that I use on my time sheet, I'm not in help
- 6 desk, but that's an example of someone in CIO who
- 7 would record their time to a PPA code. That would
- 8 then be the activity and we would sum all that up.
- 9 Then we have the number of help desk tickets by
- 10 system.
- 11 MR. OLECHOWSKI: Let me try to maybe
- 12 explain that a little more. We have a cost for
- what the help desk costs the USPTO to run. It's
- 14 people's salaries, it's contracts, it's buying
- 15 equipment, it's phone systems and everything else.
- 16 So we collect those costs and now we have to
- 17 allocate those costs across the USPTO.
- 18 MR. KRIEGER: Exactly, and that's what
- 19 we do. It's as simple as that. Some of the
- 20 drivers are very good usages like for example
- 21 gigabytes of storage. Those are very good usage
- 22 based drivers that we can use.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 The last slide talks about where we can

- get the information. There's a couple of inputs.
- 3 We have WebTA which is where I record my time.
- 4 Every federal employee records their time in a
- 5 system called WebTA. That gets processed by NFC
- 6 who is our payroll service provider. We also have
- 7 inputs from our contracts. They have to record
- 8 their -- what they call a receiver which is I
- 9 received the goods and services, they record a
- 10 transaction in our core financial system that
- 11 tells what activity they were performing. We take
- that information along with the information from
- our payroll services and that gets into our
- 14 activity based information system, and from the
- other side comes the workload drives that we have
- and that makes up our activity based information
- 17 system. Up top what you see there are some of the
- 18 outputs which is fee setting, financial
- 19 statements, budgeting, performance reporting, we
- 20 have cost efficiency measures that are really good
- 21 that are good indicators of where we stand.
- That's our ABC or ABI methodology in a nutshell.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

| 1 | TT | you | nave | any | questions, | we | would | be |
|---|----|-----|------|-----|------------|----|-------|----|
| | | | | | | | | |

- 2 happy to answer them. Steve and I have been
- 3 involved in this for a while and we've looked at
- 4 it in painstaking detail.
- 5 MR. OLECHOWSKI: I'd like to tie the
- 6 loop on what the original question though is why
- 7 aren't business unit costs tied directly to the
- 8 revenue stream, it's because there's a more
- 9 accurate way of determining what those goods and
- 10 services are that are being procured. For
- instance we mentioned help desk. It would seem
- 12 unfair at least to us and many who are familiar
- with the model to charge the help desk strictly on
- 14 the revenue stream. If the help desk receives 30
- 15 phone calls from the trademarks organization and
- only 20 from the patents organization and maybe
- 17 from the support organizations, there has to be a
- 18 better methodology and a more reasonable way to
- 19 allocate those costs based on those drivers. The
- 20 same thing where Mark mentioned on the OPM
- 21 payment. The Post Office does it as well. We're
- 22 the only federal agency besides the Post Office

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

who actually has to pay that bill. When we became

- a PBO, part of the deal was that we would pay
- 3 postretirement benefits for our employees so
- 4 that's a more accurate methodology. We know
- 5 exactly where everybody works and what
- 6 organization they go to so that's a much better
- 7 driver to determine where those costs should be
- 8 allocated.
- 9 I think the last slide, what's important
- 10 about the last slide is, there are opportunities
- 11 here to improve the model all the time. The
- 12 places where we have these little people are where
- people have to input into the system. So that's
- an opportunity on a daily basis for not only the
- workers, the managers, and the supervisors to make
- sure that the input that's going into the system
- is accurate. Also when we talk about drivers and
- 18 resource objects, that's another opportunity to
- 19 say is that the most reasonable way to drive
- 20 costs. Maybe help desk tickets is not the most
- 21 reasonable way, but that's what the ABI Steering
- 22 Committee is for. It's for somebody to raise

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

their hand and say I'm just now sure that that's a

- 2 good way to drive the costs into patents and
- 3 trademarks and those kinds of issues are addressed
- 4 and resolved to consensus in the ABI Steering
- 5 Committee.
- 6 So the model is a living document, a
- 7 living system that we're certainly always trying
- 8 to improve. That doesn't mean that as we make a
- 9 change that meant the model before was wrong, it
- just means that we've gotten more information. I
- 11 think one of the things we've talked about is CPU
- 12 usage. If we're going to share a piece of CIO
- equipment between two organizations, it would be
- 14 nice to know how much the CPU is running what
- 15 system. We don't have the ability to
- 16 automatically gather that type of information so
- 17 that may be something in the future where we have
- 18 automated tools for gathering those workload
- 19 models and workload drives. So that might be an
- 20 example of something that's in the future for PTO
- 21 to better allocate costs.
- MS. GRABER: If I can interrupt real

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 quickly, Mark, as I mentioned to the group, one of

- 2 the things I did for the undersecretary was to
- 3 look into this model and particularly the drivers
- as they concerned the IT costs in the OCIO. One
- 5 thing to point out is when you do modernize your
- 6 IT equipment, you do get better insight into the
- 7 drivers. As Mark said, the thing that impressed
- 8 me the most about this ABI team and these models
- 9 is that they are indeed living in that you can
- improve them, so there might be a time where you
- only have a coarse insight into what the drivers
- 12 are. A good example is the number of gigabytes of
- 13 storage that Mark mentioned. We may have a piece
- of equipment and we know that trademark data and
- patent data are both stored on it, but we may not
- 16 have because the technology is older -- for
- 17 example, in the past we may not have had insight
- into what percentage of the total gigabytes of
- 19 available storage are used by trademark data and
- what percentage are used by patent's data. And so
- 21 maybe at one we had a coarse drive that was all
- 22 discussed and agreed upon that the size of the

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 underlying system will be the drive for dividing

- 2 up the cost of this storage unit. But as our IT
- 3 modernizes, we get finer and finer drivers and so
- 4 now we have the ability to know how many gigabytes
- of storage is trademark's, how many gigabytes is
- 6 patent's.
- 7 So I think what you'll find with the ABI
- 8 model and the thing that impressed me most about
- 9 it is that these drivers are constantly revisited
- and as our IT modernizes we get more insight into
- 11 actual usage, like Mark said, CPU usage of this
- box. We're better able to determine each time we
- modernize the equipment as we go along.
- 14 MR. OLECHOWSKI: I guess my final point
- is that the drivers are only used to allocate
- 16 costs that can't be strictly identified to patents
- or trademarks. It's very easy to conceive that if
- 18 Lynne's examining attorneys are examining
- 19 trademarks, that's a direct PPA code that says I'm
- 20 working on trademark stuff. When Wendy's and
- John's gang are doing development or fixing TRAM
- 22 or TEAS, there are PPA codes that drive that thing

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

| 1 | right | directly | +0 0 | trademark | acat | aontor | Ιt |
|---|--------|----------|------|-----------|------|---------|----|
| _ | r.Tanr | arrectiv | LO a | trademark | COSL | center. | |

- becomes a little more challenging, John has this
- 3 chart up there, when you have infrastructure
- systems that are shared. When somebody goes and
- 5 works on RAM because RAM went down last night and
- 6 your customers couldn't get in and pay their fees,
- 7 how do we drive that cost to patents and
- 8 trademarks? How do we split the HR people's time
- 9 when they're doing their stuff? Or how do we
- 10 split the CFO time when we're generating financial
- 11 statements which are done for the entire PTO? How
- do we split a lawyer's time when they're reviewing
- our appropriations bill? That's the key to having
- 14 a solid ABI system and drivers that's a living,
- 15 breathing document to constantly review that
- information to make sure we're as accurate and
- 17 reasonable as we can be.
- MS. PEARCE: I'd like to say something.
- John came up with a good analogy and I was trying
- 20 to put all of this in my head in terms of the
- 21 roommate analogy that you came up with where
- 22 you're sharing the rent. A lot of times with

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 roommates, one's got a bigger bedroom than the

- other and the rent will be based on who's got a
- 3 bigger room. But there are certain shared costs.
- 4 The electricity that runs the refrigerator for
- 5 instance. How do you allocate that? Does one
- roommate cook more than the other? Do you really
- 7 want to have to keep track of that sort of thing?
- 8 Can you do it fairly? The electricity that runs
- 9 the cable TV, that runs the air conditioner,
- 10 everybody benefits. Does somebody benefit more
- 11 than another? If you're sharing an apartment with
- 12 a flight attendant who's only there 2 weeks out of
- the month, maybe, but if you're both living there
- 14 full time, you got eggs in the refrigerator and
- 15 nobody's a vegetarian. I've known roommates who
- 16 broke up because they started initialing the eggs
- as to who bought what and what belonged to whom
- and everything in the refrigerator got labeled.
- 19 You could do that with cleaning supplies. You can
- 20 do that with a lot of things.
- 21 I am impressed that you're really making
- 22 an effort with the drivers to drill down where you

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

- 1 can and pleased that as you are updating the
- 2 system you'll be able to do more and more of that.
- 3 But I think there are times when it's just the
- 4 cost of doing business for shared services. You
- 5 can try to do a better, fairer job about that in
- 6 the future, but essentially nobody wants to do
- 7 without electricity in an apartment because you
- 8 can't figure out how to divvy it up.
- 9 Some of it is just what you have to live
- 10 with and you try not to be unfair to people. If
- one roommate is a vegetarian, then clearly that
- 12 person doesn't need to be paying for the eggs if
- they're not being used. But otherwise, you just
- 14 hope that people are as fair as they can be about
- it and any transparency in the reporting that you
- 16 can do that you can explain to us so that we just
- feel like we've being vigilant, that makes a huge
- 18 different. But I think I'm getting a better
- 19 understanding now of how difficult it can be to
- 20 take some of these gray areas and really slice
- 21 them and dice them to perfect. You really can't,
- but I'm glad to see that probably going forward

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 you're going to be able to do that with more and

- 2 more precision just because of the drivers that
- 3 you've built into the system. It's very
- 4 encouraging to hear.
- 5 MR. OLECHOWSKI: I appreciate your
- 6 comments, Elizabeth, and it is hard and it is
- 7 complex and I think we are open and transparent,
- 8 and to pile onto the roommate analogy, you not
- 9 only have two roommates in the room, you actually
- 10 have three other ones who aren't even paying rent.
- 11 MS. PEARCE: I see you met my husband in
- 12 college.
- MR. OLECHOWSKI: So you're not only
- 14 discussing between yourselves what the patent and
- 15 trademark share should be, you're arguing about I
- have to pay the CFO, CIO, CAO, OGC rent also. How
- much of my hard earned \$10 should go to paying his
- 18 portion of the rent. So it is a very complex and
- 19 moving piece of equipment that needs to be
- 20 addressed. But I do think we do a good job of
- 21 managing those cost allocations. We're certainly
- 22 open as I mentioned before to improvements. We

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 want to get as much automated. We want to drive

- 2 as many costs directly to the patent and
- 3 trademarks business lines as we can. The
- 4 challenge as you mentioned always is those other
- 5 organizations that are shared between the patents
- 6 and trademarks.
- 7 MS. PEARCE: Another thing to keep in
- 8 mind if you're concerned about the price of
- 9 electricity in the apartment, perhaps if you both
- 10 chip in and buy an energy efficient air
- 11 conditioner. Everybody benefits. There are
- 12 always things that you can do better. Perhaps
- 13 you're paying a little bit more up front more than
- 14 you feel like is completely 100 percent your
- share, but in the end the cost savings will get
- 16 passed along to you. So sometimes you have to
- 17 bite the bullet on that a little bit too.
- 18 Combining your cable and internet and the phone
- 19 service wound up saving us a lot of money also
- when we moved into a new apartment. So I think
- 21 you're taking all of that into account. There can
- 22 be some efficiencies in throwing your resources in

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 together. And perhaps separating these things out

- 2 is not going to be as cost effective for either
- 3 group as we might have hoped.
- 4 This was a very good report. I
- 5 understand a whole lot better this year than I did
- 6 last year about what the different factors are and
- 7 how you reached your decisions. And I'd like to
- 8 take you up on that tour. I know John. John's
- 9 going to schedule us for a tour in February.
- 10 Right?
- MR. FARMER: Yes, we're going to be a
- 12 lot of touring.
- MS. PEARCE: We're going to be doing a
- lot of touring. But I think that that would be
- helpful and I'd like to take you up on that.
- MR. KRIEGER: And those are the types of
- 17 questions we want to answer with ABC, how we can
- 18 combine resources, how we can do things better and
- 19 more efficiently. Those are the questions. We
- 20 want to raise the questions and try to get answers
- and try to get better.
- MR. FARMER: Before I ask any questions,

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

let's reverse things. Do other TPAC members have

- 2 questions or comments that they wanted to jump in
- 3 with?
- 4 MR. STORIE: I had one. I think
- 5 certainly there are a number of circumstances
- 6 where we could look at the two offices and see
- 7 where trademarks might have a disproportionately
- 8 higher portion of costs. For instance, even using
- 9 your example of help desk. If we are a system as
- 10 we've talked about before that is more highly
- 11 automated than the patent side, then it would make
- sense that we might have proportionately more
- 13 calls to the help desk because we've got more
- 14 people -- more often perhaps. In terms of we're
- looking at the drivers, are there areas that come
- 16 to mind as the committee looks at drivers that you
- 17 still see are being most subjected in the process?
- 18 Are there places in terms of costs where we still
- 19 use a fairly subjective means of determining what
- 20 that is?
- 21 MR. KRIEGER: There is one area that is
- 22 subjective and that would be in the policy

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

organizations. Some of them that cannot be driven

- directly are based on a survey split. For
- 3 example, enforcement in the policy organization
- 4 splits their time by survey fifty-fifty saying
- 5 they spend an equal share of time on patents and
- 6 trademarks.
- 7 MR. STORIE: And that's a survey of the
- 8 personnel?
- 9 MR. KRIEGER: People who do the work.
- 10 So once again we want to encourage the Office of
- 11 External Affairs and OIPPE too when they're
- working on a patent issue, when they're working on
- trademarks, when they travel with Lynne to the
- 14 Singapore Treaty, that's a trademarks function and
- they should be charging directly to trademarks.
- 16 But when they're out talking just about general IP
- 17 and enforcement IP policy, it becomes a little bit
- 18 more subjective, what percentage of your work do
- 19 you believe is patents or trademarks? So that's
- just another methodology of getting information
- into the system. While we'd love to have
- 22 everybody's time directly charged, we know where

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 the CIOs work and we know where the CFOs work, and

- there are those things where things are more
- 3 subjective. So instead of having a pure PPA code
- 4 or a driver, we use the survey to determine how to
- 5 drive those costs.
- 6 MR. STORIE: Do all of our FTEs actually
- 7 use a PPA code for all of their stuff?
- 8 MR. KRIEGER: Yes, and there's a fine
- 9 line there. Do you want people spending an
- 10 inordinate amount of time on their timesheet or
- 11 would you rather than do the work and there is a
- gray area there where you need to draw the line
- 13 somewhere.
- 14 MS. LEIMER: This is Jackie Leimer at
- 15 Kraft Foods. Our organization is going through a
- 16 restructure now whereby we're adopting a shared
- 17 services model and we're just beginning some of
- 18 the work related to the allocation of costs for
- 19 the various functions including the legal function
- which I'm a part of. One of the things that we're
- 21 doing is is discussing a lot of the same things
- 22 that you raise here in terms of drivers that lead

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 to these costs. But the corollary of that are the

- 2 contracts if you will that we're entering into
- 3 with the buyers of our service for service level
- 4 expectations and a whole variety of terms. That
- 5 gives the buyer of our services some flexibility
- 6 in choosing whether, A, they want the service.
- 7 Some services are required others are lines that
- 8 cost. If you want to turn around a 24 hour legal
- 9 service, you pay more than if you can wait 3 days.
- 10 So we're going through a very in depth discussion
- about service level requirements and I was curious
- 12 as to what you do here on that side, what I would
- 13 call the flip side of this coin, in terms of
- 14 entering into agreements so that the functions
- 15 have -- the buyer pays, but the function has to
- 16 serve.
- 17 MR. STORIE: Accountability.
- MS. LEIMER: And accountability, yes.
- 19 So I'm curious about that side and what you do on
- 20 that. Perhaps that's for another day. That may
- 21 be a complex methodology as well, but I'd be
- 22 curious to have a top line I think if you could

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

- 1 today.
- 2 MR. OLECHOWSKI: Thanks, Jackie. I'm
- going to answer the question, and if it's not the
- 4 question you asked please either restate it or
- 5 we'll certainly for an action. All of the
- business units who perform services for the Patent
- 7 and Trademark organization, the CFO, the CIO, OGC,
- 8 the CAO, actually have service level agreements
- 9 for the products and services they provide and
- 10 those are tracked. The CFO tracks those on a
- 11 monthly basis and reports out. It's actually part
- of my performance plan and it's part of the people
- in OGC. They may be a straightforward as I have
- one day to get a requisition into the system. My
- 15 Office of Procurement has 24 hours from when a
- 16 requisition is entered into or assign it to a
- 17 contracting officer and get it working down its
- path. I'm sure Wendy can talk about the SLAs that
- 19 are within the CIO as well as OGC. OGC, I'll pick
- one off the top of my head, when we ask them a
- 21 question on appropriations law or something like
- 22 that, they have a 5 day turnaround and those are

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 monitored. They're actually reported out to our

- 2 Deputies' Committee on a quarterly basis. We
- 3 report out on how well we did on our SLAs.
- 4 I'm not so sure if that ties into cost
- 5 accounting in terms of if that's where your
- 6 question is, but we do have agreements with our
- 7 business units and we're held responsible for
- 8 delivering our products and services. And we can
- 9 certainly provide you copies of those SLAs to give
- 10 you an idea of what types of agreements we have
- 11 with our business units.
- MR. TOUPIN: I'm not speaking as a
- lawyer but as a business unit person, in terms of
- 14 what Mark was saying about the relationship of the
- 15 SLAs to cost drivers, we just went through a
- 16 situation in the Office of General Counsel which
- 17 concerns administrative law advice from which he
- 18 gets the fiscal law advice. We said at our
- 19 current staffing level we will not be able to make
- 20 these SLAs next year. So we went to the deputy
- 21 the choice to either change the SLAs or fund
- 22 additional staff for that office and they made the

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

decision to fund the additional staff. So to that

- 2 extent the SLAs are a driver of costs.
- 3 MS. LEIMER: That's helpful. Thank you.
- 4 MS. BERESFORD: Yes, but I will say if
- 5 they aren't met they -- a driver down of cost.
- 6 MS. LEIMER: That's an interesting point
- 7 and I guess that gets to the linkage because in
- 8 the model we are developing at my company we
- 9 clearly have a decrease in costs if we don't
- 10 receive the services and vice versa. We certainly
- are adopting mechanisms for election as you point
- 12 out and that's important. We can choose to
- 13 upgrade the service by paying more, but we have
- 14 the flip side of that as well. So perhaps that's
- 15 a discussion we should take on another time, but I
- 16 think it's important to discuss the linkage
- between the service agreements and the cost.
- 18 MR. OLECHOWSKI: I agree. I think it's
- 19 certainly a worthwhile topic to talk about. Once
- again, there's a lot of moving pieces as Elizabeth
- 21 noted on our other discussion. Mark can attest to
- this and all of my directors, we've entered into a

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

discussion at the CFO level about SLAs. We've

- 2 been able to meet our SLAs this year for the most
- 3 part and my question to them is at what cost. I
- know you're not spending overtime on it. Are you
- 5 using uncompensated overtime? What's not getting
- 6 done? If you're spending all your time getting
- 7 this stuff done, what's not getting done? So I
- 8 think it's a little bit more complex. And Jim can
- 9 certainly attest to it, to bring in to a group of
- 10 people who are going to make a funding decision
- and say here's the data. I can't get this stuff
- 12 done. I think it hits home because we're
- 13 customers of the Office of General Counsel as well
- and we can see that, so it's certainly worth the
- 15 discussion whether it drives the cost down or
- 16 drives the cost up. It's day to day things that
- need to be addressed and we're certainly willing
- 18 to report back or have that discussion.
- 19 MS. LEIMER: Yes, I think it would be
- 20 useful to have more discussion that. And the
- 21 other point that I think it would be interesting
- 22 to discuss at that time would be to what extent do

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

| 4 | . 1 | | | 1 | | | | 7 7 1 |
|---|-----|----------|-------|------|----|--------|----------|---------|
| 1 | the | business | unita | have | an | ontion | $+ \cap$ | decline |
| | | | | | | | | |

- 2 services, and that's again part of our model, what
- 3 are mandatory services and what are optional
- 4 services. In the context of the General Counsel's
- 5 office when we were having this debate on can a
- 6 business unit in my company decline compliance
- 7 service? No. That is a mandatory service. It
- 8 must be provided and the business will pay. There
- 9 are other services it can decline. So I think
- it's an interesting dialogue and I think it's
- 11 something that's very current in business and
- 12 something perhaps we could pick up at --
- discussion about agenda setting. I don't mean to
- take over that part, but I think it's an
- 15 interesting topic.
- MR. OLECHOWSKI: No, I think that's a
- great topic about what should our core businesses
- 18 be not only in terms of patent and trademarks, but
- 19 what services should we be providing, whether they
- 20 be outsourced or not done at all. I think that's
- 21 certainly worthy of review.
- 22 MS. BERESFORD: For those who are new to

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 the committee, one of the reasons that the issue

- 2 of overhead and indirect costs is to vital to the
- 3 trademark organization is because in the past
- 4 we've spent less than half of our income on direct
- 5 costs. So the majority of trademark fee money is
- 6 paid out to units that support trademarks and
- 7 that's been a big issue for us. If you're in an
- 8 organization where you have 10 percent overhead,
- 9 it's less important, but when you're in an
- 10 organization where you have 50 percent overhead,
- 11 then it becomes a cost that you have to be really
- 12 concerned about. So for the trademark
- organization, the allocation of costs is an
- 14 extremely -- it's as important as our business
- model because it spends as much money. So for new
- 16 members who aren't conversant with why are we
- 17 talking about ABI so much, this is one of the
- 18 reasons we're talking about it.
- 19 MR. OLECHOWSKI: Let me just take a
- 20 minute, Lynne, to respond to that. While Lynne is
- 21 correct that the direct trademark cost is less
- than 50 percent, that's not all the direct charges

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 to the trademark business line. When I charge

- directly to trademarks, if I have a PPA code
- 3 that's charged directly to trademarks that's not
- 4 included in Lynne's number. When the CIO does
- work, when the OGC does work, when HR does work,
- 6 those in our cost accounting are still allocated
- 7 direct costs. So if you add the Office of
- 8 Trademarks in what Lynne terms as direct plus
- 9 those allocated direct costs, it climbs upwards of
- 10 70 percent which I think may provide a little bit
- 11 better overview of what truly is direct. And why
- 12 I said in the ABI model what we want to make sure
- 13 people are doing is charging direct to patents or
- 14 trademarks as much as they can so that those
- 15 costs, there's no intermediate driver or research
- driver, it goes right to the patent or trademark
- business line and then it's only those unallocated
- or indirect costs that truly have to be driven to
- 19 a business line.
- 20 MR. KRIEGER: I would also like to give
- 21 a couple more examples. We fund things for
- 22 efficiency. For example, rent. Rent is paid out

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

```
of MGE and it's driven, but that's actually
```

- 2 treated as a support cost. But you need rent.
- You need power. All that stuff is funded out of
- 4 MGE. It's a little misleading because it's the
- 5 way we fund things for efficiency purposes. We
- 6 don't want every office to do a requisition in
- 7 here for rent. It's inefficient. So we do one
- 8 overall for rent and then we drive it. On the
- 9 surface it looks like it's a support cost, but
- it's directly related to trademarks or patents.
- 11 Another example of that is server space.
- 12 You need a place to put the servers. Right? So
- you have rent and that's another example. These
- are things that we just can't do without.
- MR. OLECHOWSKI: I think a really great
- 16 example is this room. This room today is being
- 17 used exclusively for trademarks but the costs for
- this room, we do not charge today's activities
- 19 directly to a trademarks cost code. It's bundled
- 20 up into EA. This rent space actually belongs to
- 21 External Affairs, and so that's driven to the
- 22 patent and trademarks line by the EA split

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 essentially. So in this case, I don't know what

- 2 the EA split is off the top of my head, it's
- 3 probably like 75/25 or 2 to 1, so actually the
- 4 commissioner of patents is paying a good portion
- of this bill today for us to use this space. But
- 6 the point is that we have to make sure we have a
- 7 cost allocation methodology that is reasonable,
- 8 that will drive costs in a reasonable method
- 9 without burdening everybody to go measure how many
- 10 minutes of a day some office is being used and
- 11 then directly charge that. We still have time
- when it's down and in the middle of the night.
- MS. PICARD: May I give a point of
- 14 clarification? I've heard us talk about two
- 15 different terminologies and I think that we've
- done a really good job of explaining the
- 17 difference between allocation and percent of
- income. I get back to Mark and Wendy's examples
- 19 earlier in their presentation. Lynne is
- 20 absolutely right that given the income in
- 21 trademarks is smaller, it is a bigger concern on
- 22 the shared services that are allocated to the

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 trademark organization, but it's not that the

- 2 allocation to the trademark organization is 50
- 3 percent. The allocation is the split between the
- 4 two organizations. On that first chart Mark
- 5 showed it's the 7921. That's your allocation.
- 6 Back to Mark and Wendy's example that for the
- 7 trademark organization the percentage of their
- 8 income just happens to be higher than the patent
- 9 one. So I just wanted to make that we're talking
- apples to apples and we're using the word
- 11 allocation.
- 12 MR. FARMER: I wanted to go back to see
- if I had bring up that -- calculation I was doing
- earlier just so see if I'm off base. That is,
- looking at some numbers, it looks like the full
- 16 time equivalents side of the patent side of the
- 17 USPTO has about 65 percent of the full time
- 18 equivalents in terms of employment, and the
- 19 trademark side has 5 percent of the full time
- 20 equivalents, and that leaves roughly 30 percent
- 21 that fall in neither, it's somewhere in the
- 22 overhead in the administration of the office and

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 functions that see over both parts. When I look

- 2 at the OCIO division of costs between the two
- 3 sides it's roughly 80/20. And if I'm doing my
- 4 math right, that would mean that roughly that cost
- 5 for the overall function, that 30 percent, is
- 6 being fairly evenly split between the patent and
- 7 trademark side. I'm not saying that that's wrong
- 8 or not properly determined by our models, but is
- 9 my back of the envelope calculation roughly
- 10 correct?
- 11 MR. OLECHOWSKI: I'm not so sure I
- 12 follow the back of the envelope calculation, sir,
- 13 but the slide on page 3 will show you that the
- 14 split among those support organizations if that's
- what we're going to call them are not fifty-fifty.
- 16 If you look at policy, it's 21 to 78. The CIO
- 17 it's 22 to 78. The CFO is 21 to 78. So I think
- 18 the important point would be to make sure that the
- 19 model is as accurate as it can be, that it's a
- 20 living document, that if there are concerns
- 21 whether they be from TPAC or the trademark office,
- 22 the Office of General Counsel, or even within the

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 support organizations, that the costs are properly

- driven to the right business line. So I want to
- 3 make sure I answer your question, Mr. Farmer, but
- 4 I want to lead us away from doing back of the
- 5 envelope kinds of calculations because it really
- 6 has to do with the goods and services procured and
- 7 how those costs are driven from the goods and
- 8 services that are procured.
- 9 One of the examples, when we started
- 10 talking about the IT split, could we have
- 11 trademark's IT and patent's IT, I think the
- 12 example is the same in cost allocation for all of
- the business units. We absolutely as I mentioned
- 14 want to drive costs as much as we can directly to
- patents and trademarks. The question is what do
- we do with those costs that are unable to be
- driven because we don't want to have people doing
- things to 5 minute timeframes or they're doing
- something on behalf of the whole office, they're
- 20 preparing financial statements or they're
- 21 providing a question on appropriations law. I
- 22 want to make sure that the model itself will drive

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 those costs appropriately to patents and

- 2 trademarks.
- 3 There are certain things that are
- absolutely FTE driven. Off the top of my head,
- 5 I'm sure Mark or Steve can give you an example,
- 6 the OPM transfer is a really great example. We
- 7 know exactly where people work. That cost which I
- 8 believe is close to \$5- or \$6,000 a year per
- 9 person are driven right to the person who is in
- our retirement system. So the 5- or 6,000 patent
- employees and the 700 trademark employees are
- easy, but then when you get to Wendy's, I guess
- 13 next week when she goes back to patents, John's
- 14 retirement benefits, mine, Mr. Toupin's, those
- still have to be driven to patents and trademarks
- 16 because they're the only two income streams we
- 17 have.
- MS. PEARCE: I have a question I'd like
- 19 to ask and I'm not sure you're off the hook, Mark.
- 20 It's actually for Karen who is my statistician.
- 21 She and I were going to talk at some point, and
- 22 you may not know this off the top of your head,

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 but I just thought I'd ask because it might be

- 2 interesting to make it a public record. Looking
- 3 at page 3 here which is 2008, Karen can you tell
- 4 me whether or not these numbers are in line with
- 5 2007? My instinct is that the trademark
- 6 percentage has gone down a smidge from 2007 for a
- 7 lot of these offices. Am I wrong about that? And
- 8 if you don't know, that's perfectly all right.
- 9 You and I can talk about it later. But I was
- 10 wondering if you would happen to know.
- 11 MS. STROHECKER: My name is Karen
- 12 Strohecker. The actual cost, the \$202 million
- that's reported here for 2008, is actually lower
- 14 than the cost for 2007 reported to trademarks. So
- it's a decrease of about 5.2 percent I believe.
- 16 But the actual percentages are pretty close to the
- same in terms of the splits.
- MS. PEARCE: That was something that
- 19 I've got to do, the budget section for the annual
- 20 report, so this is why I knew Karen was working on
- 21 this material for me. But the overall amount did
- 22 go down a little bit which is good.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

| 1 | MS. | STROHECKER: | It did. | It actually |
|---|-----|-------------|---------|-------------|
| | | | | |

- 2 increased on the patent side because overall for
- 3 the PTO the actual costs in 2008 were higher than
- 4 they were in 2007. I think I've already sent to
- 5 you, and if I haven't I can give it to you again,
- the actual distribution on a percentage basis of
- 7 the different organizations showing the patent
- 8 share and the trademark share based on the cost
- 9 allocation from the ABC model.
- 10 MR. FRIEDMAN: There's been a lot of
- 11 talk about the cost allocation. Particularly for
- the new members at TPAC, I'd always viewed this as
- two issues. One is the one we've been talking
- 14 about for the past 2 hours which is are costs
- 15 allocated fairly between trademarks and patents.
- And then the issue that we always drill down to is
- in particular are costs allocated fairly when it
- 18 comes to the OCIO department. But the other issue
- 19 I want to raise more as a comment than a question
- 20 simply goes like this. Even assuming the cost
- 21 allocation is fair or especially if we still have
- 22 questions about how fair the cost allocation is to

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 trademarks when it comes to OCIO, are we getting

- 2 the kind of service that trademarks deserves where
- 3 we're spending \$55 million? I would suggest if we
- 4 circle back from your presentation to the
- 5 presentations of John, Wendy, and Keith and
- Michelle and others, is that since TPAC for a
- 7 number of years has been very concerned about the
- 8 level of service delivered to trademarks when we
- 9 thought the OCIO shop was doing pretty well, you
- 10 can imagine at least sitting in the cheap seat
- 11 that I'm in as a nonvoting member, but I assume
- that voting members agree also that I would be
- much more reluctant to accept at face value that
- 14 at least for 2008 the \$55 million that we're going
- 15 to spend is going to deliver the type of service
- 16 that we hope.
- We were always concerned, it's always
- great when I can speak for the commissioner, I
- 19 assume Lynne in all seriousness has always
- 20 expressed concern about whether she was getting
- value for her dollar, and we were doing that in an
- 22 environment where we thought things were okay in

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 the OCIO. So the only thing I would add if we

- 2 combine this presentation with these presentations
- 3 is I'm that much more skeptical that at least
- 4 speaking on behalf of trademarks we're going to
- 5 get or expect that we're going to get what we
- 6 deserve. Yes, procedures are being put in place,
- 7 there's a roadmap, obviously there's a lot of
- 8 cleanup that has to take place, but I think we all
- 9 agree that that cleanup takes time and I'm
- 10 concerned in 2008, maybe I'll be a little less
- 11 concerned in 2009, and maybe it will abate
- 12 completely in 2010 though I doubt it. But a lot
- 13 of concerns in view of the fact that we have cost
- 14 allocation issues and wondering what value we get
- even if the cost allocation is fairly on spot.
- MR. FARMER: Thank you, Howard. Are
- 17 there any other comments or questions before we
- 18 wrap up the morning session?
- 19 MR. STORIE: Just one quick question.
- 20 In the reporting would it be a significant task
- 21 for us to be able to see in calculations like this
- 22 what the allocated direct costs were from the

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

| 1 | shared departments? |
|----|--|
| 2 | MR. OLECHOWSKI: Absolutely. |
| 3 | MR. FARMER: Anything else? In that |
| 4 | case we'll take a lunch recess until 12:50 p.m. |
| 5 | and at that time we will kick off Section IV of |
| 6 | the agenda. Also before we break in case there |
| 7 | are specially on the financial side and the CIC |
| 8 | side that won't be here if that's the case, I'd |
| 9 | like to thank each of you for your time and your |
| 10 | service and your preparation to come and speak for |
| 11 | us. We really appreciate it and don't think that |
| 12 | our tough questions implies to anything but total |
| 13 | respect and gratitude for your services. |
| 14 | (Whereupon, a luncheon recess was |
| 15 | taken.) |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| | |

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

| Т | AFTERNOON SESSION |
|----|--|
| 2 | (12:56 p.m.) |
| 3 | MR. FARMER: We are now on for the |
| 4 | afternoon portion of our agenda and my goal is to |
| 5 | wrap it up by 3 o'clock, and if we get done |
| 6 | earlier that's a bonus for all involved. Some |
| 7 | people here have traveled for quite a distance and |
| 8 | the TPAC members have an executive session after |
| 9 | this. So we'll just try to move things right |
| 10 | along. |
| 11 | I'm going to turn the floor over to |
| 12 | Lynne Beresford to kick off our afternoon agenda. |
| 13 | MS. BERESFORD: Joining me will be |
| 14 | Sharon Marsh who is sitting between Elizabeth |
| 15 | Pearce and John Owens. She is the Deputy Director |
| 16 | for Trademark Policy. The first item on the |
| 17 | afternoon agenda is the Madrid Protocol. This is |
| 18 | a treaty that the United States is a member of and |
| 19 | we have a number of filings both into the U.S. and |
| 20 | out of the U.S. under this particular treaty. In |
| 21 | the international context there is a great deal of |
| 22 | comment about how Madrid could be changed to make |
| | ANDERSON COURT REPORTING |
| | 706 Duke Street, Suite 100 |
| | Alexandria, VA 22314 |

it a more useful filing treaty. What we wanted to

- 2 bring to the TPAC today to get comments on were
- 3 some of the suggestions that are currently being
- 4 vetted at WIPO. I don't particularly expect that
- 5 you will all come down with a final answer today,
- 6 but we are interested in hearing at least your
- 7 perspective on how you view these changes at least
- 8 as a first cut. We may come back to this at the
- 9 next meeting when folks have had a chance to talk
- 10 to other trademark holders that they know or other
- organizations that they know about these
- 12 proposals.
- 13 Having said that, you were all sent this
- 14 little paper in advance to look at the various
- 15 suggested changes such as getting rid of the
- 16 requirement for basic application or registration,
- 17 things about linguistic diversity, and other
- 18 items. And you may have ideas of your own. So I
- just open the floor for discussion. Sharon, do
- you want to say anything?
- 21 MS. MARSH: Sharon Marsh, USPTO. Maybe
- 22 I'll give them just a little bit more information

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

| 1 | about | +he | proposal | thatiq | outlined | in | thic | nanei |
|---|-------|------|----------|---------|----------|-----|------|-------|
| _ | about | CIIC | PIUPUSAI | LIIAL S | Outtilea | T11 | CIII | Paper |

- which everyone may not have had a chance to read.
- 3 There's a series of working group
- 4 meetings of the Madrid members, both agreement and
- 5 protocol countries. Amy Cotton from our
- 6 international office as well as someone from
- 7 trademarks attend those meetings. Under this
- 8 proposal to end the requirement for a basic
- 9 application or registration, the trademark owner
- 10 would still be able to file one application with
- one set of fees in one language, and also after
- 12 they obtain international registration and
- 13 extension to the various countries, have a
- 14 centralized place for renewal, so that all would
- 15 remain the same. The change is that the trademark
- 16 holder would no longer have to have a basic
- 17 application or basic registration in their country
- 18 of origin.
- I think we've identified probably four
- 20 major ways that would change the current Madrid
- 21 system, and I'll just briefly run through those.
- One, if the international registration is no

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

| 1 | longer | dependent. | on | а | basic | application | or |
|---|--------|------------|----|---|-------|-------------|----|
| | | | | | | | |

- 2 registration in the home country, the concept of
- 3 central attack disappears. Central attack was the
- 4 idea that a trademark owner could seek to cancel
- 5 or oppose an application or registration in the
- country of origin and if they were successful then
- 7 all of the countries to which the trademark holder
- 8 had extended, the registrations in those countries
- 9 would also become inactive so that that feature
- 10 would disappear if you are just filing directly
- into each of the countries. You would have to go
- 12 after registrations in each country.
- The other function that disappears we
- 14 think is what Amy has labeled the gatekeeper
- 15 function where now when someone gets into the
- 16 Madrid system, they've been through the
- 17 application process in their country of origin so
- if they filed an application that doesn't even
- 19 have the basic information in it, if they have
- 20 filed for a mark that's generic, theoretically
- 21 those get weeded out of the system by the country
- of origin and then none of the designated

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 countries have to address those problems. Again

- 2 if instead you filed applications directly into
- 3 each of the countries to seek to register in,
- 4 those offices would have to deal with the problems
- 5 individually.
- 6 The third issue I think this affects is
- 7 the issue of identifications of goods and
- 8 classification. Under the current Madrid system,
- 9 the IB sets classification, number one, and number
- 10 two, once they've done that you can't add classes
- or move goods around too much or add goods. So
- that would be gone under this system. You would
- 13 be able to file individual applications and
- 14 presumably you could add on to applications in
- 15 each country as you needed to. Perhaps more
- importantly, one of the complaints we've heard
- from U.S. trademark owners about Madrid is that if
- 18 you file through Madrid, they are limited by the
- 19 USPTO's very strict policy regarding information
- of goods and services so that because if you limit
- 21 your goods in the U.S., then you also must limit
- 22 the goods in all of the countries you've extended

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 to. That would disappear if you could file

- 2 individually into each country.
- 3 Then the last potential issue, our
- 4 colleagues from the Japanese issue have raised an
- 5 issue in the working group meetings about a
- 6 problem that they face along with other countries
- 7 that use languages that have non-Latin characters
- like China, Korea, et cetera. The trademark owner
- 9 in the home country files in their own characters,
- 10 so Chinese characters, Korean characters,
- 11 Vietnamese characters, whatever. But then when
- they want to do business in other countries, they
- 13 frequently are not using their native language.
- 14 They're going to use the language, either a
- 15 transliteration or a translation of the term in
- 16 the other country and so the Madrid system doesn't
- work for them because their basic application
- isn't for the same mark. So that's another issue
- 19 that's before the working group. It could be
- 20 attacked either through the current Madrid system
- or this idea of getting rid of the basic
- 22 application would also address that problem. So

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

that's just a little bit of background. And like

- 2 Lynne said, we don't expect you all to have
- decisions or opinions today, but we are
- 4 desperately seeking feedback from users as to what
- 5 you want the Madrid system to be in the future.
- 6 MR. FARMER: Comments from TPAC?
- 7 MR. LOCKHART: What would be the
- 8 advantage --
- 9 MR. FARMER: Wouldn't that be the
- 10 elimination of central attack in that for example
- 11 you might be hesitant to take a U.S. -- tell me if
- 12 I get this right, Sharon, you might be hesitant to
- take a U.S. application to make it the base
- 14 application for a Madrid filing because of the
- various and sundry ways that that U.S. application
- 16 could get knocked out or because you're going in
- 17 with a narrower description of goods and services
- 18 than you might otherwise have to?
- 19 MS. MARSH: I think central attack can
- work both ways. If you're going after the bad guy
- 21 you can file one opposition against their home
- 22 country application and kill off all the

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 applications in the other countries. But it's

- 2 also what you describe, if your home country
- 3 application gets attacked and cancelled for some
- 4 reason, then everything else dies as well.
- 5 MS. BERESFORD: Some people view central
- 6 attack is like a safety valve against really bad
- 7 registrations that somehow get in the Madrid
- 8 system and get spread across a number of
- 9 countries. Others see it as you've just described
- 10 it, as maybe my own basic application or
- 11 registration is a little shaky and if central
- 12 attack weren't around I wouldn't have to worry
- about this. So really it's depending on which
- 14 side of the fence you're looking at.
- MS. LEIMER: And to add, I think the
- 16 central attack period right now is pretty long and
- so there's a long period of uncertainty 5 years
- where we're not sure whether we might be subject
- to a central attack when we're the applicant and
- 20 that doesn't give us the kind of certainty that
- 21 our businesses need. In some of the countries the
- 22 registration could issue much, much sooner than

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 that period so that has prompted some of us to

- 2 have what I think are redundant portfolios. We
- 3 have international registrations and we have
- 4 separate national registrations which is really
- 5 kind of a crazy to proceed, but that central
- 6 attack has been the reasons cited for that.
- 7 MR. FARMER: Since right now all that
- 8 we're really talking about is we'll be interested
- 9 in taking the next step so that a dialogue can be
- 10 engaged in with I guess other Madrid partners so
- 11 that we could eventually down the road see what
- language may look like, and of course the devil is
- in those details.
- MS. MARSH: Yes, and I think what Amy
- has said is we don't want go to Geneva and
- 16 encourage this discussion to continue to take
- 17 positions on proposals and then find out that
- 18 that's not what the U.S. bar wants. So it would
- 19 be really helpful to us if we have a sense going
- 20 into this what the needs of users are.
- 21 MR. FARMER: Are there any TPAC members
- 22 who feel that it would not be productive to go

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 that next step and just to start seeing what these

- 2 changes would look like? In other words, are
- 3 there any TPAC members who feel like we ought to
- 4 consider freezing things now and not looking
- 5 further? I'll now state it in inverse to give you
- 6 a chance to knock it down that way, and that is do
- 7 you share my sentiment, and this is just my
- 8 individual sentiment, that it's worth taking the
- 9 next step and see what it looks like because it's
- an intriguing concept, and of course the devil
- 11 will be in the details?
- 12 MR. JOHNSON: I see no reason not to
- 13 continue to pursue it. I don't see any down side
- for U.S. trademark owners. The one comment I
- 15 didn't understand and maybe you can help me with
- is about the language diversity issue. If there's
- 17 an exact translation of the Japanese mark, why is
- that stretching the foreign equivalency doctrine
- 19 beyond the breaking point?
- 20 MS. MARSH: I think that was just a
- 21 comment that to try to apply this theoretically to
- 22 every case that might come up could result in some

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 results that we hadn't anticipated. Amy, do you

- 2 want to address that?
- 3 MS. COTTON: The Japanese delegation has
- 4 issued another paper in exploring this linguistic
- 5 diversity idea and talking to other delegations
- 6 informally. What they decided was that linguistic
- 7 diversity really can't be addressed within the
- 8 existing system because of this idea of sameness
- 9 between Japanese characters and English, that in
- some cases it might be exactly the same but in
- 11 other cases it might be different. If you look at
- 12 Apple versus pomme in French, it could very well
- be a different commercial impression and so for us
- 14 it's not equivalent on the doctrine of foreign
- 15 equivalence, but it's really going to depend on a
- 16 case by case basis. So you couldn't say every
- time that just a strict translation is going to be
- 18 same mark and the same commercial impression, and
- 19 from what I understand, translations are an art
- 20 and not a science. So I think from that
- 21 perspective that's what I meant when I was saying
- it might stretch the doctrine of foreign

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 equivalence to have a rule saying, yes, you can

- 2 file your international application in a
- 3 translated form of your basic every time. It
- 4 might very well be a different mark in most of
- 5 those cases and it could be that there's going to
- 6 be gamesmanship of the system to do that, here's
- 7 my basic and a slight difference here, or with
- 8 transliteration there's many different ways to
- 9 transliterate a mark with Japanese or Chinese
- 10 characters in particular how it sounds, they use
- 11 the characters but it sounds -- like when you
- 12 speak it those characters -- when you say those
- 13 characters. So there's just too board of an area
- 14 that the sameness of the mark is not going to be
- something that can be applied across the board
- 16 consistently without stretching the rights or
- 17 expanding the rights when you really didn't want
- 18 to do that to the system.
- 19 MR. JOHNSON: So your position would be
- 20 against this language diversity?
- 21 MS. COTTON: Actually, Japan came back
- and said we don't think we can address linguistic

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

- diversity within the existing system and the
- 2 existing rules. We think the best approach is
- 3 probably going to be to get rid of the basic
- 4 requirement, the basic -- requirement. So the
- 5 extent that somebody with linguistic diversity in
- 6 their system has said that, that's very persuasive
- 7 to me that there may not be a way to approach the
- 8 issue of linguistic diversity within the existing
- 9 system and therefore a diplomatic conference would
- 10 be in order in order to change the system to
- 11 accomplish that. The question for you and for the
- 12 U.S. Bar is do we want to entertain the notion
- 13 that linquistic diversity is an important element
- 14 to consider in going forward in addressing the
- 15 Madrid system and so we want to accommodate that.
- 16 For us for the most part we're using English --
- 17 basic mark is in English characters and it goes
- out in English characters so it's not as much an
- issue, for those countries that have different
- language requirements it is a bigger issue. So do
- 21 we care? Do we feel for those countries that this
- is a problem enough so that we want to address

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 that -- maybe, maybe not, but I put that question

- 2 out there.
- 3 MR. JOHNSON: I guess I worry about the
- 4 translations and meanings and trying to -- trying
- 5 to figure out is this translation accurate, but
- 6 that's the same you face anyway.
- 7 MS. MARSH: Jim, if we move to getting
- 8 rid of the basic, they would just file individual
- 9 applications for the Japanese version, the English
- 10 transliteration or translation of that.
- MS. BERESFORD: Just allow me to make
- one more comment here. I looking at changing
- 13 Madrid I hope you will not limit your thoughts to
- 14 the ones that are presented here. Would Madrid be
- 15 better if WIPO had a universal application, for
- 16 example? And you fill that out and that was a way
- of dealing with transmitting your marks and how
- would that application have to be tied to the
- 19 basic application or registration? Could it be
- 20 partially tied? Do you have to have everything
- 21 that's in the basic application? Or can you add
- 22 classes? You really have to I think take the

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 bricks apart and start sorting them in a variety

- of ways and saying if I were writing this treaty
- 3 today in this day and age how would I do it to
- 4 most take advantage of both the ability of
- 5 computers to do things but also in a sense the
- 6 smallness of the world where trademarks are
- 7 concerned where there are so many folks
- 8 registering in so many places? This is a treaty
- 9 based over 100 years ago when paper was the medium
- 10 and it's also a treaty based on a international
- 11 model of trademarks. It's really not based on
- 12 common law model at all. So think this is a time
- when you can actually really think outside the
- 14 box. If there's a way that we could set up a
- 15 filing treaty which is what Madrid is starting
- over, what would you want in that treaty? Here's
- an opportunity to really think about what would be
- 18 the most effective way to have one of these
- 19 treaties and maybe the answer is just simply get
- 20 rid of the basic application or maybe it's
- 21 something else. But here's an opportunity to
- 22 think about is there some other way that we could

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 have a model here that would be really, really

- 2 useful to U.S. trademark owners.
- MR. FARMER: Are there any comments from
- 4 TPAC based on Lynne's comment?
- 5 MS. LEIMER: I just want to say thank
- 6 you very much all of you who have brought this to
- 7 our attention and gave us this opportunity. I
- 8 personally think that the Madrid system is a good
- 9 one and an important one and to the extent that we
- 10 can improve it and therefore make more people use
- it, it will be better. So I certainly an
- 12 encouraged, and thank you that we're having this
- opportunity and we'll certainly want to talk to
- our colleagues and come back with other ideas.
- 15 And I think, Sharon, you mentioned that you will
- 16 be reaching out to other associations and I
- 17 certainly encourage that to get as broad a view as
- 18 possible from as many owners.
- The Europeans are much more familiar
- 20 with this system than U.S. practitioners because
- of their long history and if you have an
- opportunity to speak to European mark owners, you

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 might get some other ideas, and I would encourage

- 2 you to do that.
- 3 MR. FARMER: Than you, Jackie. To put a
- 4 bow on this issue though, I think your basic
- 5 question was should we continue to explore this
- 6 and pursue it or not and I think that the answer
- 7 of the committee is yes. And if you need us to
- 8 say that in any other way except right now orally
- 9 just let us know and we'll find a way to do that.
- 10 I think that takes us down to item IV-B which is
- 11 fee setting, should the USPTO postregistration
- 12 Section 9 fee? Perhaps the topic will end up
- being a little broader than that, and I'll turn to
- 14 Lynne.
- MS. BERESFORD: We've talked about fee
- 16 setting here in the Public Advisory Committee off
- and on for a number of meetings. I feel that
- 18 trademarks should be run as efficiently as
- 19 possible and that we should in fact end the year
- 20 with maybe a little bit of surplus but not too
- 21 much and have good budgets so we know we have
- 22 enough money to fund our various requirements in

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 the following year. This year trademarks is going

- 2 to overcollect and have a surplus. When we
- 3 initially sent this information to the TPAC
- 4 members we had a different number for this
- 5 surplus. This number keeps changing from as we go
- 6 through tying up the budget in the spending
- 7 numbers. But we also had a different economy even
- 8 more importantly than we have at the moment. So I
- 9 think things have changed radically.
- 10 Again if I am confident that we can
- 11 support ourselves with the fee money we're
- 12 bringing in and I have access, I'm willing to
- lower fees. That's what I want to do. At the
- 14 moment we change the application fee which is our
- 15 big income fee because it's considered to be
- 16 statutory and we have to get Congress to change
- 17 that fee. But all the other fees that trademarks
- charges are set by rule making and it can be
- 19 changed. One of the suggestions was that we look
- 20 at our postregistration fees and talk about
- 21 changing those fees and there's a lot of
- discussion within the office about doing a fee

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 study about how much we're spending actually doing

- 2 postregistration work. The obvious thing is the
- 3 fee right now is I believe \$400 and it used to be
- 4 renewal actually included an examination of
- 5 specimens and other things, but with the change
- 6 that we made in our law to make renewal a mere
- 7 request for renewal and the examinations actually
- 8 with the Section 8 affidavit that's filed at or
- 9 around the time the renewal request is filed, the
- 10 renewal fee didn't change even though the amount
- of work associated with the renewal changed rather
- 12 dramatically.
- So with that background TPAC input on
- this matter, we're looking for you input on this
- 15 matter. Again, we're in a little shakier economic
- times than when we first proposed this, but still
- something that we're interested in getting
- 18 feedback on.
- 19 MR. FARMER: Lynne, do you have any
- 20 feeling given the economic slowdown we may be
- 21 experiencing or are about to experience whether we
- 22 will be in a position to cut fees or whether it's

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 uncertain enough that we can't really go there

- 2 yet?
- 3 MS. BERESFORD: My own view, we keep
- 4 redoing our filing estimates which is a big income
- 5 driver is how many people file, and we are now
- 6 expecting actually about a 2 percent drop in
- 7 filings next year. So the original income
- 8 estimates that we had for next year are quite a
- 9 bit different than the estimates we're having now.
- 10 At this point in time I'm not sure whether we can
- 11 sustain a fee cut at this point. I think we'll
- 12 know more maybe in February, but I'm not sure.
- 13 Again I remain committed to trying to put the fees
- 14 at a level where we pay for our services and pay
- for our infrastructure costs and that's it. We
- are in the business of making money, I don't want
- 17 to make money, I just want to pay for things.
- 18 MS. PEARCE: We did discuss this in
- 19 subcommittee yesterday, I think James will back me
- up on this, we really urged that there be a fee
- 21 study done so that we can figure out what the
- 22 actual cost is for doing an -- declaration or a

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

- 1 renewal or statement of use so that we can
- determine which of these fees are out of line
- 3 which helps justify where cuts might be made.
- 4 They seem to think that we could make great
- 5 headway on that study by February, that we'd have
- 6 more information by then. Apparently they've
- 7 already done this for the Patent Office and indeed
- 8 had started doing it or considering it doing it
- 9 for the Trademark Office. So they were well aware
- 10 of the need for it.
- I also think that we wouldn't have to do
- 12 massive cuts right away, that there could be a
- 13 period where things were done one at a time in a
- 14 measured matter just seeing how the economy is
- going to go. There probably is going to be a drop
- in filings next year, but at least historically
- 17 things do not continue to drop. There will be a
- 18 drop and then things come back. My feeling
- 19 representing a trademark owner is the filing fees
- 20 are pretty fair. You get a lovely discount for
- 21 filing electronically and for using TEAS Plus. I
- 22 feel like those are pretty much in line. The fees

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

- 1 that had never been examined have been the
- 2 postregistration fees. So I think that the study
- 3 which we've asked for will give us a lot of
- 4 insight there.
- 5 And I believe that we are going to be
- 6 able to make some inroads there. We've not quite
- 7 sure what yet and I think it's going to be over
- 8 time. You want to be wise about this. But I
- 9 think it's a wonderful testament to the Trademark
- 10 Office that this can be done in an economic
- 11 climate where the cost of everything else is going
- up to be able to legitimately reduce the cost of
- 13 something makes a great deal of difference. It's
- 14 also my understanding, Lynne, that for the
- 15 Trademark Office, a whole lot less income is
- dependent on postregistration fees than it is for
- 17 the Patent Office. The Patent Office, that is a
- 18 huge cash cow for them. They would have major
- 19 problems if they had to cut their maintenance
- 20 fees. It is a less drastic matter for the
- 21 Trademark Office.
- 22 MS. BERESFORD: Definitely. Most of our

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 income comes from our application fee. Again,

- 2 we've made every effort to make electronic filing
- 3 attractive, so in fact we're lowered our
- 4 application fees twice in the not too distant past
- 5 so we have addressed that to some extent. But
- 6 we're more than willing to do a fee study and
- 7 we'll be happy to see the results.
- 8 MS. DENISON: I wanted to add that the
- 9 proposal was 400 to 100. Is that right?
- MS. BERESFORD: Yes.
- MS. DENISON: If there's concern, you
- could go to 200 or 300. It doesn't have to be
- 13 that.
- MS. PEARCE: This was my question
- originally Mary. If a statement of use costs
- \$100, and that's not to say that's what it costs,
- but that's what you're charged for it, what is the
- difference in effort between a statement of use,
- an 815 declaration, and an 89? There didn't seem
- 20 to be a tremendous amount of difference in this
- 21 electronic age, and that was purely where the 100
- 22 came from. That was why she was using it as the

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 basis. But you're correct. There's no reason

- 2 we've got to go to 100. Maybe all we can do is go
- 3 to three and that's three per class and a lot of
- 4 times with these older registrations that saves a
- 5 significant amount of money. Perhaps in these
- 6 economic times where people are not filing as much
- 7 they will be especially if it were affordable a
- 8 lot more likely to renew what they already have.
- 9 MR. FARMER: The other thing that I
- 10 would be curious about is that presently we have a
- 11 fee for filing a statement of use even though you
- don't get a discount for filing a 1-B application
- or a 1-A application. And I would be curious to
- 14 find out whether there is an increasing cost when
- someone doesn't put in their proof at the time of
- 16 the filing of the application but puts it in later
- during amendment to alleged use or a statement of
- use, whether that adds costs to examining the use
- or not. Are there any other questions or
- 20 comments?
- 21 MR. LOCKHART: In the context of doing
- this I hope too we could look at the fee for

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 requesting an extension of time which has always

- 2 seemed to me to be the one that maybe could use
- 3 some adjustment.
- 4 MS. PEARCE: I'd like to speak to that
- 5 because we discussed this a little bit yesterday.
- Ordinarily I would agree that you want the fees to
- 7 only be more or less what it costs the office, but
- 8 since trademark rights in this country are based
- 9 on use, anything that encourages people to go
- 10 ahead and use that mark and not use their full 3
- 11 years' worth of extensions I think is better for
- 12 the trademark community. So that is personally my
- justification for it being a little bit higher
- 14 than it needs to be. If it is cheaper to go ahead
- and file your specimen and it's possible we could
- 16 even wind up reducing the statement of use cost,
- do that. Don't keep extending which ties
- 18 everybody else up particularly for something that
- 19 you may never intend to use. It's a little bit
- 20 more of an incentive where some of the rest of
- them are carrots. Maybe that one's a stick.
- 22 MR. FARMER: Elizabeth are you saying

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

that folks might just reflexively keep extending

- 2 if they didn't have to pay to extend?
- 3 MS. PEARCE: I think they're doing that
- 4 anyway and I think it would become even more
- 5 prevalent, and I'm speaking as somebody who
- represents AIG who has to use that stick to beat
- 7 the business units over the head, if I can tell
- 8 them how much it's going to cost them to extend
- 9 versus letting it lapse because they're admitting
- 10 now that they're never going to use that mark,
- 11 they'll use something else instead, it reduces my
- 12 cost and it just makes more sense. That needs to
- go back into public domain, that mark does if
- 14 we're not going to do anything with it. There is
- no point in our keeping somebody else from using
- it for what might even be different services.
- 17 They're even in our space but it could be a
- 18 potential conflict. So I think it's just a way of
- 19 keeping people a little bit more on their toes.
- 20 I'm not saying it always does that, but I think
- 21 that if we cut that fee we would wind up with even
- 22 more people who just coast through for 3 years

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

- before they make up their minds.
- 2 MS. BERESFORD: I agree. I think one of
- 3 the things that has to be considered is the policy
- 4 behind the fees and what the fees do for the
- 5 trademark system because obviously we're all
- 6 interested in having the system operate as well
- 7 and efficiently as possible, so that's something
- 8 that has to be considered too.
- 9 MR. FARMER: Anything else on this
- 10 issue?
- 11 MS. BAYLOR: I wanted to say something.
- 12 I agree with Elizabeth. I work in the Trademark
- 13 Assistance Center. That is one of the common
- issues that we have when assisting customers is
- 15 that they never have intentions on actually
- showing use of their 1-B application and therefore
- once they found out how much the fee costs,
- they'll say I'm using the mark differently anyway
- 19 so they'll go ahead and allow the application to
- 20 abandon and just refile. But also in reference to
- 21 what John said as well, once we're assisting
- 22 customers of the procedures of filing a trademark,

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

when they know that they have to pay an additional

- 2 fee to filing a statement of use later on as
- 3 opposed to just paying the initial filing fee. If
- 4 they're filing on a 1-A they're more likely to not
- file a trademark at all until they're actually
- 6 using the mark to save from having to file that
- 7 additional \$100 later on in the process.
- So we explain the process to them they
- 9 are more so -- even though they are attracted by
- 10 filing online because there are cheaper filing
- 11 fees, they recognize the fact that all of the
- 12 requirements for TEAS Plus is not applicable to
- them so they're looking for other avenues to save
- 14 money with the economy. So what they'll do is
- 15 because I cannot file on a 1-A, then I'll just
- 16 wait until 6 months or a year from now once I'm
- 17 actually using the mark and just go ahead and file
- then and then that will save me having to file
- 19 requests for an extension of time for \$150 or
- 20 either the statement of use later on for \$100. So
- 21 that may be also a reason why filing applications
- is not as much as it used to be because they're

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

- 1 looking at ways of saving money.
- MR. FARMER: To put a death grip on that
- 3 obvious point, it means that by having a fee for
- 4 an SOU later you discourage folks reserving marks
- 5 they're never going to use and it keeps more marks
- 6 available for others to use.
- 7 MS. BAYLOR: Yes.
- 8 MR. FARMER: I'm slow, but I -- thanks.
- 9 That's a good comment. Any others from TPAC? I
- 10 think we can go on to the next issue then. Item
- 11 C, should the USPTO accept a geographical
- indications registration of another country as the
- 13 equivalent of a trademark registration?
- MS. BERESFORD: I'm going to turn this
- issue over to Sharon who will discuss this, or is
- 16 it Amy?
- 17 MS. MARSH: I'll start it off. I don't
- 18 know that we have to get into a lot of detail.
- 19 You have a paper that was given to you that has
- 20 some of the issues laid out. The question is
- 21 under Section 44, as you know, that's the basis
- 22 for application or registration based on the

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

| 1 | application | or | registration | you | have | in | your |
|---|-------------|----|--------------|-----|------|----|------|
| | | | | | | | |

- 2 country of origin where you have either a domicile
- 3 or a commercial establishment and that applies.
- The way we've always applied is that you have to
- 5 have a trademark registration or a service mark or
- 6 collective or certification mark registration in
- 7 your home country. The question that's come up
- 8 recently is whether or not an applicant who has a
- 9 registration or a geographical indication in their
- 10 country of origin, should they be allowed to use
- 11 that as a basis for application or registration
- here under Section 44. When this issue came up,
- our International Office was cheering because we
- 14 go around the world. The geographical indication
- issue is a hot international issue. Our standard
- 16 way of approaching it is saying that we have
- 17 trademark registration and geographical
- 18 indications are trademarks and you can use our
- 19 trademark registration system to protect your GIs.
- 20 So accepting GI registrations under Section 44
- 21 would I think further that line of thinking.
- 22 So we are seeking opinions from TPAC,

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 and again it doesn't have to be today, on whether

- 2 you think that that would be acceptable or not.
- 3 In your materials we copied the relevant
- 4 provisions of the Paris Convention and Section 44
- of the Trademark Act and you can take a look at
- 6 those at your leisure.
- 7 MR. FARMER: Any comments or questions
- 8 from TPAC? I know that the International and --
- 9 Subcommittee did some listening to and thinking
- 10 about that yesterday. So especially if there are
- any comments from that subcommittee from those
- members.
- 13 MS. LEIMER: This is Jackie Leimer at
- 14 Kraft. Thank you, Sharon, for that report. I
- think there are a lot of questions about how this
- 16 would actually be executed, the devil is in the
- details, if you will, and so I think we would
- 18 appreciate to have continued dialogue as you
- 19 development further refinement on this. But I
- 20 think as an interesting issue it certainly is
- 21 consistent with the U.S. Government's view that
- 22 GIs are protected in the United States as

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 trademarks and to execute this would be further

- 2 reinforcement of the U.S. position and it's a
- 3 position that Kraft Foods shares, that GIs can be
- 4 trademarks and should be protected as trademarks
- 5 in the United States. That means going through
- 6 the rigors of the trademark examination and
- 7 meeting all the other statutory requirements in
- 8 the United States.
- 9 So that being said, from a personal
- 10 Kraft point of view, this is certainly something
- 11 that we'd like to hear more about as you answer
- 12 some of the questions that I know you have.
- 13 MS. BERESFORD: I don't think there's
- any idea that we're not going to examine these
- just like we examine everybody else who comes
- 16 through the door asking for a registration. This
- isn't a shortcut to registration. This is just
- 18 are these acceptable under Section 44 as bases for
- 19 either a priority claim or as basis for ultimately
- 20 a registration under Section 44. And it's a very
- interesting issue, one we faced some years ago
- 22 with registrations and applications coming from

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

OHED and I think we consulted the Public Advisory

- 2 Committee many years ago on that topic and they
- 3 ultimately decided that it was okay to use an OHED
- 4 application and registration as the basis for
- filing into the United States. So it's a similar
- 6 issue but also slightly different.
- 7 MR. FARMER: Any other comment on this
- 8 issue? James?
- 9 MR. CONLEY: I just have one question.
- 10 This is James Conley from Northwestern. I know
- 11 that this is just being discussed but in looking
- downstream, could this applicant who is the owner
- of the GI take the U.S. Registration and then
- 14 subsequently take it to the country where the GI
- is not a vehicle for trademark prosecution but use
- 16 the U.S. trademark status to achieve trademark
- 17 registration in that country where the GI was not
- 18 grounds for trademark registration?
- MS. MARSH: They'd have to meet the
- 20 country of origin requirements. They've had to be
- 21 doing business in the U.S. or be connected to the
- 22 U.S. in some way.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

| 1 | MR. | CONLEY: | The | assumption | is | that |
|---|-----|---------|-----|------------|----|------|
|---|-----|---------|-----|------------|----|------|

- because we go through this that they get trademark
- 3 registration in the U.S. Could they take that and
- 4 use that as their basis for getting around the law
- of the land that as stated here would not accept a
- 6 GI?
- 7 MS. MARSH: Right, but probably to use
- 8 their U.S. Registration to obtain registration in
- 9 another country they'd have to show that they were
- 10 connected to the U.S. Because they were a
- 11 national or have a domicile or a commercial
- 12 establishment here. If they could do that, maybe.
- 13 I don't know.
- MS. BERESFORD: The Paris Convention
- 15 requirements would still apply. You have to have
- domicile, nationality or a real and effective
- industrial or commercial establishment in that
- 18 country where you're claiming your trademark
- 19 rights from. So if you've come into the U.S.
- 20 With a GI and you get a registration but you
- 21 actually don't have use here which of course you
- 22 can do under Section 44, then it would very hard

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

- 1 for you if anybody looked at your trademark
- 2 application in another country to argue that you
- 3 effectively those rights in that country because
- 4 you don't have domicile, nationality, or an
- 5 effective industrial or commercial establishment
- 6 in the U.S. So there's a built-in check in the
- 7 terms of the Paris Convention.
- 8 MR. FARMER: Any other comments there?
- 9 I'm going to gather that the sense of the
- 10 committee is keep us posted. Let's go on to IV-D,
- 11 proposed rules. Should there be a fee for a
- 12 certificate of mailing? I guess that's -- more
- 13 than one option.
- MS. BERESFORD: Right. I think we sent
- 15 you a paper on this. When we put out our proposed
- 16 rule to amend certificate of mailing and
- 17 certificate of facts transmissions to exclude
- 18 certain documents in February, we got a lot of
- 19 feedback, some of it negative, some of it
- 20 positive, all over the map, from various trademark
- owners and various bar groups. Of course, we take
- 22 all those really seriously. One of the comments

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

was that in certain circumstances it's very, very

- 2 important to continue to have certain options
- 3 available. Of course, the office's horse in this
- 4 race is we continue to nudge people as much as we
- 5 can toward electronic filing of all documents. We
- 6 aren't going to force anybody to file
- 7 electronically but we keep nudging them toward
- 8 that because from our experience it's good for
- 9 everybody in the long run. Maybe in the short run
- 10 it's not so easy, but in the long run we get
- 11 better quality. Applicants once they learn how to
- 12 use our electronic systems are quite happy with
- them and want to continue that. And it totally
- improves the quality of the data in our database.
- 15 Makes it a much stronger place to find out exactly
- what's in applications and registrations.
- 17 So the proposal here was instead of
- 18 eliminating certain options, we would just simply
- charge a fee because essentially we're still
- 20 handling paper in those options if you want to
- 21 continue to use those options. Sharon, do you
- want to add anything to that?

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

| 1 | MS. MARSH: I don't think so. We put |
|----|--|
| 2 | this issue before the committee back when we did |
| 3 | the initial rule making proposal to just eliminate |
| 4 | certificate of mailing and the response was quite |
| 5 | negative from the public. It seems that the bar |
| 6 | wants a safety net. They raised questions about |
| 7 | what happens if I'm trying to file my paper at 11 |
| 8 | o'clock on the day before it's due and TEAS goes |
| 9 | down or my computer goes down? They wanted to |
| 10 | have a way to feel confident that they would be |
| 11 | able to get a timely filing off even if something |
| 12 | happened to the computer system. So this is one |
| 13 | alternative that came up of we'll let you file |
| 14 | paper and use certificates of mailing but you have |
| 15 | to pay an extra fee if you're going to do that. |
| 16 | MR. FARMER: And you would probably just |
| 17 | pay that fee at the time you're submitting your |
| 18 | filing by certificate or mailing, just put the |
| 19 | check in there? |
| 20 | MS. MARSH: That would be one question. |
| 21 | Would we accept the paper if you forgot the extra |
| 22 | fee? I know again for the safety net factor, |

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 people would want to say that I can file my paper

- and if I forget to include the extra fee for paper
- 3 that the PTO will give me 30 days to pay the fee.
- 4 MR. FARMER: A safety net with a safety
- 5 net.
- 6 MS. MARSH: Yes.
- 7 MR. FARMER: If hypothetically TPAC was
- 8 of a mood that it sounds like a sensible proposal
- 9 to encourage electronic filing by charging a fee
- 10 so that you still leave that option open, what
- 11 would happen next in the process to try to make
- this the rule? Would there be a proposed rule
- making along that line?
- MS. MARSH: Yes, I believe so.
- MR. FARMER: Does anyone on TPAC
- 16 disagree with the concept of potentially charging
- 17 a fee there to encourage electronic filing while
- 18 still keeping the option --
- 19 MR. STORIE: Personally I don't think
- 20 that the charge is going to have the effect in the
- 21 sense that the only thing that's been penalized is
- 22 filing at the last minute because if I mail this

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

thing 2 days before or 3 days before, it's still

- 2 being handled on paper. So it's really just this
- 3 question of my having used this stamp that gives
- me this extra day. So it's really just a penalty
- for utilizing the last day. It doesn't change the
- 6 work whatsoever at least from the best I can tell.
- 7 MS. BERESFORD: I think it will change
- 8 the work because what will happen is folks who
- 9 right now routinely use paper filing, when they
- 10 get into the situation that they're filing at the
- last minute, will have to make that difficult
- decision, do I fire up my computer and file this
- online or do I pay the extra money. Some people
- 14 will say I can't really genuinely justify a \$50
- 15 fee, I will grit my teeth and I will file this
- 16 electronically. I think eventually that that will
- in fact change behavior.
- MR. STORIE: You've always got this
- 19 question of how sophisticated this user is,
- 20 whether or not his computer system is reliable,
- 21 whether or not the network or their online access
- 22 is reliable. Sometimes you get on and it works

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

- well, sometimes it doesn't.
- 2 MS. BERESFORD: They still have the
- 3 option of filing on paper with the fee. But I
- 4 think this will a rather gentle but over time
- 5 behavior changing process. I could be wrong about
- 6 that. I've been wrong about many things.
- 7 MS. DENISON: But it just encourage
- 8 people to file by FedEx 1 day earlier.
- 9 MS. BERESFORD: That's exactly right.
- MR. STORIE: But you don't get the same
- 11 protection with FedEx. You may feel confident
- that FedEx is going to arrive because you trust
- 13 FedEx, but you lose the legal protection.
- MS. DENISON: I understand.
- MS. MARSH: Could I just clarify? I
- think we're hearing that you think that we're only
- 17 charging a fee if you use a certificate of
- 18 mailing. The fee would be for a paper filing
- 19 whether you have certificate or mailing or not.
- 20 MR. STORIE: That was not my
- 21 understanding.
- MS. MARSH: So if you file 2 days early

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

on paper you would still have to pay the paper

- 2 filing fee.
- 3 MR. STORIE: So any response on paper
- 4 that could be filed electronically would have this
- 5 \$50 fee or whatever it's going to be?
- 6 MS. MARSH: Yes. If you're filing
- 7 electronically there is no fee.
- 8 MR. STORIE: So anything that's filed on
- 9 paper that could have been filed electronically
- 10 regardless of when it's filed.
- MS. MARSH: Right.
- MR. JOHNSON: Does \$50 cover the extra
- 13 cost? Is the \$50 fee based on the additional cost
- 14 to the office? That's what you've calculated?
- MS. MARSH: Yes.
- MS. BERESFORD: I'm sorry I explained
- 17 that wrong. My apologies.
- 18 MS. MARSH: The other thing I think we
- should mention, in the comments to the original
- 20 rule making notice the other complaint in addition
- 21 to the safety net issue was that to file a TEAS
- response to office action where you have many

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 attachments was cumbersome and that there are

- limits on the size of each page that you attach to
- 3 a TEAS response to office action form. So they
- 4 felt that it was a lot of extra work to use the
- 5 electronic system and so that was another reason
- 6 that they wanted the option of paper filing.
- 7 MR. MORRIS: Craig Morris, USPTO. I'm
- 8 not sure if my list was written actually because
- 9 this is referencing extension of the 3 megabyte
- 10 location and we've already expanded it to 5
- 11 megabytes, so we did try to address that concern.
- 12 In the middle of that fourth paragraph though
- there is unfortunately an overstatement of what
- 14 we've done where it says that we -- there is
- 15 currently on TEAS form for that purpose.
- 16 Certainly that's something that we want to do in
- 17 the future but we have not in fact implemented
- 18 that -- look on TEAS for request to divide form,
- 19 it does not exist at this point.
- MS. BAYLOR: I wanted to make the
- 21 statement that I think like Lynne said it would
- just be a gradual process. Normally customers who

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

call in if they have to submit it in paper form

- 2 and utilize the certificate of mailing it's
- 3 because not that they waited -- yes, they waited
- 4 until the last minute along with maybe something
- 5 is wrong with TEAS or something is wrong with
- 6 their computer and they're pressing for time. So
- 7 I don't think they'll be really too concerned
- 8 about paying the fee having to send it by paper
- 9 but you do have those customers who are really
- just stuck in paper filing and they will call way
- ahead of time before they have more than enough
- time to submit their documents but you have those
- 13 customers who are not computer savvy or they don't
- 14 have access to a computer and they're set in their
- 15 ways to do a paper filing so they have no problem
- 16 with paying whatever fee the agency puts on the
- 17 limitations as far as submitting a paper filing.
- 18 So I think that if the concept is to charge a fee
- 19 so that will use the electronic base, we won't see
- 20 too much of a change, maybe later on down the
- line, but more so now we'll just see the change of
- 22 paper filings being paid for by maybe attorneys or

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 pro se applicants whose system crashed or it got

- 2 stuck or something of that nature and they have to
- 3 pay the fee but for those who are continually
- filing documents by paper, we won't see that
- 5 change probably for a good while because they're
- 6 just set in their way of paying whatever the
- 7 agency sets so that they can continue to file a
- 8 paper filing.
- 9 MS. DENISON: When you have a large 2F
- submission, frankly it's a whole lot cheaper to
- 11 pay the \$50 and submit it on paper than it is to
- 12 pay the paralegal to sit there if it takes a long
- time to break it up into different things and get
- 14 it all ready for an electronic filing. So I don't
- that's going to be a deterrent for that sort of
- 16 filing.
- MS. MARSH: And that does come up
- 18 periodically. I love the electronic system. We
- 19 use TEAS Plus for absolutely everything we can,
- 20 but every now and then like Mary said we've got a
- 21 2F or something that's very much the exception to
- the rule and sometimes those 2Fs because they're

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

| 1 | waiting | for | evidence | from | business | units, | the |
|---|---------|-----|----------|------|----------|--------|-----|
| | | | | | | | |

- 2 stuff gets to you at the last minute or you've
- 3 held out to the last minute hoping you could get
- 4 more that's clearly not coming. It's easier just
- 5 to go ahead and ship it off in paper form and let
- somebody else handle that, but we don't begrudge
- 7 anybody the extra fee and we only do that once in
- 8 a very blue moon, but there probably are going to
- 9 be some exceptions like that that are always going
- 10 to turn up. And we would pay for whatever the
- 11 cost is of the administrative work and we don't at
- 12 all mind doing that, and we try not to abuse the
- 13 system of course, but there will always be some.
- MS. BERESFORD: I think it probably
- would be useful for the committee to know I think
- 16 the last time we looked at the percentage of
- 17 electronic filing of responses to office actions
- 18 was at about 60 percent. So we know that 40
- 19 percent of the filings come in on paper and 40
- 20 percent of them don't have large attachments, 40
- 21 percent of them aren't being filed at the last
- 22 minute. I understand everyone's concerns because

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 nobody wants to lose an option, but in looking at

- 2 it from the perspective of can we move people more
- 3 toward this system because there are some really
- 4 systemic advantages both to trademark owners and
- 5 to the office for this. We think that there are
- 6 reasons to go forward with this, but of course
- 7 that's why we're talking to TPAC about it.
- 8 MR. MORRIS: The flip side of that
- 9 issue, do you think it would be fair where you in
- 10 fact you are submitting a voluminous amount of
- 11 paper we in turn have to scan it.
- MS. MARSH: Absolutely.
- MR. MORRIS: So should we be able to
- 14 charge a fee for our cost to get it into our
- 15 system?
- MS. MARSH: Yes. I completely agree
- 17 with that.
- 18 MR. LOCKHART: Actually arguably that's
- 19 provided for in your fees now because there is an
- 20 hourly charge for work that doesn't fall within
- 21 the four corners of the individual items that are
- 22 listed up above and you could say if you submit

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 more than X number of pages of attachments or

- 2 exhibits and we have to scan it, it's going to be
- 3 at the hourly rate.
- 4 MS. BERESFORD: That is another way to
- 5 look at the fees. Again we are proposing a fee
- for the paper filings because having an across the
- 7 board fee encourages electronic submission and in
- 8 a sense it spreads the cost of paper filing onto
- 9 everyone who chooses to file. So if you file a
- 10 100 page paper filing you pay the same amount as
- 11 the person who files the 2 page paper filing. So
- 12 it's just another way of looking at it, but again
- 13 there's nothing wrong with thinking about --
- 14 except it's kind of hard to administer a per page
- 15 type fee. Then you have to start keeping track of
- 16 the pages in individual paper filings which has
- its own administrative cost, but it's something
- 18 certainly worth thinking about.
- 19 MR. FARMER: I'm not trying to cut off
- 20 anyone's question. I'm gathering that the sense
- of TPAC is that we find this concept interesting
- 22 enough and don't such a big reason to try to spike

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

it now, that it would be reasonable for it to go

- onto the next step where there would be a proposed
- 3 rule to look at.
- 4 MS. BAYLOR: I just have one more thing.
- 5 Sharon spoke earlier that if the paper filing came
- 6 in and they say they didn't submit the fee, would
- 7 it still be processed or would they be able to get
- 8 a letter and be able to submit that fee within 30
- 9 days. That's somewhat the same concept if they
- 10 were to have to revive the abandoned application
- and they needed to file a request, they have to
- 12 file their request for an extension. So the
- office would send them a letter letting them know
- 14 that they have to submit this payment by a certain
- 15 timeframe if they want their application to
- 16 proceed forward. I think if that option is
- 17 somewhat available and if they are filing on
- paper, we'll be more prone sending out more 30 day
- 19 notices requesting the fee as opposed to if they
- 20 know they send in this request by paper and they
- 21 don't submit the fee that it will not be processed
- 22 if it's not done timely. So I think it would be

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 more work for the agency if we do accept the

- 2 paper, give them a letter you have to submit this
- 3 money within 30 days, and then we can go ahead and
- 4 proceed forward, it's going to put more work on
- 5 the office because I think we'll be sending out
- 6 more letters than getting rid of the concept of
- 7 them filing by paper, period.
- 8 MS. MARSH: And I think that's one of
- 9 those things you've got to build into the fee
- 10 time.
- MS. BAYLOR: Right.
- MS. MARSH: We need to think about all
- 13 of these costs. There's absolutely no reason you
- 14 need to be cutting people a special deal for
- anybody out there particularly a trademark
- 16 practitioner who's responding to a 2 page office
- 17 action response which may be something as simple
- as a clarification of goods and services or a
- 19 disclaimer and they're filing by paper and their
- 20 client is getting charged extra for that. The
- 21 clients need to wake up and take notice. All of
- 22 that, but all of the costs should be built into

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

that, and you're right, there are additional back

- and forth costs unless something has been charged
- 3 to a deposit account or something along that line
- 4 and all of that needs to be taken into account.
- 5 But there are times, yes, we have filed those
- 6 voluminous 2Fs by mail. Mea culpa.
- 7 MR. FARMER: Let's go on to the next one
- 8 then, accelerated examination.
- 9 MS. BERESFORD: This is a rule that's
- 10 still in house. It hasn't been published for
- 11 comment because of some fee issues that are
- 12 associated with accelerated examination. For us
- the sticking point I think in house is this
- 14 proposal has been discussed and we've looked at it
- as being exception processing. Someone makes an
- 16 accelerated examination request, somebody gets
- 17 assigned to it and they shepherd it along. In
- 18 general the view of the office is we shouldn't
- 19 have exception processing, if we're going to have
- 20 a process for accelerated examination it should be
- 21 planned to be where you file a particular type of
- application, he's handled by the computer, it's

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

identified by the computer, it moves through the

- 2 computer system. So when we initially wrote up
- 3 this rule, and I think we shared the rule with the
- 4 committee at the last meeting, we had a \$500 cost
- 5 which was associated with doing exception
- 6 processing, assigning a human being to the
- 7 application and having that human being shepherd
- 8 the application along.
- 9 We're now considering what the cost
- 10 would be if we modified our IT systems for this
- 11 cost and I would assume that given the costs of IT
- in this agency that the cost would be considerably
- higher, but until we have those figures and until
- 14 we can go forward with this, the rule is still in
- house and we're still considering it. Sharon?
- MS. MARSH: The other update, we did a
- draft rule and OMB has designated the original
- draft rule with the \$500 as significant and they
- 19 have some questions about whether this is
- 20 necessary given our very low pendency rate
- 21 currently and also the impact on all applicants
- 22 because if a few applicants are getting

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 preferential treatment that might slow down

- 2 everybody who's behind them. So we're really just
- 3 at a point where it's a wait and see. We're
- 4 answering questions from OMB and as matters
- 5 progress we'll keep you updated.
- 6 MS. BERESFORD: We're just trying to
- 7 keep everybody on the committee up to date on
- 8 where we are with this proposed rule.
- 9 MR. FARMER: Go ahead, Jeff.
- 10 MR. STORIE: Given the nature of our
- 11 examination process and the need for publication
- 12 and those kinds of things, I have clients who I
- 13 think would like this idea. As was talked about I
- 14 think in one of the pieces we got about the
- dynamics of trademark filing, ICUs are filed a lot
- of times emotionally. People get tied up in their
- new business venture and they're really pumped up
- and they're convinced they have to race their
- 19 competitors to the courthouse and the only thing
- 20 you can tell them is you're going to have your
- 21 registration in a year they're completely undone.
- 22 No matter how many times you tell them, they still

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

don't get the fact that it necessarily doesn't

- 2 mean -- that they don't have in hand before they
- 3 go do their business. Those things are hard to
- 4 get them to understand sometimes but the emotional
- 5 part of that, I can see some people saying \$500
- 6 and I can get in front of the line, let me do
- 7 that.
- 8 The thing I'm curious about though is
- 9 really how much benefit can we really give them in
- 10 light of the opposition, in light of the
- 11 publication requirements and how things are going
- 12 to work? Are we really just talking about saying
- we'll have you respond back or first action back
- in a month or is it going to be a whole different
- 15 kind of process? I don't think we can change
- 16 fundamentally how we examine a trademark so I'm
- just not sure how much of a benefit we can create.
- MS. MARSH: If I remember correctly too
- from this, the onus is on them to respond to
- office actions within a month also. So the
- 21 applicant bears some responsibility for moving the
- 22 process along too. It's not just a matter of

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 sitting back passively and waiting for the office

- 2 to do all of the work.
- 3 One thing I was thinking of, and this is
- a little bit how our economy has changed, we're
- 5 somewhat victims of our own success. Many years
- ago, and are some young people in this room who
- 7 may not remember this, IP work was not considered
- 8 glamorous, it was not considered interesting.
- 9 People did not want to talk to you about it at
- 10 cocktail parties. Now thanks to the glories of
- 11 branding, everybody's new favorite word, this is a
- 12 hot, hot thing. What this means is if somebody is
- 13 starting up a new business particularly if they
- 14 think they might be selling that business of
- they've got interested investors, they want to
- 16 file at least a provisional patent application to
- 17 protect something. They want to be able to brand
- 18 the name of the company plus any notable products.
- 19 They want registration as quickly as they can get
- 20 it because they understand that looks good in the
- 21 eyes of the public. Even to be able to say that
- they've applied for accelerated examination,

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 anything along that line that will look good in

- 2 front of investors or potential buyers is
- 3 something that this is chicken feed compared to
- 4 what they're hoping to get that kind of payoff on.
- 5 That's how the economy has changed. Ten years ago
- 6 this would never have come up. But this is the
- 7 way in the internet world things work now.
- 8 Initially I thought accelerated
- 9 examination, why do you need that? Things have
- 10 gotten so great. But as Jeff said, there may be
- 11 people out there who are seeing it differently
- from a business point of view than we do and there
- may be a market for that. We have to make sure
- 14 the system does not get abused and that may be
- setting a realistic fee, maybe \$500 is too low,
- and it may be a matter of not getting more than an
- 17 extra month or two just because pendency is so low
- anyhow, but there may be times when that's worth
- 19 it to someone as long as they understand what
- 20 their responsibilities are and realistically what
- 21 the timeframe could be.
- MS. COHN: If I could just add onto

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 that, Debbie Cohn. The proposal as it currently

- 2 stands I believe really calls for accelerated
- 3 examination and then publication in less than 6
- 4 months hopefully, but not necessarily registration
- 5 in less than 6 months, and the answer to that
- 6 question really depends on your consideration of
- 7 the next issue which is what are our obligations
- 8 under the Paris Convention and it is an issue
- 9 because right now we're at the point with TEAS
- 10 Plus where we're publishing applications in less
- than 6 months and in a few cases they're actually
- going to registration. So we need to consider
- 13 that issue anyway, but certainly in the context of
- 14 accelerated examination and what it would mean if
- 15 the acceleration only leads to publication and
- 16 then things stop. So that's something that we
- 17 would certainly want to consider.
- 18 MS. BERESFORD: And just for this
- 19 committee's information, I believe that last month
- 20 about 3 percent of our applications that were
- 21 published were published in less than 6 months and
- the number is growing. We are in fact getting

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 faster and faster as the workflow continues to be

- very efficient. So there are at least 3 percent
- 3 of our people who are already getting to the
- 4 publication stage prior to the 6 month timeframe
- 5 and we expect to have that happen more and more
- often which is one of our issues.
- 7 MR. FARMER: Before we go to the next
- 8 agenda item which is that 6 month issue, to
- 9 continue the conversation on the previous one, one
- 10 thing just speaking for myself individually and
- 11 speaking for the committee that I like generally
- is anything that makes the process go along
- 13 quickly because those of us here who experience
- 14 trademark -- things are going pretty doggone fast
- right now and that's a credit to your
- 16 administration. But folks in the business world
- still are here a year or 13 months and it's longer
- 18 than they -- they shouldn't have expected that. I
- 19 see opportunities for speed aside from this simply
- when you can realize your 21st century plan and so
- 21 that things from notice of publication assuming on
- 22 opposition through registration issuance go

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

| 1 | faster, | and | I'm | very | interested | in | electronically | y |
|---|---------|-----|-----|------|------------|----|----------------|---|
| | | | | | | | | |

- 2 issued certifications of registration so that you
- 3 can just pop it out and it doesn't have to go to
- 4 printing and maybe you have an option that if
- 5 someone really wants the sheepskin so to speak
- 6 they pay an additional fee and they get a nice
- 7 looking little certificate, but still you can get
- 8 your PDF which you may need for certain domain
- 9 name reasons or other reasons right away and then
- 10 you're getting your registration faster even if
- 11 you don't have accelerated examination and if you
- do and it doesn't mess you up on your regular
- speed applications, that's gravy.
- MS. BERESFORD: Of course the issue of
- 15 electronic certificates is one that's also under
- discussion in the office and has a lot to do with
- 17 the roadmap that you heard about earlier. In
- 18 terms of our processing mapping, let me say that
- 19 we still have parts -- we've done this 2 year
- 20 processing mapping in trademarks, there are still
- 21 parts of that processing mapping that we're
- 22 putting into place which are going to further

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 reduce the time after publication. I fully expect

- 2 that in the next year we will see back end
- 3 pendency dropping further -- the registration
- 4 pendency dropping further and some drop-off in the
- 5 time between examination and publication. So I
- fully expect we're going to get faster. I think
- 7 that is something realistic to expect.
- 8 In terms of electronic certificates, in
- 9 internal discussions, one of the things that we've
- 10 discovered is that as the way the roadmap
- 11 proceeds, doing electronic certificate in kind of
- 12 a rational way which means doing it as part of the
- improvement of trademark systems means putting it
- off for a while because the cost of doing it and
- doing it kind of out of order will slow down other
- 16 parts of the roadmap. So that's been put on hold
- 17 although we're still discussing and trying to
- 18 realign things internally. But it's not something
- 19 we've given up, we just think it will happen but
- the electronic certificates isn't going to happen
- 21 right away, and that's where we are there.
- 22 MR. JOHNSON: I have a concern and it's

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 all about educating your client, but if you start

- 2 charging them \$500 on expected review, their
- 3 expectation is going to be they're going to have
- 4 the certificate in hand and not just get --
- faster. All you're going to get is a refusal from
- 6 the trademark office or an opposition and they're
- 7 going to say but I paid my \$500. It's not a
- 8 reason not to do it but it's just managing that
- 9 expectation which as we try to explain things to
- 10 them as Jeff says he explains over and over that
- 11 your trademark rights are based on years and not
- 12 registration, it doesn't matter if you get the
- 13 certificate today or tomorrow. I've spent my life
- 14 telling clients that too and it doesn't seem to
- 15 register. I just know that if they hear about
- 16 this expedited process or even experience it --
- even get one fast, faster you're now setting
- 18 yourself up for the next 10 times when it doesn't
- 19 go through that fast and they'll say why did I pay
- 20 my \$500?
- 21 MR. FRIEDMAN: Probably a related issue
- 22 is if I exhibit it 5 weeks after it's submitted

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

and I give you a refusal then we're going to have

- 2 some hurdles to overcome with the client as far as
- 3 expectations. Obviously you can talk until your
- face is blue, but the fact you get to pay more
- 5 money -- relationship to getting publication and
- 6 registration but you're going to have to manage
- 7 some more difficult expectations when they get
- 8 that refusal in 5 weeks instead of 3 months.
- 9 MR. JOHNSON: That' what they're
- 10 hearing, so I paid \$500 to get to no faster.
- 11 That's what you have to explain to them. That's
- just something we'll have to worry about.
- 13 MR. MARSH: That's when you tell them if
- they were filing a patent how bad it would be.
- This is how I manage expectations in my office.
- 16 Every time the trademark whine, I tell them about
- 17 patents and I tell them about Venezuela. Always
- my favorite example of how slow a trademark office
- 19 can be. And that does at least let them see how
- 20 much progress we've made in the United States.
- MR. FARMER: Mary, you had a comment?
- 22 MS. DENISON: When I first heard about

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

- this I did an informal poll of some ENTA (?)
- 2 members and there was not very much interest in
- 3 the procedure. Since then I personally have used
- 4 the U.K. accelerated system twice for clients.
- 5 When I told them it was going to save them a
- 6 month, they still wanted to pay the money because
- 7 in one case they had a potential licensing deal
- 8 and they wanted to move it forward as quickly as
- 9 possible. In the other there were some
- 10 infringement issues. So in both cases they
- 11 thought it was worth the extra money to pay the
- 12 extra \$100 even though I told them I didn't think
- it was worth it, but they made that call and they
- 14 did it. So there may be more interest than I
- originally thought there was going to be.
- MS. MARSH: And you actually got those a
- month earlier than you would have expected to?
- MS. DENISON: They're in the 3 month
- 19 transition period.
- 20 MR. FARMER: Sometimes you want to
- 21 quicker for litigation purposes too because you
- 22 want to get those presumptions as quickly as you

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

- 1 can that come with having an issued registration.
- MS. BERESFORD: I think one of the other
- 3 thing that -- needs to perhaps think about is if
- 4 you have accelerated exam, what should be the
- 5 limitations on it. Clearly we would have an
- accelerated examination process where you had to
- 7 show exceptional circumstances to get accelerated
- 8 exam, and maybe that's going to be in litigation
- 9 or something is happening in your business model
- 10 that your really need a registration for that
- 11 purpose. If you limit it that way then you really
- 12 limit down the demand and you make it a special
- 13 process. On the other hand, if you pay us enough
- 14 money and you get accelerated exam then you have
- 15 the whole other set of issues that go with that
- 16 because I don't want to have accelerated exam if
- it affects pendency for the person who's paid the
- 18 regular application fee. They shouldn't have to
- 19 suffer because of accelerated exam. Again as with
- 20 most things in life, there's a whole array of ways
- 21 that this could be done. The question is do we
- need to do it and how should we do it, and of

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

- 1 course this is why we're getting input.
- 2 MS. MARSH: The petition to make special
- 3 -- patents, didn't you used to have to give a
- 4 reason and you no longer do? Does anybody here
- 5 know?
- 6 MS. GARBER: I can speak up. I was in
- 7 charge of accelerated examination patents so I
- 8 know a little bit about it. In the old petition
- 9 to make special which wasn't completely replaced,
- 10 you had to give a reason, but you just had to
- 11 state it, here's my reason, I'm old. I'm sick.
- 12 There were reasons. What -- we replaced it, we
- 13 kept age and health as reasons for old
- 14 applications to make special, but under
- 15 accelerated examination now you no longer have to
- give a reason, but what you have to do is the
- 17 preexamination search and the examination support
- document where we ask the applicants to help bear
- 19 some of the burden of the examination, if you
- 20 will, before they come on board. But the old
- 21 petitions to make special aren't completely gone,
- but you did have to state a reason. It wasn't

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 merely paying a fee. It was more than that. Does

- 2 that answer your question?
- 3 MS. MARSH: Yes.
- 4 MR. LOCKHART: I believe the Copyright
- 5 Office had an accelerated registration procedure
- 6 in anticipation of litigation and I realize they
- 7 don't do anything like the -- examination of
- 8 applications done here, but I wonder if it would
- 9 make sense for somebody to talk to the folks at
- 10 the Copyright Office and see what percentage of
- 11 those applications are requested to be done on an
- 12 expedited basis, how they handle it, does it cause
- 13 problems.
- MR. FARMER: There's a big multiple
- though isn't it, Tim, compared to copyright based
- 16 application fee to the accelerated?
- 17 MR. LOCKHART: The base fee is \$40 per
- 18 work, so what it is for --
- 19 MR. JOHNSON: Isn't it \$1,000?
- 20 MR. FARMER: I think it's at least a
- 21 multiple of which is a big difference than just
- 22 knocking it up 25 or percent.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 MR. LOCKHART: But I'm just wondering if

- 2 it would be worthwhile since they do it so they've
- 3 got some real world experience to maybe just see
- 4 what their experiences were. And I realize it's
- 5 not an exact --
- 6 MR. FARMER: They don't look at right in
- 7 those --
- 8 MS. MARSH: But they would have some
- 9 understanding of the administrative costs and that
- 10 kind of thing that might be useful.
- MS. BERESFORD: We can call Mary Beth
- 12 and ask her.
- MR. FARMER: We're just at the
- 14 exploratory stage. Would it be fair to say that
- 15 the sense of TPAC is that we realize that we're at
- 16 a very exploratory stage of this and it's worth
- 17 exploring it further to get an idea as to what the
- 18 fee would be like in the recommendation of the
- office and whether you feel that you could pull it
- off in a way that wouldn't create pendency
- 21 problems for the general applications because I
- think that I would be surprised if there were

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

```
1 support on TPAC for slowing down regular
```

- 2 applications to speed this up? Does anyone
- 3 disagree with what I just said?
- 4 MS. BERESFORD: That's fine. Thank you.
- 5 MR. FARMER: Let's go on to the 6 month
- 6 issue then.
- 7 MS. BERESFORD: We gave you some
- 8 background material for this, but essentially
- 9 under the Paris Convention we give priority rights
- 10 to anyone who files based on a foreign application
- or registration if they file within 6 months of
- 12 their first filing in their home country. One of
- the advantages of course is that you have
- 14 advantages over maybe an earlier filed U.S.
- 15 application. That application might be suspended
- and your priority based application would go to
- 17 publication and possibly registration ahead of the
- 18 later filed U.S. application. Let me rephrase
- 19 that -- the earlier filed U.S. application filed
- 20 after your priority period. Is that too
- 21 confusing? Should I start over from the
- 22 beginning? Does everybody understand because I

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

| 1 | didn't say that very clearly? | | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 2 | The question of course is do we have an | | | | | |
| 3 | obligation as we publish more and more things | | | | | |
| 4 | before the 6 month priority is up do we have an | | | | | |
| 5 | obligation to check and see if anything has been | | | | | |
| 6 | filed with an earlier priority date? Do we have | | | | | |
| 7 | an obligation to hold those things if we find | | | | | |
| 8 | something with an earlier priority date? What are | | | | | |
| 9 | our obligations under the Paris Convention? It's | | | | | |
| 10 | a serious issue in this country mostly because in | | | | | |
| 11 | Lynne's opinion it changes the costs of opposition | | | | | |
| 12 | which can be a fairly hefty amount of money. If | | | | | |
| 13 | you give the priority filer the right, then the | | | | | |
| 14 | later filed the earlier filed but with no | | | | | |
| 15 | priority right U.S. applicant has to bear the cost | | | | | |
| 16 | of the opposition and this is serious money here. | | | | | |
| 17 | So making this decision is one where you're | | | | | |
| 18 | balancing what do you think are obligations are | | | | | |
| 19 | under the Paris Convention. Do we have an | | | | | |
| 20 | obligation to these priority filers to check and | | | | | |
| 21 | make sure we're really honoring their priority? | | | | | |
| 22 | I can tell you from my own experience in | | | | | |
| | ANDERSON COURT REPORTING | | | | | |
| | 706 Duke Street, Suite 100 | | | | | |

Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

Alexandria, VA 22314

a number of countries, nobody cares about this.

- 2 They register and if you have priority rights you
- 3 are expected to come in and defend those priority
- 4 rights. So there is certainly precedent in other
- 5 countries for just saying you have a priority
- 6 right but that's your problem and your cost if the
- 7 U.S. applicant manages to get to publication or
- 8 registration ahead of you.
- 9 MR. JOHNSON: So Lynne you know of no
- 10 trademark office that does this check that you're
- 11 talking about from around the world, any other
- 12 Paris Convention?
- MS. BERESFORD: I do not know of any
- other -- that would be a fair question. Let's
- 15 face it though, I don't know about that many --
- 16 there are hundreds of trademark offices, I only
- 17 know of a few, and various trademark offices and
- 18 various trademark systems have various ways of
- 19 allocating costs. Here it's pretty clear that
- 20 there are very serious cost consequences to doing
- 21 this one way or the other as all of you know
- 22 better than me. But I do know of no country, even

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 common law countries like the United States, that

- 2 have examination processes -- I know of no country
- off the top off my head where applications are
- 4 held up in order to publish and register or
- 5 there's a check done at the 6 month period to make
- 6 sure that there is no priority filing. Amy?
- 7 MS. COTTON: I do not know of any.
- 8 MR. FARMER: Sharon?
- 9 MR. JOHNSON: So there's no obligation.
- 10 Maybe some people would consider it a service to
- 11 be alerted that there's now a pending application
- that's there, but you'd have to pay an extra cost
- to have you go back and check.
- MS. BERESFORD: If we wanted to have a
- service alerting people, that would be something
- 16 we could offer if wanted to do that and of course
- it wouldn't be a free service, we'd have to charge
- for it, but the question here is are we meeting
- our Paris Convention obligations, and again we
- 20 sent you all the language out of the Paris
- 21 Convention and out of Section 44 so you could look
- 22 at it and make sure that we are all on the same

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 page about whether or not we have an obligation to

- 2 check at the 6 month period to make sure there are
- 3 no Paris Convention obligations out there and then
- 4 if we find something, if we find a priority filing
- for the same or similar mark or for the same or
- 6 similar goods and services, do we have to hold up
- 7 the U.S. applicant and go forward with the Paris
- 8 Convention filing. So those are the questions for
- 9 TPAC. I haven't been clear, but hopefully all of
- 10 you know enough about this subject matter that you
- 11 can answer the question.
- MR. FARMER: Lynne, has there been or
- would there be any analysis from the General
- 14 Counsel's Office and the -- Office as to what they
- think of this or do you think it's really best for
- 16 only TPAC?
- MS. BERESFORD: Jim's office would
- 18 necessarily be the office that would do this. It
- 19 would probably come out of our Office of
- 20 International Affairs that would be the office
- 21 that would go analysis of this. Have they asked
- you for a statement on this, Amy?

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

- 1 MS. COTTON: Not formally, no.
- 2 MS. BERESFORD: Amy Cotton has just
- 3 indicated that we have not formally asked for an
- 4 opinion out of our International Office on this
- 5 particular issue.
- 6 MR. FARMER: The reason I asked that is
- 7 that I wonder if we may not be better advisers on
- 8 policy as opposed to writing a judicial opinion.
- 9 We're all lawyers and practice trademark law, but
- 10 I think the feedback that's going to come from us
- is probably going to be more in the nature of what
- 12 would work well. Does anyone have any thoughts on
- that concept before we discuss the merits
- 14 generally of this issue? It was discussed some
- 15 yesterday in International Subcommittee and there
- 16 were some good thoughts there. I sat in on that
- for a while and I'm interested in the reaction of
- 18 the other TPAC members to this. When I actually
- 19 started running hypotheticals in my mind where
- someone would end up losing their opportunity in
- 21 the Paris Convention it became hard for me to come
- 22 up with a line of circumstances where it would

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

- 1 actually be a problem because you figure if
- 2 someone is filing a U.S. Application that gets to
- 3 registration in 6 months, it's probably going to
- 4 be a 1-A application where they file their proof
- 5 up front. If they go 1-B, it would be almost
- 6 impossible them to get through in time. Which
- 7 means that unless they're lying or mistaken that
- 8 they have a usage date that predates their date of
- 9 filing and if that's the case it just seems like
- 10 the entity that the Paris Convention writes is
- 11 rarely going to be in a circumstance where they
- 12 can win. So even if we put them in a position to
- have to file a petition to cancel, they're rarely
- going to look at it and say, yes, we can win that.
- Or at least they wouldn't know that they'd have to
- 16 gather information through discovery to find out
- 17 that it would be difficult to win. So it was just
- 18 hard for me to see.
- MR. JOHNSON: Not if you had an intent
- 20 to -- application.
- 21 MR. FARMER: Those wouldn't tend to get
- through in 6 months.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

| 1 | MR. | JOHNSON: | Ιt | would | get | published | in |
|---|-----|----------|----|-------|-----|-----------|----|
|---|-----|----------|----|-------|-----|-----------|----|

- 2 6 months, it's possible to get published, and then
- 3 they're gone. There's no opportunity to oppose
- 4 them. I worry about that, and you try to again
- 5 remind your clients about this possibility that
- 6 there's -- I only recall a couple of times that
- 7 it's happened that somebody's shown up, but I
- 8 don't know if we have an obligation to do
- 9 anything. That's why I asked Lynne the question
- 10 do other trademark offices see it because nobody
- 11 else seems to see this obligation and all the
- 12 other hundred and -- worth looking at, but if
- there are 190 signatories to the Paris Convention
- and none of them see this obligation, that would
- 15 answer the question for us.
- MS. BERESFORD: Maybe we would query
- 17 WIPO on this issue and see what they have to say
- about it because again it's just my experience
- 19 with the offices that I've seen, I don't know of
- 20 any that hold up applications for this Paris
- 21 Convention reason.
- 22 MR. FARMER: And not only that, but if

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 we were not going to put them in a position of

- filing a cancellation petition, you'd have to stop
- 3 before publication.
- 4 MS. BERESFORD: Right.
- 5 MR. FARMER: So I don't know what
- 6 percentage of applications get to publication or
- 7 approved for publication within 6 months.
- 8 MS. BERESFORD: Three percent right now.
- 9 MR. FARMER: That's going to climb.
- MS. BERESFORD: It's going to climb.
- 11 MR. FARMER: And I don't think we want
- to slow down our system that Lynne has worked so
- hard to speed up.
- MS. BERESFORD: That is definitely a
- 15 consideration that it's going to add to our
- 16 pendency.
- 17 MR. FARMER: To take us into TPAC, I'm
- 18 not sensing anyone throwing up stop signs saying
- 19 that we should try to stop now and keep things
- from going to publication within 6 months. Does
- 21 anyone see that differently?
- 22 MS. BERESFORD: We'll look more into the

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

legal -- we'll get an official legal opinion if we

- 2 can and we'll talk to WIPO about this and see if
- 3 they have any sense of how this particular clause
- 4 of the Paris Convention operates in countries
- 5 around the world.
- 6 MR. FARMER: Shall we go on to the next
- 7 issue? Hearing no objection, we're off to V,
- 8 report of recent changes/events, A, consistency
- 9 mailbox.
- 10 MS. BERESFORD: Our consistency mailbox.
- 11 That is a mailbox that we put up. We put out an
- 12 announcement about it, and in limited
- circumstances where it's the applicant that it
- 14 believes that it's getting inconsistent treatment
- in two of its applications or in an application it
- 16 recently published in a recently registered mark,
- they can email the mailbox and under the procedure
- we've set up we will put together a little
- 19 committee that will look at the complaint
- 20 essentially. This was an attempt, and at the
- 21 moment it's very limited as to who can file into
- 22 this mailbox. It has to be an applicant with two

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 applications or an application -- or three

- 2 applications or something, or a recently
- 3 registered mark can do this. We limited this
- 4 because over the years probably the most
- 5 consistent quality complaint we've had is our lack
- of consistency and we thought here's a possibility
- 7 to actually start addressing this in another way.
- 8 But we didn't want to make it too easy because we
- 9 weren't sure we wouldn't get a thousand things
- 10 dumped into it and we want to be prompt in
- 11 addressing these issues. So we've very narrowly
- defined what could come into the mailbox, and as
- of last week we had two items in the mailbox. Now
- 14 we have four. It opened on the last day of
- 15 September and we're now 20 days into October and
- 16 we have had four items in the mailbox which I
- 17 assume we're dealing with in the way that we said
- 18 we would. So I'm just giving the committee a
- 19 heads up on this what we thought was going to be
- 20 maybe the flood of complaints has turned out to be
- 21 the trickle. Of course, it may be just that
- 22 people haven't -- we sent out a mailing about this

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 to all the people who are on our trademark mailing

- 2 list. We have several thousand on that mailing
- 3 list. We sent that out. We put out an
- 4 announcement about it, et cetera, but sometimes it
- 5 takes a while for people to figure out that this
- 6 process is available. But just to let you know,
- 7 we haven't had a lot of action in the consistency
- 8 mailbox as yet.
- 9 MS. PEARCE: Lynne, we were talking
- 10 about this one at lunch which is one of the great
- 11 virtues of lunch, you get lots of different points
- of view, and one thing that came up was that those
- of us who've had issues with this in the past
- 14 usually have been able to work them out fairly
- 15 easily with the examiners. Is there a requirement
- 16 that they discuss this with the examiner first or
- is it encouraged that they discuss it with the
- 18 examiner first before they go to the consistency
- 19 help line?
- 20 MS. BERESFORD: You mean in terms of our
- 21 announcement? Everyone is always encouraged to
- 22 talk to the examiner first because if you can work

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 it out with the examiner then your problems are

- 2 solved. Sometimes you have two different
- 3 examiners and you can't get the problem solved
- 4 easily and that is again something that we get
- 5 occasional complaints about, examiner A won't do
- 6 what examiner B is doing and they won't talk to
- 7 each other and they both insist they're right and
- so on. So this was one of the objects of this
- 9 mailbox, although again business hasn't been good
- in the consistency mailbox which I'm happy about.
- 11 But we do encourage the applicants to talk to the
- 12 examiner first.
- MS. COHN: That was actually in the
- 14 announcement itself, that encouragement. Also
- this is limited to substantive issues and we
- 16 specifically excluded identifications of goods and
- 17 services issues because those things generally are
- 18 worked out between the examining attorneys and
- 19 that would be just a humungous flood into the
- 20 mailbox if every --
- 21 MS. BERESFORD: Although if business
- 22 doesn't pick up, Debbie --

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 MS. COHN: Actually, Lynne, and Cynthia,

- 2 you said that four messages were in that mailbox.
- 3 Actually one of those messages was from an
- 4 internal examining attorney just simply copying
- 5 the mailbox on a message to this manager, so
- 6 really it's even fewer than four.
- 7 MS. BERESFORD: So we're not doing too
- 8 well on the consistency mailbox business. Again
- 9 the plan was that if we went through a period of
- 10 time and we didn't get much response from the
- 11 public to this mailbox, we'll expand the criteria
- so that more things can come into it because again
- 13 we want to expand what we consider and when we
- 14 talk about consistency we want to keep moving the
- 15 bar up and getting the feedback.
- MR. FRIEDMAN: Since business is slow,
- do I hear a motion to -- consistency mailbox or do
- 18 we wait a few months? I know the first two -- was
- 19 the fourth one earmarked to the committee or is it
- 20 still being --
- 21 MS. COTTON: I think it just came in
- today so I don't think anyone has looked at it

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

- 1 yet.
- 2 MS. BERESFORD: So we encourage you if
- 3 you encounter inconsistencies in your practice,
- 4 please feel free to email the consistency mailbox.
- 5 We'll be happy to hear from you.
- 6 MR. FARMER: Shall I go on to the next
- 7 item?
- 8 MS. BERESFORD: Rule packages. I'll
- 9 turn this over to Sharon. We've talked about
- 10 almost everything that's in progress. Is there
- 11 anything?
- MS. MARSH: There's not a lot to report.
- 13 We talked about the accelerated examination rule
- and a certificate of mailing rule. Earlier this
- 15 year we issued notices of proposed rule making, a
- 16 housekeeping package, and some rules on signature
- 17 requirements, most of that just codifying current
- 18 practice, and we're developing responses to the
- 19 comments and are moving forward with the final
- 20 rule and the committee of course will get a copy
- of the final rule at the appropriate time.
- The only one I think that's still

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

1 pending is the proposal to change the request for

- 2 reconsideration after final procedure. If you
- 3 recall, our initial proposal was that you have to
- 4 use TEAS and respond within 3 months or request
- 5 for reconsideration after final. Response to that
- 6 was pretty uniformly negative and we're still
- 7 considering what options we should move forward
- 8 with.
- 9 MR. FARMER: Anything in response to
- 10 that? Legislation?
- 11 MS. BERESFORD: I think we already had a
- 12 legislation report from John Dudas.
- 13 MR. FARMER: We can check that one off?
- MS. BERESFORD: Yes, we can check it.
- MR. FARMER: Are there any questions
- 16 from TPAC members, if any, on any other issues
- 17 before the office? Any other information that
- 18 Lynne sent out or other things?
- 19 MR. LOCKHART: I do not have anything
- 20 else.
- 21 MR. FARMER: In that case, let's go to
- 22 VII. Are there any members of the public who've

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

| 1 | joined us or other who work for the office who |
|----|--|
| 2 | want to make any comments or pose any questions to |
| 3 | TPAC to the folks here? In that case, I will |
| 4 | thank you all for coming. I want to thank all the |
| 5 | folks at the PTO who put so much time and effort |
| 6 | into preparing reports, talking with us on the |
| 7 | phone, educating those of us who are new, and we |
| 8 | thank you for your service and look forward to |
| 9 | working with you more, and I'll declare the |
| 10 | meeting to be adjourned, and after we can clear |
| 11 | the room, TPAC would like to reconvene in |
| 12 | executive session just to do some planning stuff. |
| 13 | (Whereupon, at 3:00 p.m., the |
| 14 | PROCEEDINGS were adjourned.) |
| 15 | * * * * |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| | ANDEDCON COLLDE DEDODETIC |

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

| 1 | CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC |
|----|--|
| 2 | |
| 3 | I, Carleton J. Anderson, III do hereby certify |
| 4 | that the forgoing electronic file when originally |
| 5 | transmitted was reduced to text at my direction; |
| 6 | that said transcript is a true record of the |
| 7 | proceedings therein referenced; that I am neither |
| 8 | counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of |
| 9 | the parties to the action in which these |
| 10 | proceedings were taken; and, furthermore, that I |
| 11 | am neither a relative or employee of any attorney |
| 12 | or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor |
| 13 | financially or otherwise interested in the outcome |
| 14 | of this action. |
| 15 | /s/Carleton J. Anderson, III |
| 16 | Notary Public # 351998 |
| 17 | in and for the Commonwealth of Virginia |
| 18 | My Commission Expires: November 30, 2008 |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| | ANDERSON COURT REPORTING |
| | |

706 Duke Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314