UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE (USPTO)
OFFICE ACTION (OFFICIAL LETTER) ABOUT APPLICANT'S TRADEMARK APPLICATION

U.S. APPLICATION SERIAL NO.   79125780

MARK: SIMCORD

CORRESPONDENT ADDRESS:
    Dmytro M. Romanenko
    P.O. Box 151
    Kiev 01042
    UKRAINE

APPLICANT: Tovarystvo z obmezhenoiu
vidpovidalnisti ETC.

**CORRESPONDENT'S REFERENCE/DOCKET
NO:**
    N/A
CORRESPONDENT E-MAIL ADDRESS:

79125780

CLICK HERE TO RESPOND TO THIS LETTER:
http://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/teas/response_forms.jsp

OFFICE ACTION

INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATION NO. 1149097

STRICT DEADLINE TO RESPOND TO THIS NOTIFICATION: TO AVOID ABANDONMENT OF THE REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF PROTECTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATION, THE USPTO MUST RECEIVE A COMPLETE RESPONSE TO THIS PROVISIONAL FULL REFUSAL NOTIFICATION **WITHIN 6 MONTHS** OF THE "DATE ON WHICH THE NOTIFICATION WAS SENT TO WIPO (MAILING DATE)" LOCATED ON THE WIPO COVER LETTER ACCOMPANYING THIS NOTIFICATION.

In addition to the Mailing Date appearing on the WIPO cover letter, a holder (hereafter "applicant") may confirm this Mailing Date using the USPTO's Trademark Status and Document Retrieval (TSDR) system at http://tsdr.uspto.gov/. To do so, enter the U.S. application serial number for this application and then select "Documents." The Mailing Date used to calculate the response deadline for this provisional full refusal is the "Create/Mail Date" of the "IB-1rst Refusal Note."

This is a **PROVISIONAL FULL REFUSAL** of the request for extension of protection of the mark in the above-referenced U.S. application. *See* 15 U.S.C. §1141h(c). See below in this notification (hereafter "Office action") for details regarding the provisional full refusal.

The referenced application has been reviewed by the assigned trademark examining attorney. Applicant must respond timely and completely to the issue(s) below. 15 U.S.C. §1062(b); 37 C.F.R. §§2.62(a), 2.65(a); TMEP §§711, 718.03.

LIKELIHOOD OF CONFUSION REFUSAL – CLASS 42
Registration of the applied-for mark is refused because of a likelihood of confusion with the mark in U.S. Registration No. 4314425. Trademark Act Section 2(d), 15 U.S.C. §1052(d); *see* TMEP §§1207.01 *et seq.* See the enclosed registration.

Trademark Act Section 2(d) bars registration of an applied-for mark that so resembles a registered mark that it is likely that a potential consumer would be confused or mistaken or deceived as to the source of the goods and/or services of the applicant and registrant. *See* 15 U.S.C. §1052(d). The court in *In re E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.*, 476 F.2d 1357, 177 USPQ 563 (C.C.P.A. 1973) listed the principal factors to be considered when determining whether there is a likelihood of confusion under Section 2(d). *See* TMEP §1207.01. However, not all of the factors are necessarily relevant or of equal weight, and any one factor may be dominant in a given case, depending upon the evidence of record. *In re Majestic Distilling Co.*, 315 F.3d 1311, 1315, 65 USPQ2d 1201, 1204 (Fed. Cir. 2003); *see In re E. I. du Pont*, 476 F.2d at 1361-62, 177 USPQ at 567.

Applicant seeks to register the mark SIMCORD for, *inter alia*, "Computer programming; computer software

consultancy; computer software design; computer system analysis; computer system design; conversion of data or documents from physical to electronic media; data conversion of computer programs and data not physical conversion; maintenance of computer software; rental of computer software; updating of computer software."

Registrant has registered the mark SYMCORDIA for "Computer software for the collection, editing, organizing, modifying, book marking, transmission, storage and sharing of data and information."

Comparison of the Marks

In a likelihood of confusion determination, the marks are compared for similarities in their appearance, sound, meaning or connotation and commercial impression. *In re E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.*, 476 F.2d 1357, 1361, 177 USPQ 563, 567 (C.C.P.A. 1973); TMEP §1207.01(b). Similarity in any one of these elements may be sufficient to find a likelihood of confusion. *In re White Swan Ltd.*, 8 USPQ2d 1534, 1535 (TTAB 1988); *In re Lamson Oil Co.*, 6 USPQ2d 1041, 1043 (TTAB 1987); *see* TMEP §1207.01(b).

Although not identical, applicant's mark SIMCORD is highly similar to the registered mark SYMCORDIA. Applicant has essentially adopted the registered mark substituting a letter "I" for the letter "Y" and then deleting the final two letters. Further, the marks are virtually phonetic equivalents. Slight differences in the sound of similar marks will not avoid a likelihood of confusion. *In re Energy Telecomm. & Elec. Ass'n*, 222 USPQ 350, 351 (TTAB 1983); *see In re Viterra Inc.*, 671 F.3d 1358, 1367, 101 USPQ2d 1905, 1912 (Fed. Cir. 2012).

When comparing marks, the test is not whether the marks can be distinguished in a side-by-side comparison, but rather whether the marks are sufficiently similar in their entireties that confusion as to the source of the goods and/or services offered under applicant's and registrant's marks is likely to result. *Midwestern Pet Foods, Inc. v. Societe des Produits Nestle S.A.*, 685 F.3d 1046, 1053, 103 USPQ2d 1435, 1440 (Fed. Cir. 2012); *Edom Labs., Inc. v. Lichter*, 102 USPQ2d 1546, 1551 (TTAB 2012); TMEP §1207.01(b). The focus is on the recollection of the average purchaser, who normally retains a general rather than specific impression of trademarks. *L'Oreal S.A. v. Marcon*, 102 USPQ2d 1434, 1438 (TTAB 2012); *Sealed Air Corp. v. Scott Paper Co.*, 190 USPQ 106, 108 (TTAB 1975); TMEP §1207.01(b).

Comparison of the Goods and Services

The goods and/or services of the parties need not be identical or directly competitive to find a likelihood of confusion. *See Safety-Kleen Corp. v. Dresser Indus., Inc.*, 518 F.2d 1399, 1404, 186 USPQ 476, 480 (C.C.P.A. 1975); TMEP §1207.01(a)(i). Rather, they need only be related in some manner, or the conditions surrounding their marketing are such that they would be encountered by the same purchasers under circumstances that would give rise to the mistaken belief that the goods and/or services come from a common source. *In re Total Quality Group, Inc.*, 51 USPQ2d 1474, 1476 (TTAB 1999); TMEP §1207.01(a)(i); *see, e.g., On-line Careline Inc. v. Am. Online Inc.*, 229 F.3d 1080, 1086-87, 56 USPQ2d 1471, 1475-76 (Fed. Cir. 2000); *In re Martin's Famous Pastry Shoppe, Inc.*, 748 F.2d 1565, 1566-68, 223 USPQ 1289, 1290 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

Applicant's computer services are identified broadly and are presumed to feature registrant's more particularly identified software. When analyzing an applicant's and registrant's goods and/or services for similarity and relatedness, that determination is based on the description of the goods and/or services stated in the application and registration at issue, not on extrinsic evidence of actual use. *See Octocom Sys. Inc. v. Hous. Computers Servs. Inc.*, 918 F.2d 937, 942, 16 USPQ2d 1783, 1787 (Fed. Cir. 1990); *see also Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Packard Press Inc.*, 281 F.3d 1261, 1267, 62 USPQ2d 1001, 1004 (Fed. Cir. 2002). Absent restrictions in an application and/or registration, the identified goods and/or services are presumed to travel in the same channels of trade to the same class of purchasers. *Citigroup Inc. v. Capital City Bank Grp., Inc.*, 637 F.3d 1344, 1356, 98 USPQ2d 1253, 1261 (Fed. Cir. 2011); *Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Packard Press Inc.*, 281 F.3d at 1268, 62 USPQ2d at 1005. Additionally, unrestricted and broad identifications are presumed to encompass all goods and/or services of the type described. *See In re Jump Designs*, 80 USPQ2d 1370, 1374 (TTAB 2006); *In re Linkvest S.A.*, 24 USPQ2d 1716, 1716 (TTAB 1992).

In this case, the identification set forth in the application and registration(s) has no restrictions as to nature, type, channels of trade, or classes of purchasers. Therefore, it is presumed that these goods and/or services travel in all normal channels of trade, and are available to the same class of purchasers. Further, the application uses broad wording to describe the services and this wording is presumed to encompass all services of the type described, including those featuring registrant's more narrowly identified goods.

The attached Internet evidence consists of web pages that establish that the same entity commonly provides computer software goods and services and markets them under the same mark. Therefore, applicant's and

registrant's goods and/or services are considered related for likelihood of confusion purposes. *See, e.g., In re Davey Prods. Pty Ltd.*, 92 USPQ2d 1198, 1202-04 (TTAB 2009); *In re Toshiba Med. Sys. Corp.*, 91 USPQ2d 1266, 1268-69, 1271-72 (TTAB 2009). Evidence obtained from the Internet may be used to support a determination under Trademark Act Section 2(d) that goods and/or services are related. *See, e.g., In re G.B.I. Tile & Stone, Inc.*, 92 USPQ2d 1366, 1371 (TTAB 2009); *In re Paper Doll Promotions, Inc.*, 84 USPQ2d 1660, 1668 (TTAB 2007).

Consumers are likely to be confused by the use of similar marks on or in connection with goods and with services featuring or related to those goods. TMEP §1207.01(a)(ii); *see In re Hyper Shoppes (Ohio), Inc.*, 837 F.2d 463, 6 USPQ2d 1025 (Fed. Cir. 1988) (holding BIGG'S for retail grocery and general merchandise store services likely to be confused with BIGGS for furniture); *In re United Serv. Distribs., Inc.*, 229 USPQ 237 (TTAB 1986) (holding design for distributorship services in the field of health and beauty aids likely to be confused with design for skin cream); *In re Phillips-Van Heusen Corp.*, 228 USPQ 949 (TTAB 1986) (holding 21 CLUB for various items of men's, boys', girls' and women's clothing likely to be confused with THE "21" CLUB (stylized) for restaurant services and towels); *In re U.S. Shoe Corp.*, 229 USPQ 707 (TTAB 1985) (holding CAREER IMAGE (stylized) for retail women's clothing store services and clothing likely to be confused with CREST CAREER IMAGES (stylized) for uniforms); *Steelcase Inc. v. Steelcare Inc.*, 219 USPQ 433 (TTAB 1983) (holding STEELCARE INC. for refinishing of furniture, office furniture, and machinery likely to be confused with STEELCASE for office furniture and accessories); *Mack Trucks, Inc. v. Huskie Freightways, Inc.*, 177 USPQ 32 (TTAB 1972) (holding similar marks for trucking services and on motor trucks and buses likely to cause confusion).

Conclusion

Because the marks are highly similar and the goods and services are closely related, consumers are likely to be confused as to the source of applicant's services. Accordingly, registration must be refused under Section 2(d).

The overriding concern is not only to prevent buyer confusion as to the source of the goods and/or services, but to protect the registrant from adverse commercial impact due to use of a similar mark by a newcomer. *See In re Shell Oil Co.*, 992 F.2d 1204, 1208, 26 USPQ2d 1687, 1690 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Therefore, any doubt regarding a likelihood of confusion determination is resolved in favor of the registrant. TMEP §1207.01(d)(i); *see Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Packard Press, Inc.*, 281 F.3d 1261, 1265, 62 USPQ2d 1001, 1003 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *In re Hyper Shoppes (Ohio), Inc.*, 837 F.2d 463, 464-65, 6 USPQ2d 1025, 1025 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

The stated refusal refers to International Class 42 only and does not bar registration in the other class.

Applicant may respond to the stated refusal by submitting evidence and arguments against the refusal. In addition, applicant may respond by doing one of the following:

(1)   Deleting the class to which the refusal pertains; or

(2)   Filing a request to divide out the goods and/or services that have not been refused registration, so that the mark may proceed toward publication for opposition in the class to which the refusal does not pertain. *See* 37 C.F.R. §2.87. *See generally* TMEP §§1110 *et seq.*, (regarding the requirements for filing a request to divide). If applicant files a request to divide, then to avoid abandonment, applicant must also file a timely response to all outstanding issues in this Office action, including the refusal. 37 C.F.R. §2.87(e).

Applicant must respond to the requirement(s) set forth below.

IDENTIFICATION OF THE SERVICES
Applicant identifies the services as follows:

Class 36:   *Brokerage*; capital investments; *clearing, financial*; electronic funds transfer; exchanging money; financial analysis; financial consultancy; financial information;   financial management; stock exchange quotations.

Class 42:   Computer programming; computer software consultancy; computer software design; computer system analysis; computer system design; conversion of data or   documents from physical to electronic media; *data conversion of computer   programs and data [not physical conversion]*; maintenance of computer software;   rental of computer software; updating of computer software.

The wording "Brokerage; ...; clearing, financial; ...; data conversion of computer programs and data [not physical conversion];" in the identification of services is indefinite and must be clarified because the wording does not satisfy the Office's requirements for specificity and the nature of the services is not clear. *See* TMEP §1402.01. Applicant must amend this wording to specify the common commercial or generic name for the services. If there is no common commercial or generic name for the services, then applicant must describe the nature of the services as well as their main purpose, channels of trade, and the intended consumer(s).

Also, the identification of goods and/or services contains brackets. Generally, parentheses and brackets should *not* be used in identifications. Parenthetical information is permitted in identifications only if it serves to explain or translate the matter immediately preceding the parenthetical phrase in such a way that it does not affect the clarity of the identification, e.g., "obi (Japanese sash)." TMEP §1402.12. Therefore, applicant must remove the parentheses from the identification of goods and/or services and incorporate the parenthetical information into the description.

In an application filed under Trademark Act Section 66(a), an applicant may not change the classification of goods and/or services from that assigned by the International Bureau in the corresponding international registration. 37 C.F.R. §2.85(d); TMEP §§1401.03(d), 1904.02(b). Further, in a multiple-class Section 66(a) application, an applicant may not transfer goods and/or services from one existing international class to another. 37 C.F.R. §2.85 (d); *see* TMEP §§1402.07(a), 1904.02(c). Therefore, any modification to this wording must identify goods and/or services in the same International Class specified in the application for these goods and/or services.

The following substitute wording is suggested, if accurate:

- Aircraft brokerage; investment brokerage; capital investments; financial clearing house services; electronic funds transfer; exchanging money; financial analysis; financial consultancy; financial information; financial management; stock exchange quotations (INT. CLASS 36)

- Computer programming; computer software consultancy; computer software design; computer system analysis; computer system design; conversion of data or documents from physical to electronic media; data conversion of computer programs and data, not physical conversion; maintenance of computer software; rental of computer software; updating of computer software (INT. CLASS 42)

An applicant may amend an identification of services only to clarify or limit the services; adding to or broadening the scope of the services is not permitted. 37 C.F.R. §2.71(a); *see* TMEP §§1402.06 *et seq.*, 1402.07 *et seq.*

For assistance with identifying and classifying goods and/or services in trademark applications, please see the USPTO's online searchable *U.S. Acceptable Identification of Goods and Services Manual* at http://tess2.uspto.gov/netahtml/tidm.html. *See* TMEP §1402.04.

ENTITY INFORMATION
Applicant indicates that the applicant is a "limited company" of the Ukraine. Unfortunately, this designation is not acceptable. The term "limited company" is acceptable if the applicant is from the United Kingdom or another commonwealth country. However, the Ukraine is not listed among the commonwealth countries listed on the commonwealth website at http://www.thecommonwealth.org/Internal/142227/members/. Therefore, the designation is not acceptable because there is no clear U.S. equivalent entity and the entity designation does not appear in Appendix D of the *Trademark Manual of Examining Procedure*. *See* TMEP §803.03(i). Applicant must indicate the U.S. equivalent of its entity type or provide a description of the nature of the foreign entity. *See id.*

SIGNIFICANCE OF WORDING
Applicant must explain whether "SIMCORD" and/or "SIM" and/or "CORD" has any meaning or significance in the industry in which the goods and/or services are manufactured/provided, or if such wording is a "term of art" within applicant's industry. *See* 37 C.F.R. §2.61(b); TMEP §814.

Failure to respond to a request for information is an additional ground for refusing registration. *See In re Cheezwhse.com, Inc.*, 85 USPQ2d 1917, 1919 (TTAB 2008); *In re DTI P'ship LLP*, 67 USPQ2d 1699, 1701 (TTAB 2003); TMEP §814.

TRANSLATION

Applicant must specify whether "SIMCORD" in the mark has any meaning in a foreign language. *See* 37 C.F.R. §2.32(a)(9); TMEP §§809, 814. An applicant must submit an English translation of all foreign wording in a mark. 37 C.F.R. §2.32(a)(9); TMEP §809.

Accordingly, if the wording has meaning in a foreign language, applicant should provide the following translation statement with applicant providing the information in brackets:

The English translation of "SIMCORD" in the mark is "[*INDICATE English meaning*]".

TMEP §809.03.

Alternatively, if the wording does not have meaning in a foreign language, applicant should provide the following statement:

The wording "SIMCORD" has no meaning in a foreign language.

Id.

MARK DESCRIPTION
Applications for marks not in standard characters must include an accurate and concise description of the entire mark that identifies literal elements as well as any design elements. *See* 37 C.F.R. §2.37; TMEP §§808.01, 808.02, 808.03(b). However, applicant seeks to register a mark in standard characters. Therefore, the mark description will not be printed on any registration that may subsequently issue.

APPLICANT MAY WISH TO HIRE A LAWYER
Because of the legal technicalities and strict deadlines involved in the USPTO application process, applicant may wish to hire a private attorney specializing in trademark matters to represent applicant in this process and provide legal advice. Although the undersigned trademark examining attorney is permitted to help an applicant understand the contents of an Office action as well as the application process in general, no USPTO attorney or staff is permitted to give an applicant legal advice or statements about an applicant's legal rights. TMEP §§705.02, 709.06.

For attorney referral information, applicant may consult the American Bar Association's Consumers' Guide to Legal Help at http://www.abanet.org/legalservices/findlegalhelp/home.cfm, an attorney referral service of a state or local bar association, or a local telephone directory. The USPTO may not assist an applicant in the selection of a private attorney. 37 C.F.R. §2.11.

In addition, foreign attorneys, other than authorized Canadian attorneys, are not permitted to represent applicants before the USPTO (e.g., file written communications, authorize an amendment to an application, or submit legal arguments in response to a requirement or refusal). *See* 37 C.F.R. §§2.17(e), 11.14(c), (e); TMEP §602.03-.03(c).

The only attorneys who may practice before the USPTO in trademark matters are as follows:

(1) Attorneys in good standing with a bar of the highest court of any U.S. state, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and other federal territories and possessions of the United States

(2) Canadian agents/attorneys who represent applicants located in Canada and (a) are registered with the USPTO and in good standing as patent agents or (b) have been granted reciprocal recognition by the USPTO

See 37 C.F.R. §§2.17(a), (e), 11.1, 11.14(a), (c); TMEP §602.

RESPONSE GUIDELINES
For this application to proceed toward registration, applicant must explicitly address each refusal and/or requirement raised in this Office action. If the action includes a refusal, applicant may provide arguments and/or evidence as to why the refusal should be withdrawn and the mark should register. Applicant may also have other options for responding to a refusal and should consider such options carefully. To respond to requirements and certain refusal response options, applicant should set forth in writing the required changes or statements.

If applicant does not respond to this Office action within six months of the issue/mailing date, or responds by expressly abandoning the application, the application process will end, the trademark will fail to register, and the application fee will not be refunded. *See* 15 U.S.C. §1062(b); 37 C.F.R. §§2.65(a), 2.68(a), 2.209(a); TMEP §§405.04, 718.01, 718.02. Where the application has been abandoned for failure to respond to an Office action, applicant's only option would be to file a timely petition to revive the application, which, if granted, would allow the application to return to live status. *See* 37 C.F.R. §2.66; TMEP §1714. There is a $100 fee for such petitions. *See* 37 C.F.R. §§2.6, 2.66(b)(1).

CLOSING

If applicant has questions regarding this Office action, please telephone the assigned trademark examining attorney. E-mail communication will not be accepted as a response to this Office action and will not extend the deadline for filing a proper response. *See* 37 C.F.R. §2.191; TMEP §§304.01-.02, 709.04-.05. Further, although the trademark examining attorney may provide additional explanation pertaining to the refusal(s) and/or requirement(s) in this Office action, the trademark examining attorney may not provide legal advice or statements about applicant's rights. *See* TMEP §§705.02, 709.06.

/Tracy L. Fletcher/
Trademark Examining Attorney
Law Office 115
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Telephone: (571) 272-9471
Facsimile: (571) 273-9471
tracyfletcher@uspto.gov

WHO IS PERMITTED TO RESPOND TO THIS PROVISIONAL FULL REFUSAL: Any response to this provisional refusal must be personally signed by an individual applicant, all joint applicants, or someone with legal authority to bind a juristic applicant (e.g., a corporate officer or general partner). 37 C.F.R. §§2.62(b), 2.193(e)(2)(ii); TMEP §712.01. If applicant hires a qualified U.S. attorney to respond on his or her behalf, then the attorney must sign the response. 37 C.F.R. §§2.193(e)(2)(i), 11.18(a); TMEP §§611.03(b), 712.01. Qualified U.S. attorneys include those in good standing with a bar of the highest court of any U.S. state, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and other federal territories and possessions of the United States. *See* 37 C.F.R. §§2.17(a), 2.62(b), 11.1, 11.14(a); TMEP §§602, 712.01. Additionally, for all responses, the proper signatory must personally sign the document or personally enter his or her electronic signature on the electronic filing. *See* 37 C.F.R. §2.193(a); TMEP §§611.01(b), 611.02. The name of the signatory must also be printed or typed immediately below or adjacent to the signature, or identified elsewhere in the filing. 37 C.F.R. §2.193(d); TMEP §611.01(b).

In general, foreign attorneys are not permitted to represent applicants before the USPTO (e.g., file written communications, authorize an amendment to an application, or submit legal arguments in response to a requirement or refusal). *See* 37 C.F.R. §11.14(c), (e); TMEP §§602.03-.03(b), 608.01.

DESIGNATION OF DOMESTIC REPRESENTATIVE: The USPTO encourages applicants who do not reside in the United States to designate a domestic representative upon whom any notice or process may be served. TMEP §610; *see* 15 U.S.C. §§1051(e), 1141h(d); 37 C.F.R. §2.24(a)(1)-(2). Such designations may be filed online at http://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/teas/correspondence.jsp.

TO RESPOND TO THIS LETTER: Go to http://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/teas/response_forms.jsp. Please wait 48-72 hours from the issue/mailing date before using the Trademark Electronic Application System (TEAS), to allow for necessary system updates of the application. For *technical* assistance with online forms, e-mail TEAS@uspto.gov. For questions about the Office action itself, please contact the assigned trademark examining attorney. **E-mail communications will not be accepted as responses to Office actions; therefore, do not respond to this Office action by e-mail.**

All informal e-mail communications relevant to this application will be placed in the official application record.

WHO MUST SIGN THE RESPONSE: It must be personally signed by an individual applicant or someone with

legal authority to bind an applicant (i.e., a corporate officer, a general partner, all joint applicants). If an applicant is represented by an attorney, the attorney must sign the response.

PERIODICALLY CHECK THE STATUS OF THE APPLICATION: To ensure that applicant does not miss crucial deadlines or official notices, check the status of the application every three to four months using the Trademark Status and Document Retrieval (TSDR) system at http://tsdr.uspto.gov/. Please keep a copy of the TSDR status screen. If the status shows no change for more than six months, contact the Trademark Assistance Center by e-mail at TrademarkAssistanceCenter@uspto.gov or call 1-800-786-9199. For more information on checking status, see http://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/process/status/.

TO UPDATE CORRESPONDENCE/E-MAIL ADDRESS: Use the TEAS form at http://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/teas/correspondence.jsp.

How Can We Help?

with Thomson Reuters

...premier provider of Python-based data analytics solutions and services, today announced a new partnership with Thomson Reuters (NYSE: TRI) to make large financi...

- SciPy Call for Abstracts
  SciPy 2013, the twelfth annual Scientific Computing with Python conference, will be held June 24th - 29th in Austin, Texas. The main conference themes are Machine Learning & Reprodu...
- Continuum Analytics Receives $3M in DARPA XDATA Funding
  Continuum Analytics, the premier provider of Python-based data analytics solutions and services, announced today that it has received approximately $3 million in research funding from t...
- Continuum Analytics Releases Anaconda v1.3
  Version 1.3 updates conda, NumbaPro, IOPro, and wiseRF Pine Continuum Analytics, the premier provider of Python-based data analytics solutions and services....

engineers, scientists, and analysts of all experience levels. We focus on the practical application and common problems faced by Python programmers in real development environments.

In addition, we offer customized courses for specialists in finance and energy. To schedule a training or for more information contact us at training@continuum.io.

Full Training Schedule

The GPU revolution of the past few years provides inexpensive access to hundreds of specialized computational units in a single silicon die. The challenge is efficiently accessing these...

- SAT based Sudoku solver in Python
  The Boolean satisfiability problem can be solved extremely efficiently using SAT solvers. Over the past 20 years, SAT solvers have drastically improved. In the early 90's SAT sol...
- Wakari and Big Finance
  Continuum is proud to announce a new partnership with Thomson Reuters. ...

Subscribe to Continuum Announcements

Subscribe

CONTINUUM
ANALYTICS

3801 Capital of Texas Highway South
Suite 250
Austin, TX 78704

512.222.5440
info@continuum.io

Products
Anaconda
Anaconda Accelerate
IOPro
Wakari
Open Source
Documentation
Services
Consulting
Support

Training
Developers
Company
Our Team
Careers
Blog
News/Events
In the
Press
NumFocus
Contact

Follow us on Twitter!
RT @PyDataConf: #PyData SV 2013 videos now up! http://t.co/bNXmKAT2uV
4 days ago

RT @PythonWeekly: SAT based Sudoku so in Python via @ContinuumIO
http://t.co/PfRFZuok5s #python #sudoku
4 days ago

View Your Cart

CONTINUUM
ANALYTICS

Python Visualization and Data Exploration

Home   Products ▾   Services ▾   Training ▾   Company ▾   Contact Us   g+ 🐦 in f

Products

Select Your Product

Anaconda
(Free Python Distribution)
- Linux and Windows: 64-bit and 32-bit
- Mac OS X: Intel 64-bit
- Python 2.6, 2.7, 3.3

Download

Anaconda Accelerate
$129.00
- NumbaPro
- MKL (Linux only)
- wiseRF Pine (Linux & Mac OSX 64-bit only)

Buy Now

Anaconda IOPro
$79.00
- IOPro

Optimized NumPy/SciPy with Intel Math Kernel Library (MKL)
$29.00
Coming Soon

Buy Now	Coming Soon
Wakari	**Open Source**
• Chrome, Firefox, Safari	• Blaze, Bokeh, Numba, etc.
Sign Up Now	Download

Live Chat

Type your question here

Live Chat

Type your question here

CONTINUUM
ANALYTICS

3801 Capital of Texas Highway South
Suite 250
Austin, TX 78704

512.222.5440
info@continuum.io

Products
Anaconda
Anaconda Accelerate
IOPro
Wakari
Open Source
Documentation
Services
Consulting
Support

Training
Developers
Company
Our Team
Careers
Blog
News/Events
In the
Press
NumFOCUS
Contact

Follow us on Twitter!
RT @PyDataConf: #PyData SV 2013 videos
now up! http://t.co/bNXmKAT2uV
4 days ago

RT @PythonWeekly: SAT based Sudoku so
in Python via @ContinuumIO
http://t.co/PfRFZuok5s #python #sudoku
4 days ago

© 2012 Continuum Analy

View Your Cart

CONTINUUM
ANALYTICS
Python Visualization and Data Exploration

Home   Products ▾   Services ▾   Training ▾   Company ▾   Contact Us

Consulting

Continuum Analytics, leaders in scientific computing with Python, specialize in solving large data set problems in technical computing with a specific focus on data management, analysis, and visualization. Our developers are highly trained in various scientific specialties with advanced degrees from leading institutions throughout the world. In addition, they have many years working on challenging projects in Energy, Finance, Defense, Biomedical, and other scientific domains.

With this unique combination of scientific knowledge and programming expertise, we can provide clients with innovative, effective solutions for even the most challenging of problems. We apply our deep technical expertise both creatively and pragmatically, drawing upon wisdom and perspective gained from years and years of solving real problems for real customers.

We prefer an iterative development model in which our clients are an active part of the development process. Clients are able to work with the product as it is prototyped and refined, and provide regular feedback throughout the engagement. Additionally, when we face decisions about key trade-offs (as is often the case when solving hard problems), customers are able to provide much more meaningful input because they have been actively engaged throughout the development process. Iterated development best ensures overall customer satisfaction.

In order to ensure successful adoption, we provide integration, product training and support services for

How Can We Help?

Ask a question below or email us at consulting@continuum.io.

Verification Code:

In order to ensure successful adoption, we provide integration, product training and support services for each software package we produce.

Our areas of expertise include:

- data management for analysis
- interactive visual dashboards for analysis and reporting
- information visualization for data exploration
- vectorized & array-oriented computing
- parallel and scalable computing on clusters
- low-level performance optimization on GPUs and multi-core CPUs
- performance-aware algorithm design
- end-user oriented software and work-flow design

Contact Us   Reset

Live Chat ⬈ ✕
Type your question here

CONTINUUM
ANALYTICS

3801 Capital of Texas Highway South
Suite 250
Austin, TX 78704

512.222.5440
info@continuum.io

g+ 🐦 in f

Products
Anaconda
Anaconda Accelerate
IOPro
Wakari
Open Source
Documentation
Services
Consulting
Support

Training
Developers
Company
Our Team
Careers
Blog
News/Events
In the
Press
NumFocus
Contact

Follow us on Twitter!
RT @PyDataConf: #PyData SV 2013 videos now up! http://t.co/bNXmKAT2uV
4 days ago

RT @PythonWeekly: SAT based Sudoku so in Python via @ContinuumIO
http://t.co/PfRFZuok5s #python #sudoku
4 days ago

© 2012 Continuum Analy

Live Chat ⬈ ✕
Type your question here

DESIGN MARK

Serial Number
85542086

Status
REGISTERED

Word Mark
SYMCORDIA

Standard Character Mark
Yes

Registration Number
4314425

Date Registered
2013/04/02

Type of Mark
TRADEMARK

Register
PRINCIPAL

Mark Drawing Code
(4) STANDARD CHARACTER MARK

Owner
The Merlyn Group, LLC LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY GEORGIA 2200
Constitution Court Roswell GEORGIA 30075

Goods/Services
Class Status -- ACTIVE. IC 009. US 021 023 026 036 038. G & S:
Computer software for the collection, editing, organizing, modifying,
book marking, transmission, storage and sharing of data and
information. First Use: 2012/01/01. First Use In Commerce:
2012/10/25.

Filing Date
2012/02/14

Examining Attorney
JACKSON, STEVEN

SYMCORDIA