

Abridged Sneak Peek Version 2.0

White Book for the 1st World Robot Patent Drafting Symposium

Cannes, France
September 23-24, 2022



Abridged Sneak Peek of the White Book for Robot Patent Drafting Symposium

Introduction

Good day, this is Martin Schweiger. I am a patent attorney in Singapore.

What you see in front of you is an Abridged Version of the White Book for the first World Robot Patent Drafting Symposium 2022. The full version of the White Book will include more content.

To my knowledge, such an event has never been held before.

I have been working on the topic of “automated preparation of patent applications” for several years. But only since last year – for the first time – has it become realistic to use this technology to increase the throughput speed and quality when preparing patent applications. And it is exciting that the price for software to automatically prepare patent applications has now fallen to a few hundred Euros per case, and even significantly less for large volumes.

I took these developments as an opportunity to organize and host the first ever World Robot Patent Drafting Symposium 2022, via my personal blog “IP Lawyer Tools”.

If you attended the World Robot Patent Drafting Symposium, thank you for contributing to our collective learning.

If you did not, this White Book will bring you up to speed about the revolutionary technology that automatically drafts patents from invention disclosures or patent claims, and how and why you should adopt it in your own patent practice.



Abridged Sneak Peek of the White Book for Robot Patent Drafting Symposium

Full Table of Contents

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Foreword – Where We Are Coming From | 8 |
| Introduction – Keynote Speech | 10 |
| Takeaways | 10 |
| Robot Patent Drafting Is Disruptive Innovation | 10 |
| What Counts as Robot Patent Drafting Software..... | 11 |
| Example: Individual Work Versus Crowdfunding Software | 12 |
| Crowdfunding Example: Gearbox Patent Drafting | 12 |
| Prevailing Myth: Automated Patent Drafting Does Not Work | 13 |
| Robot Patent Drafting. Can Lawyers Now Also Draft Average Patents? | 14 |
| Why the Symposium Sessions Are Not Recorded | 14 |
| What Patent Offices Think About Robot Patent Drafting | 15 |
| You Have Premium Online Access to More Information..... | 15 |
| Speakers' Profiles | 16 |
| Volker Römermann | 16 |
| David Perkins..... | 16 |
| Felicita Banzhaf | 16 |
| Bastian Best..... | 17 |
| Malte Köllner..... | 17 |
| Shawn Lillemo | 17 |
| Ian Schick..... | 18 |
| Simon Booth..... | 19 |
| Kim Gerdes | 19 |
| François Veltz | 20 |
| Jack Xu..... | 20 |
| Thomas Lerdal | 20 |
| Anand Kamal | 21 |
| Matthew Wahlrab | 21 |
| Falco Braun..... | 21 |
| Michael Carey..... | 22 |
| Dmitry Brandt..... | 22 |
| Martin Schweiger | 23 |
| Symposium Theme: Edward de Bono's Six Thinking Hats | 24 |
| Summaries of the Symposium Talks | 26 |



Abridged Sneak Peek of the White Book for Robot Patent Drafting Symposium

| | |
|---|----|
| Day 1 – Session 1: White Hat Discussions | 26 |
| Overview | 26 |
| The Current State of the Industry and the New Normal..... | 26 |
| What Can Automated Patent Drafting Technology Do..... | 26 |
| The Biggest Challenges of Automation Are Data Silos..... | 27 |
| Automation Is a Paradigm Shift for Patent Work | 27 |
| There Are Benefits to Both Quality and Time..... | 27 |
| Machines Are Getting Better at Translations and Natural Language | 28 |
| How Does a Machine Do It?..... | 28 |
| Current Limitations and Future Wants | 28 |
| The PatentPal Tool and Its Benefits to Lawyers..... | 29 |
| Summary of the Wider Benefits of Automation Software..... | 29 |
| Q&A | 29 |
| How Easy Is an RPD Tool to Use? [PatentPal]..... | 29 |
| What Is the Pricing Strategy so That Users Can Break Even on Buying an RPD Tool? [PatentPal] .. | 29 |
| AI Can Do Boring Drafting Tasks, But Can It Generate Claims and Replace an Attorney?..... | 30 |
| How Do You Deal With Data Confidentiality When Training an AI Model?..... | 30 |
| How Can Machines And Humans Work Together for the Best Outcome? | 30 |
| The Risks of Adopting Robot Patent Drafting (“RPD”)..... | 31 |
| Does RPD Help Smaller Clients?..... | 31 |
| The Readability of Automated Patents Is Essential | 32 |
| RPD May Significantly Affect Mass Filings | 32 |
| Cost Considerations of Adopting RPD..... | 32 |
| What Is the Future for Patent Attorneys With RPD? | 32 |
| Opinions, Limits and Predications About the Current Tools..... | 33 |
| On International Filing Differences..... | 33 |
| Do Tools Really Save Time, or Create More Complexity and Work? | 34 |
| Banning RPD: Speakers Raise Potential Legal Issues | 34 |
| On Workflows: Speakers Discuss How They Work With Tools | 34 |
| Takeaways on How (or Not) To Use RPD Tools..... | 34 |
| What Is Your Experience With These Tools? | 35 |
| Day 1 – Session 3: Green/Yellow Hat Discussions | 35 |
| Demonstration of Patent CAD | 35 |
| Law Firms and IT Adoption: Benefits and Resistance | 36 |
| Firms Are Resistant Because of Compliance About Data Not Leaving Cloud Provider Jurisdictions. How To Deal With This?..... | 36 |



Abridged Sneak Peek of the White Book for Robot Patent Drafting Symposium

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Demonstration of Qatent..... | 36 |
| 8 predictions about RPD..... | 37 |
| For Defensive Publications on a Massive Scale, Is There Adequate Public Disclosure if It Is Not Humanly Readable Despite Being Machine Searchable? And How Does It Affect Policy if Anybody Can Just Take Over a Space? | 37 |
| How Much of a Difference Will Standards Make in Growing the Market or Helping the Early Adoption of This Technology? | 38 |
| Day 2 – Session 1: White Hat Discussions | 38 |
| Monetisation of Current RPD Tools: Costs and Usability | 39 |
| Determining Product Value: Time, Quality or Price? | 39 |
| On Successful Sales Models for Manufacturers | 39 |
| Reasons for the Slow Adoption of RPD | 40 |
| 2 Speakers Explain the Benefits, Functionalities and Philosophies of Their Tools | 40 |
| How Do You Measure the Quality of an RPD Tool? | 41 |
| Open Discussion: What Must a Good RPD Tool Have? | 42 |
| On the Legality of Selling Robot Patent Drafting Services..... | 42 |
| Predictions About Industry Change As the Technology Improves | 43 |
| Presentation: 10 Major Mistakes in Marketing and Sales by RPD Manufacturers..... | 44 |
| Who Is the Right Customer in Terms of Early User Adoption?..... | 45 |
| Day 2 – Session 3: Green/Yellow Hat Discussions | 45 |
| A Scale for Assessing the State of Patent Automation | 45 |
| 3 Industry Trends That Drive Machine-Assisted Patent Drafting | 46 |
| A Framework for Content Types: How and Where Automation Can Help..... | 46 |
| Why Are Existing Templates Useful?..... | 46 |
| What if You Lose the Uniqueness of Your Own Work? | 47 |
| How To Explain to Clients That You Have Their Best Interests at Heart, Despite Using RPD? | 47 |
| Expectations for the Future and Impact on Attorneys and Clients | 47 |
| Demonstration of TurboPatent/Rowan | 48 |
| A Framework for Organising Patents by Hierarchical Structure..... | 48 |
| Manufacturer Philosophy: Content Versus Structure | 48 |
| Will This Technology Wipe Out Our Profession?..... | 49 |
| On Developments in IT and User Behaviour | 49 |
| The Honestly Brutal Robot Patent Drafting How-To Guide: The Seven Steps of Riding an RPD Tool | 50 |
| Introduction: There Is Probably Not One Single Patent Drafting Robot That Meets ALL Your Needs | 50 |
| Step #1: Understand Yourself | 51 |



Abridged Sneak Peek of the White Book for Robot Patent Drafting Symposium

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Step #2: Find Your Personal Use Case for Your Patent Drafting Robot | 52 |
| Step #3: What Is Your Preferred Data Security Standard and Your Preferred Way of Communicating With the Patent Drafting Robot?..... | 52 |
| Step #4: Is Your Expected Gain in Speed Really Worth the Effort To Overcome the Learning Curve That Comes With It? | 53 |
| Step #5: Are You a Juicy Target for a Patent Drafting Robot Manufacturer? | 53 |
| Step #6: Are You in a Position To Command the Use of a Patent Drafting Robot in Your Own Work Environment? | 54 |
| Step #7: Prepare to Test Several Patent Drafting Robots | 54 |
| Conclusion: You Are Now Ready for Shopping (or Not) for Patent Drafting Robots | 54 |
| Call-to-action: | 55 |
| Industry Directory | 56 |
| Automated Patent Drafting Products – Feature Comparison List | 57 |
| Feedback from Attendees | 61 |
| Conclusion | 64 |
| Glossary | 66 |



Abridged Sneak Peek of the White Book for Robot Patent Drafting Symposium

Foreword – Where We Are Coming From

This is Martin Schweiger. I am a patent attorney in Singapore. Thank you for purchasing our White Book of the World Robot Patent Drafting Symposium 2022. To the best of my knowledge, such an event has never been held before.

I have been working on the topic of “automated preparation of patent applications” for several years. Since this year – for the first time – it has become realistic to use this technology to increase throughput speed and quality of patent application preparation. The price for using software to automatically prepare a patent application has fallen to a few hundred Euros per case, and even significantly less for large volumes.

I took this development as an opportunity to host the World Robot Patent Drafting Symposium 2022 via my personal blog “IP Lawyer Tools”.

There are many motives for using Robot Patent Drafting (“RPD”) software (also called “robotic patent drafting software”) for the automated drafting of patents. , There are also reasons to not use this software at all, and we spoke about both in the symposium. What does not work is to force patent drafting software down the throat of an employee, and it is a fact that the currently available patent drafting robots are also not designed to draft patents for every different use case in the patent drafting ecosystem.

What I learned during the World Robot Patent Drafting Symposium 2022 was that today, patent practice in the US is understaffed at the junior level and at the mid-level. This is in line with the trend of a global labour shortage that will last for the coming 20 years. So, automation must happen in the patent drafting industry, whether we want it or not.

AI experts who participated in the symposium have explained that patent documents that contain highly-structured, publicly available data can be used for fine-tuning AI models. This will result in more efficient patent drafting, and also better quality outcomes. It will favour Patent Drafting Robots that can support a human in writing patents, over those that only automatically execute the entire patent drafting process.

In short: AI will not replace patent attorneys, but patent attorneys who can use AI will replace those who do not.

What you hold in your hand is a 360° documentation of the Robot Patent Drafting industry, as of September 2022. I call it the “RPD Manifesto”. It contains everything that you need in order to start with the automated drafting of patent applications today. *And by today, I mean literally, “right now”.*

Martin “RPD” Schweiger

martin.schweiger@ip-lawyer-tools.com



Abridged Sneak Peek of the White Book for Robot Patent Drafting Symposium

Important note

If you purchase our White Book which is one of our **premium products**, you will have **full access** to the **closed “Robot Patent Drafting Q&A Forum”** on www.ip-lawyer-tools.com. You can post about your experiences there and discuss with other RPD users, including RPD software manufacturers.

On the same website, you can find a section about “Robot Patent Drafting”, at <https://ip-lawyer-tools.com/category/free-articles/robot-patent-drafting/>

Here, you will find product reviews, helpful tips and news from the RPD industry.



Abridged Sneak Peek of the White Book for Robot Patent Drafting Symposium

Conference Theme: Edward de Bono's Six Thinking Hats

We organized the World Robot Patent Drafting Symposium around Edward de Bono's Six Thinking Hats, a powerful tool for separating thinking into six clear functions and roles:

The Black Hat is about difficulties, dangers, risks and worries. We use critical judgement and logical reasoning to identify some bottlenecks, shortcomings and problems of robot patent drafting.

The White Hat evaluates the facts and information that are currently available. We identify missing pieces of information and discuss how to get them.

The Red Hat raises intuitions, emotions, and even hunches that are not backed by facts. An open discussion without need for reason – it might even become religious and political.

The Blue Hat makes sure that discussions are only about relevant ideas. By default, the moderators of each session wear the Blue Hat; they organize ideas, and if necessary, shift them to another session.

The Yellow Hat is about positive impacts that robot patent drafting will have on the patent industry and on users of the patent system, substantiated by facts and logical reasoning.

The Green Hat brings up new ideas and creative thinking for improving robot patent drafting. It also addresses and finds solutions to Black Hat problems raised in other sessions.

To facilitate discussions, we combined some hats. We developed our ideas in sequential order – with three sessions per day, each session was built upon ideas discussed in the previous one.

First Session: White Hat Discussion

The speakers presented White Hat (facts, information) matters. A moderator wore the Blue Hat to ensure that only factual statements were made and that no religious or political matters were discussed.

Second Session: "Black Hat/Red Hat Discussion"

The speakers talked about Black Hat (problems) and Red Hat (feelings, intuitions) matters. A Blue Hat moderator made sure that the core issues were collected and presented to the Green Hat/Yellow Hat discussion that followed.

Third Session: "Green Hat/Yellow Hat Discussion"

The speakers discussed Green Hat (possibilities) and Yellow Hat (positives) matters. The Blue Hat moderator ensured that only positive aspects, visions and ideas were brought up, and that previous factual Black Hat problems were addressed.



Abridged Sneak Peek of the White Book for Robot Patent Drafting Symposium

Conference Talks

A brief summary of each session's speakers and the topics they discussed.

Day 1 – Session 1: White Hat Discussion

Speakers: Shawn Lillemo, Kim Gerdes, Jack Xu

Moderator: Martin Schweiger

The current state of the patent drafting industry, the paradigm shifts to automation and its potential, and the major challenges and benefits to lawyers, law firms, and companies.

Day 1 – Session 2: Black and Red Hat Discussion

Speakers: Malte Köllner, Felicita Banzhaf

Moderator: Matthew Wahrab

Problems and risks of RPD, cost considerations, potential legal issues, opinions and predications about current tools, and how users work with these tools.

Day 1 – Session 3: Green and Yellow Hat Discussion

Speakers: François Veltz, Simon Booth

Moderator: Martin Schweiger

Demonstration of tools, ideas for improving automated patents, predictions about RPD, and discussion on standards and technology adoption.

Day 2 – Session 1: White Hat Discussion

Speakers: Dmitry Brant, Falco Braun, Anand Kamal

Moderator: David Perkins

Current tools and their functionalities and philosophies, successful business models, obstacles to RPD adoption, and the features that good tools must have.

Day 2 – Session 2: Black and Red Hat Discussion

Speakers: Matthew Wahrab, Martin Schweiger

Moderator: Volker Römermann

Poking holes in the technology, issues with its adoption and legality, problems faced by manufacturers, and anticipated changes in the patent drafting industry.

Day 2 – Session 3: Green and Yellow Hat Discussion

Speakers: Thomas Lerdal, Ian Schick, Michael Carey

Moderator: Martin Schweiger

Automation and industry trends, manufacturer frameworks, technology development and user behaviour, and potential impacts on attorneys, clients, and the industry.



Abridged Sneak Peek of the White Book for Robot Patent Drafting Symposium

Some of the questions that are answered in the White Book

- How easy is a tool to use?
- What is the pricing strategy so that users can break even on buying the tool?
- AI can do boring drafting tasks, but can it generate claims and replace an attorney?
- How do you deal with data confidentiality when training a model?
- How can machines and humans work together for the best outcome?
- Does it help smaller clients?
- What is the future for patent attorneys with RPD?
- Do tools really save time, or create more complexity and work?
- What is your experience with these tools?
- Firms are resistant because of compliance about data not leaving cloud provider jurisdictions. How to deal with this?
- For defensive publications on a massive scale, is there adequate public disclosure if output is not humanly readable despite being machine searchable?
- How much of a difference will standards make in growing the market or helping the early adoption of this technology?
- How do you measure the quality of the tool?
- Who is the right customer in terms of early user adoption?
- What if you lose the uniqueness of your own work?
- How to explain to clients that you have their best interests at heart, despite using RPD?
- Will this technology wipe out our profession?



Abridged Sneak Peek of the White Book for Robot Patent Drafting Symposium

Actual Page from the Book

Industry Directory

| Product Name | First Name | Last Name | Company | Email | Website |
|---------------|------------|-----------|-------------------|--|--|
| Patent Blast | Anand | Kamal | Patent Yogi | anand@patentblast.com | patentblast.com |
| Claim Master | Dmitry | Brandt | Claim Master | dmitry@patentclaimmaster.com | patentclaimmaster.com |
| Patent Engine | Falco | Braun | Design to IP GmbH | falco@designtoip.de | designtoip.de |
| Qatent | François | Veltz | Qatent | francois@qatent.com | qatent.com |
| Specifio | Ian | Schick | Specifio | ian@specifio.io | specif.io |
| Patent Pal | Jack | Xu | Patent Pal | jack@patentpal.com | patentpal.com |
| Fenix.ai | Michael | Carey | Fenix | michael@fenix.ai | fenix.ai |
| Patent Drafr | Shawn | Lillemo | Harrity & Harrity | shawn@patentdrafr.com | www.patentdrafr.com |
| PatentCAD | Simon | Booth | Polsinelli | simon@polsinelli.com | polsinelli.com/in-house-automated-patent-drafting-tool |
| Turbo Patents | Thomas | Lerdal | RowanTELS | thomas@rowanpatents.com | rowanpatents.com/turbopatent/ |



Abridged Sneak Peek of the White Book for Robot Patent Drafting Symposium

Actual Page from the Book

Day 1 – Session 1: White Hat Discussions

Speakers: Shawn Lillemo, Kim Gerdes, Jack Xu

Moderator: Martin Schweiger

Overview

A discussion between Shawn Lillemo of [Harrity & Harrity LLP](#), Jack Xu of PatentPal and Kim Gerdes of [Université Paris-Saclay](#), moderated by Martin Schweiger of [IP-lawyer-tools.com](#) on currently known facts about the automated patent drafting industry.

Here are the key takeaways, plus an audience Q&A that expands on the topics discussed.

Talking points

The current state of the industry and the new normal

The patent drafting industry is rapidly changing; it won't be the same next year and it will be totally different in 5 years from now. Already, the trend shows shorter drafting time – long patent applications have decreased from ~40h to 19h work time. To be competitive, the new normal will be 1 day to draft a typical patent, 8 - 12 work hours.

However, patent drafting won't be totally automated. Regardless of the patent type, you still need people to draft, and you still need to spend work time on patent drafts.

The main difference is that historically, we use boilerplate and fill in the blanks. Now with software, we use natural language processing – our job will be to input text into software and modify the output to match a final application.

What can automated patent drafting technology do?

Two years ago, we could already do document-centric functions like claim mirroring, drawings, descriptions, abstract generation, auto-updating.

But generating a patent is not easy. Is there standard language for certain verbs? Is there access to the claims file and specs file? Is there documentation of client roadmaps and how they handle their data? The goal is to automatically mine data from the client portfolio and the patent office, so that the software can generate good drafts.

Enables better performance: helps lawyers quickly deliver a superior legal product, more consistent drafting, more time spent on claims and strategies instead of describing key embodiments, and really covering the scope and predictability of the IP.

Price point accessibility: by bringing down the cost of legal services, it allows law firms (users) to capture market share for start-up companies (end-users) and still remain profitable. Law firms can now build a book of business with early-stage start-ups, who could not afford such services in the past.



Abridged Sneak Peek of the White Book for Robot Patent Drafting Symposium

Actual Page from the Book

Industry Directory

| 1 | Brand name of the Software | Brand A | Brand B | Brand C |
|----|---|--------------------------|------------|----------------|
| 2 | "Input data is generated by a single user" or "Input data can be generated by multiple users at the same time" | Single User | Multi-User | Single-User |
| 3 | Standard definitions can be included into the patent draft text | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 4 | Boilerplate language can be included into the patent draft text | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 5 | Input data comprises patent claims | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 6 | Input data comprises invention disclosure | No | Yes | Yes (optional) |
| 7 | Input data comprises drawings | Yes | Yes | No |
| 8 | Software generates support section, starting from patent claims | Yes | No | Yes |
| 9 | Software includes definitions for selected terms in the patent claims | No | No | Yes |
| 10 | Software generates figure description based on input data. | Yes | No | Yes |
| 11 | Software provides reference numerals for selected terms in the input data | Yes | Yes | Yes (optional) |
| 12 | Average time savings for patent drafting, as compared with manual drafting | 10-20% for initial draft | 30-50% | 25-50% |
| 13 | Software checks for consistency issues in the input data (which ones) | | | |
| 14 | "Dedicated hardware is needed on-site" vs. "SaaS" | | | |
| 15 | "Interactive editing of the input data, while the resulting patent draft is shown" vs. "batch processing of input data" | | | |
| 16 | Other useful features of the software | | | |

Abridged Sneak Peek of the White Book for Robot Patent Drafting Symposium

Why you should get the full White Book

Did you miss out on an essential conference?

The World Robot Patent Drafting Symposium was

- an exclusive, invite-only event for cutting-edge leaders in the IP industry
- focused on one quest: minimizing human input while maximizing human value-add for patent application drafting
- featured early-adopters: delegates eager to shorten the learning curve and start using this technology in their patent practices

After some intense discussions, we learnt so much that we had to consolidate everything into a book. This is the White Book, a comprehensive manual with **in-depth conference takeaways, a how-to technical guide, and a detailed industry directory.**

You're now holding the Sneak Peek – an abridged version that is merely a taster of what is inside.

Why get the full White Book? Because

- it gives you **practical actions**, which you can take to stay ahead of the curve
- it shows you the **information you need**, to start with automated patent drafting today
- it explains **pitfalls and problems to avoid**, when you enter this whole new area

The world is changing, and our industry is changing with it.

This White Book is the outcome of 10 hours of discussion, bringing together the insights and experiences of 17 pioneers in this technology.

We are the early adopters. We know that robot patent drafting is already here, and it is here to stay.

If you are serious about our profession, you need to stay up to date.

Be among the first.

Join us!

Pre-Order now and get the book at €248.40 instead of €276.00 here:

<https://buy.stripe.com/28og1Kay89ay3N69AD>

