

Subject: Post-Event Evaluation: Women in IP Symposium

Dear Colleagues,

We want to express our sincere appreciation for your participation in the Women in IP Symposium. Your presence and engagement contributed to the overall success of the event.

In our ongoing commitment to enhance future editions of the symposium, we kindly invite you to complete a brief post-event evaluation. Your feedback is instrumental in shaping our future events to better cater to your needs and address topics that are relevant to you.

To complete the evaluation, please click [[Insert Evaluation Link](#)]. The survey should take no more than [10 minutes], and please rest assured that all responses will be treated with the utmost confidentiality.

Your insights are of great value to us, and we eagerly anticipate incorporating them into our future initiatives. We also hope to have the pleasure of welcoming you back at next year's event!

Thank you for your time and valuable input.

Best regards,

[[Name of USPTO Lead](#)]

[[USPTO Contact Information](#)]

PRA Statement

A Federal agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, nor shall a person be subject to a penalty for failure to comply with an information collection subject to the requirements of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, unless the information collection has a valid OMB Control Number. The OMB Control Number for this information collection is 0651-0080. Public burden for this survey is estimated to average 10 minutes per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the information collection. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this information collection, including suggestions for reducing this burden to the Office of the Chief Administrative Officer, United States Patent and Trademark Office, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 or email InformationCollection@uspto.gov.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Konstantinos Georgaras (CIPO) • Valencia Martin Wallace (USPTO) 						
<p>Session 1.4 IPO panel- Education and outreach to youth and underrepresented communities, including indigenous peoples</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Michael Schwager (IP Australia) • Clyphendie Pierre-Louis (CIPO) • Emmelina Masanque (IPO PHL) 	○	○	○	○	○	○
<p>Session 1.5 [NOT HYBRID] Facilitated conversations and Working Lunch</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sharon Watson (USPTO) 	○	○	○	○	○	○
<p>Session 1.6 Women’s Entrepreneurship (WE) International: Global initiatives and opportunities for women</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vivienne Katjuongua (BIPA Namibia) • Claudia Franco (DINAPI Paraguay) • Clyphendie Pierre-Louis (CIPO) • Felicita Aguilar 	○	○	○	○	○	○

(IPO PHL)						
Session 1.7 Building an IP mindset among K-20 STEAM students internationally (Workshop) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Joyce Ward (USPTO) 	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Session 1.8 Panel: Investing in the future of IPO leadership to support DEIA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Denisse Pérez Fierro (INAPI Chile) Sara Callegari (WIPO) 	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Session 1.9 IPO presentation - “From inclusion to belonging” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jennifer Hutchinson (IP Australia) 	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Session 1.10 Day one wrap-up and Video addresses from IPO leadership <ul style="list-style-type: none"> USPTO 	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q.2.1.1 [If respondent selects “strongly disagree” or “disagree” in Q.2.1, then Q.2.1.1 appears]

You've indicated disagreement with the relevance of one or more topics to you. Can you please share more details about your perspective?

Q.2.2 For each of the following presentations or workshops, indicate your level of agreement with this statement: The topics were presented in an easy-to-understand manner.

<p>Session 1.5 [NOT HYBRID] Facilitated conversations and Working Lunch</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sharon Watson (USPTO) 	○	○	○	○	○	○
<p>Session 1.6 Women’s Entrepreneurship (WE) International: Global initiatives and opportunities for women</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vivienne Katjuongua (BIPA Namibia) • Claudia Franco (DINAPI Paraguay) • Clyphendie Pierre-Louis (CIPO) • Felicita Aguilar (IPO PHL) 	○	○	○	○	○	○
<p>Session 1.7 Building an IP mindset among K-20 STEAM students internationally (Workshop)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joyce Ward (USPTO) 	○	○	○	○	○	○
<p>Session 1.8 Panel: Investing in the future of IPO leadership to support DEIA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Denisse Pérez Fierro (INAPI Chile) • Sara Callegari (WIPO) 	○	○	○	○	○	○

<p>Law)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Colleen Chien (Berkeley Law School) • Jenny Simmons (INTA) • Kelly Anderson (GIPC) • Debra Hughes (INTA) • Joana De Mattos Siqueira (INTA) 						
<p>Session 2.2 Lessons learned from Private Sector Initiatives and PPP and how to improve them (Workshop)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joan Toth (ChIPs Network) • Ricardo Fischer (ASIPI) • Kelly Anderson (GIPC) • Debra Hughes (INTA) • Joana De Mattos Siqueira (INTA) • Vital Voices • USPTO 	○	○	○	○	○	○
<p>Session 2.3 Panel: “Best practices on DEIA within the innovation economy”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joan Toth (ChIPs Network) • Vankita Brown (NOAA) • Susan Harrison (USIPA) 	○	○	○	○	○	○

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Zoe Dean-Smith (Vital Voices) • Ricardo Fischer (ASIPI) 						
Session 2.4 [NOT HYBRID] Photo session / Working Lunch / Diversity Showcase & Fair / Networking <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cassandra Downs (USPTO) 	○	○	○	○	○	○
Session 2.5 CIPO's Research on Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elias Collette (CIPO) 	○	○	○	○	○	○
Session 2.6 Using studies and data: CIPC South Africa - collecting demographic data in patent applications <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amanda Lothingen (CIPC South Africa) 	○	○	○	○	○	○
Session 2.7 Japan's Current Situation on DEIA and JPO's initiatives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mai Miyaoka (JPO) 	○	○	○	○	○	○
Session 2.8 Chile's studies on IP Data: A Gender Perspective <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alvaro González López (INAPI Chile) 	○	○	○	○	○	○
Session 2.9 Retrospective Study of Women Patenting in	○	○	○	○	○	○

<p>LATAM countries (Colombia, Mexico and Chile)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Esteban Santamaria (CAIINNO and GLIPA) 						
<p>Session 2.10 Empowering women: fueling inventive activity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roberta Romano-Götsch (EPO) 	○	○	○	○	○	○
<p>Session 2.11 Women in Design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carolina Arias Burgo (EUIPO) 	○	○	○	○	○	○
<p>Session 2.12 Demo of WIPO's IP and Gender Policy Initiatives database</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aikaterini "Katerina" Kanellia (WIPO) 	○	○	○	○	○	○
<p>Session 2.13 Facilitated Workshop to discuss collecting and sharing data to demonstrate the importance of DEIA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adriana Fleitas (DINAPI Paraguay) • USPTO 	○	○	○	○	○	○
<p>Session 2.14 IPO Presentation: U.S Copyright Office</p>	○	○	○	○	○	○

<p>Bagley (Emory University School of Law)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Colleen Chien (Berkeley Law School) • Jenny Simmons (INTA) • Kelly Anderson (GIPC) • Debra Hughes (INTA) • Joana De Mattos Siqueira (INTA) 						
<p>Session 2.2 Lessons learned from Private Sector Initiatives and PPP and how to improve them (Workshop)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joan Toth (ChIPs Network) • Ricardo Fischer (ASIPI) • Kelly Anderson (GIPC) • Debra Hughes (INTA) • Joana De Mattos Siqueira (INTA) • Vital Voices • USPTO 	○	○	○	○	○	○
<p>Session 2.3 Panel: “Best practices on DEIA within the innovation economy”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joan Toth (ChIPs Network) 	○	○	○	○	○	○

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vankita Brown (NOAA) • Susan Harrison (USIPA) • Zoe Dean-Smith (Vital Voices) • Ricardo Fischer (ASIPI) 						
<p>Session 2.4 [NOT HYBRID] Photo session / Working Lunch / Diversity Showcase & Fair / Networking</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cassandra Downs (USPTO) 	○	○	○	○	○	○
<p>Session 2.5 CIPO's Research on Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elias Collette (CIPO) 	○	○	○	○	○	○
<p>Session 2.6 Using studies and data: CIPC South Africa - collecting demographic data in patent applications</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amanda Lothringen (CIPC South Africa) 	○	○	○	○	○	○
<p>Session 2.7 Japan's Current Situation on DEIA and JPO's initiatives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mai Miyaoka (JPO) 	○	○	○	○	○	○
<p>Session 2.8 Chile's studies on IP Data: A Gender Perspective</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alvaro González López (INAPI) 	○	○	○	○	○	○

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> USPTO 						
Session 2.14 IPO Presentation: U.S Copyright Office	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maria Strong (USCO) 						
Session 2.15 Recap of AIPLA’s 2024 DEIA Colloquium						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meghan Donohoe (AIPLA) Ann Muetting (AIPLA) 	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Session 2.16 Day Two wrap-up and Video addresses from IPO leadership	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> USPTO 						
Session 2.17 [NOT HYBRID] Reception in Honor of International Women's Day	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q.3.2.1 [If respondent selects “strongly disagree” or “disagree” in Q.3.2, Q.3.2.1 appears]

You've indicated disagreement with the clarity of one or more topics to you. Can you please share more details about your perspective?

Page 4 :

Day 3, Friday, March 8

IWD Celebration, Leadership, Creativity, Collaboration

[If respondent selects “Day 3” in Q.1, Page 4 appears.]

<p>(CIPC South Africa)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Michelle Sara King (ITA) Molly Ply (GSA) Miranda Richardson (DCIS) 						
<p>Session 3.5 [NOT HYBRID] Facilitated Workshop and Working Lunch</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> USPTO 	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<p>Session 3.6 Panel - Creativity and Entrepreneurship</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stephanie Leparmentier (INFPI France) NaThanya Ferguson (USPTO) Patricia Bianco (USPTO) Holly Fechner (Invent Together) Miriam Lord (USCO) 	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<p>Session 3.7 Taking our work forward: Diversity Pledge and Day three wrap-up event closing (Workshop)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Valencia Martin Wallace (USPTO) 	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q.4.1.1 [If respondent selects “strongly disagree” or “disagree” in Q.4.1. then Q.4.1.1 appears]

You've indicated disagreement with the relevance of one or more topics to you. Can you please share more details about your perspective?

Q.4.2 For each of the following presentations or workshops, indicate your level of agreement with this statement: The topics were presented in an easy-to-understand manner.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amanda Lotheringen (CIPC South Africa) • Michelle Sara King (ITA) • Molly Ply (GSA) • Miranda Richardson (DCIS) 						
<p>Session 3.5 [NOT HYBRID] Facilitated Workshop and Working Lunch</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • USPTO 	○	○	○	○	○	○
<p>Session 3.6 Panel - Creativity and Entrepreneurship</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stephanie Leparmentier (INFPI France) • NaThanya Ferguson (USPTO) • Patricia Bianco (USPTO) • Holly Fechner (Invent Together) • Miriam Lord (USCO) 	○	○	○	○	○	○
<p>Session 3.7 Taking our work forward: Diversity Pledge and Day three wrap-up event closing (Workshop)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Valencia Martin Wallace (USPTO) 	○	○	○	○	○	○

Q.4.2.1 [If respondents select “strongly disagree” or “disagree” in Q.4.2, then Q.4.2.1 appears]

You've indicated disagreement with the clarity of one or more topics to you. Can you please share more details about your perspective?

Page 5

Q 5.1 Is this your first Women in IP Symposium?

- Yes [[Proceed to page 7](#)]
- No [[Proceed to page 6](#)]

Page 6

Q.6.1 Overall, how would you rate this year's event in comparison to previous years?

- Much Better
- Somewhat better
- About the same
- Somewhat worse
- Much worse
- Unsure/no comment

Q.6.1.1 [If respondents select “somewhat worse” or “much worse” in Q.6.1, then Q.6.1.1 appears.]

You've indicated this year's event was worse than in previous years. Can you please share more details about your perspective?

Page 7

Q.7.1 Did you attend any of the networking activities associated with the event?

- Yes [[Proceed to page 8](#)]
- No [[Proceed to page 9](#)]

Page 8

Q.8.1 For each of the following networking activities, indicate your level of agreement with this statement: The networking activities provided opportunities to connect with relevant professionals.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
Rise and Shine: Morning Mixer with USPTO Leadership (Day 1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
USPTO Formal Reception: National Inventors Hall of Fame Museum (Day 2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Formal networking event (Day 3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q.8.1.1 [If respondents select “strongly disagree” or “disagree” in Q.8.1, then Q.8.1.1 appears]

You've indicated disagreement that the event provided opportunities to connect with relevant professionals. Could you share how this could be improved?

Q.8.2

Q.8.2 To what extent did the networking activities enhance the overall event?

- Much better
- Somewhat better
- About the same
- Somewhat worse
- Much worse
- Unsure/no comment

Page 9

Q 9.1 Overall, how useful was this year's Women in IP Symposium to you.

- Very Useful
- Useful
- Neutral
- Not useful
- Not at all useful

Q.9.1.1 [If respondents select "not useful" or "not at all useful" in Q.9.1, then Q.9.1.1 appears.]

You've indicated this year's event was not entirely useful to you. Specifically, what aspects or elements do you feel could be improved, and are there any suggestions you have for enhancing the overall utility of the event in the future?

Q.9.2 Are there specific topics or subjects you would like to see addressed in future events?

Q.9.3 What factors or improvements would contribute to making your attendance at future events more convenient or accessible?

Q.9.4 Do you have any additional comments or feedback you would like to share regarding the Symposium?

PAGE 10

Demographics

Q.10.1 How did you attend the conference?

- In-person [End survey]

- Online [If selected proceed to page 11]
- Hybrid (both in-person and online) [If selected proceed to page 11]

Q.10.2 From which region did you attend the conference?

- Africa
- Middle East
- Asia / Pacific
- Europe
- North America
- South America

PAGE 11

Q.11.1

To what extent would you agree with the following statement: Overall, it was easy to contribute to the conversation as a virtual participant?

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

Q11.1.1 [If respondents select “strongly disagree” or “disagree” in Q.11.1, then Q.11.1.1 appears.]

You've indicated that it was difficult to contribute to the conversation. Specifically, what aspects or elements do you feel could be improved in future events?