

BPIP discussion on Proposed CEPIUG Mission – 11/08/2021

Attendees

Kathy Burrows	RB
Jane List	ExtractInfo
Jeanette Eldridge	independent
Susan Bates	Shell
James Rudman	GSK
Jeremy O'Hare	British Library
Rachel Lewis	RB
Hannah Sophia	independent

Apologies

Paula Jukes	UCB
Rob Austin	Unilever
Nathan Pennington	independent
Chris Harrison	UK IPO
Stephen Adams	Magister

Jane List chaired the discussion. Jeanette took notes. Kathy, as BPIP's representative on CEPIUG Board, gave a brief summary of the background to the revisions proposed for CEPIUG's vision and mission as shared in July 2021 for discussion at this meeting. For the benefit of BPIP members who were unable to attend this meeting, the background is summarised below.

The above-named BPIP members discussed the various proposed statements within the document, and the feedback has been summarised and aligned to the elements of the V-MOST model, as far as possible.

The details from the section entitled "Vision" onwards have been shared with CEPIUG to provide a summary of our feedback. This does include feedback from BPIP members who were not able to attend the meeting who submitted comments by email.

We hope these will be useful for the further development of the CEPIUG Vision and other statements.

Background

CEPIUG was originally formed in 2008 and had a particular mission, to work towards a framework for the certification of patent information professionals. This was achieved (see the timeline <https://www.qpip.org/about-us>) in 2018, with the International Standards Board for Qualified Patent Information Professionals (ISBQPIP) officially established and registered at the Chamber of Commerce in The Hague.

Particularly now with the ISBQPIP now in place, CEPIUG, as a separate organisation, is reviewing its vision and mission, along with its objectives, strategy and tactics, using the V-MOST model, and asked for feedback on the draft document.

Vision

We felt that the revised vision statement, when compared to the original, might cause concerns for existing national patent information user groups, thinking that they may risk being marginalised by CEPIUG explicitly stating their representation will be of “all European users”, rather than “the national information user groups at a European level”.

We realise this is not the intention, as the three **Objectives** below the **Vision** are “designed to maintain the full independence of the national patent information user groups”.

However, for the **Vision** to be seen to be inclusive, maybe it needs to be a higher-level, more engaging statement, containing more “lofty” ambitions; the current revision essentially just preserves the *status quo* for CEPIUG.

We therefore suggest discussing the inclusion of phrases and words such as:

“raising the standards of ... “professional development”, “expertise”,
“enabling ... “education/training/awareness/support/outreach”, “innovation”
“support the future development of... “information/digital literacy”

We support the aim to represent individuals who are not currently affiliated with a national patent information user group (“national PIUG”), and would expect the emphasis to be that these individuals are given clear information by CEPIUG on existing groups or support to set up one for their own country – so, for example, it might also be a specific **Tactic** for CEPIUG to direct individuals to a national PIUG in a related country, where the same working language is used, from which to learn or to join.

In addition, we believe the definition of “user” in the **Vision** could also include patent information experts within vendor organisations; although some national PIUGs do not allow vendor members, some do, as CEPIUG does, and CEPIUG might also usefully include academic patent information users, who also might not be included at the national PIUG level, so that a wider range of interests, needs and expertise is explicitly represented – not only patent information searching and retrieval but also analysis, research and innovation, and product development.

In particular, we do see that there is a significant opportunity for CEPIUG to become an effective umbrella organisation in representing individuals and smaller organisations (rather than “**all** European users”?), who might not be currently members of national groups, nor are they big enough organisations to be represented within bodies such as the P-D-G.

Mission

BPIP strongly supports CEPIUG’s promotion of collaboration of national PIUGs across Europe.

1st Objective

We agree that this first objective aligns well with the **Mission**, and would suggest measurable outcomes demonstrating its achievement might be through an increase in individual members joining existing or forming new national groups, or seeing that non-national individuals are invited and accepted as members.

2nd Objective

We agree that this is an important objective to define explicitly. Where CEPIUG representatives are elected, as individuals or as members from national PIUGs, to bodies such as EPO [sub-]committees or WIPO task forces, it is important that there is a two-way dialogue on CEPIUG and individual or national PIUG interests, so that there is understanding of shared themes to take to those European and international organisations, and where there might be conflicts of interest for representatives.

3rd Objective

Similarly, we agree that this third objective is valuable to define; however, we think that this could be expanded beyond traditional patent searching tools, to include more in terms of advanced toolkits, supporting upskilling of patent information professionals for the future and in new and innovative industries; and for analytics expertise applied to a whole range of small-scale through to complex datasets; as well as generally supporting the development of expertise of all patent information users (beyond only searchers), through outreach, education and training activities; and further developing relationships with vendor organisations so that they understand the needs of the various groups of European patent information users.

Action

BPIP members would be prepared to be part of a CEPIUG working group to develop these statements further, and as native English speakers would be able to help to confirm preferred wording options.