



Topic 1: **Lessons Learned from Analyses of PCT National Phase Examination and Backlog Processing in Several Jurisdictions**

Lutz Mailänder

Head, Cooperation on Examination and Training Section

PCT International Cooperation Division

Harare
September 18, 2017

Agenda

- Situation of processing PCT NPEs in different countries
 - Pending workload: backlog or not?
- Small to medium size IPOs
- "Passive work-sharing": utilization of external examination work products
 - International phase
 - Other national phases
 - Final work products: claims granted or rejected
 - Intermediary work products (reports)
- Tools and other resources
- What is needed?
- What options exist and what may be recommended?
 - Backlog processing
 - Regular processing of new PCT NPEs

Trans Pacific Partnership Agreement (TPPA)

Article 18.14: Patent Cooperation and Work Sharing

1. The Parties recognize the importance of improving the **quality** and **efficiency** of their respective patent registration systems as well as simplifying and streamlining the procedures and processes of their respective patent offices for the benefit of all users of the patent system and the public as a whole.
2. Further to paragraph 1, the Parties shall endeavor to **cooperate** among their respective patent offices to facilitate the **sharing** and **use** of **search and examination work** of other Parties. This may include:
 - (a) making search and examination results available to the patent offices of other Parties; and
 - (b) exchanging information on quality assurance systems and quality standards relating to patent examination.

Case studies

- First case studies with systematic analysis and sampling of Bahrain PCT **backlog**
- Further analyses and hands-on workshops on **pending cases** in
 - Smaller IPOs: Sri Lanka, Laos, Cambodia, Qatar, Bhutan, Oman, Mongolia
 - Medium IPOs: Malaysia, Thailand, Philippines, Viet Nam
- What work products are available for other PCT national phase in other jurisdictions, and how useful are they?
- How to implement systematic passive work-sharing to make examination more efficient?
- 23 arbitrarily selected sample cases used for training
 - Mostly older applications
 - > more likely that national phase examination is completed

Family table for PCT NPEs sample cases

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P
1	Case studies BH, LK, MY, TH, BT, PH, KH, LA workshops														
2	Status: Aug 17, 2016														
3	Simple Family														
4	National Application Numbers	PCT Member of Family	Size of Inpadoc Family	Number of Simple Families in Inpadoc Family	Grants	Withdrawn or Lapsed or Abandoned	Refused or Rejected	Pending	Earliest priority/first/latest grant dates	Pending range	Grants but in Extended Family	Observations Observations ISR (only A?)	Observations lack of unity (in ISR, or national reports)	Supplementary prior art searches in national phases (e.g. EP-A4)	main claims available in English (different, equivalent, equal to WO-A1? To grants in other jurisdictions?)
5	BH 20080018 MY 149627A PH 1-2008-502595 TH?	PCT/KR2007/00247 3 stable composition	24	1	AU, CA, EA, EP, US, JP, CN, 2xKR, UA, MY, MA, MX, NZ, UA, (CR, SV, GT), PH			BH	2006-05-22 KR(2); 2009-09-18 KR; 2016-01-06 EP	3-10		only A ISA=KR	no, 2 KR grants are the 2 priorities	EP-A4 JP more than ISR AU more than ISR US more than ISR	MY equal to WO-A1 AU-B different to WO-A1: one substantial difference ('lyophilizing') EP-B a bit narrower US-B only method (a bit narrower than AU) PH has US main claim as composition
6	BH 20090030 LA 96 MY 147396A PH 1-2009-500273 TH?	PCT/JP2007/06757 2 plant cultivation	34	7	AP, AU, 2xCN, US, NZ, CA, KR, EA, JP, MA, MX, MY, TW, UA, E(12g), PH			EP, BH	2006-09-20 JP(2); 2008-09-03 JP; 2014-04-01 TW	2-8+	JP	only A, only JP ISA=JP		EP-A4 CA, US more than ISR add prior art by CA seen also by US;	AU, JP, MY equal to WO-A1; CA is narrower; US narrower than CA PH mc equal to US mc
7	BH? KH 2012/0150 MY 155685A PH 1-2013-501448 TH?	PCT/JP2012/00023 7 solid liquid separation	16	1	AU, CA, CN, EP, JP, KR, MY, RU, US(12g), PH				2011-01-24 JP(2); 2012-02-08 JP; 2016 US	1-5		only A ISA=EP		JP, KR, US more than ISR	AU, CA, mc equal to WO-A1 EP mc (2 part claim) equivalent to WO-A1 MY equal to EP US different by one substantial detail PH equal to EP with one error ('preventing' instead of
8	BH 20080005 MY 150185A PH none TH?	PCT/EP2007/05301 5 energy conversion	19	1	CA, CN, US, RU, MY, MA, MX		KR, JP	EP, BH	2006-03-31 DE(5); 2009-05-04 MA; 2014-12-09 CA	3-8+		5X ISA=EP		KR more than ISR rejected over citation of US, not in ISR	WO-A1 German language MY, US and CA equal, and different from WO-A1
9	BH 20090006 MY 153238A PH 1-2009-500135 TH?	PCT/EP2007/05738 0 cryogenic engine	24	1	AP, CU, US, CN, AU, KR, EA, MX, MA, NZ, MY, PH	EP		CA, JP(?), BH	2006-07-21 FR; 2009-07-01 MA; 2015-01-29 MY	3-9+		4Y ISA=EP		AU, JP, KR more than ISR EA has seen only ISR	AU is equivalent to WO US is substantially different, includes more components of the engine PH mc is equal to US
10	BH 20090047 MY 151581A PH 1-2009-501523 TH?	PCT/FR2008/05010 3 insulated tank	30	1	FR, US, EP, CA, AU, EA, NZ, RU, CN, EG, JP, MA, MX, MY, TW, UA, PH				2007-02-13 FR; 2010-06-23 EP; 2014-06-13 MY	3-7		3X ISA=EP		JP, US, AU more than ISR	AU, EP, US all are different from each other WO mc in French US being the narrowest MY =EP
11	BH 20090066 MY 150324A PH none TH?	PCT/US2008/00119 remote control	7	1	AU, GB, US, MY				2007-01-31 US; 2011-04-28 AU; 2013-12-31 MY	4-6		X ISA=EP		US more than ISR AU only ISR	AU narrower than WO-A1; US narrower than AU MY equal to AU
12	BH 20090019 MY 151783A PH 1-2009-500417 TH?	PCT/EP2007/05918 compressed air engine	25	1	AP, US, AU, FR, CN, KR, MA, MY, UA, NZ, PH		2xJP	EP, JP, CA, BH	2006-09-05 FR; 2009-09-01 MA; 2014-05-16 KR	3-8+		3Y ISA=EP		the 2 rejected JP applications used one JP prior art that was not considered by the other offices AU, AP only ISR KR, US more than ISR	AU, US and MY and PH equal to WO-A1
13	BH 20090028 MY 148768A PH 1-2009-500495	PCT/US2007/07432 7 secure transaction	21	1	AU, US, NZ, TW, GB, EA, MX, MY, UA,	US, PH	EP, KR, JP business method	BH	2006-09-18 US, EP, GB; 2009-01-07 GB; 2014-09-21 TW	3-8		Y, A, only US ISA=US		JP, US more than ISR AU only ISR	AU and US equal an different from WO GB different from AU and US MY appears 2b equal to GB CA, EP and AU different from WO-A1; subtle differences of EP and AU re catalyst layer details; CA and AU very similar but no
14	BH 20080024 MY 150103A PH none TH?	PCT/JP2007/050357 polyolefin	15	1	AU, CN, CA, KR, JP, EP, MX, MY, RU, FI			BH	2006-06-14 FI; 2010-11-15 FI; 2015-08-05 EP	4-9		X,Y ISA=EP		EP-A4 add EP prior art not seen by others AU only ISR	

Example: WO2008035580

- 2 JP priorities
- Inpadoc family: 39 members
- Simple family; 35 members

Families: Topic 3

Status: Topic 4

- **Simple** family: **grants** in AP, AU, 2xCN, US, NZ, CA, KR, EA, MA, MX, MY, TW, UA, PH, VN, EP
- **Extended** family: further grants in: 2xJP
- **Pendency: 2-10 years**
 - 2006-09-20 earliest priority date
 - 2008-09-03 JP grant
 - 2016-10-26 EP
- Still pending in BH, LA,...

Simple – extended family?

- Examination is based on claims; claims need to be supported by the description
- If claims or descriptions are not fully equivalent the utility of foreign work products may be limited
- Are the descriptions of family members equivalent?

- **Simple family:** all members share the same priorities
- **Simple family (PCT w/o priority):** all members share the same PCT application number
 - **It is very likely that descriptions of family members are equal or very similar**
 - "Equivalents", "also published as"
 - same invention or group of very similar inventions

- **Extended (Inpadoc) family:** biggest possible family, may include several simple families sharing priorities indirectly
 - **If priorities are partly different: It is quite likely that descriptions are different**
 - Applications in the same extended but not the same simple family usually cover different but related inventions in same area of technology

Examples of grants: WO2008035580

WO-A1 = AU-B2 = JP-B1

1. A plant cultivation system comprising:

- a nonporous hydrophilic film for cultivating a plant thereon, and
- a feeding means for supplying water or a nutrient fluid to the lower surface of said nonporous hydrophilic film in the absence of a hydroponic tank for accommodating water or a nutrient fluid and cultivating a plant therein.

CA-C

1. A plant cultivation system comprising:

- a nonporous hydrophilic film for cultivating a plant thereon;
- a feeding means for feeding water or a nutrient fluid to the lower surface of said nonporous hydrophilic film,
- said feeding means comprising at least one layer which is a water impermeable material layer or a water absorbing material layer,
- said at least one layer is laid and extends under said nonporous hydrophilic film,
- wherein, when said feeding means comprises both the water impermeable material layer and the water absorbing material layer, the water absorbing material layer is disposed between said nonporous hydrophilic film and said water impermeable material layer and in contact with the lower surface of said nonporous hydrophilic film;
- and a drip tube as an irrigation means for supplying water or a nutrient fluid to the feeding means,
- said drip tube being disposed below said nonporous hydrophilic film in a manner such that water or a nutrient fluid supplied from the drip tube is fed to the lower surface of the nonporous hydrophilic film.

Examples of grants: WO2008035580

CA-C

1. A plant cultivation system comprising:
 - a nonporous hydrophilic film for cultivating a plant thereon;
 - a feeding means for feeding water or a nutrient fluid to the lower surface of said nonporous hydrophilic film,
 - said feeding means comprising at least one layer which is a water impermeable material layer or a water absorbing material layer,
 - said at least one layer is laid and extends under said nonporous hydrophilic film,
 - wherein, when said feeding means comprises both the water impermeable material layer and the water absorbing material layer, the water absorbing material layer is disposed between said nonporous hydrophilic film and said water impermeable material layer and in contact with the lower surface of said nonporous hydrophilic film;
 - and a drip tube as an irrigation means for supplying water or a nutrient fluid to the feeding means,
 - said drip tube being disposed below said nonporous hydrophilic film in a manner such that water or a nutrient fluid supplied from the drip tube is fed to the lower surface of the nonporous hydrophilic film.

US-B2

1. A plant cultivation system comprising:
 - a nonporous hydrophilic film for cultivating a plant thereon,
 - a feeding means for feeding water or a nutrient fluid to the lower surface of said nonporous hydrophilic film in the absence of a hydroponic tank for accommodating water or a nutrient fluid and cultivating a plant therein,
 - said feeding means comprising at least one layer selected from the group consisting of a water impermeable material layer and a water absorbing material layer,
 - which is laid and extends under said nonporous hydrophilic film,
 - wherein, when said feeding means comprises both of said water impermeable material layer and said water absorbing material layer, said water absorbing material layer is disposed between said nonporous hydrophilic film and said water impermeable material layer and is in contact with the lower surface of said nonporous hydrophilic film,
 - and a drip tube as an irrigation means for supplying water or a nutrient fluid to said feeding means,
 - said drip tube disposed below said nonporous hydrophilic film in a manner such that water or nutrient fluid supplied from said drip tube is fed to the lower surface of said nonporous hydrophilic film;
 - wherein said nonporous hydrophilic film is a film which exhibits an electrical conductivity (EC) difference of 4.5 dS/m or less,
 - said EC difference being determined by a method comprising contacting water with a saline solution having a salt concentration of 0.5% by weight through said nonporous hydrophilic film, measuring the electrical conductivity of each of the water and the saline solution 4 days (96 hours) after the start of the contact, and calculating the difference in electrical conductivity between the water and the saline solution.

Comparing grants: Topic 9

ISR: 2 category A documents only

INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT

International application No.

PCT/JP2007/067578

A. CLASSIFICATION OF SUBJECT MATTER

A01G27/00(2006.01)i, A01G1/00(2006.01)i, A01G7/00(2006.01)i, A01G13/00(2006.01)i, A01G25/00(2006.01)i

According to International Patent Classification (IPC) or to both national classification and IPC

B. FIELDS SEARCHED

Minimum documentation searched (classification system followed by classification symbols)
A01G27/00, A01G1/00, A01G7/00, A01G13/00, A01G25/00

Documentation searched other than minimum documentation to the extent that such documents are included in the fields searched
Jitsuyo Shinan Koho 1922-1996 Jitsuyo Shinan Toroku Koho 1996-2007
Kokai Jitsuyo Shinan Koho 1971-2007 Toroku Jitsuyo Shinan Koho 1994-2007

Electronic data base consulted during the international search (specify name of data base and, if practicable, search terms used)

C. DOCUMENTS CONSIDERED TO BE RELEVANT

Category*	Classification of document, with indications, where appropriate, of the relevant passages	Relevant to claim No.
A	JP 2001-292643 A (Taiyo Kogyo Kabushiki Kaisha), 23 October, 2001 (23.10.01), Full text; all drawings (Family: none)	1-13
A	JP 2003-506051 A (E.I. Du Pont De Nemours & Co.), 18 February, 2003 (18.02.03), Full text; all drawings & US 6484439 B1 & WO 2001/010192 A1 & EP 1530896 A2	1-13

Citations:
Topic 6

Only A
documents

EP-A4: Supplementary EP search report



SUPPLEMENTARY PARTIAL EUROPEAN SEARCH REPORT

under Rule 62a and/or 63 of the European Patent Convention.
This report shall be considered, for the purposes of
subsequent proceedings, as the European search report

Application Number

EP 07 82 8221

DOCUMENTS CONSIDERED TO BE RELEVANT			
Category	Citation of document with indication, where appropriate, of relevant passages	Relevant to claim	CLASSIFICATION OF THE APPLICATION (IPC)
X	EP 1 695 615 A1 (UNIV LAVAL [CA]) 30 August 2006 (2006-08-30) * paragraph [0011] - paragraph [0013]; figures * -----	1	INV. A01G27/00 A01G1/00 A01G7/00 A01G13/00 A01G25/00 A01G31/02

Reasons for substantial differences

- Examiners may have applied different prior art
 - Different prior art searches, i.e. prior art documents
 - Different priority dates applied
- Differences in national legislation (exclusions) or case law
- Individual examiner's views/experience
- Patents do not belong to same simple family, i.e. applicants have sought protection for different subject matter (e.g. continuations/divisions); descriptions most likely differ

Reasons for additional citations/searches

- Lack of trust in other work product, e.g. if
 - ISR with only category A documents
 - ISR including citations of only one single jurisdiction
- Claims amended before national phase entry (ISRs with X citations)
- Claims amended during national phase examination
- Familiarity/expertise of examiner with relevant documentation
- Strict prior art disclosure requirement, for example in the US

CONCLUSIONS

- ISR and WO may be very **useful for applicants** to assess potential success of application
- ISR and WO may be of **limited utility for examiners**, in particular, when claims are amended for national phase entry, and additional prior art searches often appear to be needed in national phases.

Family table for PCT NPEs sample cases

Case studies BH, LK, MY, TH, BT, PH, KH, LA workshops														
Status: Aug 17, 2016														
Simple Family														
National Application Numbers	PCT Member of Family	Size of Inpadoc Family	Number of Simple Families in Inpadoc Family	Grants	Withdrawn or Lapsed or Abandoned	Refused or Rejected	Pending	Earliest priority/first/latest grant dates	Pending range	Grants but in Extended Family	Observations Observations ISR (only A?)	Observations lack of unity (in ISR, or national reports)	Supplementary prior art searches in national phases (e.g. EP-A4)	main claims available in English (different, equivalent, equal to WO-A1? To grants in other jurisdictions?)
BH 20080018 MY 149627A PH 1-2008-502595 TH ?	PCT/KR2007/00247 3 stable composition	24	1	AU, CA, EA, EP, US, JP, CN, 2xKR, UA, MY, MA, MX, NZ, UA, (CR, SV, GT), PH			BH	2006-05-22 KR(2); 2009-09-18 KR; 2016-01-06 EP	3-10		only A ISA=KR	no, 2 KR grants are the 2 priorities	EP-A4 JP more than ISR AU more than ISR US more than ISR	MY equal to WO-A1 AU-B different to WO-A1: one substantial difference ('lyophilizing') EP-B a bit narrower US-B only method (a bit narrower than AU) PH has US main claim as composition
BH 20090030 LA 96 MY 147396A PH 1-2009-500273 TH ?	PCT/JP2007/06757 2 plant cultivation	34	7	AP, AU, 2xCN, US, NZ, CA, KR, EA, JP, MA, MX, MY, TW, UA, E(12g), PH			EP, BH	2006-09-20 JP(2); 2008-09-03 JP; 2014-04-01 TW	2-8+	JP	only A, only JP ISA=JP		EP-A4 CA, US more than ISR add prior art by CA seen also by US;	AU, JP, MY equal to WO-A1; CA is narrower; US narrower than CA PH mc equal to US mc
BH ? KH 2012/0150 MY 155685A PH 1-2013-501448 TH ?	PCT/JP2012/00023 7 solid liquid separation	16	1	AU, CA, CN, EP, JP, KR, MY, RU, US(12g), PH				2011-01-24 JP(2); 2012-02-08 JP; 2016 US	1-5		only A ISA=EP		JP, KR, US more than ISR	AU, CA, mc equal to WO A1 EP mc (2 part claim) equivalent to WO-A1 MY equal to EP US different by one substantial detail PH equal to EP with one error ('preventing' instead of
BH 20080005 MY 150185A PH none TH ?	PCT/EP2007/05301 5 energy conversion	19	1	CA, CN, US, RU, MY, MA, MX		KR, JP	EP, BH	2006-03-31 DE(5); 2009-05-04 MA; 2014-12-09 CA	3-8+		5X ISA=EP		KR more than ISR rejected over citation of US, not in ISR	WO-A1 German language MY, US and CA equal, and different from WO-A1
BH 20090006 MY 153238A PH 1-2009-500135 TH ?	PCT/EP2007/05738 0 cryogenic engine	24	1	AP, CU, US, CN, AU, KR, EA, MX, MA, NZ, MY, PH	EP		CA, JP(?), BH	2006-07-21 FR; 2009-07-01 MA; 2015-01-29 MY	3-9+		4Y ISA=EP		AU, JP, KR more than ISR EA has seen only ISR	AU is equivalent to WO US is substantially different, includes more components of the engine PH mc is equal to US
BH 20090047 MY 151581A PH 1-2009-501523 TH ?	PCT/FR2008/05010 3 insulated tank	30	1	FR, US, EP, CA, AU, EA, NZ, RU, CN, EG, JP, MA, MX, MY, TW, UA, PH				2007-02-13 FR; 2010-06-23 EP; 2014-06-13 MY	3-7		3X ISA=EP		JP, US, AU more than ISR	AU, EP, US all are different from each other WO mc in French US being the narrowest MY =EP
BH 20090066 MY 150324A PH none TH ?	PCT/US2008/00119 remote control	7	1	AU, GB, US, MY				2007-01-31 US; 2011-04-28 AU; 2013-12-31 MY	4-6		X ISA=EP		US more than ISR AU only ISR	AU narrower than WO-A1; US narrower than AU MY equal to AU
BH 20090019 MY 151783A PH 1-2009-500417 TH ?	PCT/EP2007/05918 compressed air engine	25	1	AP, US, AU, FR, CN, KR, MA, MY, UA, NZ, PH		2xJP	EP, JP, CA, BH	2006-09-05 FR; 2009-09-01 MA; 2014-05-16 KR	3-8+		3Y ISA=EP		the 2 rejected JP applications used one JP prior art that was not considered by the other offices AU, AP only ISR KR, US more than ISR	AU, US and MY and PH equal to WO-A1
BH 20090028 MY 148768A PH 1-2009-500495	PCT/US2007/07432 7 secure transaction	21	1	AU, US, NZ, TW, GB, EA, MX, MY, UA,	US, PH	EP, KR, JP business method	BH	2006-09-18 US, EP, GB; 2009-01-07 GB; 2014-09-21 TW	3-8		Y, A, only US ISA=US		JP, US more than ISR AU only ISR	AU and US equal an different from WO GB different from AU and US MY appears 2b equal to GB CA, EP and AU different from WO-A1; subtle differences of EP and AU re catalyst layer details; CA and AU very similar but no
BH 20080024 MY 150103A PH none TH ?	PCT/JP2007/050357 polyolefin	15	1	AU, CN, CA, KR, JP, EP, MX, MY, RU, FI			BH	2006-06-14 FI; 2010-11-15 FI; 2015-08-05 EP	4-9		X,Y ISA=EP		EP-A4 add EP prior art not seen by others AU only ISR	

Evidence derived from sample set (PCT)

- Large patent families: 10++ members
 - Many work products from many other national phases can be utilized
- Large fraction of families with grants: >95%
 - Most likely a patent can be granted; but which claims from which country?
 - The first foreign grant (PPH; e.g. for the sake of speediness)?
- Wide range of pendencies: 3-10 years after priority filing
 - What is backlog? How long to wait?
- Granted claims different from WO-A1/2 claims: >90%
- Granted claims substantially different from claims granted in other jurisdictions: >60%
 - Careful selection of suitable claim sets
- Usually supplementary prior art searches in national phases: >90%
 - Take into account for claim selection or decision to await further results
 - Do not trust a single grant based solely on an ISR
 - Do not solely rely on ISR
- Grants in some, rejections and withdrawals on other jurisdiction: 20%
 - Carefully analyze reasons for rejections/substantial withdrawals

→ Exercises

Strategy for backlog processing I

■ Preparatory stage

- Research family and examination status
- If still pending in other jurisdiction(s): check if additional prior art applied there warrants further waiting for completion of examination in that/those jurisdiction(s)
- Compare claims and select suitable claim set (e.g. narrowest main claim; more citations;..); even if applicant submitted specific request, e.g. claims granted by EPO
- Confirm compatibility of selected set with national legislation
- Check if selected set is supported by description of (your) pending application
- Optionally, sort and prioritize in
 - **Easy cases**: only grants, no rejections, no substantial withdrawals in family
 - > grant is likely
 - > one should attempt to get the applicant adopt the selected claim set
 - > an analysis of the patentability of the pending claims may be avoided
 - **Complex/contentious cases**: grants and rejections in same simple family
 - > rejection may be due
 - > Contentious cases may require a detailed analysis of the patentability of the pending claims and the claims granted by other IPOs

Strategy for backlog processing II

■ Applicant interaction stage

- Selected claims may not be granted immediately
- Principles of 'party disposition' and 'fair trial' require communications/reports and consent of applicant

Easy cases

- Propose selected claim set to applicant
- "Motivate" applicant to adopt proposal, e.g. by issuing a 'smart' report mentioning the comparison of results of other national phase, additional citations,..
- Initially avoid as much as possible discussion of patentability of pending claims (time consuming)
- If applicant doesn't agree, place case in contentious category

Contentious cases

- Most likely requires regular substantive examination procedure
- 1st action: report explaining non-patentability of pending claims


Summary

- **Preparatory stage:** External work products may enable you to
 - **Avoid your own prior art search**
 - **Avoid your own analysis of novelty and inventiveness**
 - Takes 1-3h per case for a skilled examiner

- **Applicant interaction stage:**
 - May be time consuming for contentious cases, i.e.
 - If applicants disagree with proposed claim set and insist on their own claims
 - Additional prior art search may become necessary, e.g. if amended claims or parts thereof were never searched before
 - Rejection ruling may have to be issued
 - May require examiner with technical expertise, e.g. for conducting a supplementary search or analyzing obviousness
 - Difficult to estimate the time needed for contentious cases

Which work load is backlog? What is delay?

- Set timelines, for example applications older than 5 years?
 - From earliest priority?
 - From filing date?
 - From national phase entry?
- Just pending, or pending with examination request?
- Awaiting first substantive examiner action?
- Examiner actions already taken but application still pending?
- Availability of external work products?
- Completed in one, or in several other jurisdictions?
- Still pending in major Office?



Discussions
Topic 11
Wrap up

Regular PCT NPE examination:

Strategies for small/under-resourced IPOs

When examiners have no expertise in technical field or number of staff is limited:

- Avoid as much as possible resource consuming patentability analysis of pending claims, in particular conducting prior art searches
- Rather await final results from other IPOs
- For PCT NPEs, mostly likely a grant will become possible
- However, **for the sake of quality patents**:
 - Await several grants of other jurisdictions, and compare for consistency
 - Expected average waiting period: 2-3 years after PCT NPE
 - **At least**, compare citations applied in different jurisdictions, e.g. when processing a PPH request, or validating any foreign patents
 - If additional citations appear to be relevant and patentability is at issue in other jurisdictions, the further progress there should be monitored before adopting results from first to grant grant authority
- Apply "**active waiting/monitoring**": regularly check availability of further work products or use RSS feeds; then no one can complain about a delay caused by the office (e.g. for TPPA, or FTA provisions on patent term extensions)

What is needed for work-sharing?

Top priority:

- Comprehensive patent family information, detailed as
 - Simple (all priorities are the same)
 - Extended family
- Examination status information

Lower priority:

- Access to examination work products
- Translation tools for work products
- Tools for comparing work products
 - Citations (search reports)
 - Claims
- Information on differing national practices (naming and content of work products; important case law; exclusions; ..)

What is available for work-sharing?

- Primary sources: **National Patent Registers**
 - **authoritative** information on status and national family relations
 - National file inspection; national publications
 - For some countries accessible online and therefore useful for work-sharing

- Two major secondary platforms ("one-stop-shop") provide access to family and status information and work products from several offices
 - **Espacenet**
 - Includes most comprehensive compilation of family data:
 - Systematically derived from bibliographic data of all jurisdictions sharing such data with EPO and updated weekly
 - Largest coverage of jurisdictions (distinguishing simple, extended, domestic, national families)
 - Includes national legal status (INPADOC) covering jurisdictions sharing such data with EPO; updated weekly
 - ...

What is available for work-sharing?

- Espacenet [continued]
 - Global Dossier: one-stop-shop for accessing IP5 Offices' file wrappers; always up-to-date because retrieved on-the-fly from IP5 national registers; includes derived up-to-date status
 - Common Citation Document: viewing and comparing of search reports/citations of members of extended and simple families of AU, CN, DE, EP, JP, KR, US, WO
- Global Dossier (stand alone version)
- WIPO-CASE
 - One-stop-shop for file inspection
 - Accessible only for 'accessing' and 'providing' Offices
 - Family information includes only so-called for 'complex' families and only family members of 'providing' Offices (IP5 plus GB, CA, CL, AU, IL) recorded in the system
 - Complementary to Espacenet for file inspection: in addition to IP5 files it includes access to files of GB, CA, CL, AU, IL

What is needed for small IPOs? For efficient PCT NPE examination anywhere?

- **National policies/strategies for substantive examination of PCT NPEs and other foreign applications, e.g.**
 - **Emphasize quality, i.e. don't grant as soon as a first grant has become available; don't rely on ISR only**
 - **strategy of "active waiting", i.e. regular monitoring progress at other IPOs**
- Suitable national legislation enabling work-sharing
- Tailored competency models for examiners in smaller IPOs
- Specific training for work-sharing
 - Selection stage
 - Applicant interaction stage
 - Contentious cases

Retrieval - Example: Cambodia patent law

Article 31.-

The applicant shall, at the request of the Registrar, furnish him with the following documents relating to one or more of the foreign applications referred to in Article 30 of this Law:

- (i) a copy of any communication received by the applicant concerning the results of any search or examination carried out in respect of the foreign application;
- (ii) a copy of the patent granted on the basis of the foreign application;
- (iii) a copy of any final decision rejecting the foreign application or refusing the grant requested in the foreign application.

The applicant shall, at the request of the Registrar, furnish him with a copy of any final decision invalidating the patent granted on the basis of the foreign application referred to in the 1st paragraph of this Article.

For much of this, we now have retrieval tools

Utilization - Example: Cambodia patent law

Article 37.-

The Registrar shall take into account, for the purposes of Article 36 of this Law, as following:

- (i) the results of any international search report and any international preliminary examination report established under the PCT in relation to the application; and/or
- (ii) a search and examination report submitted under item (i) of the 1st paragraph of Article 31 of this Law relating to, or a final decision submitted under item (iii) of the 1st paragraph of Article 31 of this Law on the refusal to grant a patent on, a corresponding foreign application; and/or
- (iii) a search and examination report which was carried out upon his request by an external search and examination authority.

+ authorization to base grant on foreign grant

Observations/Conclusions

- Duplication/repetition of work is not a bad thing as such
 - Improves the overall quality of patents
 - For PCT NPEs, examiners should not fully rely only on ISR/WO
 - Awaiting results from other national phases may be an option to enhance quality and efficiency
- Cooperative examination would be the ideal way for improving
 - Quality of all patents of a family, and not just those ones granted last, and
 - Efficiency of procedures overall
 - Avoid delaying examination
- Sharing of application and legal status data needs to improve a lot, e.g. for regional cooperation
- Family building needs to be expanded, in particular with a view to IPOs in emerging and developing economies
- Patent families are global: Only one-stop-shop type platforms for work-sharing including as many family members as possible make work-sharing efficient
 - regional solutions are not really useful

Thank you

lutz.mailander@wipo.int