



An Roinn Fiontar, Trádála agus Fostaíochta
Department of Enterprise, Trade and Employment

Regulatory Impact Analysis

of the

The London Agreement

January 2009

Table of Contents

1. Policy Context, Objectives and Options	3
1.1 Policy Context	3
1.1.1 Introduction	
1.1.2 Background	
1.1.3 Current Requirements re Translation of European Patent	
1.1.4 Objectives of the London Agreement	
1.1.5 Options	
Option 1: Ratification of the London Agreement	
Option 2: Do Nothing	
2. Identification of Costs, Benefits and Impact	7
2.1 Identify Costs of Each Option	7
Option 1 and 2: Costs	
Option 1 and 2: Benefits	
2.2 Impact Under the Following Headings if we Ratify	12
a) Impact on National Competitiveness	
b) Impact on the Economic Market	
2.3 Summary of Costs, Benefits and Impact of Each Option	13
2.4 Conclusion and Preferred Option	14
3. Consultation	15
3.1 Stakeholders Consulted	15
3.2 Summary	16
4. Enforcement and Compliance	17
5. Review	17
6. References	18

1. Policy Context, Objectives and Options

1.1 Policy Context

1.1.1 Introduction

The aim of this Regulatory Impact Analysis (RIA) is to consider whether Ireland should ratify the London Agreement on the application of Article 65 of the European Patent Convention (EPC). The Agreement sets out to reduce the cost to applicants of the patent process, by reducing the requirement to file translations of granted patents under the European Patent Convention in designated States. The London Agreement entered into force on the 1 May 2008, following the deposit of the instruments of ratification and accession by 13 EPC Contracting States, including the 3 where the most European patents– took effect in 1999, France, Germany and the United Kingdom.

This Agreement is an optional one so there is no legal deadline for an Irish accession. However, should a decision be made to ratify the London Agreement, amendments to primary legislation will first be required in order to effect the necessary changes to Section 119 of the Patents Act, 1992 as amended by the Patents (Amendment) Act 2006.

1.1.2 Background

The European Patent Convention came into force in 1977 and established the European Patent Organisation. Ireland became a member on 1st August 1992. There are currently 35 Contracting States to the European Patent Organisation.

The European Patent Organisation established the European Patent Office (EPO) in Munich in order to process the patent applications received under the EPC. Patent applications through the EPO can be filed in one of its three official languages -French, English or German. Whichever of these languages is chosen will be the one in which the application is processed all the way to the grant of a patent. This saves on translation costs. The cost savings in terms of national filing and search/examination fees involved can be considerable. The reduced need to provide translations at this stage also allows the inventor more time to establish the business prospects for his/her invention, to decide whether patent protection will be needed in each State designated and to raise funds.

After examination the EPO grants a European patent, which must be validated in each of the designated States in which protection is requested. At this stage, the procedure requires a translation into a national language if the language used during processing is not an official language in that State. It is only when the translation is lodged in the relevant national patent office that the patent is validated in that State.

Experience of this system did indicate, however, that the costs of translating a European patent into the official language of the Contracting States still made up a very sizeable portion of the costs of acquiring a European patent. As a result, the Paris Intergovernmental Conference of June 1999 mandated the Working Party on Cost Reduction to prepare a report to the Governments of the European Patent Organisation Contracting States showing how the translation costs for European patents into the official languages of the Contracting States could be reduced by approximately 50%. This Working Party produced the text of the [London Agreement on the Application of Article 65 of the European Patent Convention](#), which was adopted by the Inter-Governmental Conference in London on 17 October 2000.

1.1.3 Current Requirements re Translation of European Patents

Article 65 of the European Patent Convention (EPC) provides that any Contracting State may require a translation of the text of a European patent into one of its languages if that language is different from the language in which the patent was granted. Currently, every EPC Contracting State - apart from Luxembourg and Monaco, require a translation of the patent including the specification to be filed with their national patent offices within a prescribed timeframe.

Irish applications for European patents file their applications in English. The application is thus processed in English and, upon grant, the EPO translates the granted patent (claim) into the other two EPO Official languages -French and German. These translation costs are included in the application fee to the EPO. Following grant of the patent and depending on the specific States in which protection is sought, the applicant must file translations of the complete patent including the specification in whichever States are designated. The cost of the translations and the validation fees to national patent offices must be borne by the applicant.

In the Irish case, Section 119(6) of the Patents Act, 1992 requires that where a European patent designates Ireland and is drawn up in either French or German, the specification of such a patent must be translated into English and lodged in the Irish Patent Office within six months from the date of publication of the patent specification in order for it to be validated in Ireland.

1.1.4 Objectives of the London Agreement

The London Agreement aims to further reduce the need for, and costs of, translations for European patents. The implementation of the Agreement is expected to reduce significantly the cost of validating a patent after grant by the EPO in Contracting States through reducing current translation costs by almost half.

Article 1 of the London Agreement – Dispensation with translation requirements states:

1. *“Any State party to the Agreement having an official language in common with one of the official languages the European Patent Office shall dispense with the translation requirements provided for in Article 65, paragraph 1 of the European Patent Convention.*
2. *Any State party to this agreement having no official language in common with one of the official languages of the European Patent Office shall dispense with the translation requirements provided for in Article 65, paragraph 1 of the European Patent Convention, if the European patent has been granted in the official language of the European Patent Office prescribed by that state, or translated into that language and supplied under the conditions provided for in Article 65, paragraph 1 of the European Patent Convention.*
3. *The States referred to in paragraph 2 shall continue to have the right to require that a translation of the claims into one of their official languages be supplied under the conditions provided for in Article 65, paragraph 1 of the European Patent Convention.*
4. *Nothing in this agreement shall be construed as restricting the right of the States parties to this agreement to dispense with any translation requirements or to apply more liberal translation requirements than those referred to in paragraph 2 and 3.”*

Under the Agreement, parties undertake to waive, entirely or largely, the requirement for translations of European patents to be filed in their national language. More specifically, States –like Ireland, having an official language in common with the European Patent Office (English, German or French) are obliged to dispense with all the translation requirements provided for under Article 65 EPC, whilst maintaining the requirement to

supply the claims in the three EPO languages provided for under Article 14 (6) of the EPC. States with no official language in common with the three EPO ones can still require a translation of the claims in one of its official languages but it has to drop any requirements to translate the European patent into one of its official languages if such a translation has been supplied in the EPO language prescribed by that State.

In effect under the agreement, States with English, French or German as an official language will dispense with translation requirements for the patent to come into effect after grant. Other European Patent Organisation Contracting States, who do not have English, French or German as an official language, can require a translation of the description into whichever one of the three languages that they prescribe, while retaining the right to require a translation of the patent claims into their official language.

1.1.5 Options

Option I: Ratification of the London Agreement

The main advantage of the agreement for Irish inventors seeking patent protection abroad would be that they would no longer be required to furnish translations to the same extent as now in those countries which become a party to the Agreement, thereby, reducing the cost of protecting the patent in Contracting States to the Agreement.

If Ireland acceded to the Agreement, having English as an official language would mean that we would have to drop the present requirement to provide English translations of European patents drawn up in either French or German and accept the latter as being valid.

Option 2: Do Nothing

Doing nothing in this matter would mean that the present requirements would remain for the filing of translations in order to validate a European patent in Ireland.

Whether we decide to ratify the London Agreement, it should be noted that, in any case, Irish applicants seeking protection abroad would no longer be required to furnish translations to the same extent in those States which ratified the Agreement.

2. Identification of Costs, Benefits and Impacts

2.1 Identify Costs of Each Option

There is clear scope for immediate savings for patent applicants arising from ratification of the London Agreement in respect of translation and administration costs for the protection of their intellectual property within Europe. Signing the agreement may also assist in increasing the level of patent activity in Ireland and especially so, in the case of, start-ups and Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs). It is more difficult, however, to estimate the scale of that effect at this point.

Option 1: Costs

In January 2006, the European Commission launched a broad consultation on the future of patent policy in Europe. [*Enhancing the patent system in Europe*](#), sets out a medium –term strategy for the reform of the patent system in Europe. The strategy drew on the correlation between the use of intellectual property rights and good innovation performance.

Commission research indicated that the sectors where most patents are issued tend also to be more innovative. It also pointed to wide recognition across the EU that the high cost of patenting in Europe is a disincentive to obtaining patents, especially in the case of Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs).

At the global level, the high cost of the European patent makes Europe uncompetitive when compared to the cost of obtaining US and Japanese patents. The EU strategy document, mentioned above, quoted recent research –summarised at Table 1 following, comparing the scale of the cost disadvantage facing European compared to US and Japanese patent applicants:

Table 1
Comparison of European, US & Japanese Patent Translation and Validation Costs
2003

Procedural fees	EPO-3 States (Euro)	EPO – 13 Contracting States (Euro)	USPTO (US\$)	JPO (JP Yen)
Translation Cost	3,400*	13,600	Nil	Nil
Validation Cost	95	1,700	Nil	Nil
Total Procedural Cost	8,070	20,175	2,404	212,600
	Euro	Euro	Euro	Euro
Procedural Costs without Translation	4,670	6,575	1,856	1,541
Procedural Costs with Translation	8,070	20,175	1,856	1,541

(Notes)

*It is assumed that translation costs are €1,700 per language and this includes the translation and attorney's fees. The data in this table is extracted from table at

<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2007:0165:FIN:EN:PDF>

This data indicates that, for the three EPC Member States that are most frequently designated -Germany, France and the United Kingdom, translation costs accounts for 42% of the procedural costs of acquiring a European patent designating those three States.

According to the EPO annual report of 2003, the 13 States that are designated for protection by more that 60% of patent applications are Germany, United Kingdom, France, Italy, Spain, the Netherlands, Sweden, Switzerland, Belgium, Austria, Denmark, Finland and Ireland. This block of 13 States is seen by many applicants as offering the best trade-off between maximum coverage of protection and minimum cost for further translations, still gives rise to the costs for 8 translations.

Overall, the 2003 European cost levels in procedural, and, more especially in translation terms, are far higher than in the US or Japanese cases.

The most recent figures quoted by the European Patent Organisation indicate that translation costs are about 40% of patent costs, with the average cost per translation at around €3,800. Depending on the technical field in which the patent has been granted, on

the length of the patent text and the languages involved, costs can however, go substantially higher. In 2007, there were 126 European patents granted originating from Ireland. 28 States were designated and the total cost of translations to protect the patents in the designated States is estimated at €6 million. This is a very significant cost to Industry.

Analysis of the EPO 2007 data, shows Irish industry as elsewhere took a selective cost-effective approach when designating states for patent protection. Of the 126 EPO Patents generated in Ireland during 2007, only 21 patents designated Poland for patent protection, whereas all 126 patents designated neighbouring Germany. While Germany is one of the previously mentioned group of 13 states where only 8 translations are required for validation, Poland has a population of over 38 million, an expanding economy and increasing knowledge base so its non-designation by Irish patents applicants leaves Irish industry and intellectual property vulnerable in Poland.

The London Agreement came into effect in May 2008. To date, 14 of the 35 European Patent Organisation contracting countries have signed up to the agreement. The present arrangements of these 14 are summarised in Table 2 following:

Table 2

Current Patent Translation Regimes of the 14 European Patent Organisation Contracting States which have ratified the London Agreement.

Dispensed with translation requirements - Agreement Art. 1(1) of	Requiring translation of claims in their official language - Agreement Art.1(3)	Dispensed with further (specification) translation where granted patent is in the official language prescribed by them - Agreement Art 1 (2)	Dispensed with further translation requirements with no prescribed language - Agreement Art. 1(2)
France, Germany, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Monaco, Switzerland, United Kingdom	Croatia (Croatian) Denmark (Danish) Iceland (Icelandic) Latvia (Latvian) Netherlands (Dutch) Slovenia (Slovenian) Sweden (Swedish)	Croatia (English) Denmark (English) Iceland (English) Netherlands (English) Sweden (English)	Latvia, Slovenia

Seven States have dispensed completely with the translation requirements (France, Germany, Luxembourg, Monaco, Switzerland, Liechtenstein and the United Kingdom) Therefore, translation costs for validating a patent in any of those States are completely eliminated. Latvia, Lithuania and Slovenia require the claims to be lodged in their respective national offices in their official language. Croatia, Denmark, Iceland, the Netherlands and Sweden also require the translation of the claims into one of their official languages, but will dispense with the requirement to lodge the specification if the specification is available in English. These States dispense with further translation requirements if the European patent has been granted in English or translation supplied in English after grant.

Option 2: Costs

Irish applicants seeking protection abroad would no longer be required to furnish translations to the same extent in the States which have ratified the London Agreement, so the costs involved in protecting a patent will decrease in those States, irrespective of whether we decide to ratify or not.

It is difficult to identify a loss to an Irish patent applicant if Ireland was not to sign up to the London Agreement, as the cost savings outlined in Option 1 above are applicable to all applications designating those MS which have committed to the agreement.

There would be a modest loss of revenue to the Patent Office in relation to lodgement fees for translations in the context of Ireland becoming a party to the Agreement. Currently, when patents designating Ireland are drawn up in either French or German, the applicant must lodge an English translation in the Irish Patent Office within 6 months together with a fee of €35 on filing such translations. This fee would be eliminated under Option 1 resulting in a saving for patent applicants but there would equally be a loss of revenue to the Patents Office.

Table 3

Patents Office -Number of translations received and revenue generated-2005/07

2005	1,687 translations	€59,080.00
2006	1,764 translations	€61,750.00
2007	1,495 translations	€52,337.50

Option 1: Benefits

As indicated at Table 1 above, the European patent is considerably more expensive than equivalent protection afforded in the US and Japan. The London Agreement is aimed at reducing the translations cost element accounting for a lot of these cost differences. Those European Patent Organisation Contracting States that have already ratified the Agreement have already reduced and, in some cases, eliminated their translation requirements completely. The translation cost reductions resulting are expected to particularly benefit start-ups and Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs). It is very much in line with current policy to reduce cost burdens on innovation and on productive investment projects.

Even though the cost of translating the specifications into various languages is quite significant, there is no evidence that more than a very small percentage of these translations are ever consulted. There appears to be little benefit to business maintaining the present translation arrangements, while the costs arising are quite substantial.

While adopting the London Agreement would in the Irish case involve a limited number of cases in which patent protection in Ireland would be accorded based on a patent specification available only in either French or German, the patent claim (i.e. the part of the specification defining the legal scope or extent of the protection conferred by the patent) would continue to be published in English. The abstract would also be available in English, as would, for the most part, diagrams and chemical formulae.

While there would be a modest loss of fees to the Patents Office as set out at Table 3 above, it is also likely that the new Agreement arrangements would encourage more French and German language patent applications to designate Ireland for patent protection. This could further help the Patent Office's finances, which already benefit from European Patents renewal fees. (In 2007, the Patent office generated €7.7 million from European Patents renewal fees, 50% of which accrues to the Exchequer).

Option 2: Benefits

The requirement of lodging a full translation of the patent in each designated State's national office affords much better protection to the patent holder against infringement of

their patent when the full specification is available in each State. Should the Agreement come into force in Ireland this will mean that in a number of cases where the European patent designating the State is not drawn up in English and the patent claim, while given notice of the patent may not give sufficient information to establish whether or not there is an infringement of the patent.

Likewise, an Irish patent holder may find it difficult to protect his/her patent as the patent infringer may use the defence of unknowingly infringing the patent because they did not have access to the specification in their own language.

In the two scenarios outlined above, the potential loss of revenue to the patent holder by the infringement of the patent and in the case of litigation proceeding having to be instigated, cannot be estimated but could potentially be quite significant in particular cases.

2.2 Impact Under the Following Headings if we ratify

a) Impact on National Competitiveness

The reduced cost of translations and patent processing should benefit all Irish inventors at the crucial early stage of their inventions. It should also encourage more inventors to protect their inventions through patenting. While the national innovation record has improved over recent years compared to other European countries, there is significant scope for increased use of patenting compared with other indicators commonly used to benchmark innovation progress and trends.

b) Impact on the Economic Market

Ratification of the London Agreement would benefit Irish industry by attracting new technology investors to develop their products in Ireland.

2.3 Summary of Costs, Benefits and Impact of Each Option

Option 1: Ratify

Ratification of the London Agreement would be a positive step. The very significant reduction in translations and administration costs would ease the burden of inventors and companies seeking to protect their intellectual property.

Ratifying the Agreement may encourage other States to follow and this would lead to significant savings for Irish inventors when filing in other non-English language European States and provide increased protection for Irish intellectual property abroad.

There would be a consequence in adopting the Agreement that patent protection in Ireland would be afforded in some cases on the basis of patent specifications available only in French or German. While there may be concerns that this could lead to court actions due to inadvertent infringements, the fact that the claim sets out what is being patented will continue to be provided in English should minimise such risk.

There would likely be an increase in patent applications designating Ireland arising from the fact that Ireland is an English speaking State. Again the likelihood that a larger number of patents would be validated in Ireland would potentially benefit the economy. Currently, Ireland is designated in 53% of patent applications for European patents.

Option 2: Do Not Ratify

To date, only 14 of the 35 European Patent Organisation Contracting States have ratified the Agreement so perhaps we could defer a ratification choice. We will still benefit from other States ratifying in that applicants from Ireland would benefit from others foregoing their requirement for the translation of the specification of the patent into their own languages. However, not ratifying would delay cost savings and benefits to industry and inventors.

There is the concern that Irish firms could unwittingly find themselves being sued for infringement of a European patent where the patent specification granted was in either French or German. However, this is unlikely to present particular problems for several

reasons. Firstly, the full specification will be available for inspection in the Patents Office in Kilkenny. As indicated above, the patent claim will in all cases still be available in English. Most importantly perhaps, while less than 1% of European patents ever give rise to litigation, in the case of a dispute relating to a European patent, the patent proprietor, at his own expense, must –on request– supply to the alleged infringer, a full translation into an official language of the State in which the alleged infringement took place. This is covered under Article 2 of the Agreement.

Article 2 of the London Agreement: Translations in case of dispute

“Nothing in this Agreement shall be construed as restricting the right of the States parties to this Agreement to prescribe that, in the case of a dispute relating to a European patent, the patent proprietor, at his own expense, (a) shall supply, at the request of an alleged infringer, a full translation into an official language of the State in which the alleged infringement took place, (b) shall supply, at the request of the competent court or quasi judicial authority in the course of legal proceedings, a full translation into an official language of the State concerned.”

National Patent Attorneys and specialist translation services would continue to generate revenue from validations.

2.4 Conclusion and Preferred Option

The aim of this RIA is to consider whether Ireland should ratify the London Agreement or not. Since the London Agreement came into force on the 1 May 2008 translation costs have been reduced significantly in many Member States and in some, such costs have been completely eliminated. This eases the immediate burden on inventors and companies seeking to patent their intellectual property within Europe and, as such, will aid innovation levels.

Irish ratification of the Agreement would lead to significant savings for Irish inventors when filing in other non-English language European States. Translation costs, publications fees and patent attorney fees would be reduced with the greatest saving on translation costs. For example, in 2007, there were 126 European patents granted originating from Ireland. 28 States were designated and the total cost of translations to protect the patents in the designated States is estimated at €6 million. This is a very significant cost to Industry.

Ratification is likely to lead to Ireland being designated in more patent applications and to lead to more patent –related activity in Ireland. More inventors and small and medium-sized enterprises, who do not currently patent because of the high costs involved, would see that it is in their interest to protect their intellectual property. This could only have a positive effect for Ireland as innovation facilitates economic growth through promoting better processes and products.

The continued availability of all patent claims in English and the obligation in the Agreement on the patent owner to provide a full translation, at his expense in the event of an infringement dispute, should mitigate any concerns arising from having to afford protection to patent specification available only in French or German.

Given the expected cost reduction, the increased incentive to patent and resulting innovation benefits, Ireland should ratify the London Agreement. The current positive effects from the Agreement’s ratification by the 14 European Patent Organisation Contracting States can be increased by the remaining Contracting States, including Ireland, also adding their support.

The next step is to prepare a Memorandum to Government seeking approval to amend Section 119 (6) of the Patents Act 1992 as amended by the Patent (Amendment) Act 2006 to dispense with the requirement for an English translation of the specification of a patent granted in French or German.

3. Consultation

3.1 Stakeholders Consulted

A consultation process was undertaken in the early part of 2008 on whether Ireland should ratify the London Agreement or not. The [consultation document](#) was put on the Department of Enterprise, Trade and Employment’s website and the following organisations were consulted directly: the Controller and relevant personnel in the Patents Office, the Association of Patent and Trade Marks Attorneys, IBEC, ISME, the Law Library, the Law Society and the Patents Office Users Council, (which includes members from Enterprise Ireland, the Licensing Executive Society, UCD, DCU and Microsoft Ireland).

3.2 Summary

A reasonable number of responses were received and most of the points raised were addressed in the earlier part of this RIA.

Overall, most responses favoured ratification of the Agreement on the grounds that any measure that seeks to reduce both the cost and administrative burden on applicants seeking patent protection in Ireland and Europe should be encouraged. Ratification of the Agreement was highlighted in a number of submissions as important for Irish SMEs.

Two submissions that strongly favoured the ratification of the London Agreement pointed out that the patent system in Europe is considered more expensive than in other jurisdictions and that Ireland should do everything possible to make the European patent as cost effective as possible. It is vital to keep Ireland on a level playing field with other States who either have ratified or intend to ratify. Both these submissions indicated that a considerable number of their clients would favour ratifying the London Agreement and suggested that businesses located in those States, which have ratified, would have a competitive edge in attracting new technology investors.

In the absence of a Community Patent, ratification of the London Agreement was seen as offering something in terms of reducing patent costs.

On the advantages of not ratifying, it was observed that if the agreement is implemented in Ireland, this would result in a considerable increase in the number of patents having legal force in Ireland emanating from French and German-speaking countries, without any up-take in the number of Irish originating patents. It was observed that the agreement will do nothing to encourage Irish industry to innovate and would have the opposite effect by enabling foreign companies to obtain legal rights in Ireland.

Another reason put forward for not ratifying is that an Irish company seeking to understand the scope of a non-English language European patent would have to request the translation from the country of origin rather than it being available in the Irish Patent Office for immediate inspection.

4. Enforcement and Compliance

There are no enforcement or compliance issues. No one is obliged to apply for a patent and, equally, while it does have certain enforcement functions, the Patent Office is not primarily an enforcement agency. As Ireland's accession to the Agreement is deemed to be in the national interest, the matter will be brought before the Government for its approval to ratify the Agreement and, as a prelude, to amend Section 119 of the Patents Act, 1992 as amended by the Patents (Amendment) Act 2006.

The changes in the legislation to enable such ratification would mean that Ireland, having English, as an official language, would have to dispense with the requirement to seek a translation of European patents drawn up in French or German.

However, as indicated earlier, the patent claims -that is -the part of the patent documentation, that defines what the patent protects, and which have always had to be published in the three official EPO languages (including English) will continue to be so published under the London Agreement

The change to primary legislation would have to be enacted before we could ratify the Agreement.

5. Review

The annual report of the Patents Office (http://www.patentsoffice.ie/en/publications_report.aspx) provides information on the number of patents granted by the EPO to applicants from within the State and the EPO's annual report (<http://www.epo.org/about-us/office/annual-reports.html>) provides statistics on the number of patents granted that designate Ireland. These statistics will enable the monitoring of the effect of the London Agreement on patent activity into the future.

In the unlikely event that the London Agreement would have a negative affect on patent activity in Ireland, there is an exit clause in the agreement as follows:

Article 8 of the London Agreement–Denunciation

“Any State party to this Agreement may denounce it at any time, once the Agreement has been in force for three years. Notification of denunciation shall be given to the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany. The denunciation shall take effect one year after the date of receipt of such notification. No rights acquired pursuant to this Agreement before the denunciation took effect shall thereby be impaired.”

6. References

Documents referred to in this RIA are listed below

[Agreement on the application of Article 65 of the Convention on the Grant of European Patents](#)

[http://documents.epo.org/projects/babylon/eponet.nsf/0/7FD20618D28E9FBFC125743900678657/\\$File/London_Agreement.pdf](http://documents.epo.org/projects/babylon/eponet.nsf/0/7FD20618D28E9FBFC125743900678657/$File/London_Agreement.pdf)

[Enhancing the Patent System in Europe](#) European Commission. Brussels 3 April 2007:
<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2007:0165:FIN:EN:PDF>

[Consultation on the Optional Agreement on the Application of Article 65 of the European Patent Convention- London Agreement](#)
<http://www.entemp.ie/science/ipr/londonagreeconsulta.pdf>

Annual Report of the Patents Office

http://www.patentsoffice.ie/en/publications_report.aspx

EPO's Annual Reports

<http://www.epo.org/about-us/office/annual-reports.html>

Annex 1

Tables showing EPO Patents designating Ireland, and EPO Patents originating from Ireland with State of designation.

Granted EPO Patents designating Ireland																		
	AT	BE	BG	CH	CY	CZ	DE	DK		EE	ES	FI	FR	GB	GR	HU		
2005	396	330	4	1,341	6	16	6,427	368		3	248	522	2,331	1,625	11	28		
2006	543	422	4	1,639	13	14	8,030	464		2	307	669	3,090	1,784	29	32		
2007	421	408	6	1,569	12	29	7,351	401		4	298	614	2,896	1,565	13	34		
	IE	IS	IT	LI	LT	LU	LV	MC	MT	NL	PL	PT	RO	SE	SI	SK	TR	<u>Total</u>
2005	94	17	1,342	62	1	64	0	8		929	12	17	3	929	22	6	19	17,181
2006	106	6	1,739	77	0	51	2	9		1,326	11	19	0	1,125	19	6	31	21,569*
2007	112	11	1,547	66	1	64	3	15	0	1,380	25	19	4	1,262	13	9	36	20,188*

In the EPO tables supplied, the contracting states across the top of the table amalgamate CH and LI as CH/LI but the table on the left-hand side shows CH and LI separately.

The totals for 2006 and 2007 were not shown on the EPO tables but rather computed by totalling the figures provided in the tables.

Granted EPO Patents originating from Ireland and designating as indicated

	<u>AT</u>	<u>BE</u>	<u>BG</u>	<u>CH/LI*</u>	<u>CY</u>	<u>CZ</u>	<u>DE</u>		<u>DK</u>	<u>EE</u>	<u>ES</u>	<u>FI</u>	<u>FR</u>	<u>GB</u>	<u>GR</u>	<u>HU</u>
2005 (116)	100	102	21	100	89	21	113		99	21	105	96	113	110	97	7
2006 (121)	111	111	41	112	105	41	121		111	41	112	110	119	115	111	24
2007 (126)	117	118	66	118	112	67	126		118	66	118	116	126	122	117	51
	<u>IE</u>	<u>IS</u>	<u>IT</u>	<u>LT</u>	<u>LU</u>	<u>LV</u>	<u>MC</u>	<u>MT</u>	<u>NL</u>	<u>PL</u>	<u>PT</u>	<u>RO</u>	<u>SE</u>	<u>SI</u>	<u>SK</u>	<u>TR</u>
2005	94	0	0	0	95	0	95		105	1	98	5	98	8	21	55
2006	106	2	110	1	110	0	108		112	9	111	21	112	27	41	81
2007	112	11	14	9	117	4	117	0	118	21	117	50	119	53	66	99

In the EPO tables supplied, the contracting states across the top of the table amalgamate CH and LI as CH/LI but the table on the left-hand side shows CH and LI separately.