

EXHIBIT 20

Bahr, Robert

From: Collier, John [JohnCollier@icfi.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 08, 2007 1:23 PM
To: Bahr, Robert
Subject: RE: AIPLA definition of "minimal complexity"

Thanks Bob.

John

From: Bahr, Robert [mailto:Robert.Bahr@USPTO.GOV]
Sent: Tuesday, May 08, 2007 12:51 PM
To: Collier, John
Subject: RE: AIPLA definition of "minimal complexity"

John,

This spreadsheet shows the relationship between application generation (initial application through a tenth+ continuation/CIP) and whether the application has 10 or fewer total claims or has more than 10 total claims.

Bob

-----Original Message-----

From: Collier, John [mailto:JohnCollier@icfi.com]
Sent: Monday, May 07, 2007 5:00 PM
To: Bahr, Robert
Subject: FW: AIPLA definition of "minimal complexity"

Bob,

Can you provide us with data on the number/percent of continuations applicable to –

- (a) "simple" applications, referenced by AIPLA as those applications having "10 page specification, 10 claims"; and
- (b) applications that would NOT be affected by the claims requirements (i.e., < 15/75)

If your answers are percentages, please specify the denominator (e.g., percent of all filings, percent of continuations).

Thanks!

John

From: Gormsen, Elizabeth
Sent: Monday, May 07, 2007 4:42 PM
To: Collier, John
Subject: AIPLA definition of "minimal complexity"

In the survey question that asks attorneys what their typical charge is for an original, non-provisional utility patent application for an invention of minimal complexity, AIPLA provides clarification of minimal complexity as follows: "(e.g., 10 page specification, 10 claims)"

Liz Gormsen
ICF International
ph: 703-934-3103
fax: 703-934-3740
egormsen@icfi.com

7/16/07

A08244

7/16/07

A08245

| | Entity | Current Filing <= 10 Total Claims | Current Filing > 10 Total Claims |
|-------------------------|--------|--|---|
| Initial Applications | Large | 40,928 | 165,602 |
| | Small | 20,354 | 59,034 |
| First CON/CIP | Large | 4,270 | 14,629 |
| | Small | 2,218 | 8,826 |
| Second CON/CIP | Large | 1,071 | 3,355 |
| | Small | 499 | 2,089 |
| Third CON/CIP | Large | 435 | 1,157 |
| | Small | 206 | 737 |
| Fourth CON/CIP | Large | 231 | 544 |
| | Small | 64 | 347 |
| Fifth CON/CIP | Large | 126 | 286 |
| | Small | 49 | 172 |
| Sixth CON/CIP | Large | 71 | 153 |
| | Small | 18 | 87 |
| Seventh CON/CIP | Large | 53 | 97 |
| | Small | 19 | 42 |
| Eighth CON/CIP | Large | 19 | 43 |
| | Small | 10 | 24 |
| Ninth CON/CIP | Large | 18 | 40 |
| | Small | 6 | 13 |
| Tenth + CON/CIP | Large | 298 | 94 |
| | Small | 14 | 57 |
| TOTALS | Large | 47,520 | 186,000 |
| | Small | 23,457 | 71,428 |

* assumed

ALL CONs/CIPs consecutively claimed.

Totals of Columns D & E <> totals of Column I due to different run dates.

The "Individual Cases" and "With NO CON/CIP" rows were completely updated and are consistent between these

e columns.