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The need for cooperation

• What benefits can it bring?
• Where is it needed?
• What can it achieve?
• What difficulties does it raise?

“No man is an island, entire of itself; every man is a piece of the continent, a part of the main;”
John Donne (1572-1631)
(I) Benefits – why cooperate?

- If patent data are to be fit for 21\textsuperscript{st} century purposes, they must be generated, stored and distributed with \textit{multiple uses} in mind.
- We live in the age of ‘big data’ and ‘linked data’
  - lack of standardization will hinder the integration of patent data into modern decision-making processes, at local, national or international level.
  - limited integration = limited visibility/usefulness.
Benefits – why cooperate?

• Each user group approaches patent data from a different viewpoint:
  • Business analysis (tactical R&D-led, strategic level)
  • Financial/tax affairs (erosion of tax base, ‘patent box’ arrangements)
  • Innovation metrics/economic planning (regional, national level)
  • Licensing/sale/divestment opportunities (valuation, individual IP rights, entire portfolios)
  • Legal affairs (enforcement, jurisdiction for disputes)
• Form of search, analysis and presentation is unique to each user group.
• No *single* organisation in the IP community has the mandate to organise the data for *all* applications – therefore, cooperation is needed.
(II) Focus of action – where is the work needed?

• “Where?” in the patenting process
  • at all points in the life cycle, from application, through to grant and beyond expiry. [TIME]
  • by all the parties involved in the processing cycle, from initial data entry (applicant), through prosecution and publication (IPOs), commercial data distributors, to a range of end users of the data. [PARTIES]
How does patent information reach the user?

‘First-level’, raw data, official registers

Additional editorial ‘value-add’ services

Multiple databases, common retrieval interfaces
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How does patent information reach the user?

Standards here may help one group of users...

... but a different standard here may help a different group.
Focus of action – where is the work needed?

• “Where?” in the patenting process
• TIME – generally, achieving some degree of standardization as early as possible in the life of the data will be helpful (‘ripple-through’)
  • cooperation between applicants and IPOs is required.
• PARTIES – private sector data aggregators are better placed to impose other forms of structure onto the original public data
  • but this can result in multiple (and conflicting) proprietary systems
  • cooperation in the private sector is needed, too.
(III) Potential for improvement – what can it achieve?

- **Efficiency**
  - in retrieval of all the information which is deemed ‘relevant’ to the enquiry in hand

- **Clarity**
  - when analysing the retrieved information and integrating it with additional data, in order to make a decision
Example 1: Multilingual publication - implications for name records

PCT/RUYYYY/ (Ru)  
Пётр Ильич Чайковский

WO-A (transliterated)  
Pyotr Ilyich Chaykovsky

GB-B (En)  
Peter Ilyich Tchaikovsky

DE-B (De)  
Pyotr Ilyitsch Chaikowskii

PCT International Application filed in Russian

PCT International Application published in English

National phase entry published by United Kingdom

National phase entry published by Germany
Example 2: Patent family structure – implications for ownership records

1 patent family
7 published documents
4 publishing authorities
3 corporate identities
1 rights owner

Applicant: ROTORK APPLIANCES LIMITED
Rotork House Brassmill Lane
Bath BA1 3JQ (GB)

Proprietor: ROTORK APPLIANCES LIMITED
Rotork House Brassmill Lane
Bath BA1 3JQ (GB)

(73) Granted to Prototypes, Ltd.
U.K.

(73) Granted to Prototypes, Ltd., Bath, England

(73) Granted to Notetry Limited, Bristol, England

(7) Anseger: *NOTETRY LIMITED;
(IV) Challenges to implementation – what difficulties does it raise?

• "Quis custodiet ipsos custodes?"
  • Any identifiers / ontologies / company tree structures must be
    • accurate and up-to-date (within and across national boundaries)
    • compatible (some data processors may use a sub-set, but not a different set)
    • dynamic (not just ‘who owns whom’ but also ‘who used to own whom’)
    • archived and version-controlled (not just ‘who used to own whom’ but also ‘when’)
  
  • Whose task is it to supervise these issues?
    • National harmonisation? International oversight?

• Implementation into back-file data will be especially challenging (if not impracticable).
  • future users will need to know how to handle old data as well.
Accurate data - authoritative national dictionaries are vital

### 1. CELL TRANSDIFFERENTIATION INTO BROWN ADIPOCYTES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inventor:</th>
<th>CPC:</th>
<th>IPC:</th>
<th>Publication info:</th>
<th>Priority date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZHOU ZHENQING [US]</td>
<td>A61K48/005</td>
<td>C12N15/06</td>
<td>US836112 (B2)</td>
<td>2014-09-16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNIV/MIAM [US]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIV/MIAM [US]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. COMPOSITIONS AND METHODS FOR INDUCING MIGRATION BY DENDRITIC CELLS AND AN IMMUNE RESPONSE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inventor:</th>
<th>CPC:</th>
<th>IPC:</th>
<th>Publication info:</th>
<th>Priority date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STONE GEOFFREY WILLIAM [US]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIV/MIAM [US]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### United States Patent

- **(54)** CELL TRANSDIFFERENTIATION INTO BROWN ADIPOCYTES
- **(71)** Applicant: **Miami University, Oxford, OH (US)**
- **(73)** Assignee: **Miami University, Oxford, OH (US)**

### United States Patent

- **(54)** COMPOSITIONS AND METHODS FOR INDUCING MIGRATION BY DENDRITIC CELLS AND AN IMMUNE RESPONSE
- **(75)** Inventor: **Geoffrey William Stone, Coral Gables, FL (US)**
- **(73)** Assignee: **University Of Miami, Miami, FL (US)**
Dynamic data –
corporate structures create special challenges

Source: www.independent.co.uk, 8 Mar 1996

Ciba-Geigy and Sandoz to merge into £40bn giant
Pharmaceutical fusion: Biggest merger in history will create ‘Novartis’, the world’s second-largest drugs group, while bid spotlight turns on Zeneca

Source: www.globenewswire.com, 21 Jan 2003

Novartis to Unite Its Generics Businesses Under One Single Global Brand: Sandoz

Source: www.globenewswire.com, 21 Jan 2003
Published PCT applications in the name of ‘Sandoz’ as corporate applicant, 1980-2014

Merger with Ciba-Geigy to form Novartis

Re-birth as Novartis subsidiary company
Is current IP data fit for purpose?

“Without data about value and risk, ownership, strategy and information allowing us to make market comparisons, it is hard to see how a functional and active market [in IPR] can be developed; and while data is not the only ingredient, transparency, visibility and understanding of the patent world has to be the starting point”.

Scott Bell, head of UK investment banking, Deutsche Bank

“The lack of visibility and data around IP means it is currently very difficult to transact IP at a level that makes economic sense.”

Philip David, General Counsel, ARM Ltd.

(both quoted in “The Trillion-dollar tipping point”, © Aistemos, Sept. 2014)