

Minutes of the 49th British Patent Information Professionals BPIP Meeting

Wednesday 11 November 2020 from 8am to 5.30pm
Hosted by Adam Hope and Cristina Crespo Garcia, Pilkington Group, Ormskirk
Meeting chaired by Paula Juckes (UCB)

Agenda

Please see **Appendix 1**.

This meeting saw the successful use of teleconferencing technology (MS Teams and Zoom) to enable the meeting to be run exclusively virtually, as it took place during the second Covid-19 pandemic lockdown period in the UK in 2020, when travel restrictions and social distancing conditions were imposed to prevent the spread of the coronavirus infection.

Where materials detailed in the sections below and in the appendices include hyperlinks, these lead to materials on the members-only pages of the BPIP website. Explicit links to external materials are also given in some session notes.

Attendees/Apologies

Please see **Appendix 2**.

Brief biographies, some previously shared at the 48th meeting, and others provided for the 49th meeting, were used for planning the breakout session topics, and are available for members only to view (see link in **Appendix 2**).

49.00.1 [Welcome from the Meeting Chair](#) (Paula Juckes, UCB)

Paula gave a warm welcome to all attendees at this, BPIP's first fully virtual meeting.

In a similar vein to the biographies provided by other members, Paula gave a brief summary of her role and background. Thanks were also extended to the 49th meeting planning team, including Adam Hope and Cristina García Crespo (both at Pilkington) as hosts of the virtual meeting and Rachel Lewis (RB) coordinating speakers sessions and meeting question management.

49.00.2 [Introduction](#) (Adam Hope)

Adam Hope provided an overview of Pilkington and the wider NSG Group, which generated some discussion regarding IP on automotive glass; for example, are Pilkington involved in supplying replacement parts for vintage cars, and if so, how do they identify current owners of IP from the sparse and changing ownership records? Adam responded that the focus is on automotive glazing replacements mainly for "modern" cars (~15-20 years old), so ownership is unlikely to have changed or to be hard to ascertain; the company policy is to avoid infringement regardless of whether a patent is considered valid, and the company will seek a licence for 3rd party rights – but it is not a high margin business, so usually prefer to avoid infringements rather than having to seek a licence.

49.01 [Chairperson’s Report](#) (Nathan Pennington)

A breakdown of BPIP’s current membership (85 individuals) was provided: the majority of BPIP members come from the corporate sector (56%, a slight increase compared to last year), with a significant proportion (24%) of total members now identifying as individual independent patent information professionals (up from 16%).

Retirements from BPIP itself were also noted since the 48th meeting (two members having been retired for some time from employment):

Mike Blackman (whom many members will know not just from his long membership of BPIP and its earlier incarnations, but also from his past tenure as Editor-In-Chief at World Patent Information, as well as from his roles at the UK Patent Office, in PATMG and his many patent information publications, conference presentations and reports) sent a farewell email to the members in October:

“At 76 I no longer have an active interest in the IP world and patent information so I would be grateful if you would delete me from the BPIP contact list.

I enjoyed the company of so many friends and colleagues, especially in the patent information field, but it is now the right time to thank you all and wish you all the very best for the future. Should anyone want to get in touch my active email is now michaeljrb44@gmail.com.”

Shortly after the 49th meeting, **Neil Walden** (as he notes below, one of the founder members of the Derwent UK User Group – an earlier incarnation of BPIP – and host of the inaugural meeting at Rhone Poulenc Rorer; also a frequent Chair of and contributor to many of the subsequent meetings) sent this message:

“Thank you for regularly sending me details of the BPIP meetings and other patent conferences and meetings. I have now been retired for three and a half years and no longer have any active interest in patent information or search or analysis techniques. Please would you remove my name from your mailing list.

Please could I ask you to pass on my best wishes to all your colleagues who still remember me from the BPIP and its precursor groups going back to 1990? I was privileged to be a founder member of the original Derwent UK user group and to work with a number of current BPIP members in various patent information groups and conferences.

I can be contacted via LinkedIn or by email: neil.r.walden@gmail.com.”

Since the last meeting we have welcomed more than 10 new members (see links to profiles from **Appendix 2**).

An action for all from the BPIP Chairman’s Report:

49.01.1	BPIP members are requested to volunteer to contribute to or take over management of our LinkedIn Group and Twitter feed	Action: contact NP/JE to discuss
----------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------

49.02 [Secretary's Report](#) (Jeanette Eldridge)

Jeanette noted that after the meeting in November 2019, two workstreams were initiated, with two teams, to look at the planning activities for both this (49th) and the forthcoming 50th meeting.

With virtual discussions organised through most of 2020, in alternate months for the two workstreams, this enabled the preparation activities to be shared and scheduled through the year.

See more on the 50th meeting preparations in **49.13**.

As this was a particularly challenging year, with restrictions regarding business travel and on-site meetings being implemented, an early decision was made for this 49th meeting to be run wholly virtually.

This actually extended the scope for attendance, and several existing members indicated interest from colleagues to attend, in some cases just for specific agenda items. This was seen as a benefit, where normally not all members of a corporate patent information professional team are permitted to be out of the office at an external meeting at the same time.

With regard to membership more generally, although the number of members has stayed stable at 80-85 over several years, significantly fewer new members have joined as a result of recommendations through meeting existing members at external conferences, as most external meetings this year, if they took place, were mostly virtual and therefore networking opportunities were reduced.

The membership discussion provoked a number of comments, both in the meeting, in the breaks and via email subsequently, so it is clear we need a subgroup to be convened to discuss further (see outstanding action item **48.2.1** in section **49.03**):

- It was noted that if members include vendors, then the vendor rep on BPIP would not be accepted as nominee for SACEPO/PDI. The EPO have other committees focused on industry vendor interactions, PDI is meant to be for reps from industry/academia.
- Some felt reluctance to include vendor reps because of their company allegiance.
- Others raised the whole question around access to our meetings and minutes if a vendor was interested in our thoughts about product development/feedback – even if a vendor rep was excluded from the meeting, the info would be accessible in our minutes.

A subgroup to look at membership criteria could help to bring in not only new members, but also speakers/sponsors for the 50th meeting and beyond, and help to future-proof BPIP, by tapping into people in other industry sectors/types – also through personal contacts, widened LinkedIn searching, and through e.g. CILIP, other trade/professional networks. Also perhaps the subgroup could consider including members where patent info is part of a broader info professional role?

As background to the CEPIUG and SACEPO/PDI roles confirmed in the Chairman's Report, Jeanette provided a summary of the criteria and history of these roles, and related activities in CEPIUG and with WIPO.

49.03 Minutes and Action arising from the 48th BPIP meeting

Actions outstanding and follow-up items

Section	Details	Action
48.2.1	Set up sub-group to review and clarify our membership criteria	Action outstanding: NP/JE to initiate in 2021; some individuals have already volunteered
48.2.2	GDPR consent and members area website access	Action completed: JE sent out reminder re GDPR consent and updated welcome email for new members Action completed: JE to remind members who have not yet requested members area access to do so via (https://www.bpipinfo.com/members-only)
48.2.3	Annual fees due February 2020; Stuart has volunteered again to fund the 2021 website fees, with Nathan paying the fees for URL maintenance	Action completed: NP to follow up with Stuart Newbold who kindly continues to pay the website fee
48.2.4	Future membership fees/sponsorship options to be explored	Action outstanding: JE to canvas BPIP for input and contact CEPIUG groups who have similar arrangements in place review as part of the sub-group on membership criteria (see 48.2.1)
48.4.2	Members who are interested in any of the roles should contact Nathan and/or Jeanette	Action outstanding: All members are requested to volunteer or propose others
48.5.2	Members who are interested in the CEPIUG Board role should contact Jane, Nathan and/or Jeanette	Action completed: As noted in the Chairman's report, Kathleen Burrows has agreed to represent BPIP on the CEPIUG Board from the 25 th Annual CEPIUG members virtual meeting on 02/12/20 onwards
48.5.3	SACEPO/PDI representation, as Stephen is not seeking re-nomination	Action completed: As noted in the Chairman's report, Hannah Sophia is our nomination for the 2021-2023 term representative on SACEPO/PDI, proposed to CEPIUG at the 25 th Annual CEPIUG members virtual meeting on 02/12/20
48.6.1	Set up survey during Q1 for preferred date and venue for 49 th meeting	Action completed: Survey completed during April 2020
48.6.2	Set up sub-group to prepare for 49 th meeting	Action completed: First meeting took place online 01/05/20
48.6.3	Set up sub-group to start to prepare for 50 th meeting	Action completed: Initial discussion took place 20/04/20

49.04 Actions outstanding from preceding 47th meeting in 2018

Section	Details	Action
47.2.3	Correspondence spreadsheet being prepared to provide list of items since last meeting to share with new members who join between meetings	Action outstanding: JE To be followed up as part of new website by end of Q2 2021

Section	Details	Action
47.2.4	Proposal for JE as back-up to Chairman for website, blog, LinkedIn	Action completed: NP has provided JE with edit access to website and blog, and has set up auto-forward on BPIPinfo@gmail.com account Action outstanding: see new action item 49.01.1: To be followed up during 2021
47.2.5	Proposal for development of repository for website for sharing materials cf. CEPIUG (GoogleDrive?)	Action outstanding: JE/SZ To be followed up as part of new website by end of Q2 2021
47.4.1	IPI Award	See item in 49.07

With amendments from the above points, the minutes for the 48th BPIP meeting in 2019 are approved and the final version loaded on the [website](#).

49.05 Representation of BPIP on other organisations' boards, at other meetings

Reports from representatives of BPIP at other organisations' meetings (CEPIUG, SACEPO/PDI, WIPO) added further useful insights to the points identified in the Secretary's Report.

CEPIUG Board

Jane List confirmed that the Board has monthly meetings. CEPIUG is an official observer at WIPO. CEPIUG can make representations to EPO. Other UG members of CEPIUG meet more frequently than we do in BPIP.

49.05.1	BPIP meeting/comms frequency vs CEPIUG Board meeting feedback; in future, we could set up smaller groups or more comms channels to gather comments for CEPIUG matters	Action: JL/KB/JE to discuss
---------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------

The last year has seen a number of changes to the Board and to the website so has been a bit "underground".

SACEPO/PDI

Stephen Adams will stop being PDI rep. The Annual meeting planned for March 2020 was cancelled, so neither Stephen nor Hannah were able to attend. The term of service was 2018-2020.

There has been a new round of nominations – Hannah has been re-nominated for 2021-2023. Stephen showed the EPO website showing the objectives of SACEPO:

<https://www.epo.org/about-us/services-and-activities/Consultingourusers/sacepo/objectives.html>

which is the parent body to SACEPO/PDI, which shows some recently formed working parties; PDI is now listed as a working party, but it is a permanent subcommittee.

With forthcoming changes in EPO products, some details are confidential, particularly regarding proposals or plans for EPO's own info services, as this is sensitive market info. So a few of the SACEPO/PDI conversations are confidential, but this is a minority of the discussions, most topics between EPO and members are more open.

Stephen has been involved for several years, originally took over from David Newton as rep for PATMG (no longer in existence). Feels the meetings are worthwhile to attend to keep in touch with EPO developments. Happy to support Hannah. Noted that appointment is on a specific individual basis, so can't send an alternate if rep is unable to attend. He noted that the annual meeting is not the venue for raising very detailed questions, it is more directed towards general usability discussions.

WIPO

Susan Bates noted that she was formerly rep for PATMG, which no longer exists. The representation is on a named individual invitation basis, as for the EPO (which is probably why Susan Helliwell is still listed even though Susan Bates has explained the situation).

Stephen noted that WIPO have a lack of knowledge of /connections to all user groups, so is only advertising to groups that they know exist; but they do want to be inclusive, and know their weakness regarding their [lack of] comms. Individuals can join on a personal or a rep basis, as we have seen from recent comms. Meetings have a similar format as for past EPO conferences, which are used to publicise WIPO's own user services. Interested parties can get access to documents afterwards.

49.06 Meeting attendance feedback

Please see calendars of external meetings from [2019](#) and [2020](#) for the full list of meetings for which feedback has been requested, since the last BPIP meeting in November 2019. With the pandemic disrupting events, most meetings originally planned for early 2020 were pushed into late 2020 (or even into 2021), reconvened as hybrid or fully virtual meetings, or cancelled altogether (so the calendars may not be completely accurate!).

[IP Service World](#), 25-27 November 2019 – this annual conference has been infrequently attended by BPIP members in the past, so is not a priority generally, but this [link](#) takes you to videos from the 2019 meeting.

[PIUG 2020 Biotechnology Conference](#) – 25-26 February 2020 was one of the few events in 2020 which continued as scheduled; see [this review](#) of the meeting highlights.

[CIIPM training sessions](#), planned to start in March 2020, were rescheduled throughout the year and successfully revised to be delivered online, starting from May 2020.

[PatentSight Summit](#), 13-14 May 2020 – Susan Bates attended and said this meeting provided good product presentations with real examples for business decisions; it was generally good to see examples, get ideas of how people are working.

[Recordings](#) are available, including of the panel discussion on “Patent Analytics at International Patent Offices - Challenges and Expectations” with Nigel Clarke (EPO), Chris Harrison (UK IPO), and others.

[Shaping tomorrow: 3D printing and its impact on IP](#), hosted by the EPO and EUIPO on 13-16 July 2020 as EPO’s first digital conference, provides access to materials from the meeting’s four days of presentations.

[AI-SDV](#) (The Artificial Intelligence Conference on Search, Data and Text Mining, Analytics and Visualization) – postponed from April to 5-7 October 2020, this hybrid meeting was attended by several BPIP members including Paula Juckes, Kathleen Burrows, Chris Harrison, Jane List and Maddy Marley, who provided the following brief points of feedback:

- Paula – noted the meeting was relatively small, with good updates on new services and trends, but more techy than Paula would like, but overall, felt it was the best virtual conference for info pros attended in the past year.
- Jane – agreed, and felt there was some good info about tools targeted towards less professional roles.
- Maddy – felt it was good that access to exhibitors was possible, to see what's on offer.

Presentations from Bayer, Novartis, etc., are available via links on the [conference programme](#) website; additional slidesets are found by searching in Slideshare for “**AI-SDV**” 2020 (see [AI-SDV Meeting in Nice](#)).

[Search Matters 2020](#) was rescheduled from its original dates of 11-13 May 2020 to 14-16 October 2020, and was then run as an online meeting; materials are available from the plenary sessions across the three days, and useful highlights and additional webinars of interest are highlighted by the [PIUG-PF](#).

[PIUG 2020 Annual Conference](#) – “Taking Patent Information to the Next Level”, 26-30 October 2020: feedback from Rachel Lewis, Adam Hope, Stephen Adams, Kathy Burrows.

- Differences in opinion were shared regarding the value of the conference:
- Rachel did not find it all that helpful, and long at 5 days
- Adam felt it was expensive for a virtual conference
- Kathy felt it was good, had never attended before because US travel was restricted; the conference was really good for patent landscaping; also things coming e.g. from academia, not near market yet.
- There were issues with the breakout sessions for vendors as changeover times between sessions were challenging.
- Stephen did two very good talks!

Stephen noted that PIUG relies on volunteers so there are limited funds, instead costs need to be covered by registration fees; 5 days is a long meeting but 2 days were workshops, and there were LOTS of presentations by vendors. Preparations for the Orlando meeting were well advanced before the cancellation due to COVID-19; forward bookings hotels would have been made and probably not covered by insurance.

Gilman has attended in the past and noted that maybe in normal years, finances are delivered through vendors registration fees.

[EPO Patent Information Conference 2020 \(EPO PIC\)](#) was intended to be hosted in Tallinn, Estonia, but was instead held as an online meeting on its scheduled dates of 3-4 November 2020.

Feedback from Jane List was that it was well run, better for exhibitors, products on IP management, searching and making use of AI. Stephen Adams stated that it was more solely focused on EPO's tools and services; different people attended virtually who otherwise couldn't afford to attend in person normally.

Conference reports on the eight [discussion rounds](#) are available, e.g. "[Non-patent literature: what are the searcher's needs and are they being met?](#)".

49.07 Forthcoming events

[IPIConfEx, IPI Award](#) – Jane noted in discussions regarding item **47.4.1** that a decision was made not to award the IPI Award in 2020, as it required an event/location at which to present the award; the funds are still available for the award, but the IPIConfEx is not taking place; Lucy Akers approached attendees at EPOPIC, and members of CEPIUG, PDG and PIUG aim to get together to collaborate on how to award it and where.

[East meets West 2020](#), a forum on patent knowledge from Asia and beyond, held online at 23-25 November 2020; Jane List is attending; it will be a shorter format meeting, so the plan is to dip in and out.

[The role of patents in an AI driven world](#), to be held by the EPO on 17-18 December 2020 as a digital conference, provides access to [all the materials](#) including recordings and presentations.

[5th CIIPM annual meeting](#), the first as a virtual meeting, to be held on 20-21 January 2021, see [here](#) for a summary; the next annual meeting is planned for [December 2021](#).

[PIUG 2021 Combined Annual and Biotechnology Virtual Conference](#): the PIUG conferences have been combined and offered in a virtual format, covering "Unconventional Times Require Unconventional Search and Analysis Techniques", 24-28 May 2021.

[AI-SDV 2021](#) is being planned as both a physical and virtual meeting, in Nice, France, 4-6 October 2021, with a focus on Artificial Intelligence (AI), Digitization 2.0 (about making companies, processes and people ready for AI), Deep Learning and other topics; the [call for papers](#) deadline is 30 April 2021.

49.08 Meeting break discussions

The meeting suspended discussions at 11 am, in order to observe two minutes silence to mark Armistice Day.

Informal discussions between a few members during the break developed around how virtual working due to COVID-19 restrictions seems to have accelerated permanent changes to the working environment.

- Gilman said they have various occupancy / access arrangements at Delonghi.
- Geetha is based in Aberdeen, working with colleagues in Bristol, Bangalore and mostly in the USA. Remote working is normal, has been done for the last 10-12 years, but people go into the office for the "human angle", so this recognises the loss of personal interactions, general socialisation needs.
- Others noted that it may become more normalised that people will not be expected to spend 5 days in the office.
- The ONS, which has a huge workforce, already has a process in place where people can book a desk in the office or work at home.

49.09 [“Rethinking ‘Advanced Search’: A New Approach to Complex Query Formulation”](#) (Tony Russell-Rose, UX Labs, 2DSearch)

Please see Tony’s [biography](#); note that the presentation slides are also shared via [LinkedIn](#).

The focus of this presentation is on 2D search - next generation advanced search. Tony identified some key areas of searching such as healthcare, recruitment, and, of course, patents which are examples of areas which typically need complex search, which needs to be comprehensive, reproducible and transparent.

Tony then used examples from the healthcare environment, particularly systematic reviews, which aim to demonstrate all three of these qualities, and summarised some of the common issues, that web query builders are not sufficiently sophisticated for complex query development, that lengthy keyword-based search strategies are prone to errors and even when “complex” are still inadequate to retrieve high relevance results.

Early online databases (with which many of BPIP will be well-versed!) were based on Boolean terms, with proprietary syntax; the complexity of search strategy development in these environments required skills in mental parsing of the text query in order to understand purpose of the search, which is hard to do, and it is particularly hard for another searcher to be absolutely clear about the question the search is trying to answer from examination of the search statements alone. Looking at example searches, how easy is it to determine the strategy is what the requester wanted? Different interpretations lead to unintended consequences

So Tony suggested there is an opportunity to learn from other disciplines; the challenges in complex searches are paralleled by software programming languages – so why not borrow and learn from other disciplines, e.g. debugging/ error correction in software engineering – in order to inject some rigour.

So look at visualising search strategies, with an overview of overall search structure with detail in line by line, as well as separating selection of terms from query manipulation, designing out errors caused by "hanging" parentheses, etc.

Different visualisation models include:

- Early semantic search presentation had blocks of white on black to denote ANDed terms, black on white as negated terms
- Filters overlaying data points
- Venn diagrams
- “Dust and magnet” - terms drawn towards “poles”
- Polar coordinates
- Boolify: <https://www.kidzsearch.com/boolify/>

These techniques generate a “universal” representation that then generates relevant strategies across different resources, down to the level of indexing, effectively "3rd party" translation of search strings.

Tony is looking at developing numbers of databases, e.g. Google patents, espacenet (Jane List suggested patent test data set from WPI and will send details to Tony). Aiming to read in and output "legacy Boolean" strings

Tony noted some other useful resources:

DBPEDIA - <https://wiki.dbpedia.org/> - wikipedia for databases

GitHub - <https://github.com/> - where developers share code

[See also https://pss.mlanet.org/mailman/listinfo/expertsearching_pss.mlanet.org - group of systematic review expert searchers sharing expertise on a range of databases, and resources mainly for healthcare topics – Jeanette Eldridge]

Responses to queries and discussion points:

- Tool is agnostic of underlying database
- Coverage of patent databases is restricted because they are mostly subscription based - not yet discussed with vendors
- Stephen noted that the scalability of this system means it can deliver for patent information searches
- Good options to revisit strategy build with broadening/narrowing, difficult to achieve line by line, which is "1D", so 2D visualisation is quite a strong selling point
- Geetha asked how to assess the quality of the search accuracy away from Boolean - a bit of a stretch for patent info pros! Tony noted there are two key elements to evaluation - "does visualisation method make searcher more productive/less error prone?" - this is being assessed; and "is the output any better?" - quality criteria are more tricky, as very subject dependent.

49.10 **“Doctrine of Equivalence”** (Andrew Marsh, Pilkington)

Andrew began with an overview of this concept before describing the key case of Eli Lilly vs Actavis, which is now established as case law, quoted by newer cases, examples of which detail the different current approaches, such as whether there is a role for validity in equivalence – “Gillette Defence”, or where the opinion at the end is not binding – “Formstein Defence”.

One particular, surprising impact is the unintended consequence of changes at the EPO, where “prosecution history has no impact on scope of claims”.

In the Fibrogen v Akebia 2020 case did it make it harder to prove patentee's case? There is a narrow interpretation of the inventive concept; hundreds of pages of evidence were provided on whether molecules are the “same” – but the decision was no infringement, as the narrow scope focused on “compound C”.

The description listed many broader compounds, but the technical choice was made for “compound C”; other, more similar, compounds were NOT claimed. The prosecution file was considered, as it would not be in the public interest to disregard, despite the narrower claims, due to the patent validity, in contrast to Regen Labs vs Estar, where it would have infringed but has been revoked.

The Q&A raised further points:

- Does this reward "bad drafting"? Regen patent was badly drafted as the infringement centred on the claim of a specific value (0.10M) rather than a range.
- This example focused on chemistry, other areas might have a different argument; here there IS a substantial similarity in binding, despite the difference in structure; but could be different example in other sectors – the field of invention made a difference in interpretation.
- What was the real purpose of DoE (US vs Europe) emphasis on better drafting? Not “riding” on someone else's invention?
- A concern is that the recommendation is to avoid stating any features that are essential, but this cuts across the contract with the public through the patenting process, that is, disclosure of what the invention actually is!
- So this makes the patent virtually useless to third parties to understand what they need to avoid or areas that are free to exploit.
- Europe vs US - no best mode requirements, so almost pushing towards “worst mode” requirements!
- Examples don't limit the claim scope, but some areas, e.g. Mechanical, they won't have examples in applications.
- Apart from main claim of what's preferable, “most preferable” still won't clearly define the invention.

49.11 [“Democratisation of chemistry searching in PubChem with 38 million patent-extracted structures”](#) (Christopher Southan, TW2Informatics)

Please see Chris's [biography](#).

Chris gave an intro on why chemical searching in patents is valuable, for example:

- In scoping competitor company activities and more specifically locating structure–activity relationships of compounds which may otherwise be unpublished.
- Examiner reports are also useful to researchers – underrated as resources [for researchers], but useful as their job is to find prior/ close art!
- Text mining – publishers still restrict what can be done with literature collections, while patents are completely open.
- Open Science – the aim is NOT to file, but people need to be aware of possible infringements.

PubChem

Chris has been involved with WIPO / PubChem developments. He noted that

- there are roughly 2 substances to every compound entry, but this is massively skewed by some records with hundreds of substances for some single compound entries
- Bioassays are dominated by ChEMBL data (<https://www.ebi.ac.uk/chembl/>)
- 31 million PubMed IDs are linked back to the compound, but often “common” chemicals
- 24 million patents are indexed from Google patents
- The IBM patents collection stopped contributing to PubChem in 2011; IBM patent data went into the now defunct “Watson chemistry” tool; they stopped passing data to PubMed but are still running extraction internally; the unique feature is the parallel extraction from PubMed (see 2012 article: https://researcher.watson.ibm.com/researcher/view_group.php?id=2134)
- 39 million structures, 21 million for “rule of 5”; low vendor representation
- Thomson Pharma were submitting data from Derwent – high-quality structures; stopped in 2011
- SureChem moved to EBI in 2009, now SureChEMBL (<https://www.surechembl.org/search/>) funded by Wellcome Trust
- Google Patents – parallel extraction from Google Scholar, but not clear which source the data comes from; offers “similar” patent clustering. This is a complex data feed for PubChem to manage

Chris provided some links to other resources used:

- UniChem (<https://www.ebi.ac.uk/unichem/ucquery/listSources>)
- USPTO CWU (<https://www.uspto.gov/patent/initiatives/complex-work-unit-pilot-program>) used by commercial vendors
- BindingDB (<http://bindingdb.org/bind/info.jsp>) have curating patents for about the last 3 years
- InfoChem (<https://www.deepmatter.io/about-us/infochem/>) moved from Springer Nature to DeepMatter in 2019 (<https://group.springernature.com/gb/group/media/press-releases/springer-nature-completes-sale-of-infochem-to-deepmatter-group/16548446>)
- Also content from Thieme (<https://pubchemblog.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/2019/01/15/more-than-a-million-chemical-article-links-from-thieme-chemistry-added-into-pubchem/>)
- SCRIPDB (<http://dcv.uhnres.utoronto.ca/SCRIPDB/search/>) is a legacy resource, some unique structures

PubChem processes new patents in about 1 week, but there are long update cycles (2-6 months) to add to PubMed.

There are challenges with the unique content in each of the big 3 datasets, and similarly across the larger dataset of 760 sources which all have some level of unique data - but are they valuable? Most are probably of lower value; so there is a risk of futile indexing! Claims would provide much more focused content rather than indexing across full-text documents, but it was also noted that extraction from claims is poorer than examples from the description.

Strange things have been pushed into PubChem - see

<https://cdsouthan.blogspot.com/2015/07/chessboardane-and-other-strange-patent.html>

Chris can provide PubChem masterclass - see

<https://sites.google.com/view/tw2informatics/home>

Patentscope

See https://www.wipo.int/patentscope/en/news/pctdb/2020/news_0002.html;
Chris gave webinar with WIPO & InfoChem at a recent PIUG meeting: <https://www.piug.org/PIUG-PF/9244619#9244619>; see also <https://cdsouthan.blogspot.com/search?q=wipo>.

Other resources

- NextMove software (<https://www.nextmovesoftware.com/index.html>) - see recent patent mining presentations/publications <https://www.nextmovesoftware.com/talks.html>
- GoStar - commercial database (<https://www.gostardb.com/gostar/>) – “largest SAR knowledgebase in the world” – “all published and patented inhibitors (>5.1million) against most biological targets and their associated SAR data (>12million quantitative SAR points) screened from 1.9million patents and 275,000 journals”.

Comments

- To help resolve redundancy, a suggestion was made to integrate/map onto INPADOC (for the best family data) and legal status databases
- Also extract data from exam reports in WIPO

49.12 [BPIP website developments](#) (Sheena Zuberi)

Sheena provided an update of the work she has been doing to develop a new website with a more up-to-date visual experience and better navigation. We will now set up a Focus Group to provide feedback and beta testing, to support a planned launch in early 2021.

49.12.1	Volunteers for the Focus Group to contact JE/SZ by end of 2020	Action: All
----------------	----------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------

49.13 [Planning ahead for 50th BPIP meeting](#) (Chris Harrison)

Chris provided a summary of the proposals for the 50th meeting, namely:

- To be hosted at UK IPO offices in Newport, Wales in November 2021
- To prepare as a hybrid meeting, in anticipation of continuing restrictions on travel, face-to-face contact
- To run as a 1.5-day meeting, to allow for attendance at a celebratory dinner

Chris then provided a graphical representation of the survey results completed by BPIP members in advance of the 49th BPIP meeting, which showed:

Q1: positive support to running the 50th meeting as “day 1 - 13:30-16:30, day 2 - 09:30-15:00”

Q2: a very positive response to having the option for an at-desk session with an IPO patent examiner

Q3: at least 7 votes were cast for each of the areas of IPO activity suggested as presentations

Items for a draft agenda, to start people thinking about contributions, include:

- BPIP – a trip down memory lane. Digging into the archives – please circulate any photos, etc., that you may have from over the years, to the 50th meeting planning team
- A selection of IPO presentations (noting your preferences in Q3 of the recent survey)
- Other presentations from BPIP members – (very informal) abstract submission deadline of end of April 2021
- Looking to the future - what will BPIP look like in 2030?
- Plus all the usual great content (conference/meeting feedback, sharing tips/tricks and new features)

The 50th BPIP meeting planning team includes:

Chris Harrison
 Sheena Zuberi
 Tania Zuberi
 Nathan Pennington
 Jeanette Eldridge

49.13.1	Forward any archive materials that you are happy to share to the team	Action: All
49.13.2	50 th BPIP meeting planning team will start meeting in the New Year – please contact us if you are interested to join!	Action: BPIP 50 th meeting planning team
49.13.3	Ideas for BPIP presentations? Other agenda items including looking to the future? Send in any informal submissions!	Action: contact BPIP 50 th meeting planning team
49.13.4	Call for papers will be initiated in the New Year	Action: BPIP Secretary
49.13.5	Finalise specific dates in November 2021	Action: BPIP 50 th meeting planning team

49.14 Comments and current issues / General Tips & Tricks that would be useful for all

[ECLI](#)

Susan Bates identified ECLI for EU case law; it provides a unique identifier for cases at the EU Board of Appeal and other courts. See also:

- [ECLI manual](#)
- [ECLI brochure](#)
- [BETA version of the European e-Justice Portal](#)

Shell are using ECLI as they don't have access to [DARTS-IP](#) (now owned by Clarivate and merged into Derwent data for a more complete history). DARTS-IP and [Questel](#) have partnered on litigation and opposition details (Orbit Intelligence).

[PatentSight](#) analytical software (LexisNexis)

Sheena Zuberi highlighted that users can import Derwent and other resource search strings.

Post-meeting note: see PIUG page on [analysis tools](#).

[WIPO Publish](#), [WIPO Pat-INFORMED](#)

Stephen Adams highlighted WIPO Publish (“developed to enable offices to make IP data available nationally and internationally”) and WIPO Pat-INFORMED (“the Gateway to Medicine Patent Information”).

A similar free resource from an independent consortium, Medicines Patents Pool, the Medicines Patents and Licences Database ([MedsPaL](#)) provides IP info for selected essential medicines in low- and middle-income countries.

Post-meeting note: see FAQs for comparison of coverage of [Pat-INFORMED](#) vs MedsPaL.

How EPO and WIPO are supporting coronavirus searching

See Joanne Jennings’ recent posts:

<https://www.dyoung.com/en/knowledgebank/articles/covid-epo-search>

<https://www.dyoung.com/en/knowledgebank/articles/patentscope-covid-19>

PatSnap

Stuart Newbold felt that sequence searching on PatSnap did not find some of the hits found in the STN full file, so falls short of replacing STN sequence searching.

[Orbit Innovations](#)

Paula Jukes has looked at Orbit Innovations, which is now in production, to show, for example, linking research collaborations between universities and corporate labs.

Also notes was the [UK Science & Innovation Network in the Netherlands](#), which has a database of British-Dutch collaborations.

Post-meeting note: see the [UK Science and Innovation Network \(SIN\)](#) for more general information.

[CILIP/UKeIG webinars](#)

Jeanette Eldridge noted that one of our speakers today, Tony Russell-Rose, and another who may be available for our 50th meeting, Karen Blakeman, were both identified from the recent programme of CILIP/UKeIG webinars.

Susan Bates commented that these 60-minute webinars are very good; Stephen Adams said he would really recommend Karen Blakeman as a speaker, he has known her for years and she has a very good record of helping others to use web search in a more sophisticated manner.

Patent Pilot

Paul Gilbert is using Patent Pilot for analytics of patent filings.

Non-Patent Information

Paula noted that it is critical to use Google to help to find relevant non-patent information compared to what is found in online hosts such as CAS, etc., and Maddy commented that it is often challenging to find non-patent information as full-text.

Post-meeting note: [Google \[Patent\] results](#) for non-patent literature may provide links to full-text: "Non-patent results contain a snippet of the original document, a link to the document, and metadata. A link to the full text can often be found in the metadata section as "View PDF" or "View HTML"." I also find Google Scholar useful to identify non-subscription access to full-text articles, using the "[All versions](#)" option to display a list of links to pdf, perhaps in open-access repositories, or at least html versions. [Jeanette]

Post-meeting note: Members might remember some papers on this topic published as part of a [special issue](#) of *World Patent Information* in 2018, edited by Stephen Adams, Thomas L. Bereuter and Nigel S. Clarke, available open access.

BizInt "FTO Family Status"

Nicholas Cole gave a short presentation on BizInt FTO, requested originally by GSK, to address the issue of working with two different reports already available in BizInt – Patent Family and Patent Family Status – which were messy to combine, with limits to the page width in Word for displaying in a report, and repeated columns but different content so were hard to line up. The suggested solution was to add spacings to get the two family formats to align, which is now available.

Patent Term

Stephen Adams reminded us of the official [patent term calculator](#) on the USPTO website.

Clearstone IP, Minesoft IP Share

Paula described a trial starting at UCB in parallel for Clearstone IP and Minesoft IP Share, which she is involved in setting up, but mainly for the attorneys.

Adam has used Clearstone IP in the past and is a massive fan - it's really good for patent attorneys but at NSG it was not getting engagement and there was lack of take up, not clear why.

Geetha commented that it may be because there is some quite a lot of manual interaction needed, for loading of data and clicking of check boxes!

Joanne Jennings has also been looking at using IPShare so would be interested in comments on this.

Orbit

Maddy noted GSK are using the output of results from Orbit as landscapes for the attorneys to keep and then monitor themselves.

[Bizint SmartCharts: Extracting Specific Patent Numbers from PatBase Folders](#)

Post-meeting note: Paula has shared these slides for a tip regarding the extraction of patent numbers, with the context, needed in her reports (there are assumptions made that readers are PatBase or Bizint Smart Chart users).

49.15 Tips & Tricks – breakout sessions

Each planning team member noted below hosted a separate concurrent Zoom session for one of the topic areas, optional for attendees to join for 45 min, before coming back to the main meeting to provide a few points of feedback and to complete the final agenda items.

49.15.1 AI in IP and innovation – Nathan Pennington

Recording not available.

This topic was proposed to discuss questions raised by members, e.g.

- Anthony Coleman (Coller IP) “Interested to know thoughts on the use of AI-aided or AI-based searching tools?”
- Jan Powell (Foseco) “Use of Artificial Intelligence to assist the retrieval of relevant patent alerts”

Nathan summarised that major patent info vendors are not yet offering AI tools; individuals indicated that some tests are ongoing, but as yet, there is limited experience of using AI tools for patent searching.

49.15.2 Biosequence searching – Paula Juckes

Recording not available.

Attendees at this session notes that it was great to have a small group conversation, to share experiences, having the breakout group was really useful and good to have the opportunity to discuss biosequence searching.

Emmanuelle shared the following recorded webinar from PatSnap: [IP and R&D Trends in Biological Sequencing](#).

49.15.3 Chemical data from patents – Rachel Lewis

Please access the audio recording available [here](#) for the discussion points.

49.15.4 IP Competitive Intelligence – Adam Hope

Recording not available.

Discussions were around the challenges in the presentation of landscaping reports - need to be very clear on what the story is, and what the different platforms provide; there was emphasis that landscaping is only part of the picture to help with risk assessment.

49.15.5 Patent search results presentation tools – Cristina Crespo

Please access the audio recording available [here](#).

49.16 Round up and Any Other Business

During the meeting breaks, some of the planning team members stayed on the main Teams connection and chatted with BPIP members as they also stayed on or returned to the call; although this doesn't fully replicate the networking opportunities in a face-to-face meeting, it did allow members to chat and catch up, making new or reviving past connections.

The real-time feedback was very positive, confirming that attendees felt our first fully virtual meeting was a success. A photo was taken of nearly 30 of the attendees at the end of the meeting; at its height, there were over 40 BPIP members on the call.

Post-meeting note: More structured feedback was requested after the meeting, see [Summary](#).

Appendix 1: Agenda 2020 49th British Patent Information Professionals (BPIP) Meeting

Hosted by Cristina Crespo, Adam Hope

Pilkington, Ormskirk, Lancashire

Wednesday 11 November 2020

08:00-09:20

- [Welcome from the Meeting Chair](#) (Paula Juckes)
- [Introduction](#) (Adam Hope)
- [Chairperson's Report](#) (Nathan Pennington) including Members' news
- [Secretary's Report](#) (Jeanette Eldridge)08:00-09:20

09:00-09:30 Break

09:30-10:00

- [Matters and Actions arising from the 48th BPIP meeting](#)
- Reports from representatives of BPIP at other organisations' meetings (CEPIUG, SACEPO/PDI, WIPO)

10:00-10:45

- Since last BPIP meeting, any other meetings feedback

10:45-11:05 Break and **Two Minutes Silence**

11:05-12:00

- Tony Russell-Rose: "[Rethinking 'Advanced Search': A New Approach to Complex Query Formulation](#)"

12:00-12:45

- Andrew Marsh (Pilkington): "[Doctrine of Equivalence](#)"

12:45-13:30 Lunch break

13:30-14:30

- Christopher Southan: "[Democratisation of chemistry searching in PubChem with 38 million patent-extracted structures](#)"

14:30-15:00

- Sheena Zuberi: [BPIP website developments](#)

15:00-15:10 Break

15:10-15:40

- Chris Harrison: [Planning ahead for 50th BPIP meeting](#)

15:40-16:20

- Comments and current issues re: e.g. Derwent Innovation, Questel, PatBase, STN, Total Patent, etc.,
- General Tips & Tricks that would be useful for all

16:00-16:15

- Nicholas Cole: [BizInt "FTO Family Status"](#)

16:15-16:30 Break, then call in to **separate Tips & Tricks breakouts**

16:30-17:00

Tips & Tricks breakouts – see planning team member as contact:

- **AI in IP and innovation** – Nathan Pennington
- **Biosequence searching** – Paula Jukes
- **Chemical data from patents** – Rachel Lewis
- **IP Competitive Intelligence** – Adam Hope
- **Patent search results presentation tools** – Cristina Crespo

17:00-17:15

- Any Other Business

17:15-17:30

- Meeting round up

17:30 Close

Appendix 2: Attendees at the 2020 49th British Patent Information Professionals (BPIP) Meeting

BPIP 49th Meeting Planning Team

Paula Juckes	UCB	49 th Meeting Chair	biosequence
Cristina García Crespo	Pilkington Group	Meeting Host	patent search tools
Adam Hope	Pilkington Group	Meeting Host	IP CI
Rachel Lewis	RB	Meeting Support	chemistry
Nathan Pennington		BPIP Chair	AI in IP / innovation
Jeanette Eldridge		BPIP Secretary	

BPIP 49th Meeting Presenters

Attendee	Affiliation	Breakout session
Andrew Marsh	Pilkington	
Tony Russell-Rose	UX Labs	
Christopher Southan	TW2Informatics Ltd	chemistry
Stephen Adams	Magister	
Rebecca Ashton	IP Pragmatics	IP CI
Geetha Basappa	Baker Hughes	IP CI
Marcus Bates	Bates IP	
Susan Bates	Shell	patent search tools
Alyson Birch		
Kathleen Burrows	RB	patent search tools
Nicholas Cole	GSK	
Anthony Coleman	Coller IP	AI in IP / innovation
Susan Cooper	Dyson	patent search tools
Katherine Galbraith	GSK	biosequence
Paul Gilbert	Marks & Clerk LLP	patent search tools
David Goodchild	David Goodchild Ltd	
Gilman Grundy	Delonghi	IP CI
Christopher Harrison	UK IPO	AI in IP / innovation
Jack Hennessy	Marks & Clerk LLP	IP CI
Joanne Jennings	D Young & Co	
Ed Jones	Dyson	
Joanne Kirkwood	JA Kemp	IP CI
Dharmista Lad	Unilever	
Emmanuelle Laurine	Bio-logicIP	biosequence
Jane List	Extract Information	
Jim Maddison	Dyson	
Maddy Marley	GSK	chemistry
Stuart Newbold	Patent Search & Information Management	IP CI
Jan Powell	Foseco	AI in IP / innovation
Syed Rabbi	BP	biosequence
Karim Rashidmanesh	Shell	IP CI
Steve Royle		chemistry
James Rudman	GSK	chemistry
Jo Shaw	Victor Green & Company	patent search tools
Akshay Thaman	GovGrant	
Rachel Walkley	RB	IP CI
Simon Wilson	DePuy Synthes	AI in IP / innovation
Sheena Zuberi	Cambridge Display Technology	AI in IP / innovation

Apologies	Affiliation
Robert Austin	Unilever
Debra Bennett	Pilkington Group
Louise Brookes	Jinfo Ltd
Kate Buddle	Unilever
Clare Challenger	Pfizer
Rich Corken	UK IPO
Rasik Davda	IP Searches Limited
Peter Egerton	Priory Patent Search Services
John Endacott	GSK
Victor Green	Victor Green & Company
Lesley MacLachlan	GSK
Richard Nicholas	GSK
Anna Song	Dyson
Hannah Sophia	

Please see [here](#) for some new and existing member biographies submitted this year and for the BPIP meeting in 2019.

Screenshot of members present at the end of the meeting!

