

Guidelines for Examination in the European Patent Office

April 2026

ISBN 978-3-89605-415-9

DOI 10.65216/20260401-0010

epo.org

Published by the European Patent Office (EPO)
Principal Directorate 5.3 – Patent Law and Procedures
80298 Munich
Germany
patentlaw@epo.org

© EPO 2026
ISBN 978-3-89605-415-9
DOI 10.65216/20260401-0010

Guidelines for Examination in the European Patent Office

April 2026

List of Contents

General Part

Contents	a
1. Preliminary remarks	1
2. Explanatory notes on how to use the Guidelines	2
3. Procedures covered and guidance provided	6
4. Work at the EPO to guarantee quality, equal treatment and equal service levels	8
5. The use of artificial intelligence	9
6. Summary of the processing of Euro-direct and Euro-PCT applications and European patents at the EPO	10
7. Contracting states to the EPC	12
8. Extension to and validation in states not party to the EPC	13
9. Unitary Patent protection	13

Part A Guidelines for Formalities Examination

Contents	a
Chapter I Introduction	I-1
Chapter II Filing of Euro-direct applications and examination on filing	II-1
Chapter III Examination of formal requirements	III-1
Chapter IV Special provisions	IV-1
Chapter V Communications concerning formal deficiencies; amendment of application; correction of errors	V-1

Chapter VI	Publication of application; request for examination and transmission of the dossier to examining division	<u>VI-1</u>
Chapter VII	Languages	<u>VII-1</u>
Chapter VIII	Common provisions	<u>VIII-1</u>
Chapter IX	Drawings	<u>IX-1</u>
Chapter X	Fees	<u>X-1</u>
Chapter XI	Inspection of files; communication of information contained in files; consultation of the European Patent Register; issue of certified copies	<u>XI-1</u>
Chapter XII	Euro-PCT applications in the European phase before the EPO as designated/elected Office	<u>XII-1</u>
Chapter XIII	Examination of minimum and further requirements for entry into the European phase – legal consequences – remedies	<u>XIII-1</u>
Chapter XIV	Amendments and claims fee under Rules 161 and 162 – Supplementary European search – Examination – Search under Rule 164	<u>XIV-1</u>
Chapter XV	Review and correction of errors and omissions	<u>XV-1</u>

Part B – Guidelines for Search

Contents		a
Chapter I	Introduction	I-1
Chapter II	General	II-1
Chapter III	Characteristics of the search	III-1
Chapter IV	Search procedure and strategy	IV-1
Chapter V	Preclassification, IPC and CPC classification of European patent applications	V-1
Chapter VI	The state of the art at the search stage	VI-1
Chapter VII	Unity of invention	VII-1

Chapter VIII	Subject-matter to be excluded from the search	<u>VIII-1</u>
Chapter IX	Search documentation	<u>IX-1</u>
Chapter X	Search report	<u>X-1</u>
Chapter XI	The search opinion	<u>XI-1</u>

Part C – Guidelines for Procedural Aspects of Substantive Examination

Contents		<u>a</u>
Chapter I	Introduction	<u>I-1</u>
Chapter II	Formal requirements to be met before the division starts substantive examination	<u>II-1</u>
Chapter III	The first stage of examination	<u>III-1</u>
Chapter IV	Examination of replies and further stages of examination	<u>IV-1</u>
Chapter V	The final stage of examination	<u>V-1</u>
Annex	Standard marks for indicating amendments or corrections by the divisions	<u>V-19</u>
Chapter VI	Time limits and acceleration of examination	<u>VI-1</u>
Chapter VII	Other procedures in examination	<u>VII-1</u>
Chapter VIII	Work within the examining division	<u>VIII-1</u>
Chapter IX	Special applications	<u>IX-1</u>

Part D – Guidelines for Opposition and Limitation/Revocation Procedures

Contents		<u>a</u>
Chapter I	General remarks	<u>I-1</u>
Chapter II	The opposition division	<u>II-1</u>

Chapter III	Opposition	III-1
Chapter IV	Procedure up to substantive examination	IV-1
Chapter V	Substantive examination of opposition	V-1
Chapter VI	Procedure for the examination of the opposition	VI-1
Chapter VII	Details and special features of the proceedings	VII-1
Chapter VIII	Decisions of the opposition division	VIII-1
Chapter IX	Costs	IX-1
Chapter X	Limitation and revocation procedure	X-1

Part E – Guidelines on General Procedural Matters

Contents		a
Chapter I	Introduction	I-1
Chapter II	Communications and notifications	II-1
Chapter III	Oral proceedings	III-1
Chapter IV	Taking and conservation of evidence	IV-1
Chapter V	Derogating from the language of the proceedings at oral proceedings	V-1
Chapter VI	Examination by the EPO of its own motion; facts, evidence or grounds not submitted in due time; observations by third parties	VI-1
Chapter VII	Interruption, stay and consolidation of the proceedings	VII-1
Chapter VIII	Time limits, loss of rights, further and accelerated processing and re-establishment of rights	VIII-1
Chapter IX	Decisions	IX-1
Chapter X	Impartiality of divisions	X-1
Chapter XI	Appeals	XI-1

Chapter XII	Request from a national court for a technical opinion concerning a European patent	XII-1
Chapter XIII	Registration of changes of name, transfers, licences and other rights	XIII-1

Part F – The European Patent Application

Contents	a
Chapter I	Introduction
	I-1
Chapter II	Content of a European patent application (other than claims)
	II-1
Annex 1	Checklist for considering the abstract (see F-II, 2.5)
	II-17
Annex 2	Units recognised in international practice as determined by the President under Rule 49(2) (see F-II, 4.13)*
	II-18
Chapter III	Sufficiency of disclosure
	III-1
Chapter IV	Claims (Art. 84 and formal requirements)
	IV-1
Annex	Examples of essential features
	IV-43
Chapter V	Unity of invention
	V-1
Chapter VI	Priority
	VI-1

Part G – Patentability

Contents	a
Chapter I	Patentability
	I-1
Chapter II	Inventions
	II-1
Chapter III	Industrial application
	III-51
Chapter IV	State of the art
	IV-1
Chapter V	Non-prejudicial disclosures
	V-1

Chapter VI	Novelty	<u>VI-1</u>
Chapter VII	Inventive step	<u>VII-1</u>
Annex	Examples relating to the requirement of inventive step – indicators	<u>VII-26</u>

Part H – Amendments and Corrections

Contents		<u>a</u>
Chapter I	The right to amend	<u>I-1</u>
Chapter II	Admissibility of amendments – general rules	<u>II-1</u>
Chapter III	Admissibility of amendments – other procedural matters	<u>III-1</u>
Chapter IV	Allowability of amendments	<u>IV-1</u>
Chapter V	Allowability of amendments – examples	<u>V-1</u>
Chapter VI	Correction of errors	<u>VI-1</u>

Index for Computer-Implemented Inventions 1

Guidelines for Examination Alphabetical keyword index 1

List of sections amended in 2026 revision 1

General Part

Contents

1.	Preliminary remarks	1
1.1	How the Guidelines are published and kept up to date	1
1.2	Suggestions for improvements	2
2.	Explanatory notes on how to use the Guidelines	2
2.1	Overview of the contents of the Guidelines	2

Each part of the Guidelines is divided into chapters, each subdivided into numbered sections that may be further divided into subsections. Cross-references to other sections include the relevant letter of that part, followed by the chapter number (a Roman numeral) and then the section or subsection number (e.g. C-V, 4.6 would be used to refer to subsection 4.6 of chapter V of Part C).

2.2 Abbreviations, terms and references 3

3.	Procedures covered and guidance provided	6
3.1	"Euro-direct route"	6
3.2	"Euro-PCT route", "international phase" and "European phase"	6
3.3	Law applicable to Euro-direct, Euro-PCT and international applications	7
3.4	Character of the guidance provided	7
3.5	Proceedings not covered	8
4.	Work at the EPO to guarantee quality, equal treatment and equal service levels	8
5.	The use of artificial intelligence	9
6.	Summary of the processing of Euro-direct and Euro-PCT applications and European patents at the EPO	10
6.1	Procedural steps in the processing of a Euro-direct application	10
6.2	Procedural steps in the processing of a Euro-PCT application	11
7.	Contracting states to the EPC	12

8.	Extension to and validation in states not party to the EPC	<u>13</u>
9.	Unitary Patent protection	<u>13</u>

1. Preliminary remarks

In accordance with Art. 10(2)(a) of the European Patent Convention (EPC), the President of the European Patent Office (EPO) had adopted, effective as at 1 June 1978, the Guidelines for Examination in the European Patent Office.

Any references to persons made in the Guidelines are to be understood as being gender-neutral.

1.1 How the Guidelines are published and kept up to date

These Guidelines are updated every year in April to take account of developments in European patent law and practice. Usually, updates involve amendments to specific sentences or passages on individual pages to bring the text into line with patent law and EPO practice as these continue to evolve. It follows that no update can ever claim to be complete. In general, each edition is updated to reflect the situation as at 1 December of the previous year.

The **binding** version of the Guidelines for Examination in the European Patent Office is published by the EPO in searchable HTML format and as a PDF file on the EPO website ([epo.org](https://www.epo.org)).

Both the HTML and PDF versions of the Guidelines contain:

- (a) a non-exhaustive alphabetical keyword index
- (b) an index of computer-implemented inventions (CII), with a collection of direct hyperlinks to the relevant chapters in the Guidelines
- (c) a full list of the sections that have been amended, together with the corresponding hyperlinks.

In the HTML publication, modifications can be viewed by selecting the **Show modifications** box in the upper right corner, which displays inserted text with a green background and deleted text in red strikethrough font. For sections in which no changes have been made, the selection box is greyed out.

1.2 Suggestions for improvements

Users are invited to provide feedback on the most recent edition of the Guidelines in a public consultation each spring. Further suggestions for additions or improvements are welcome at any time and may be sent by email to Guidelines@epo.org.

2. Explanatory notes on how to use the Guidelines

2.1 Overview of the contents of the Guidelines

The main body of these Guidelines comprises the following eight parts:

<u>Part A:</u>	Guidelines for Formalities Examination
<u>Part B:</u>	Guidelines for Search
<u>Part C:</u>	Guidelines for Procedural Aspects of Substantive Examination
<u>Part D:</u>	Guidelines for Opposition and Limitation/Revocation Procedures
<u>Part E:</u>	Guidelines on General Procedural Matters
<u>Part F:</u>	The European Patent Application
<u>Part G:</u>	Patentability
<u>Part H:</u>	Amendments and Corrections

Part A deals with the procedures for formalities examination mainly with regard to grant proceedings in respect of both Euro-direct applications and Euro-PCT applications (see General Part, 3).

Part B deals with search matters.

Part C and Part D relate to procedures to be followed in examination and opposition proceedings, respectively.

Part E deals with general procedural matters relevant to several or all of the stages in procedures before the EPO.

Part F deals with the requirements which the application must fulfil other than patentability, in particular unity of invention (Art. 82), sufficiency of

disclosure (Art. 83), clarity (Art. 84) and the right to priority (Art. 87 to Art. 89).

Part G deals with the requirements of patentability provided for in Art. 52 to Art. 57, in particular exclusions from patentability (Art. 52(2) and Art. 53), novelty (Art. 54), inventive step (Art. 56) and industrial application (Art. 57).

Part H deals with the requirements relating to amendments and corrections. It relates in particular to questions of admissibility (Rule 80 and Rule 137) and compliance with Art. 123(2) and (3), Rule 139 and Rule 140.

Information on the most recent updates and editions of the Guidelines, including their date of entry into force, is published annually in the January edition of the EPO's Official Journal. A list of the corresponding publications is available on the EPO website (epo.org).

Re April 2026 update:	<u>OJ EPO 2026, A4</u>
Re April 2025 update:	<u>OJ EPO 2025, A4</u>
Re March 2024 update:	<u>OJ EPO 2024, A9</u>
Re March 2023 update:	<u>OJ EPO 2023, A6</u>
Re March 2022 update:	<u>OJ EPO 2022, A10</u>
Re March 2021 update:	<u>OJ EPO 2021, A6</u>
Re November 2019 update:	<u>OJ EPO 2019, A80</u>
Re November 2018 update:	<u>OJ EPO 2018, A73</u>
Re November 2017 update:	<u>OJ EPO 2017, A75</u>
Re November 2016 update:	<u>OJ EPO 2016, A76</u>
Re November 2015 update:	<u>OJ EPO 2015, A74</u>
Re November 2014 update:	<u>OJ EPO 2014, A88</u>
Re September 2013 update:	<u>OJ EPO 2013, 447</u>
Re June 2012 update:	<u>OJ EPO 2012, 420</u>
Re April 2010 update:	<u>OJ EPO 2010, 230</u>
Re April 2009 update:	<u>OJ EPO 2009, 336</u>
Re December 2007 update:	<u>OJ EPO 2007, 589</u>
Re June 2005 update:	<u>OJ EPO 2005, 440</u>
Re December 2003 update:	<u>OJ EPO 2003, 582</u>
Re October 2001 update:	<u>OJ EPO 2001, 464</u>
Re February 2001 update:	<u>OJ EPO 2001, 115</u>
Re June 2000 update:	<u>OJ EPO 2000, 228</u>

Each part of the Guidelines is divided into chapters, each subdivided into numbered sections that may be further divided into subsections. Cross-references to other sections include the relevant letter of that part, followed by the chapter number (a Roman numeral) and then the section or subsection number (e.g. C-V, 4.6 would be used to refer to subsection 4.6 of chapter V of Part C).2.2 Abbreviations, terms and references

In the Guidelines, the following abbreviations are used:

AAD	Arrangements for the automatic debiting procedure
ADA	Arrangements for deposit accounts
Art.	Article
BNS	Back-file conversion numerical system
EESR	Extended European Search Report

EPC	European Patent Convention
EPO	European Patent Office
ESOP	European Search Opinion (Rule 62)
EU	European Union
EVL	Electronic virtual library
IPEA	International Preliminary Examining Authority
IPER	International Preliminary Examination Report
IPRP	International Preliminary Report on Patentability
ISA	International Searching Authority
ISR	International search report
OJ EPO	Official Journal of the European Patent Office
PCT	Patent Cooperation Treaty
Prot. Art. 69	Protocol on the Interpretation of Art. 69 EPC
Prot. Centr.	Protocol on the Centralisation of the European patent system and on its introduction (Protocol on Centralisation)
rec.	Recital
RFees	Rules relating to Fees
SISA	Supplementary International Searching Authority
UP	Unitary Patent / European patent with unitary effect
WIPO	World Intellectual Property Organization
WO-ISA	Written Opinion of the International Searching Authority
IA	International Authority

References to the EPC are references to the European Patent Convention as amended by the Act revising the EPC of 29 November 2000 and the decision of the Administrative Council of 28 June 2001 adopting the new text of the European Patent Convention (OJ EPO Special editions No. 4/2001, OJ EPO Special editions No. 1/2003, pages 3 *et seq*; OJ EPO Special editions No. 1/2007, pages 1 to 88) and the Implementing Regulations as adopted by decision of the Administrative Council of 7 December 2006 (OJ EPO Special edition No. 1/2007, pages 89 *et seq*) and as subsequently amended by decisions of the Administrative Council of 6 March 2008 (OJ EPO 2008, 124), 21 October 2008 (OJ EPO 2008, 513), 25 March 2009 (OJ EPO 2009, 296, and OJ EPO 2009, 299), 27 October 2009 (OJ EPO 2009, 582), 28 October 2009 (OJ EPO 2009, 585), 26 October 2010 (OJ EPO 2010, 568, OJ EPO 2010, 634, and OJ EPO 2010, 637), 27 June 2012 (OJ EPO 2012, 442), 16 October 2013 (OJ EPO 2013, 501, and OJ EPO 2013, 503), 13 December 2013 (OJ EPO 2014, A3, and OJ EPO 2014, A4), 15 October 2014 (OJ EPO 2015, A17), 14 October 2015 (OJ EPO 2015, A82, and OJ EPO 2015, A83), 30 June 2016 (OJ EPO 2016, A100), 14 December 2016 (OJ EPO 2016, A102), 28 June 2017 (OJ EPO 2017, A55), 29 June 2017 (OJ EPO 2017, A56), 13 December 2017 (OJ EPO 2018, A2), 28 June 2018 (OJ EPO 2018, A57), 28 March 2019 (OJ EPO 2019, A31), 12 December 2019 (OJ EPO 2020, A5), 27 March 2020 (OJ EPO 2020, A36), 15 December 2020 (OJ EPO 2020, A132, and OJ EPO 2021, A3), 14 December 2021 (OJ EPO 2022, A3), 13 October 2022 (OJ EPO 2022, A101), 14 December 2023 (OJ EPO 2024, A3, OJ EPO 2024, A16) and 10 December 2024 (OJ EPO 2024, A105, and OJ EPO 2025, A16).

Where necessary, reference is made to the European Patent Convention of 5 October 1973 as amended by the act revising Article 63 EPC of 17 December 1991 and by the decisions of the Administrative Council of 21 December 1978, 13 December 1994, 20 October 1995, 5 December 1996, 10 December 1998 and 27 October 2005.

References to articles and rules – and their paragraphs – of EPC 2000 are as follows: "Article 123, paragraph 2" is: "Art. 123(2)", "Rule 29, paragraph 7" is: "Rule 29(7)". Articles and rules of EPC 1973, of the PCT and articles of the Rules relating to Fees are referred to in a similar way, e.g. "Art. 54(4) EPC 1973", "Art. 33(1) PCT" and "Art. 10(1) RFees" respectively. Only where deemed appropriate, i.e. in order to avoid confusion, references to articles and rules of the EPC are provided with the extension "EPC 2000".

References to articles and rules and their paragraphs of EPC 2000 are normally given without the extension "EPC 2000" as follows:

- Article 123, paragraph 2: Art. 123(2)
- Rule 29(7), paragraph 7: Rule 29(7)

The extension "EPC 2000" is only added exceptionally where articles and rules of EPC 2000 and EPC 1973 are quoted next to each other.

Articles and rules of EPC 1973, the PCT and the Rules relating to Fees are generally referred to with the extension added, e.g.:

- Art. 54(4) EPC 1973, Rule 19(1) EPC 1973
- Art. 33(1) PCT
- Art. 10(1) RFees

Marginal references to articles and rules without further identification indicate the articles or rules of the EPC as the legal basis for what is stated in the text.

Decisions and opinions of the Enlarged Board of Appeal will only be referred to with their capital letter and their number, e.g. "G 2/88". Decisions of the technical boards of appeal and the Legal Board of Appeal will be referred to in the same way, e.g. "T 152/82", "J 4/91" and "T 169/88". References to decisions of the Court of Appeal of the Unified Patent Court, where relevant and applicable, are referred to as "UPC CoA". All decisions and opinions of the Enlarged Board of Appeal and all decisions of the boards of appeal of the EPO are published on the EPO website (*epo.org*).

The arrangements for deposit accounts and their annexes, including the arrangements for the automatic debiting procedure plus explanatory notes, are published in the Official Journal of the EPO.

3. Procedures covered and guidance provided

These Guidelines provide guidance on the practice in proceedings before the EPO in respect of "Euro-direct applications" (see General Part, 3.1) and in proceedings before the EPO as designated/elected Office in respect of "Euro-PCT applications" (see General Part, 3.2). Several relevant terms in that context are defined in General Part 3.3.

The character and aim of the guidance given in these Guidelines is clarified in General Part, 3.4.

Procedures not covered in these Guidelines are mentioned in General Part, 3.5.

3.1 "Euro-direct route"

The terms "Euro-direct route" and "Euro-direct application" refer to the procedure for and origin of a European patent application respectively. If a European patent application is filed directly under the EPC, the European Patent Convention and its Implementing Regulations apply. In this context, it is noted that the terms "Euro-direct" and "EP-direct" are both used in EPO publications to refer to an application filed under the EPC. These Guidelines use the term "Euro-direct" only.

3.2 "Euro-PCT route", "international phase" and "European phase"

An application filed under the PCT is generally referred to by both terms "international application" and "PCT application". Since all PCT contracting states are designated in the international application by default, such an application has the effect of a regular European application ("Euro-PCT application") from the date of filing (Art. 11(3) PCT, Art. 153(2) EPC, see A-XII 1.1 and 2.1). Therefore, the EPO must grant a European patent for such applications under Art. 97 EPC in combination with Art. 2 EPC if all conditions for the grant of a European patent are fulfilled.

The term "Euro-PCT application" is used in these Guidelines to refer to international applications in the procedure before the EPO as designated/elected Office (A-XII, 2).

The terms "Euro-PCT route" and "Euro-PCT application" thus refer – like the terms "Euro-direct route" and "Euro-direct application" – to the procedure for and origin of a European patent application. They provide an indication of the law applicable to the European patent application concerned, as set out in General Part, 3.3.

All proceedings relating to a PCT application before the EPO or another patent office acting as receiving Office, (S)ISA and/or IPEA are referred to as the "international phase" of an international application (General Part, 3.5). The proceedings relating to a PCT application before the EPO as designated/elected Office are referred to as proceedings in the "European phase" (A-XII, 1.2).

The European-phase processing of an international application starts once the EPO has become competent to act as designated/elected Office

(A-XII, 3). For information on the terms "designated" and "elected" Office in such proceedings, see A-XII, 2.1 and 2.2.

3.3 Law applicable to Euro-direct, Euro-PCT and international applications

The terms "Euro-direct", "Euro-PCT" and "international" give an indication both of the law applicable as a consequence of the filing route chosen and of the procedural stage of the proceedings before the EPO.

In the case of the Euro-direct route, the entire European patent grant procedure is governed solely by the EPC. With regard to the Euro-PCT route, the first phase of the grant procedure (the international phase) is primarily regulated by the provisions of the PCT, while the processing in the European phase before the EPO as designated/elected Office is governed primarily by the EPC. In both procedural stages, however, the PCT prevails (Art. 150(2) EPC, see A-XII, 1.1).

If an international application is subject to proceedings before the EPO in any of its roles under the PCT, the legal basis for any such EPO activity is provided for in the EPC, Part X (see A-XII, 1). Arts. 150 to 153 oblige and allow the EPO to act as receiving Office, International Authority (IA), i.e. (S)ISA and IPEA, and designated/elected Office in accordance with the principle of precedence of the PCT and supplementary application of the EPC (Art. 150).

3.4 Character of the guidance provided

The present Guidelines are primarily for examiners and formalities officers of the EPO, but are also intended to serve the parties to the proceedings and patent practitioners as a basis for illustrating the law and practice in proceedings before the EPO. As a general rule, party to the proceedings denotes the applicant, the patent proprietor or the opponent and, if the party is represented, their representative (see A-VIII, 1).

The Guidelines cannot cover all possible occurrences and exceptions in every detail but must be regarded as general instructions that may need to be adapted to the individual case.

The application of the Guidelines to individual European patent applications or patents is the responsibility of the formalities officers and examiners. As a general rule, parties may expect the EPO to act in accordance with the Guidelines until the EPO announces a change of practice or until such time as the Guidelines – or the relevant legal provisions – are amended. Notices concerning such amendments or changes of practice are published in the Official Journal of the EPO available on the EPO website (epo.org).

Furthermore, it should be noted that the Guidelines do not constitute legal provisions. For the ultimate authority on practice in the EPO, it is necessary to refer firstly to the European Patent Convention itself, including any international treaties it refers to (such as the PCT), the Implementing Regulations, the Protocol on the Interpretation of Article 69 EPC, the Protocol on Centralisation, the Protocol on Recognition, the Protocol on Privileges and Immunities and the Rules relating to Fees, and secondly to

the interpretation put upon the EPC by the boards of appeal and the Enlarged Board of Appeal.

Where a decision or an opinion of the Enlarged Board of Appeal is referred to, this is to inform the reader that the practice described has been adopted to take account of the decision or opinion referred to. The same applies where decisions of the Legal Board of Appeal or technical boards of appeal are explicitly referred to.

While decisions of the Legal Board of Appeal or technical boards of appeal may on occasion diverge from the common practice, EPO examiners and formalities officers will, as a rule, follow the practice described in the Guidelines, which applies until further notice. Furthermore, the Guidelines reflect only those decisions of the boards of appeal incorporated into the EPO's general practice due to their general procedural significance; they do not take into account any deviating decisions taken in an individual case, given that the binding effect referred to in Art. 111(2) applies to that specific case only.

As regards search, the EPO also carries out searches for national patent applications from certain countries. The instructions in Part B apply in the main also to such searches.

3.5 Proceedings not covered

The proceedings under the PCT are referred to as the "international phase" of an international application. The international-phase proceedings before the EPO as receiving Office, (S)ISA and/or IPEA are addressed in the Guidelines for Search and Examination at the EPO as PCT Authority ("PCT-EPO Guidelines").

Except for important aspects relating to interlocutory revision, the appeal procedure is not dealt with in these Guidelines.

Nor do these Guidelines deal with proceedings relating to Unitary Patent protection (Regulations (EU) No 1257/2012 and No 1260/2012, OJ EPO 2013, 111, and 132) other than those aspects arising during the European patent grant procedure (see C-IV, 7.2) or, for example, for requesting unitary effect for the granted patent (see C-V, 2.1). All other aspects relating to the Unitary Patent system are dealt with in the Unitary Patent Guidelines ("UP Guidelines") (see General Part, 9).

4. Work at the EPO to guarantee quality, equal treatment and equal service levels

The setting up of the EPO represented a major step forward in the history of patents. Its reputation depends on all employees, regardless of nationality, working harmoniously together and giving of their best. But it is on the search, examination and opposition, more than anything else, that the EPO will be judged by the patent world.

Therefore, and given its status as a public authority, the EPO must ensure equal treatment and equal service levels within the limits of the law in all proceedings related to applications and patents regardless of their country

of origin, the language in which they are written or whether they were filed as a Euro-direct or a Euro-PCT application.

Employees of the EPO work with colleagues who not only speak a different language but also come from a different patent background with different training. Some may also have had experience in their national patent office. It is therefore important to mention that all employees in the EPO are working under a common system as laid down in the EPC.

These Guidelines support EPO staff in applying the same standards, thus contributing to patent quality and equal treatment in the processing of all patent applications under the EPC. They therefore help to achieve transparency as to what applicants and the public may expect of the EPO.

A further purpose of the Guidelines is to make clear how the areas of responsibility are distributed among the different departments, e.g. the Receiving Section, the examining or opposition divisions, in order to harmonise the working processes and to avoid duplicate work.

Finally, it should not be forgotten that the reputation of the EPO depends not only on the quality of its work products as such but also on the timeliness with which it delivers them. The EPC imposes various time limits on the parties. The European patent system will be judged a success only when examiners and other employees also operate within reasonable time frames.

5. The use of artificial intelligence

The parties are responsible for the content of their patent applications and submissions to the EPO and for complying with the requirements of the EPC and/or PCT regardless of whether a document has been prepared with the assistance of an artificial intelligence (AI) tool.

Artificial intelligence can improve the quality and efficiency of the EPO and may support its work in many areas. While leveraging AI, the EPO remains mindful of the ethical and legal considerations. Its dedicated AI policy (see epo.org/web/about-us/transparency-portal/en-epo-ai-policy.pdf) clearly defines roles, responsibilities and procedures to ensure a human-centric approach.

6. Summary of the processing of Euro-direct and Euro-PCT applications and European patents at the EPO

The processing of Euro-direct and Euro-PCT applications, including the grant of a European patent for any such application, is carried out in a number of distinct procedural steps which are summarised below. Whether from the Receiving Section, an examining division, an opposition division or the Legal Division, any decision which adversely affects a party is appealable and, thus, subject to review before a board of appeal of the EPO.

6.1 Procedural steps in the processing of a Euro-direct application

The processing of a Euro-direct application may be summarised as follows:

1. The application is filed with the EPO or a competent national authority.
2. The Receiving Section examines the application to determine if a date of filing can be accorded to the application.
3. The Receiving Section carries out the formalities examination of the application.
4. Once the Receiving Section has established that the application complies with the formal requirements, the search division draws up an extended European search report (EESR).
5. The application and the search report are published by the EPO either together (A1) or separately (A2 followed by A3).
6. On receipt of a request for examination from the applicant or, if the request for examination has been filed before the search report has been transmitted to the applicant, on confirmation from the applicant that they desire to move ahead with the European patent application, the application proceeds to substantive examination.
7. Provided the requirements of the EPC are met, the examining division grants a European patent for the states designated.
8. The specification of the European patent is published by the EPO (B1 publication) and, on the same day, the mention of the grant is published in the European Patent Bulletin.
9. The patent proprietor may file a request for unitary effect up to one month after the date of publication of the mention of the grant in the European Patent Bulletin, provided the requirements for this are met.
10. Within three months of the date of mention of the grant of the European patent in the European Patent Bulletin, the applicant can validate the European patent in any of the EPC contracting states and any of the designated extension and validation states.

11. Within nine months of the date of publication of the mention of the grant of the European patent in the European Patent Bulletin (and the B1 publication), any person may give notice of opposition to the European patent granted. After examining the opposition, the opposition division decides whether to reject the opposition, maintain the patent in amended form or revoke the patent.
12. The patent proprietor may request limitation or revocation of the granted European patent; the examining division will decide on this request.
13. If the European patent is amended, the EPO publishes a new specification of the European patent amended accordingly (B2 after opposition or B3 after limitation).

6.2 Procedural steps in the processing of a Euro-PCT application

A European patent application may also be filed via the PCT route as a Euro-PCT application (see General Part, 3.2). Since the processing in the European phase is partly determined by the international-phase processing, the procedural elements of that procedure are set out below (see also A-XII, 1.3-1.4).

Procedural steps in the international phase

1. The international application is filed with a competent receiving Office designating the EPO (i.e. a Euro-PCT application).
2. International search is performed by an ISA.
3. The international application and the international search report are published by the International Bureau of WIPO either together (A1) or separately (A2 followed by A3).
4. Once the ISR is issued, the applicant may decide to file a demand for international preliminary examination under Chapter II PCT, electing the EPO as IPEA (A XII, 2.2).
5. If the international search has been carried out by an office other than the EPO, the applicant may ask the EPO to perform a supplementary international search (SIS) in its capacity as SISA.

Procedural steps in the European phase

6. The applicant indicates that they wish to start the procedure for the grant of a European patent before the EPO as designated/elected Office.
7. The Receiving Section checks whether all formal requirements for the start of the processing in the European phase are met (see A XII, 3).
8. The translation of the application, if applicable, is published.

9. After expiry of the time limit for filing amendments under Rule 161(2), the search division draws up a supplementary European search report.
10. On condition that the request for examination has been filed or, if the request for examination has been filed before the supplementary European search report's transmission to the applicant, on confirmation from the applicant that they desire to move ahead with the European patent application, the application proceeds to substantive examination.
11. Where the EPO acted as ISA, the supplementary European search report is dispensed with, and the application proceeds to substantive examination after expiry of the time limit under Rule 161(1), provided a valid reply to the communication has been filed.
12. See steps 7-12 under General Part, 6.1, which also apply to Euro-PCT applications.

7. Contracting states to the EPC

The following states are contracting states* to the EPC (date of effect of the ratification in brackets). All EPC contracting states are also PCT contracting states (A-XII, 2):

Albania	(1 May 2010)
Austria	(1 May 1979)
Belgium	(7 October 1977)
Bulgaria	(1 July 2002)
Croatia	(1 January 2008)
Cyprus	(1 April 1998)
Czech Republic	(1 July 2002)
Denmark ¹	(1 January 1990)
Estonia	(1 July 2002)
Finland	(1 March 1996)
France ²	(7 October 1977)
Germany	(7 October 1977)
Greece	(1 October 1986)
Hungary	(1 January 2003)
Iceland	(1 November 2004)
Ireland	(1 August 1992)
Italy	(1 December 1978)
Latvia	(1 July 2005)
Liechtenstein	(1 April 1980)
Lithuania	(1 December 2004)
Luxembourg	(7 October 1977)
Malta	(1 March 2007)
Monaco	(1 December 1991)
Montenegro	(1 October 2022)
Netherlands ³	(7 October 1977)

* An up-to-date list of the contracting states to the EPC is published on epo.org (see epo.org/en/about-us/foundation/member-states).

¹ The EPC does not apply to Greenland and the Faroe Islands.

² The EPC applies to the territory of the French Republic, including the overseas territories.

North Macedonia	(1 January 2009)
Norway	(1 January 2008)
Poland	(1 March 2004)
Portugal	(1 January 1992)
Romania	(1 March 2003)
Serbia	(1 October 2010)
San Marino	(1 July 2009)
Slovakia	(1 July 2002)
Slovenia	(1 December 2002)
Spain	(1 October 1986)
Sweden	(1 May 1978)
Switzerland	(7 October 1977)
Türkiye	(1 November 2000)
United Kingdom ⁴	(7 October 1977)
(total: 39)	

8. Extension to and validation in states not party to the EPC

Currently it is possible to extend the European patent to one extension state and in six validation states not party to the EPC. For further details, see A-III, 12, and subsections.

9. Unitary Patent protection

After a European patent is granted, the patent proprietor can file a request for unitary effect and obtain a Unitary Patent, i.e. a European patent with unitary effect.

For further details, including the territorial scope of a Unitary Patent, see the **Unitary Patent Guidelines** (epo.org/en/legal/guidelines-up) and epo.org/applying/european/unitary.html.

³ The EPC is also applicable to Sint Maarten, Curaçao, Bonaire, Sint Eustatius and Saba, but not to Aruba.

⁴ The EPC is also applicable to the Isle of Man. For further information on the registration of European patents (UK) in crown dependencies, UK overseas territories and Commonwealth countries, see [OJ.EPO.2018.A97](#).

Part A

Guidelines for Formalities Examination

Contents

Chapter I – Introduction I-1

1.	Overview	I-1
2.	Responsibility for formalities examination	I-1
3.	Purpose of Part A	I-1
4.	Other parts relating to formalities	I-1

Chapter II – Filing of Euro-direct applications and examination on filing II-1

1.	Where and how applications may be filed	II-1
1.1	Filing of applications by means of electronic communication	II-1
1.1.1	Filing of applications in electronic form	II-1
1.1.2	Filing of applications by fax	II-1
1.2	Filing of applications by delivery by hand or by postal services	II-2
1.3	Filing of applications by other means	II-2
1.4	Subsequent filing of documents	II-2
1.5	Debit orders for deposit accounts held with the EPO	II-2
1.6	Forwarding of applications	II-3
1.7	Application numbering system	II-3
2.	Persons entitled to file an application	II-3
3.	Procedure on filing	II-4
3.1	Receipt; confirmation	II-4
3.2	Filing with a competent national authority	II-4
4.	Examination on filing	II-5
4.1	Minimum requirements for according a date of filing	II-5
4.1.1	Indication that a European patent is sought	II-5
4.1.2	Information concerning the applicant	II-6
4.1.3	Description	II-6
4.1.3.1	Reference to a previously filed application	II-6
4.1.4	Deficiencies	II-8

4.1.5	Date of filing	<u>II-9</u>
5.	Late filing of missing drawings or missing parts of the description	<u>II-10</u>
5.1	Late filing of missing drawings or missing parts of the description – on invitation	<u>II-10</u>
5.2	Late filing of missing drawings or missing parts of the description – without invitation	<u>II-10</u>
5.3	The date of filing changes	<u>II-10</u>
5.4	Missing parts of the description or missing drawings based on the priority application, no change in date of filing	<u>II-11</u>
5.4.1	Late filed missing parts when priority is claimed	<u>II-12</u>
5.4.2	The missing parts of the description or missing drawings are completely contained in the priority application	<u>II-12</u>
5.4.3	Copy of the priority application	<u>II-13</u>
5.4.4	Translation of the priority application	<u>II-13</u>
5.5	Withdrawal of late filed missing drawings or missing parts of the description	<u>II-13</u>
5.6	Additional fee for pages	<u>II-14</u>
6.	Correction of erroneously filed application documents or parts	<u>II-14</u>
6.1	Correction of erroneously filed application documents or parts – on invitation	<u>II-14</u>
6.2	Correction of erroneously filed application documents or parts – without invitation	<u>II-15</u>
6.3	The date of filing changes	<u>II-15</u>
6.4	Correct application documents based on priority application, no change in the date of filing	<u>II-15</u>
6.4.1	Later filed correct application documents or parts when priority is claimed	<u>II-17</u>
6.4.2	Copy of the priority application	<u>II-17</u>
6.4.3	Translation of the priority application	<u>II-17</u>
6.5	Withdrawal of correct application documents or parts	<u>II-17</u>
6.6	Same-day corrections	<u>II-17</u>
6.7	Correct application documents or parts filed after the search has started	<u>II-18</u>
6.8	Additional fee for pages	<u>II-18</u>

6.9	Claims fee	II-18

Chapter III – Examination of formal requirements

III-1

1.	General	III-1
1.1	Formal requirements	III-1
1.2	Further checks	III-1
2.	Representation	III-2
2.1	Requirements	III-2
2.2	Non-compliance	III-2
3.	Physical requirements	III-2
3.1	General remarks	III-2
3.2	Documents making up the application, replacement documents, translations	III-2
3.2.1	Physical requirements of applications filed by reference to a previously filed application	III-4
3.2.2	Physical requirements of late-filed application documents or correct application documents or parts	III-4
3.3	Other documents	III-4
4.	Request for grant	III-4
4.1	General remarks	III-4
4.2	Examination of the request for grant form	III-5
4.2.1	Information on the applicant	III-5
4.2.2	Signature	III-5
4.2.3	Further requirements laid down by Rule 41(2)	III-5
5.	Designation of inventor	III-6
5.1	General remarks	III-6
5.2	Waiver of right to be mentioned as inventor	III-6
5.3	Designation filed in a separate document	III-6
5.4	Deficiencies	III-7
5.5	Incorrect designation	III-7
5.6	Changing the order of inventors	III-7

6.	Claim to priority (see also F-VI)	<u>III-7</u>
6.1	General remarks	<u>III-7</u>
6.2	Applications giving rise to a right of priority	<u>III-9</u>
6.3	Multiple priorities	<u>III-9</u>
6.4	Examination of the priority document	<u>III-10</u>
6.5	Declaration of priority	<u>III-10</u>
6.5.1	Filing a new priority claim	<u>III-10</u>
6.5.2	Correcting an existing priority claim	<u>III-11</u>
6.5.3	Deficiencies in the priority claim and loss of the priority right	<u>III-11</u>
6.6	Priority period	<u>III-12</u>
6.7	Copy of the previous application (priority document)	<u>III-12</u>
6.7.1	Filing priority documents	<u>III-12</u>
6.7.2	Electronic retrieval of priority documents	<u>III-13</u>
6.7.3	Invitation to file a certified copy	<u>III-14</u>
6.8	Translation of the previous application	<u>III-14</u>
6.8.1	Invitation to file the translation before examination	<u>III-14</u>
6.8.2	Invitation to file the translation in examination/opposition	<u>III-15</u>
6.8.3	Loss of rights and legal remedies	<u>III-16</u>
6.8.4	Translation of previous application already filed	<u>III-16</u>
6.8.5	Voluntary filing of the translation of the previous application	<u>III-16</u>
6.8.6	Declaration replacing the translation	<u>III-17</u>
6.9	Non-entitlement to right to priority	<u>III-18</u>
6.10	Loss of right to priority	<u>III-18</u>
6.11	Notification	<u>III-18</u>
6.12	Copy of the search results for the priority or priorities	<u>III-18</u>
7.	Title of the invention	<u>III-20</u>
7.1	Requirements	<u>III-20</u>
7.2	Responsibility	<u>III-21</u>
8.	Prohibited matter	<u>III-21</u>
8.1	Morality or " <i>ordre public</i> "	<u>III-21</u>
8.2	Disparaging statements	<u>III-21</u>
9.	Claims fee	<u>III-22</u>

10.	Abstract	<u>III-23</u>
10.1	General remark	<u>III-23</u>
10.2	Content of the abstract	<u>III-23</u>
10.3	Figure accompanying the abstract	<u>III-24</u>
11.	Designation of contracting states	<u>III-24</u>
11.1	General remarks	<u>III-24</u>
11.2	European patent applications filed on or after 1 April 2009	<u>III-24</u>
11.2.1	Designation fee; time limits	<u>III-24</u>
11.2.2	Payment of designation fee	<u>III-24</u>
11.2.3	Consequences of non-payment of the designation fee	<u>III-25</u>
11.2.4	Withdrawal of designation	<u>III-25</u>
11.3	European patent applications filed before 1 April 2009	<u>III-26</u>
12.	Extension and validation of European patent applications and patents to/in states not party to the EPC	<u>III-26</u>
12.1	General remarks	<u>III-26</u>
12.2	Time limit for payment of extension and validation fees	<u>III-27</u>
12.3	Withdrawal of the extension or validation request	<u>III-28</u>
12.4	Extension and validation deemed requested	<u>III-28</u>
12.5	National register	<u>III-28</u>
13.	Filing and search fees	<u>III-28</u>
13.1	Payment of fees	<u>III-28</u>
13.2	Additional fee (if application documents comprise more than 35 pages)	<u>III-30</u>
13.3	Additional fee for divisional applications	<u>III-31</u>
14.	Translation of the application	<u>III-31</u>
15.	Late filing of claims	<u>III-32</u>
16.	Correction of deficiencies	<u>III-33</u>
16.1	Procedure for formalities officers	<u>III-33</u>

16.2	Period allowed for remedying deficiencies	III-33

Chapter IV – Special provisions **IV-1**

1.	European divisional applications (see also C-IX, 1)	IV-1
1.1	General remarks	IV-1
1.1.1	Pendency of the earlier application	IV-1
1.1.2	Sequences of divisional applications	IV-3
1.1.3	Persons entitled to file a divisional application	IV-3
1.2	Date of filing of a divisional application; claiming priority	IV-3
1.2.1	Date of filing	IV-3
1.2.2	Priority claim of a divisional application	IV-4
1.3	Filing a divisional application	IV-5
1.3.1	Where and how to file a divisional application	IV-5
1.3.2	Request for grant	IV-5
1.3.3	Language requirements	IV-7
1.3.4	Designation of contracting states	IV-7
1.3.5	Extension and validation states	IV-7
1.4	Fees	IV-8
1.4.1	Filing, search and designation fee	IV-8
1.4.1.1	Additional fee for divisional applications of second or subsequent generations	IV-8
1.4.2	Claims fees	IV-9
1.4.3	Renewal fees	IV-9
1.5	Designation of the inventor	IV-10
1.6	Authorisations	IV-10
1.7	Other formalities examination	IV-10
1.8	Search, publication and request for examination of divisional applications	IV-11
2.	Art. 61 applications and stay of proceedings under Rule 14	IV-11
2.1	General	IV-11
2.2	Stay of proceedings for grant	IV-12
2.2.1	Responsible department	IV-12
2.2.2	Date of the stay of proceedings	IV-12
2.2.3	Legal nature and effects of the stay	IV-12
2.2.4	Interruption of periods	IV-13
2.2.5	Resumption of the proceedings for grant	IV-14
2.2.5.1	Resumption after final decision in entitlement proceedings	IV-14

2.2.5.2	Resumption regardless of the stage of entitlement proceedings	IV-14
2.3	Limitation of the option to withdraw the European patent application	IV-14
2.4	Prosecution of the application by a third party	IV-14
2.5	Filing a new application	IV-15
2.6	Refusal of the earlier application	IV-15
2.7	Partial transfer of right by virtue of a final decision	IV-15
3.	Display at an exhibition	IV-16
3.1	Certificate of exhibition; identification of invention	IV-16
3.2	Defects in the certificate or the identification	IV-16
4.	Applications relating to biological material	IV-16
4.1	Biological material; deposit of such	IV-16
4.1.1	New deposit of biological material	IV-17
4.1.2	Application filed by reference to a previously filed application	IV-18
4.2	Missing information; notification	IV-19
4.3	Availability of deposited biological material to expert only	IV-19
4.4	Requests for samples of biological material	IV-20
5.	Applications relating to nucleotide and amino acid sequences	IV-21
5.1	Sequence information filed under Rule 56	IV-22
5.2	Sequence information filed under Rule 56a	IV-24
5.3	Sequence listings of an application filed by reference to a previously filed application	IV-24
5.4	Sequence listings of a divisional application	IV-25
6.	Conversion into a national application	IV-26

Chapter V – Communications concerning formal deficiencies; amendment of application; correction of errors

V-1

1.	Communications concerning formal deficiencies	V-1

2.	Amendment of application	<u>V-1</u>
2.1	Filing of amendments	<u>V-1</u>
2.2	Examination of amendments as to formalities	<u>V-1</u>
3.	Correction of errors in documents filed with the EPO	<u>V-2</u>

Chapter VI – Publication of application; request for examination and transmission of the dossier to examining division

VI-1

1.	Publication of application	<u>VI-1</u>
1.1	Date of publication	<u>VI-1</u>
1.2	No publication; preventing publication	<u>VI-1</u>
1.3	Content of the publication	<u>VI-2</u>
1.4	Publication in electronic form only	<u>VI-3</u>
1.5	Separate publication of the European search report	<u>VI-3</u>
2.	Request for examination and transmission of the dossier to the examining division	<u>VI-4</u>
2.1	Communication	<u>VI-4</u>
2.2	Time limit for filing the request for examination	<u>VI-4</u>
2.3	Legal remedy	<u>VI-5</u>
2.4	Transmission of the dossier to the examining division	<u>VI-5</u>
2.5	Refund of examination fee	<u>VI-6</u>
2.6	Reduction in examination fee	<u>VI-7</u>
3.	Response to the search opinion	<u>VI-7</u>

Chapter VII – Languages

VII-1

1.	Admissible languages on filing	<u>VII-1</u>
1.1	General	<u>VII-1</u>
1.2	Filing by reference	<u>VII-1</u>
1.3	European divisional applications; Art. 61 applications	<u>VII-1</u>
1.4	Invitation to file the translation	<u>VII-1</u>

2.	Language of the proceedings	<u>VII-1</u>
3.	Derogations from the language of the proceedings in written proceedings	<u>VII-2</u>
3.1	Parties' written submissions	<u>VII-2</u>
3.2	Admissible non-EPO languages	<u>VII-2</u>
3.3	Priority document	<u>VII-2</u>
3.4	Documents filed as evidence	<u>VII-3</u>
3.5	Third-party observations	<u>VII-3</u>
4.	Derogations from the language of the proceedings in oral proceedings	<u>VII-3</u>
5.	Documents filed in the wrong language	<u>VII-3</u>
6.	Languages of publication	<u>VII-4</u>
7.	Conformity, correction and certification of the translation	<u>VII-4</u>
8.	Authentic text of the application or patent	<u>VII-5</u>
Chapter VIII – Common provisions		<u>VIII-1</u>
1.	Representation	<u>VIII-1</u>
1.1	General principles	<u>VIII-1</u>
1.2	Representation by a professional representative; list of professional representatives	<u>VIII-1</u>
1.3	Representation by a legal practitioner	<u>VIII-2</u>
1.4	Representation by an association of representatives	<u>VIII-2</u>
1.5	Representation by an employee	<u>VIII-2</u>
1.6	Common representative	<u>VIII-3</u>
1.7	Signed authorisation	<u>VIII-3</u>
1.8	General authorisation	<u>VIII-5</u>
1.9	Invitation to appoint a representative and legal consequence of non-compliance	<u>VIII-6</u>
1.10	Invitation to file authorisation and legal consequence in case of non-compliance	<u>VIII-6</u>

2.	Form of documents	<u>VIII-6</u>
2.1	Documents making up the European patent application	<u>VIII-6</u>
2.2	Replacement documents and translations	<u>VIII-7</u>
2.3	Other documents	<u>VIII-7</u>
2.4	Number of copies	<u>VIII-7</u>
2.5	Filing of subsequent documents	<u>VIII-7</u>
3.	Signature of documents	<u>VIII-8</u>
3.1	Documents filed after filing the European patent application	<u>VIII-8</u>
3.2	Documents forming part of the European patent application	<u>VIII-8</u>
3.3	Form of signature	<u>VIII-9</u>
3.4	Joint applicants	<u>VIII-9</u>

Chapter IX – Drawings **IX-1**

1.	Graphic forms of presentation considered as drawings	<u>IX-1</u>
1.1	Technical drawings	<u>IX-1</u>
1.2	Photographs	<u>IX-1</u>
2.	Representation of drawings	<u>IX-1</u>
2.1	Grouping of drawings	<u>IX-1</u>
2.2	Reproducibility of drawings	<u>IX-1</u>
2.3	Figure accompanying the abstract	<u>IX-2</u>
3.	Conditions if drawings are filed on paper	<u>IX-2</u>
4.	Presentation of the pages of drawings	<u>IX-2</u>
4.1	Usable surface area of sheets	<u>IX-2</u>
4.2	Page numbering of drawings	<u>IX-2</u>
5.	General layout of drawings	<u>IX-3</u>
5.1	Page-setting	<u>IX-3</u>

5.2	Numbering of figures	IX-3
5.3	Whole figure	IX-4
6.	Prohibited matter	IX-4
7.	Executing of drawings	IX-4
7.1	Drawings of lines and strokes	IX-4
7.2	Shading	IX-5
7.3	Cross-sections	IX-5
7.3.1	Sectional diagrams	IX-5
7.3.2	Hatching	IX-5
7.4	Scale of drawings	IX-5
7.5	Numbers, letters and reference signs	IX-5
7.5.1	Leading lines	IX-6
7.5.2	Arrows	IX-6
7.5.3	Height of the numbers and letters in the drawings	IX-6
7.5.4	Consistent use of reference signs in description, claims and drawings	IX-6
7.5.5	Consistent use of reference signs in drawings	IX-7
7.6	Variations in proportions	IX-7
8.	Text matter on drawings	IX-8
9.	Conventional symbols	IX-8
10.	Amendments to drawings	IX-8
10.1	Replacement drawings under Rule 58	IX-9
11.	Graphic forms of presentation not considered as drawings	IX-9
11.1	Chemical and mathematical formulae	IX-9
11.2	Tables	IX-10
11.2.1	Tables in the description	IX-10
11.2.2	Tables in the claims	IX-10

Chapter X – Fees **X-1**

1.	General	X-1
2.	Methods of payment	X-1
3.	Currencies	X-2

4.	Date considered as date on which payment is made	<u>X-2</u>
4.1	Payment or transfer to a bank account held by the European Patent Organisation	<u>X-2</u>
4.2	Deposit accounts with the EPO	<u>X-2</u>
4.2.1	General remarks	<u>X-2</u>
4.2.2	Payments to replenish a deposit account	<u>X-2</u>
4.2.3	Debiting the deposit account	<u>X-3</u>
4.2.4	Date of receipt of the debit order; insufficient funds	<u>X-5</u>
4.3	Automatic debiting procedure	<u>X-5</u>
4.4	Payment by credit card	<u>X-6</u>
5.	Due date for fees	<u>X-6</u>
5.1	General	<u>X-6</u>
5.1.1	Due date	<u>X-6</u>
5.1.2	Amount of the fee	<u>X-7</u>
5.2	Due date for specific fees	<u>X-7</u>
5.2.1	Filing fee and search fee	<u>X-7</u>
5.2.2	Examination fee and designation fee	<u>X-7</u>
5.2.3	Fee for grant and publishing	<u>X-8</u>
5.2.4	Renewal fees	<u>X-8</u>
5.2.5	Claims fees	<u>X-11</u>
5.2.6	Fees for limitation/revocation, opposition, appeal, petition for review	<u>X-11</u>
5.2.7	Fees payable for procedural and other requests	<u>X-11</u>
6.	Payment in due time	<u>X-12</u>
6.1	Basic principle	<u>X-12</u>
6.2	Late payment of fees – period for payment considered observed	<u>X-12</u>
6.2.1	Fees paid by bank transfer – application of Art. 7(3) and Art. 7(4) RFees	<u>X-12</u>
6.2.2	Safety provision for late replenishment of deposit accounts	<u>X-12</u>
6.2.3	Debit orders filed with a competent national authority	<u>X-13</u>
6.2.4	Amount of fee payable	<u>X-13</u>
6.2.5	Noting of loss of rights	<u>X-13</u>
7.	Purpose of payment	<u>X-13</u>
7.1	General	<u>X-13</u>
7.1.1	Conditions for valid payment	<u>X-13</u>
7.1.2	Purpose of payment	<u>X-14</u>

7.2	Indication of the purpose of the payment in the case of designation fees for applications filed before 1 April 2009	<u>X-14</u>
For information on paying designation fees in respect of applications filed before 1 April 2009, see A-III, 11.3 and the April 2025 edition of the Guidelines, A-X,		
	7.2.7.3 Indication of the purpose of payment in the case of claims fees	<u>X-15</u>
7.3.1	Claims fees payable on filing the European patent application	<u>X-15</u>
7.3.2	Claims fees payable before the grant of the European patent	<u>X-15</u>
8.	No deferred payment of fees, no legal aid, no discretion	<u>X-15</u>
9.	Reduction of fees	<u>X-15</u>
9.1	General	<u>X-15</u>
9.2	Fee-related support measures for small entities and micro-entities	<u>X-15</u>
9.3	Reduction under the language arrangements	<u>X-15</u>
9.3.1	Conditions	<u>X-15</u>
9.3.2	Reduction of the filing fee	<u>X-18</u>
9.3.3	Reduction of the examination fee	<u>X-18</u>
9.3.4	Non-compliance with eligibility criteria	<u>X-19</u>
9.4	Reduction under the scheme for micro-entities	<u>X-19</u>
9.4.1	Conditions	<u>X-19</u>
9.4.2	Fees concerned	<u>X-20</u>
9.4.3	Non-compliance with eligibility criteria	<u>X-21</u>
9.5	Special reductions	<u>X-21</u>
9.5.1	Reduction of the search fee for a supplementary European search	<u>X-21</u>
9.5.2	Reduction of the examination fee where the international preliminary examination report is drawn up by the EPO	<u>X-23</u>
10.	Refund of fees	<u>X-23</u>
10.1	General remarks	<u>X-23</u>
10.1.1	Fee payments lacking a legal basis	<u>X-23</u>
10.1.2	Late payments	<u>X-24</u>
10.1.3	Insignificant amounts	<u>X-24</u>
10.2	Special refunds	<u>X-24</u>
10.2.1	Refund of the search fee	<u>X-24</u>
10.2.2	Refund of the further search fee	<u>X-24</u>
10.2.3	Refund of the examination fee	<u>X-24</u>
10.2.4	Refund under Rule 37(2)	<u>X-25</u>
10.2.5	Refund of the fee for grant and publishing	<u>X-25</u>

10.2.6	Refund of the appeal fee	X-25
10.3	Method of refund	X-25
10.3.1	Refunds to a deposit account	X-25
10.3.2	Refunds to a bank account	X-26
10.3.3	Claiming refunds in Central Fee Payment	X-26
10.4	Reallocation instead of refund	X-27
11.	Crediting of fees under Rule 71a(5)	X-27
11.1	Crediting of the fee for grant and publishing	X-27
11.2	Crediting of claims fees	X-27
11.3	Separate crediting of the fee for grant and publishing and claims fees	X-28
11.4	Further processing fee and crediting of fees	X-28

Chapter XI – Inspection of files; communication of information contained in files; consultation of the European Patent Register; issue of certified copies

XI-1

1.	General	XI-1
2.	Inspection of files	XI-1
2.1	Documents open to file inspection	XI-1
2.2	Conducting file inspections	XI-2
2.3	Restrictions to file inspection	XI-2
2.4	Confidentiality of the request	XI-3
2.5	File inspection before publication of the application	XI-4
2.6	Publication of bibliographic data before publication of the application	XI-5
3.	Communication of information contained in the files	XI-5
4.	Consultation of the European Patent Register	XI-5
5.	Issue of certified copies	XI-6
5.1	Certified copies of documents from the files or of other documents	XI-6
5.2	Priority documents issued by the EPO	XI-6

Chapter XII – Euro-PCT applications in the European phase before the EPO as designated/elected Office

XII-1

1.	General remarks on the processing in the European phase	<u>XII-1</u>
1.1	Precedence of the PCT and supplementary application of the EPC in the European phase	<u>XII-1</u>
1.2	European phase, designated/elected Office, Euro-PCT application	<u>XII-3</u>
1.3	Other parts of the Guidelines relating to Euro-PCT applications	<u>XII-4</u>
1.4	Relevance of the international phase for the proceedings in the European phase	<u>XII-4</u>
2.	The competence of the EPO as designated/elected Office	<u>XII-4</u>
2.1	The EPO as designated Office by default	<u>XII-5</u>
2.1.1	Loss of the designation EP	<u>XII-5</u>
2.2	The EPO as elected office	<u>XII-7</u>
2.3	Whether the Receiving Section or the examining division is competent	<u>XII-7</u>
3.	Competence of the EPO to start the European phase processing	<u>XII-7</u>
3.1	Processing ban – lifting the ban	<u>XII-8</u>
3.2	Start of the European phase processing – the 31-month period under Rule 159(1)	<u>XII-9</u>
4.	Indicating the wish to enter the European phase – minimum requirements and further requirements for entry into the European phase	<u>XII-9</u>
4.1	Procedure on receipt of an indication that the applicant wishes to initiate the European phase – EPO Form 1200	<u>XII-10</u>
4.2	Procedure if European phase is not initiated	<u>XII-11</u>
4.3	Minimum requirements for entry into the European phase	<u>XII-12</u>
4.4	Further requirements to be complied with on entry into the European phase	<u>XII-13</u>

5.	Documents making up the basis for processing in the European phase, the language of the proceedings, priority claims and further documents	<u>XII-14</u>
5.1	Language of the proceedings	<u>XII-15</u>
5.2	Documents that need not be filed by the applicant	<u>XII-16</u>
5.3	Documents that must be filed by the applicant – specification under Rule 159(1)(b)	<u>XII-17</u>
5.3.1	Amendments as the basis for European phase processing	<u>XII-18</u>
5.4	Priority claim and priority right in the proceedings before the EPO as designated/elected Office	<u>XII-18</u>
5.5	Precedence of the PCT provisions on physical requirements to be met by application documents and translations	<u>XII-20</u>
5.5.1	Prohibited statements	<u>XII-20</u>
5.6	Special requirements for applications referring to nucleotide or amino acid sequences	<u>XII-20</u>
5.7	Special requirements concerning applications referring to biological material before the EPO as designated/elected Office	<u>XII-21</u>
6.	Information on the applicant(s), persons entitled to act in the European phase and representation	<u>XII-21</u>
6.1	Information concerning the applicant(s) – missing entitlement	<u>XII-21</u>
6.2	Extent of the obligation to be represented – appointment of a professional representative	<u>XII-22</u>
6.2.1	Identification by appointed representative	<u>XII-23</u>
6.2.2	Representation in the European phase by the international agent	<u>XII-23</u>
6.3	Communication with the applicant and address for correspondence	<u>XII-23</u>
7.	"Early processing" and other measures to accelerate the European grant proceedings	<u>XII-24</u>
7.1	The request for early processing	<u>XII-24</u>
7.2	Waiving the right to the communication under Rules 161 and 162	<u>XII-28</u>
7.2.1	Waiving the remainder of the six-month period	<u>XII-29</u>

7.3	Waiving the right to the invitation under Rule 70(2) to confirm wish to proceed with examination	<u>XII-29</u>

7.4	Request for PACE	<u>XII-30</u>

Chapter XIII – Examination of minimum and further requirements for entry into the European phase – legal consequences – remedies

XIII-1

1.	General	<u>XIII-1</u>

2.	Overview of the minimum requirements	<u>XIII-1</u>

3.	Translation of the international application and further documents that are part of the international publication	<u>XIII-2</u>

3.1	Translation requirements if the EPO acts in its capacity as designated or elected Office	<u>XIII-3</u>

3.2	Legal consequence if the translation is not filed	<u>XIII-4</u>

3.3	Remedy if the translation is not filed	<u>XIII-5</u>

4.	Filing fee and additional fee	<u>XIII-6</u>

4.1	Additional fee for Euro-PCT applications	<u>XIII-6</u>

4.1.1	Amended application	<u>XIII-7</u>

4.1.2	Erroneously filed application documents	<u>XIII-9</u>

4.2	Legal consequence and remedy if the filing fee, including the additional fee, is not paid	<u>XIII-9</u>

5.	Designation, extension and validation fee	<u>XIII-10</u>

5.1	Designation fee	<u>XIII-10</u>

5.2	Extension and validation	<u>XIII-11</u>

5.3	Legal consequence and remedy if the designation fee and/or an extension or validation fee is not paid	<u>XIII-11</u>

6.	Search fee	<u>XIII-12</u>

6.1	Legal consequence and remedy if the search fee is not paid	<u>XIII-13</u>

7.	Request for examination	<u>XIII-13</u>

7.1	Legal consequence and remedy if the examination fee is not paid or the request for examination not filed	<u>XIII-15</u>

8.	Renewal fees	<u>XIII-15</u>
8.1	Remedy if the third-year renewal fee is not paid by expiry of the 31-month time limit	<u>XIII-16</u>
9.	General aspects of full and partial compliance and non-compliance with the minimum requirements	<u>XIII-16</u>
9.1	Effects of full or partial compliance	<u>XIII-16</u>
9.1.1	Provisional protection under Art. 67	<u>XIII-17</u>
9.1.2	Divisional applications	<u>XIII-17</u>
9.1.3	Prior-art effect under Rule 165	<u>XIII-18</u>
9.2	Remedies in the case of non-compliance with more than one of the applicable minimum requirements	<u>XIII-18</u>
10.	Publication and file inspection	<u>XIII-19</u>
10.1	Publication of the international application	<u>XIII-20</u>
10.2	Information on the publication of the ISR and the supplementary European search report	<u>XIII-21</u>
10.3	Inspection of files	<u>XIII-21</u>
11.	Examination of further formal requirements – non-compliance	<u>XIII-22</u>
11.1	Missing designation of inventor	<u>XIII-23</u>
11.2	Missing file number or copy of priority claim	<u>XIII-23</u>
11.2.1	Translation of a priority document for a Euro-PCT application	<u>XIII-24</u>
11.3	Missing sequence listing	<u>XIII-25</u>
11.4	Missing information for any applicant	<u>XIII-25</u>
11.5	Missing appointment of a representative	<u>XIII-25</u>
11.6	Certificate of exhibition	<u>XIII-26</u>
11.7	Search results of a priority application (Rule 141)	<u>XIII-26</u>
11.8	Payment of claims fees under Rule 162(1)	<u>XIII-27</u>

Chapter XIV – Amendments and claims fee under Rules 161 and 162 – Supplementary European search – Examination – Search under Rule 164

XIV-1

1.	General	<u>XIV-1</u>
1.1	Exemption from European supplementary search	<u>XIV-2</u>
2.	General – amendments and claims fees under Rules 161 and 162	<u>XIV-2</u>
2.1	Amendments under Rule 161(1) and (2)	<u>XIV-2</u>
2.1.1	Voluntary and mandatory comments and amendments	<u>XIV-4</u>
2.1.2	Application of Rule 137(4)	<u>XIV-4</u>
2.1.3	Further possibilities for amending the application	<u>XIV-5</u>
2.2	Payment of claims fees under Rule 162	<u>XIV-5</u>
3.	EPO was (S)ISA – Rule 161(1)	<u>XIV-7</u>
3.1	Exceptions where a response to the Rule 161(1) invitation is not required	<u>XIV-8</u>
4.	EPO was not (S)ISA – Rule 161(2)	<u>XIV-9</u>
5.	Supplementary European search	<u>XIV-9</u>
5.1	Non-unity – Rule 164(1)	<u>XIV-10</u>
5.2	The communication under Rules 70(2) and 70a(2) after supplementary European search	<u>XIV-11</u>
6.	Substantive examination of a Euro-PCT application	<u>XIV-12</u>
6.1	At least one communication in examination	<u>XIV-12</u>
6.2	Rule 164(2) – No examination of multiple inventions	<u>XIV-13</u>
6.3	Substantive examination of a Euro-PCT application accompanied by an IPER	<u>XIV-14</u>
6.3.1	Comparative test results	<u>XIV-14</u>
6.3.2	Basis for substantive examination	<u>XIV-14</u>
6.3.3	Consideration of the contents of the IPER	<u>XIV-15</u>

Chapter XV – Review and correction of errors and omissions**XV-1**

1.	General	<u>XV-1</u>
1.1	Review and correction on request and of the EPO's own motion	<u>XV-1</u>
1.2	Role of the applicant in initiating review or correction	<u>XV-2</u>
1.3	Review of filing date and priority claims considered void	<u>XV-3</u>
2.	Review under Article 25 PCT	<u>XV-3</u>
3.	Review under Article 24 PCT and excuse of delays under Article 48(2) PCT	<u>XV-4</u>
4.	Review of filing date and priority claims considered void under Rule 82~~ter~~.1(a) PCT	<u>XV-5</u>
5.	Restoration of priority and review of the grant of a request for restoration of the priority right	<u>XV-5</u>
6.	Missing parts and correction of erroneously filed application document or parts	<u>XV-7</u>
6.1	Application of Rules 56 and 56a by the EPO as designated/elected Office in order to maintain the original filing date	<u>XV-7</u>
6.2	Determination of filing date in cases of erroneously filed elements or parts of the international application	<u>XV-7</u>
6.3	Review of filing date under Rule 82 ~~ter~~ .1(b) PCT	<u>XV-8</u>

Chapter I – Introduction

1. Overview

Part A of the Guidelines deals with:

- (i) the filing of European patent applications ("Euro-direct applications") and the requirements and procedures to be followed in the various aspects of the formalities examination of such (see A-II to VI)
- (ii) formalities matters of a more general nature that can arise during the application procedure or post-grant stage (see A-VII and VIII)
- (iii) the presentation and execution of drawings and figurative representations accompanying a Euro-direct application (see A-IX)
- (iv) fee matters (see A-X)
- (v) inspection of files, communication of information contained in files, consultation of the European Patent Register and issue of certified copies (see A-XI)
- (vi) the requirements and procedures to be followed in the proceedings before the EPO as designated/elected Office on and after entry into the European phase ("Euro-PCT applications") (see A-XII to A-XV).

2. Responsibility for formalities examination

The matters covered in this part are intended for EPO formalities staff at all sites (The Hague, Munich and Berlin) and in particular for the Receiving Section, which is specifically responsible under the EPC for ensuring that the formal requirements for Euro-direct and Euro-PCT applications are met. Once an application is transferred to the examining division, the latter accepts responsibility for the formalities of the application, although it should be understood that the term "examining division" is intended to include the formalities officer to whom this work is entrusted (see the decisions of the President of the EPO dated 12 December 2013, OJ EPO 2014, A6, 23 November 2015, OJ EPO 2015, A104, and 14 June 2020, OJ EPO 2020, A80).

Rule 10
Rule 11(3)

3. Purpose of Part A

This part of the Guidelines is intended to provide formalities officers with the knowledge and background to help them carry out their duties efficiently and uniformly. It does not override the EPC (see, in particular, section 3 of the General Part).

4. Other parts relating to formalities

Formalities officers should not concern themselves with only Part A of the Guidelines. They will need to refer frequently to the other parts and in particular Part E, where appropriate.

Chapter II – Filing of Euro-direct applications and examination on filing

1. Where and how applications may be filed

European patent applications must be filed in writing. They may be filed by means of electronic communication (see A-II, 1.1) or by delivery by hand or by postal services (see A-II, 1.2). *Rule 1*
Rule 2(1)

1.1 Filing of applications by means of electronic communication

1.1.1 Filing of applications in electronic form

European patent applications may be filed electronically with the EPO (see the decision of the President of the EPO dated 8 July 2025, OJ EPO 2025, A52) using either

- (i) Online Filing 2.0 or
- (ii) the EPO Contingency Upload Service.

Other documents may also be filed electronically in proceedings under the EPC (see the decision of the President of the EPO dated 8 July 2025, OJ EPO 2025, A52; see A-II, 1.4 and A-VIII, 2.5).

Certain procedural acts may be filed electronically using the web-based online service MyEPO (see the decision of the President of the EPO dated 9 February 2024, OJ EPO 2024, A20, and the notice from the EPO dated 9 February 2024, OJ EPO 2024, A21, as well as the decision of the President of the EPO dated 24 March 2025, OJ EPO 2025, A27, and the notice from the EPO dated 24 March 2025, OJ EPO 2025, A28). Currently, only those submissions and further acts provided for in MyEPO and specified in the above notice dated 9 February 2024 or in another suitable form may be filed using this service.

European patent applications may also be filed electronically with the competent national authorities of those contracting states that permit this.

For filing sequence listings, see A-IV, 5. For filing international (PCT) applications, please refer to the PCT-EPO Guidelines, A-II, 1.2.

1.1.2 Filing of applications by fax

Fax is not a permitted means of filing at the EPO. Applications sent to the EPO by fax are therefore deemed not to have been received (see the decision of the President of the EPO dated 22 April 2024 concerning the abolition of fax as a means of filing patent applications and other documents, OJ EPO 2024, A41, and the corresponding notice from the EPO dated 22 April 2024, OJ EPO 2024, A42). However, applications may still be filed by fax with the competent national authorities of contracting states that permit this. For further details, see the latest version of the publication "National law relating to the EPC" available on the EPO website (*epo.org*).

1.2 Filing of applications by delivery by hand or by postal services

Art. 75(1)
Rule 35(1)

European patent applications may be filed by delivery by hand or by postal services at the EPO's filing offices in Munich, The Hague or Berlin. The EPO's sub-office in Vienna is not a filing office, nor is the Brussels Bureau.

The opening hours of the EPO's filing offices are published in the notice from the EPO dated 2 April 2025, OJ EPO 2025, A35. Dates on which at least one of the filing offices is not open to receive documents are announced at regular intervals in the EPO Official Journal (see also E-VIII, 1.4). The filing offices may remain open during public holidays observed in the contracting states in which they are located. Since mail is not delivered on these days (see also E-VIII, 1.4), applications may be filed by delivery by hand or using other permitted means of filing (see A-II, 1.1; A-II, 1.3).

The EPO filing offices in Berlin and Munich's PschorrHöfe building (see the decision of the President of the EPO dated 2 April 2025, OJ EPO 2025, A33) are equipped with automated mailboxes, which may be used at any time. There is no automated mailbox facility in Munich's Isar building or at the branch in The Hague; outside office hours documents may be handed to the porter.

European patent applications (with the exception of divisional applications, see A-IV, 1.3.1, and applications according to Art. 61(1)(b), see A-IV, 2.5) may also be filed at the central industrial property office or other competent authority of a contracting state if permitted by that state's national law (see A-II, 1.6). First filings may need to be filed at national offices (see A-II, 3.2 and the booklet "National law relating to the EPC" on epo.org).

1.3 Filing of applications by other means

The filing of European patent applications by other means such as **email** is not allowed (see also the notice from the EPO dated 12 September 2000, OJ EPO 2000, 458).

1.4 Subsequent filing of documents

For the subsequent filing of documents, see A-VIII, 2.5.

1.5 Debit orders for deposit accounts held with the EPO

Point 7.1.2 ADA
Point 12.1 ADA

For European patent applications, debit orders for the fees due must be filed in an accepted electronic format (see A-X, 4.2.3), irrespective of how the application itself is filed. If an application is filed with a competent national authority (Art. 75(1)(b)) on paper, a paper debit order on mandatory Form 1020 for the fees intended to be paid is accepted by way of exception if it is included with that application on filing (see the Arrangements for deposit accounts (ADA), Supplementary publication 2, OJ EPO 2024, and the decision of the President of the EPO dated 12 February 2025, OJ EPO 2025, A17). Paper Form 1020 is not accepted if filed direct with the EPO.

1.6 Forwarding of applications

The central industrial property office of a contracting state is obliged to forward applications filed (see A-II, 3.2) with it or with other competent authorities in that state to the EPO in the shortest time compatible with its national law on the secrecy of inventions (for debit order enclosures, see A-II, 1.5).

Art. 77(1)
Rule 37(1)

A time limit of six weeks after filing is specified for the onward transmission to the EPO of applications not classified as secret. This is extended to four months or, where priority has been claimed, to 14 months after the date of priority, for applications requiring further examination as to their classification as secret. An application received outside the specified time limits, either six weeks or four months, must be processed, provided it is received in Munich, The Hague or Berlin before the end of the 14th month after filing or, where appropriate, after the date of priority. Applications received after 14 months are deemed withdrawn. Re-establishment of rights and further processing in respect of the period under Rule 37(2) are not possible, since the loss of rights does not result from the applicant's failure to observe a time limit (see J 3/80). However, the applicant may file a request for conversion under Art. 135(1)(a) (see A-IV, 6).

Art. 77(3)
Rule 37(2)
Art. 135(1)(a)

If the time limit referred to in Rule 37(2) expires on a day on which the delivery or transmission of mail is interrupted or subsequently dislocated within the meaning of Rule 134(2), it will extend to the first day following the end of the period of interruption or dislocation.

Rule 134(2)

1.7 Application numbering system

The patent application numbering system currently in use was introduced in 2002 (see OJ EPO 2001, 465).

The application number consists of nine digits. The first two digits reflect the filing year. The next six digits are assigned sequentially in the order in which the applications are received at the place of filing, starting from the lowest number within a specific range of six-digit numbers. The specific number range reflects the place of filing. Where applicable, the range is subdivided into two ranges to distinguish between applications filed electronically and on paper. The last (ninth) digit is a check digit.

For international applications designating "EP" (Euro-PCT applications), the first digit within the dedicated range for the six-digit number is "7", "8" or "9" and does not reflect the place or method of filing.

2. Persons entitled to file an application

A European patent application may be filed by any natural or legal person, or any body equivalent to a legal person by virtue of the law governing it.

Art. 58

For the purposes of proceedings before the EPO, the applicant will be deemed to be entitled to exercise the right to the European patent.

Art. 60(3)

The application may be in the name of one person or several persons may be named as joint applicants. The application may also be filed by two or more applicants designating different contracting states. It may arise that a

Art. 59
Art. 118

first applicant designates one group of contracting states and a second designates a different group of contracting states, while both applicants jointly designate a third group of contracting states. If the applicants for a patent are not the same for different contracting states they will be regarded as joint applicants in proceedings before the EPO (see A-III, 4.2.1 and 11.1 on when and under what circumstances the matter dealt with in this paragraph must be considered during formalities examination).

Art. 61(1)

If a national court finds that a person other than the applicant is entitled to the grant of a European patent that person has the option of prosecuting the application as their own application in place of the applicant (see A-IV, 2).

3. Procedure on filing

3.1 Receipt; confirmation

Rule 35(2)

The receipt of European patent applications filed via Online Filing 2.0 is acknowledged electronically following submission. Where it becomes apparent that the acknowledgment was not transmitted successfully, the EPO will transmit it by other means where possible on the basis of the information supplied (see Art. 10 of the decision of the President of the EPO dated 8 July 2025, OJ EPO 2025, A52).

The receipt of European patent applications filed using the EPO Contingency Upload Service is confirmed electronically by the EPO in the service itself. An acknowledgment of receipt indicating the application number assigned is sent separately in accordance with the provisions governing the filing of documents on paper (see following paragraph).

The acknowledgement of receipt of European patent applications filed on paper (usually the last page of EPO Form 1001) is issued by the authority with which the application is filed – either the EPO (Munich, The Hague or Berlin) or the competent national authority. The receipt must be issued without delay and include the application number and the date of receipt.

3.2 Filing with a competent national authority

Rule 35(3)

If the application is filed with a competent national authority, that authority must inform the EPO without delay of receipt of the documents making up the application and indicate the nature and date of receipt of the documents, the application number and any priority date claimed. It is recommended that the authority should also indicate the applicant's or representative's reference number, where provided. In practice, the EPO receives the above information when the actual application is forwarded to it unless national security checks by the national authority delay the forwarding of the application, in which case a separate notice is sent by that authority to the EPO.

Rule 35(4)

When the EPO receives an application forwarded by the national authority of a contracting state, it notifies the applicant, indicating the date of receipt at the EPO. Once this communication has been received, all further documents relating to the application must be sent direct to the EPO.

Where an application is not received by the EPO from the national authority of a contracting state before the end of the 14th month after filing or, if priority has been claimed, after the date of priority and is consequently deemed withdrawn (see A-II, 1.6), the applicant must be notified accordingly; all fees must be refunded, including any fees paid in advance of their due date.

Art. 77(3)
Rule 37(2)
Rule 112(1)

4. Examination on filing

4.1 Minimum requirements for according a date of filing

The EPO examines applications to determine whether they meet the minimum requirements for according a date of filing. This is done by the Receiving Section. These requirements are satisfied where the documents filed contain:

Art. 90(1)
Rule 10(1)

- (a) an indication that a European patent is sought Rule 40(1)(a)
- (b) information identifying the applicant or allowing the applicant to be contacted Rule 40(1)(b)
- (c) a description or reference to a single previously filed application. Rule 40(1)(c)

It is not necessary for the applicant to provide any claims to obtain a date of filing. If the application is filed without claims but satisfies all requirements for obtaining a date of filing, the applicant will be requested to provide at least one claim later according to Rules 57(c) and 58 (see A-III, 15).

Where the description is filed by reference to a previously filed application (see A-II, 4.1.3.1), the reference must contain the following information for the application to qualify for a date of filing according to Rule 40(2):

- (i) the date of filing of the previously filed application
- (ii) its file number
- (iii) the office where it was filed
- (iv) an indication that this reference replaces the description and any drawings.

To be accorded a date of filing, these documents do not have to meet any particular requirements as to form or presentation. They must, however, be sufficiently legible to enable the information to be discerned.

Rule 1

4.1.1 Indication that a European patent is sought

The requirement, referred to in A-II, 4.1(a), to provide an indication that a patent is sought is fulfilled if the applicant uses the prescribed request for grant form (EPO Form 1001), which is available in Online Filing 2.0 (see A-II, 1.1.1) or can be downloaded in PDF format free of charge from the EPO website (epo.org). While using EPO Form 1001 is mandatory, it is not a requirement for obtaining a date of filing (see also A-III, 4 and 16).

4.1.2 Information concerning the applicant

For the purposes of establishing a date of filing, information must be supplied which:

- (i) identifies the applicant or
- (ii) allows the applicant to be contacted.

If there are multiple applicants, the above information has to be supplied for only one of them. Any kind of information that allows the applicant to be contacted will be considered to fulfil requirement (ii), for example:

- (a) the name and address of the applicant's representative
- (b) a PO box number
- (c) a phone number.

If the information supplied is sufficient to establish a date of filing but not for the EPO to establish whether or not the applicant requires a representative according to Art. 133(2), the procedure outlined in A-III, 16 will be followed.

In deciding whether the applicant information supplied satisfies the requirements for establishing a date of filing, the EPO will take into account all data contained in the documents filed (see J 25/86). Objection should not be raised at this stage with regard to the status of the applicant or the entitlement to apply, or where, in the case of joint applicants, there is doubt as to the contracting states designated by the individual applicants.

4.1.3 Description

The contents of the description do not require close scrutiny – it is sufficient to identify a document (or documents) that appear(s) to include a description. If, instead of filing a description, the applicant files a reference to a previously filed application, see A-II, 4.1.3.1.

4.1.3.1 Reference to a previously filed application

Instead of application documents, the applicant can file a reference to a previously filed application under Rule 40(1)(c). The previously filed application referenced does not need to be claimed as priority.

Rule 40(2)

Details required on the date of filing

Under Rule 40(2), to qualify for a date of filing, the applicant must indicate the following details on the filing date:

- (i) the filing date of the previously filed application
- (ii) its file number
- (iii) the office where it was filed

- (iv) an indication that this reference replaces the description and any drawings.

The previously filed application referenced may also be an application for a utility model.

Copy of the previously filed application

Rule 40(3)

Rule 53(2)

The applicant must supply a copy of the previously filed application certified as correct by the authority with which it was filed within two months of filing the application (Rule 40(3)). However, according to Rule 40(3), last sentence, this requirement is dispensed with where the previously filed application is already available to the EPO under the conditions specified by the President. According to the notice from the EPO dated 14 September 2009, OJ EPO 2009, 486, a certified copy does not need to be filed where the previously filed application is a Euro-direct application or an international one filed with the EPO as receiving Office under the PCT. In all other cases, a certified copy of the previously filed application referenced must be filed within the time limit under Rule 40(3).

Where the previously filed application referenced is the claimed priority application, only one certified copy needs to be filed to satisfy the requirements relating to both the filing date (Rule 40(3)) and the priority claim (Rule 53(1), see A-III, 6.7).

For divisional applications filed by reference, see A-IV, 1.3.1.

Translation of the previously filed application

Rule 40(3)

If the previously filed application is not in an official EPO language, the applicant must also file a translation into one such language within two months of filing the application (Rule 40(3)). If the translation of the previously filed application is already available to the EPO, a copy of it will be included in the file free of charge and the applicant will not need to file it (Rule 40(3)).

Note that where the previously filed application is in an official language of an EPC contracting state according to Art. 14(4), the application may qualify for a reduction of the filing fee under the language-related fee reduction scheme (see A-X, 9.3.1 and 9.3.2). The reduction applies even in cases where the description is filed by reference to a previously filed application according to Rule 40(1)(c), where the previously filed application is in a language specified in Art. 14(4) but the claims are filed after the date of filing in accordance with Rules 57(c) and 58 and in an official EPO language. This is because the essential element for establishing a date of filing (the provision of a description, see Rule 40(1)(c)) has been provided in a language giving rise to the entitlement to the reduction (see G 6/91, mutatis mutandis).

The claims

Applicants can also indicate that the reference to the previously filed application should also replace the claims (Rule 57(c)). This must be done

on the date of filing, preferably by selecting the appropriate box on the request for grant (EPO Form 1001). In that case, the claims of the previously filed application will form the basis for the search and, as they satisfy the requirement of Rule 57(c), the applicant will not be invited to file claims later.

If applicants do not refer to the claims of the previously filed application but only to the description and any drawings, they may file a set of claims at the same time as the reference (i.e. on the date of filing). If they do not do so, the Receiving Section will invite them under Rule 58 to file claims (see A-III, 15).

4.1.4 Deficiencies

If the EPO (Receiving Section) notes either of the following deficiencies:

- Rule 40(1)(a) – no indication that a European patent is sought or
- Rule 40(1)(c) – no description or reference to a previously filed application,

either of which prevents the application being accorded a date of filing, it communicates this to the applicants and invites them to remedy the deficiency within a non-extendable period of two months from notification of a communication under Rule 55. If the requirements of Rule 40(1)(a) or Rule 40(1)(c), as applicable, are not met at the end of this period, the application will not be dealt with as a European patent application. The EPO will notify the applicant accordingly under Rule 112(1). In reply, the applicant may file a request for a decision under Rule 112(2) (see E-VIII, 1.9.3) or request re-establishment of rights under Art. 122 and Rule 136 (see E-VIII, 3).

If none of the available means of redress is filed on time, any fees paid are refunded. If the applicant wishes to pursue a European patent application, all documents relating to the purported application will have to be re-filed. Any such re-filed application will be accorded as the date of filing the date on which all the requirements of Rule 40 are fulfilled.

Deficiency under Rule 40(1)(b)

If the information on the applicants is missing or does not enable the EPO to contact them (Rule 40(1)(b)), a communication concerning the deficiency cannot be sent. The European patent application will not come into existence unless the applicants correct this deficiency on their own initiative within two months of the date of receipt of the original documents. In this case, the date of filing is the date on which all the requirements of Rule 40 are met.

Art. 90(1) and (2)
Rule 55
Rule 112(1)

Filing by reference to a previously filed application

Where the application is filed by reference to a previously filed application and the EPO (Receiving Section) notes that any of the following information is missing:

- (i) the filing date of the previously filed application
- (ii) its file number
- (iii) the office where it was filed
- (iv) an indication that this reference replaces the description and any drawings

then it proceeds as above and invites the applicant to remedy the deficiency within a two-month time limit (Rule 55). If the applicant does not remedy the deficiencies in due time, the application is not treated as a European patent application.

If the applicant does not provide the certified copy of the previously filed application within two months of filing the application (Rule 40(3)) and it is not already available to the EPO (see A-II, 4.1.3.1), then a communication according to Rule 55 will be sent to the applicant requesting that the certified copy be filed within a non-extendable period of two months. If the applicant does not provide the certified copy in due time, the application is not treated as a European patent application. Where a translation of the application is required but is not provided within the above time limit, the procedure given in A-III, 14 is followed. The date of filing is unaffected by a missing translation.

4.1.5 Date of filing

The date of filing accorded to the application is the date the application meets the requirements of Rule 40 and is either:

- (i) the date of receipt at the EPO or competent national authority or
- (ii) the date, not later than the two-month period referred to in Rule 55, on which the applicant rectifies any deficiencies. The applicant is informed of the date of filing accorded to the application in this case.

Case (ii) is subject to one exception. Where the application is filed by reference to a previously filed application and the applicants fail to file the certified copy of the previously filed application within two months of filing the application as required by Rule 40(3), an invitation is sent to them to file it within two months of a communication according to Rule 55. If they file the certified copy within this two-month period, the application maintains its original date of filing, provided that all other requirements for acquiring a filing date have been met.

The date of filing may also change in cases where the applicant inserts missing parts of the description or missing drawings under Rule 56.

(see A-II, 5) or corrects erroneously filed parts under Rule 56a (see A-II, 6) after the filing date.

5. Late filing of missing drawings or missing parts of the description

5.1 Late filing of missing drawings or missing parts of the description – on invitation

Art. 90(1)
Rule 56(1)
Rule 56(4)(a)
Rule 56a(1)

The application is examined on filing to check that it is entitled to a date of filing. If, during this check, the EPO notes that parts of the description or drawings appear to be missing, it will invite the applicant to file the missing parts within a time limit of two months of a communication under Rules 56(1) and 56a(1) (see A-II, 6). During this time limit, the applicant may proceed under Rule 56 or 56a. If the applicant does not reply to this communication in time, then all references to the missing parts are deemed deleted. It should be noted that the applicant may not invoke the omission of the communication under Rules 56(1) and 56a(1).

Missing parts of the claims cannot be filed under Rule 56.

5.2 Late filing of missing drawings or missing parts of the description – without invitation

Rule 56(2)
Rule 56(4)(a)

Applicants may also file missing parts of the description or missing drawings on their own initiative (without being invited to do so by the EPO) within two months of the original date of filing. If the applicant does not do so within this period, all references to the missing parts are deemed deleted. If the applicant is invited by the EPO to file the missing parts, the period under Rule 56(1) takes precedence (see A-II, 5.1).

If, within two months of the original date of filing, applicants notice that parts of the description or drawings are missing in the application as originally filed, they should, on their own initiative, file the missing parts or missing drawings as soon as possible under Rule 56(2) because, in the absence of a communication from the EPO sent under Rules 56(1) and 56a(1), the possibility for applicants to file any missing or correct parts under these rules ends two months after the original date of filing.

Rule 135(2)

Further processing is ruled out for the time limits referred to in Rule 56 (Rule 135(2)).

5.3 The date of filing changes

Rule 56(2)

If the applicant files missing parts of the description or missing drawings in accordance with the procedure specified in A-II, 5.1 or 5.2, then the date of filing changes to the date on which the missing parts are received at the EPO. The applicant is informed of the new date of filing. This is subject to the exception explained in A-II, 5.4.

A "drawing" means a single numbered figure. Only whole figures are accepted according to Rule 56, even where only a part of the original figure was missing.

5.4 Missing parts of the description or missing drawings based on the priority application, no change in date of filing

If the applicant files missing parts of the description or missing drawings after the date of filing in accordance with the procedure specified in A-II, 5.1 or 5.2, the date of filing does not change, provided that all of the following criteria are satisfied:

- (i) the missing parts are filed within the applicable time limit*
- (ii) the application claims priority on the date on which the requirements laid down in Rule 40(1) were fulfilled (see A-II, 4.1 and 5.4.1)
- (iii) the applicant requests that the late-filed missing parts be based on the claimed priority in order to avoid a change in the date of filing (see A-II, 5.4.1), and does so within the applicable time limit*
- (iv) the late-filed missing parts of the description or missing drawings are completely contained in the priority application (see A-II, 5.4.2)
- (v) the applicant files a copy of the priority application within the applicable time limit* unless such a copy is already available to the EPO under Rule 53(2) (see A-II, 5.4.3) Rule 56(3)(a)
- (vi) where the priority application is not in an official EPO language, the applicant files a translation into one such language within the applicable time limit* unless such a translation is already available to the EPO under Rule 53(3) (see A-II, 5.4.4) Rule 56(3)(b)
- (vii) the applicant indicates where in the priority application and, if applicable, where in its translation, the late-filed missing parts of the description or missing drawings are completely contained, and does so within the applicable time limit* (see A-II, 5.4.2). Rule 56(3)(c)

*For the applicable time limit, see whichever of A-II, 5.1 or 5.2 applies.

Where the conditions for including the missing parts of the description or missing drawings under Rule 56(3) are fulfilled, the date of filing remains unchanged. The EPO will inform the applicant of this in accordance with Rule 56(3).

Where criterion (i) is not satisfied, the late filing of missing parts is deemed not to have occurred and all references to those parts in the application are deemed deleted under Rule 56(4)(a) (see A-II, 5.1 and 5.2). In this case the date of filing does not change nor are the late-filed missing parts introduced into the application.

If the request according to Rule 56(3) does not comply with one or more of the above requirements (ii)-(iv), then according to Rule 56(2) the date of filing changes to the date on which the EPO receives the late-filed missing parts of the application. The EPO will inform the applicant of this in accordance with Rule 56(2). Rule 56(2)

Rule 56(5)

If the request according to Rule 56(3) does not comply with one or more of the above requirements (v)-(vii), then according to Rule 56(5) the date of filing changes to the date on which the EPO receives the late-filed missing parts of the application. The EPO will inform the applicant of this in accordance with Rule 56(5).

5.4.1 Late filed missing parts when priority is claimed

In the case of a request under Rule 56(3), the EPO checks that the requirements for the priority claim are met (see A-III, 6).

Rule 40(1)

Where the applicant files a request under Rule 56(3) (see A-II, 5.4), the priority claim in question must have been in existence no later than on the date on which the requirements laid down in Rule 40(1) were first fulfilled (see A-II, 4.1).

5.4.2 The missing parts of the description or missing drawings are completely contained in the priority application

In cases where no translation of the priority application is required and both the European patent application and the priority application are in the same official EPO language, the requirement that the late-filed parts of the application be "completely contained" in the priority application is met only if the parts of the priority application identified by the applicant according to Rule 56(3)(c) contain the same drawings with the same annotations or, for late-filed parts of the description, contain the same text.

The "completely contained" requirement applicable to late-filed missing drawings also requires them to be in the same format as the drawings of the priority application, meaning that the drawings filed under Rule 56(3) may contain colour or greyscale content only to the same extent as the drawings in the priority application; see the notice from the EPO dated 5 September 2025 (OJ EPO 2025, A57).

If a translation of the priority application is required, then the requirement that the late-filed parts of the application be "completely contained" in the priority application is met only if the parts of the translation identified by the applicant according to Rule 56(3)(c) contain the same drawings with the same annotations or, for late-filed parts of the description, contain the same text.

Rule 56a

In addition to the requirement that the missing drawings or the missing parts of the description be identical to the corresponding drawings or parts of the priority application, they must also be inserted in the description in a manner that does not result in additional technical content. Drawings of low visual quality are not considered missing within the meaning of Rule 56 and can, therefore, not be remedied under this provision (see J.12/14). However, it may be possible to remedy drawings of low visual quality under Rule 56a (see A-II, 6).

Final assessment of the "completely contained" requirement falls under the responsibility of the examining division (see C-III, 1).

5.4.3 Copy of the priority application

The copy of the priority application that is required for the request according to Rule 56(3) does not need to be certified. However, if the applicants do provide a certified copy for their request according to Rule 56(3), they will not need to provide it again for their priority claim according to Rule 53(1).

Where a copy of the priority document is already available to the EPO under Rule 53(2) in accordance with the conditions laid down by the President, the applicant does not need to file it. See also A-III, 6.7.

5.4.4 Translation of the priority application

Where a translation of the priority application is already available to the EPO under Rule 53(2), the applicant does not need to file it.

In cases where the priority application is in an official EPO language and the European patent application is in a different official EPO language, the applicant is not required to file a translation of the priority application according to Rule 56(3)(b). However, since the language of the priority application differs from that of the European patent application, the requirement that the newly introduced drawings (if they contain annotations) or parts of the description be "completely contained" in the priority application (Rule 56(3)) is not met.

This can be overcome by the applicant's supplying within the applicable time limit (see whichever of A-II, 5.1 or 5.2 applies), either:

- (i) a translation from the official language of the priority application into the official language of the European patent application of those parts of the priority application identified by the applicant as completely containing the missing parts of the description or missing drawings (Rule 56(3)(c)) or
- (ii) a declaration indicating that the late-filed missing parts of the description or missing drawings are an exact translation of the parts of the priority application identified by the applicant according to Rule 56(3)(c).

The entire priority application does not need to be translated, since this translation is required to satisfy the "completely contained" requirement of Rule 56(3), not the translation requirement of Rule 56(3)(b).

5.5 Withdrawal of late filed missing drawings or missing parts of the description

Where applicants file missing parts of the description or missing drawings and make no request to base these late-filed parts on a claimed priority, they are informed of the new date of filing in a communication from the EPO (see A-II, 5.3). Within one month of this communication, the applicants may withdraw the late-filed parts of the application and if they do so, the redating of the application is deemed not to have taken place and all references to the missing parts of the description or missing drawings are deemed deleted. The EPO will inform the applicants of this.

Rule 56(2) and (4)

Rule 56(2), (4) and (5)

Where applicants file missing parts of the description or missing drawings and request that these late-filed parts be based on a claimed priority, but the requirements of Rule 56(3) are not met within the applicable time limit, the date of filing changes to the date on which the late-filed parts of the application are received at the EPO (Rule 56(2) or (5)). The applicants are informed of the new date of filing in a communication from the EPO. Within one month of this communication, they may withdraw the late-filed parts of the application (Rule 56(6)); if they do so, the redating of the application is deemed not to have taken place, any filing of missing parts of the description or missing drawings is deemed not to have occurred and all references to the missing parts of the description or missing drawings are deemed deleted (Rule 56(4)). The EPO will inform the applicants of this.

Where a reference to a missing figure, e.g. "see Fig. 4", is deemed deleted, then reference signs cited in it are also deemed deleted, although any technical information in the reference that is still technically meaningful without the reference may be retained: e.g. "see Fig. 4, a distillation column (1), provided with a condenser (2)" becomes "a distillation column provided with a condenser". The publication of the application (see A-VI, 1.3) in such a case will contain the application documents as originally filed, without the references deleted.

If the late-filed missing parts of the application do not satisfy the physical requirements of Rule 49(2) in conjunction with the decision of the President of the EPO dated 7 July 2025 (OJ EPO 2025, A49), the EPO will invite the applicant to correct this deficiency according to Rule 58 after the one-month period for withdrawing them has expired unless the applicant has withdrawn the documents (see A-III, 3.2.2).

5.6 Additional fee for pages

For the calculation of the additional fee for pages in excess of 35 ("page fee"), see A-III, 13.2.

6. Correction of erroneously filed application documents or parts

6.1 Correction of erroneously filed application documents or parts – on invitation

Rule 56a(1)Rule 56a(5)

The application is examined on filing to check that it is entitled to a date of filing. If, during this check, the EPO establishes that the description, claims or drawings (or parts of them) appear to have been erroneously filed, it will invite the applicant to file the correct documents within a time limit of two months of a communication under Rules 56(1) and 56a(1) (see A-II, 5). During this time limit, the applicant may proceed under Rule 56a or Rule 56. If the applicant does not reply to this invitation in time, any filing of the correct application documents or parts will be deemed not to have occurred and the erroneously filed documents or parts will remain in the application as filed (Rule 56a(5)). It should be noted that the applicant may not invoke the omission of the communication under Rules 56(1) and 56a(1) (see the notice from the EPO dated 23 June 2022, OJ EPO 2022, A71).

Claims filed after the date of filing (see A-II, 4.1) cannot be corrected under Rule 56a.

6.2 Correction of erroneously filed application documents or parts – without invitation

Applicants may also file correct (parts of) the description, claims or drawings on their own initiative (without being invited to do so by the EPO) within two months of the original date of filing. If the applicant is invited by the EPO to file correct application documents or parts, the period under Rule 56a(1) takes precedence (see A-II, 6.1). *Rule 56a(3)*

If, within two months of the original date of filing, applicants notice that they filed erroneous application documents or parts, they should, on their own initiative, file the correct ones as soon as possible under Rule 56a(3) because, in the absence of an EPO communication sent under Rules 56 and 56a(1), the possibility for applicants to file any missing or correct parts under these rules ends two months after the original date of filing.

Whether documents were erroneously filed depends only on the applicants' statement as to their intention. No further evidence is required by the EPO.

Further processing is ruled out for the time limits under Rule 56a(1) and (3) to (7) (Rule 135(2)). *Rule 135(2)*

6.3 The date of filing changes

If, after the date of filing, the applicant corrects the application documents (or parts) in accordance with the procedures explained in A-II, 6.1 or 6.2, then the erroneously filed documents will be deemed not to have been filed and the correct documents will be added to the application. The date of filing changes to the date on which the EPO receives the correct parts. The applicant is informed of the new date of filing under Rule 56a(3). This is subject to the exception explained in A-II, 6.4.

Erroneously filed application documents remain in the file, even if they are considered not part of the application as filed. As such, following publication of the application, the erroneous application documents or parts are open to file inspection (see A-XI, 2.1 and 2.3).

6.4 Correct application documents based on priority application, no change in the date of filing

If, after the date of filing, the applicant corrects the application documents (or parts) in accordance with the procedures explained in A-II, 6.1 or 6.2, then the date of filing does not change, provided that all of the following criteria are satisfied: *Rule 56a(4)*

- (i) the correct application documents (or parts) are filed within the applicable time limit*
- (ii) the application claims priority on the date on which the requirements of Rule 40(1) were fulfilled (see A-II, 4.1 and 6.4.1)

- (iii) the applicant requests that the correct application documents be based on the claimed priority (see A-II, 6.4.1) to avoid a change in the date of filing, and does so within the applicable time limit*
- (iv) the correct application documents are completely contained in the priority application (see A-II, 6.4.1)
- (v) the applicant files a copy of the priority application within the applicable time limit* unless such a copy is already available to the EPO under Rule 53(2) (see A-II, 6.4.2)
- (vi) where the priority application is not in an official EPO language, the applicant files a translation into one such language within the applicable time limit* unless such a translation is already available to the EPO under Rule 53(3) (see A-II, 6.4.3)
- (vii) the applicant indicates where in the priority application and, if applicable, where in its translation, the correct application documents are completely contained, and does so within the applicable time limit* (see A-II, 6.4.2).

*For the applicable time limit, see whichever of A-II, 6.1 or 6.2 applies.

Where the conditions for including the correct application documents or parts under Rule 56a(4) are fulfilled, the date of filing remains unchanged. The correct application documents or parts are included in the application and the erroneously filed ones remain in the application as filed. The EPO informs the applicants of this in a communication under Rule 56a(4). The erroneously filed documents may only be removed by amending the application during the grant proceedings and subject to Art. 123(2).

Rule 56a(5)(a)

Where criterion (i) is not satisfied, any filing of the correct application documents or parts is deemed not to have occurred. In this case, the date of filing does not change and the erroneously filed application documents or parts remain in the application. The EPO will inform the applicant of this in accordance with Rule 56a(5).

Rule 56a(3)

If the request according to Rule 56a(4) does not comply with one or more of criteria (ii)-(iv) above, then the date of filing will change to the date on which the EPO received the correct application documents or parts. They will be included in the application and the erroneously filed documents or parts will be deemed not to have been filed. The EPO will inform the applicant of this in accordance with Rule 56a(3).

Rule 56a(6)

If the request according to Rule 56a(4) does not comply with one or more of criteria (v)-(vii) above, then the date of filing will change to the date on which the EPO received the correct application documents or parts and the erroneously filed ones will be deemed not to have been filed. The EPO will inform the applicant of this in accordance with Rule 56a(6).

6.4.1 Later filed correct application documents or parts when priority is claimed

In the case of a request under Rule 56a(4), the EPO will check that the requirements for the priority claim are met (see A-III, 6). *Rule 56a(4)*

Where the applicant files a request under Rule 56a(4) (see A-II, 6.4), the priority claim in question must have been in existence on the date on which the requirements laid down in Rule 40(1) were fulfilled (see A-II, 4.1).

The requirement that the correct application documents or parts be completely contained in the priority application is the same as for missing parts of the description or missing drawings filed under Rule 56(3) (see A-II, 5.4.2).

Final assessment of the "completely contained" requirement falls under the responsibility of the examining division (see C-III, 1).

6.4.2 Copy of the priority application

The same requirements apply as for missing parts of the description or missing drawings filed under Rule 56(3) (see A-II, 5.4.3).

6.4.3 Translation of the priority application

The same requirements apply as for missing parts of the description or missing drawings filed under Rule 56(3) (see A-II, 5.4.4).

6.5 Withdrawal of correct application documents or parts

Where applicants are informed about the new date of filing, they may, within one month of the communication under Rule 56a(3) or (6) as applicable (see A-II, 6.3 and 6.4), withdraw the correct application documents or parts in order to maintain the initial date of filing. In this case, redating of the application and any filing of the correct documents or parts will be deemed not to have occurred. The erroneously filed documents or parts will be restored to the application as filed. The EPO will inform the applicants of this in accordance with Rule 56a(7). *Rule 56a(7)*

If the correct application documents or parts do not satisfy the physical requirements of Rule 49(2) in conjunction with the decision of the President of the EPO dated 7 July 2025 (OJ EPO 2025, A49), the EPO will invite the applicant to correct this deficiency according to Rule 58 after the one-month period for withdrawing them has expired unless the applicant has withdrawn the documents (see A-III, 3.2.2).

6.6 Same-day corrections

If applicants become aware that they filed incorrect application documents or parts and wish to file correct ones on or before the date the requirements of Rule 40(1) are fulfilled (see A-II, 4.1), they can do so without needing to file a new application and pay the corresponding fees (Rule 56a(2)). The correct application documents or parts are included in the application and the erroneously filed ones are deemed not to have been filed. The EPO will inform the applicants of this in accordance with Rule 56a(2). *Rule 56a(2)*

6.7 Correct application documents or parts filed after the search has startedRule 56a(8)Rule 112(1)Rule 135(2)

If applicants file correct application documents or parts after the EPO has already begun to draw up the search report, the EPO will invite them to pay a further search fee under Rule 56a(8) within a time limit of one month. If the fee is paid in time, the search will be completed on the basis of the date of filing accorded and the application documents established under the procedures described in A-II, 6.3, 6.4 or 6.5. If the fee is not paid in time, the application will be deemed withdrawn (Rule 112(1)). Further processing is available (Rule 135(2)). Payment of the further search fee is excluded from automatic debiting (see Annex A.1 to the ADA, point 3.2(j)).

6.8 Additional fee for pages

For the calculation of the additional fee for pages in excess of 35 ("page fee"), see A-III, 13.2.

6.9 Claims fee

For the calculation of the claims fee, see A-III, 9.

Chapter III – Examination of formal requirements

1. General

1.1 Formal requirements

The formal requirements that an application has to meet are examined by the Receiving Section and relate to: *Art. 90(3)*
Rule 57

- (i) representation
- (ii) signature
- (iii) physical requirements of the application
- (iv) abstract
- (v) request for grant
- (vi) claim to priority
- (vii) designation of inventor
- (viii) translations, where required
- (ix) the presence of at least one claim
- (x) filing and search fees.

1.2 Further checks

In addition, the Receiving Section has to:

- (i) carry out a preliminary check of the description and claims to ensure that the title of the invention, which will appear in the published application, generally meets the requirements of *Rule 41(2)(b)*
- (ii) check whether any claims fees due have been paid (see also *A-III, 9*) *Rule 45(1) and (2)*
- (iii) check whether the certificate of exhibition under *Rule 25* has been filed where the invention has been displayed under *Art. 55(1)(b)* (see also *A-IV, 3*) *Art. 55(1)(b)*
Rule 25
- (iv) check whether in the case of European patent applications relating to biological material the information under *Rule 31(1)(c)* and (d) is complete (see also *A-IV, 4*) *Rule 31*
- (v) check whether in the case of an application with nucleotide and/or amino acid sequences a prescribed sequence listing has also been filed (see also *A-IV, 5* as well as the decision of the President of the EPO dated 14 November 2025, *OJ EPO 2025, A64*, and the notices *Rule 30*

from the EPO dated 9 December 2021 (OJ EPO 2021, A97) and 14 November 2025 (OJ EPO 2025, A66).

The requirements listed above and the procedure to be followed when they are not met are considered in the following sections.

2. Representation

2.1 Requirements

The formalities officer must ensure that the requirements with regard to representation as set out in A-VIII, 1 are met. The main points are:

<u>Art. 133(2)</u>	(i) applicants who have neither a residence nor principal place of business in a contracting state must be represented by a professional representative or legal practitioner fulfilling the requirements of <u>Art. 134(8)</u>
<u>Art. 133(3)</u>	(ii) where an applicant having residence or principal place of business in a contracting state is represented by an employee, the employee is authorised
<u>Rule 152</u>	(iii) the authorisation, if any is required (see <u>A-VIII, 1.2</u> and <u>1.3</u> , the decision of the President of the EPO dated 7 July 2025, <u>OJ EPO 2025, A45</u> , the notice from the EPO dated 8 July 2024, <u>OJ EPO 2024, A77</u> , and the notice from the EPO dated 7 July 2025, <u>OJ EPO 2025, A47</u>), must be duly signed (see <u>A-VIII, 3.2</u> and <u>3.4</u>) and filed in due time.

2.2 Non-compliance

The effect of non-compliance with the provisions concerning representation and the action to be taken by the formalities officer in dealing with any deficiency are considered in A-III, 16.

3. Physical requirements

3.1 General remarks

<u>Art. 90(3)</u>	Every application that is subject to formal examination is examined for compliance with the requirements as to form set out below. Non-compliance with the requirements is considered in <u>A-III, 16</u> .

3.2 Documents making up the application, replacement documents, translations

The Receiving Section must ensure that the documents making up the application, i.e. request, description, claims, drawings and abstract, meet the requirements of Rule 49(2) in conjunction with Art. 4(2) of the decision of the President of the EPO dated 7 July 2025 (OJ EPO 2025, A49) to the extent necessary for satisfactory reproduction and reasonably uniform publication of the application under Rule 68(1). This equally applies to any supplementary document filed as an appendix to the description. When evaluating the quality of the application documents and their suitability for electronic and direct reproduction, the Receiving Section's objective must be to ascertain the discernibility of all details originally disclosed in the

documents received on the date of filing. The Receiving Section should not, however, draw the applicant's attention to any deficiencies in the content of the application, namely those listed in Art. 1(2)(i) and (j) and Art. 2(8), fourth sentence, of the decision of the President of the EPO dated 7 July 2025 (see also the notice from the EPO dated 25 November 2022, OJ EPO 2022, A114, point 8, and A-III, 16.1).

In the case of requirements that may necessitate some technical knowledge, such as those of Art. 1(2)(f) and (2)(h) of the decision of the President of the EPO dated 7 July 2025, the Receiving Section should, if in doubt, consult and take the advice of the search division. It should also consider taking action when the search division identifies a deficiency previously overlooked. It should be noted that flow sheets and diagrams are to be considered as drawings (Art. 1(3) of the decision of the President of the EPO dated 7 July 2025).

If the formal requirements under Rule 49(2) are not met, the applicant is invited to remedy this deficiency within a non-extendable two-month period (Rules 58 and 50(1)). If it is not remedied in time, the application is refused (Art. 90(5)).

Once the examining division assumes responsibility for the application, it also becomes responsible for formal matters. It should pay particular attention to the more technical requirements, in particular those laid down in Art. 1(2)(i) and (j), Art. 2(8), fourth sentence, and Art. 2(9) and (10) of the decision of the President of the EPO dated 7 July 2025 (see also the notice from the EPO dated 25 November 2022, point 8).

Rule 10
Art. 94(1)

Replacement documents, including the amendment of granted patents (Rule 86), and translations in an official language of documents filed under the provisions of Art. 14(2) or (4) are subject to the same requirements as the documents making up the application. They must therefore be typed or printed. Any drawings in translations filed under Art. 14(2) and Rule 6(1) may contain colour or greyscale content only to the same extent as the original drawings (see the notice from the EPO dated 5 September 2025 (OJ EPO 2025, A57)). Submissions containing handwritten amendments to application or patent specification documents are formally deficient and need to be corrected (see OJ EPO 2013, 603; however, see also E-III, 8.7 and OJ EPO 2016, A22, as well as H-III, 2.2).

Rule 1
Rule 49(2)
Rule 50(1) and (2)
Rule 86

In examination proceedings the invitation to correct formal deficiencies is sent by the formalities officer on behalf of the examining division (see the decision of the President of the EPO dated 12 December 2013, OJ EPO 2014, A6).

With regard to sequence listings, see A-IV, 5.

The particular requirements for drawings are dealt with in A-IX. For drawings of improved quality filed under Rule 58, see A-IX, 10.

3.2.1 Physical requirements of applications filed by reference to a previously filed application

If the application is filed by reference to a previously filed application under Rule 40(1)(c) (see A-II, 4.1.3.1), and if no translation is required, the certified copy of the previously filed application required under Rule 40(3) must satisfy the physical requirements. If the previously filed application is not in an official EPO language, only the translation under Rule 40(3) must satisfy the physical requirements (Rule 49(2)), provided that the authenticity of the contents of the original is not impugned.

3.2.2 Physical requirements of late-filed application documents or correct application documents or parts

Where claims are filed after the date of filing (see A-III, 15) or where missing parts of the description, missing drawings or correct application documents or parts are inserted after the date of filing (see A-II, 5 and 6), all of these late-filed application documents must also satisfy the physical requirements. Consequently, the EPO will carry out two separate checks, first on the physical requirements of the original application documents, and second on any late-filed or correct application documents or parts. Any deficiencies will be communicated only when the complete application documents are on file.

If the late filing of missing parts of the description, missing drawings or correct application documents or parts results in a change of the date of filing, the applicant can withdraw the late-filed parts of the description or drawings up to one month after being notified of the change in date of filing (Rule 56(6)). Similarly, they can withdraw correct application documents or parts filed under Rule 56a within the same period (Rule 56a(7)). Consequently, if the late-filed missing parts of the description, missing drawings or correct application documents or parts:

- (i) contain deficiencies with regard to the physical requirements and
- (ii) result in a change of the date of filing,

the EPO will wait until the one-month period for their withdrawal has expired and will then send a communication according to Rule 58 in respect of these deficiencies, if the applicant has not withdrawn them in time.

3.3 Other documents

Rule 50(2)

All documents other than those making up the application must be typewritten or printed with a left margin of about 2.5 cm on each page (Art. 3 of the decision of the President of the EPO dated 7 July 2025, OJ EPO 2025, A49).

4. Request for grant

4.1 General remarks

Rule 41(1)

The request for grant must be made on the appropriate EPO form (EPO Form 1001), even though the request (the indication that a patent is sought, referred to in A-II, 4.1(a)) need initially be in no particular form. The latest version of EPO Form 1001 can be accessed in Online Filing 2.0 or

downloaded in PDF format from the EPO website (*epo.org*) (see A-II, 1.1.1).

For paper filings and filings made with the EPO Contingency Upload Service, applicants should always use the latest version of the form.

4.2 Examination of the request for grant form

The Receiving Section examines the request form to ensure that it contains the information listed in Rule 41(2), including the integral petition for grant (Rule 41(2)(a)). The applicant must be allowed to correct deficiencies in the request to the extent indicated in A-III, 16.

4.2.1 Information on the applicant

As specified in Rule 41(2)(c), the request must contain the name, address and nationality of the applicant and the state in which that party's residence or principal place of business is located. Where the application is filed by more than one applicant, the requirement must be satisfied for each applicant.

To verify this for the purpose of Rule 39(2a) (see OJ EPO 2024, A105 and A106), applicants must always indicate their nationality or nationalities, as well as their residence or place of business. *Rule 39(2)(a)*

At this stage in the proceedings, the formalities officer will consider the person named as applicant's entitlement to apply for a patent (A-II, 2).

Applicants (whether natural or legal persons) whose residence or principal place of business is in an EPC contracting state and who act without a professional representative can use an address for correspondence other than their residence. It must be the applicant's own address and be in an EPC contracting state. For the address to be used in proceedings before the EPO applicants must explicitly inform the EPO that it is to be used for correspondence, preferably by entering it in the box marked "Address for correspondence" on EPO Form 1001 (see the notice from the EPO dated 4 September 2014, OJ EPO 2014, A99). Correspondence cannot be sent to a different (natural or legal) person, since that requires a valid form of representation under Arts. 133 and 134.

4.2.2 Signature

The request must be signed by the applicant or their representative. If there is more than one applicant, each applicant or their representative must sign the request. For further details as to the signature of the request, see A-VIII, 3.2 to 3.4. *Rule 41(2)(h)*

4.2.3 Further requirements laid down by Rule 41(2)

The provisions of Rule 41(2)(b), (e), (f) and (g), dealing respectively with the title of the invention, divisional applications, Art. 61 applications and claim to priority, are considered in subsequent sections of this chapter and in A-IV.

5. Designation of inventor

5.1 General remarks

Art. 81
Rule 19
Rule 41(2)(j)

Every application must designate the inventor, who must be a natural person (J 8/20). The designation is incorporated in Online Filing 2.0 (see A-II, 1.1.1). When filing on paper or using the EPO Contingency Upload Service, the designation is filed on a separate document where the applicant is not the inventor or the sole inventor. Where that is not the case, the designation must be effected on the request for grant form (EPO Form 1001) by selecting the appropriate box in section 22. Where the designation is effected on a separate document, a trilingual form – EPO Form 1002 – available on the EPO website should preferably be used.

5.2 Waiver of right to be mentioned as inventor

Rule 20(1)
Rule 143(1)(g)
Rule 144(c)
Art. 129(a)

Inventors designated by the applicant may send the EPO a written waiver of their right to be mentioned as inventor in the published European patent application and the European patent specification. If it is received in time, their name is not mentioned in the published European patent application, the European patent specification, the European Patent Register (Rule 143(1)(g)) and, consequently, the European Patent Bulletin. Moreover, in accordance with Rule 144(c), the designation of the inventor as well as the waiver is then excluded from file inspection under Art. 128(4). If the waiver is received after the publication of the European patent application, the mention of the inventor will be removed in the European Patent Register.

5.3 Designation filed in a separate document

Rule 19(1)

Where filed in a separate document, the designation must contain the inventor's family name, given names and country and place of residence. The place of residence is the city or municipality, i.e. not the province or region, where the inventor permanently resides and should preferably include the postal code (see the notice from the EPO dated 22 February 2021, OJ EPO 2021, A12). The country and place of residence may also be that of the inventor's employer (e.g. a company). The designation must contain the statement, referred to in Art. 81, indicating the origin of the right to the patent and the signature of the applicant or the appointed representative.

In the case of assignment, the words "by agreement dated ..." suffice. For inventions by employees, it is sufficient to mention that the inventor(s) is/are employee(s) of the applicant(s) and for cases of succession that the applicant(s) is/are heir(s) of the inventor(s).

The designation of inventor must be signed by the applicant or the appointed representative. With regard to the signature, the provisions set out in A-VIII, 3.2 to 3.4, apply.

Rule 19(2)

The EPO does not verify the accuracy of the information given in the designation of the inventor but checks whether the designated inventor is a natural person (J 8/20).

If the designation of inventor is filed subsequently, the requirements set out in A-VIII, 3.1 apply.

5.4 Deficiencies

Where a designation is not filed or cannot be considered validly filed due to a deficiency (e.g. inventor's name / country / place of residence / applicant's signature is missing), the applicant is informed that the European patent application will be refused if the deficiency is not remedied within the period prescribed under Rule 60(1), i.e. within 16 months of the date of filing or, if priority is claimed, of the priority date. This time limit is deemed met if the information is communicated before completion of the technical preparations for publication (see A-VI, 1.2). For divisional applications, see A-IV, 1.5. Where the applicant has requested early publication and, accordingly, technical preparations for publication are completed before expiry of the 16-month time limit, the applicant can still file the designation within that time limit (see J 1/10). If the deficiency is not remedied in time, the application is refused and the applicant is notified accordingly. Further processing is possible according to Art. 121 and Rule 135 (see E-VIII, 2).

Art. 90(3) to (5)

Art. 93(1)

Rule 60(1)

Art. 121

5.5 Incorrect designation

An incorrect designation may be rectified, provided that a request is received together with the consent of the wrongly designated person and that of the patent's applicant or proprietor where the request is not filed by that party. If a further inventor is to be designated, the consent of the inventor(s) previously designated is not necessary (see J 8/82). The provisions of A-III, 5.3 apply to the corrected designation *mutatis mutandis*. Rectification may also be requested after the proceedings before the EPO are terminated.

Rule 21(1)

Where an incorrect designation has been rectified and where the incorrect designation was recorded in the European Patent Register or published in the European Patent Bulletin, its rectification or cancellation will also be recorded or published there. Rectification of the designation of an inventor falls under the responsibility of the Legal Division (see the decisions of the President of the EPO dated 21 November 2013, OJ EPO 2013, 600 and 601).

Rule 21(2)

5.6 Changing the order of inventors

A request to change the order of inventors may be filed at any time, provided that proceedings are pending before the EPO. Such a request may also be filed, for example, in reply to the communication under Rule 71(3) (see C-V, 1) without delaying the grant of the European patent.

6. Claim to priority (see also F-VI)

6.1 General remarks

A European patent applicant is entitled to – and may claim – the priority of an earlier first application where:

- (i) the previous application was filed in or for a state or WTO member recognised as giving rise to a priority right in accordance with the provisions of the EPC (see also A-III, 6.2)

Art. 87(1), (2)
and (5)

- (ii) the European patent applicant was the applicant who made the previous application or is their successor in title
- (iii) the European patent application is made during a period of twelve months from the date of filing of the previous application (see, however, A-III, 6.6) and
- (iv) the European patent application concerns the same invention as the invention disclosed in the previous application (see also A-III, 6.4 and F-VI, 1), which must be the "first application" (see F-VI, 1.4 and 1.4.1).

As concerns (i), the previous application may be an application for a patent, the registration of a utility model or a utility certificate. However, a priority right based on the deposit of an industrial design is not recognised (see J 15/80).

Art. 87(3)

So long as the contents of the previous application were sufficient to establish a date of filing, that date can be used to determine a priority date, irrespective of the outcome (e.g. subsequent withdrawal or refusal) of the application.

As concerns (ii), it is important to note that the transfer of the priority right is distinct from a possible transfer of the priority application and must be assessed under the EPC, regardless of any national laws. The EPC does not set out any formal requirements for the transfer of the priority right (see G 1/22 and G 2/22). Where the previous application was filed by joint applicants, all of them must be among the applicants of the later European patent application or have transferred their rights in the priority application to the applicant of the later European patent application (see T 844/18). Yet, absent any substantiated indication to the contrary, there is a strong rebuttable presumption under the EPC that an applicant or joint applicants claiming priority in accordance with Art. 88(1) and Rule 52 are also entitled to the claimed priority. The burden of proof is shifted, and the examining division, opponent or third party challenging an applicant's entitlement to priority has to prove that this entitlement is missing. Especially where an international application under the PCT is filed by joint applicants, including the priority applicant, but without naming the priority applicant as applicant for the European designation, the mere fact of the joint filing implies an agreement between the applicants allowing all of them to rely on the priority right unless substantial facts indicate otherwise (see G 1/22 and G 2/22).

However, in the case of joint applicants filing the later European patent application, it is sufficient if one of the applicants is the previous application's applicant or their successor in title. There is no need for a special transfer of the priority right to the other applicant(s), since the later European patent application has been filed jointly. The same applies where the previous application itself was filed by joint applicants, provided that all of them, or their successor(s) in title, are among the later European patent application's joint applicants.

As concerns (iii), the priority period starts on the day following the first application's date of filing (Art. 4C(2) Paris Convention and Rule 131(2)). Accordingly, where a priority claim relates to an application filed on the same day as the European patent application, it will be disregarded (see, however, also A-III, 6.6).

6.2 Applications giving rise to a right of priority

Applications giving rise to a right of priority referred to in A-III, 6.1(i) are those filed at industrial property offices:

- (a) of or acting for states party to the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property Art. 87(1)
- (b) of or acting for any member of the World Trade Organisation (WTO) or Art. 87(1)
- (c) not subject to either the Paris Convention or the Agreement establishing the WTO, but where: Art. 87(5)
 - (i) that authority recognises that a first filing made at the EPO gives rise to a right of priority under conditions and with effects equivalent to those laid down in the Paris Convention and
 - (ii) the EPO President issues a communication indicating this.

To date, no such communication referred to in (c)(ii) has been issued and so this does not as yet apply. Furthermore, the members of the WTO do not necessarily have to be states as such but may also be intergovernmental bodies or territories with special status such as Taiwan, Province of China.

In view of the wording of Art. 87(1), which refers to filings "in or for" any state party to the Paris Convention or member of the WTO, priority may be claimed of an earlier first-filed national application, a previous European patent application, a previous application filed under another regional patent treaty or an international application filed under the PCT. This includes the US "provisional application for patent" (notice from the EPO President dated 26 January 1996, OJ EPO 1996, 81). A list of the countries party to the Paris Convention is available on WIPO's website and regularly published on the EPO website (epo.org). Likewise, a list of the members of the WTO is regularly updated on the WTO website.

6.3 Multiple priorities

The applicant may claim more than one priority based on previous applications in the same or different states and/or WTO members. Where multiple priorities are claimed, time limits calculated from the priority date run from the earliest date of priority and, as a result, the European patent application must be made within twelve months of the earliest priority date (see, however, A-III, 6.6); this applies if earlier applications have been filed in any of the industrial property offices mentioned in A-III, 6.2. Art. 88(2)

6.4 Examination of the priority document

The Receiving Section is not required to examine the content of the priority document. However, where it is obvious, e.g. from the title of the document, that the document concerns subject-matter quite different from that of the application, the applicant should be informed that that the document filed might not be relevant.

6.5 Declaration of priority

An applicant wishing to claim priority must file a declaration of priority indicating:

- (i) the date of the previous application
- (ii) the state or WTO member in or for which it was filed
- (iii) its file number.

The declaration of priority should preferably be made on filing the European patent application (Rule 52(2)). In such a case the declaration of priority, indicating at least the date on which and the country for which the earlier application was filed, should be included on the request for grant form (Rule 41(2)(g)). However, if a priority claim is added or corrected after the request for grant form has been filed (see A-III, 6.5.1 and 6.5.2), the applicant will not be invited by the EPO to file a corrected request for grant.

The time limit for filing the certified copy of the priority document is the same as for making the priority claim (see A-III, 6.5.1 and 6.7). Consequently, where:

- (a) the applicant supplies the certified copy on time and
- (b) the date and file number are indicated on the certified copy

the requirements of Rule 52(1) are met.

6.5.1 Filing a new priority claim

The declaration of priority should preferably be made on filing but can be made up to 16 months from the earliest priority date claimed. That is to say, items (i)-(iii) mentioned in A-III, 6.5 can be supplied up to 16 months after the earliest priority date. Where the priority claim is inserted after the filing date and causes a change in the earliest priority date, this 16-month period is calculated from that new earliest priority date in accordance with Art. 88(2). A priority claim inserted after the filing date cannot be used in support of a request made under Rule 56(3) or 56a(4) (see A-II, 5.4 and 6.4).

The applicant cannot request further processing in respect of the time limit for introducing a new priority claim under Rule 52(2), since it is ruled out by Rule 135(2).

Art. 88(1)

Rule 52(1)

Rule 41(2)(g)

Art. 90(4)

Rule 52(2)

6.5.2 Correcting an existing priority claim

The applicant may correct the declaration of priority within 16 months of the earliest priority date. Where the correction causes a change in the earliest claimed priority date, this time limit is the earlier to expire of: *Rule 52(3)*

- (i) 16 months from the earliest priority date as originally claimed or
- (ii) 16 months from the earliest priority date as corrected.

However, this time limit cannot expire earlier than four months after the date of filing. Thus, if the originally claimed priority date is incorrect and precedes the date of filing by more than twelve months, the applicants will always have at least four months to correct this date, i.e. the same period as if they had claimed the correct priority date (and for example got the file number wrong) and claimed a full twelve-month priority period.

If the applicant files a request for correction later it may, exceptionally, be allowed if it is apparent from the published application that a mistake was made (see A-V.3 and other sources mentioned there).

6.5.3 Deficiencies in the priority claim and loss of the priority right

Four potential deficiencies exist with regard to the priority claim, namely: *Art. 90(4) and (5)*

- (i) failure to indicate a date of the previous application or to indicate the correct date
- (ii) failure to indicate a state or WTO member in or for which it was filed or to indicate the correct state or WTO member
- (iii) failure to supply a file number
- (iv) failure to indicate the correct file number.

Deficiencies (i) and (ii) can only be corrected in accordance with the procedures and within the time limit indicated in A-III.6.5.2. Failure to correct either of these deficiencies in time results in loss of the priority right in question according to Art. 90(5). Further processing does not apply to the time limit under Rule 52(3), since it is ruled out by Rule 135(2).

However, where applicants have failed to indicate the file number of the previous application (deficiency (iii)), as required by Rule 52(1), before expiry of the 16-month time limit laid down in Rule 52(2), they are invited by the EPO to provide it within a two-month period under Rule 59. This period can be extended under Rule 132(2) (see A-XIII.11.2 for Euro-PCT applications), but further processing is ruled out by Rule 135(2). Failure to reply in time to this communication results in the loss of the priority right in question according to Art. 90(5). *Art. 90(4) and (5)*
Rule 59

If the applicant has failed to indicate the correct file number of the priority application (deficiency (iv)), a request for correction under Rule 139 can be filed (see A-V.3).

6.6 Priority period

Art. 87(1)

Art. 122

Rule 133

Rule 134

Rule 136

The priority period under Art. 87(1) is twelve months from the date of filing of the application from which priority is claimed. Rules 133 and 134 apply to the priority period. Where the date of filing of the European patent application is outside the priority period of the priority application, the applicant will be informed by the Receiving Section that their priority claim is considered invalid unless they:

- (i) indicate a corrected date lying within the priority period and do so within the time limit according to Rule 52(3) (see A-III, 6.5.2) or
- (ii) request re-establishment of rights in respect of the priority period and do so within two months of the expiry of the priority period, and this request is subsequently granted (see paragraph below). This only applies where the applicant also filed the European patent application within the same two-month period.

Where priority is claimed from an application having the same date of filing as the European patent application (see A-III, 6.1), the EPO will inform the applicant that priority cannot be claimed from this application unless the priority date can be corrected (see A-III, 6.5.2).

If the date indicated for the previous application is subsequent to or the same as the date of filing, the procedure set out in A-III, 6.5.2 also applies (with regard to the possibility of correcting clerical or similar errors, see A-V, 3).

According to Art. 122 and Rule 136(1) re-establishment of rights in respect of the priority period is possible. The request for re-establishment must be filed within two months of expiry of the priority period (Rule 136(1)) and the omitted act, i.e. the establishment of a date of filing for the European patent application, must also be completed in this period (Rule 136(2)). For more details on requesting re-establishment of rights, see E-VIII, 3.

6.7 Copy of the previous application (priority document)

Rule 53(1)

Art. 88(2)

Art. 90(4)

A copy of the previous application from which priority is claimed (priority document) must be filed before the end of the 16th month after the priority date. Where multiple priorities are claimed, the time limit runs from the earliest priority date.

6.7.1 Filing priority documents

Priority documents may be filed in paper form or electronically using Online Filing 2.0, provided the latter are in an accepted document format, have been digitally signed by the issuing authority proving that the document has not been modified since the signature was applied and the signature is accepted by the EPO. Such electronic priority documents are currently being issued by the patent offices of Austria, Brazil, Czech Republic, Greece, Italy, France, Poland, Portugal, Singapore and the USA, with further offices expected to follow. Priority documents may not be filed using the EPO Contingency Upload Service (see the decision of the President of the EPO dated 8 July 2025, OJ EPO 2025, A52).

The copy and the date of filing of the previous application must be certified as correct by the authority with which the previous application was filed. Certification of the date may take the form of a separate certificate issued by that authority stating the date of filing of the previous application (Rule 53(1), second sentence) or may be an integral part of the priority document itself. The certification of the copy's authenticity may also be a separate document or an integral part of the priority document.

Rule 53(1)

A copy of the previous application (priority document) can also be filed on physical media other than paper, e.g. CD-R disc, provided that:

- (a) the physical medium containing the priority document is prepared by the authority with which the previous application was filed and comes with the guarantee that its content cannot undetectably be altered subsequently
- (b) the content of the physical medium is certified by that authority as an exact copy of (parts of) the previous application and
- (c) the date of filing of the previous application is also certified by that authority.

The certificate(s) may be filed separately on paper together with the physical medium. The physical medium must be readable and free of computer viruses and other forms of malicious logic.

6.7.2 Electronic retrieval of priority documents

At the request of the applicant, the EPO will include free of charge in the file of a European patent application a copy of the previous application from which priority is claimed retrieved via the WIPO Digital Access Service (DAS). DAS permits the automatic electronic exchange of priority documents between participating patent offices. The participating offices are published on the WIPO website (wipo.int/das/en/participating_offices). Applicants may request the office of first filing (OFF) to make certified copies of previously filed patent applications available to DAS and then request offices of second filing (OSF) to retrieve the copies via DAS by indicating the DAS access code(s) corresponding to the previous application(s) (see the decision of the President of the EPO dated 13 November 2021, [OJ EPO 2021, A83](#), and the notice from the EPO dated 22 February 2019, [OJ EPO 2019, A27](#)).

Rule 53(2)

The EPO will include free of charge a copy of the previous application in the file of the European patent application, if the previous application is:

- (i) a European patent application
- (ii) an international application filed with the EPO as receiving Office under the PCT.

No request is necessary for this. If the language of the previous application was not one of the official EPO languages, it may still be necessary to file the translation or declaration under [Rule 53\(3\)](#) (see [A-III, 6.8](#)).

Where the applicant has already supplied a copy of the priority document in connection with a request to base late-filed parts of the description or drawings on the claimed priority under Rule 56 (see A-II, 5.4(v)) or to base correct application documents or parts on the claimed priority under Rule 56a (see A-II, 6.4(v)), there is no need to file it again. However, if the copy already provided was not certified as to its content and/or date of filing, the applicant will need to provide a certified copy within the above time limit.

6.7.3 Invitation to file a certified copy

Art. 90(4) and
(5)
Rule 59

If applicants fail to provide a certified copy of the priority document within the 16-month period under Rule 53(1) (A-III, 6.7), the EPO will invite them to provide it within a two-month period under Rule 59. This period can be extended under Rule 132(2) (for Euro-PCT applications, see A-XIII, 11.2), but further processing is ruled out by Rule 135(2). If the applicant fails to provide the certified copy within this period, the priority right in question is lost (Art. 90(5)).

A copy of the previous application that cannot be included in the file will not be deemed duly filed under Rule 53(2). The EPO will inform applicants in good time and give them an opportunity to file the certified copy in accordance with Rule 53(1) (see the decision of the President of the EPO dated 13 November 2021, OJ EPO 2021, A83, and the notice from the EPO dated 13 November 2021, OJ EPO 2021, A84).

6.8 Translation of the previous application

Art. 88(1)
Rule 53(3)

Where the previous application claimed as priority is not in an official EPO language and the validity of the priority claimed is relevant for assessing the patentability of the invention concerned, the EPO will invite the applicant for or proprietor of the European patent to file a translation into an official EPO language within a period specified. The duration of this period will vary depending on the stage of proceedings at which the invitation is sent (see the subsequent subsections).

6.8.1 Invitation to file the translation before examination

Where the search division notes that a translation of the previous application is required, the invitation to provide it according to Rule 53(3) may be sent at the same time as either item (i) or item (ii) below:

- (i) the communication according to Rules 69(1) and 70a(1) (where the applicant does not file the request for examination before the search report is transmitted – see A-VI, 2.1).

In this case, the time limit for providing the translation is the same as for filing the request for examination, i.e. six months from the date of mention of the publication of the European search report according to Rule 70(1).

- (ii) the communication according to Rule 70(2) (where the applicant files the request for examination before the (supplementary) European search report is transmitted – see A-VI, 2.3).

In this case the time limit for providing the translation is the same as for filing the confirmation of the request for examination according to Rule 70(2):

- (a) for applications not filed via the PCT, this is six months from the date of mention of the publication of the European search report (see A-VI, 2.3).
- (b) for Euro-PCT applications subject to the preparation of a supplementary European search report (see B-II, 4.3.2), this is six months from the notification of the communication according to Rule 70(2) (see A-XIII, 11.2.1).

In practice, the invitation according to Rule 53(3) will be sent to the applicant in a separate communication and, in some cases, might not be dispatched on exactly the same date as the applicable communication indicated in (i) or (ii) above. However, this will not affect the expiry date of the period for providing the translation, since the relevant event used in its calculation (the mention of the publication of the European search report or the notification of the communication under Rule 70(2)) is not related to the notification of the invitation according to Rule 53(3). An exception applies where the communication under Rule 53(3) is notified less than two months before expiry of the resulting period; in that case the time limit for filing the translation will be considered extended until two months after the notification of the invitation, without prejudice to its possible extension under Rule 132(2) (see E-VIII, 1.6).

6.8.2 Invitation to file the translation in examination/opposition

The period for providing the translation in either examination or opposition proceedings is four months. Rule 132(2)

If not sent earlier (see A-III, 6.8.1), an invitation according to Rule 53(3) may be sent in examination proceedings either alone or as an annex to a communication according to Art. 94(3). When sent as an annex to a communication according to Art. 94(3), the time limit set for reply to that communication is the same as for providing the translation (i.e. four months), even where the issues raised in the communication are minor (see E-VIII, 1.2).

For Euro-PCT applications where the EPO acted as the ISA or the Supplementary International Searching Authority (SISA, Rule 45b/s PCT), an invitation according to Rule 53(3) may be sent by the examining division only after the period according to Rule 161(1) has expired (see A-XIII, 11.2.1).

Since the proprietor of a European patent might not have previously been invited to file a translation (in the examination procedure or earlier as indicated in A-III, 6.8.1) in cases where the validity of the claimed priority becomes relevant for assessing patentability in opposition proceedings, the EPO may make the above invitation during the opposition procedure.

In examination and opposition proceedings, where the applicant or proprietor has been invited to provide the translation, no summons to oral proceedings will be sent until either the translation is provided or (in examination proceedings) the period for further processing in respect of the time limit according to Rule 53(3) has expired, whichever is the earlier.

In practice, the search, examining or opposition division dealing with the patent application or patent will inform the formalities officer that a translation of the previous application is required and the formalities officer will then dispatch the above communication.

6.8.3 Loss of rights and legal remedies

If the applicant for or proprietor of the European patent does not provide the translation in time, the right of priority is lost and the applicant or proprietor is informed accordingly (see A-III, 6.11). This has the effect that the intermediate document(s) will become prior art under Art. 54(2) or Art. 54(3), as applicable, and therefore relevant for the assessment of patentability. There is no further invitation to the applicant or proprietor to file the translation. However, in examination proceedings, further processing is available in cases of failure to file the translation in time (see E-VIII, 2). Where appropriate, the applicant can also request a decision under Rule 112(2) (see E-VIII, 1.9.3).

Where translations of more than one previous application are requested and not provided in time, one further processing fee is due according to Rule 135(1) and Art. 2(1), item 12, RFees for each of these priorities. This applies even where the translations were requested in a single Rule 53(3) invitation.

In the event of failure to file the translation in time in opposition proceedings, the proprietor can request re-establishment of rights according to Art. 122 and Rule 136 (see E-VIII, 3). Further processing is not available to the patent proprietor in opposition proceedings. A decision according to Rule 112(2) may, however, be requested, if applicable (see E-VIII, 1.9.3).

6.8.4 Translation of previous application already filed

Where the applicant has already supplied a translation of the previous application in connection with a request to base late-filed parts of the description or drawings on the claimed priority under Rule 56 (see A-II, 5.4(vi)) or to base correct application documents or parts on the claimed priority under Rule 56a (see A-II, 6.4(vi)), the applicant does not need to file it again.

6.8.5 Voluntary filing of the translation of the previous application

Applicants for or proprietors of the European patent can file a translation of the previous application on their own initiative at any time during examination or opposition proceedings before the EPO.

6.8.6 Declaration replacing the translation

Alternatively, a declaration that the European patent application is a complete translation of the previous application may be submitted within the time limits referred to in A-III, 6.8.1 (see also F-VI, 3.4 and D-VII, 2).

The declaration may also be made by selecting the appropriate box on the request for grant form (EPO Form 1001). This declaration is only valid if the text of the European patent application as filed is an exact translation of the previous application of which priority is claimed, i.e. with nothing added or omitted.

If the European patent application did not contain claims on the date of filing (see A-II, 4.1), the applicant can file these later (see A-III, 15). In such cases, for the declaration to be valid, the description of the European patent application must be an exact translation of the description of the claimed priority, regardless of whether the latter contained claims on its filing date. However, where the European patent application contains claims on its date of filing and the previous application did not or contained fewer claims on its filing date, the declaration is not valid. Furthermore, if the European patent application contains more or less text than is contained in the previous application as filed, such a declaration cannot be accepted as valid.

If the certified copy of the priority application is on file when the formalities examination is carried out, the Receiving Section will check the application documents against the priority document in respect of any obvious and easily identifiable differences, e.g. compare the number of claims and any drawings. If discrepancies are found, the declaration is considered not to be valid and the applicant is informed accordingly.

Where the declaration cannot be accepted for any of the above reasons, to comply with the requirement for filing a translation, a complete translation must be filed within the set time limit. A declaration's validity is not affected by the simple rearrangement of its various parts (i.e. the claims vs. the description) (e.g. if the claims are presented at the end of the application, whereas in the previous application they are at the beginning) or by the use of a different type of reference sign (e.g. Arabic rather than Roman numerals). However, a declaration is not acceptable if changes have been made within the parts of the application (e.g. different order of claims, added reference signs) or if sections of the application (e.g. listing of components, section headings and words in the drawings) are not identical to those in the previous application.

Where a European patent application claims multiple priorities, the declaration will only in exceptional cases be a translation of the full text of one of the previous applications. In such cases, it may be filed in respect of the identical previous application, while a complete translation of the other previous application(s) will have to be filed on request.

6.9 Non-entitlement to right to priority

A European patent application has no right to priority if:

Art. 87(1)

- (i) the application was not filed within the twelve-month period referred to in A-III, 6.1(iii) and the applicant has neither:
 - (a) corrected the priority date on time (see A-III, 6.5.2) such that the European patent application's date of filing no longer exceeds the twelve-month priority period under Art. 87(1) or the priority date is no longer the same as the date of filing (see A-III, 6.6), nor
 - (b) successfully requested re-establishment of rights in respect of the priority claim (see A-III, 6.6)

Art. 87(1)

- (ii) the previous application did not seek an industrial property right giving rise to a priority right (see A-III, 6.1) or

Art. 87(1) and (4)

- (iii) the previous application does not give rise to a priority right in respect of the state, WTO member or industrial property authority in or for which it was filed (see A-III, 6.1(i) and 6.2).

6.10 Loss of right to priority

The right to priority for a European patent application is lost where:

Art. 90(4) and (5)
Rule 53(3)

- (i) the declaration of priority is not filed in due time (see A-III, 6.5.1)
- (ii) the declaration of priority is not corrected in due time (see A-III, 6.5.2 and 6.5.3)
- (iii) the certified copy of the previous application is not filed in due time (see A-III, 6.7)
- (iv) the translation of the previous application or the declaration referred to in A-III, 6.8.6 is not filed in due time in response to an invitation according to Rule 53(3) (see A-III, 6.8.3).

6.11 Notification

Rule 112(1)

The applicant is notified of any non-entitlement to or loss of a priority right. The computation of time limits that depend on the priority will take this new situation into account. This also applies where entitlement to a priority right is surrendered. The termination of a priority right has no effect on a time limit that has already expired (see also F-VI, 3.4 and E-VIII, 1.5). If the search has not yet been carried out, the Receiving Section notifies the search division of a loss of or non-entitlement to a priority date.

6.12 Copy of the search results for the priority or priorities

Rule 141(1)

An applicant claiming priority within the meaning of Art. 87 must file a copy of the results of any search carried out by the authority with which the previous application was filed together with the European patent application either without delay after receiving such results or, in the case of a Euro-PCT application, on entry into the European phase. This requirement

also applies to priority claims that are subsequently withdrawn or lapse and to priority claims introduced or corrected after the filing date (see A-III, 6.5.1 and 6.5.2). The obligation under Rule 141(1) exists as long as the application is pending before the EPO and applies to all European and Euro-PCT applications filed on or after 1 January 2011 (OJ EPO 2009, 585). In the case of divisional applications, the relevant date is that on which the divisional application was received by the EPO (see A-IV, 1.2.1), not the filing date of the parent application. Where the copy is not provided to the EPO before the examining division assumes responsibility, the procedure is as set out in C-II, 5 and C-III, 6.

Where multiple priorities are claimed, the copy of the search results referred to above must be provided for all applications claimed as priority. If the search results are not drawn up in an official EPO language, no translation is required. The copy of the search results submitted must be a copy of the official document issued by the office where the previous application was filed. A simple listing of the prior art drawn up by the applicant will not suffice. Copies of the cited documents do not have to be provided (see the notice from the EPO dated 28 July 2010, OJ EPO 2010, 410).

The copy referred to in Rule 141(1) is deemed duly filed if it is available to the EPO and is to be included in the European patent application's file under the conditions determined by the EPO President. According to the decision of the President of the EPO dated 5 October 2010, OJ EPO 2010, 600, these exceptions relate to cases where a search report of the following type was drawn up by the EPO on an application whose priority is claimed:

Rule 141(2)

- (i) European search report (Art. 92)
- (ii) international search report (Art. 15(1) PCT)
- (iii) international-type search report (Art. 15(5) PCT)
- (iv) search report prepared on behalf of a national office on a national application (see OJ EPO 2024, A7).

The EPO also includes a copy of the search results referred to in Rule 141(1) in the European patent application's file, thus exempting the applicant from filing said copy where, based on an agreement with the national patent offices, the priority of a first filing made in one of the following states is claimed:

- Austria (see the decision of the President of the EPO dated 19 September 2012, OJ EPO 2012, 540)
- People's Republic of China (see the decision of the President of the EPO dated 8 April 2021, OJ EPO 2021, A38)
- Czech Republic (see the decision of the President of the EPO dated 11 July 2022, OJ EPO 2022, A79)

- Denmark (see the decision of the President of the EPO dated 10 December 2014, OJ EPO 2015, A2)
- Japan (see the decision of the President of the EPO dated 9 December 2010, OJ EPO 2011, 62)
- Republic of Korea (see the decision of the President of the EPO dated 27 February 2013, OJ EPO 2013, 216)
- Spain (see the decision of the President of the EPO dated 10 February 2016, OJ EPO 2016, A18)
- Sweden (see the decision of the President of the EPO dated 14 May 2021, OJ EPO 2021, A39)
- Switzerland (see the decision of the President of the EPO dated 4 June 2019, OJ EPO 2019, A55)
- United Kingdom (see the decision of the President of the EPO dated 9 December 2010, OJ EPO 2011, 62)
- United States of America (see the decision of the President of the EPO dated 9 December 2010, OJ EPO 2011, 62)

For divisional applications, where the results of the search on the claimed priority have already been provided in respect of the parent application, the applicant need not provide them again in respect of the divisional application (see the notice from the EPO dated 28 July 2010, OJ EPO 2010, 410).

7. Title of the invention

7.1 Requirements

Rule 41(2)(b)

The request for grant must contain the title of the invention. In the case of disparity between the title as given on the request for grant and any given on any other document such as the abstract, it is the title of the invention given on the request for grant which is taken as being proposed by the applicant. A requirement of Rule 41(2)(b) is that the title must clearly and concisely state the technical designation of the invention and must exclude all fancy names. In this regard, the following should be taken into account:

- (i) personal names, fancy names, the word "patent" or similar terms of a non-technical nature that do not serve to identify the invention should not be used
- (ii) the abbreviation "etc.", being vague, should not be used and should be replaced by an indication of what it is intended to cover
- (iii) titles such as "Method", "Apparatus", "Chemical Compounds" alone or similar vague titles do not meet the requirement that the title must clearly state the technical designation of the invention

- (iv) trade names and trade marks should also not be used; the Receiving Section, however, need only intervene when names are used which, according to common general knowledge, are trade names or trade marks.

7.2 Responsibility

The examining division bears ultimate responsibility for ensuring that the title accords with the provisions of the Implementing Regulations. The search division will nevertheless take action and amend the title to avoid, if possible, the publication of applications having titles that obviously do not comply with the applicable EPC provisions (see also [F-II, 3](#)). In such cases, the EPO will change the title on its own initiative if this appears necessary (see [OJ EPO 1991, 224](#)).

[Rule 41\(2\)\(b\)](#)

The applicant learns if the title proposed has been approved by the search division upon transmission of the European search report. The wording of the title (in the three official EPO languages), as approved by the search division, is notified by the communication announcing the forthcoming publication.

The title of the invention is published and entered in the European Patent Register ([Rule 143\(1\)\(c\)](#)) in capital letters.

8. Prohibited matter

8.1 Morality or "*ordre public*"

The application must not contain statements or other matter contrary to "*ordre public*" or morality. Such matter may be omitted when the application is published, the published application indicating the place and number of words or drawings omitted. (Where drawings are omitted regard should be had to the physical requirements of [A-III, 3.2](#).) The Receiving Section may check the description, claims and drawings to ascertain whether they contain offending matter. In order not to delay unduly the formalities examination, if carried out, this will entail a cursory examination to ensure that the application does not contain the following prohibited matter: statements constituting an incitement to riot or to acts contrary to "*ordre public*", racial, religious or similar discriminatory propaganda, or criminal acts and grossly obscene matter. The Receiving Section may also take action to prevent the publication of such matter where the search division draws its attention to such matter which it had overlooked. The applicant is notified of the material omitted. In practice, it will usually be the search division that brings the existence of such material in the application to the attention of the Receiving Section.

[Art. 53\(a\)](#)

[Rule 48\(1\)\(a\)](#) and
(2)

8.2 Disparaging statements

According to [Rule 48\(1\)\(b\)](#), the application must not contain statements disparaging the products or processes of any particular person other than the applicant, or the merit or validity of applications or patents of any such person. However, mere comparisons with the prior art are not to be considered disparaging *per se*. Statements clearly falling into this category that are evident from the cursory examination referred to in [A-III, 8.1](#) or to which attention is drawn by the search division may be omitted by the

[Rule 48\(1\)\(b\)](#) and
(3)

Receiving Section when publishing the application. In cases of doubt the matter should be left for the examining division. The published application must indicate the place and number of any words omitted and the EPO must furnish, upon request, a copy of the passage omitted. The applicant is again notified of the material omitted. (See also treatment of prohibited matter in proceedings before the examining division, F-II, 7.)

9. Claims fee

Rule 45(1) to (3)

Rule 112(1)

Rule 37(2)

Art. 2(1), item 15,

RFees

A European patent application containing more than 15 claims at the time of filing the claims (see the paragraph below) incurs a claims fee in respect of each claim in excess of that number. For Euro-direct applications filed and Euro-PCT applications entering the regional phase on or after 1 April 2009, a higher amount is payable for each claim in excess of 50. The claims' order is their sequence at their time of filing. The fee exemption relates to the first 15 claims of the first set of claims filed, meaning a reselection of the claims for which fees are payable is not allowed within these first 15 claims. If the applicant wishes to reduce the number of claims fees to be paid, they must make their selection in respect of claims numbered 16 and above. If an application contains more than one set of claims, Rule 45 only applies to the set of claims containing the highest number of claims. If, as a result of claims having been deleted owing to non-payment of claims fees, the number of claims remaining in the set that originally incurred the fees falls below that of another set, then the number of claims in the latter set has to be reduced to the same number as that remaining in the set originally incurring the fees (see J 8/84). The claims fees must be paid within one month of filing the claims.

Where correct claims are filed under Rule 56a(3) or (4) (see A-II, 6), the claims fee is calculated on the basis of the set of claims first filed.

The claims may be filed at the following stages:

- (a) on the filing date or on the date on which the divisional application is filed (see A-II, 4.1.5 and A-IV, 1.2.1)
- (b) after the filing date, in a timely response to a communication from the EPO indicating their absence under Rule 58 (see A-III, 15)
- (c) after the filing date, by applicants on their own initiative before the EPO sends a communication according to Rule 58 (see A-III, 15).

Consequently, the claims fees must be paid within one month of whichever of the above dates of receipt applies.

If the claims fees have not been paid in due time, they may still be validly paid within a non-extendable grace period of one month from notification of a communication under Rule 45(2) pointing out the failure to observe the time limit. The applicant cannot waive this communication. If a claims fee is not paid within the grace period, the corresponding claim is deemed abandoned and the applicant is notified accordingly. The applicant cannot waive the communication under Rule 112(1) noting the deemed abandonment of claims under Rule 45(3). If the claims fees paid are

insufficient to cover all the claims incurring fees (i.e. claim 16 onwards as filed), and if when payment was made no indication was given as to which claims were covered by the fees paid, then the applicant is requested to specify which claims incurring fees are covered by the claims fees paid. The Receiving Section notifies the search division of claims that are deemed abandoned. Any claims fee duly paid is refunded only in the case referred to in Rule 37(2) (see A-II, 3.2, last paragraph).

In cases where:

- (i) the application was filed by reference to a previously filed application (see A-II, 4.1.3.1) and
- (ii) the applicant indicates on filing that the claims of this previously filed application take the place of claims in the application as filed,

the claims fees are due within one month of the filing date (since the claims of the previously filed application are effectively present on the filing date). However, the EPO will not send the applicant a communication under Rule 45(2) with an invitation to pay any claims fees due until the applicant has, within two months of the filing date (Rule 40(3)), filed the copy of the previously filed application, since it is only at this point that the EPO will know how many claims there are and consequently how many claims fees, if any, are due.

Features of a claim deemed abandoned under Rule 45(3) and not otherwise to be found in the description or drawings cannot subsequently be reintroduced into the application and, in particular, into the claims (see J 15/88). However, by filing a divisional application, applicants can pursue any (features of a) claim deemed abandoned due to non-payment of the claims fee in the procedure for the grant of a patent for the parent application.

Regarding Euro-PCT applications entering the European phase, see A-XIII, 11.8.

10. Abstract

10.1 General remark

Every application for a patent must contain an abstract. The effect of non-compliance with this requirement is dealt with in A-III, 16.

Art. 78(1)(e)
Art. 90(3)
Rule 57(d)

10.2 Content of the abstract

While responsibility for the definitive content of the abstract lies with the EPO (see F-II, 2), in practice, this is delegated to the search division since the definitive content of the abstract must be determined and transmitted to the applicant along with the search report. Where the search division confirms that the abstract filed does not relate to the claimed invention, the applicant is informed that the document filed does not constitute an abstract and is invited to correct the deficiency (see A-III, 16).

Rule 66

10.3 Figure accompanying the abstract

Rule 47(4)

If the application contains drawings, applicants should indicate the figure (or figures, in exceptional cases) of the drawings that they suggest should accompany the abstract. Where this requirement is not met, the search division decides which figure(s) to publish. For the further procedure, see F-II, 2.4.

11. Designation of contracting states

11.1 General remarks

Art. 79(1)

All states party to the EPC at the filing date of the application are deemed designated in the request for grant of a European patent (for a list of the EPC contracting states, see General Part, section 6). Any other state entered on the request for grant must be disregarded (for the designation of contracting states on the request for grant form, see A-III, 11.2.2). When the application is in the name of joint applicants, each may designate different contracting states (see A-II, 2); objection is to be raised during the examination of formal requirements if there is any ambiguity as to the states designated by the individual applicants.

11.2 European patent applications filed on or after 1 April 2009

11.2.1 Designation fee; time limits

Art. 79(2)

A designation fee is payable for designating contracting states.

Rule 39

Art. 149(1)

Art. 2(1), item 3,

RFees

For applications filed on or after 1 April 2009 this is a flat fee covering all EPC contracting states. Therefore, for these applications, the system of charging designation fees for individual designated states (see A-III, 11.3) no longer applies. For European divisional applications, see also A-IV, 1.3.4 and 1.4.1.

Rule 39

For European patent applications, the designation fee must be paid within six months of the date on which the European Patent Bulletin mentions the publication of the European search report.

Rule 17(3)

Rule 36(4)

For divisional applications and new applications under Art. 61(1)(b), the designation fee must be paid within six months of the date on which the European Patent Bulletin mentions the publication of the European search report drawn up in respect of the European divisional application or the new European patent application (see A-IV, 1.4.1).

For Euro-PCT applications entering the European phase on or after 1 April 2009, see A-XIII, 5.

Rule 7a(3)

Art. 14(1) RFees

The designation fee is reduced by 30% if the applicant is eligible for a fee reduction under the fee reduction scheme for micro-entities (see A-X, 9.4).

11.2.2 Payment of designation fee

Rule 39(1)

All states party to the EPC at the time of filing a European patent application are automatically designated when the application is filed. The designation fee, however, may be paid later (see A-III, 11.2.1).

Payment of the designation fee covers all contracting states, except those for which the designation has been expressly withdrawn.

Art. 2(1), item 3,
RFees

11.2.3 Consequences of non-payment of the designation fee

An application is deemed withdrawn where the designation fee has not been paid by expiry of the period specified in Rule 39(1).

Rule 39(2)

In this case, the EPO sends the applicant a communication under Rule 112(1) notifying them of the loss of rights. In response, the applicant can request further processing according to Art. 121 and Rule 135 (see E-VIII, 2).

The loss of rights ensues on expiry of the period under Rule 39(1) and not on expiry of the period for further processing (see G 4/98, mutatis mutandis).

For Euro-PCT applications entering the European phase on or after 1 April 2009, see A-XII, 5.1.

11.2.4 Withdrawal of designation

Subject to the final sentence of this paragraph, the applicant may withdraw the designation of one or more contracting states at any time up to the patent's grant. Withdrawing the designation of all contracting states results in the application being deemed withdrawn and the applicant being notified accordingly.

Art. 79(3)
Rule 39(2) and
(3)

In neither case is a validly paid designation fee refunded (see A-X, 10.1.1).

A contracting state's designation may not be withdrawn from the date a third party proves to the EPO that they have initiated entitlement proceedings and up to the date when the EPO resumes proceedings for grant.

Rule 15

The applicant may withdraw designations when filing the European patent application, e.g. to avoid overlapping prior national rights with the priority application according to Art. 139(3). Timely payment of the designation fee will not cause those designations that have been withdrawn to be reactivated.

Where the applicant or one of the applicants is a Russian national, a natural person residing in Russia or a legal person, entity or body established in Russia, the designation of those contracting states that are Member States of the European Union will be deemed withdrawn (see OJ EPO 2024, A105 and OJ EPO 2024, A106).

Rule 39(2a)

For European divisional applications, see A-IV, 1.3.4.

*Rule 39, in force until
31 March 2009*

*Rule 17, in force until
31 March 2009*

*Rule 36 in force until
31 March 2009*

*Rule 160, in force
until 31 March 2009*

11.3 European patent applications filed before 1 April 2009

For information on the relevant provisions that were in force until 31 March 2009 and that remain applicable to European patent applications filed and Euro-PCT applications entering the European phase before 1 April 2009, see the April 2025 edition of the Guidelines, A-III, 11.3.

12. Extension and validation of European patent applications and patents to/in states not party to the EPC

12.1 General remarks

At the applicant's request and on payment of the prescribed fee, European patent applications (direct or Euro-PCT) and thus patents can be extended to European states having an extension agreement with the EPO (extension states). The same applies to requests for validation in European or non-European states having a validation agreement (validation states).

The states for which such requests may currently be filed are listed below:

(i) extension may be requested for the following European state:

Bosnia and Herzegovina (BA) since 1 December 2004

The EPO's extension agreements with the **Republic of Slovenia** (entry into force: 1 March 1994), the **Republic of Romania** (15 October 1996), the **Republic of Lithuania** (5 July 1994), the **Republic of Latvia** (1 May 1995), the **Republic of Croatia** (1 April 2004), the **Republic of North Macedonia** (as the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia) (1 November 1997), **Albania** (1 February 1996), the **Republic of Serbia** (1 November 2004) and **Montenegro** (1 March 2010) terminated when these countries acceded to the EPC with effect from 1 December 2002, 1 March 2003, 1 December 2004, 1 July 2005, 1 January 2008, 1 January 2009, 1 May 2010, 1 October 2010 and 1 October 2022 respectively. However, the extension system continues to apply to all European and international applications filed prior to those dates and to all European patents granted in respect of such applications.

(ii) validation may be requested for the following states:

Morocco (MA)	since 1 March 2015	<u>OJ EPO 2015, A20</u>
Republic of Moldova (MD)	since 1 November 2015	<u>OJ EPO 2015, A85</u>
Tunisia (TN)	since 1 December 2017	<u>OJ EPO 2017, A85</u>
Cambodia (KH)	since 1 March 2018	<u>OJ EPO 2018, A16</u>
Georgia (GE)	since 15 January 2024	<u>OJ EPO 2023, A105</u>
The Lao People's Democratic Republic (LA)	since 1 April 2025	<u>OJ EPO 2025, A23</u>

Extension and validation agreements are bilateral international treaties concluded between the European Patent Organisation and an individual state. Within the territory of that state, the effects of a European patent application for which an extension or validation request has been filed, or of

a European patent that has been validated in an extension or validation state, are based on national law. The provisions of the EPC, its Implementing Regulations and the Rules relating to Fees do not apply to the extension and validation systems unless and only to the extent that those provisions are referred to by the applicable national law. Thus, the EPC provisions concerning applicants' legal remedies and appeals do not apply in respect of any action taken by the EPO under the extension or validation procedure (see J 14/00, J 4/05 and J 22/10), e.g. where the extension or validation fee has not been paid within the applicable time limit indicated (A-III, 12.2). Similarly, no different claims, description or drawings are acceptable in respect of extension or validation states (see H-III, 4.4), as Rule 138 does not apply to the extension and validation systems.

A request for extension to or validation for the above-mentioned states is deemed made with any European patent application filed after entry into force and, in the case of the former, before termination of the respective extension agreements. This also applies to Euro-PCT applications, provided that the EPO has been designated for a European patent **and** the extension or validation state has been designated for a national patent in the international application (see A-XII, 2.1.1 and A-XIII, 5.2). The request is deemed withdrawn if the extension or validation fee is not paid within the prescribed time limit (see A-III, 12.2). It is by paying the extension or validation fee that the applicant decides to extend the application to an extension state or validate it in a validation state. The declaration in the appropriate section of the request for grant form (EPO Form 1001) or of EPO Form 1200 for entry into the European phase before the EPO where the applicant is asked to state whether they intend to pay the extension or validation fee is merely for information purposes and intended to assist in recording fee payments.

A request for extension or validation in respect of a divisional application (see A-IV, 1) is deemed made only if the respective request is still effective in the parent application when the divisional application is filed.

12.2 Time limit for payment of extension and validation fees

Under the applicable national provisions of the extension and validation states, the extension or validation fee must be paid

- (i) for European patent applications within six months of the date on which the European Patent Bulletin mentions the publication of the European search report
- (ii) for Euro-PCT applications within the period for performing the acts required for an international application's entry into the European phase or within six months of the date of publication of the international search report, whichever is the later.

If the fee for an extension or validation state has not been paid within the corresponding basic period (see items (i) and (ii) above), the applicant can still pay the extension or validation fee together with a 50% surcharge

- (a) within a grace period of two months from expiry of the basic period for payment or
- (b) if the designation fee has not been paid, along with the filing of a valid request for further processing concerning the designation fee, within two months of notification of a communication of loss of rights with regard to the designation fee (see the notices from the EPO dated 2 November 2009, OJ EPO 2009, 603, and 5 February 2015, OJ EPO 2015, A19).

If the applicant fails to pay the extension or validation fee during the basic and the grace period, the request for extension or validation is deemed withdrawn. No communication of loss of rights is issued.

However, a noting of loss of rights for failure to pay the designation fee under Rule 39(2) or 159(1)(d) will draw the applicant's attention to the non-payment of the extension or validation fee, where appropriate, triggering the time limit mentioned in item (b) above.

A request for re-establishment of rights according to Art. 122 and Rule 136 is not possible in respect of payment of the extension or validation fee.

12.3 Withdrawal of the extension or validation request

The request for extension or validation may be withdrawn at any time. It will be deemed withdrawn if the European patent or Euro-PCT application is finally refused, withdrawn or deemed withdrawn. A separate communication is not issued to the applicant. Validly paid extension or validation fees are not refunded.

12.4 Extension and validation deemed requested

Extension and validation are deemed requested in respect of all extension and validation states (see, however, A-III, 12.1, sixth paragraph, regarding Euro-PCT applications), and this is indicated in the published application, the European Patent Register and the European Patent Bulletin. Those states for which the extension or validation fees have been paid are subsequently indicated in the European Patent Register, the European Patent Bulletin and the published patent specification.

12.5 National register

Extension and validation states publish in their national register the relevant data relating to European patent applications and patents extending to their territory.

13. Filing and search fees

13.1 Payment of fees

The applicant is required to pay a filing fee and, subject to the exception mentioned below (see the note to point (iii) below), a search fee. The filing and search fees must be paid within the following periods:

- (i) where neither (ii) nor (iii) applies, within one month of filing the Rule 38 European patent application

Rule 36(3)
Rule 17(2) (ii) for European divisional applications or European patent applications filed according to Art. 61(1)(b), within one month of filing the divisional or Art. 61(1)(b) application

Rule 159(1) (iii) for Euro-PCT applications, within 31 months of the filing date or, where applicable, from the earliest claimed priority date*.

*Note that when a supplementary European search report is dispensed with by the EPO (see B-II, 4.3), no search fee is required for the Euro-PCT application (Rule 159(1)(e), see A-XIII, 6).

Art. 90(3)
Rule 57(e)
Art. 78(2)
Rule 36(3)
Rule 17(2) With regard to applications of types (i) and (ii), the EPO will check that these fees have been paid. If either fee is not paid on time, the application is deemed withdrawn. The applicant will be notified by the EPO as to the loss of rights according to Rule 112(1) and can respond by requesting further processing according to Art. 121 and Rule 135.

Under Art. 2(1) RFees as amended by Administrative Council decision of 14 December 2023 (OJ EPO 2024, A3) the filing fee amount depends on the method used for filing the European patent application. The latest information on the applicable fee levels and amounts can be found on the EPO website (see also A-X, 1).

With regard to Euro-PCT applications (type (iii)), see A-XIII, 4 and A-XIII, 6.

Rules 7a(1) to (3), (5),
7b(1) For the reduction of the filing fee under the language arrangements, see A-X, 9.3.1 and A-X, 9.3.2.

Rule 7

For the reduction of the filing fee and the search fee under the fee reduction scheme for micro-entities, see A-X, 9.4.1 and A-X, 9.4.2.

13.2 Additional fee (if application documents comprise more than 35 pages)

Rule 38(2) and
(3)
Art. 2(1), item 1a,
RFees
Rule 49 This section relates only to applications filed on or after 1 April 2009 (see also the notice from the EPO dated 26 January 2009, OJ EPO 2009, 118, and its supplement, OJ EPO 2009, 338).

An additional fee is payable as part of the filing fee for European patent applications filed on or after 1 April 2009 and comprising more than 35 pages. The fee amount depends on the number of pages over 35. For fee reductions under the language arrangements, see A-X, 9.3.1 and A-X, 9.3.2; for fee reductions under the scheme for micro-entities, see A-X, 9.4.1 and A-X, 9.4.2. The additional fee is payable within one month of the filing date of the application or of the date of receipt of a European divisional application or a European patent application according to Art. 61(1)(b). If the application is filed without claims or by reference to a previously filed application, the additional fee is payable within one month of filing the first set of claims or the certified copy of the application referred to in Rule 40(3), whichever expires later. The additional fee is calculated on the basis of the pages of the description, claims, any drawings and one page

for the abstract, in the language of filing. Where formal deficiencies in the documents making up the European patent application need to be corrected, the number of pages complying with the physical requirements (see [A-III, 3](#) and [A-IX](#)) is taken as the basis for calculation. In particular, deficiencies relating to minimum margins, each document making up the application starting on a new sheet, line spacing and character size as well as the scale of drawings can potentially impact the number of pages (see the decision of the President of the EPO dated 7 July 2025, [OJ EPO 2025, A49](#)). Where this is the case, any additional fee due for the higher number of pages may be paid within two months of the invitation under [Rule 58](#) drawing the applicant's attention to this requirement.

The pages of the request for grant (EPO Form 1001) and those forming part of a sequence listing within the meaning of [Rule 30\(1\)](#) are not counted, provided the sequence listing contained in the description is filed in XML format, in compliance with WIPO Standard ST.26 (see [OJ EPO 2021, A97](#)). By way of exception, an additional fee is not due either for a parent application's ST.25 sequence listing filed in PDF format as part of a divisional application (see [OJ EPO 2023, A98](#), and [A-IV, 5.4](#)). If the application is filed by reference to a previously filed application, the pages of the certified copy are taken as the basis for the calculation, excluding the pages for the certification, for bibliographic data and any sequence listing in ST.25 format contained in the certified copy under [Rule 40\(3\)](#). If the application is filed without claims, the additional fee takes account of the pages of the first set of claims filed.

Where missing parts are filed under [Rule 56](#) (see [A-II, 5](#)) or correct application documents are filed under [Rule 56a](#) (see [A-II, 6](#)), the additional fee is calculated on the basis of the documents present at expiry of the time limit under [Rule 38\(3\)](#).

For Euro-PCT applications entering the European phase, see [A-XIII, 4.1](#).

13.3 Additional fee for divisional applications

Regarding the additional fee payable as part of the filing fee for divisional applications of second or subsequent generations filed on or after 1 April 2014, see [A-IV, 1.4.1.1](#) and the notice from the EPO dated 8 January 2014, [OJ EPO 2014, A22](#).

[Rule 38\(4\)](#)
[Art. 2\(1\), item 1b](#),
[RFees](#)

For fee reductions under the language arrangements, see [A-X, 9.3.1](#) and [9.3.2](#); for fee reductions under the scheme for micro-entities, see [A-X, 9.4.1](#) and [9.4.2](#).

14. Translation of the application

There are three situations in which a translation of the European patent application will be required:

[Art. 14\(2\)](#)
[Rule 6\(1\)](#)

- (i) the European patent application was filed according to [Art. 14\(2\)](#) in a non-EPO language
- (ii) the European patent application was filed by reference to a previously filed application in a non-EPO language ([Rule 40\(3\)](#))

- (iii) the European divisional application was filed in the same language as the earlier (parent) application on which it is based, where this was not an official EPO language (Rule 36(2) – see A-IV, 1.3.3).

In all cases, a translation of the application must be filed at the EPO: in cases (i) and (ii) this must occur within two months of the date of filing according to Rule 6(1) (for type (i)) or Rule 40(3) (for type (ii)); in case (iii) it must occur within two months of filing the divisional application according to Rule 36(2).

Art. 90(3)
Rule 57(a)

The EPO will check compliance with this requirement. If the translation has not been filed, the EPO will invite the applicant to rectify this deficiency under Rule 58 within two months in accordance with the procedure explained in A-III, 16.

Rule 58

Failure to file the translation on time in response to the invitation under Rule 58 results in the application being deemed withdrawn according to Art. 14(2). The EPO will then notify the applicant of this loss of rights according to Rule 112(1). Further processing is ruled out by Rule 135(2) for the above time limits for supplying the translation under Rules 40(3), 6(1) and 36(2) and for the time limit for rectifying the failure to file the translation under Rule 58. Consequently, further processing is not possible in this case. However, the applicant may request re-establishment according to Art. 122 and Rule 136 for failure to comply with the time limit under Rule 58.

For translations in respect of international applications entering the European phase, see A-XIII, 3.

15. Late filing of claims

Art. 80
Rule 40(1)

To obtain a date of filing, the European patent application does not have to contain any claims. The presence of at least one claim is nonetheless a requirement for a European patent application according to Art. 78(1)(c), but a set of claims can be provided after the date of filing according to the procedure described below.

Art. 90(3) and
(5)
Rule 57(c)
Rule 58

The EPO will check whether at least one claim is present in the application. If there is not, the EPO will issue an invitation under Rule 58 inviting the applicant to file one or more claims within two months. If the applicant fails to do so within this period, the application is refused according to Art. 90(5). The applicant is notified of this decision according to Rule 111. Further processing for failure to observe the time limit under Rule 58 is ruled out under Rule 135(2). The applicant may, however, request re-establishment according to Art. 122 and Rule 136 or may appeal.

Where the application documents as originally filed did not include at least one claim, applicants may also file claims on their own initiative after the date of filing but before the EPO invites them to do so under Rule 58. In this case, the EPO does not issue a communication under Rule 58.

If the applicant does supply a set of claims in response to the invitation under Rule 58, the claims must have a basis in the application documents

(description and any drawings) provided on the date of filing (Art. 123(2)). This requirement will first be checked at the search stage (see B-XI, 2.2).

If the application was filed by means of a reference to a previously filed application in accordance with Rule 40(3) and the applicant indicated on the date of filing that the claims of the previously filed application were to take the place of claims in the application as filed (see A-II, 4.1.3.1), then, provided the previously filed application also contained claims on its date of filing, claims were present on the European patent application's date of filing and no communication under Rule 58 will be sent.

The above procedure also applies to divisional applications (Art. 76(1)) and applications filed in accordance with Art. 61(1)(b).

16. Correction of deficiencies

16.1 Procedure for formalities officers

Where, when examining for compliance with the requirements set out in earlier sections of this chapter, the formalities officer discovers deficiencies that may be corrected, they must give the applicant the opportunity to rectify each such deficiency within a specified period. The most common potential deficiencies at this stage of the procedure and the provisions governing their rectification are: *Art. 90(3)*

A-III, 2	Representation	Rule 58
A-III, 3	Physical requirements	Rule 58
A-III, 4	Request for grant	Rule 58
A-III, 5	Designation of inventor	Rule 60
A-III, 6	Claim to priority	Rule 52(3), Rule 59
A-III, 9	Payment of claims fees	Rule 45
A-III, 10	Abstract	Rule 58
A-III, 13	Filing fee, including any additional fee, search fee	Rule 112(1), Rule 135
A-III, 14	Translation of the application	Rule 58
A-III, 15	Late filing of claims	Rule 58
A-IV, 5	Late furnishing of a standard-compliant sequence listing	Rule 30(3)

The formalities officer should raise all formal objections that become evident from a first examination of the application – with the exception of those noted in A-III, 3.2 – in the appropriate communication. The definitive resolution of certain matters will likely be impossible at this stage, e.g. filing of priority documents for which the filing period has not expired, and further reports may be necessary. If the applicant is required to appoint a representative but has not done so, the formalities officer should deal with only this deficiency in the first report. Any request(s) for correction of other deficiencies will not be sent until a representative has been appointed, and will be sent to that representative.

16.2 Period allowed for remedying deficiencies

Rule 58

The period for remedying the following deficiencies is two months from a communication pointing them out according to Rule 58:

- (i) non-appointment of a representative where the applicant has neither residence nor principal place of business in a contracting state – see A-III, 2 (regarding failure to file an authorisation where this is necessary, see A-VIII, 1.10 and the decision of the President of the EPO dated 7 July 2025, OJ EPO 2025, A45, the notice from the EPO dated 8 July 2024, OJ EPO 2024, A77, and the notice from the EPO dated 7 July 2025, OJ EPO 2025, A47)
- (ii) documents making up the application not complying with physical requirements (see A-III, 3)
- (iii) request for grant (with the exception of the priority criteria) not satisfactory (see A-III, 4)
- (iv) abstract not filed (see A-III, 10)
- (v) where required, translation of the application not filed (see A-III, 14)
- (vi) no claims (see A-III, 15).

Art. 90(5)
Art. 14(2)

The period under Rule 58 is not extendable. If the above deficiencies under (i)-(iv) or (vi) are not rectified in time, the application is refused under Art. 90(5). If the deficiency under (v) is not rectified in time, the application is deemed withdrawn under Art. 14(2). Under Rule 135(2), further processing is ruled out for all of the above losses of rights, which all arise from the failure to observe the time limit of Rule 58.

The following deficiencies are rectified under provisions other than Rule 58:

- (vii) non-payment of the claims fees (Rule 45 – see A-III, 9)
- (viii) priority document or file number of the previous application is missing (Rule 59 – see A-III, 6)
- (ix) non-payment of filing fee, including any additional fee, and search fee (see A-III, 13)
- (x) non-filing of a standard-compliant sequence listing (Rule 30(3) – see A-IV, 5).

Rule 45

According to Rule 45(2), the period for remedying deficiencies related to the payment of claims fees under (vii) is one month from a communication pointing out their non-payment. Failure to correct this deficiency in time leads to the claims in question being deemed abandoned under Rule 45(3). Further processing applies to this loss of rights.

Art. 90(5)
Rule 59

Deficiencies under (viii) are to be corrected within two months of a communication under Rule 59. This period can be extended under Rule 132(2) (see A-XIII, 11.2 for Euro-PCT applications) but further

processing is ruled out by Rule 135(2). Failure to correct this deficiency in time leads to the loss of the priority right.

Failure to pay the filing, additional or search fee on time results in the deemed withdrawal of the application according to Art. 78(2). This loss of rights ensues directly on expiry of the applicable time limit (see A-III, 13). Deficiencies under (ix) can be corrected by requesting further processing.

The deficiency under Rule 30(1) can be corrected within two months of a communication under Rule 30(3). This period is not extendable but further processing is available. Failure to correct this deficiency in time leads to the refusal of the European patent application (see A-IV, 5). Rule 30

Where appropriate, the search division is informed of any loss of rights.

Chapter IV – Special provisions

1. European divisional applications (see also C-IX, 1)

1.1 General remarks

A divisional application may be filed relating to any pending earlier European patent application. A divisional application filed on the same day as the parent application is not considered validly filed. The term "earlier application" is understood to mean an application filed at least one day before the divisional application and refers to the immediate application on which the divisional application is based ("parent application"). Where the earlier application is a Euro-PCT application, a divisional application can only be filed upon effective entry of the earlier application into the European phase (see A-XIII, 9.1.2).

Art. 76

Rule 36(1)

The divisional application is accorded the same date of filing as the parent application and benefits from any priority right of the parent application in respect of the subject-matter contained in the divisional application (see A-IV, 1.2.1).

Where the applicant inserts missing parts of the description and/or missing drawings under Rule 56 (see A-II, 5) or corrects erroneously filed parts under Rule 56a (see A-II, 6) after the divisional application's date of receipt, the requirements of Rule 36(1) may no longer be fulfilled (see A-IV, 1.1.1). If the divisional application claims priority, the date of receipt does not change if the missing parts or the correct application documents are completely contained in the earlier application whose priority is claimed (Art. 88(1)).

A European patent application may give rise to more than one divisional application. A divisional application may itself give rise to one or more divisional applications.

Where a divisional application is deemed not validly filed due to non-fulfilment of one of the filing conditions (see also A-IV, 1.1.1 and 1.1.3), the applicant will be duly informed in a communication under Rule 112(1) stating that the application will not be processed as a European divisional application and providing the opportunity to apply for a decision on the EPO's findings under Rule 112(2) (see E-VIII, 1.9.3). Any fees paid will be refunded if the loss of rights becomes final.

1.1.1 Pendency of the earlier application

The parent application must be pending when a divisional application is filed. Reference is made in this regard to the observations in G 1/09 and J 18/09 as to what constitutes a pending application. In the case of an application filed as a divisional application from an application that is itself a divisional application, it is sufficient that the latter is still pending on the second divisional application's date of receipt.

An application is pending up to (but **not** on) the date that the European Patent Bulletin mentions the grant of the patent (OJ EPO 2002, 112). Rule 134 does not apply in this case. It is not possible to validly file a

divisional application when the parent application has been finally refused, withdrawn or is deemed withdrawn (see also the paragraphs below).

If an application is **deemed withdrawn** due to non-observance of a time limit (e.g. following failure to pay the filing fee (Art. 78(2)), a renewal fee (Art. 86(1)), the fee for grant and publishing or the claims fees, or to file the translation of the claims (Rule 71(7)) in due time), the application is no longer pending when the non-observed time limit has expired.

If a renewal fee is not paid by the due date (Rule 51(1)), the application is pending up to the last day of the six-month period for payment of that fee with an additional fee (Rule 51(2), first sentence), and a divisional application may still be filed during this period – even if the fees are ultimately not paid. Deemed withdrawal of the application takes effect on expiry of the six-month period (Rule 51(2), second sentence).

Once the application is deemed withdrawn, a divisional application can only be validly filed if the loss of rights, as communicated under Rule 112(1), is subsequently remedied. In such a case, the application is deemed to have been pending throughout.

Art. 112a(5)

Depending on the non-observed time limit, the loss of rights may be remedied either by means of an allowable request for further processing (see E-VIII, 2) or, where applicable, by a request for re-establishment of rights (see E-VIII, 3). Furthermore, if the findings in the notice of loss of rights are considered inaccurate, the applicant may also request a decision under Rule 112(2) (see E-VIII, 1.9.3). If the competent EPO body shares this opinion or if it gives an unfavourable decision that is subsequently overturned on appeal, no loss of rights will have ever occurred and the application will have been pending throughout (see J 4/11, reasons 22). The same applies if the appeal decision is set aside by the grant of a petition for review and the appeal proceedings are reopened under Art. 112a(5), with the consequence that the decision under Rule 112(2) is overturned.

If an application has been **refused** and no appeal has (yet) been filed, the application is still pending within the meaning of Rule 36(1) until expiry of the time limit for filing the notice of appeal (Art. 108), and a divisional application can be validly filed until this period expires (see G 1/09). Where the applicant does validly file a notice of appeal but fails to submit the written statement setting out the grounds of appeal, the refused application is pending until the time limit for filing the grounds of appeal under Art. 108 expires (see J 23/13). If the grounds of appeal are submitted in due time, the decision to refuse cannot take effect until the appeal proceedings are over. As the provisions relating to the filing of divisional applications also apply in appeal proceedings (Rule 100(1)), a divisional application may then be filed while such appeal proceedings are under way. If the appeal proceedings are reopened under Art. 112a(5), the application will have been pending throughout.

If the parent application is **withdrawn** by the applicant, a divisional application can be filed up to (i.e. including) the date on which the declaration of withdrawal is received by the EPO.

While proceedings are stayed in accordance with Rule 14(1) (see A-IV, 2.2), divisional applications cannot be filed. Rule 14(1) constitutes a *lex specialis* with regard to the right to file a divisional on a pending application provided for in Rule 36(1) (see J 20/05 and G 1/09, reasons 3.2.5).

If a purported divisional application is filed when the parent application is not pending, the EPO will issue a communication under Rule 112(1) (see A-IV, 1.1). The pendency of the earlier application is not a procedural deadline or time limit that would lead to a loss of rights in the event of non-compliance. Instead, it is a condition of a substantive nature for the filing of divisional applications (see G 1/09, reasons 3.2.3). Therefore, the provisions on re-establishment of rights and further processing do not apply to the filing of divisional applications (see J 10/01, reasons 15).

1.1.2 Sequences of divisional applications

A divisional application can also be an earlier application within the meaning of Art. 76(1) for one or more further divisional applications. The characterising feature of a sequence of divisional applications, each divided out from its predecessor, is that each member of the sequence claims as date of filing the date of the root application in which the subject-matter divided out in sequences of divisional applications was first disclosed (see G 1/05, G 1/06).

In a sequence of divisional applications, a first-generation divisional application is a divisional application based on an application that is not itself a divisional application, i.e. the root application. A second-generation divisional application is a divisional application based on a first-generation divisional application; and so on.

1.1.3 Persons entitled to file a divisional application

Only the applicant on record of the earlier application may file a divisional application. In the case of multiple applicants, a divisional application may only be filed jointly by all applicants on record. This means that, in the case of a transfer of an application, a divisional application may only be filed by or on behalf of the new applicant(s) if the transfer was duly registered and therefore effective vis-à-vis the EPO (Rule 22) at the divisional application's date of receipt. A purported divisional application that is not (jointly) filed in the name of the applicant(s) of the parent application will not be processed as a European divisional application. The EPO will inform applicants by issuing a communication under Rule 112(1) (see A-IV, 1.1).

1.2 Date of filing of a divisional application; claiming priority

1.2.1 Date of filing

A European divisional application may be filed in respect of subject-matter not extending beyond the content of the parent application as filed. Provided this requirement is met, the divisional application is deemed filed

Art. 76(1),
2nd sentence

on the parent application's date of filing and enjoys that application's priority (see A-IV, 1.2.2).

As of 1 October 2025, the electronic filing of colour and greyscale drawings is permitted, including for European divisional applications (see the notice from the EPO dated 5 September 2025 (OJ EPO 2025, A57)). As for any other element of the divisional application, such drawings will be examined for compliance with Art. 76(1) (see C-IX, 1.4).

Art. 63(1)
Art. 80
Rule 40(1)

A divisional application filed in due form, i.e. meeting the requirements of Art. 80 and Rule 40(1) (see A-II, 4.1 et seq.), is accorded the same date of filing as the parent application or that of the root application in the case of a sequence of divisional applications. Whether the divisional application's subject-matter is confined to that of the parent application is not decided until the examination procedure (see C-IX, 1.4 et seq.). The term of a patent granted for a European divisional application is 20 years from its date of filing, i.e. the date of filing of the root application.

Since Rule 40(1) does not require a European patent application to contain any claims on its date of filing, the same applies to a European divisional application. The applicant can file the claims after filing the divisional application according to the procedures detailed in A-III, 15. This may be done after the parent application is no longer pending, provided that the requirements of Rule 40(1) were satisfied with regard to the divisional application when the parent application was still pending. If the claims of the parent application are included in the description of the divisional application, they must be clearly identified as part of the description (see F-IV, 4.4).

1.2.2 Priority claim of a divisional application

Art. 76(1)
Rule 53(2) and
(3)

A priority claimed in the parent application also applies to the divisional application, provided that the parent application's priority claim has not been lost or withdrawn by the date the divisional application is filed; it is not necessary to claim it formally a second time. The priority claim can be withdrawn in respect of the divisional application (F-VI, 3.5, E-VIII, 8.2 and 8.3). However, this will have no effect on the parent application's priority claim. Similarly, any withdrawal of the priority claimed in the parent application after filing the divisional application has no effect on the priority claim in the latter.

Where the parent application claims multiple priorities under Art. 88(2), the applicant may claim fewer priorities in respect of the divisional application. To do so, they must file a clear and unambiguous withdrawal of the priority claim or claims in question in respect of the divisional application (see the notice from the EPO dated 12 November 2004, OJ EPO 2004, 591). In the absence of such a withdrawal, all priorities that have not lapsed in respect of the parent application when the divisional is filed also remain valid with respect to that application. What is more, all such priority claims remain valid for the divisional, even if the applicant provides an incorrect or incomplete priority claim when filing it.

If a certified copy and a translation of the previous application, if applicable (see A-VII, 3.3), have been filed in respect of the parent application before the divisional application is filed, it is not necessary to file the priority document and any translation again in respect of the divisional. The EPO makes a copy of these documents and places them in the divisional application's file (see the decision of the President of the EPO dated 12 July 2007, Special edition No. 3, OJ EPO 2007, B.2).

If, when the divisional application is filed, a priority document has not been filed in respect of the parent application, it must be filed in respect of the divisional application and, if the priority claim of the parent application's remaining subject-matter is to be retained, in respect of the parent application also. Applicants can also inform the EPO, within the time limit set for filing priority documents in the divisional application proceedings, that they have meanwhile submitted these documents in respect of the parent application. If the divisional application's subject-matter relates only to some of the priorities claimed in the parent application, priority documents in respect of the divisional application need be filed for those priorities only.

This applies also as regards indicating the file number of the previous application. For the time limits for indicating the file number and for filing the priority documents, see A-III, 6.5, 6.5.3 and 6.7 et seq.

Rule 52(2)

1.3 Filing a divisional application

1.3.1 Where and how to file a divisional application

A divisional application must be filed with the EPO. It may be filed using Online Filing 2.0 or the EPO Contingency Upload Service (see A-II, 1.1.1). If filed by delivery by hand or by postal services, divisional applications must be filed with the EPO in Munich, The Hague or Berlin.

Rule 36(2)

Rule 35(1)

The filing of a European divisional application with a national authority has no effect in law; the authority may however, as a courtesy service, forward the European divisional application to the EPO. If a competent national authority chooses to forward the application, it is not deemed received until the documents have reached the EPO.

The divisional application may be filed by reference to a previously filed application. The procedures are as provided for in Rule 40(1)(c), (2) and (3) (see A-II, 4.1.3.1). Where the divisional application is filed by reference to an international application that has effectively entered the European phase (see A-IV, 1.1) and was not filed with the EPO as receiving Office, a certified copy of the international application originally filed with the PCT receiving Office must be filed (OJ EPO 2009, 486).

1.3.2 Request for grant

The request for grant of a patent must contain a statement that a divisional application is sought and state the number of the parent application. It should also mention which generation of divisional application is being filed (Rule 38(4), Art. 2(1), item 1b, RFees). If the request is deficient, as can arise if there is no indication that the application constitutes a divisional

Rule 41(2)(e)

application, even though some of the accompanying documents contain an indication to that effect or if the number is missing, the deficiency may be corrected in the manner indicated in A-III, 16 or under Rule 139 (see A-V, 3).

1.3.3 Language requirements

As indicated in A-VII, 1.3, a divisional application must be filed in the language of the proceedings of the parent application. Alternatively, if the earlier (parent) application was filed in a non-official EPO language, the divisional application may be filed in the same language. In this case a translation into the language of the proceedings of the earlier application must then be filed within two months of filing the divisional application (see A-III, 14). *Rule 36(2)*

1.3.4 Designation of contracting states

All contracting states designated in the earlier application at the time of filing a European divisional application are deemed designated in the divisional application (see also G 4/98). If no designations have been withdrawn in respect of the parent application, then all states party to the EPC at the date of the parent's filing are automatically designated in the divisional application when filed. Conversely, contracting states that have had their designation withdrawn in respect of the parent application at the time of filing the divisional application, cannot be designated in respect of the divisional application. *Art. 76(2)*
Rule 36(4)
Rule 39(2a)
Rule 36(5)

The provisions of Rule 39(2a) concerning the deemed withdrawal of the designation of those contracting states that are Member States of the European Union also apply to divisional applications (see Rule 36(5)) where the applicant or one of the applicants is a Russian national, a natural person residing in Russia or a legal person, entity or body established in Russia (see A-III, 11.2.4).

If the parent application was filed before 1 April 2009 and the time limit for paying the designation fees has not yet expired for the parent application when the divisional application is filed, and no designations have been withdrawn in respect of the parent application, then all states party to the EPC at the date of filing of the parent are automatically designated in the divisional application when it is filed. Conversely, contracting states that have had their designation withdrawn or deemed withdrawn in respect of the parent application at the time of filing the divisional application, cannot be designated in respect of the divisional application.

The flat designation fee payable for divisional applications filed on or after 1 April 2009 does not cover contracting states that have had their designation withdrawn or deemed withdrawn at the time of filing the divisional application.

1.3.5 Extension and validation states

All extension and validation states designated in the earlier application at the time of filing a European divisional application are deemed designated in the divisional application. For more details regarding the designation of these states, see A-III, 12.1.

1.4 Fees

1.4.1 Filing, search and designation fee

Rule 36(3) and (4)
Art. 79(2)

The filing fee and search fee for the divisional application must be paid within one month of filing the European patent application. For the additional fee due for any pages in excess of 35, see A-III, 13.2. For the additional fee due for divisional applications of second or subsequent generations, see A-IV, 1.4.1.1.

The search fee must be paid even if a further search fee has already been paid under Rule 64(1) in respect of the search report on the parent application for the part of the application that was lacking in unity and that is now the subject of the divisional application (for reimbursement of the search fee, see A-IV, 1.8).

The designation fee must be paid within six months of the date on which the European Patent Bulletin mentions the publication of the European search report drawn up in respect of the divisional application. Regarding the examination fee, see A-IV, 1.8.

Rule 36(3) and (4)

If, within the applicable time limit, the filing or search fees have not been paid, the application is deemed withdrawn. The EPO informs the applicant of the loss of rights in a communication under Rule 112(1). If the designation fee is not paid within the applicable time limit, the application is likewise deemed withdrawn and a loss of rights communication under Rule 112(1) is sent. The applicant can request further processing according to Art. 121 and Rule 135 (see E-VIII, 2).

For divisional applications filed before 1 April 2009, see the April 2025 edition of the Guidelines, A-III, 11.3.2 and A-III, 11.3.4 for the deemed withdrawal of single designations or of the application and applicable remedies.

For fee reductions under the language arrangements, see A-X, 9.3.1 and 9.3.2; for fee reductions under the scheme for micro-entities, see A-X, 9.4.1 and 9.4.2.

1.4.1.1 Additional fee for divisional applications of second or subsequent generations

Rule 38
Art. 2(1), item 1b, RFees

An additional fee is payable as part of the filing fee for divisional applications of second or subsequent generations filed on or after 1 April 2014 (see the notice from the EPO dated 8 January 2014, OJ EPO 2014, A22). The fee amount varies depending on the generation to which the divisional application filed belongs (see A-IV, 1.1.2). First-generation divisional applications are not subject to the additional fee. The fee amount grows progressively from the second to the fifth generation and becomes a flat fee for the fifth and subsequent generations (Art. 2(1), item 1b, RFees).

Example:

In this example, no additional fee would be due in respect of EP2 and EP3, as they are first-generation divisional applications. The amount of the additional fee for second-generation divisional applications would apply to EP4, and the amount for third-generation divisional applications would apply to EP5.

The additional fee is part of the filing fee for divisional applications of second and subsequent generations. Therefore, it must be paid within the same period as the filing fee, and the same provisions apply if not paid in due time (see A-IV, 1.4.1).

For fee reductions under the language arrangements, see A-X, 9.3.1 and 9.3.2; for fee reductions under the scheme for micro-entities, see A-X, 9.4.1 and 9.4.2.

1.4.2 Claims fees

If, at the time of filing the first set of claims, the divisional application comprises more than 15 claims, a claims fee is payable in respect of each claim in excess of that number (see A-III, 9). Claims fees are payable even if they were paid in the parent application in respect of claims relating to the subject-matter now the subject of the divisional application (see A-III, 9).

Rule 45(1)

1.4.3 Renewal fees

For the divisional application, as for any other European patent application, renewal fees are payable to the EPO. They are due in respect of the third year and each subsequent year, calculated from the date of filing of the earlier (parent) application or that of the root application in the case of a sequence of divisional applications. Under Art. 76(1) in conjunction with Rule 51(3), the parent application's date of filing is also the date from which the time limits for paying the renewal fees for the divisional application (Art. 86(1)) are calculated. If, when the divisional application is filed, renewal fees for the parent application have already fallen due, these must also be paid for the divisional application and fall due when the latter is filed (see also A-IV, 1.1.1). The period for paying these fees is four months after filing the divisional application. If not paid in due time, they may still be validly paid within six months of the date on which the divisional application was filed, provided that at the same time the additional fee of 50% of the renewal fees paid late is paid.

Art. 86(1)

Art. 76(1)

Rule 51(3)

Art. 2(1), item 5,

RFees

If, within the four-month period referred to above, a further renewal fee falls due or a renewal fee falls due for the first time, it may be paid without an additional fee within that period. It may otherwise still be validly paid within six months of the due date, provided that at the same time the additional fee of 50% of the renewal fee paid late is paid. When calculating the additional period the principles developed by the Legal Board of Appeal should be applied (see J 4/91).

Rule 51(3)

Art. 2(1),

item 5, RFees

Further processing for failure to pay renewal fees on time is ruled out by Rule 135(2). However, re-establishment is possible. In the case of applications for re-establishment of rights in respect of renewal fees falling

due on filing of the divisional or within the four-month period laid down in Rule 51(3), second sentence, the one-year period prescribed by Rule 136(1) starts to run only after the six months under Rule 51(2) have expired.

Example:

25.03.2008:	date of filing of parent application
11.01.2011:	filing of divisional application and due date of renewal fee for the third year
31.03.2011:	due date of renewal fee for the fourth year
11.05.2011:	expiry of four-month period under <u>Rule 51(3)</u>
11.07.2011:	expiry of six-month period under <u>Rule 51(2)</u> in respect of the renewal fee for the third year
30.09.2011:	expiry of six-month period under <u>Rule 51(2)</u> in respect of the renewal fee for the fourth year
11.07.2012:	expiry of one-year period under <u>Rule 136(1)</u> in respect of the renewal fee for the third year
01.10.2012:	expiry of one-year period under <u>Rule 136(1)</u> in respect of the renewal fee for the fourth year (extended under <u>Rule 134(1)</u>).

For other examples see A-X, 5.2.4.

For fee reductions under the scheme for micro-entities, see A-X, 9.4.1 and 9.4.2.

1.5 Designation of the inventor

Rule 60(2)

The provisions of A-III, 5.4 apply with regard to the designation of the inventor, except that, where the designation of the inventor has not been provided or is deficient (i.e. it does not comply with Rule 19), the applicant will be invited to provide or correct it within a two-month period specified by the EPO (see E-VIII, 1.6). The divisional application requires a separate designation, independent of the parent application on which it is based.

1.6 Authorisations

The provisions of A-VIII, 1.7 and A-VIII, 1.8 apply with regard to authorisations in respect of the divisional application. If, according to these provisions, the representative has to file an authorisation, they may act on the basis of an individual authorisation filed in respect of the parent application only if it expressly empowers them to file divisional applications.

1.7 Other formalities examination

Other than for matters referred to in A-IV, 1.1 to 1.6, the formal examination of divisional applications is carried out as for other applications. The provisions of Rule 30 apply with regard to divisional applications relating to nucleotide or amino acid sequences filed after 1 January 1993 (see A-IV, 5).

1.8 Search, publication and request for examination of divisional applications

Divisional applications are searched, published and examined in the same way as other European patent applications.

The search fee is refunded if the conditions of [Art. 9\(2\) RFees](#) are met (see the decision of the President of the EPO dated 27 February 2025 concerning the refund of the search fee under [Art. 9\(2\) RFees](#), [OJ EPO 2025, A25](#), for divisional applications for which the search is completed on or after 1 April 2025).

The divisional application is published in accordance with [Art. 93\(1\)](#). The filing or priority date taken for calculation of the 18-month period for publication is the date of filing or the earliest priority date claimed (see [A-IV, 1.2.1](#)). Since this period has usually already expired when the divisional application is filed, the technical preparations for publication are completed as soon as all formal requirements with respect to the divisional application have been fulfilled. The applicant is informed of the intended publication date (see also [A-VI, 1.1](#)).

The time limit for filing the request for examination, including payment of the examination fee, begins to run on the date on which the European Patent Bulletin mentions the publication of the search report concerning the divisional application. For fee reductions under the language arrangements, see [A-X, 9.3.1](#) and [9.3.2](#); for fee reductions under the scheme for micro-entities, see [A-X, 9.4.1](#) and [9.4.2](#).

2. [Art. 61](#) applications and stay of proceedings under [Rule 14](#)

2.1 General

Under [Art. 61\(1\)](#), a court or competent authority ("court") may by a final decision find that a person other than the registered applicant is entitled to the grant of a European patent. Provided that the European patent has not yet been granted, this third party may, within three months after the decision has become final, in respect of those contracting states designated in the European patent application in which the decision has been taken or recognised or has to be recognised on the basis of the Protocol on Recognition annexed to the European Patent Convention:

[Art. 61\(1\)](#)
[Rule 16](#)

- (i) prosecute the application as their own application in place of the applicant (see [A-IV, 2.4](#) and [2.7](#)) [Art. 61\(1\)\(a\)](#)
- (ii) file a new European patent application in respect of the same invention (see [A-IV, 2.5](#) and [2.7](#)) or [Art. 61\(1\)\(b\)](#)
- (iii) request that the application be refused (see [A-IV, 2.6](#) and [2.7](#)). [Art. 61\(1\)\(c\)](#)

If the application is no longer pending due to its having been withdrawn, refused or being deemed withdrawn, the third party can still file a new European patent application in respect of the same invention, in accordance with [Art. 61\(1\)\(b\)](#) (see [G 3/92](#)).

2.2 Stay of proceedings for grant

Rule 14(1)

If a third party provides proof to the EPO that they have opened proceedings against the applicant for the purpose of seeking a judgement that they are entitled to the grant of the European patent, the EPO will stay the proceedings for grant unless it receives written consent from the third party to continue such proceedings. This consent is irrevocable.

Proceedings for grant may not be stayed before the publication of the European patent application. In the case of a Euro-PCT application proceedings may only be stayed after expiry of the time limit for entry into the European phase.

Furthermore, Rule 14(1) only refers to national entitlement proceedings that result directly, i.e. generally and automatically, in decisions mentioned in Art. 61(1) and not to proceedings initiated before a court of a non-contracting state (see J.6/03, r.21). Jurisdiction and the recognition of decisions regarding the right to the grant of a European patent for EPC contracting states are governed by the Protocol on Recognition, which under Art. 164(1) is an integral part of the EPC. Arbitration awards may be recognised, provided that they may automatically be recognised by all designated contracting states, e.g. in line with the New York Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards of 10 June 1958.

The dates on which proceedings are stayed and resumed will be entered in the European Patent Register (Rule 143(1)(s)). They will also be communicated to the parties.

For the stay of opposition proceedings, see D-VII, 4.1.

2.2.1 Responsible department

Art. 20

Sole responsibility for procedures where the applicant is not entitled lies with the EPO's Legal Division (see the decision of the President of the EPO dated 21 November 2013, OJ EPO 2013, 600).

2.2.2 Date of the stay of proceedings

A stay of proceedings under Rule 14(1) takes immediate effect from the date the EPO receives satisfactory evidence that national proceedings have been instituted against the applicant seeking a decision within the meaning of Art. 61(1) (J.9/12).

The requirements for effectively initiating court proceedings are governed by national law (J.7/00).

2.2.3 Legal nature and effects of the stay

The stay of proceedings is a unique preliminary procedural measure that is justified as a preventive measure to preserve the third party's possible rights to the patent in dispute and that takes immediate effect (J.28/94, J.15/06). In particular, the stay of the grant proceedings is ordered by a communication of the EPO without having heard the applicant. However, the applicant may, in view of that communication, request the issue of an appealable decision.

Stay of proceedings implies that the legal status quo existing at the time of the suspension is maintained, i.e. neither the EPO nor the parties can validly perform any legal acts while proceedings are suspended (J.38/92). In particular, the applicant is not allowed to withdraw either the European patent application or the designation of any contracting state (Rule 15). Likewise, no divisional application can be filed during the stay of proceedings (J.20/05 and J.9/12).

An automatic debit order ceases to be effective on the day a stay of the proceedings under Rule 14 takes effect (see point 11.1(c) AAD, Annex A.1 to the ADA, Supplementary publication 2, OJ EPO 2024). Therefore, after resumption of proceedings a new automatic debit order must be filed if the applicant wishes to continue using the automatic debiting procedure.

2.2.4 Interruption of periods

The periods in force at the date of stay other than those for payment of renewal fees are interrupted by such stay. The time that has not yet elapsed begins to run from the date on which proceedings are resumed. However, the time still to run after the resumption of the proceedings must not be less than two months. As for renewal fees, they continue to fall due during the period of stay. Also, in accordance with Rule 14(4), the period for payment of renewal fee with an additional fee provided for in Rule 51(2) is not interrupted.

Rule 14(4)

Example: The European Patent Bulletin mentions the European search report's publication on 15 March 2017. Proceedings are stayed on Friday, 5 May 2017 and resumed on Friday, 18 August 2017. At the resumption of proceedings, the six-month period from the date of the mention of the search report's publication for payment of the examination fee (Rule 70(1)) does not begin to run again in its entirety but only for the days and months not yet elapsed. This time must not be less than two months (Rule 14(4)).

The six-month period starts on the day following the search report's publication, in accordance with Rule 131(2), i.e. on 16 March 2017, and ends on 15 September 2017. The period that is already running when proceedings are stayed on 5 May 2017 ends on 4 May 2017.

The period that has elapsed between 15 March 2017 and 4 May 2017 is one month and 19 days. The remaining period to run after the resumption is more than two months.

Calculation of the remaining non-elapsed period:

On the date of stay, 5 May 2017, the first month of the running period has passed and so have 19 days of the second month. Thus, on that day, 11 days and four months remain (from 5 May 2017 to 15 May 2017 inclusive and from 15 May 2017 to 15 September 2017 inclusive). This non-elapsed period must be added to the date of resumption in order to calculate the deadline for payment of the examination fee.

Resumption is on 18 August 2017. All time limits start running again from and including this day (Rule 131(2) does not apply):

After adding first the remaining days and then the remaining months, it is necessary to check whether the last day falls on a day on which the EPO receives mail according to Rule 134(1): calculating 11 days from and including 18 August 2017 results in 28 August 2017. Adding four months to that gives 28 December 2017 as the end of the time limit for payment of the fee. Since the EPO was closed from Monday, 25 December 2017 to Monday, 1 January 2018, the period is extended to 2 January 2018 in accordance with Rule 134(1).

2.2.5 Resumption of the proceedings for grant

Rule 14(3)

The date of resumption of proceedings as well as the legal basis for the resumption is to be communicated to the third party and the applicant.

2.2.5.1 Resumption after final decision in entitlement proceedings

Rule 14(2)

Grant proceedings will be resumed where evidence is provided that a final decision within the meaning of Art. 61(1) has been taken unless a new European patent application under Art. 61(1)(b) has been filed for all the designated contracting states. If the decision is in favour of the third party, the proceedings may not be resumed earlier than three months after the decision has become final unless the third party requests the resumption.

2.2.5.2 Resumption regardless of the stage of entitlement proceedings

Rule 14(3)

The Legal Division may also order the resumption of grant proceedings regardless of the stage reached in the proceedings against the applicant. In this case, it is at the discretion of the Legal Division to decide whether the proceedings are to be continued. This discretion is to be exercised with due regard to the interests of the parties. In particular, the outcome of the court proceedings in the first instance and the duration of the stay of proceedings before the EPO are to be taken into consideration, as well as an evident abuse of proceedings, e.g. in the form of delaying tactics.

2.3 Limitation of the option to withdraw the European patent application

Rule 15

From the time when a third party proves to the EPO that they have initiated proceedings concerning entitlement (see A-IV. 2.2) and up to the date on which the EPO resumes the proceedings for grant (see A-IV. 2.2.5), neither the European patent application nor the designation of any contracting state may be withdrawn.

2.4 Prosecution of the application by a third party

Art. 61(1)(a)

Any third parties wishing to avail themselves of the possibility open to them under Art. 61(1)(a) (see A-IV. 2.1(i)) must declare their intention in writing to the EPO in due time. They then take the place of the erstwhile applicant. The proceedings for grant are continued from the point reached when they were stayed or when the declaration was filed by the third party (see A-IV. 2.2).

2.5 Filing a new application

A new European patent application under Art. 61(1)(b) must be filed electronically or on paper with the EPO in Munich, The Hague, or Berlin. It is not possible to file an application according to Art. 61(1)(b) with the competent authorities of a contracting state.

Art. 61(1)(b)
Art. 76(1)

The new application is in many other respects treated as a European divisional application and corresponding provisions apply. In particular, the following provisions relating to divisional applications apply *mutatis mutandis*:

- (i) accordance of the date of filing of the earlier application and entitlement to priority date – see A-IV. 1.2;
- (ii) information in the request for grant – see A-IV. 1.3.2;
- (iii) filing, search, designation and claims fees – see A-IV. 1.4.1 and 1.4.2;
Rule 17(2) and (3)
Rule 45(1)
- (iv) designation of inventor – see A-IV. 1.5.
- (v) language requirements – see A-IV. 1.3.3.

However, arrangements for renewal fees are different. For the year in which the new application is filed and for the years beforehand, no renewal fees are payable.

Rule 51(6)

In other respects the formal examination is carried out as for other applications.

If it is adjudged that a third party is entitled to the grant of a European patent for only some of the contracting states designated in the earlier application, and the third party files a new application for these states, the earlier application continues to be in the name of the earlier applicant for the remaining states.

The earlier application is deemed withdrawn on the new application's filing date for the contracting states originally designated in which the decision has been taken or recognised.

Rule 17(1)

2.6 Refusal of the earlier application

The EPO must accede to a third-party request under Art. 61(1)(c) to refuse the earlier application. The decision is open to appeal (Art. 106(1)).

Art. 61(1)(c)

2.7 Partial transfer of right by virtue of a final decision

If by a final decision it is adjudged that a third party is entitled to the grant of a European patent in respect of only part of the matter disclosed in the European patent application, Art. 61 and Rules 16 and 17 apply to that part.

Rule 18(1)

3. Display at an exhibition

3.1 Certificate of exhibition; identification of invention

Art. 55(1)(b) and (2)

Rule 25

Where an applicant states when filing an application that the invention which is the subject of the application has been displayed at an official or officially recognised international exhibition falling within the terms of the Convention on international exhibitions, they must file a certificate of exhibition within four months of the filing of the European patent application. The exhibitions recognised are published on the EPO website (epo.org). The certificate must:

- (a) have been issued during the exhibition by the authority responsible for the protection of industrial property at that exhibition
- (b) state that the invention was exhibited at the exhibition
- (c) state the opening date of the exhibition and the date of the first disclosure, if different from the opening date of the exhibition
- (d) be accompanied by an identification of the invention, duly authenticated by the above-mentioned authority.

3.2 Defects in the certificate or the identification

The Receiving Section acknowledges receipt of the certificate and identification of the invention. It draws the applicant's attention to any manifest defects in said documents in case it is possible to rectify the deficiencies within the four-month period allowed. The applicant is notified according to Rule 112(1) if the certificate or identification is not furnished within the time allowed. The applicant may request further processing in respect of this loss of rights according to Art. 121 and Rule 135.

4. Applications relating to biological material

4.1 Biological material; deposit of such

Rule 26(3)

In accordance with Rule 26(3), "biological material" means any material containing genetic information capable of reproducing itself or being reproduced in a biological system.

Rule 31(1)(c) and (d)

Rule 31(2)

Where in relation to an application concerning biological material an applicant states having deposited in accordance with Rule 31(1)(a) the biological material with a depositary institution recognised for the purposes of Rules 31 and 34, the applicant must, if such information is not contained in the application as filed, submit the name of the depositary institution and the accession number of the culture deposit and, where the biological material has been deposited by a person other than the applicant, the name and address of the depositor, within whichever of the following periods is the first to expire:

Rule 31(2)(a)

- (i) within 16 months of the European patent application's date of filing or the priority date, this time limit being deemed to have been met if the information is submitted before completion of the technical preparations for publication of the European patent application

- (ii) if a request for early publication of the application according to Art. 93(1)(b) is submitted, up to the date of such submission Rule 31(2)(b)
- (iii) if it is communicated that a right to inspection of the files under Art. 128(2) exists, within one month of such communication. Rule 31(2)(c)

Further processing is ruled out by Rule 135(2) for the above time limit according to Rule 31(2). Nor is Art. 122 applicable because a lack of disclosure cannot be remedied by way of re-establishment under Art. 122 (see the notice from the EPO dated 7 July 2010, OJ EPO 2010, 498).

Moreover, where the depositor and applicant are not identical, the same time limit applies for submitting a document satisfying the EPO that the depositor has authorised the applicant to refer to the deposited biological material in the application and has given unreserved and irrevocable consent to the deposited material being made available to the public in accordance with Rule 33(1) and (2) or Rule 32(1). The depositor's authorisation for the applicant to refer to the deposit and the consent to the material being made available to the public must have existed from the date of filing of the application in question. For a recommended wording for this declaration, see paragraph 3.5 of the above notice. For Euro-PCT applications, the document referred to above must be provided to the International Bureau before completion of the technical preparations for international publication (see the notice from the EPO dated 7 July 2010, OJ EPO 2010, 498, points II.7 to II.8). See also A-XII, 5.7. Rule 31(1)(d)

Note, however, that where the depositor is one of several applicants the document referred to in Rule 31(1)(d) is not required (see the above notice).

The depositary institution must be on the list of depositary institutions recognised for the purposes of Rules 31 to 34. This list includes the depositary institutions, especially the International Depositary Authorities under the Budapest Treaty. An up-to-date list is published on the EPO website (epo.org). Rule 33(6)

The applicant is strongly recommended to file the deposit receipt issued by the depositary institution with the EPO since this document indicates, in particular, the depositor and shows the information required under Rule 31(1)(a) and (c). This information enables the EPO to certify any requests to issue a sample (see A-IV, 4.2 and 4.4) and the examining division to establish whether the application satisfies the requirements under Art. 83 (see also F-III, 6.2 and 6.3). A deposit receipt must be filed for each sample of biological material disclosed in the application and deposited under the Budapest Treaty for the purposes of Rule 31. The deposit receipt may be filed as long as proceedings before the EPO are pending.

4.1.1 New deposit of biological material

Rule 34

If biological material deposited according to Rule 31 ceases to be available from the recognised depositary institution, an interruption in availability shall be deemed not to have occurred if:

- (i) a new deposit of that material is made in accordance with the Budapest Treaty
- (ii) a copy of the receipt of that new deposit issued by the depositary institution is forwarded to the EPO within four months of the date of the new deposit, stating the number of the European patent application or patent.

The non-availability may occur because, for example:

- (a) the material has degraded such that it is no longer viable
- (b) the authority with which the original deposit was made no longer qualifies for that kind of material, either under the Budapest Treaty or under bilateral agreements with the EPO.

In either case (a) or (b) above, a new deposit must be made within three months of the depositor's being notified of the non-availability of the organism by the depositary institution (Art. 4(1)(d) Budapest Treaty). This is subject to the exception where:

- the non-availability of the deposit is for the above reason (b) and
- the depositor does not receive the above notification from the depositary institution within six months of the date on which it is published by the International Bureau that the depositary institution is no longer qualified in respect of the biological material in question.

In this exceptional case, the new deposit must be made within three months of the date of the said publication by the International Bureau (Art. 4(1)(e) Budapest Treaty).

If, however, the original deposit was not made under the Budapest Treaty but rather at a depositary institution recognised by the EPO by virtue of a bilateral agreement, the above-mentioned six-month period is calculated from the date when the EPO publishes the fact that the depositary institution is no longer qualified to accept deposits of the biological material in question under that bilateral agreement.

4.1.2 Application filed by reference to a previously filed application

Where the application was filed by reference to a previously filed application in accordance with the procedures described in A-II, 4.1.3.1 and the previously filed application referenced already satisfied the requirements of Rule 31(1)(b) and (c) on its date of filing, these requirements will also be satisfied in respect of the European patent application.

If the information on the deposited biological material present in the previously filed application as filed does not satisfy Rule 31(1)(c), the EPO will not know this until the applicant files the certified copy and any required translation of the previously filed application (at the latest within two months of the date of filing – Rule 40(3)). Even where the certified copy and any translation required are filed up to two months from the date of filing, if the requirements of Rule 31(1)(c) are not satisfied, the time limit for rectification of this deficiency according to Rule 31(2) is unaffected (see A-IV, 4.2).

4.2 Missing information; notification

When the Receiving Section notices that the information required under Rule 31(1)(c) (indication of the depositary institution and accession number of the culture deposit) or the information and the document referred to in Rule 31(1)(d) (authorisation to refer to the deposit and consent to it being made available) is not contained in or has not yet been submitted with the application, it should notify the applicant of this fact, as this information can only be validly submitted within the time limits specified in Rule 31(2). In the case of missing information under Rule 31(1)(c), the deposit must be identified in the patent application as filed in such a way that the accession number submitted later can be traced back without ambiguity. This can normally be done by indicating the identification reference given by the depositor within the meaning of Rule 6.1(a)(iv) of the Budapest Treaty (see G 2/93). Where the depositary institution and/or the accession number is/are missing in the application on the date of filing but the applicant provides the information within the applicable time limit (Rule 31(2)), the missing information about the depositary institution and/or the accession number is published on the front page of the published European patent application (see A-VI, 1.3).

Art. 97(2)

Rule 31

Art. 83

The applicant is also informed when a deposit with a recognised depositary institution is referred to but no depositary institution receipt has been filed (the applicant is advised to provide this receipt when filing the application, if possible – see the notice from the EPO dated 7 July 2010, OJ EPO 2010, 498). Filing the receipt is essential for identifying the depositor, whose name needs to be established before the EPO can certify a third party's request for the issue of a sample of the deposited material (see also A-IV, 4.1). Any further action, i.e. establishing whether the information available satisfies the sufficiency-of-disclosure requirement, is a matter for the examining division. See also F-III, 6, in particular F-III, 6.3(ii), as regards the examining division's treatment of applications relating to biological material. If the examining division is of the opinion that the invention is not sufficiently disclosed due to a lack of information concerning the biological material that constitutes the subject of the invention, it may refuse the European patent application (see F-III, 3). Further processing is ruled out by Rule 135(2) for the time limit according to Rule 31(2) for supplying the information required by Rule 31(1)(c) and (d).

4.3 Availability of deposited biological material to expert only

Under Rule 32(1)(a) and (b), until the date on which the technical preparations for publication of the application are deemed complete, the applicant may inform the EPO that, until the publication of the mention of the grant of the European patent or, where applicable, for 20 years from the

Rule 32(1)

date of filing if the application has been refused or withdrawn or is deemed withdrawn, the availability referred to in Rule 33 is to be effected only by the issue of a sample to an independent expert nominated by the requester.

The above communication must take the form of a written declaration addressed to the EPO. This declaration may not be contained in the description and the claims of the European patent application but may be given in the appropriate section of the request for grant form (EPO Form 1001).

If the declaration is admissible, it is mentioned on the front page when the European patent application is published (see also A-VI, 1.3).

For Euro-PCT applications published in the international phase in an official EPO language, the applicant must request the expert solution from the International Bureau before completion of the technical preparations for international publication, preferably using Form PCT/RO/134 (see the notice from the EPO dated 7 July 2010, OJ EPO 2010, 498). For Euro-PCT applications not published in the international phase in an official EPO language, the applicant may request the expert solution under Rule 32(1) before completion of the technical preparations for publication of the translation of the international application required under Rule 159(1)(a) (see the above notice). See also A-XII, 5.7.

Rule 32(2)

If the applicant duly informs the EPO under Rule 32(1), the biological material is issued only to an independent expert nominated by the requester. The requirements and obligations applying to experts are laid down by the EPO President and are deemed fulfilled by signing the relevant declaration on a dedicated EPO form (see the decision of the President of the EPO dated 10 July 2017, OJ EPO 2017, A60, and the notice from the EPO dated 10 July 2017, OJ EPO 2017, A61). Expert nominations must be accompanied by a declaration whereby the experts undertake to comply with the pertinent requirements and obligations and confirm that they know of no circumstances that might give rise to justified doubts as to their independence or that might conflict in any other way with their function as expert.

4.4 Requests for samples of biological material

Rule 33

From the date of publication of a European patent application relating to biological material, the biological material deposited in accordance with Rule 31 will be made available on request to any person having the right to inspect the files (see A-XI, 1). Such availability will be effected by issuing a sample to the person making the request or, where the applicant has so requested, to an expert nominated by the requester (see A-IV, 4.3). The issuing of a sample of the biological material to a third party (requester) is subject to that requester's undertaking vis-à-vis the applicant not to make the biological material issued to them or any biological material derived from it available to any other party and to use that material for experimental purposes only. The patent applicant may expressly waive this right to an undertaking from the requester by filing a separate, signed statement (Rule 33(2)). Such statement may be made with the request for grant (EPO

Form 1001), the request for entry into the European phase (EPO Form 1200) or at any time after the application has been filed.

The EPO makes available on its website the forms to be used for obtaining samples of biological material deposited under the Budapest Treaty and that the EPO is asked to certify under [Rule 33\(4\)](#).

The EPO's certification of the request signals to the depositary institution that, based on its verification of the status of the application/patent and the related data in the EPO records, it may issue a sample of the biological material to the requester or the expert, as applicable. The EPO is exempted from verifying and assessing the expert's suitability and independence ([OJ EPO 2017, A60](#)).

After certification, the EPO will send the request to the depositary institution and copies to the applicant or proprietor of the European patent and to the certified party. It is up to the certified party to pay the fees requested by the recognised depositary institution direct to them.

5. Applications relating to nucleotide and amino acid sequences

If nucleotide and amino acid sequences within the meaning of [Rule 30\(1\)](#) are disclosed in the European patent application, they are to be represented in a sequence listing that complies with WIPO Standard ST.26. WIPO Standard ST.26 is a worldwide standard that, in Annex VII, contains recommendations on how to prevent potential added or deleted subject-matter in sequence listings due to conversion from WIPO Standard ST.25 to WIPO Standard ST.26. The EPO relies on these recommendations as guidance for examination. Each nucleotide or amino acid sequence extending over the minimum length as defined in the standard and disclosed in the application documents (including drawings) needs to be listed in the sequence listing, even if the sequence is only a fragment of another disclosed sequence. The sequence identification numbers (SEQ ID Nos.) used in the description must correspond to those used in the sequence listing, with the same SEQ ID Nos. referring to the same sequences (see WIPO Standard ST.26, point 10).

[Rule 57\(j\)](#)

[Rule 30\(1\)](#)

[Rule 30\(2\)](#)

[Art. 123\(2\)](#)

The sequence listing must be filed in electronic form, i.e. in XML format as required under WIPO Standard ST.26, using Online Filing 2.0, the EPO Contingency Upload Service or MyEPO. Within MyEPO, files containing standard-compliant sequence listings may be uploaded in a ZIP file when performing any of the permitted procedural acts and requests. XML sequence listings exceeding the maximum upload size of 50 MB or filed as part of a paper submission may be submitted on an accepted electronic data carrier (see the decision of the President of the EPO dated 14 November 2025 on the filing of sequence listings, [OJ EPO 2025, A64](#), and the notice from the EPO dated 14 November 2025, [OJ EPO 2025, A66](#)). The sequence listing must not be filed on paper or in PDF format. Regarding divisional applications, see [A-IV, 5.4](#). Nonetheless, if two or more sequence listings are filed on the date of filing, all are considered part of the application but only the standard-compliant sequence listing will be used as the basis for the search. See the decision of the President of the EPO dated 14 November 2025, [OJ EPO 2025, A64](#), and the notice from

the EPO dated 9 December 2021, OJ EPO 2021, A97, as well as the decision of the President of the EPO dated 14 May 2024, OJ EPO 2024, A54, and the notice from the EPO dated 14 May 2024, OJ EPO 2024, A55.

Where a sequence listing is filed or corrected after the date of filing, the applicant is required to submit a statement that it does not include matter going beyond the content of the application as filed. Standard-compliant sequence listings filed subsequent to the date of filing on the applicant's own initiative or in reply to the invitation under Rule 30(3) are not part of the description and, therefore, not published with the European patent application. Whenever a sequence listing that is part of the description is corrected or amended, a complete new sequence listing must be filed. The corrected or amended sequence listing must comply with the applicable WIPO standard, which depends on the application's date of filing. For applications filed on or after 1 July 2022, sequence listings must comply with WIPO Standard ST.26. For applications filed before that date, the sequence listing must comply with WIPO Standard ST.25.

For applications referring to sequences belonging to the prior art, see F-II, 6.1.

Art. 90(3)
Rule 30(3)

The Receiving Section will inform the applicant of any deficiencies as to the sequence listing and issue an invitation to remedy the deficiencies and pay a late furnishing fee within a non-extendable period of two months. The late furnishing fee compensates for the administrative efforts of issuing the communication under Rule 30(3) and delaying the transmission of the application to the search division until after availability of a standard-compliant sequence listing. The late furnishing fee therefore does not have to be paid if the standard-compliant sequence listing is filed after the date of filing but before the Receiving Section has issued the communication under Rule 30(3). If the requirements of Rule 30 in conjunction with the decision of the President of the EPO dated 9 December 2021 are not complied with in due time, where appropriate following the invitation to do so from the Receiving Section, which includes the payment of the late furnishing fee, the application will be refused according to Rule 30(3). This also applies if a sequence listing is subsequently filed in the required electronic format but still contains deficiencies with respect to the WIPO standard. Such deficiencies will not prompt the EPO to issue another invitation under Rule 30(3) triggering a new period of two months unless the previous invitation did not draw the applicant's attention to such remaining deficiencies (see J 7/11).

Art. 121
Rule 135

If the European patent application is refused under Rule 30(3), the applicant may request further processing (see E-VIII, 2).

5.1 Sequence information filed under Rule 56

The possibility of filing a sequence listing as a missing part of the description is, as a rule, very rare. The principle of Rule 56 is that it must be obvious from the application documents as filed that part of the description appears to be missing (see A-II, 5.1). Very few cases fulfil the conditions for parts of the description being missing in the form of a sequence listing. Rule 56, for example, is applicable where the description quotes sequence

identifier numbers (SEQ ID Nos.) but the sequences are not further disclosed in the description. Although in such a case the disclosure is missing in the form of a sequence listing, the Receiving Section is not expected to identify such omissions as qualifying for Rule 56, and according to Rule 56(1) the applicant may not invoke the omission of a communication under Rule 56(1) or (2). However, applicants may file the missing parts of the description relating to sequences on their own initiative within two months of the date of filing according to Rule 56(2) (see A-II, 5.2).

According to Rule 57(j), any late-filed sequence information will be checked for compliance with Rule 30(1) in conjunction with the rules laid down by the EPO President.

If the late-filed sequence information or sequence listing does not conform to the above requirements, then the communication under Rule 30(3) is sent to the applicant (see A-IV, 5).

If, on the other hand, the late-filed sequence information includes a standard-compliant sequence listing according to the requirements of Rule 30(1), no Rule 30(3) communication will be sent. In such a case the late furnishing fee under Rule 30(3) does not fall due.

The above applies regardless of whether the late-filed parts of the description result in a change of the date of filing (see A-II, 5.3) or if the late-filed missing parts can be based on the claimed priority, allowing the original date of filing to be maintained (see A-II, 5.4). If, however, the late-filed parts of the description result in a change of the date of filing, any communication according to Rule 30(3) which might be required will only be sent after the one-month period for the withdrawal of the late-filed parts has expired without the applicant having withdrawn them (see A-II, 5.5).

In the case where the applicant inserts a sequence listing into the description as a late-filed part of the description according to Rule 56, the sequence listing so added, whether standard-compliant or not, is considered part of the description on the date of filing (regardless of whether this has changed) and, consequently, is published with the European patent application.

The rare possibility to file a sequence listing as a late-filed missing part must, however, be clearly differentiated from those cases where the application as filed contains:

- the complete sequence information in the body of the description but no standard-compliant sequence listing
- a sequence listing that does not contain all sequences disclosed in the application documents
- a sequence listing that does not comply with the applicable WIPO standard.

In such cases, Rule 30 applies and the applicant will be invited under Rule 30(3) to file a standard-compliant sequence listing.

5.2 Sequence information filed under Rule 56a

Erroneously filed sequence listings may be corrected under Rule 56a (see A-II, 6).

5.3 Sequence listings of an application filed by reference to a previously filed application

Where the application is filed by reference to a previously filed application (see A-II, 4.1.3.1), and that previously filed application contained sequence listings on its date of filing, then those sequence listings form part of the application as originally filed. Where, however, the sequences only appear in the claims and not in the description or drawings of the previously filed application, and the applicant did not include the claims of the previously filed application in the reference, a sequence listing may have to be filed, depending on the content of the claims. If in such a case the sequence listing is filed on the European patent application's date of filing, it is published with the European patent application.

A sequence listing complying with the applicable WIPO standard and filed in the previously filed application after the date of filing is not part of the description (Rule 30(2)) and, therefore, not included in the reference to the description and any drawings under Rule 40(1)(c). Consequently, the applicant must file a standard-compliant sequence listing for the European patent application separately.

Where the previously filed application is not available to the EPO, it will not be possible to carry out the check according to Rule 57(j) on the compliance of the sequence listing with Rule 30(1) until the applicant files the certified copy and any translation required, which must be done within two months of the date of filing (Rule 40(3)). If, after receipt of the certified copy and translation, where applicable, the examination by the Receiving Section reveals that the sequence listing contained does not comply with Rule 30(1) in conjunction with the rules laid down by the EPO President, the EPO will send a communication according to Rule 30(3) inviting the applicant to correct any deficiencies and pay the late furnishing fee (see A-IV, 5).

If the previously filed application referred to is a European patent application or an international application filed with the EPO as receiving Office, and the sequence listing contained satisfied the requirements of Rule 30 or Rule 5.2 PCT on its date of filing then all the requirements of Rule 30(1) are satisfied automatically on the date of filing of the European patent application filed by reference to this application. If the sequence listing of the previously filed application does not comply with WIPO Standard ST.26, for instance because it was filed before the standard entered into force, an invitation will be issued under Rule 30(3) to submit a standard-compliant sequence listing.

If the previously filed application was filed with any other office, the applicant will have to ensure that all the requirements of Rule 30(1), in

conjunction with the rules laid down by the EPO President, are met. In particular, the applicant must consider that any electronic standard-compliant sequence listing filed on the date of filing of the previously filed application will in most cases not be part of the certified copy under Rule 40(3) issued by the filing office: due to technical limitations, the certified copy received by the EPO will in most cases contain, if anything, a converted sequence listing that is not standard-compliant. Hence, the applicant will still have to provide a standard-compliant sequence listing to the EPO to satisfy the above requirements. The same applies where the previously filed application was a European patent application or an international application filed with the EPO as receiving Office, but where one or more of the elements required to satisfy the requirements of Rule 30(1) or Rule 5.2 PCT in conjunction with WIPO Standard ST.26 were not present on the date of filing. If this is not the case, the procedure in A-IV.5 will be followed (a communication under Rule 30(3) will be sent).

In alignment with the practice for divisional applications, a sequence listing in WIPO Standard ST.25 format contained in the certified copy under Rule 40(3) (e.g. converted from the TXT file available to the issuing office) is excluded from the calculation of the additional fee for pages in excess of 35 (see also A-IV.5.4 and A-III.13.2).

5.4 Sequence listings of a divisional application

As an independent European patent application, a divisional application must also satisfy the requirements of Rule 30 in conjunction with the decision of the President of the EPO dated 14 November 2025 on the filing of sequence listings, OJ EPO 2025, A64 (see G.1/05, reasons 3.1). Without prejudice to the requirements of Art. 76(1), second sentence, if a sequence listing is to form part of the description of the divisional application, it must be submitted together with the other documents making up the divisional application unless reference is made to a previously filed application containing a sequence listing as part of the application (Rule 40(1)(c)). Where the sequence listing of the parent application is in a format complying with WIPO Standard ST.25, it must be converted into one complying with WIPO Standard ST.26. To avoid the potential risk of adding and/or losing subject-matter due to conversion, applicants may additionally file the parent application's ST.25 sequence listing in PDF format as part of the divisional application. In such cases, the pages of the ST.25 sequence listing are excluded from the calculation of the additional fee for pages in excess of 35 ("page fee"). The same practice applies to divisional applications filed by reference where the certified copy (Rule 40(3)) contains a sequence listing in ST.25 format (see also A-IV.5.3 and A-III.13.2). In order to comply with Rule 30(1), the sequence listing in WIPO Standard ST.26 format must in such cases be filed subsequently (see OJ EPO 2023, A98). The late furnishing fee under Rule 30(3) does not fall due if the ST.26 sequence listing is filed before the EPO issues the communication under Rule 30(3) (see A-IV.5).

An applicant who has filed a WIPO Standard ST.26-compliant sequence listing under Rule 30 with regard to the earlier application (parent application) is exempted from having to submit said sequence listing if it is

intended to be used for search purposes only (i.e. not as part of the description) in respect of the divisional application (the relevant check box for this is preselected in section 38.3 on Form 1001). This enables the EPO to add a copy of the standard-compliant sequence listing filed for the earlier (parent) application to the dossier of the divisional application in XML format and for search purposes only (see OJ EPO 2021, A97, point 18). However, since the content of the disclosure of the invention is the responsibility of the applicant, any sequence listing that is to form part of the description must be filed by them. The sequence listing of the earlier application is, thus, not automatically added to the dossier of the divisional application if

- the applicant files a WIPO Standard ST.26-compliant sequence listing as part of the divisional application's description
- the sequence listing available in the earlier application does not comply with WIPO Standard ST.26.

6. Conversion into a national application

Art. 135

The central industrial property office of a contracting state must apply the procedure for the grant of a national patent or another protective right provided for by the legislation of that state at the request of the applicant for or the proprietor of the European patent under the circumstances specified in Art. 135(1). If the request for conversion is not filed within the three-month period specified in Rule 155(1), the effect referred to in Art. 66 will lapse (i.e. the European patent application will cease to be equivalent to a regular national filing in the designated contracting states).

Art. 135(2) Rule 155(2) and (3)

The request for conversion is to be made to the EPO, except where the application is deemed withdrawn under Art. 77(3); in this case the request is filed with the central industrial property office with which the application was filed. That office will, subject to national security provisions, transmit the request direct to the central industrial property offices of the contracting states specified in it, together with a copy of the file relating to the European patent application. If the central industrial property office with which the application was filed does not transmit the request before the expiry of 20 months from the date of filing, or if claimed, from the priority date, then Art. 135(4) applies (i.e. the effect of Art. 66 lapses).

Art. 135(3) Rule 155(2)

If a request for conversion is filed with the EPO, it must specify the contracting states in which the application of national procedures is desired. The EPO transmits the request to the central industrial property offices of the specified contracting states accompanied by a copy of the files relating to the European patent application or patent.

Chapter V – Communications concerning formal deficiencies; amendment of application; correction of errors

1. Communications concerning formal deficiencies

Where an application is found to be formally deficient during a formalities examination, the Receiving Section or, where appropriate, the examining division issues one or more communications to the applicant identifying all the particular EPC requirements not met and, in the case of deficiencies that can be corrected, inviting the applicant to correct them within specified periods (see A-III, 16). In the exceptional case of communications that do not detail all deficiencies, see A-III, 16.1. The applicant will be notified of the consequences, e.g. application deemed withdrawn, priority right lost, that result from the deficiencies or failure to take appropriate action within due time.

In general, depending on the deficiency in question, either:

- (i) a time limit will be specified by the EPO, subject to Rule 132, for meeting the objection, e.g. an invitation to supply the priority document or priority file number under Rule 59 or
- (ii) a fixed time limit will apply, e.g. two months for correcting deficiencies under Rule 58.

For further details see E-VIII, 1. If a deficiency is not rectified in due time, then the legal effects that are envisaged will apply.

2. Amendment of application

2.1 Filing of amendments

Prior to receiving the European search report, the applicant may amend the application only if invited by the Receiving Section to remedy particular deficiencies, including when no claims are present in the application as originally filed. In this case, the applicant must rectify this deficiency by filing a set of claims in response to a communication according to Rule 58 (see A-III, 15). In the period between receiving the European search report and a first communication from the examining division, i.e. also when the application may still be with the Receiving Section, applicants may of their own volition amend the description, claims and drawings (Rule 137(2)). Where a search opinion accompanies the search report under Rule 62(1), the applicant must respond to it by filing observations and/or amendments (see B-XI, 8 for details and exceptions to this requirement). However, the European patent application may not be amended in such a way that it contains subject-matter extending beyond the content of the application as filed (regarding the publication of claims thus amended in response to the European search report under Rule 137(2), see also A-VI, 1.3).

Rule 58
Rule 137(1) and (2)
Art. 123(1) and (2)
Rule 68(4)

2.2 Examination of amendments as to formalities

The Receiving Section examines amendments, filed before the receipt of the search report, for formal requirements. Such amendments must remedy

Rule 58
Rule 137(1)

the deficiencies notified by the Receiving Section. The description, claims and drawings may be amended only to the extent sufficient to remedy the disclosed deficiencies, which makes it necessary for the Receiving Section to compare any amended description, claims and drawings with those originally filed. Where, for example, a fresh description is filed to replace an earlier description that was objected to on account of non-compliance with the physical requirements, the Receiving Section must compare both descriptions, and the objection is not met until the wording is identical. However, identity of wording with the application documents as originally filed is not a requirement for amendments rectifying the following deficiencies:

- (i) filing at least one claim according to Rule 58, where no claims existed on filing (see A-III, 15) (these claims must still satisfy the requirements of Art. 123(2), but this check is carried out by the search and examining divisions)
- (ii) the filing of missing parts of the description or missing drawings according to Rule 56 (see A-II, 5).

Drawings filed to remedy deficiencies notified by the Receiving Section must adhere to the format of the original drawings, i.e. they may contain colour or greyscale content only to the same extent as the original drawings (see the notice from the EPO dated 5 September 2025, OJ EPO 2025, A57).

Amendments that extend beyond the remedying of deficiencies and that are filed prior to receipt of the search report may be taken into consideration in the subsequent procedure, provided that on receipt of the search report the applicants declare that they wish them to be maintained.

Examination as to formalities of amendments filed after the receipt of the search report and before the application is transferred to the examining division is the responsibility of the Receiving Section.

The procedure for effecting amendments is dealt with in H-III, 2.

3. Correction of errors in documents filed with the EPO

Linguistic errors, errors of transcription and mistakes in any document filed with the EPO may be corrected at the applicant's request under Rule 139, first sentence. Requests for such corrections may be made at any time, provided that proceedings are pending before the EPO (see J.42/92). However, if the error to be corrected concerns items that third parties might expect to be able to take at face value and whose correction would jeopardise their rights, the request for correction must be filed as soon as possible, and at least in time for incorporation in the publication of the European patent application. With regard to the addition or correction of priority claims, specific provisions apply with a view to protecting the interests of third parties and allow the applicant to add or correct priority claims and lay down a time limit for doing so (see Rule 52(2) and (3), and A-III, 6.5.1 and 6.5.2). This ensures that corrected priority information is available when the application is published. After expiry of the applicable

Rule 139,
1st sentence

period under Rule 52(2) or (3), and in particular after publication of the application, the applicant can only correct the priority claim under Rule 139 (the mistake being an omitted or wrong priority claim) under certain limited circumstances where it is apparent on the face of the published application that a mistake has been made. See J 2/92, J 3/91 and J 6/91 as well as J 11/92 and J 7/94. Each of these decisions indicated situations under EPC 1973 where the requester could correct priority data even though it was too late for a warning to be published with the application. These same situations apply *mutatis mutandis* under EPC 2000 to the acceptance of requests to correct priority claims after the end of the time limit according to Rule 52(3). Regarding correction of the date indicated for the previous filing, see also A-III, 6.6.

After expiry of the two-month time limit for correcting erroneous (parts) of the application documents under Rule 56a(1) or 56a(3) (see A-II, 6), the correction of errors in application documents is governed by Rule 139, second sentence. The allowability of such corrections under Rule 139 is subject to strict requirements.

Rule 56a

If the error is in the description, claims or drawings, the correction must be obvious in the sense that it is immediately evident that nothing else could have been intended than what is offered as the correction. Such a correction may be effected only within the limits of what a skilled person would derive directly and unambiguously, using common general knowledge, and seen objectively and relative to the date of filing, from all of the documents as filed (see G 3/89 and G 11/91; see also H-VI, 2.2.1). The documents to be considered in assessing whether the correction is allowable are those of the application as originally filed, including any late-filed missing parts of the description or missing drawings filed according to Rule 56, or application documents or parts corrected according to Rule 56a, regardless of whether this resulted in a change of the date of filing (see A-II, 5 et seq and A-II, 6 et seq). However, claims filed after the date of filing in response to an invitation according to Rule 58 (see A-III, 15) cannot be used in assessing the allowability of the request.

Rule 139,
2nd sentence

It is not allowable under Rule 139 to replace the complete set of application documents (i.e. description, claims and drawings) with other documents that the applicant had intended to file with the request for grant (see G 2/95).

The examining division decides on the request for correction. If such a request is pending before termination of the technical preparations for publication, a reference to it is published on the front page.

In the case of electronic filing of European patent applications, the technical documents (description, claims, abstract and drawings) may be attached in their original format, provided it is one listed in the decision of the President of the EPO dated 8 July 2025, OJ EPO 2025, A52. Under this decision, these technical documents may also be attached in a format other than those listed, provided that on filing the application the applicant informs the EPO where it can reasonably acquire the corresponding software. If, on the date of filing, the documents making up the European patent application

are available both in the format allowed for filing in Online Filing 2.0 and in another admissible format in accordance with the above decision, the documents in the latter format can also be used to determine whether a request for correction of the description, claims or drawings is allowable.

Chapter VI – Publication of application; request for examination and transmission of the dossier to examining division

1. Publication of application

1.1 Date of publication

The application is published as soon as possible after the expiry of a period of 18 months from the date of filing or, where priority is claimed, from the earliest priority date. Upon request from the applicant, the application may, however, be published before that date, provided that the filing and search fees have been validly paid and there are no formal deficiencies in the application documents (see A-III, 1.1 and 16). Deficiencies not yet remedied concerning the designation of inventor are not a bar to early publication (see A-III, 5.4 and J 1/10). If the application is ready for grant before expiry of the 18-month period, see C-IV, 7.1 and C-VI, 3.

Art. 93(1)

If the applicant abandons the priority date, the publication is deferred, provided that the EPO receives the abandonment notification before the technical preparations for publication are completed. These preparations are considered completed at the end of the day that comes five weeks before expiry of the 18th month following the earliest date of priority if priority is claimed, or following the date of filing if the priority is abandoned or no priority is claimed (see the decision of the President of the EPO dated 12 July 2007, Special edition No. 3, OJ EPO 2007, D.1). The applicant is informed about the termination of the preparations, the publication number and intended publication date. Where the priority abandonment notification is received after that time, publication, if not already completed, takes place as if the priority date applied, although a notice as to the abandonment of the priority will appear in the European Patent Bulletin (see F-VI, 3.5). The same procedure is followed when the priority right is lost under Art. 90(5) (see A-III, 6.10).

1.2 No publication; preventing publication

The application is not published if it has been finally refused or deemed withdrawn or withdrawn before the technical preparations for publication are completed (see A-VI, 1.1). These preparations are considered completed at the end of the day that comes five weeks before expiry of the 18th month following the filing or priority date (see the decision of the President of the EPO dated 12 July 2007, Special edition No. 3, OJ EPO 2007, D.1). The application is, however, published if, upon termination of the preparations, a request for a decision under Rule 112(2) has been received but no final decision has yet been taken (see OJ EPO 1990, 455) or if there is a pending request for re-establishment of rights under Art. 122 and Rule 136(1).

Rule 67(2)

If, after termination of the preparations, the application is withdrawn, non-publication cannot be guaranteed. However, the EPO will endeavour (in accordance with the principles of J 5/81) to prevent publication on a case-by-case basis if the stage reached in the publication procedure

permits this without undue effort (see the notice from the EPO dated 25 April 2006, [OJ EPO 2006, 406](#)).

Rule 15

The application may be withdrawn by means of a signed declaration, which should be unqualified and unambiguous (see [J 11/80](#)). EPO Form 1018, which can be downloaded free of charge from [epo.org](#), ensures that the declaration is unambiguous (also in respect of any conditions for withdrawal). It is therefore highly recommended to use it for withdrawing the European patent application (see also the notice from the EPO dated 12 August 2019, [OJ EPO 2019, A79](#)). The applicant is bound by an effective declaration of withdrawal (see [C-V, 11](#)) but may make it subject to the proviso that the content of the application not be made known to the public. This takes into account the procedural peculiarity that the applicant making the declaration of withdrawal in the five weeks before the date of publication cannot know whether publication can still be prevented. However, neither the application nor the designation of a contracting state may be withdrawn from the time a third party proves that they have initiated entitlement proceedings and up to the date on which the EPO resumes the proceedings for grant (see also [E-VIII, 8](#)).

1.3 Content of the publication

Rule 68(1), (3) and (4)

Rule 20

Rule 32(1)

The publication must contain the description, the claims and any drawings as filed, including any sequence listing filed on the date of filing. Drawings in colour or greyscale in Euro-direct applications filed electronically on or after 1 October 2025 are published in that format (see the notice from the EPO dated 5 September 2025, [OJ EPO 2025, A57](#)); for Euro-PCT applications, see [A-XIII, 10.1](#).

The publication must also contain any late-filed missing parts of the description or missing drawings filed according to [Rule 56\(2\)](#) or [\(3\)](#) (see [A-II, 5](#)) or any correct (parts of the) application documents according to [Rule 56a\(3\)](#) or [\(4\)](#) (see [A-II, 6](#) and the notice from the EPO dated 23 June 2022, [OJ EPO 2022, A71](#)). Where correct (parts of the) application documents are included under [Rule 56a\(4\)](#), the publication also contains the erroneous (parts of the) application documents – clearly marked as erroneously filed – as the application as filed. Where the procedure under [Rule 56](#) or [56a](#) is not finalised when the technical preparations for publication are terminated, a correction of the publication will be initiated as soon as the date of filing and content of the application are finally determined.

The publication will also specify, where possible, the person(s) designated as the inventor(s). If the claims were filed after the date of filing according to the procedures explained in [A-III, 15](#), this will be indicated when the application is published ([Rule 68\(4\)](#)).

The publication also indicates as designated contracting states all states party to the EPC on the date the application was filed unless individual states have been withdrawn by the applicant before the termination of the technical preparations for publication. When a European patent application filed before 1 April 2009 is published, the states for which protection is actually sought may not yet be known because the time limit under

Rule 39(1) for paying the designation fees is still running. Those definitively designated – through actual payment of designation fees – are announced later in the European Patent Register and the European Patent Bulletin (see Information from the EPO, OJ EPO 1997, 479). For European divisional applications, see A-IV, 1.3.4.

The publication also contains any new or amended claims filed by the applicant under Rule 137(2), together with the European search report and the abstract determined by the search division if both are available before the technical preparations for publication are terminated. Otherwise the abstract filed by the applicant is published. The search opinion is not published with the European search report (Rule 62(2)), though it is open to file inspection (see A-XI, 2.1). If the EPO has received a communication from the applicant under Rule 32(1) ("expert solution"), this too must be mentioned (see the notice from the EPO dated 7 July 2010, OJ EPO 2010, 498). Further data may be included at the discretion of the EPO President.

Rule 68(2) and (4)
Rule 66

With the exception of documents that have to be translated, originals of documents filed are used for publication purposes where they meet the physical requirements referred to in A-VIII, 2; otherwise, the amended or replacement documents meeting these requirements are used. Application documents that are of such bad quality that any improvement would result in an extension of the subject-matter as originally filed are published as filed. Prohibited matter may be omitted from the documents before publication, the place and number of words or drawings omitted being indicated (see A-III, 8.1 and 8.2). Documents incorporated in an electronic file are deemed to be originals (Rule 147(3)).

If a request for correction under Rule 139 of errors in the documents filed with the EPO is allowed, it must be incorporated in the publication. If, upon termination of the technical preparations for publication, a decision is still pending on a request for correction of items that third parties might expect to be able to take at face value and whose correction would jeopardise their rights, this must be mentioned on the front page of the publication (see the case law in A-V, 3), as must a request for correction of errors in the description, claims or drawings (see A-V, 3).

Rule 139

The correction of errors occurring in the course of the European patent application's publication can be requested at any time (see H-VI, 3). Complete republication of the application will take place where appropriate.

1.4 Publication in electronic form only

All European patent applications, European search reports and European patent specifications are published in electronic form only, on a publication server (see the decision of the President of the EPO dated 12 July 2007, Special edition No. 3, OJ EPO 2007, D.3, and OJ EPO 2005, 126) accessible via the EPO website (*epo.org*).

1.5 Separate publication of the European search report

If not published with the application, the European search report is published separately (also electronically).

2. Request for examination and transmission of the dossier to the examining division

2.1 Communication

Rule 69(1) and (2)

The Receiving Section communicates to the applicant the date on which the European Patent Bulletin mentions the publication of the European search report and draws attention to the provisions with regard to the request for examination as set out in Art. 94(1) and (2) and Rule 70(1). In the unlikely event that the communication wrongly specifies a later date than the date of the publication's mention, the later date is decisive as regards the time limit for filing the request for examination (see A-VI, 2.2 and C-II, 1) and also for responding to the search opinion (see B-XI, 8 and A-VI, 3) unless the error is obvious. In the communication, the applicant is also informed that the designation fee must be paid within six months of the date on which the European Patent Bulletin mentions the search report's publication (see A-III, 11.2 and 11.3).

Rule 70a(1)

Where the time limit under Rule 70(1) is that within which the applicant must reply to the search opinion (i.e. where Rule 70(2) does not apply), the invitation under Rule 70a(1) is sent in a combined communication with the communication according to Rule 69(1) (see C-II, 3.3).

2.2 Time limit for filing the request for examination

Art. 94(1) and (2)
Rule 70(1)

The request for examination may be filed by the applicant up to the end of six months after the date on which the European Patent Bulletin mentions the European search report's publication. The request for examination is not deemed filed until the examination fee has been paid (see C-II, 1). If the applicant does not file the request for examination and pay the examination fee within the above time limit, then the procedure explained in A-VI, 2.3 applies.

Art. 78(1)(a)
Rule 41(1)

The mandatory request for grant form (EPO Form 1001) contains a written request for examination. To confirm the written request, the applicant only needs to pay the examination fee within the time limit under Rule 70(1).

Art. 11(a) RFees

Applicants may also pay the examination fee as from the date of filing and prior to receipt of the European search report. In that case, the Receiving Section invites them under Rule 70(2) to indicate within six months of the date of the mention of the search report's publication in the European Patent Bulletin whether they wish to proceed further with their application (see C-II, 1.1). If, after receipt of the European search report, the applicant decides not to pursue the application and does not react to the invitation under Rule 70(2), the application will be deemed withdrawn under Rule 70(3), and the examination fee will be refunded in its entirety (see A-VI, 2.5).

Point 5.1(c) AAD

If the applicant has filed an automatic debit order, the examination fee will normally be debited at the end of the six-month period. For cases in which the applicant wishes the application to be transmitted earlier to the examining division, see the AAD in Annex A.1 to the ADA, Supplementary publication 2, OJ EPO 2024.

The request for examination may not be withdrawn.

Rule 70(1)

Regarding Euro-PCT applications entering the European phase, see A-XIII, 7.

2.3 Legal remedy

If the request for examination is not validly filed by paying the examination fee before expiry of the period under Rule 70(1), the application is deemed withdrawn and the applicant is notified accordingly. In response to this loss-of-rights communication, the applicant can request further processing in accordance with Art. 121 and Rule 135 (see E-VIII, 2).

Art. 94(2)

Rule 112(1)

If the applicants have validly filed a request for examination before the European search report has been transmitted to them, the Receiving Section invites them according to Rule 70(2) to indicate within six months of the date of the mention of the search report's publication in the European Patent Bulletin whether they wish to proceed further with their application. If they fail to respond to this request in time, the application is deemed withdrawn and the applicants are notified accordingly. In this case, the applicants may also avail themselves of the legal remedy under Art. 121 and Rule 135 (further processing of the application). Regarding reimbursement of the examination fee, see A-VI, 2.2 and A-X, 10.2.3. C-VI, 3 describes the procedure in respect of a categorical request for examination, as provided for in Rule 10(4), where the applicant waives the right to the communication according to Rule 70(2).

Rule 70(2) and (3)

Rule 112(1)

Art. 121

Regarding Euro-PCT applications entering the regional phase, see A-XIII, 7.1.

2.4 Transmission of the dossier to the examining division

If the Receiving Section finds that the request for examination was filed in due time, or the wish to proceed further with the application was indicated in due time (Rule 70(2)), it transmits the application to the examining division. Otherwise, it will notify the applicant of the loss of rights that has occurred (see Rule 112(1)).

Art. 16

Art. 18(1)

Rule 10

The dossier as transmitted to the examining division contains the following:

- (i) all documents filed in relation to the application, including priority documents, translations and any amendments
- (ii) any certificate filed in relation to display at an exhibition (see A-IV, 3) and any information furnished under Rule 31 if the application relates to biological material (see A-IV, 4)
- (iii) the European search report, if applicable the search opinion, the content of the abstract as drawn up by the search division and the internal search note, if any
- (iv) documents cited in the search report and publication document(s)

- (v) the applicant's response to the search opinion (see B-XI.8) or to the WO-ISA, supplementary international search report or IPER prepared by the EPO (see A-XIV.3 and 4)
- (vi) all relevant correspondence.

The Receiving Section will direct attention to any aspects of the application requiring urgent attention by the examining division, e.g. any letters that have to be answered before the application is examined in its proper turn.

2.5 Refund of examination fee

Art. 11 RFees

The examination fee is refunded:

- (i) in full if the European patent application is withdrawn, refused or deemed withdrawn before substantive examination has begun (Art. 11(a) RFees)
- (ii) at a rate of 50% if the European patent application is withdrawn after substantive examination has begun and
 - before expiry of the (extended) time limit for replying to the first invitation under Art. 94(3) issued by the examining division proper or
 - if no such invitation has been issued, before the date of the communication under Rule 71(3) (Art. 11(b) RFees).

As concerns (i) above, this applies to all European patent applications that are withdrawn, refused or deemed withdrawn on or after 1 July 2016. As concerns (ii) above, this applies to all European patent applications for which substantive examination began on or after 1 November 2016 (see the Administrative Council decision of 29 June 2016, OJ EPO 2016, A48).

Communications under Art. 94(3) "issued by the examining division proper" (see also C-III.4) are all communications indicating that the application does not meet the requirements of the EPC and referring to deemed withdrawal under Art. 94(4) if the deficiencies are not duly remedied. These include the following:

- minutes of consultations by phone or in person, accompanied by an invitation to remedy deficiencies
- communications relating to the "completely contained" criterion under Rule 56(3) or 56a(4)
- summonses to oral proceedings under Rule 115(1) to which a communication complying with the requirements of Art. 94(3) and Rule 71(1) is annexed.

In contrast, communications addressing purely formal deficiencies and issued by formalities officers as part of the duties entrusted to them, even if issued on the basis of Art. 94(3), do not constitute communications under

Art. 94(3) "issued by the examining division proper". Likewise, communications issued by the examining division proper on some other legal basis, such as Rule 164(2)(a), Rule 53(3) or Art. 124, have no bearing on the period for a withdrawal qualifying for the 50% refund (see the notice from the EPO dated 30 June 2016, OJ EPO 2016, A49).

An applicant unsure whether substantive examination has begun and wanting to withdraw the application only if certain to receive the 100% refund may make withdrawal contingent upon the refund ("conditional" withdrawal). The date of the start of examination (C-IV, 7.1) is indicated by means of EPO Form 2095 in the public part of the dossier and is thus open to file inspection in the European Patent Register after the patent application's publication. If EPO Form 2095 is not on file, substantive examination is deemed to have started on the date on which the first communication from the examining division proper is issued (e.g. a communication under Art. 94(3), Rule 71(3) or any other legal basis as mentioned above). Before publication, the applicant can request the relevant information from the EPO or access it electronically in MyEPO. For more details, see OJ EPO 2013, 153, and OJ EPO 2024, A20.

2.6 Reduction in examination fee

Where applicants having their residence or principal place of business within the territory of a contracting state having an official language other than English, French or German and nationals of that state who are resident abroad make use of the options provided for under Art. 14(4), the examination fee is reduced under certain circumstances (see A-X, 9.3.1 and 9.3.3).

Art. 14(4)

Rule 7a

Art. 14(1) RFees

For the reduction of the examination fee under the fee reduction scheme for micro-entities, see A-X, 9.4.1 and 9.4.2.

3. Response to the search opinion

The applicant is required to respond to the search opinion within the time limit under Rule 70(1) or, if a communication under Rule 70(2) is sent (see C-II, 1.1), within the time limit under Rule 70(2). If the applicant fails to respond to the search opinion on time, the application is deemed withdrawn (Rule 70a(3)). For more details, see B-XI, 8.

Rule 70a

Chapter VII – Languages

1. Admissible languages on filing

1.1 General

European patent applications can be filed in any language. However, if filed in a language other than an official EPO language (English, French and German), a translation into one of the official languages must be filed within two months of the date of filing (Rule 6(1)). Although filing in any language is in principle possible, there may be limitations due to the applicable national law for applications filed at a central industrial property office or the competent national authority under Art. 75(1)(b).

Art. 14(1) and
Art. 14(2)
Rule 6(1)

In the case of applications filed in "an admissible non-EPO language" (see A-VII, 3.2), a reduction of the filing fee is allowed for certain categories of applicants (see A-X, 9.3.1 and 9.3.2).

Rule 7a(1)
Rule 7a(2)
Rule 7a(5)

Filing a European patent application in a single language is not a requirement for according a date of filing (Art. 90(3) in conjunction with Art. 14(2)). However, where an application is filed in more than one language, the EPO will invite the applicant to remedy the deficiency.

1.2 Filing by reference

Where the description is filed by reference to a previously filed application (see A-II, 4.1.3.1) and the latter is not in an official EPO language, the applicant must also file a translation into one such language within two months of the date of filing.

Rule 40(3)

1.3 European divisional applications; Art. 61 applications

European divisional applications must be filed in the language of the proceedings of the earlier (parent) application. Alternatively, if the earlier (parent) application was not in an official EPO language, the divisional application may be filed in the language of the earlier (parent) application. In this case a translation into the language of the proceedings of the earlier application must be filed within two months of the filing of the divisional application.

Rule 36(2)

The same applies to the filing of a new European patent application under Art. 61(1)(b).

Art. 61(2)

1.4 Invitation to file the translation

Where the translation is not filed in due time, the EPO will invite the applicant to rectify this deficiency within a non-extendable period of two months. Failure to file the translation in time in response to this invitation results in the application being deemed withdrawn under Art. 14(2), in which case further processing is ruled out (see A-III, 14).

Art. 90(3)
Rules 57 and 58

2. Language of the proceedings

The official EPO language (English, French or German) in which the application is filed, or into which it is subsequently translated, constitutes the "language of the proceedings". Where the EPO invites the applicant to file the translation (see A-VII, 1.4), the invitation will be sent by default in

Art. 14(3)

English with an update to the language of the proceedings on receipt of the translation, if applicable.

The language of the proceedings is the only language used by EPO departments in written proceedings on that application (see [G 4/08](#)).

Rule 3(2)

Where European patent applications are filed in one of the official EPO languages, or after they have been translated into one of them, the description, claims and drawings can only be amended in that official language, which is the language of the proceedings.

Any claims filed after the date of filing will need to be filed in the language of the proceedings.

Example: If an application is filed without claims in Japanese and is then translated into English, the claims will need to be filed in English. Subsequent amendments to the application will also have to be filed in English.

3. Derogations from the language of the proceedings in written proceedings

3.1 Parties' written submissions

Rule 3(1)

With the exception of amendments to the European patent application or European patent, any party may use any of the EPO's three official languages in written proceedings before the EPO.

3.2 Admissible non-EPO languages

Art. 14(3) and
Art. 14(4)

Natural or legal persons having their residence or principal place of business within an EPC contracting state having a language other than English, French or German as an official language, and nationals of that state resident abroad, may file documents that have to be filed within a time limit in an official language of that state ("admissible non-EPO language"). For example, an Italian or Swiss applicant may file a reply in Italian to a communication from the examining division issued under [Art. 94\(3\)](#).

Rule 6(2)

A translation of a document filed in an admissible non-EPO language into an official language of the EPO must be filed within a non-extendable period of one month ([Rule 6\(2\)](#)). However, if the document is a notice of opposition or appeal or a petition for review ([Art. 112a](#)), the period extends to the end of the opposition or appeal period or the period for petition for review, if this expires later. The translation can be into any of the EPO's official languages, regardless of the language of the proceedings.

3.3 Priority document

Rule 53(3)

Where the certified copy of the previous application whose priority is claimed (priority document) is not in an official EPO language, a translation into one such language need only be filed at the invitation of the EPO. This invitation is issued only where the validity of the priority claim is relevant to determining the patentability of the invention concerned. The translation may be replaced by a declaration that the European patent application is a complete translation of the previous invention.

See A-III, 6.8 for more information on the translation of priority documents.

3.4 Documents filed as evidence

Documents to be used as evidence may be filed in any language. This applies to all proceedings before the EPO and, especially, to publications (for instance, an extract from a Korean periodical cited by an opponent to show lack of novelty or lack of inventive step). However, the department dealing with the case may require a translation of the document or relevant parts of it in one of the official EPO languages, to be chosen by the person filing the document. If the document is filed by the applicant in pre-grant proceedings, the EPO should require a translation of the document or relevant parts of it unless the examiners are fully competent in the language concerned. In opposition proceedings the same principles apply, taking into account the interests of all parties. The time limit for filing the translation will be specified by the competent EPO department on a case-by-case basis and will depend on the language concerned and the length of the document or relevant parts, taking account of the provisions of Rule 132 (see E-VIII, 1.2). If the required translation is not filed in due time, the EPO may disregard the document in question.

Rule 3(3)

3.5 Third-party observations

Third-party observations (E-VI, 3) must be filed in writing and in one of the EPO's official languages. Supporting documents, e.g. prior-art citations, can be written in any language.

Rule 114(1)

If the third-party observations and/or prior art are not in an official EPO language (Art. 14(1)), the EPO may invite the third party, if identifiable, to submit a translation of the observations and, where appropriate, of the cited prior art in one such language within a period according to Rule 132.

4. Derogations from the language of the proceedings in oral proceedings

This subject is dealt with in E-V.

Rule 4

5. Documents filed in the wrong language

Documents making up the European patent application can only be filed in the wrong language on the occasion of its amendment, since the application can originally be filed in any language (see A-VII, 1.1). In such a case, as well as if any other document is not filed in the prescribed language or any required translation is not filed in due time, the document is deemed not filed. The person who has filed the document will be notified accordingly by the EPO. Even though deemed not filed, the document concerned will become part of the file and therefore accessible to the public according to Art. 128(4).

Art. 14(1)

In the event of failure to file a translation of the filed documentary evidence upon invitation in due time, the documents in question may be disregarded by the EPO.

Rule 3(3)

Where submissions accompanying the performance of a procedural act subject to a time limit (e.g. filing the designation of the inventor, filing a certified copy of the earlier application for which priority is claimed or filing

the translation of the priority document under Rule 53(3)) are not filed in an official EPO language, they will be included in the file without note being taken of their content.

Rules 79(1)
and 114(2)

Observations by third parties and notices of oppositions will be communicated to the applicant or the patent proprietor even if they are deemed not filed.

6. Languages of publication

Art. 14(5) and (6)

European patent applications are published only in the language of the proceedings, whereas European patent specifications are published in the language of the proceedings together with translations of the claims in the other two official languages.

7. Conformity, correction and certification of the translation

Art. 14(2)
Art. 14(3)
Rule 7
Rule 5

According to Art. 70(2), if the European patent application has been filed in a language which is not an official language of the EPO, that text constitutes the authentic text within the meaning of the EPC.

Unless evidence is provided to the contrary, the EPO will assume, for the purposes of determining whether the subject-matter of the European patent application or European patent extends beyond the content of the application as filed (Art. 123(2)), that the translation filed under Art. 14(2) or Rule 40(3) is in conformity with the original text of the application (e.g. in Japanese). The text of the application as filed however remains the basis for determining the allowability of amendments under Art. 123(2) or the content of the disclosure for the purposes of Art. 54(3) (see G-IV, 5.1).

The Receiving Section will review the translation of the application documents for any obvious and easily identifiable differences from the application documents filed in the non-EPO language, e.g. the number of claims. If discrepancies are found, the applicant will be informed accordingly.

Applicants have the possibility to correct any error in the translation by bringing it into conformity with the application as filed at any time during patent grant proceedings and also during opposition proceedings.

However, correction of the translation during opposition proceedings will not be allowed if the corrections contravene Art. 123(3), i.e. if they imply an amendment of the claims that extends the protection conferred.

In pre-grant as well as post-grant proceedings, a correction to bring the translation into conformity with the original text must comply with the requirements of Art. 123(2). For Euro-direct applications filed in a non-EPO language, the original text is taken into account in proceedings before the EPO in order to determine whether the subject-matter of the application extends beyond the content of the application as filed. For Euro-PCT applications (see A-XIII, 3), the documents as originally filed in the PCT phase form the basis for the determination under Art. 123(2) during the European phase (see H-IV, 2.3.4).

If the correction of the translation does not comply with the requirements under Art. 123(2), or if the examining or opposition division (see D-V, 2.2) has reasonable doubts as to the translation's accuracy, it will invite the applicant or proprietor to comment.

Should serious doubts still remain as to the accuracy of the translation or correction of the translation, the examining division has the discretion to require the filing, within a period to be specified, of a certificate attesting that the translation corresponds to the original text or that the correction of the translation brings the translation into conformity with the original text (see E-VIII, 1.2 and 1.6). Failure to file the certificate in due time leads to the document being deemed not received unless the EPC provides otherwise. Further processing is possible under Art. 121 and Rule 135.

The certificate does not necessarily need to concern the translation of the whole application but may be limited to a paragraph, a sentence or even a single term. The required scope of the certification must be specified by the EPO when issuing the invitation under Rule 5.

Rule 5

The certificate must be issued by a person authorised under the relevant national law to attest to the accuracy of a translation before the respective national courts or administrative authorities.

As a rule, certification is not required in respect of the translations of the claims in the other two official languages required under Rule 71(3).

8. Authentic text of the application or patent

The text of an application or patent in the language of the proceedings is the authentic text. It therefore follows that the translation of the claims of the patent specification required by Art. 14(6) is for information only.

Art. 70(1)

Art. 14(8)

Chapter VIII – Common provisions

1. Representation

1.1 General principles

Subject to the next sentence, no person may be compelled to be represented by a professional representative in proceedings before the EPO; this holds for all parties to such proceedings, e.g. applicants, proprietors, opponents. A party (natural or legal person) who has neither residence nor principal place of business in a contracting state must be represented by a professional representative; the party must act through a professional representative in all proceedings other than in filing the application (which includes all acts leading to the accordance of a date of filing) or, for Euro-PCT applications, initiating the European phase within the applicable time limit (see [A-XII, 6.2](#)). To "be represented" is to be interpreted as meaning due representation, including not only notice of the appointment of a professional representative but also, where applicable, the filing of authorisations of the appointed representative (see [A-VIII, 1.7](#)).

[Art. 133\(1\) and
Art. 133\(2\)
Art. 90\(3\)
Rule 152](#)

Parties having their residence or principal place of business in a contracting state may also act direct before the EPO, even if they have appointed a professional representative (see [A-VIII, 1.2](#)), a legal practitioner (see [A-VIII, 1.3](#)), an association of representatives (see [A-VIII, 1.4](#)) or an employee (see [A-VIII, 1.5](#)) to act on their behalf. When conflicting instructions are received from parties and their representative, each will be advised of the other's action.

Should opponents who are party to proceedings and do not have either residence or principal place of business within the territory of one of the contracting states fail to meet the requirement set out under [Art. 133\(2\)](#) in the course of the opposition procedure (e.g. the representative withdraws from the opposition case or is deleted from the list of professional representatives), they are requested to appoint a new representative. Irrespective of whether they do so, the EPO will nevertheless inform opponents of the date and location of any oral proceedings and point out that if they appear alone they will not be entitled to act before the division.

1.2 Representation by a professional representative; list of professional representatives

Representation of natural or legal persons in proceedings before the EPO may only be undertaken by professional representatives whose names appear on a list kept for this purpose by the EPO and published as a searchable database on the EPO website (see the decision of the President dated 27 November 2024 concerning the publication of the list of professional representatives, [OJ EPO 2024, A107](#), and the corresponding notice from the EPO dated 27 November 2024, [OJ EPO 2024, A109](#). See also [OJ EPO 2024, A108](#)). See, however, also [A-VIII, 1.6](#). The Legal Division has responsibility for entries and deletions in the list of professional representatives (see [Art. 20\(1\)](#) and the decision of the President of the EPO dated 21 November 2013, [OJ EPO 2013, 600](#) and the notice from the EPO dated 24 March 2025, [OJ EPO 2025, A36](#)). Professional representatives may use MyEPO to submit requests relating to their entry

[Art. 134\(1\)](#)

on the list and self-manage their telecommunication details registered with the EPO and published in the searchable database on the EPO website, if applicable (see the notice from the EPO dated 13 May 2024, [OJ EPO 2024, A57](#)).

If several representatives are appointed, all of them must be duly authorised. Where an authorisation has to be filed, it must name all appointed representatives. The EPO will communicate with the first-named representative only.

1.3 Representation by a legal practitioner

[Art. 134\(1\)](#) and
[Art. 134\(8\)](#)

Representation in proceedings under the EPC may also be undertaken in the same way as by a professional representative (see [A-VIII, 1.2](#)) by any legal practitioner qualified in one of the contracting states and having their place of business within such state, to the extent that they are entitled, within the said state, to act as a professional representative in patent matters. Legal practitioners entitled to act as representatives before the EPO are not entered on the list of professional representatives (see [J.18/99](#)). However, they are registered in an internal database administered by the Legal Division (see [OJ EPO 2013, 600](#)). Legal practitioners may use MyEPO to submit requests relating to their registration and self-manage their telecommunication details registered with the EPO.

1.4 Representation by an association of representatives

[Rule 152\(11\)](#)

A group of at least two professional representatives and/or legal practitioners registered with the EPO as an association within the meaning of [Rule 152\(11\)](#) may be appointed collectively to represent a party under the association's name (see the notice from the EPO dated 8 July 2025 concerning associations of representatives, [OJ EPO 2025, A48](#)). Each member of the association may then perform procedural acts on behalf of the party, while correspondence from the EPO, according to [Rule 130](#), is addressed to the association rather than to one particular member. Parties are recommended to clearly specify whether they wish to appoint the association – preferably by citing the association's name and representative number – or an individual representative belonging to that association, upon the appointment of the representative (see also [A-VIII, 1.8](#)).

Registration of an association is free of charge. An association can be registered and its composition or data modified using the self-service function in MyEPO or by the Legal Division on request ([OJ EPO 2025, A48](#)).

1.5 Representation by an employee

[Art. 133\(3\)](#)
[Art. 134\(1\)](#)
[Rule 152](#)

Parties having their residence or principal place of business in a contracting state are not obliged to be represented by a professional representative or legal practitioner in proceedings before the EPO. They may, irrespective of whether they are legal or natural persons, act through an employee, who need not be a professional representative or legal practitioner but who must always file an authorisation (see [A-VIII, 1.7](#) and [A-VIII, 1.8](#)).

1.6 Common representative

Joint applicants, joint proprietors of patents and more than one person giving joint notice of opposition or intervention may act through a common representative. If the request for the grant of a European patent, the notice of opposition or the request for intervention does not name a common representative, the party first named in the relevant document will be considered the common representative. The common representative can thus be a legal person. However, if one of the parties is obliged to appoint a professional representative and has done so, this representative will be considered the common representative acting on behalf of all parties. In such a case, no other party can act as common representative. However, if the first named party in the document has appointed a professional representative, that representative will be considered to be acting on behalf of all parties.

Art. 133(4)

Rule 151(1) and (2)

If the European patent application or patent is transferred to more than one person, and such persons have not appointed a common representative, the preceding provisions will apply. If such application is not possible, the EPO will require the parties to appoint a common representative within a two-month period specified by the EPO (see E-VIII, 1.6). If this request is not complied with, the EPO will appoint the common representative (J 10/96).

In the case of joint applicants for whom a change of representative is requested, any authorisation must be signed by all applicants. If this is not the case, the parties will likewise be invited to appoint a common representative before registration can take place. If the invitation is not complied with, the EPO will appoint the common representative.

For Rule 151 to apply, each party or their duly authorised representative must have signed the document (request for grant, notice of opposition, etc.) giving rise to their participation (see also A-III, 4.2.2 and A-VIII, 3.2 and 3.4). Otherwise the party cannot take part in the proceedings, nor therefore be represented by a common representative.

1.7 Signed authorisation

Representatives acting before the EPO must, on request, file a signed authorisation (see A-VIII, 3.2) within a two-month period specified by the EPO (see E-VIII, 1.6). Both individual and general authorisations (see A-VIII, 1.8) within the meaning of Rule 152(4) serve the same purpose. In the case of general authorisations for employees, the indication of the registration number is equivalent to the filing of the authorisation itself. The filing of an authorisation is distinct from the appointment of a representative for a specific case. If the requirements of Art. 133(2) are not fulfilled, the same period will be specified for the communication of the appointment and, where applicable, for the filing of the authorisation.

Rule 152

Professional representatives and legal practitioners entitled to act in accordance with Art. 134(8) will be required to file a signed authorisation only in certain circumstances, in particular if there is a change of representative without the EPO being notified by the previous representative that their authorisation has terminated (see Art. 1(2) of the

decision of the President of the EPO dated 7 July 2025 on the filing and signing of authorisations, [OJ EPO 2025, A45](#), and the notice from the EPO dated 8 July 2024, [OJ EPO 2024, A77](#)). No authorisation is required where a professional representative or legal practitioner other than the appointed one (and not being a member of the same association or law firm, as the case may be) performs a procedural act on behalf of a party to proceedings, e.g. filing a reply to the communication under [Rule 71\(3\)](#), provided that it is apparent from the submission that they are acting at the request of that party without the intention to take over representation. If there is any doubt as to the entitlement of a professional representative or legal practitioner to act on behalf of a party, the EPO may require the filing of an authorisation (see Art. 1(3) of the above decision).

However, an employee acting for an applicant in accordance with [Art. 133\(3\)](#), first sentence, but who is not a professional representative or legal practitioner, must always file a signed individual or general authorisation or cite the registration number of a registered general authorisation (see Art. 2 of the above decision) to be in a position to validly perform procedural acts. In Euro-PCT proceedings, persons representing applicants in this capacity are not required to file signed authorisations if they have already filed an authorisation expressly covering proceedings established by the EPC with the EPO as receiving Office, ISA or IPEA (see [A-XII, 6.2.2](#)).

Where a representative is appointed to act on behalf of the applicant in several of that party's applications, it is not necessary to file an individual authorisation for each application (see [A-VIII, 2.4](#)). A clear indication of the applications concerned is sufficient; the EPO will make sure that a copy of the authorisation is included in all of the files concerned.

The authorisation can also be filed by the applicant. This also applies where the applicant is obliged to be represented, as fulfilling the requirement to be represented is not itself a procedural step under [Art. 133\(2\)](#) to which the rule of obligatory representation applies.

An association of representatives (see [A-VIII, 1.4](#)) can be authorised to represent a party before the EPO ([Rule 152\(11\)](#)). A party appointing several representatives can authorise them collectively as an association instead of having to do so individually, provided that the association in question is registered with the EPO ([OJ EPO 2025, A48](#)). Where invited to file an authorisation by way of an exception, a reference to the association's representative number in the authorisation will suffice.

An authorisation remains in force until its termination is communicated to the EPO. Transfer of representation or termination of authorisation can, subject to certain conditions, be effected electronically by the representative using MyEPO (see the decision of the President of the EPO dated 9 February 2024, [OJ EPO 2024, A20](#), and the notice from the EPO dated 9 February 2024, [OJ EPO 2024, A21](#)). The authorisation will not terminate upon the death of the person who gave it unless the authorisation provides to the contrary ([Rule 152\(9\)](#)).

Authorisations may bear handwritten, facsimile or text-string signatures (see A-VIII, 3.3), or digital signatures under the conditions specified by the EPO (see the decision of the President of the EPO dated 7 July 2025, OJ EPO 2025, A45, and the notice from the EPO dated 8 July 2024, OJ EPO 2024, A77). Where a digital signature is used, the authorisation must be filed electronically (see A-II, 1.1.1 and A-VIII, 2.5).

1.8 General authorisation

An authorisation may cover more than one application or patent. Also, a general authorisation enabling a representative to act in respect of all the patent transactions of the party making the authorisation may be filed.

*Rule 152(2), (4), (7),
(8) and (9).*

An authorisation given for EP proceedings (EPO Form 1004) does not extend to UP proceedings unless this is indicated by selecting the corresponding box on EPO Form 1004. Alternatively, a separate general authorisation solely for UP proceedings may be used (EPO Form 7004, see Unitary Patent Guidelines, 8.2.4). A corresponding procedure applies to the withdrawal of an authorisation.

A general authorisation does not need to indicate the applications concerned. If a general authorisation is filed to authorise a representative in several applications, the EPO will make sure that a copy of it is included in all of the files concerned.

General authorisations for professional representatives, legal practitioners and associations are not registered by the EPO (see the decision of the President of the EPO dated 7 July 2025 on the filing and signing of authorisations, OJ EPO 2025, A45, and the notice from the EPO dated 7 July 2025 concerning the registration of general authorisations, OJ EPO 2025, A47). Professional representatives, legal practitioners and associations acting under a general authorisation can file an electronic copy of it in the proceedings using one of the EPO's permitted means of electronic filing. These groups of representatives must no longer refer to a previously registered general authorisation's registration number.

Art. 133(2)

The Legal Division registers general authorisations for employees (see the decision of the President of the EPO dated 7 July 2025 on the filing and signing of authorisations, OJ EPO 2025, A45, and the notice from the EPO dated 7 July 2025 concerning the registration of general authorisations and new related MyEPO features, OJ EPO 2025, A47, and OJ EPO 2013, 600). Once the general authorisation has been registered, employees may cite the registration number in proceedings. General authorisations for employees can also be managed in MyEPO (OJ EPO 2025, A47).

1.9 Invitation to appoint a representative and legal consequence of non-compliance

Where the Receiving Section notes during the examination under Art. 90(3) that a party having neither residence nor principal place of business within a contracting state has failed to fulfil the requirements of Art. 133(2) (see A-VIII, 1.1), it will send the invitation under Rule 58 (Rule 163(5) for Euro-PCT applications, see A-XII, 6.2) to appoint a representative within a two-month period direct to the party concerned. The period is not extendable (see E-VIII, 1.1). If a representative is not appointed in due time, the application will be refused under Art. 90(5). This decision may be remedied by requesting re-establishment of rights under Art. 122 and Rule 136 (see E-VIII, 3) or by filing a notice of appeal (see E-XI).

If the representative withdraws from representation during the examination phase and no new appointment is made, the two-month time limit for appointing a representative may be extended upon request according to Rule 132 (see E-VIII, 1.6). If the deficiency is not remedied in due time, the application will be deemed withdrawn (Art. 94(4)). The loss of rights may be remedied by filing a request for further processing under Art. 121 and Rule 135 (see E-VIII, 2) or by requesting a decision under Rule 112(2) (see E-VIII, 1.9.3).

1.10 Invitation to file authorisation and legal consequence in case of non-compliance

Rule 152(2) and (6)

Rule 132

Where the filing of an authorisation is required but is not filed in due time, any procedural steps taken other than filing a European patent application or initiating the European phase within the applicable time limit (see A-XIII, 11.5) will, without prejudice to any other legal consequences provided for in the EPC, be deemed not taken.

Where an employee who is not a professional representative or legal practitioner is acting for an applicant in accordance with Art. 133(3), first sentence, without an authorisation being filed, the applicant is invited to file the authorisation within a two-month period specified by the EPO (see E-VIII, 1.6). Where the filing of an authorisation is required for a professional representative, a legal practitioner or an association of representatives, the invitation is sent to them.

2. Form of documents**2.1 Documents making up the European patent application**

The physical requirements that the documents making up the European patent application, i.e. request, description, claims, drawings and abstract,

must satisfy are set out in Rule 49(2) in conjunction with the decision of the President of the EPO dated 7 July 2025 (OJ EPO 2025, A49). In particular, when amending the application documents, amendments must be typed. Any submissions containing handwritten amendments to application documents – unless they involve graphic symbols and characters and chemical and mathematical formulae – are a formal deficiency (see Art. 2(7) of the decision of the President of the EPO dated 7 July 2025 and Rule 50(1)). The EPO President may lay down further special formal or technical requirements for the filing of documents, in particular with regard to the filing of documents by means of electronic communication (Rule 2(1)). Notes on the preparation of OCR-readable patent applications are published in OJ EPO 1993, 59. The particular requirements relating to drawings are dealt with in A-IX.

2.2 Replacement documents and translations

Replacement documents and translations in an official language of documents filed under the provisions of Art. 14(2) or Rule 40(3) are subject to the same requirements as the documents making up the application. Rule 49(1)
Rule 50(1)

2.3 Other documents

Documents other than those referred to in the previous paragraphs should be typewritten or printed with a left margin of about 2.5 cm on each page (Art. 3 of the decision of the President of the EPO dated 7 July 2025, OJ EPO 2025, A49). Rule 50(2)

2.4 Number of copies

Documents relating to more than one application or patent (e.g. individual or general authorisation) or having to be communicated to more than one party, only need to be filed in one copy.

For example, where two different applications share a common priority claim, the applicant only needs to file one certified copy of the priority document in one of them. However, a separate EPO Form 1038 (or cover letter) must be filed in both applications, each relating to one or the other application. Each EPO Form 1038 (or letter) must be duly signed and indicate one or the other of the two application numbers in respect of which the priority document is being filed (see also A-VIII, 3.1).

2.5 Filing of subsequent documents

After a European patent application has been filed, the documents referred to in Rule 50 may be filed by delivery by hand, by postal services (see A-II, 1.2) or by means of electronic communication (see A-II, 1.1). These include filing electronically by means of Online Filing 2.0, the EPO Contingency Upload Service or, for certain procedural actions, MyEPO (see A-II, 1.1.1). Documents may not be filed by fax (see the decision of the President of the EPO dated 22 April 2024, OJ EPO 2024, A41, and the notice from the EPO dated 22 April 2024, OJ EPO 2024, A42). Priority documents are excluded from filing using the EPO Contingency Upload Service. For the means of filing accepted for priority documents, see A-III, 6.7.1 and 6.7.2. Rule 2(1)

Subsequent documents may not be filed by email or similar means. However, during telephone consultations and during interviews and oral

proceedings held by videoconference, documents filed subsequently as referred to in Rule 50, including authorisations, must be filed by email (for more details see the decision of the President of the EPO dated 13 May 2020, OJ EPO 2020, A71; see also E-III, 8.5.2).

3. Signature of documents

3.1 Documents filed after filing the European patent application

Rule 50(3)
Art. 133

All documents, other than annexes, filed after filing the European patent application must be signed by a person entitled to act. Under Art. 133, only the applicant or the authorised representative may act in the European patent grant procedure (see A-VIII, 1.1). Documents filed after filing the European patent application may therefore be effectively signed only by these persons.

Documents such as the priority document or its translation must be accompanied by a cover letter or at least bear a note on the document itself addressed to the EPO and duly signed by a person authorised to act before the EPO. This also applies, for example, to the designation of inventor if this has been signed by an applicant with neither residence nor principal place of business in one of the contracting states. As regards the authorisation, see A-VIII, 1.7. The signature of the entitled person confirming performance of a written act of procedure helps to clarify the state of the proceedings. It shows whether the act of procedure has been validly performed and also prevents circumvention of the provisions relating to representation. EPO Form 1038 (letter accompanying subsequently filed items) may also be used as a separate letter.

Rule 50(3)

Submissions filed electronically must be signed by an entitled person, although they may be transmitted electronically by another person. If the signature is omitted on a document not falling within the meaning of A-VIII, 3.2, the EPO must invite the party concerned to sign it within a fixed time limit. This also applies if the document in question bears the signature of an unentitled person (e.g. the secretary of an authorised representative), a deficiency which for the purposes of the time limits under way is treated as equivalent to omission of the signature of an entitled person. If signed in due time, the document retains its original date of receipt; otherwise it is deemed not received. See also A-VIII, 3.2 below.

3.2 Documents forming part of the European patent application

In addition to the documents referred to in A-VIII, 3.1, certain documents forming part of the application must be signed. These include the request for grant, the designation of the inventor and, where applicable, the authorisation of a representative. If a European patent application is filed electronically, a facsimile image of the signer's handwritten signature or a text-string signature, as applicable, may be used to sign the above documents (Art. 9 of the decision of the President of the EPO dated 8 July 2025, OJ EPO 2025, A52).

Documents may be signed by an authorised representative instead of the applicant/applicants (see A-III, 4.2.2 and A-VIII, 3.4). This does not apply to

the authorisation of a representative, which can only be signed by the applicant/applicants.

3.3 Form of signature

Where documents are filed using Online Filing 2.0 or the EPO Contingency Upload Service, the signature may take the form of a facsimile signature or a text-string signature. Procedural actions performed in MyEPO require a signature in the form of a text string (see OJ EPO 2024, A20). Authorisations may also be digitally signed (see OJ EPO 2025, A45, and OJ EPO 2024, A77).

A facsimile signature is a reproduction of the filing person's signature. A text-string signature is a string of characters, preceded and followed by a forward slash (/), selected by the signatory to prove their identity and intent to sign.

Administrative instructions under the PCT, Annex F, points 3.3.1, 3.3.2

For signatures accepted on electronically filed assignment documents, see E-XIII, 3.

For signatures accepted on electronically filed authorisations, see A-VIII, 1.7.

Where a document is filed on paper, a rubber stamp impression of a party's name, whether a natural or legal person, must be accompanied by a personal signature. Initials or other abbreviated forms will not be accepted as a signature.

Where the party concerned is a legal person, a document may in general be signed by any person who purports to sign on behalf of that legal person. The entitlement of a person signing on behalf of a legal person is not checked by the EPO, except where there is reason to believe that the person signing is not authorised and in that case evidence of authority to sign should be called for.

3.4 Joint applicants

If there is more than one applicant (see A-VIII, 1.3), each applicant or their appointed representative must sign the request for grant and, where applicable, the appointment of the common representative. This also applies if one of the applicants is considered the common representative under Rule 151(1), first sentence. However, the common representative may sign the designation of inventor and all documents filed after the filing of the application under Rule 50(3). Authorisations on behalf of more than one applicant must be signed by all applicants.

Rule 151(1)

Chapter IX – Drawings

This chapter deals with the requirements to be met by drawings contained in the application or patent. Guidance on the presentation of application documents, including drawings, is provided in the decision of the President of the EPO dated 7 July 2025 (OJ EPO 2025, A49, Rule 49(2)), in conjunction with the notices from the EPO dated 25 November 2022 (OJ EPO 2022, A114) and 5 September 2025 (OJ EPO 2025, A57), which is the legal basis for the practice described below.

Rule 49

Rule 50

1. Graphic forms of presentation considered as drawings

1.1 Technical drawings

All types of technical drawings are considered drawings within the meaning of the EPC; these include, for instance, perspectives, exploded views, sections and cross-sections, details on a different scale, etc. Drawings also cover "flow sheets and diagrams", which include functional diagrams and graphic representations of a given phenomenon expressing the relationship between two or more magnitudes.

Other graphic forms of presentation – chemical and mathematical formulae and tables – may also be included in the description, claims or abstract but are not subject to the same requirements as drawings (see Art. 2(8) of the decision of the President of the EPO dated 7 July 2025). These are dealt with in A-IX, 11. If they are nevertheless submitted as drawings, they are subject to the same requirements as drawings.

1.2 Photographs

The EPC makes no express provision for photographs; they are nevertheless allowed where it is impossible to present in a drawing what is to be shown and provided that they are directly reproducible and fulfil the applicable requirements for drawings (e.g. page size, margins, etc.). With regard to colour or greyscale in photographs, see A-IX, 7.1. Colour or greyscale photographs filed before 1 October 2025 are published and made available via file inspection only in black and white.

Photographs (or their copies) are to be numbered like drawings and briefly described in the description (Rule 42(1)(d)).

2. Representation of drawings

2.1 Grouping of drawings

All drawings must be grouped together on the pages specifically intended for drawings and may not be included in the description, claims or abstract, even if these finish at the top of a page or leave sufficient room, and even if there is only one figure.

OJ EPO 2025, A49

2.2 Reproducibility of drawings

The drawings must be presented in such a way as to allow their electronic or direct reproduction, in particular by scanning and photography, in an unlimited number of copies. When filed by means of electronic

OJ EPO 2025, A49

communication, drawings must also be sufficiently rich in contrast and suitable to be clearly displayed at a resolution of 300 dpi.

2.3 Figure accompanying the abstract

As regards the figure, or exceptionally figures, to accompany the abstract in a European patent application containing drawings, see [A-III, 10.3](#) and [F-II, 2.3](#) and [2.4](#). The figure(s) illustrating the abstract must be the figure(s) most representative of the invention and must be chosen from the drawings accompanying the application. It is therefore not permissible to draw a special figure for the abstract that differs from the other figures in the application.

3. Conditions if drawings are filed on paper

[OJ EPO 2025, A49](#)

In the case of paper filings, drawings must be on pages of A4 paper (29.7 cm x 21 cm) which must be pliable, strong, white, smooth, matt and durable (recommended paper weight: 80-120 g/m², see [OJ EPO 1994, 74](#)).

All pages must be free from cracks, creases and folds. Only one side of the page may be used. The use of card is not allowed.

Each page must be reasonably free from erasures and must be free from alterations. Non-compliance with this rule may be authorised if the authenticity of the content is not in question and the requirements for good reproduction are not in jeopardy.

Any corrections made must be durable and permanent so that they cannot give rise to any doubt. Special products for corrections, such as white masking fluid, may be used, provided they are indelible and comply with the other requirements of the decision of the President of the EPO dated 7 July 2025 ([OJ EPO 2025, A49](#)).

The pages must be connected in such a way that they can easily be turned over, separated and joined together again.

Permanent fastenings (for example, crimped eyelets) are not permitted. Only temporary fastenings (staples, paper clips and grips, etc.) that leave only slight marks in the margin may be used.

4. Presentation of the pages of drawings

4.1 Usable surface area of sheets

On pages containing drawings, the usable surface area may not exceed 26.2 cm x 17 cm. These pages may not contain frames round the usable or used surface. The minimum margins are as follows: top : 2.5 cm; left side: 2.5 cm; right side: 1.5 cm; bottom 1 cm.

4.2 Page numbering of drawings

All pages making up the European patent application must be numbered in consecutive Arabic numerals. These must be centred at the top of the page but not in the top margin.

The numbering on pages of drawings must be positioned within the maximum usable surface area as defined in Art. 1(1) of the decision of the President of the EPO dated 7 July 2025 (OJ EPO 2025, A49). Instead of appearing in the middle of the page, the numbering may, however, be positioned towards the right-hand side if the drawing comes too close to the middle of the edge of the usable surface. This numbering should be clear, for example in numbers larger than those used for reference numbers.

All application page must be numbered consecutively. The application consists of all the following documents: the request, the description, the claims, any drawings and the abstract. The numbering should preferably be effected using three separate series of numbering, each beginning with one. The first series applies to the request only and is already printed on the form to be used. The second series commences with the first page of the description and continues through the claims until the last sheet of the abstract. The third series applies only to the page of the drawings and commences with the first page of such drawings.

There are no objections to including the description, claims, abstract and drawings in one series of numbering beginning with one. The series of numbering must then commence with the first sheet of the description.

5. General layout of drawings

The various figures on the same page of drawings must be laid out according to certain requirements as to page-setting and numbering, and figures divided into several parts must comply with particular requirements.

5.1 Page-setting

As far as possible all figures of the drawings should be set out upright on the page. If a figure is broader than it is high, it may be set out so that the top and bottom of the figure lie along the sides of the page with the top of the figure on the left side of the page.

In this case, if other figures are drawn on the same page, they should be set out in the same way, so that all the figures on a single page lie along parallel axes.

Where the page has to be turned in order to read the figures, the numbering should appear on the right-hand side of the page.

5.2 Numbering of figures

The different figures must be numbered consecutively in Arabic numerals, independently of the numbering of the pages.

This numbering should be preceded by the abbreviation "FIG", whatever the official language of the application. Where a single figure is sufficient to illustrate the invention, it should not be numbered and the abbreviation "FIG" must not appear. This also applies to numbers and letters identifying the figures, i.e. they must be simple and clear and may not be used in association with brackets, circles or inverted commas. They should also be larger than the numbers used for reference signs.

An exception to the above may be permitted only as regards partial figures intended to form one whole figure, irrespective of whether they appear on one or several pages. In this case the whole figure may be identified by the same number followed by a capital letter (e.g. FIG 7A, FIG 7B).

5.3 Whole figure

Where figures drawn on two or more pages are intended to form one whole figure, the figures on the various pages must be so arranged that the whole figure can be assembled without concealing any part of the partial figures.

Partial figures drawn on separate pages must always be capable of being linked edge to edge, that is to say no figure may contain parts of another.

The case may arise where the parts of a whole figure are drawn on a single page following a layout different from that of the whole figure, e.g. a very long figure divided into several parts placed one above the other and not next to one another on a page. This practice is permitted. However, the relationship between the different figures must be clear and unambiguous. It is therefore recommended that a scaled-down figure be included showing the whole formed by the partial figures and indicating the positions of the sections shown.

6. Prohibited matter

The provisions on the omission of prohibited matter within the meaning of Rule 48(1)(a) (see A-III, 8.1 and F-II, 7.2) also apply to drawings.

Rule 48(1) and (2)

Statements or other matter of the type referred to in Rule 48(1)(c) (see F-II, 7.4) that are likely to appear in drawings are, in particular, various kinds of advertising, e.g. where the applicant includes in the drawing obvious business or departmental markings or a reference to an industrial design or model, whether registered or not. Doing so introduces matter that is clearly irrelevant or unnecessary, which is expressly prohibited by Rule 48.

Rule 48(1)(c)

7. Executing of drawings

7.1 Drawings of lines and strokes

The decision of the President of the EPO dated 7 July 2025 (OJ EPO 2025, A49) sets certain standards for lines and strokes in the drawing to permit satisfactory reproduction by the various means described in Art. 2 of that decision.

The drawings must be executed in black and white. As of 1 October 2025, colour and greyscale is also permitted in drawings, provided they are filed in electronic form (see A-II, 1.1.1) (see the decision of the President dated 7 July 2025 (OJ EPO 2025, A49) and the notice from the EPO dated 5 September 2025 (OJ EPO 2025, A57)). Drawings containing colour or greyscale in applications filed before 1 October 2025 or filed on paper are published and made available via file inspection in black and white only. In respect of the content of priority documents issued by the EPO, see A-XI, 5.2.

In all cases the thickness of the lines and strokes must take into account the scale, nature, execution and perfect legibility of the drawing and of the reproductions.

All lines must be drawn with the aid of drafting instruments save those for which no instrument exists, e.g. irregular diagrams and structures.

7.2 Shading

The use of shading in figures is allowed provided it assists in their understanding and is not so extensive as to impede legibility.

7.3 Cross-sections

7.3.1 Sectional diagrams

Where the figure is a cross-section on another figure, the latter should indicate the position and may indicate the viewing direction.

Each sectional figure should be capable of being quickly identified, especially where several cross-sections are made on the same figure, e.g. by inscribing the words "Section on AB", or to avoid the use of lettering, by marking each end of the cross-section line on the diagram with a single Roman numeral. This number will be the same as the (Arabic) numeral identifying the figure where the section is illustrated. For example: "Figure 22 illustrates a section taken along the line XXII-XXII of Figure 21".

7.3.2 Hatching

A cross-section must be set out and drawn in the same manner as a normal view whose parts in cross-section are hatched with regularly spaced strokes, the space between strokes being chosen on the basis of the total area to be hatched.

Hatching should not impede the clear reading of the reference signs and leading lines. Consequently, if it is not possible to place references outside the hatched area, the hatching may be broken off wherever references are inserted. Certain types of hatching may be given a specific meaning.

7.4 Scale of drawings

If the scale of the figure is such that all essential details would not be clearly distinguished when reproduced electronically or photographically with a linear reduction in size to two-thirds, then the figure must be redrawn to a larger scale, and if necessary the figure should be split up into partial figures so that a linear reduction in size to two-thirds is still intelligible.

The graphic representation of the scale of drawings in cases where its inclusion is considered useful must be such that it is still usable when the drawing is reproduced in reduced format. This excludes indications of size such as "actual size" or "scale 1/2", both on the drawings and in the description, in favour of graphic representations of the scale.

7.5 Numbers, letters and reference signs

Numbers, letters and reference signs and any other data given on the pages of drawings, such as the numbering of figures, page numbers of the

drawing, acceptable text matter, graduations on scales, etc., must be simple and clear, and not used in association with any brackets, inverted commas, circles or outlines whatsoever. Signs such as 6' and 35" are not regarded as including inverted commas and are therefore permitted.

Numbers, letters and reference signs should preferably all be laid out the same way up as the diagram to avoid having to rotate the page.

7.5.1 Leading lines

Leading lines are lines between reference signs and the details referred to. Such lines may be straight or curved and should be as short as possible. They must originate in the immediate proximity of the reference sign and extend at least as far as the features indicated.

Leading lines must be executed in the same way as lines in the drawing in accordance with Art. 1(2)(a) of the decision of the President of the EPO dated 7 July 2025 (OJ EPO 2025, A49).

7.5.2 Arrows

Arrows may be used at the end of the leading lines, provided that their meaning is clear. They may indicate a number of points:

- (i) a freestanding arrow indicates the entire section towards which it points
- (ii) an arrow touching a line indicates the surface shown by the line looking along the direction of the arrow.

7.5.3 Height of the numbers and letters in the drawings

A minimum size of 0.32 cm is required for all numbers and letters used on the drawings so that their reduction in size to two-thirds remains easily legible.

The Latin alphabet should normally be used for letters. The Greek alphabet is acceptable however where it is customarily used, e.g. to indicate angles, wavelengths, etc.

7.5.4 Consistent use of reference signs in description, claims and drawings

Reference signs not mentioned in the description and claims may not appear in the drawing, and vice versa.

Reference signs appearing in the drawing must be given in the description and the claims taken as a whole. As regards use of these signs in the claims, see F-IV, 4.18.

If drawings are filed with colour or greyscale content, references to any colour- or greyscale-specific features should be avoided in the description, claims or abstract, as colour specifications may not always be reliably and objectively identifiable (see the notice from the EPO dated 5 September 2025, OJ EPO 2025, A57).

Features of a drawing should not be designated by a reference in cases where the feature itself has not been described. This situation may arise as a result of amendments to the description involving the deletion of pages or whole paragraphs. One solution would be to strike out on the drawing reference signs that have been deleted in the description. Such corrections must be made in accordance with Art. 2(11) of the decision of the President of the EPO dated 7 July 2025 (OJ EPO 2025, A49).

Where for any reason a figure is deleted then the applicant or proprietor ought to delete all reference signs relating solely to that figure appearing in the description and claims.

In the case of applications dealing with complex subjects and incorporating a large number of drawings, a reference key may be attached to the end of the description. This key may take whatever form is appropriate and contain all the reference signs together with the designation of the features that they indicate. This method could have the advantage of standardising the terminology used in the description.

7.5.5 Consistent use of reference signs in drawings

The same features, when denoted by reference signs, must be denoted by the same signs throughout the application.

It would be very confusing if a single feature were allocated different reference signs in the various drawings. However, where several variants of an invention are described, each with reference to a particular figure, and where each variant contains features whose function is the same or basically the same, the features may, if this is indicated in the description, be identified by reference numbers made up of the number of the figure to which it relates followed by the number of the feature, which is the same for all variants, so that a single number is formed, e.g. the common feature "15" would be indicated by "115" in Fig. 1 while the corresponding feature would be indicated by "215" in Fig. 2. This system has the advantage that an individual feature and the figure on which it is to be considered can be indicated at the same time. It can also make complex cases involving many pages of drawings easier to read. Instead of the common reference sign being prefixed by the number of a figure, it may, when the individual variants are described with reference to particular groups of figures, be prefixed by the number of the particular variant to which it relates; this should be explained in the description.

7.6 Variations in proportions

Elements of the same figure must be in proportion to each other unless a difference in proportion is indispensable for the clarity of the figure.

As a preferred alternative to a difference in proportion within one figure for clarity purposes, a supplementary figure may be added giving a larger-scale illustration of the element of the initial figure. In such cases it is recommended that the enlarged element shown in the second figure be surrounded by a finely drawn or "dot-dash" circle in the first figure pinpointing its location without obscuring the figure.

8. Text matter on drawings

Art. 1(2)(d) and (g) of the decision of the President of the EPO dated 7 July 2025 (OJ EPO 2025, A49) also applies to text matter on the drawings.

For indications of the type "section on AB", see A-IX, 7.3.1.

The drawings must not contain text matter except when absolutely indispensable, and then only a single word or a few words. As flow sheets and diagrams are considered drawings (see A-IX, 1.1.), text must be kept to the absolute minimum indispensable for understanding the drawing.

Where text matter is deemed indispensable for understanding the drawing, only the barest minimum of words should be used, and a space free of all lines of drawings should be left around them for the translation.

Compared with other types of drawings, flow sheets comprising method steps may need more than just a bare minimum of words to be understood since the essential information may not be adequately conveyed by the graphical part of the drawing. In such cases, the requirement to keep the text to an absolute minimum may be relaxed somewhat to allow more than a few words, such as a short sentence, for each method step.

As regards the justification for text matter on drawings, see F-II, 5.1.

9. Conventional symbols

Known devices may be illustrated by symbols having a universally recognised conventional meaning, provided no further detail is essential for understanding the subject-matter of the invention. Other signs and symbols may be used on condition that they are not likely to be confused with existing conventional symbols, that they are readily identifiable, i.e. simple, and that they are clearly explained in the text of the description.

Different types of hatching may also have different conventional meanings as regards the nature of a material seen in cross-section.

10. Amendments to drawings

Amendments are permitted to the drawings, as well as to the other documents. These amendments may be made at the request of the party concerned or of the EPO. The amendments may concern either clerical errors or more substantial changes.

Amendments to drawings are subject to the same rules as apply in respect of amendments to other application documents and therefore do not require further analysis here. See also A-III, 16, A-V, 2, B-XI, 8, C-III, 2, C-IV, 5, Part H, in particular H-II, 2 and H-III, 2 and the notice from the EPO dated 5 September 2025 (OJ EPO 2025, A57).

The general rule governing the admissibility of amendments, which the examiner must always bear in mind, is that they must not extend the content of the application as filed, i.e. they must not have the effect of introducing new material. This also applies to drawings in colour or greyscale which are filed to replace drawings originally filed in black and white (OJ EPO 2025, A57).

10.1 Replacement drawings under Rule 58

If drawings that depart substantially from the physical requirements laid down in the Implementing Regulations are filed to establish a particular date of filing or retain a priority date, they may be replaced upon invitation from the Receiving Section under Rule 58, provided that the better-quality drawings do not contain any alterations compared with the original drawings. This requirement also extends to their format in so far as drawings of improved quality submitted under Rule 58 may contain colour or greyscale only to the same extent as the original drawings. In view of the requirements under Art. 123(2), applicants should take care that any "informal" drawings filed clearly show all the features necessary to illustrate the invention. For the late-filing of missing or correct drawings filed under Rule 56(3) or 56a(4), see A-II, 5.4.2 and 6.4.1.

Rule 58

11. Graphic forms of presentation not considered as drawings

11.1 Chemical and mathematical formulae

In exceptional cases, chemical or mathematical formulae may be written by hand or drawn if necessary, but it is recommended that appropriate aids such as stencils or transfers be used. For practical reasons, formulae may be grouped together on one or more pages annexed to the description and paginated with it. It is recommended in such cases that each formula be designated by a reference sign and the description should contain references to these formulae whenever necessary.

Chemical or mathematical formulae must employ symbols in general use and must be drawn in such a way that they are completely unambiguous. Figures, letters and signs that are not typed must be legible and identical in form in the various formulae, irrespective of the document in which they appear.

Chemical or mathematical formulae appearing in the text of the application or patent must have symbols, the capital letters of which are at least 0.21 cm high. Where they appear on pages of drawings, these symbols must be at least 0.32 cm high.

All mathematical symbols used in a formula appearing in a description, in an annex or on sheets of drawings must be explained in the description unless their significance is clear from the context. In any case, the mathematical symbols used may be collated in a list.

11.2 Tables

11.2.1 Tables in the description

For the sake of convenience, the tables may also be grouped together on one or more pages annexed to the description and paginated with it.

If two or more tables are necessary, each should be identified by a Roman number, independently of the pagination of the description or drawings or of the figure numbering, or by a capital letter, or by a title indicating its contents, or by some other means.

Each line or column in a table must begin with an entry explaining what it represents and, if necessary, the units used.

Both characters and tables alike must satisfy the requirements of Art. 2(7) and (4) of the decision of the President of the EPO dated 7 July 2025 (OJ EPO 2025, A49) regarding the maximum usable surface areas of pages.

11.2.2 Tables in the claims

The claims may include tables if their subject-matter indicates a need for them. In this case, the tables must be included in the text of the relevant claim; they may not be annexed to the claims nor may reference be made to tables contained in or annexed to the description. The claims may refer to other application documents only where this is absolutely necessary (see F-IV, 4.17). The mere desire to avoid copying said documents does not constitute absolute necessity.

Chapter X – Fees

1. General

Various fees have to be paid for a European patent application, to renew a European patent and to obtain legal remedies. Fees may also need to be paid by third parties, as is the case, for example, for issuing certified copies of documents or the certified extract from the European Patent Register (see [OJ EPO 2019, A15](#)) unless the request is filed using MyEPO (see [OJ EPO 2024, A5](#)). Fees may be validly paid by any person. The amounts of the fees, the ways in which they are to be paid and the date of payment are determined in the [Rules relating to Fees \(RFees\)](#). Guidance for the payment of fees, expenses and prices with information about:

- the current version of the [Rules relating to Fees](#) and the schedule of fees
- important implementing rules to the [Rules relating to Fees](#)
- the payment and refund of fees and expenses
- other notices concerning fees and prices and
- international applications, including Euro-PCT applications entering the European phase,

as well as the amounts of the principal fees for European and international applications and an extract from the [Rules relating to Fees](#) is published at regular intervals in the Official Journal. Information relating to fees and methods of payment, including the EPO bank account for payments in euro, can also be found on the EPO website ([epo.org](#)).

The EPC and its Implementing Regulations lay down the time limits for paying fees and the legal consequences of non-compliance with the time limits. The time limits for payment and the legal consequences of non-payment are dealt with in the chapters of the Guidelines covering the respective stages of the procedure. The methods of payment, the date on which payment is considered to be made, due dates, particulars concerning the purpose of payments and reimbursement of fees are all dealt with below.

2. Methods of payment

Fees may be paid:

[Art. 5 RFees](#)

- (i) by payment or transfer to a bank account held by the EPO
- (ii) by debiting a deposit account opened in the records of the EPO in Munich (see [A-X, 4.2](#) and [4.3](#))
- (iii) by credit card (see [A-X, 4.4](#))
- (iv) by requesting reallocation of a refund (see [A-X, 10.4](#)).

3. Currencies

Art. 5 RFees
Point 1 ADA

The fees due to the EPO must be paid in euro. A debit order must be in euro.

4. Date considered as date on which payment is made

4.1 Payment or transfer to a bank account held by the European Patent Organisation

Art. 7(1),
(3) and
(4) RFees

The date on which payment is deemed made is the date on which the amount payable actually enters the European Patent Organisation's bank account. The date on which payment is deemed made may therefore be the day following the payment or transfer or an even later date in the event of delays within the bank. However, payment may still be considered made in due time, despite being paid late, if the payment or transfer was effected before expiry of the time limit for payment in a contracting state and if evidence to this effect is provided (see A-X, 6). For the steps required for the efficient processing of payments made by bank transfer, see the notice from the EPO dated 19 July 2022, OJ EPO 2022, A81. Regarding the automatic validation of certain categories of fees, see A-X, 4.2.3.

4.2 Deposit accounts with the EPO

4.2.1 General remarks

Art. 7(2) RFees

The Arrangements for deposit accounts (ADA) and their annexes are updated on a regular basis, either in their entirety or in part, whenever a change or clarification of the scope of practice is required. The ADA were last published in full as Supplementary publication 2, OJ EPO 2024 (and were subsequently amended by decision of the President dated 25 September 2024, OJ EPO 2024, A81, and by decision of the President dated 12 February 2025, OJ EPO 2025, A17).

A distinction must be drawn, in connection with deposit accounts, between:

Point 3 ADA

(i) payments to replenish deposit accounts and

Point 1 ADA

(ii) payments of fees in connection with proceedings under the EPC or the PCT.

4.2.2 Payments to replenish a deposit account

Point 3.2 ADA
Point 3.3 ADA

Payments to replenish a deposit account are to be made in euro to the EPO bank account. Payments in a different currency will only be accepted if freely convertible. However, the deposit account will always be credited in euro (the only currency in which these accounts are kept) after conversion at the current rate of exchange. Replenishments are credited to the deposit account on the date on which the payment actually enters the EPO bank account.

Point 4.2 ADA
Point 5.2 ADA

Repayments of deposit account balances can only be remitted to the deposit account holder. For this purpose, the deposit account holder must send a signed substantiated request as an email attachment to the EPO at support@epo.org or complete the online contact form available on the EPO

website and submit it together with all bank details necessary for the transfer (point 5.2 ADA).

4.2.3 Debiting the deposit account

Debiting occurs on the basis of an electronic debit order which has been duly signed or authenticated by the account holder, the authorised representative or a person authorised by the account holder using means accepted for the online service in question. The debit order may be for individual fees for one or more patent applications, i.e. a single or batch debit order, or an automatic debit order for one or more patent applications. Batch debit orders are only possible in Central Fee Payment (see A-X, 4.3).

Point 7.1.1 ADA

The debit order for European patent applications must be filed in an electronically processable format (XML) via:– Online Filing 2.0 using EPO Forms 1001E, 1200E or 1038E

Point 7.1.2 ADA

Point 7.1.3 ADA

- Central Fee Payment or
- MyEPO.

See also the decision of the President of the EPO dated 15 February 2024 concerning the revision of the Arrangements for deposit accounts and their annexes, Supplementary publication 2, OJ EPO 2024, and the notice from the EPO dated 19 July 2022, OJ EPO 2022, A81. For debit orders filed during proceedings related to European patents with unitary effect, see the Unitary Patent Guidelines.

Debit orders submitted in any other way, e.g. on paper or via the EPO Contingency Upload Service or using a different format such as a PDF attachment, are invalid and thus will not be executed (for two exceptions, see paragraph below and A-II, 1.5). This may result in the time limit for paying a fee being missed. In that case applicants may make use of any of the legal remedies available.

Point 7.1.3 ADA

Point 10.3 ADA

If any of the accepted means of filing debit orders is unavailable at the EPO on the last day for paying a particular fee, the payment period will be extended until the next day on which all such means as are available for the type of application concerned can be accessed again. Payment periods are also extended in the event of a general unavailability of electronic communication services, or other like reasons within the meaning of Rule 134(5) (see the notice from the EPO dated 22 October 2020, OJ EPO 2020, A120). The EPO Contingency Upload Service may be used in exceptional cases to file debit orders, on condition that the payment period expires on the day of the debit order's submission, the deposit account contains sufficient funds for the debit to be carried out and evidence is provided (e.g. in the form of screenshots) demonstrating that a system outage, regardless of its origin, prevented the payer from submitting the debit order in an electronically processable format (see OJ EPO 2025, A17). If any of these conditions are not met, the debit order filed via the EPO Contingency Upload Service is invalid and thus will not be carried out.

Rule 134(1) and (5)

Point 11 ADA

Point 7.1.4 ADA

When submitting a debit order via Central Fee Payment or Online Filing 2.0, "deposit account" must be selected as the payment method to pay any selected fees.

Point 7.2.1 ADA
Point 4.4 AAD

In general, debit orders will be processed immediately upon their receipt, provided there are sufficient funds in the deposit account and provided a deferred execution date (see next paragraph) has not been specified. Automatic debit orders are processed at the end of the day on the decisive payment date.

Point 10.2 ADA

A debit order may specify that payment is to be executed at a date later than the submission date. In that case, the payment date is deemed to be the execution date specified. Payment orders with a deferred execution date may be executed up to 40 days after the submission date.

A debit order must be carried out notwithstanding incorrect information given in it if the intention of the person giving the order is clear (see T 152/82). The EPO corrects a debit order on its own initiative, for example, if there is a discrepancy between the type of fee intended to be paid and the corresponding amount due on the date of receipt of the debit order (see also A-X, 7.1.2). The party is informed of any such correction by means of a communication from the EPO providing a two-month period for objection in the event of disagreement by the party. In that case, the fee will be debited as indicated in the (erroneous) debit order or, if applicable, any corrective booking executed will be reverted. The principles outlined above, however, do not allow the correction of a debit order by adding any fee that is not indicated in it, even if, according to the status of proceedings, that fee is due on the date of receipt of the debit order.

Point 13 ADA

A debit order may be revoked in whole or in part by the person making the payment by sending a signed written notice as an email attachment to support@epo.org or by completing the online contact form available on the EPO website (epo.org) and submitting it together with the signed written notice. For a debit order revocation notice to be effective, it must be received by the EPO no later than on the date on which the debit order is received. A debit order with deferred payment date may be revoked in Central Fee Payment until one day before the intended execution date or at the latest on the intended execution date by signed written notice sent to the EPO as indicated above.

Point 9 ADA

Payments via deposit account effected in Central Fee Payment are validated, meaning that the debit order for a fee is automatically rejected if the fee falls within one of the following categories:

- batch payments of renewal fees and additional fees under Rule 51(2) that are not due
- fees for the transfer of rights for definitively closed European patent applications
- double-payments for fees that can be paid only once in the proceedings before the EPO.

The above categories of fees are considered not due and will be rejected if they are paid for definitively closed European patent applications and granted patents, if they are made before the earliest valid payment date, if they have already been paid (double-payment) or if they differ in the amount due at the time of payment.

If the above categories of fees are paid by bank transfer or credit card in Central Fee Payment, they are similarly validated and rejected.

Undue renewal fees and additional fees under Rule 51(2) which are paid by bank transfer or from a deposit account without using Central Fee Payment are automatically flagged and will be repaid by the EPO to the payment source. In the case of overpayments, only the overpaid amount will be repaid (see the notice from the EPO dated 25 September 2024 concerning the repayment of renewal fees not due and additional fees not due for European patent applications, OJ EPO 2024, A82).

4.2.4 Date of receipt of the debit order; insufficient funds

Provided there are sufficient funds in the deposit account on the date the EPO receives the debit order or on the execution date, that date will be considered the date on which the payment is made.

Point 7.2.1 ADA

Point 7.4.1 ADA

This applies also where a debit order is filed together with an application filed under Art. 75(1)(b) with a competent national authority of a contracting state (see A-II, 1.6). If the EPO does not receive the debit order until after expiry of the period allowed for paying fees which can be paid on filing, that period is deemed observed if evidence is available or presented to the EPO to show that the debit order was filed with the competent authority of the contracting state at the same time as the application, provided that sufficient funds were available in the account at the time the period expired.

If, on the date of receipt of the debit order or on the date specified as the execution date (point 10 ADA), the account does not contain sufficient funds to fully cover all the fees indicated for an application (shortfall), the fees are booked in ascending order of application number ("PCT" before "EP" before "UP") and fee code, according to point 7.3 ADA, as long as the funds allow. Once a debit order cannot be executed in full due to insufficient funds, no other debit order is booked until the account is duly replenished. The outstanding payment is considered to have been made on the date on which the deposit account is duly replenished. On the application of the safety provision in the case of late receipt of the replenishment payment at the EPO, see A-X, 6.2.2.

Point 7.3 ADA

Point 7.4.1 ADA

Point 7.4.2 ADA

Point 7.5 ADA

4.3 Automatic debiting procedure

A deposit account may also be debited for one or more European patent applications on the basis of an automatic debit order, signed or authenticated by or on behalf of the account holder (automatic debiting procedure), in accordance with the Arrangements for the automatic debiting procedure (abbreviated to "AAD"). The AAD plus explanatory notes are published as Annexes A.1 and A.2 to the ADA. The AAD can also be found on the EPO website (epo.org).

Point 14 ADA

Point 1 AAD

Point 10 AAD

An automatic debit order may be filed on behalf of the applicant, the patent proprietor or the appointed representative and must be filed in an electronically processable format (XML) via Online Filing 2.0 using EPO Forms 1001E, 1200E or 1038E, or via Central Fee Payment. An automatic debit order can be revoked only via Central Fee Payment.

There are three different types of automatic debit order for paying fees during the European grant procedure (see the notice from the EPO dated 12 February 2025, OJ EPO 2025, A18):

- (i) automatic debit order for all fees
- (ii) automatic debit order for all fees except renewal fees and
- (iii) automatic debit order for renewal fees only.

Point 3.1 AAD
Point 3.3 AAD
Point 4.1 AAD

As the proceedings progress, each fee covered by the respective automatic debit order type is automatically debited and treated as having been paid in due time, provided that the deposit account contains sufficient funds. Fees not covered by the automatic debiting procedure are excluded from this payment method and must be paid by a different valid means.

Point 4.4 AAD
Point 4.5 AAD
Point 5 AAD

In the case of multiple payments from the same deposit account, the EPO processes automatic debit orders in ascending order of application number ("PCT" before "EP" before "UP") and fee code (unless otherwise indicated) at the end of the day on the decisive payment date. It is thus important for the deposit account to contain sufficient funds at the decisive payment date to cover all automatic debit orders due.

4.4 Payment by credit card

Art. 5 RFees
Art. 7 RFees

Payments by credit card must be made via Central Fee Payment, which is available on the EPO website (*epo.org*), using a credit card accepted by the EPO (American Express, Mastercard and Visa). They are deemed made on the date on which the transaction is approved (see OJ EPO 2017, A72). The EPO bears any transaction-related charges. The requirements and arrangements for payments by credit card are set out in detail in the notice from the EPO dated 16 February 2022 (see OJ EPO 2022, A18). Regarding the automatic validation of certain categories of fees, see A-X 4.2.3.

5. Due date for fees

5.1 General

5.1.1 Due date

Art. 4(1) RFees
Rule 51(1),
2nd sentence

In the EPC, the term "due date" has a special meaning, namely the first day on which payment of a fee may be validly effected, not the last day of a period for such payment (see A-X 6, "Payment in due time"). The due date for fees is generally laid down by provisions of the EPC or of the PCT. If no due date is specified, the fee is due on the date of receipt of the request for the service incurring the fee concerned.

A fee may not be validly paid before the due date. The only exceptions are:

- (i) renewal fees (see A-X, 5.2.4)
- (ii) fees paid voluntarily in response to the communication under Rule 71(3) (where amendments are also filed in response to that communication, see C-V, 4.2).

Payments that may not be validly made before the due date may be refunded by the EPO. If payment is made before the due date, it is possible that the EPO will not return the payment. In this case, however, payment only takes effect on the due date (for an example, see A-X, 5.2.2). Payments of renewal fees made before the earliest valid payment dates under Rule 51(1) will be rejected and repaid, see A-X, 4.2.3 and 5.2.4.

5.1.2 Amount of the fee

When the fees are generally increased, the date of payment is set as the relevant date for determining the amount of the fees (see Art. 2 of the Administrative Council decision of 5 June 1992, OJ EPO 1992, 344). As a rule, setting the date of payment as the relevant date makes it unnecessary to ascertain the actual due date for determining the amount of the fee. Fees cannot validly be paid before the due date (apart from the exceptions mentioned in A-X, 5.1.1(i) and (ii)).

5.2 Due date for specific fees

5.2.1 Filing fee and search fee

The filing and search fees are due on the day the European patent application is filed. They must be paid either within one month of that date (Rule 38(1), Rule 17(2), Rule 36(3)) or, for Euro-PCT applications, within 31 months of the date of filing or, where applicable, of the earliest priority claimed (Rule 159(1)(c) and (e), see A-XIII, 4 and A-XIII, 6). For the additional fees payable as part of the filing fee, see A-III, 13.2 and A-IV, 1.4.1.1.

5.2.2 Examination fee and designation fee

The examination fee is due when the request for examination is filed. Since the latter is contained in the request for grant form (EPO Form 1001), the examination fee may be paid straight away on the European patent application's date of filing if the application is filed with said prescribed EPO Form 1001. It may be paid up to expiry of the period laid down in Rule 70(1), namely within six months of the date on which the European Patent Bulletin mentions the publication of the European search report.

The designation fee falls due upon publication of the mention of the European search report. It may be paid within six months of the mentioned date of publication (Rules 39(1), 17(3) and 36(4)). Where paid before the due date, e.g. upon filing of the application, the designation fee will however be retained by the EPO. These payments will only be considered valid from the due date, provided that the amount paid corresponds to the amount payable on the date of payment (see A-X, 5.1.2).

For Euro-PCT applications, see A-XIII, 5 and A-XIII, 7.

5.2.3 Fee for grant and publishing

Rule 71(1)

Rule 71(4)

The fee for grant and publishing falls due on notification of the communication under Rule 71(3) requesting that this fee be paid. Under Rule 71(4), the same applies for claims fees added during the procedure to those that were already paid under Rule 45(1) and (2) or Rule 162(1) and (2) (see A-X, 7.3.2).

5.2.4 Renewal fees

Rule 51(1)

Renewal fees for a European patent application in respect of the coming year are due on the last day of the month containing the anniversary of the European patent application's date of filing.

According to Rule 51(1) as amended with effect from 1 April 2018 (OJ EPO 2018, A2), the renewal fee in respect of the third year may be paid up to six months before it falls due. All other renewal fees may not be validly paid more than three months before they fall due.

Example A:

15.11.2016	Date of filing
31.05.2018	Earliest date for valid payment of third-year renewal fee under <u>Rule 51(1)</u>
30.11.2018	Due date for third-year renewal fee under <u>Rule 51(1)</u>
31.08.2019	Earliest date for valid payment of fourth-year renewal fee under <u>Rule 51(1)</u>
30.11.2019	Due date for fourth-year renewal fee under <u>Rule 51(1)</u>

Example B:

15.07.2016	Priority date
14.07.2017	Date of filing
31.01.2019	Earliest date for valid payment of third-year renewal fee under <u>Rule 51(1)</u>
15.02.2019	Expiry of 31-month period for the performance of all acts required under <u>Rule 159(1)</u>
31.07.2019	Due date for third-year renewal fee under <u>Rule 51(1)</u>
30.04.2020	Earliest date for valid payment of fourth-year renewal fee under <u>Rule 51(1)</u>
31.07.2020	Due date for fourth year renewal fee under <u>Rule 51(1)</u>

Renewal fee payments made before the permissible prepayment periods are not valid. If a debit order for a renewal fee is included in a batch filed via Central Fee Payment before the earliest valid payment dates under Rule 51(1), it will be rejected at source by the validation functionality (see A-X, 4.2.3). If a payment is made too early either by filing a valid debit order via Online Filing 2.0 or by making a bank transfer payment not using

Central Fee Payment, the renewal fee is automatically flagged as undue and will be repaid by the EPO to the payment source (OJ EPO 2024, A82). However, where renewal fees or additional fees under Rule 51(2) are considered due at the time of their payment, but owing to a retroactive procedural change the fees are in fact no longer due, such fees are refunded to the applicant or their representative according to the refund procedure (see A-X, 10.1.1, A-X, 10.3, and the notice from the EPO dated 25 September 2024, OJ EPO 2024, A82).

If the renewal fee has not been validly paid on or before the due date, it may still be validly paid within six months of the said date, provided that the additional fee is paid within this period. The additional fee can be paid until the last day of the sixth month following the month containing the anniversary of the date of filing (see J 4/91, reasons 2.7). This six-month period begins on the last day of the month referred to in Rule 51(1), first sentence, even if the circumstances described in Rule 134(1), (2) and (5) apply. Rule 134 is applicable to the calculation of the expiry of the six-month time limit for payment of the additional fee (see J 4/91, reasons 3.2). Whilst a notice draws the applicant's attention to the possibility under Rule 51(2) and Art. 2(1), item 5, RFees, the omission of such notification may not be invoked (see J 12/84 and J 1/89). For renewal fees for European divisional applications, see A-IV, 1.4.3.

Rule 51(2)

Rule 134

For Euro-PCT applications, if the renewal fee in respect of the third year would have fallen due earlier under Rule 51(1), the due date is deferred to the last day of the 31-month period under Rule 159(1). This deferred due date, and hence the expiry of another period (the 31-month period), forms the basis for calculating the additional period for payment of the renewal fee with an additional fee (see J 1/89, the principles of which apply). For example:

20.04.2016 (Wed)	Priority date
17.10.2016 (Mon)	Date of filing
31.10.2018 (Wed)	Due date for third-year renewal fee under <u>Rule 51(1)</u>
20.11.2018 (Tue)	Expiry of 31-month period under <u>Rule 159(1)</u> = deferred due date for third-year renewal fee
20.05.2019 (Mon)	Last day for payment of the renewal fee (plus additional fee) since the six-month period under <u>Rule 51(2)</u> expires that day

If the applicant requests entry into the regional phase before the expiry of the 31-month period (see Arts. 23(2) and 40(2) PCT), in order for the request to become effective the renewal fee in respect of the third year has to be paid if the fee has fallen due earlier under Rule 51(1). If the renewal fee is not paid on the date early processing is requested, the request for early processing will be effective only from the date on which the renewal fee is paid (and all further requirements necessary on the latter date have been complied with) (see A-XIII, 8).

The obligation to pay renewal fees terminates with the payment of the renewal fee due in respect of the (patent) year in which the mention of the

Art. 86(1) and
Art. 141(1)

grant of the European patent is published, see [Art. 86\(2\)](#). "Patent years" are calculated as from the application's date of filing. The first patent year ([Art. 86\(1\)](#), [Art. 141\(1\)](#)) starts on the date of filing and ends on the same date of the following year. For the second and subsequent years, the patent year starts one day after the anniversary of the date of filing and ends on the same day as the date of filing of the following year.

Example of due date and time limits for payment:

15.12.2016 (Thu)	Priority date
02.07.2017 (Sun)	Date of filing
31.01.2019 (Thu)	First day for validly paying third-year renewal fee
31.07.2019 (Wed)	Due date for third-year renewal fee under Rule 51(1)
31.01.2020 (Fri)	Last day for validly paying renewal fee plus additional fee (Rule 51(2)); see J 4/91 , reasons 2.7
30.04.2020 (Thu)	First day for validly paying fourth-year renewal fee
31.07.2020 (Fri)	Due date for fourth-year renewal fee = last renewal fee to be paid to the EPO and last day for payment of this renewal fee without additional fee
04.11.2020 (Wed)	Mention of grant of the European patent in the European Patent Bulletin

Example 1 of last renewal fee payable to the EPO:

21.01.2017 (Sat)	Date of filing
22.01.2019 (Tue)	Start of third patent year
31.01.2019 (Thu)	Due date for third-year renewal fee (to be paid to the EPO)
31.10.2019 (Thu)	First day for validly paying fourth-year renewal fee
15.01.2020 (Wed)	Mention of grant of the European patent in the European Patent Bulletin
22.01.2020 (Wed)	Start of fourth patent year
31.01.2020 (Fri)	Due date for fourth-year renewal fee (no longer to be paid to the EPO; if already paid, to be refunded, see A-X 10.1.1)

This means that for the last renewal fee payable to the EPO, it is not the due date but the beginning of the respective patent year that is decisive. If the mention of the grant of the European patent is published on the anniversary of the date of filing, the renewal fee in respect of the next patent year, which has not yet begun, is no longer payable to the EPO under the EPC but to the national authorities; said renewal fee is payable to the EPO only in respect of a European patent with unitary effect.

To ensure that the publication of the mention of the grant of the European patent does not fall in the period after the start of the patent year and before the due date of the renewal fee, the EPO will, where necessary, postpone the publication of the mention of the grant until after the due date of the renewal fee in question, which is then still payable to the EPO.

Example 2 of last renewal fee payable to the EPO:

22.05.2017 (Mon)	Date of filing
23.05.2019 (Thu)	Start of third patent year
31.05.2019 (Fri)	Due date for third-year renewal fee (to be paid to the EPO)
12.05.2022 (Thu)	Date of dispatch of communication under <u>Rule 71(3)</u>
20.05.2022 (Fri)	Approval of the text for grant and translation of the claims submitted, fee for grant and publication and all claims paid
23.05.2022 (Mon)	Start of sixth patent year
31.05.2022 (Tue)	Due date for sixth-year renewal fee, payable to EPO (<u>Rule 71a(4)</u>)
30.11.2022 (Wed)	Payment of the sixth renewal fee with additional fee (<u>Rule 51(2)</u>)
04.01.2023 (Wed)	Mention of grant of the European patent in the European Patent Bulletin
31.05.2023 (Wed)	Due date for seventh-year renewal fee (no longer to be paid to the EPO)

This means that, if the renewal fee in respect of the next patent year falls due after notification of the communication under Rule 71(3) and before the next possible date for publication of the mention of the grant of the European patent, the renewal fee is payable to the EPO (Rule 71a(4)). In that case, the mention of the grant will not be published until the renewal fee has been paid. If the renewal fee or any additional fee (Rule 51(2)) is not paid in time the application is deemed withdrawn.

Special provisions apply with regard to the due date for renewal fees in respect of cases where there is a successful request for re-establishment of rights under Art. 122 or a successful petition for review of a decision of the board of appeal under Art. 112a.

Rule 51(4) and (5)

5.2.5 Claims fees

Claims fees are due upon filing the first set of claims, which may be the date of filing or may occur later (see A-III, 9 and 15). For Euro-PCT applications, see A-XIV, 2.

5.2.6 Fees for limitation/revocation, opposition, appeal, petition for review

All of these fees are due on the date that the document in question is filed (request for limitation, request for revocation, notice of opposition, notice of appeal and petition for review).

5.2.7 Fees payable for procedural and other requests

The fees payable for procedural requests are due as provided for in the Implementing Regulations. These requests become effective on payment of the prescribed fee, which thus falls due upon filing the request. This is the case, for example, for the fee for further processing (Art. 121, Rule 135(1)), see also E-VIII, 2) and the fee for re-establishment of rights (Art. 122, Rule 136(1)), see also E-VIII, 3). Similarly, the fees payable for other requests, such as the fee for the registration of transfers (Rule 22(2)) and

the administrative fees laid down by the President of the EPO in accordance with Art. 3 RFees, for instance, for issuing a priority document (Rule 54) or a certificate for a European patent (Rule 74), fall due upon filing the request. No fee is charged for certain requests provided the request is made using MyEPO (see the decision of the President of the EPO dated 25 January 2024, OJ EPO 2024, A5).

6. Payment in due time

6.1 Basic principle

A fee is considered to have been paid in due time if the date of payment (see A-X, 4) fell on or before the last day of the relevant time limit – or the time limit extended under Rule 134.

6.2 Late payment of fees – period for payment considered observed

6.2.1 Fees paid by bank transfer – application of Art. 7(3) and Art. 7(4) RFees

Art. 7(3) and
(4) RFees

If a fee paid by bank transfer enters the EPO's bank account after the period in which it should have been made, the period for payment of that fee is considered observed if the payer provides evidence to the EPO that they fulfilled one of the following conditions in an EPC contracting state within the period for payment of that fee:

- (i) payment of the fee was effected through a banking establishment
- (ii) an order was duly given to a banking establishment to transfer the amount of the payment.

The EPO may ask the person who made the payment to produce evidence, within a period to be specified by it, as to the date on which one of the conditions mentioned above was fulfilled in order for the period for payment of the fee to be considered observed.

Where the period for payment is considered observed in application of Art. 7(3) and (4) RFees, any further processing fee paid will be refunded (see A-X, 6.2.5).

6.2.2 Safety provision for late replenishment of deposit accounts

*Point 7.4.1 ADA
Point 7.5.1 ADA*

Where a payment to replenish the deposit account is considered to have been made after expiry of a period in which it should have been made (see A-X, 4.2.4), the EPO will consider the period as having been observed if evidence is provided that an adequate replenishment of the deposit account was authorised:

- (i) at least one day before expiry of the period for paying the fee if using the SEPA Credit Transfer scheme
- (ii) at the latest on the last day of the period for paying the fee if using the SEPA Instant Credit Transfer scheme

- (iii) at least three days before expiry of the period for paying the fee if any other type of order was given to a banking establishment within an EPC contracting state.

Where the requirements under point 7.5.1 ADA are fulfilled, any further processing fee paid will be refunded (see A-X, 6.2.5).

6.2.3 Debit orders filed with a competent national authority

For debit orders accompanying applications filed with a competent national authority, see A-X, 4.2.4 and A-II, 1.5.

6.2.4 Amount of fee payable

As noted in A-X, 5.1.2, the amount of fee payable is always that applying on the date of payment (see also the transitional provisions in the Administrative Council decisions revising fees). Art. 7(3) and (4) RFees protects the applicant in the event of late payment from the legal consequences of expiry of the payment period but not from the obligation to make up any differences resulting from an increase in the amount of fee in the meantime. For debit orders accompanying applications filed with a competent national office (Art. 75(1)(b)), see point 12.3 of the ADA (Supplementary publication 2, OJ EPO 2024).

6.2.5 Noting of loss of rights

If applicants who have been sent a communication under Rule 112(1) noting non-compliance with a payment time limit claim that the payment was made in due time under Art. 7(1), (3) and (4) RFees or in accordance with the safety provision for replenishment of deposit accounts, they must apply for a decision under Rule 112(2) and submit the requisite evidence. As an auxiliary request, applicants are advised to request further processing.

Rule 112

7. Purpose of payment

7.1 General

7.1.1 Conditions for valid payment

There are three conditions for a fee payment to be valid:

- (i) it must relate to pending proceedings
- (ii) it must be made in due time, i.e. the date of payment (see A-X, 4) must be on or after the due date (see A-X, 5.1.1)
- (iii) the full amount of the fee must have been paid in due time.

Art. 8 RFees

An essential condition for a valid payment by bank transfer to the EPO is that the full amount enters the bank account held by the European Patent Organisation. The payment is valid in respect of the amount entering the account. If an insufficient amount has been paid by mistake, it is not possible to rectify the error by having the shortfall paid subsequently deemed paid on the original date of payment. The same applies to payments made via credit card. However, the EPO may, where it is

considered justified, overlook any small amounts lacking without prejudice to the rights of the person making the payment (Art. 8 RFees).

In the case of payment via deposit account, the essential condition, in addition to those specified under points (i)-(iii) above, is that the debit order clearly specifies the purpose of payment by indicating the fee intended to be paid, thus authorising the EPO to debit the fee for this particular purpose. Furthermore, the EPO can only debit the full amount of the fee if there are sufficient funds in the deposit account. In respect of underpayments due to incorrect information given in a debit order, see A-X 4.2.3. See also A-X 7.1.2 concerning corrections of the purpose of payment.

Under certain circumstances, i.e. if the conditions established by the case law of the boards of appeal are fulfilled, a debit order may be corrected under Rule 139 (see G 1/12 and H-VI, 2).

7.1.2 Purpose of payment

Art. 6 RFees

A distinction must be drawn between these conditions for valid payment (see A-X 7.1.1) and the indication of the purpose of the payment. Indication of the purpose of the payment serves to identify the proceedings for which the fee is intended (e.g. for fee payments, the application number) and the specific type of fee. If the purpose of the payment cannot immediately be established, the person making the payment will be requested to communicate the purpose in writing within a specified period. If they comply with this request in due time, the payment and the original payment date remain valid. This is also the case when the clarification involves reassigning the payment to another application. Otherwise the payment will be considered not made. The boards of appeal have decided that if the purpose of the payment has evidently been given incorrectly, this deficiency is not prejudicial if the intended purpose can be established without difficulty from the remaining information. The inadvertent use of a fee by the EPO for a different purpose from that evidently intended by the person making the payment has no effect on the purpose intended by that person (see J 16/84). Similarly, a debit order must be carried out notwithstanding incorrect information given in it if the intention of the person giving the order is clear. Instructions to carry out the order must be given by the EPO department qualified to recognise what is clearly intended (see T 152/82).

In the case of changes to the purpose of payment not arising from Art. 6(2) RFees, the date of payment is the date of receipt of the request for the change.

7.2 Indication of the purpose of the payment in the case of designation fees for applications filed before 1 April 2009

Art. 2(2), item 3,

RFees

Art. 6(1) RFees

For information on paying designation fees in respect of applications filed before 1 April 2009, see [A-III, 11.3](#) and the April 2025 edition of the Guidelines, [A-X, 7.2.7.3](#) Indication of the purpose of payment in the case of claims fees

7.3.1 Claims fees payable on filing the European patent application

If the applicant pays the claims fees for all the claims incurring fees, the indication "claims fees" suffices to identify the purpose of the payment. If the amount paid is insufficient to cover all the claims fees, the procedure under [A-III, 9](#) applies.

[Rule 45\(1\)](#)

7.3.2 Claims fees payable before the grant of the European patent

In the communication under [Rule 71\(3\)](#), the applicant may be requested to pay claims fees due before the European patent is granted. If the applicant fails to pay the fee for all the claims in due time, the application is deemed withdrawn ([Rule 71\(7\)](#)).

[Rule 71\(4\)](#)

8. No deferred payment of fees, no legal aid, no discretion

The EPC makes no provision for deferring payment of fees (see [J 2/78](#), reasons 3) or for granting legal aid. An indigent party can still apply for legal aid from the competent national authority. However, the time limit for payment is not extended in such a case; a party claiming national legal aid must make the corresponding arrangements as early as possible so that they are in a position to pay the fee in due time. The EPO has no discretion in waiving or refunding, without any legal basis, fees that have become due (see [J 20/87](#)).

9. Reduction of fees

9.1 General

Where a fee reduction applies, the reduced rate may be paid instead of the full fee. The factual conditions for a reduction of the fee must be met on the day the payment is made.

9.2 Fee-related support measures for small entities and micro-entities

Applicants fulfilling certain criteria are eligible for fee reductions under the language arrangements (see [A-X, 9.3](#)) and a fee reduction scheme specifically for micro-entities (see [A-X, 9.4](#)). If applicants are eligible for a reduction under both schemes, both reductions are applied sequentially (see the decision of the Administrative Council of 14 December 2023, [OJ EPO 2024, A3](#), and the notice from the EPO dated 25 January 2024, [OJ EPO 2024, A8](#), which includes examples).

[Rule 7a](#)

[Art. 14\(3\) RFees](#)

9.3 Reduction under the language arrangements

9.3.1 Conditions

[Art. 14\(2\)](#)

European patent applications can be filed in any language. If filed in a language other than an official EPO language, a translation must be furnished. The languages that can be used for filing European patent applications fall into three categories:

- (a) official EPO languages
- (b) official languages of contracting states other than English, French or German, such as Dutch, Italian or Spanish ("admissible non-EPO languages")
- (c) all other languages, such as Chinese, Japanese or Korean.

Rule 7a(1)

Art. 14(1) RFees

A 30% reduction of the filing and/or examination fee is provided for applicants whose residence or principal place of business is within the territory of an EPC contracting state having the language in question as an official language or who are a national of such a contracting state. For international applications entering the European phase, a 30% reduction of the examination fee is provided for (see the notice from the EPO dated 25 January 2024, OJ EPO 2024, A8). In this regard, it is necessary to file the documents making up the application "as filed" and/or the request for examination in an admissible non-EPO language, and to file the translation not earlier than simultaneously (see G 6/91 and A-X, 9.3.2).

Rule 7a(2)

The categories of applicants eligible for the fee reductions are:

- microenterprises
- small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs)
- natural persons
- non-profit organisations, universities and public research organisations

whose residence or principal place of business is in an EPC contracting state with an official language other than English, French or German, and nationals of such states who are resident abroad.

The definitions of SMEs and microenterprises are those contained in European Commission Recommendation 2003/361/EC of 6 May 2003 as published in the Official Journal of the European Union (see the notice from the EPO dated 25 January 2024, OJ EPO 2024, A8). Under the recommendation, an enterprise is considered to be any entity engaged in an economic activity, irrespective of its legal form. The category of small and medium-sized enterprises is made up of enterprises employing fewer than 250 persons, having an annual turnover not exceeding EUR 50 million or an annual balance sheet total not exceeding EUR 43 million. Within the SME category, a microenterprise is defined as an enterprise employing fewer than 10 persons and whose annual turnover or balance sheet total does not exceed EUR 2 million. Staff headcount and financial ceilings are calculated in accordance with European Commission

Recommendation 2003/361/EC, which defines the data to be used for the headcount, the financial amounts as well as the reference period. This means that the economic autonomy of the company in question may have an impact on its qualification as small and medium-sized or microenterprise (see Arts. 3 and 6 of European Commission Recommendation 2003/361/EC). Further information and examples for the calculation of staff headcount and financial ceilings can be found in the European Commission's "User guide to the SME definition (2020)", see data.europa.eu/doi/10.2873/255862.

The eligibility of the further entities listed in Rule 7a(2) is subject to the following definitions:

- (i) "Non-profit organisations" are organisations not allowed by their legal form or statutes, under the relevant law, to be a source of income, profit or other financial gain to their owners, or – if allowed to make a profit – there is a legal or statutory obligation to reinvest the profits made in the interest of the organisation.
- (ii) "Universities" are to be understood as "classical" universities, meaning institutions of higher education and research, under the relevant law. However, comparable institutions, such as secondary or higher education establishments, are considered to be universities.
- (iii) "Public research organisations" are entities such as universities or research institutes that are organised under public law and, irrespective of how they are financed, have the primary goal of conducting fundamental research, industrial research or experimental development and of disseminating the results by way of teaching, publication or technology transfer. All profits must be reinvested in carrying out these activities, in disseminating the results or in teaching.

If there are multiple applicants, each one must be an entity or a natural person within the meaning of Rule 7a(2) for the fee reduction to apply; it is however sufficient for only one of them to be entitled to use an admissible non-EPO language (Art. 14(4), Rule 7a(1)).

Rule 7a(5)

Applicants wishing to benefit from the reduction in the filing or examination fee under Art. 14(1) RFees must expressly declare that they are an entity or natural person covered by Rule 7a(2). The declaration may be made either on filing the application by selecting the appropriate box on the request for grant form (EPO Form 1001) or, on filing the request for entry into the European phase by selecting the appropriate box on EPO Form 1200. It can also be filed subsequently using non-mandatory EPO Form 1011, which is available in Online Filing 2.0 or can be downloaded in PDF format from the EPO website (epo.org). For Euro-PCT applications, the filing fee is not reduced (see A-XIII, 4); for a reduction in the examination fee, see A-XIII, 7.

Rule 7b(1)

The eligibility criteria must be fulfilled and the declaration must be filed at the latest on the date of payment of the fee concerned. Changes in the

Rule 7a(6)

status of an entity which occur after the filing of the declaration will take effect only for the future and will not affect any reduced fees already paid (OJ EPO 2024, A8).

9.3.2 Reduction of the filing fee

On filing a European patent application, the presence of a description is necessary for the accordance of a date of filing (Rule 40(1)(c)). The description, therefore, needs to be in an admissible non-EPO language to qualify for the fee reduction (not the request for grant, for example; see J 4/88).

Consequently, the filing fee is reduced if the European patent application (i.e. at least the description) is filed in an admissible non-EPO language and the applicant satisfies the eligibility criteria mentioned in A-X, 9.3.1.

Where the application is filed by reference to a previously filed application (see A-II, 4.1.3.1), and the previously filed application referred to is in an admissible non-EPO language, and the applicant satisfies the eligibility criteria mentioned in A-X, 9.3.1, then the applicant is also entitled to the reduction in the filing fee. For the purposes of the reduction, it does not matter whether the applicant requested that the claims of the previously filed application take the place of the claims in the application as filed (see above).

The reduction of the filing fee is also applicable to divisional applications if the parent application was filed in an admissible non-EPO language (see A-IV, 1.3.3 and A-X, 9.3.1) and the divisional application is filed in the same admissible non-EPO language as the earlier application (Rules 36(2) and 7a(1)), provided that the other requirements for the reduction are met (see above and A-X, 9.3.1).

Since the additional fees that are payable if the application either comprises more than 35 pages or is a second- or further generation divisional application form part of the filing fee (see A-III, 13.2 and 13.3), the reduction applies also to them.

9.3.3 Reduction of the examination fee

Applicants eligible for the fee reduction will be allowed a reduction in the examination fee if the request for examination is filed in an admissible non-EPO language. EPO Form 1001 (Request for grant of a European patent) and EPO Form 1200 (Entry into the European phase) contain drop-down menus/pre-printed boxes where the request for examination in an admissible non-EPO language and the declaration under Rule 7b(1) can be selected/entered. For Euro-PCT applications, see A-XIII, 7. In these cases, the filing of a translation of the request is not necessary, since the written request for examination in the three EPO official languages is preselected in the same forms. Wordings for the request for examination in the admissible non-EPO languages are also listed on the EPO website. Where the request for examination in an admissible non-EPO language is filed subsequent to EPO Form 1001 or EPO Form 1200, a translation of the request for examination in any of the official languages must be refiled (see G 6/91). The request for examination in the admissible non-EPO language

Art. 14(4)
Rule 7a(1)

and its translation must be filed no later than the date of payment of the examination fee for the reduction to apply. Subsequent documents related to examination proceedings need not be filed in the admissible non-EPO language.

If the conditions for the reduction of the examination fee where the EPO has drawn up the international preliminary examination report are also fulfilled, see A-X, 9.5.2.

9.3.4 Non-compliance with eligibility criteria

The EPO may conduct checks to ensure compliance with the eligibility criteria laid down in Rules 7a(1), (2), (5) and 7b(1). If the checks give rise to reasonable doubt in the course of the grant proceedings as to the veracity of the declaration given by the applicant, the EPO may request appropriate evidence (Rule 7b(3)).

Should it become apparent that an incorrect declaration has been filed, the fee would not be validly paid since it was reduced unjustifiably and the application may be deemed withdrawn under Art. 78(2) and/or 94(2). The same applies if no declaration has been filed. Where applicable, the loss of rights arising from an incorrect or missing declaration may be remedied by filing a request for further processing under Art. 121 and Rule 135 (subject to making good any underpayment and paying the fee for further processing (see E-VIII, 2)) or by requesting a decision under Rule 112(2) (see E-VIII, 1.9.3).

9.4 Reduction under the scheme for micro-entities

9.4.1 Conditions

In contrast with the eligibility requirements for fee reductions under the language arrangements (see A-X, 9.3), applicants qualifying for micro-entity status may, irrespective of their nationality or domicile, have certain fees reduced under the scheme for micro-entities. The reduction applies to fee payments made on or after 1 April 2024 for European patent applications and Euro-PCT applications having entered the European phase (see A-XII, 4 and A-XIII), irrespective of their date of filing (see the decision of the Administrative Council dated 14 December 2023, OJ EPO 2024, A3, and the notice from the EPO dated 25 January 2024, OJ EPO 2024, A8).

Rule 7a(3)

No reduction applies if the same applicant has filed five or more European patent applications or Euro-PCT applications within a period of five years preceding the date of filing of the European patent application concerned, the date on which the divisional application concerned is filed, or, in the case of a Euro-PCT application, its date of entry into the European phase (see OJ EPO 2024, A3, and OJ EPO 2024, A8).

Rule 7a(4)

The categories of applicants eligible for the micro-entity fee reductions are:

Rule 7a(3)

- microenterprises
- natural persons

- non-profit organisations, universities and public research organisations

It is to be noted that small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) that do not qualify as microenterprises are not eligible for a fee reduction under Rule 7a(3). For the definition of a microenterprise and the other entities listed above, see A-X, 9.3.1.

Rule 7a(5)

If there are multiple applicants, each one must be an entity or a natural person within the meaning of Rule 7a(3) and fulfil the requirements of Rule 7a(4) for the fee reduction to apply.

Rule 7b(1)

Applicants wishing to benefit from the fee reductions for micro-entities must expressly declare that they are an entity or natural person covered by Rule 7a(3). The declaration may be made either on filing the application by selecting the appropriate box on the request for grant form (EPO Form 1001) or on filing the request for entering the European phase by selecting the appropriate box on EPO Form 1200. It can also be filed subsequently using non-mandatory EPO Form 1011, which is available in Online Filing 2.0 or can be downloaded in PDF from the EPO website (*epo.org*). For Euro-PCT applications, see A-XII, 4 and A-XIII.

Rule 7a(6)

The eligibility criteria must be fulfilled on the date of payment of the fee concerned. Changes in the status of an entity which occur after the filing of the declaration will take effect only for the future and will not affect any reduced fees already paid (OJ EPO 2024, A8).

9.4.2 Fees concerned

Art. 14(3) RFees

Where the applicant fulfils the eligibility criteria (see A-X, 9.4.1), they are entitled to a 30% reduction of the following fees (Rule 7a(3)):

- filing fee, including any additional fees (see A-III, 13.2 and 13.3)
- fee for a European search or supplementary European search
- examination fee, and in addition the previously paid international search fee where the EPO acted as ISA (see A-XIII, 7)
- designation fee
- fee for grant
- renewal fees for the European patent application.

In the case of a Euro-PCT application searched by the EPO in its capacity as ISA, the examination fee may be reduced twice under the micro-entity scheme, first by a reduction of the examination fee and, additionally, by a reduction of the amount paid for the international search (taking account of any refund or reduction already applied to that fee).

If the conditions for the search fee reduction under Art. 153(7) are also fulfilled, see A-X, 9.5.1. If the conditions for the examination fee reduction

where the EPO has drawn up the international preliminary examination report are also fulfilled, see [A-X, 9.5.2](#).

9.4.3 Non-compliance with eligibility criteria

The EPO may conduct checks to ensure compliance with the eligibility criteria laid down in [Rules 7a\(3\), \(4\), \(5\) and 7b\(1\)](#). If the checks give rise to reasonable doubt in the course of the grant proceedings as to the veracity of the declaration given by the applicant, the EPO may request appropriate evidence ([Rule 7b\(3\)](#)).

Should it become apparent that an incorrect declaration has been filed, the fee would not be validly paid since it was reduced unjustifiably and the application may be deemed withdrawn under [Arts. 78\(2\), 86\(1\), 94\(2\), Rules 71\(7\), 39\(2\) and/or 160\(1\)](#) (see also [A-XIII](#)). The same applies if no declaration has been filed. Where applicable, the loss of rights arising from an incorrect or missing declaration may be remedied by filing a request for further processing under [Art. 121](#) and [Rule 135](#) (subject to making good any underpayment and paying the fee for further processing (see [E-VIII, 2](#))), by requesting re-establishment of rights under [Art. 122](#) and [Rule 136](#) (subject to making good any underpayment (see [E-VIII, 3](#))), or by requesting a decision under [Rule 112\(2\)](#) (see [E-VIII, 1.9.3](#)).

Where a reduction under [Rule 7a\(3\)](#) is claimed, the EPO will systematically check whether the applicant has filed five or more European patent applications or Euro-PCT applications within a period of five years preceding the date of filing of the European patent application concerned, the date on which the divisional application concerned is filed, or, in the case of a Euro-PCT application, its date of entry into the European phase. If a reduced fee has been paid but the check shows that this cap on eligible applications per applicant has been exceeded, the applicant will be invited to pay the missing amount within a time limit of two months. If the shortfall is not paid within the time limit, the application may be deemed withdrawn. For renewal fees for European patent applications, the six-month grace period under [Rule 51\(2\)](#) applies so that the missing amount, including the additional fee, can still be paid within this period.

9.5 Special reductions

9.5.1 Reduction of the search fee for a supplementary European search

The search fee for a supplementary European search report is reduced by a fixed amount for PCT applications for which the patent office of Austria, Finland, Spain, Sweden or Türkiye, the Nordic Patent Institute or the Visegrad Patent Institute was the International Searching Authority or where one of these offices prepared the supplementary international search report (see the Administrative Council decisions of 27 October 2011, [OJ EPO 2011, 616](#); 25 October 2012, [OJ EPO 2012, 584](#); 16 December 2015, [OJ EPO 2016, A2](#); 28 June 2017, [OJ EPO 2017, A57](#); 12 December 2019, [OJ EPO 2020, A3](#); 15 December 2021, [OJ EPO 2022, A2](#); and 14 December 2023, [OJ EPO 2024, A3](#)). [Art. 153\(7\)](#)

Where the requirements for fee reduction are fulfilled, the fee reduction is granted only once, i.e. for the supplementary search fee paid under Rule 159(1)(e). The reduction applies independently of whether the first invention in the claims was searched by the ISA in the international phase. The reduction does not apply to any further search fee (to be) paid under Rule 164(1).

No reduction of the supplementary search fee applies for PCT applications for which an International Searching Authority other than the ones mentioned above was selected. For the latest overview of the amounts payable, see the notice from the EPO dated 29 March 2024, OJ EPO 2024, A33.

9.5.2 Reduction of the examination fee where the international preliminary examination report is drawn up by the EPO

Where the EPO has drawn up the international preliminary examination report in respect of an international application, the examination fee is reduced by 75% in proceedings before the EPO as elected Office. Accordingly, the reduction applies to the Euro-PCT application entering the European phase. The reduction of the examination fee does not apply to divisional applications for whose parent application the EPO has drawn up the international preliminary examination report.

Art. 14(2) RFees

If the conditions for a reduction under the language arrangements (see A-X, 9.3.3) are also fulfilled, the examination fee is first reduced by 75%, then by a further 30%, i.e. the total reduction is 82.5%, or the amount payable is 17.5% of the full fee. The same calculation applies if the conditions for a reduction under the scheme for micro-entities (see A-X, 9.4.1) are fulfilled. If the applicant is eligible for a reduction under both the language arrangements and the scheme for micro-entities, the examination fee is reduced by 75%, then by 30% under Rule 7a(1), and is further reduced by 30% under Rule 7a(3) (see the notice from the EPO dated 25 January 2024, OJ EPO 2024, A8). Under certain circumstances, this calculation can result in a negative amount, meaning no fee is payable. A negative amount is not offset against other fees paid.

10. Refund of fees

10.1 General remarks

A fee that has been validly paid (see A-X, 7.1.1) is not refunded. For instance, a validly paid further processing fee is not refunded if the request for further processing is rejected due to non-completion of the omitted act, which is another requirement of Rule 135(1) (see E-VIII, 2). As an exception to this general principle, a validly paid fee is refunded if there are special provisions for the refund in either the EPC or the Rules relating to Fees (see A-X, 10.2).

By contrast, any fee that has not been validly paid is to be refunded (see A-X, 10.1.1 to 10.1.3 below). For the repayment of renewal fees not due, see A-X, 5.1.1 and A-X, 5.2.4.

10.1.1 Fee payments lacking a legal basis

If a payment does not relate to a pending European patent application (e.g. it relates to a patent application already deemed withdrawn) or to pending proceedings, there is no legal basis for the payment. In these cases, the amount paid must be refunded.

If the payment is made before or on the due date and if, no later than that date, the legal basis ceases to exist (e.g. because the patent application is deemed withdrawn or is withdrawn), the amount paid is to be refunded. For the designation fee and renewal fees, see A-X, 5.2.2 and 5.2.4 respectively. Fees paid after the due date and before expiry of the time limit for payment are refunded only if there is a particular reason for a refund (see A-X, 10.2).

10.1.2 Late payments

The payment of a fee after expiry of the applicable time limit is not valid and must be refunded unless a valid request for further processing has been filed. Examples: filing fee, search fee, designation fee or examination fee paid as laid down under the provisions relating to further processing (Art. 121 and Rule 135), without the further processing fee required by Rule 135(1) and Art. 2(1), item 12, RFees (see E-VIII, 2).

10.1.3 Insignificant amounts

Art. 12 RFees

Where the sum paid is larger than the fee, the excess will not be refunded if the amount is insignificant and the party concerned has not expressly requested a refund. It has been decided that an insignificant amount is fixed at EUR 17 (see the decision of the President of the EPO dated 7 March 2023, OJ EPO 2023, A27).

10.2 Special refunds

10.2.1 Refund of the search fee

Art. 9 RFees
Rule 10

The search fee for a European or supplementary European search is refunded in the cases provided for in Art. 9 RFees and in the decision of the President of the EPO dated 27 February 2025, OJ EPO 2025, A25, which applies to European patent applications in respect of which the European or supplementary European search is completed on or after 1 April 2025. Details on criteria for refund of search fees are given in the notice from the EPO dated 9 January 2009, OJ EPO 2009, 99, according to which the search division will determine the level of refund to be applied. In the event of disagreement, the applicant may request an appealable decision (Art. 106(2)), which is issued by the Receiving Section where the examining division has not yet assumed responsibility for the application (Rule 10) (see B-XI, 2).

For the purposes of Art. 9(1) RFees, the date of the start of the search is indicated by means of EPO Form 1704 in the public part of the dossier and is thus open to file inspection in the European Patent Register after the patent application's publication (see also B-IV, 1). Before publication, the EPO will provide the applicant with the relevant information upon request, or this information can be accessed electronically in MyEPO.

10.2.2 Refund of the further search fee

Rule 64(2),
164(5)

If an applicant has paid a further search fee following a communication from the search division under Rule 64(2) but the examining division finds, on request, that the communication was not justified, the further search fee will be refunded. The same principle applies if the applicant has paid a search fee on the basis of an invitation by the examining division under Rule 164(2) (see C-III, 3.1). In such cases, the examining division will, on request, review the justification for charging the search fee in its invitation under Rule 164(2) (see C-III, 3.4).

10.2.3 Refund of the examination fee

Art. 11 RFees

The examination fee will be refunded in the situations described in Art. 11 RFees (see A-VI, 2.2, third paragraph, and A-VI, 2.5).

10.2.4 Refund under Rule 37(2)

If a European patent application filed with a competent national authority is deemed withdrawn under Art. 77(3), all fees, in particular the filing, search and designation fees and any claims fees paid, will be refunded.

Rule 37(2)

10.2.5 Refund of the fee for grant and publishing

If the application is refused, withdrawn prior to notification of the decision on the grant of a European patent or, at that time, deemed withdrawn, the fee for grant and publishing will be refunded. The date of the decision's notification is determined as indicated in E-II, 2. Note that this date is later than the date on which the decision is processed for dispatch (i.e. decision G 12/91 does not apply in this case).

Rule 71a(6)

This may happen, for example, where the applicant pays the fee for grant and publishing within the Rule 71(3) period but does not pay the claims fees due and/or neglects to file the translations of the claims leading to deemed withdrawal of the application under Rule 71(7) (see C-V, 3).

Where the application is refused, the refund will be effected only after the period for filing an appeal has expired without an appeal being filed (see E-XI, 6). Where the application is deemed withdrawn, the refund will be effected only after the period for requesting further processing has expired without further processing being requested by the applicant (see E-VIII, 2).

10.2.6 Refund of the appeal fee

The appeal fee may be refunded in full or in part in some specific situations provided for in Rule 103. However, the department of first instance is only competent to decide on and order a full refund of the appeal fee in the case of an interlocutory revision if it considers the reimbursement equitable by reason of a substantial procedural violation (Rule 103(1)(a)). See also E-XI, 7.3.

Rule 103

In all other situations, including when the appellant withdraws their notice of appeal, reimbursement of the appeal fee, in part or in full, is decided on by the board of appeal.

10.3 Method of refund

Refunds are made either to a deposit account held with the EPO or by transfer to a bank account (see the notice from the EPO dated 15 February 2024, OJ EPO 2024, A23). Refunds are not made to a credit card account (see the notice from the EPO dated 16 February 2022, OJ EPO 2022, A18).

10.3.1 Refunds to a deposit account

Fees are refunded to any deposit account that the applicant, proprietor or opponent/appellant (if applicant or proprietor) has indicated in its refund instructions. In most cases this will be the deposit account of the party to the proceedings itself, but it may also be a third party's deposit account. The EPO notifies the party to the proceedings about the intended refund and the deposit account to which the amount will be credited in a separate communication.

Point 15 ADA

Refund instructions, i.e. to which deposit account refunds are to be made, are to be filed in an electronically processable format (XML) via Online Filing 2.0, using EPO Form 1001E, 1200E or 1038E, preferably as early as possible in the proceedings before the EPO. Refund instructions submitted in any other way, e.g. on paper or via the EPO Contingency Upload Service, are invalid and will not be processed. Refund instructions can be updated at any time using EPO Form 1038E. It is important that parties ensure that the EPO has clear and up-to-date refund instructions at all times.

For international applications filed with the EPO as receiving Office or for which the EPO acted as an International Authority under the PCT, new refund instructions are to be filed when entering the European phase using EPO Form 1200E.

In the case of a request for a change of representative or a transfer of rights, new refund instructions, if applicable, should be submitted as soon as possible using EPO Form 1038E, preferably together with the request. The updated refund instructions will apply only once the EPO has confirmed the change's recording. If no new refund instructions are present, a deposit account recorded for an applicant or representative who has withdrawn from the proceedings will be deleted by the EPO on its own initiative. The same applies to the deposit account held by a third party indicated in the refund instructions of the former applicant or representative.

If no refund instructions are on file when a refund becomes due or if they are ambiguous, the EPO will on its own initiative establish whether it can make a refund to a deposit account held by the appointed professional representative or by the applicant (or appellant, if applicant/proprietor). Otherwise it will invite the person who made the payment to claim the refund online. Users of MyEPO can claim their refunds direct in Central Fee Payment (see [A-X, 10.3.3](#)).

In the case of a refund of fees not payable by the applicant, proprietor or appellant (if applicant or proprietor), e.g. the opposition fee, the EPO will on its own initiative establish whether the refund can be credited to a deposit account. Otherwise it will invite the person who made the payment to claim the refund online.

10.3.2 Refunds to a bank account

If a refund cannot be made to a deposit account and the party to the proceedings or their representative is not a user of MyEPO (see [OJ EPO 2024, A23](#)), the party or their representative is invited to claim the refund online via the EPO website (epo.org) using a refund code provided in a non-public communication. Upon successful registration and sign in, the refund can be claimed by entering the application's details, the refund code and a bank account.

10.3.3 Claiming refunds in Central Fee Payment

If a refund cannot be made to a deposit account and the party to the proceedings or their representative is a user of MyEPO, the refund can be claimed direct in Central Fee Payment without the need for a separate

refund code (see A-X 10.3.2). The EPO informs the party via a communication to their Mailbox in MyEPO that a refund is pending and can be claimed in Central Fee Payment by indicating a bank account or deposit account held with the EPO (see OJ EPO 2024, A23).

10.4 Reallocation instead of refund

If a party files a written request, the payment may be reallocated instead of being refunded. The date of receipt of the reallocation instructions is then considered the payment date for the new purpose of payment.

11. Crediting of fees under Rule 71a(5)

If, in response to an invitation under Rule 71(3), the applicant has already paid the fee for grant and publishing or the claims fees, the amount paid will be credited if a further such invitation is issued. This may happen where:

Rule 71a(5)

- (i) the applicant requests amendments or corrections in response to the first Rule 71(3) communication or requests the reversal of amendments proposed by the examining division in that communication (see C-V 4.1) and also voluntarily pays the fee for grant and publishing and claims fees (even though this is not required, C-V 4.2) and the examining division then issues a subsequent Rule 71(3) communication (see C-V 4.6 and 4.7.2)
- (ii) after the applicant has approved the text for grant in response to the first Rule 71(3) communication (which requires payment of the fee for grant and publishing and any claims fees due – see C-V 1.1), examination is resumed (see C-V 6.1) leading to a subsequent Rule 71(3) communication being issued (see C-V 6.2).

11.1 Crediting of the fee for grant and publishing

The amount of the fee for grant and publishing paid in response to the first Rule 71(3) communication is credited towards the amount of this same fee due in response to the second Rule 71(3) communication. If this fee increases between the first and second Rule 71(3) communications, the difference must be paid within the period for reply to the second Rule 71(3) communication.

For European patent applications filed before 1 April 2009 or international applications entering the European phase before that date, the fee for grant and publishing incorporates a fixed component and a component in respect of each page of the application in excess of 35 (see C-V 1.2). If the overall fee changes between the first and second Rule 71(3) communication, any shortfall must be paid within the second Rule 71(3) period (e.g. resulting from a fee increase or an increase in the number of pages). Any excess will be refunded (for example where the version of the application on which the second Rule 71(3) communication is based has fewer pages than the earlier version on which the first Rule 71(3) communication was based).

Art. 2(2),
item 7, RFees

11.2 Crediting of claims fees

The amount of the claims fees paid in response to the first Rule 71(3) communication is credited towards the amount of the claims fees due in response to the second Rule 71(3) communication. In this regard it is

important to note that, unlike claims fees paid on filing under Rule 45 or on entry into the European phase under Rule 162, it is not the number of claims paid for that is used in the calculation but rather the amount paid.

If the amount of the claims fees due increases between the first and second Rule 71(3) communications (e.g. because of an increase in the per-claim fee or in the number of claims or both), the difference must be paid within the period for reply to the second Rule 71(3) communication.

To calculate the amount of the claims fees due in response to the second Rule 71(3) communication, the number of fee-free claims (15) and also the number of claims fees paid on filing or on entry into the European phase are deducted from the number of claims on which both the first and second Rule 71(3) communications are based. Thereafter, the amount of the claims fees paid in response to the first Rule 71(3) communication is then credited towards (and so deducted from) the amount of the claims fees due in response to the second Rule 71(3) communication (if the amount of fees due after the second Rule 71(3) communication is smaller than that voluntarily paid after the first Rule 71(3) communication, see C-V, 4.2).

11.3 Separate crediting of the fee for grant and publishing and claims fees

The crediting of claims fees and the fee for grant and publishing is dealt with separately. Claims fees are not credited towards any increase in the fee for grant and publishing.

11.4 Further processing fee and crediting of fees

Where the applicant has requested further processing in respect of the first Rule 71(3) communication (see E-VIII, 2), the further processing fee is not credited towards any increase in the amount of the fees due in response to the second Rule 71(3) communication.

Nor is the further processing fee paid in respect of the first Rule 71(3) communication credited towards any subsequent request for further processing in respect of the second Rule 71(3) communication.

Chapter XI – Inspection of files; communication of information contained in files; consultation of the European Patent Register; issue of certified copies

1. General

After a European patent application has been published, any person may inspect and obtain information from the files relating to the application and the resultant European patent. Similarly, anybody may request the issue of a sample of biological material in accordance with [Rule 33](#) (see [A-IV, 4.4](#)).

[Art. 128](#)
[Rule 143](#), [Rule 144](#)
[Rule 145](#), [Rule 146](#)
[Art. 3\(1\) RFees](#)

The provisions governing file inspection are contained in [Art. 128](#) and [Rules 144](#) and [145](#) (see [A-XI, 2](#)); those governing communication of information are contained in [Rule 146](#) (see [A-XI, 3](#)). For international (PCT) applications, see [A-XIII, 10.3](#).

The European Patent Register, containing the particulars specified in [Rule 143](#) and accessible free of charge, can be consulted to ascertain the state of the proceedings and the legal status of patent rights. It also provides access to the files of published European patent applications and patents for inspection (see [A-XI, 4](#)). The inspection of paper files on the premises of the European Patent Office was discontinued in 2007.

On request, the EPO issues certified copies of documents contained in the files or of other documents (see [A-XI, 5](#)).

Any fees payable for any of the above services are laid down by the President under [Art. 3\(1\) RFees](#) and are regularly published in the Official Journal. See also the schedule of fees and expenses on the EPO website ([epo.org](#)).

An administrative fee, if any, falls due when the request is received. For certain services no fee is due, provided that the request is made using MyEPO (see the decision of the President of the EPO dated 25 January 2024 revising the Office's fees and expenses, [OJ EPO 2024, A5](#)). The methods of payment and the date on which payment is deemed made are dealt with in the [Rules relating to Fees](#) (see [A-X, 2](#) and [4](#)). Where the administrative fee has been duly paid, it will not be refunded (see [A-X, 10.1](#)).

2. Inspection of files

2.1 Documents open to file inspection

All parts of the file compiled when conducting the examination, opposition and appeal procedure with the parties are open for online inspection via the European Patent Register, subject to the restrictions mentioned below (see [A-XI, 2.3](#)). The European Patent Register includes information on the dates of the start of search and examination, any invitations under [Rule 63\(1\)](#) or [Rule 62a\(1\)](#) and the search opinion, if applicable. The European Patent Register also offers access to the Register for unitary

[Art. 128](#)
[Rule 145\(2\)](#)
[Rule 147\(2\)](#)

patent protection, which can be consulted as an integral but special part of the European Patent Register.

As regards application documents corrected under Rule 56a, see [A-II, 6](#) and the notice from the EPO dated 23 July 2022, [OJ EPO 2022, A71](#).

Observations by third parties ([Art. 115](#)) are an integral part of the files and as such are open to inspection in accordance with [Art. 128](#). A request by a third party to treat their observations or part of them confidentially cannot be granted. In such a case, the third party will be notified accordingly (see [E-VI, 3](#)).

The parts of the file excluded from inspection (see [A-XI, 2.3](#)) are kept separate from those open to inspection.

2.2 Conducting file inspections

[Rule 145\(2\)](#)
[Art. 3\(1\) RFees](#)

The EPO President determines all file inspection arrangements (see the decision of the President of the EPO dated 13 November 2025, [OJ EPO 2025, A65](#)). Whether and for which services an administrative fee is payable is determined by the President of the EPO, the fee schedule last being published in the decision of the President of the EPO revising the Office's fees and expenses dated 25 January 2024 ([OJ EPO 2024, A5](#)).

As a rule, published patent applications and granted patents can be inspected in the European Patent Register, which is accessible free of charge via the EPO website. In exceptional cases, and only if accompanied by a substantiated request, uncertified paper copies of files or uncertified extracts from the European Patent Register are still issued. This service is available free of charge (see the notice from the EPO dated 20 February 2019, [OJ EPO 2019, A15](#), and the decision of the President of the EPO dated 25 January 2024, [OJ EPO 2024, A5](#)).

Regarding requests to furnish certified copies of documents from the file or a certified extract from the European Patent Register, see [A-XI, 5](#).

2.3 Restrictions to file inspection

[Art. 128\(4\)](#)
[Rule 146](#)
[Rule 145](#)
[Rule 144](#)

Inspection of files is subject to the restrictions laid down in [Rule 144](#).

The parts of the file excluded from inspection are:

[Rule 144\(a\)](#)

- (i) the documents relating to the exclusion of or objections to members of the boards of appeal or of the Enlarged Board of Appeal

[Rule 144\(b\)](#)

- (ii) draft decisions and opinions, and all other documents used for the preparation of decisions and opinions, which are not communicated to the parties

[Rule 144\(c\)](#)

- (iii) the designation of the inventor if that party has waived the right to be mentioned as inventor under [Rule 20\(1\)](#)

[Rule 144\(d\)](#)

- (iv) any other document excluded from inspection by the EPO President on the ground that such inspection would not serve the purpose of informing the public about the European patent application or the resulting patent; these include i.a.
 - medical certificates, copies of IDs, passports and other personal information documents
 - documents relating to file inspection, the issuing of priority documents or the communication of information from the files and
 - requests for accelerated examination under the "PACE" programme
- (v) subject to Rule 94.2 and 94.3 PCT, the files relating to international preliminary examination for a Euro-PCT application in respect of which the EPO is the International Preliminary Examining Authority and for which an international preliminary examination report has not yet been established (see OJ EPO 2003, 382; see also A-XIII, 10.3). Art. 38(1) PCT
Rule 94 PCT

See the decision of the President of the EPO dated 13 November 2025, OJ EPO 2025, A65, for further details. Apart from listing the documents automatically excluded from file inspection by the EPO, the decision of the President stipulates that, on request or at the Office's instigation, (parts of) other documents may be excluded from file inspection where their inspection is claimed to be prejudicial to the legitimate personal or economic interests of a natural or legal person. Any such request needs to be duly substantiated and specify how the legitimate personal or economic interests of the party are affected and what the relevant consequences are rather than merely making a statement concerning a party's interests in general. Also, any requests for exclusion from file inspection should be clearly marked, allowing them to be immediately identified as such and to be provisionally excluded from inspection, pending a final decision on the request.

When a submission is to be excluded from file inspection only partially, only the parts or passages in question are excluded; the rest of the submission remains public.

If it is decided that certain papers, either marked "confidential" or in view of the nature of their content, are not to be excluded from file inspection under Rule 144, they are returned to the sender (see T 516/89).

2.4 Confidentiality of the request

Correspondence in proceedings relating to the inspection of files conducted between the EPO and the person requesting the inspection is included in the non-public part of the file. The EPO does not provide the applicant with any information about the proceedings relating to the inspection of files (see A-XI, 2.3(iv) but also A-XI, 2.5, third paragraph).

2.5 File inspection before publication of the application

Art. 128(1)

Until the European patent application is published, the files may be inspected only by applicants or with their consent. MyEPO allows applicants or their appointed representative to inspect the public part of the files relating to their still unpublished applications (see the decision of the President of the EPO and the notice from the EPO both dated 9 February 2024 concerning the web-based online service MyEPO Portfolio, OJ EPO 2024, A20, and OJ EPO 2024, A21, respectively). If a third party requests file inspection without at the same time submitting the applicant's consent, the EPO will not release the files until the applicant's approval has been presented.

Art. 128(2)

However, prior to the European patent application's publication, any person who can prove that applicants have invoked their rights under the application against them may also inspect the files. The rights under a European patent application are also deemed to have been invoked where rights under a first filing in a contracting state have been invoked and the subsequent European patent application is mentioned at the same time (see J 14/91). If such proof is not furnished together with the request, the EPO will invite the requester within a specified period to supply proof. If that is not done in due time, the request will be refused.

If a request for inspection of the files under Art. 128(2) is made, the applicant is entitled to notification of the identity of the person making the request. Professional representatives requesting inspection of the files on behalf of a third party under Art. 128(2) must therefore give the third party's name and address and file an authorisation.

A decision on a request for inspection of the files under Art. 128(2) is only taken once the applicant has been heard. If the applicant objects and provides grounds for believing that the requirements under Art. 128(2) are not met within the period set by the EPO, a decision will be delivered. This decision is subject to appeal.

Art. 128(3)

Prior to a European divisional application's publication the file of this divisional application may be inspected only in the cases described in Art. 128(1) and (2). This also applies where the parent application has already been published. However, where a European divisional application or a new European patent application filed under Art. 61(1)(b) is published, the files of the earlier application may be inspected prior to that earlier application's publication and without the relevant applicant's consent.

2.6 Publication of bibliographic data before publication of the application

In accordance with Art. 128(5), the EPO publishes in the European Patent Bulletin the bibliographic data relating to European patent applications that had been announced for publication but for which the application documents were not published, either because the application was withdrawn or because the announcement was erroneous. The lists of these publication numbers can be found on the European publication server, which is accessible via the EPO website (epo.org).

Art. 128(5)

3. Communication of information contained in the files

Subject to the restrictions provided for in Art. 128(1) to (4) and Rule 144 (see A-XI, 2.3), the EPO may, upon request, communicate information concerning any file of a published European patent application or a European patent. This service is available free of charge (see A-XI, 1 and OJ EPO 2024, A5).

Rule 146

However, the EPO may refer to the option to obtain inspection of the file itself, should it deem this to be appropriate in view of the quantity of information to be supplied.

Correspondence in proceedings relating to the communication of information conducted between the EPO and the person requesting the information is filed in the part of the file that is not accessible to the public (see A-XI, 2.3(iv)). The EPO does not provide the applicant with any information about the proceedings relating to the communication of information (see A-XI, 2.4).

4. Consultation of the European Patent Register

The European Patent Register can be accessed free of charge via the EPO website (epo.org) (see A-XI, 2.2). Entries in the European Patent Register are made starting from the publication of the European patent application up to expiry of the period of opposition or the termination of opposition proceedings. The European Patent Register also includes the Register for unitary patent protection. Where applicable, the date and purport of any decision taken in revocation or limitation proceedings (Art. 105b(2)) and/or on a petition for review (Art. 112a) are also included (Rule 143(1)(x) and (y)). Since the correction of the designation of the inventor may be made at any time (see A-III, 5.5), there is no time restriction for related entries in the European Patent Register.

Art. 127

Rule 143

Rule 21(2)

Apart from the data to be entered under Rule 143(1), the European Patent Register includes, under Rule 143(2), additional application and procedural data not published in the European Patent Bulletin (see the decision of the President of the EPO dated 15 July 2014, OJ EPO 2014, A86). Register data may also be obtained by contacting Customer Services: epo.org/service-support/contact-us.html. In exceptional cases, an extract from the Register will be provided on receipt of a substantiated request (see OJ EPO 2019, A15).

5. Issue of certified copies

5.1 Certified copies of documents from the files or of other documents

The EPO will issue on request a certified copy of the European patent application or European patent specification, or of other documents from the files of European patent applications and patents (e.g. an extract from the European Patent Register), provided that the conditions for file inspection (Art. 128(1) to (4)) are fulfilled and, where applicable, an administrative fee has been paid (see the decision of the President of the EPO dated 13 November 2025, OJ EPO 2025, A65). Requests for the above documents are free of charge if made using MyEPO (see A-XI.1 and OJ EPO 2024, A5).

Rule 74

A certified copy of the European patent certificate with specification attached is supplied to the patent proprietor on request (see C-V.12).

5.2 Priority documents issued by the EPO

Rule 54

Any priority document (i.e. the certified copy of the European patent application together with the certificate stating its date of filing) will only be issued to the (original) applicant or that party's successor in title on written request. If such request is missing, the EPO will invite the requester to file it and will supply the certified copy only once this requirement has been fulfilled. In the case of applications filed in a language other than an official EPO language (Art. 14(2)), the priority document relates to the application as originally filed, not to the translation in one of the official EPO languages.

Any priority document issued by the EPO electronically or on paper reflects the application documents as originally filed, including any colour or greyscale content in the drawings, provided they were filed electronically on or after 1 October 2025. This applies also to priority documents that the EPO makes available via the WIPO Digital Access Service (DAS). Offices accessing WIPO-DAS may, however, convert colour or greyscale drawings in the priority documents they retrieve to black and white, according to their practice (see the notice from the EPO dated 5 September 2025, OJ EPO 2025, A57).

The EPO President determines all necessary arrangements, including the form of the priority document and the circumstances in which an administrative fee is payable (see A-XI.1 and the decision of the President of the EPO dated 25 January 2024 revising the Office's fees and expenses, OJ EPO 2024, A5). The content of priority documents corresponds to the application documents as available on the date of filing and as contained in the electronic file (see A-IX.1.2 and 7.1).

Following a request submitted via MyEPO, the certified copy is issued free of charge in electronic format and made available via Mailbox (decision of the President of the EPO dated 16 January 2025, OJ EPO 2025, A3, notice from the EPO dated 16 January 2025, OJ EPO 2025, A7, and technical specifications, OJ EPO 2025, A8).

Where a European patent application claims the priority of a previous European patent application or an international application filed with the EPO as receiving Office under the PCT, a certified copy of the previous application will be included in the file free of charge. Furthermore, if the patent office at which a European priority document is to be filed participates in DAS, it is possible for that office to retrieve the European priority document free of charge via DAS by providing the access code that the EPO generates for every European patent application filed with it and every international application filed with the EPO as receiving Office (see also [A-III, 6.7](#)).

Chapter XII – Euro-PCT applications in the European phase before the EPO as designated/elected Office

1. General remarks on the processing in the European phase

The EPC contains a number of special provisions on the application and implementation of the PCT in the procedure in the European phase. Most of them are laid down in Art. 153 and its Implementing Rules, i.e. Rules 159 to 165 (General Part 3). However, provisions specifically concerning the European phase can also be found elsewhere, e.g. Rules 70a(2) and 141.

Art. 153

Rules 159-165

Chapters A-XII to A-XV give guidance on the practice followed by the EPO when acting as designated/elected Office in the European phase in accordance with these special EPC provisions and the PCT. They focus on formalities examination of Euro-PCT applications in the European phase in so far as it differs from the law and practice applicable to Euro-direct applications. Where the same practice applies to Euro-direct and Euro-PCT applications in the European phase, reference is made to the instructions in the earlier chapters of Part A. Other parts of the Guidelines provide specific instructions on the handling of Euro-PCT applications in the European phase where needed in the context in question, for instance search (Part B) or examination (Part C).

A-XII, 1.1 explains the reasons for the differences in how Euro-direct and Euro-PCT applications are processed in the European grant proceedings. A-XII, 1.2 defines terms relevant for the processing of a Euro-PCT application in the European phase. A-XII, 1.3 refers to some sources of specific information on the processing of Euro-PCT applications in the international phase, because the state of the file at the time an international application enters the European phase affects its processing in the European phase, as is described in A-XII, 1.4.

1.1 Precedence of the PCT and supplementary application of the EPC in the European phase

The principle that the PCT takes precedence, with the EPC applying on a supplementary basis, is explicitly laid down in Art. 150(2). This provision applies to processing before the EPO in both the international and the European phase (General Part 3.2). The fact that, in the absence of a higher-ranking PCT provision, the EPC is to be applied to international applications ensures that applicants are treated equally and receive the same service within the limits set by the PCT.

Art. 150(2)

The supplementary application of the law of the designated/elected Office follows from Art. 11(3) PCT, which states that an international application for which a national/regional office is designated Office "shall have the effect of a regular ... application ... as of the international filing date". Art. 153(2) explicitly confirms this for international applications before the EPO as designated/elected Office.

Art. 11(3) PCT

Art. 153(2)

Art. 27(1) PCT

Art. 28(1) PCT

Art. 41(1) PCT

Rule 49.5 PCT

Art. 150(2)

Rule 161

It follows that any differences in how Euro-direct and Euro-PCT applications are processed in the European grant proceedings must result from the fact that the PCT provisions take precedence. A number of provisions in both the PCT and the EPC implement and ensure the precedence of the PCT. For instance, Rule 49.5(a) PCT lays down the requirements for any translation of the international application that has to be filed pursuant to Rule 159(1)(a) in combination with Art. 22 or Art. 39 PCT (A-XIII, 3). Another example is Rule 161, which implements the right to make amendments on entry into the European phase laid down in Art. 28(1) and Art. 41(1) PCT (A-XIV, 2.1).

Art. 27(1) PCT

Art. 27(7) PCT

Pursuant to Art. 27(1) PCT, the EPO cannot require compliance with requirements "relating to form or contents of the international application different from or additional to those which are provided for in this Treaty and the Regulations". The PCT thereby provides for harmonisation of the patent law in relation to formal requirements. Accordingly, if the requirements for according an "international filing date" under Art. 11 PCT are met, that date is the filing date of the application in all proceedings, including the grant proceedings before the EPO as designated/elected Office. In other words, the "filing date" of a Euro-PCT application is the (international) filing date accorded by the receiving Office under Art. 11 PCT (A-II, 4). Only where it is established that the receiving Office failed to apply the PCT provisions correctly may the international filing date be revised in the European grant proceedings (A-XV, 2). Exceptions to the principle laid down in Art. 27(1) PCT may apply only if the PCT explicitly allows the application of different or additional formal requirements under the law of the designated/elected Offices. Examples of such provisions are Art. 27(7) PCT, which concerns the requirements as regards representation before the designated/elected Offices (A-XII, 5.2), and Art. 27(2) and Rule 51bis PCT, which concern the requirements of the designated Offices in cases of missing information and documents respectively.

Rule 49.5(j) PCT

Art. 27(5) PCT makes it clear that it is only the law on formal requirements laid down in the PCT that takes precedence, by explicitly providing that matters of substantive patent law are the exclusive competence of the designated/elected Offices. Thus, in the European phase, the EPC provisions on the substantive conditions for patentability and any other EPC provisions that are not "requirements relating to form and contents" of applications apply. The instructions in chapters A-XII to A-XV therefore concern matters of form and contents. Since the higher-ranking law in the PCT relates exclusively to these formal requirements, the differences between the grant proceedings for Euro-direct and for Euro-PCT applications are limited to matters of this nature. To the limited extent that the PCT provides for (non-prevailing) substantive patent law, it is mostly in line with the EPC, as is the case, for instance, with the prohibition on extending the disclosure by amendments under Art. 123(2), which is also laid down in the PCT (Art. 28(2), Art. 41(2) PCT).

Subject to the limits set by the principle of precedence, the PCT requires that the designated/elected Offices apply their national/regional law to international applications. Art. 11(3) PCT states that an international application for which a national/regional office is designated Office "shall

have the effect of a regular ... application ... as of the international filing date". The supplementary role of the EPC in the European phase is explicitly expressed in [Art. 153\(2\)](#), which states that a Euro-PCT application is "equivalent to a regular European patent application". These two provisions, together with [Art. 150\(2\)](#), guarantee equal treatment of applicants in the European grant proceedings within the limits set by the PCT. An example of the effect of this principle can be found in [Art. 48\(2\) PCT](#), which requires that the designated/elected Offices allow applicants to benefit from the remedies available under their law to overcome delays in meeting any time limit during processing in the international phase. [Rule 139](#), for instance, may therefore be relied on to correct errors made in the international phase before the EPO as designated/elected Office ([A-XV, 1](#)).

1.2 European phase, designated/elected Office, Euro-PCT application

Proceedings before the EPO for the grant of a European patent, which is a "regional patent" in the terms of the PCT ([Art. 2 PCT](#)), may only start on condition that the EPO as designated/elected Office has become competent to process the application. The basic requirement for the competence of any national/regional office (here, the EPO) is that the applicant has designated it ([Art. 11\(1\) PCT](#)); see [A-XII, 2](#). That is why the PCT uses the term "designated Office" to refer to the national/regional offices in their capacity as granting authority for national/regional patents (see [A-XII, 2.1](#)). The term "elected Office" is used where a designated Office has been elected in a demand for international preliminary examination (see [A-XII, 2.2](#)). The designation of the EPO is implied in the PCT request ([Rule 4.9\(a\)\(i\) and \(ii\) PCT](#)) and its election is implied in the demand ([Rule 53.7 PCT](#)), as further set out in [A-XII, 2.1](#) and [A-XII, 2.2](#).

The grant proceedings before the national and regional patent offices designated/elected by an applicant are referred to as the "national/regional processing" of an international application or the "national/regional phase". The "regional phase" of a Euro-PCT application, i.e. the proceedings for the grant of a European patent, is therefore "the European phase" of an international application. For more information, see [General Part, 3.2](#).

[Art. 2\(vi\) PCT](#)

[Art. 23 PCT](#)

[Art. 40 PCT](#)

In EPO publications, the terms "Euro-direct" and "EP-direct" application are both used to refer to an application filed under the EPC. The term "Euro-PCT application" refers both to the character of the application as one filed under the PCT and to the fact that the EPO is a designated/elected Office for that application ([A-I, 2](#); [General Part, 3](#)). The use of different terms for applications filed under the PCT and the EPC is important in the grant proceedings before the EPO as designated/elected Office, i.e. in the European phase, because of the differences in the applicable law and practice for Euro-PCT and for Euro-direct applications. Any differences must, however, always respect both the principle that the PCT takes precedence and the principle of equal treatment within the limits set by the PCT ([A-XII, 1.1](#)).

1.3 Other parts of the Guidelines relating to Euro-PCT applications

The processing of a Euro-PCT application up to the grant of a European patent is divided into two main procedures: the procedure in the international phase and the procedure in the European phase.

Processing before the EPO in the international phase is dealt with in detail in the PCT-EPO Guidelines. The General Part of the present Guidelines provides some basic information on the procedure in the international phase before the competent receiving Office, the (S)ISA and, if the applicant so wishes, the competent IPEA (General Part, 3.2 and 6.2). The General Part also gives an overview of the procedural steps in the processing of Euro-PCT applications from their filing up to the grant of a European patent that covers both the international and the European phase (General Part, 6). How these applications are processed in the European phase differs depending on the "state of the file" when the international phase ends (A-XII, 1.4), for instance as regards the applicable requirements for effective entry into the European phase under Rule 159.

1.4 Relevance of the international phase for the proceedings in the European phase

Various aspects of the processing in the international phase are important for establishing the applicable procedure in the European phase. In particular, the requirements to be complied with for effective entry into the European phase vary depending on "the state of the file" at the time of entry (A-XII, 4.1). The "state of the file" results from the "characteristics" of both the application (e.g. the language of filing and publication) and the processing in the international phase (e.g. the receiving Office, (S)ISA and IPEA that acted in the international phase). An important factor in the "state of the file" is whether the EPO acted as (S)ISA in the international phase. It is only then that no supplementary European search has to be performed and no search fee under Rule 159(1)(c) is due (A-XIII, 6). The question whether the EPO acted as (S)ISA is also relevant under Rule 161 as regards the filing of amendments in the European phase (A-XIV, 2) and under Rule 164 where the EPO acting as designated/elected Office finds a lack of unity (A-XIV, 5.1).

2. The competence of the EPO as designated/elected Office

The EPO can process the application with a view to granting a European patent only if it is (still) a designated/elected Office at the time the applicant takes the steps necessary to enter the European phase. This requires that the applicant "designated" the EPO at the time of filing the international application, which is regarded as implied in submitting the PCT request. It also means that the designation must not have been "lost" thereafter, as described in A-XII, 2.1.1. That is why the PCT uses the term "designated Office" to refer to the national/regional offices in their role as granting authority. If the EPO was designated and subsequently elected by filing the demand for international preliminary examination, it will – on condition that its election was not lost – act as "elected Office" in the European phase, as set out in A-XII, 2.2.

In addition, the EPO may start acting as a designated/elected Office only if it has become competent to start the processing. For this, the processing

Art. 11(3) PCT
Art. 150(2)
Art. 153(1)

ban must first have been lifted, which, as a rule, takes place on expiry of the 31-month period under Rule 159(1), although there are some exceptions (A-XII, 3.1 and 3.2).

The EPO's competence to act as a designated/elected Office if the PCT applicant was not entitled to file an international application is dealt with in A-XII, 6.1.

Each international application for which the EPO is designated/elected Office is (also) given a European application number, which can be retrieved from the European Patent Register once the international application has been published.

On whether the Receiving Section or the examining division is competent on an application's entry into the European phase, see A-XII, 2.3.

2.1 The EPO as designated Office by default

The proceedings for the grant of a national/regional patent before a national/regional office can only start if the applicant designated that national/regional office at the time of filing the international application. PCT applicants do not have to designate the PCT contracting states for which they wish to file the international application, because both national and, where possible, regional designations of all PCT contracting states are implied in the PCT request ("automatic designation") (Rule 4.9(a)(i) and (iii) PCT). This means that, on receipt of the PCT request, the EPO is a designated Office by default, and that every international application is therefore automatically a "Euro-PCT application", i.e. an international application that has the effect of a Euro-direct application as from the filing date. Accordingly, the proceedings for the grant of a European patent may, in principle, be started at any time after the date of filing (Art. 11(3) PCT) (A-XII, 3.1 and 3.2).

Art. 11(3) PCT
Rule 4.5 PCT
Rule 4.9(a)(i), (iii)
PCT
Art. 153(1)(a)

However, if at the time the applicant enters the European phase the designation of all EPC contracting states for a European patent has been withdrawn, the EPO is no longer a designated Office and cannot start acting as a designated/elected Office, because the international application is no longer a Euro-PCT application under Art. 11(3) PCT. In the rare case where only some EPC contracting states have been withdrawn, the EPO can still act as a designated/elected Office for all EPC contracting states that have not been withdrawn.

Since, at present, all EPC contracting states are also contracting states to the PCT, the EPO is by default a "designated Office" for an international application filed under the PCT in respect of all PCT contracting states that were also contracting states to the EPC at the filing date of the international application (OJ EPO 2014, A33; OJ EPO 2023, A79).

2.1.1 Loss of the designation EP

The EPO is no longer a designated Office in the following cases:

The first case is where the receiving Office declared the international application to be deemed withdrawn under the PCT before its effective

entry into the European phase. To remedy the loss of rights, the applicant must request a review of the receiving Office's finding (A-XV, 2 and 3). If the declaration of deemed withdrawal was notified after the date of effective entry into the European phase, the EPO will be competent in principle to continue processing the application as a European application but will consider the reasons for the declaration and may require the applicant to comply with any requirement not yet met at the time the application entered the European phase.

Rule 90bis PCT

The second case in which the EPO can lose its status as designated/elected Office is where the applicant withdraws either the international application itself or the (regional) designation of the EPO for all or some EPC contracting states in accordance with Rule 90bis PCT before effective entry into the European phase (A-XII, 3.2). In other words, in this case too, it is only if the application effectively entered the European phase before the date of the withdrawal of either the international application or the designation of the EPO (for all or some EPC contracting states) that it can continue to be processed as a European application for any EPC contracting states that were not withdrawn. Once a Euro-PCT application has entered the European phase, the loss of the effect under Art. 11(3) PCT has no legal effect on the European grant proceedings.

A European patent can thus be obtained for an EPC contracting state only if neither the designation of the EPO as regional office nor the international application was withdrawn before the European phase processing started. Subject to certain (strict) conditions, it may be possible to remedy the loss of right ensuing from such a withdrawal (or deemed withdrawal) when entering the European phase (A-XV, 1-3).

Rule 160(3)

Another, more specific exception is laid down in Rule 160(3) and concerns Euro-PCT applications for which the applicant or one of the applicants is a Russian national, a natural person residing in Russia or a legal person, entity or body established in Russia. In this case, the designation of EPC contracting states that are member states of the European Union will be deemed withdrawn on entry into the European phase (OJ EPO 2024, A105 and A106) (A-XIII, 5.1). This provision applies to international patent applications under the PCT entering the European phase before the EPO on or after 25 June 2024, irrespective of the (international) filing date.

When the international application was filed before the date on which the EPC entered into force for a certain PCT contracting state, the European phase cannot be entered as regards the state concerned, and so no European patent with effect for that state can be granted. However, it may be that an extension or validation agreement was in force between the European Patent Organisation and that state on the international filing date. Such an agreement provides for the extension or validation of a European patent application and a European patent to or in the PCT state concerned (see A-III, 12). Thus, the automatic designation of the EPO in the PCT request may – via extension or validation – ultimately result in a national patent for a state that was not an EPC contracting state but (only) a PCT contracting state on the filing date of the international application (A-III, 12;

A-XIII, 5.2). All current extension and validation states are also PCT contracting states.

2.2 The EPO as elected office

All PCT applicants have the option of requesting in accordance with Art. 31 PCT that international preliminary examination be performed in the international phase (General Part, 6.2). Applicants who want preliminary examination must file a PCT demand with a competent IPEA. In the demand form, the national/regional Offices in respect of which the results of the preliminary examination should be taken into account are to be elected. Since the filing of the demand constitutes the election of all PCT contracting states that were designated for a national and, where possible, a regional patent, this requirement will automatically be met in respect of each state that was an EPC contracting state at the international filing date (Rule 53.7 PCT), unless the applicant has withdrawn its election in the meantime (Rule 90bis PCT). If the EPO is both designated and elected Office, the term "elected Office" specifies that a preliminary examination was carried out for the application and is therefore used in the proceedings before the EPO in the European phase. The competence of the EPO as elected Office thus includes its competence as a designated Office.

Art. 31 PCT
Rule 53.7 PCT
Art. 153(1)(b)

If the EPO is no longer a designated Office, it also loses its status as elected Office. For the circumstances where this may happen, see A-XII, 2.1.

2.3 Whether the Receiving Section or the examining division is competent

At the start of the European phase processing, an application falls directly within the competence of the examining division unless a supplementary European search report must be drawn up. A supplementary European search must be performed if the EPO did not perform an international search as (S)ISA in the international phase (A-XIII, 6). In that case, the Receiving Section will be competent on entry into the European phase and will pass the application on to the search division once the formalities examination has been performed (A-XIV, 5).

If no supplementary European search report must be drawn up, the Euro-PCT application immediately falls within the competence of the examining division on effective entry into the European phase and will, after formalities examination, be passed on for substantive examination on condition that a request for examination has been validly filed (A-XIII, 7; A-XIV, 3 and 6).

3. Competence of the EPO to start the European phase processing

Before the end of the international phase, applicants must decide whether and where they want to proceed with their international application in the national/regional phase and take the required steps (Art. 22(1) or Art. 39(1)(a) PCT). In respect of the EPO as designated/elected Office, applicants must comply with the requirements laid down in Rule 159, which are usually referred to as the "minimum requirements". It follows from Rule 159 that "entry into the European phase" is not an act in itself but a series of acts to be performed (A-XII, 4.3).

Art. 22 PCT
Art. 23(1) PCT
Art. 39 PCT
Art. 40(1) PCT
Rule 159

However, even if an applicant has taken the required steps for entry into the European phase, the processing by the EPO as designated/elected Office may and will start only on condition that the EPO is competent to do so

(A-XII, 3.2). For this, the "processing ban" must first have been lifted (see A-XII, 3.1). The processing ban is most commonly lifted by expiry of the 31-month period laid down in Rule 159(1), as is set out in detail in A-XII, 3.2. However, there are two other cases in which the EPO may become competent to start the processing as designated/elected Office before expiry of the 31-month period (see A-XII, 3.1).

3.1 Processing ban – lifting the ban

Art. 23(1) PCT
Art. 40(1) PCT
Rule 159(1)

The prohibition preventing the EPO as designated/elected Office from starting processing in the national/regional phase until the international phase has come to an end is referred to as the "processing ban". This ban, laid down in Art. 23(1) PCT and Art. 40(1) PCT, guarantees that applicants have a period of at least 30 months from the filing date or the earliest priority date to decide whether and before which offices they wish to enter the national/regional phase. The priority date is defined in Art. 2(xi) PCT.

The EPO has extended the guaranteed period for entry into the European phase from 30 to 31 months from the filing date or the earliest priority date, as is laid down in Rule 159(1) (A-XII, 3.2). As a consequence of the processing ban, any time limit under the EPC that applies to a Euro-PCT application and that would expire before the end of the 31-month period under Rule 159(1) is deferred and will expire at the end of that period at the latest; see, for instance, Rule 159(1)(d), (f) and (g).

Art. 23(2) PCT
Art. 40(2) PCT

For the EPO as designated/elected Office, the processing ban is lifted by expiry of the 31-month period set in Rule 159(1) at the latest, i.e. by the lapse of the time (A-XII, 3.2). It may be lifted earlier – so that the European phase processing will start before expiry of the 31-month period – if a valid request for early processing is filed, that is, an explicit request from the applicant for an early start of the European phase processing, as provided for in Art. 23(2) and Art. 40(2) PCT (A-XII, 7.1).

Art. 24(2) PCT
Art. 25(2) PCT

If the international application is deemed withdrawn or is not accorded a filing date during the international phase, the international phase processing stops on the date of legal effect of the notification informing the applicant that the application is deemed withdrawn or could not be accorded a filing date (Art. 11(1) PCT). There is thus no (pending) application to which the processing ban could apply. However, the procedures under Art. 25(2) PCT and Art. 24(2) PCT may allow applicants to "save" their application under the national/regional law of the designated/elected Office(s). For the procedure under Art. 25(2) PCT, short time limits apply. These procedures and the applicable requirements are dealt with in more detail in A-XV, 2 and 3.

The processing ban prohibits the EPO as designated/elected Office from requiring that an applicant comply with any requirement until it has been lifted. It does not prohibit the EPO from performing purely administrative acts, such as adding documents to the file and, if applicable, recording the

European representative appointed for the European phase. These acts are important to ensure fast and correct processing, and that correspondence is notified as soon as possible after the processing ban has been lifted.

3.2 Start of the European phase processing – the 31-month period under Rule 159(1)

The end of the international phase is defined in Art. 22(1) PCT and Art. 39(1)(a) PCT, which provide that, unless a longer period applies under the national law of the designated/elected Office, the international phase will not end before expiry of 30 months from the filing date or, if priority has been claimed, from the earliest priority date. As laid down in Rule 159(1), the EPO has extended this 30-month time limit by one month in accordance with Art. 22(3) PCT and Art. 39(1)(b) PCT. The international phase in respect of the EPO as designated/elected Office thus ends 31 months after the applicable date, i.e. the filing date or the earliest priority date.

*Art. 22 PCT
Art. 39 PCT
Rule 159*

The 31-month period under Rule 159(1) applies irrespective of whether a demand for international preliminary examination was filed. Due to their different legal nature, the individual acts required under Rule 159(1) do not form a unitary procedural step but are legally independent and so not subject to one and the same but rather to independent time limits (A-XII, 4.2, E-VIII, 2). This is clear from Rule 159(1) itself, which states that a longer time limit may apply (e.g. Rule 159(1)(f)).

Rules 131, 133 and 134(1), (2) and (5) are applicable to the 31-month period for entry into the European phase under Rule 159(1) (E-VIII, 1.6.2.3).

The date of filing referred to in Rule 159(1) is that accorded under the PCT by the PCT authority which acted as the receiving Office, unless that date is corrected as a result of a review by the EPO as designated/elected Office under, in particular, Art. 24 PCT, Art. 25 PCT or Rule 82ter PCT (A-II, 4; A-XII, 3.2; A-XV, 2 to 4).

*Art. 24(2) PCT
Art. 25(2) PCT
Rule 82ter PCT*

For the applicable priority date in cases of errors or omissions in claiming the (earliest) priority, see A-XV, 4 and 5.

Applicants wishing to obtain a European patent will mostly make full use of the 31-month period and will not take the steps required to enter the European phase until shortly before its expiry. As regards starting the European phase earlier, see A-XII, 7.1 on making a request for early processing and A-XV, 2 on cases where European phase processing must start earlier owing to a loss of rights in the international phase.

4. Indicating the wish to enter the European phase – minimum requirements and further requirements for entry into the European phase

Once the EPO has established its competence to process a Euro-PCT application (A-XII, 3), it must verify whether all applicable minimum requirements for entry into the European phase are complied with.

The requirements that must be fulfilled for entry into the European phase to take effect are known as the "minimum requirements" and are provided for in Rule 159. For a general overview of the minimum requirements, see A-XII, 4.3. Each of the minimum requirements is dealt with in more detail in A-XIII, 3 to 8.

Applicants are advised to inform the EPO of their wish to enter the European phase by submitting EPO Form 1200 (A-XII, 4.1). The applicable procedure if no indication of their wish is received, i.e. where the minimum requirements are not (fully) complied with, is dealt with in A-XII, 4.2.

At the time of entry into the European phase, the applicant must also have complied with the applicable "further requirements", in particular those dealt with in Rule 163 (A-XII, 4.4). The formalities examination at the start of the processing in the European phase encompasses all checks required to verify whether both the minimum and the further requirements are complied with.

Further, if there was a loss of rights or any error or omission in the international phase, the possible means of remedying the loss of rights or correcting the error or omission under the provisions of the EPC must be considered as early as possible. In some cases, the applicant will need to request early processing to be able to benefit from a remedy under the EPC or the PCT, e.g. a request under Rule 56 or 56a (A-XV, 6). In other cases, the remedy must be requested within very short deadlines set in the PCT, e.g. the one-month time limit for requesting restoration of priority before the EPO as designated/elected Office under Rule 49ter PCT (A-XV, 5).

The EPO as designated/elected Office will inform the applicant in cases where it detects an error or other deficiency. However, applicants cannot rely on the EPO detecting every deficiency. Moreover, it may happen that a deficiency is detected and/or notified only after expiry of the time limit for invoking a certain remedy (A-XV, 1). For example, a request for restoration of priority in the procedure before the EPO as designated/elected Office in accordance with Rule 49ter.2 PCT must be made within one month of the effective date of (early) entry into the European phase or, if the application is deemed withdrawn because one of the applicable minimum requirements was not met, together with a request for further processing or for re-establishment of rights in relation to the time limit for requesting further processing (A-XV, 5). However, the EPO may not have established and notified a deficiency in time for the applicant to remedy it within the applicable time limit. In such cases, the applicant cannot invoke the lack of notification: ultimate responsibility for requesting a legal remedy within the applicable time limit lies with the applicant.

4.1 Procedure on receipt of an indication that the applicant wishes to initiate the European phase – EPO Form 1200

Although entry into the European phase does not depend on the use of a specific form (Rule 49.5 PCT), but rather (only) on compliance with the minimum requirements, the EPO strongly recommends that applicants always submit EPO Form 1200 (A-XII, 4).

Rule 49.5 PCT

The guidance provided in EPO Form 1200 helps applicants to avoid omissions and mistakes. For instance, the form includes a preselected box for the examination request. The requirement to submit a written request in order for the payment of the examination fee to take effect under Rule 159(1)(f) and Art. 94(2) (A-XIII, 7) is thus fulfilled automatically.

EPO Form 1200 and any other document filed for purposes of the proceedings in the European phase must be filed with the EPO; they must not be sent to the IB or to an authority of an EPC contracting state.

EPO Form 1200 is available in Online Filing 2.0 or can be downloaded in PDF format free of charge from the EPO website (epo.org). For more details on the available filing methods, see A-VIII, 2.5. The basic filing fee is lower where EPO Form 1200 is filed online (Art. 2(1), item 1, RFees) (A-XIII, 4.1).

On expiry of the 31-month time limit, the EPO will verify whether the applicant has complied with the applicable minimum requirements for entry into the European phase (A-XII, 4.3) and the applicable further requirements (A-XII, 4.4) that must be fulfilled within the 31-month time limit.

If the applicable minimum requirements are fulfilled and entry into the European phase is thus effective, the EPO will as a rule inform the applicant of this only in the communication under Rules 161 and 162 (A-XIV, 2.1). However, if the EPO establishes that a request for early processing is effective, the applicant is notified of the date of its effect by separate communication (A-XII, 7.1).

The legal consequences of full or partial compliance with the minimum requirements for effective entry into the European phase are dealt with in A-XIII, 9.

4.2 Procedure if European phase is not initiated

As a rule, applicants will ensure the start of the European phase processing by complying with the applicable minimum requirements shortly before expiry of the 31-month period laid down in Rule 159(1) (A-XII, 4.1). Once the 31-month period has expired, the processing ban is lifted and the EPO as designated/elected Office will start to process the application as a European patent application in accordance with Art. 11(3) PCT and Art. 153(2) (A-XII, 3.1).

Art. 11(3) PCT
Art. 153(2)
Rule 159(1)

If, on expiry of the 31-month period, the EPO has not received any indication that the applicant wishes to start the European grant proceedings or the applicable minimum requirements for entry into the European phase have not been complied with, the application is deemed withdrawn. The applicant is notified of this in a combined communication under Rules 160 and 112 concerning the loss of rights. This means that entry into the European phase will not take effect unless and until such time as the applicant remedies the loss of rights (A-XIII, 9.2). The remedies available for each of the requirements are dealt with in A-XIII, 3-8. The special aspects to be considered if more than just one requirement was not fulfilled

Art. 24(1)(iii) PCT
Art. 39(2) PCT
Rule 160

in due time are dealt with in A-XIII, 9.2. If the loss of rights is not remedied, the application will cease to have effect as a European patent application in accordance with Art. 11(3) PCT and Art. 153(2).

4.3 Minimum requirements for entry into the European phase

Rule 159(1)

All minimum requirements that, depending on the application, may be applicable are laid down in Rule 159(1). "Entry into the European phase" is not one single act but a series of individual acts to be performed. Due to their different legal nature, these required acts do not form a unitary procedural step but are legally independent and subject to independent time limits laid down in Rule 159.

Some of the requirements listed in Rule 159(1) are, strictly speaking, not minimum requirements for effective entry into the European phase, because their non-compliance does not result in a loss of rights which blocks such entry into the European phase and, as a result, the start of the European grant proceedings:

- Rule 159(1)(b): Filing a specification of the application documents on which the European grant proceedings are to be based as required under Rule 159(1)(b). If no specification is filed, there is no legal consequence, but the EPO will take all amendments received via the IB and from the applicant as the basis for the proceedings. This may result in payment of an incorrect filing fee owing to the pages that the EPO then takes into account to establish the page fee (A-XII, 5.3).
- Rule 159(1)(h): Filing a certificate of exhibition required under Rule 159(1)(h) in combination with Art. 55(2). If a certificate is not filed, this (only) affects the relevant prior art taken into account in the European phase. So, although this requirement has to be complied with within the 31-month period, a failure to do so does not block the start of the processing in the European phase (A-XIII, 11.6).

The applicable minimum requirements for effective entry into the European phase vary depending on the state of the file at the time of entry into the European phase. If any of the minimum requirements in the list below expires on the 31-month time limit, it must be complied with for effective entry into the European phase:

- supply the translation pursuant to Rule 159(1)(a) if the Euro-PCT application was not published by the IB (international publication) in one of the EPO's official languages (A-XIII, 3)
- pay the filing fee provided for in Art. 78(2), including the additional fee for applications with more than 35 pages, pursuant to Rule 159(1)(c) (A-XIII, 4)
- pay the designation fee pursuant to Rule 159(1)(d) (and any extension or validation fees) if the period under Rule 39 has expired earlier (A-XIII, 5)

- pay the search fee pursuant to Rule 159(1)(e) if a supplementary European search report is to be drawn up (A-XIII, 6)
- file the request for examination and pay the examination fee pursuant to Rule 159(1)(f) if the period under Rule 70(1) has expired earlier (A-XIII, 7)
- pay the renewal fee for the third year pursuant to Rule 159(1)(g) if the period under Rule 51(1) has expired earlier. If the due date is missed, the applicant may still pay the renewal fee with an additional fee under Rule 51(2) (A-XIII, 8).

Due to the different legal nature of the various minimum requirements, a remedy is required for each one not complied with in due time. Each minimum requirement is therefore set out separately, together with its legal consequences and the available remedy in cases of non-observance in due time, in A-XIII, 2 to 9. A-XIII, 9.2 addresses some aspects of non-compliance with several minimum requirements.

If an applicable minimum requirement is not complied with, the application is deemed withdrawn under Rule 160 (A-XIII, 3-8). However, non-payment of the renewal fee due at the expiry of the 31-month period does not result immediately in a deemed withdrawal of the application, but only if the renewal fee due is not paid in accordance with Rule 51(2) within the six-month time limit (Art. 86(1)) (A-XIII, 8; A-X, 5.2.4).

Once the application has effectively entered the European phase, a divisional application may be filed, because the application is considered pending before the EPO as designated/elected Office as from the date of entry (G 1/09, Reasons 3.2.5; J 18/09). To ensure the Euro-PCT application is not deemed withdrawn at the time a divisional application is filed, the applicable requirements of Rule 159(1) must therefore be fulfilled (A-XIII, 9.1.2; A-IV, 1). On the further effects of full or partial compliance with the minimum requirements, see A-XIII, 9.

4.4 Further requirements to be complied with on entry into the European phase

The second group of requirements that, where applicable, must be fulfilled within the 31-month period are referred to as the "further" requirements for entry into the European phase. The main difference between further requirements and minimum requirements is that a further requirement is due on entry into the European phase but the application will not be immediately deemed withdrawn, if it is not complied with. This means that non-compliance with a further requirement does not block the start of the grant proceedings before the EPO as designated/elected Office. It also means that non-compliance with further requirements does not prevent a request for early processing from having effect (A-XII, 6.2) or a divisional application from being filed (A-XIII, 9.1.2; A-IV, 1).

However, after the start of the processing in the European phase, non-compliance with a further requirement may result in a loss of rights, e.g. refusal of the application or loss of the priority right under Rule 163(6). The

Rule 163(6)

consequences of non-compliance are set out for each of the further requirements in [A-XIII, 11](#).

Moreover, non-compliance with a further requirement within the 31-month period may result in a delay in starting search or examination because the formalities officer will only refer the file to the search division for drawing up the supplementary European search report or, where the supplementary European search is dispensed with, to the examining division for substantive examination, on condition that it can be dealt with.

Depending on the circumstances of the application, the applicant may have to comply with the following further requirements, i.e. complete one or more of the following acts, within the 31-month period.

- [Rule 163\(1\)](#) – file the designation of the inventor ([A-XIII, 11.1](#))
- [Rule 163\(2\)](#) – furnish the file number or the certified copy of the application(s) from which priority is claimed ([A-XII, 5.4](#); [A-XIII 11.2](#))
- [Rule 163\(3\)](#) – furnish a sequence listing complying with the standard ([A-XII, 5.6](#); [A-XIII, 11.3](#))
- [Rule 163\(4\)](#) – furnish the details mentioned in [Rule 163\(4\)](#) for each applicant ([A-XII, 6.1](#); [A-XIII, 11.4](#))
- [Rule 163\(5\)](#)
[Art. 133\(2\)](#) – appoint a professional representative ([A-XII, 6.2](#); [A-XIII, 11.5](#))
- [Rule 159\(1\)\(h\)](#) – where applicable, file the certificate of exhibition mentioned in [Art. 55\(2\)](#) ([A-XIII, 11.6](#))
- [Rule 141](#) – furnish a copy of the results of any search carried out by or on behalf of the authority with which the priority application was filed ([A-III, 6.12](#); [A-XIII, 11.7](#))
- [Rule 162\(1\)](#) – pay any claims fees due ([A-XII, 5.3.1](#); [A-XIII, 11.8](#); [A-XIV, 2.2](#)).

5. Documents making up the basis for processing in the European phase, the language of the proceedings, priority claims and further documents

The documents serving as the basis for the European phase processing will depend on the circumstances. Some documents will always be included, whereas other documents are optional and must be specified by the applicant ([A-XII, 5.2](#) and [5.3](#)). Whether or not translations of any documents need to be filed depends on the language of the proceedings (see [A-XII, 5.1](#) and [A-XIII, 3](#)).

Of the documents that must, or may, serve as the basis for the European phase processing, there are some that must be filed by the applicant and others that need not – and indeed should not – be filed by them ([A-XII, 5.2](#) and [5.3](#)). See [A-XII, 5.3](#) as regards the requirement under [Rule 159\(1\)\(b\)](#) to specify the documents that should serve as the basis for processing in the

European phase. On the requirements to be met if the applicant wishes to proceed on the basis of amendments to the application documents in the European phase, see [A-XII, 5.3.1](#) and [A-XIV, 2](#). On claiming priority and the requirements as to the priority document and, where applicable, its translation before the EPO as designated/elected Office, see [A-XII, 5.4](#) and [A-XIII, 11.2](#).

Having due regard to the precedence of the PCT, the EPO will check whether the application documents received as the basis for the European phase processing, including any translations of such documents, comply with the applicable requirements ([A-XII, 5.5](#)). The examination will also extend to checking for any prohibited matter ([A-XII, 5.5.1](#)).

In the case of applications concerning nucleotide or amino acid sequences or referring to biological material, the EPO will check whether the special requirements for such applications are complied with ([A-XII, 6](#) and [7](#); [A-XIII, 3](#)). On the requirement to file a designation of inventor, see [A-XIII, 11.1](#). On the requirement to file the certificate of exhibition under [Rule 159\(1\)\(h\)](#), see [A-XIII, 6](#). The requirement to file documents in accordance with [Rule 141](#) is dealt with in [A-XIII, 11.7](#).

5.1 Language of the proceedings

The language of the proceedings may be chosen by the applicant only if the international application was not published by the IB in the international phase in an official language of the EPO. If it was published in the international phase in an official language of the EPO, it is not possible to change the language of the proceedings on entry into the European phase by filing a translation of it into one of the other two official languages of the EPO ([G 4/08](#)). Nor is a change of language allowed where the applicant filed a translation of the application into an official EPO language with the EPO as IPEA under [Rule 55.2\(a\) PCT](#), e.g. where the Spanish Patent Office acted as ISA and the EPO as IPEA.

[Art. 153\(3\)](#)

[Art. 150\(2\)](#)

[Art. 14\(3\)](#)

[Rule 3\(2\)](#)

In such cases, the language of the proceedings within the meaning of [Art. 14\(3\)](#) remains the language in which it was published by the IB or received by the EPO as IPEA. If a translation is filed on entry, the applicant will be informed that this translation will not be taken as the basis for processing in the European phase and that the application as published and received from the IB will serve as the basis for the proceedings in the European phase ([Art. 153\(3\)](#) and [Art. 150\(2\)](#)).

If the applicant is allowed to choose a language of the proceedings on entry into the European phase, the EPO will examine whether the requirements for translations under [Art. 153\(4\)](#) in combination with [Rule 159\(1\)\(a\)](#) are met ([A-XIII, 3](#)). If a translation must be filed, the language of the translation filed determines the language of the proceedings before the EPO.

If, on entry into the European phase, amendments are filed with the EPO as designated/elected Office which are not in the language of the proceedings, the applicant is informed that they are not duly filed and that they will not serve as the basis for the European phase ([Rule 3\(2\)](#), [Art. 14\(4\)](#), [Art. 153\(2\)](#) and [Art. 150\(2\)](#)) ([A-XII, 5.4](#); [A-XIII, 3](#)).

Rule 12.3 PCT
Rule 12.4 PCT
Art. 153(4)
Art. 14(2)
Rule 159(1)(a)

A translation of the application, whether filed on entry into the European phase under Art. 153(4) in combination with Rule 159(1), or in the international phase for the purpose of search or publication (Rules 12.3 and 12.4 PCT), may always be brought into conformity with the application as filed during the European grant proceedings. The conditions set out in A-VII.7 apply.

Art. 22(1) PCT
Art. 39(1)(a) PCT
Art. 20(1)(a) PCT
Art. 19 PCT
Art. 17(2) PCT
Rule 49.1(a-bis) PCT
Rule 47.1 PCT
Rule 44bis.1 and 2(a) PCT

5.2 Documents that need not be filed by the applicant

By the end of the international phase, the IB will have provided the EPO with various documents relating to the application and the international phase processing, and so these documents do not need to be filed by the applicant. However, depending on the case, the applicant may be required under Art. 153(4) in combination with Rule 159(1)(a) to file translations of certain documents provided by the IB (A-XII.5.1; A-XIII.3).

The EPO does not require the applicant to furnish a copy of the international application under Art. 22(1) or Art. 39(1)(a). Since the EPO has not made use of the waiver referred to in Art. 20(1)(a) PCT, the IB will provide the EPO with a copy of the international application as published, together with the ISR and the WO-ISA/IPRP Chapter I (Rule 44bis.1 PCT). Where applicable, the ISR, or any declaration under Art. 17(2)(a) PCT replacing the ISR, will include an indication that the application relates to subject-matter that the ISA need not and does not search, or that no meaningful search could be carried out (Art. 17(2)(a)(i) and (ii) PCT).

Art. 19 PCT
Art. 20(2) PCT
Rule 47.1(c) PCT

If amendments have been filed under Art. 19 PCT, the copy transmitted by the IB under Art. 20 PCT also includes these amendments and any statement the applicant has made on them (Art. 20(2) PCT). The IB will also transmit any informal comments received from the applicant in response to the WO-ISA at 30 months from the filing date or the earliest priority date. The IB will notify the applicant of the transmittal of these documents to the EPO as designated/elected office and the applicant should not file any of these documents with the EPO (Rule 47.1(c) PCT).

Art. 36(3)(a) and (b) PCT
Rule 73.1 PCT
Rule 73.2 PCT

Where a demand for international preliminary examination is filed, the IB transmits the IPER, including any annexes (in the original language), to the EPO as elected Office. The IB will notify the applicant of this, and the applicant should not file any of these documents with the EPO. However, the applicant must ensure that a translation of any annexes to the IPER is submitted if they are not available to the EPO in the language of the proceedings in the European phase (A-XII.5.1; A-XIII.3).

Art. 20(3) PCT
Art. 36(4) PCT
Art. 42 PCT

The EPO as designated Office will obtain on request any documents mentioned in the ISR from the ISA. Where new documents are cited in the IPER that were not cited in the ISR, they may be attached as an annex to the IPER in their original language (Art. 36(4) PCT, Art. 20(3) PCT). The EPO is not authorised to require that the applicant furnish copies, or information on the contents, of any papers connected with the examination relating to the same application in any other elected Office (Art. 42 PCT).

Art. 20 PCT

The EPO does not require the applicant to furnish a copy of the international application, even if the IB has not yet communicated a copy

under Art. 20 PCT at the time the application enters the European phase (PCT Gazette 14/1986, 2367). However, if the EPO is acting as designated Office and the IB has not yet transmitted a copy of the international application, the ISR and the IPRP, the applicant may – e.g. at the time of filing a request for early processing (A-XII, 7.1) – file a request with the IB for such a copy. The applicant may proceed in the same manner and submit a request to the IB if the EPO is acting as elected Office and the IB has not yet sent it a copy of the international application, the ISR, the IPRP or the IPER with its annexes.

5.3 Documents that must be filed by the applicant – specification under Rule 159(1)(b)

It is the applicant's responsibility to file any documents which are not available to the EPO but which the applicant wants the EPO to take into account in the European grant proceedings.

Rule 159(1)(b)

An example of a "required document" in this context is a translation of the application under Art. 153(4) and Rule 159(1)(a) in all cases where the international application was not published in one of the official languages of the EPO (Rule 159(1)(a)) (A-XIII, 3). Translations of the annexes to the IPER are also required documents and must be submitted by the applicant if they are not available to the EPO in the language of the proceedings in the European phase (A-XIII, 3).

An example of an "optional document" is a translation of any amendments under Art. 19 PCT that were not published in an official language of the EPO (A-XII, 5.2). If amendments filed under Art. 19 PCT are not available to the EPO in the language of the proceedings, they will not be taken into account (A-XIII, 3). A further "optional document" is an amended set of claims filed with the EPO as designated/elected Office for the European grant proceedings under Rule 161 (A-XIV, 2).

Although Rule 159(1)(b) requires the applicant to specify the documents on which they wish the European phase processing to be based, non-compliance with this requirement does not result in the application being deemed withdrawn under Rule 160 or in another loss of rights. However, compliance with this requirement is in the interest of both the EPO and the applicant because it ensures that processing is not based on the wrong set of documents. In particular, non-compliance with Rule 159(1)(b) may result in non-compliance with the requirement to pay the (correct) additional page fee and, consequently, to a deemed withdrawal of the application under Rule 160 (A-XIII, 4). The additional fee is part of the filing fee and must be paid for each Euro-PCT application comprising more than 35 pages in accordance with Rule 159(1)(c) (A-XIII, 4).

Rule 159(1)(b)

If the applicant does not specify the application documents on which the European grant proceedings are to be based, the international application as published, as well as any amendments made in the international phase, are all taken as the basis for the proceedings. The additional fee to be paid for an application comprising more than 35 pages will be calculated on the basis of the international application as published; any amendment pages filed under Art. 19 PCT and/or Art. 34 PCT are also taken into account for

calculating the additional fee, unless the applicant has specified that the European phase processing is not to be based on these pages. For information on the additional fee, see A-XIII, 4.

Applicants should preferably indicate the documents on which the proceedings in the European phase are to be based in section 6 of EPO Form 1200. Any further details may be provided on an additional sheet. This information should correspond to any indications given in the table/section provided for the calculation of the additional (page) fee to be paid for applications comprising more than 35 pages (A-XIII, 4).

If there are inconsistencies in the information provided in EPO Form 1200, the applicant will be informed: even if an inconsistency does not affect the page fee to be paid, it cannot be excluded that there is an error in the information provided, which will result in an incorrect basis for the European phase processing.

If the applicant has filed test reports (e.g. comparative examples in support of inventive step) with the EPO as IPEA and has used EPO Form 1200, the EPO will consider that the applicant has agreed to the use of these reports in the European grant proceedings. In all other cases the applicant is invited to submit these reports for use in the European phase. See also A-XIV, 6.3.1.

5.3.1 Amendments as the basis for European phase processing

Under Rule 161, applicants are entitled to submit amendments for the proceedings before the EPO as designated/elected Office as often as they want until expiry of the period under Rules 161 and 162 (A-XIV, 1). However, applicants are advised to submit any amendments that they wish to be part of the basis for the European phase processing, in particular any amendments to the claims, within the 31-month period, since this helps to avoid a loss of rights for non-payment of the (correct) claims fees under Rule 162 (A-XII, 5.2, A-XIV, 2.2). Any amendment filed with the EPO as designated/elected Office must be in the language of the proceedings in the European phase (Art. 28(4) and Art. 41(3) PCT).

Furthermore, if applicants want to speed up the European phase processing, they should consider waiving the right to the communication under Rules 161 and 162 by paying any claims fees due and correcting any deficiencies noted in the written opinion of the EPO as (S)ISA or IPEA as soon as the application enters this phase (see A-XII, 7.2).

5.4 Priority claim and priority right in the proceedings before the EPO as designated/elected Office

An international application may claim the priority of an earlier application that was filed in any state party to the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property or for any member of the World Trade Organization. Any claim to priority made for an international application thus relates to the date, or dates, claimed under the PCT (A-III, 6.7). In the proceedings before the EPO as designated/elected Office, the priority application is (also) referred to as the "previous application" in line with the terminology used in the EPC.

Art. 28(4) PCT
Art. 41(3) PCT
Rule 161
Rule 162

Art. 87
Rule 17.1 PCT
Rule 17.2 PCT

The applicant in the proceedings before the EPO as designated/elected Office must (also) be the same as the applicant of the priority application or their successor in title. Any transfer of the priority right is distinct from a possible transfer of the priority application and must be assessed under the EPC, regardless of any national laws. The EPC does not set out any formal requirements for a transfer of the priority right (G 1/22 and G 2/22) (A-III, 6.1, and F-VI). Furthermore, where the subsequent Euro-PCT application is filed by joint applicants, it is sufficient that one of them is the previous application's applicant or their successor in title. Especially where an international application is filed by joint applicants, including the priority applicant, but without naming the priority applicant as applicant for the European designation, the mere fact of the joint filing implies an agreement between the applicants allowing all of them to rely on the priority right unless substantial facts indicate otherwise (G 1/22 and G 2/22). Further information is provided in A-III, 6.1 and F-VI. A translation of a priority claim only needs to be filed with the EPO in certain cases described in A-XIII, 11.2.1.

On entry into the European phase, the applicant may need to file the results of any search carried out by or on behalf of the office of first filing for each application whose priority is claimed (A-XIII, 11.7; A-III, 6.12).

Rule 141

If the international application was filed outside the priority period, a request for restoration of the right of priority may have to be (re)filed with the EPO as designated/elected Office in accordance with Rule 49ter.2 PCT (A-XV, 5).

Rule 49ter.2 PCT

The file number of the priority application, if known at the time of filing the international application, is to be provided in Box VI of the PCT request. The applicant is required to provide the file number and to submit a certified copy of the priority application to the receiving Office or the IB during the international phase, i.e. within 16 months of the (earliest) priority date, so that both will be available to the EPO on entry into the European phase. The requirement is also met if the applicant requests the receiving Office to issue and furnish to the IB the priority document under Rule 17.1(b) PCT or requests the IB to retrieve it under Rule 17.1(b-bis) PCT.

Rule 17.1 PCT

Rule 17.2 PCT

Rule 53(2)

Rule 163(2)

In accordance with Rule 17.2 PCT, the EPO will ask the IB for a copy of the priority document. The IB will provide the EPO with this copy promptly, but not earlier than international publication, or, where the applicant has requested early processing, not earlier than the date of the request (A-XII, 7.1). In most cases, the IB provides the EPO with a copy of the previous application, i.e. the priority document, prior to expiry of the 31-month period. The IB will also upload the priority document to its PATENTSCOPE database, where it can be accessed by the EPO as soon as the international application is published. If the EPO receives the priority document from the IB or has access to it via PATENTSCOPE, the applicant does not need to furnish it to the EPO again.

Rule 17.2 PCT

The procedure under Rule 163(2) is to follow if a certified copy of the priority document or the file number of the priority application is not on file within the 31-month period is set out in A-XIII, 11.2.

5.5 Precedence of the PCT provisions on physical requirements to be met by application documents and translations

Art. 27(1) PCT

Rule 4.3 PCT

Rule 11 PCT

Art. 90(3) and (5)

Rule 58

Compliance of an international application with the PCT requirements as to form and content is, as a rule, ascertained during the international phase. The EPO checks Euro-PCT applications entering the European phase for compliance with the PCT formal requirements. The EPO is bound by the PCT and therefore must not accept an omission or evidently erroneous application of any PCT provision in the international phase. Since the PCT provisions as to form and content take precedence, the EPO will request the correction of any non-compliant documents under the PCT provision – rather than the EPC provisions – not complied with (A-XII, 1.1). This means that if the physical requirements stipulated in Rule 11 PCT have not been complied with, the EPO will issue a communication indicating the deficiencies and invite the applicant to correct them within a time limit of two months under Rule 58. If the requirements are not fulfilled in due time, the application will be refused under Art. 90(3) unless the EPC provides for another sanction (Art. 90(5)). Another example concerns the title of the invention of the international application. The title need only meet the less demanding requirements of Rule 4.3 PCT, i.e. only the PCT requirement must be met, not the requirements for Euro-direct applications (A-III, 7.1 and A-III, 7.2).

5.5.1 Prohibited statements

Art. 21(6) PCT

As prohibited statements or matter may not necessarily be omitted under Art. 21(6) PCT, the application must be examined on entry into the European phase to ensure that the provisions under the EPC are complied with (A-III, 8). Where the EPO is informed by the IB that statements or matter were omitted from the international application, as published, the Receiving Section must ensure that the corresponding material is excluded from any translation furnished by the applicant (A-XIII, 3).

5.6 Special requirements for applications referring to nucleotide or amino acid sequences

Rule 5.2 PCT

Rule 13ter.3 PCT

Pursuant to Rule 13ter.3 PCT, where the Euro-PCT application discloses nucleotide or amino acid sequences, a sequence listing in electronic form drawn up in compliance with the applicable WIPO standard must be available to the EPO as designated/elected Office on expiry of the 31-month period.

As a rule, such a sequence listing will be available to the EPO if it was contained in the international application under Rule 5.2 PCT or filed under Rule 13ter PCT with the EPO acting as (S)ISA or IPEA. It will also be accessible to the EPO if it is made available by WIPO on PATENTSCOPE and can be downloaded in a usable form.

Rule 163(3)

Rule 30(3)

The applicant should verify in due time whether the sequence listing is available to the EPO in the required format. If it is not available to the EPO, the applicant must file it before expiry of the 31-month period in the applicable electronic format, preferably via one of the EPO's online filing tools or, if not, on an electronic data carrier (A-IV, 5). If the required sequence listing is not filed, the procedure under Rule 163(3) and Rule 30(3) applies (A-XIII, 11.3).

Sequence listings must not be filed on paper or in PDF format, as is set out in the decision of the President of the EPO dated 14 November 2025 (OJ EPO 2025, A64) and in point 6 of the notice from the EPO dated 9 December 2021 (OJ EPO 2021, A97).

Where a sequence listing has been filed or corrected after the filing date, the applicant is required to submit a statement that it does not include matter going beyond the content of the application as filed. This statement can be made by selecting the appropriate checkbox in EPO Form 1200.

5.7 Special requirements concerning applications referring to biological material before the EPO as designated/elected Office

If an international application refers to biological material, the specific requirements for the sufficient disclosure of the invention must be complied with in the international phase.

Rule 31

If the requirements for the sufficient disclosure of the invention have not been met in the international phase, no remedy is available before the EPO as designated/elected Office on entry into the European phase (OJ EPO 2010, 498). If, however, on filing the international application, a reference to the deposit of biological material complying with Rule 31 has been made, but no proof of the deposit in the form of a copy of the deposit receipt issued by the depositary institution was submitted, the applicant is strongly advised to submit such a receipt copy on entry into the European phase. See also A-IV, 4 and F-III, 6.5.

If the Euro-PCT application was not published by the IB in an official language of the EPO, the biological material referred to in the application is available on request to any person (only) from the date of publication of the translation by the EPO. In this case, if the applicant files the statement under Rule 32(1) before the technical preparations for publication of the translation by the EPO are completed, the biological material concerned will be made available only by the issue of a sample to an independent expert nominated by the requester (A-IV, 4.3).

Rule 32(1)

6. Information on the applicant(s), persons entitled to act in the European phase and representation

6.1 Information concerning the applicant(s) – missing entitlement

If there is more than one applicant and the address, nationality or state of residence or principal place of business has not been provided for one or more of them in the international phase, that information must be provided within the 31-month period. If this requirement is not complied with, the procedure under Rule 163(4) applies (A-XIII, 11.4).

Art. 27(2)(ii) PCT
Rule 51bis.1(a)(i) PCT
Rule 163(4)

Art. 58 provides for an open system of applicants allowing any natural or legal person to file a European patent application. This means that no further examination as regards the entitlement to file an application is necessary

Art. 9 PCT
Art. 24(2) PCT
Art. 58

(A-II, 2). The requirements under Art. 9 PCT concerning the persons entitled to file an international application are more restrictive than under Art. 58 in that, under the PCT, an applicant must be a resident or national

of a PCT contracting state. Therefore, if it is established on entry into the European phase that the PCT applicant was not entitled to file the international application, this is remedied by Art. 11(3) PCT and Art. 153(2) in combination with Art. 58 and Art. 150(2). The same applies if a receiving Office refuses to accord an international application a filing date under Art. 11 PCT for non-compliance with Art. 9 PCT. Also in that case the international application may enter the European phase in accordance with the procedure under Art. 25(2) PCT to "save" it as a European application in accordance with Art. 11(3) and Art. 153(2) (A-XV, 2).

6.2 Extent of the obligation to be represented – appointment of a professional representative

Art. 27(7) PCT
Art. 133(2)
Art. 153(2)
Rule 163(5)

Pursuant to Art. 133(2) in combination with Art. 153(2) and Art. 150(2), applicants having neither a residence nor their principal place of business within the territory of one of the contracting states must act through a professional representative entitled to practise in proceedings before the EPO, as is the case for Euro-direct applications (Art. 134(1)) (A-VIII, 1). Representation by a legal practitioner under Art. 134(8) is also allowed (A-VIII, 1.3). Such legal practitioners are thus treated in the same way as a professional representative within the meaning of Art. 134(1).

If a representative must be appointed, this must be done within the 31-month period, i.e. before the start of the proceedings before the EPO as designated/elected Office. Appointing a representative, where applicable, is thus a further requirement (A-XII, 4.4). If this requirement is not met, the procedure under Rule 163(5) applies (A-XIII, 11.5). For so long as the obligation to appoint a professional representative or legal practitioner has not been met, the EPO as a designated/elected Office will send any communication, e.g. the combined communication under Rules 160 and 112 concerning a loss of rights, to the address of the applicant, and not to the international agent where such an agent was appointed for the procedure in the international phase.

Professional representatives and other representatives must identify themselves as having been appointed for the application concerned (A-XII, 6.2.1).

Applicants having neither a residence nor their principal place of business within the territory of one of the contracting states who do not themselves take the required steps for entry into the European phase within the 31-month period may, after expiry of that time limit, perform these and the other procedural steps – for example, filing the request for examination together with a further processing request and filing a request for re-establishment of rights (see A-XIII, 9.2) – only through a professional representative or legal practitioner entitled to practise before the EPO. Any procedural steps applicants requiring representation take themselves have no legal effect. After expiry of the 31-month period, all acts except fee payments (A-X, 10) must therefore be performed by a representative. The same applies if an effective request for early processing is filed (A-XII, 7.1). However, payments may be made by applicants themselves or by any third party.

Up to expiry of the 31-month period, however, any applicant may comply with any requirement due either by acting themselves or by acting through a representative entitled to practise before the EPO. This means, for example, that, within the 31-month period, applicants may themselves sign and file EPO Form 1200, submit amendments, file a translation of the application, file a request for early processing, submit missing information on one or more of the applicants, etc. The fact that an applicant may act on their own behalf until the EPO has become competent as designated/elected Office (A-XII, 3.2) follows from the principles laid down in Art. 150(2) and Art. 153(2) and Art. 11(3) PCT (A-XII, 1.1). The right to initiate the European phase is comparable to an applicant's right to file a Euro-direct application without being represented by a professional representative.

6.2.1 Identification by appointed representative

If an applicant has mandated a professional representative to act on their behalf (also) in the European phase, the representative needs to identify themselves accordingly to the EPO as designated/elected Office. This applies *mutatis mutandis* to a legal practitioner under Art. 134(8) (A-VIII, 1.3). The same applies where applicants having their residence or principal place of business in an EPC contracting state are represented by an authorised employee (A-VIII, 1.5).

Art. 134(1), (8)

6.2.2 Representation in the European phase by the international agent

An agent entitled to practise in the international phase before the receiving Office and the PCT International Authorities is not necessarily authorised to act before the EPO as designated/elected Office (Art. 27(7) PCT). The EPO as designated/elected Office applies Art. 133(2) in combination with Art. 153(2) and Art. 150(2) (A-XII, 6.2) in the European phase. If the applicant fails to appoint a representative, the procedure under Rule 163(5) applies (see A-XIII, 11.5).

Art. 27(7) PCT
Art. 153(2)
Art. 133

Representatives acting in the international phase who are professional representatives entitled to practise before the EPO (Art. 134(1)) or legal practitioners (Art. 134(8)), and who are therefore entitled in principle to act in the European phase, are not automatically considered to be appointed for the European phase. An exception is made only where the representative has been validly appointed in the proceedings before the EPO as receiving Office, (S)ISA, or IPEA and only on condition that it is clear from the file in question that this appointment extends to representation in the European phase. Otherwise, the applicant must inform the EPO of the (re-)appointment for the proceedings in the European phase (see A-VIII, 1.7).

6.3 Communication with the applicant and address for correspondence

All applicants (both natural and legal persons) whose residence or principal place of business is in an EPC contracting state and who act without a representative may use an address for correspondence other than their address of residence or principal place of business. However, it must be their own address and must be in an EPC contracting state (A-III, 4.2.1).

7. "Early processing" and other measures to accelerate the European grant proceedings

Applicants who wish to accelerate processing in the European phase have the following options:

- requesting the start of the European phase processing before expiry of the 31-month period (A-XII, 7.1)
- waiving their right to the communication under Rules 161(1) or (2) and 162 (A-XII, 7.2)
- waiving their right to the invitation under Rule 70(2), if a supplementary European search report is drawn up (A-XII, 7.3)
- filing a "PACE" request (A-XII, 7.4)

All four options may be combined (OJ EPO 2015, A94).

7.1 The request for early processing

Art. 23 PCT

Art. 40 PCT

When acting as designated Office, the EPO is not authorised to process or examine an international application before expiry of the period applicable under Art. 22 PCT (Art. 23(1) PCT). The same processing ban applies under Art. 40(1) PCT when the EPO acts as elected Office. One of the cases in which the processing ban ends before expiry of the 31-month period is where the EPO receives a valid request for early processing (A-XII, 3.2).

Pursuant to Art. 23(2) and Art. 40(2) PCT, the EPO may, at the express request of the applicant, start processing the international application as designated/elected Office at any time before expiry of the 31-month period set in Rule 159(1) in combination with Art. 22(3) and Art. 39(3) PCT. There is no set wording for the request, but applicants must clearly express that they wish the processing of their application before the EPO as designated/elected Office to commence without further delay.

Applicants are advised to use EPO Form 1200 and select the appropriate checkbox to file a request for early processing. For more information, see the notice from the EPO dated 7 July 2017 (OJ EPO 2017, A74).

Rule 56

Rule 56a

A request for early processing is not only a means of speeding up the European phase processing. It may in fact be essential for an applicant seeking a remedy of any sort provided for in the EPC which is subject to a time limit that will already have expired by the time the application enters the European phase at the end of the 31-month period. An example is a request under Rule 56 or Rule 56a (A-XV, 1 and 6). These provisions provide for a remedy, as opposed to a requirement for entry, and so the processing ban does not defer the time limits they set to the end of the 31-month period (A-XII, 3.1), which means that they may have expired already by the time the European phase processing starts (A-XV, 1).

For the request for early processing to be effective, applicants must not only file it but also comply with the applicable minimum requirements for

entry into the European phase under Rule 159(1) as if the 31-month period expired on the date they filed the request. If all applicable minimum requirements have been complied with on that date, the request is effective and, from that date, the Euro-PCT application will be processed in the same way as a Euro-PCT application that has entered the European phase by fulfilling the necessary requirements within the 31-month period and without a request for early processing having been filed.

Some of the minimum requirements apply independently of the date of filing of the request for early processing, i.e. they must always be complied with for entry into the European phase and thus for the request for early processing to be effective (A-XII, 3.2):

- payment of the filing fee under Rule 159(1)(c), including any additional fee under Art. 2(1), item 1a, RFees, if the application comprises more than 35 pages (A-XIII, 4)
- filing of a translation, if required under Art. 153(4) in combination with Rule 159(1)(a) (A-XIII, 3)
- payment of the search fee under Rule 159(1)(e), where a supplementary European search report has to be drawn up under Art. 153(7) (A-XIII, 6).

Other requirements stipulated in Rule 159(1) must be complied with as if the 31-month period expired on the date the applicant filed the request for early processing. It therefore depends on the date on which early processing is requested which requirements are to be fulfilled, since the (regular) time limits for paying the designation fee (Rule 39(1)) and the renewal fee (Rule 51(1)), and for filing the request for examination and paying the examination fee (Rule 70(1)), may not yet have expired on that date. If any of these time limits is still running on that date or, in the case of the renewal fee, if the due date under Rule 51(1) is later than that date, the request for early processing will therefore still be effective even if these requirements have not been fulfilled.

Furthermore, although not a minimum requirement, it is important that the applicant specify the application documents under Rule 159(1)(b) on which they wish the European phase processing to be based for the reasons given in A-XII, 5.3 and, if required, appoint a professional representative (A-XII, 6.2).

If the EPO establishes that a request for early processing is effective, the applicant is notified of the effective date of the request. As from that date, the application is processed as a European patent application in accordance with Art. 153 and Art. 150(2). Filing an effective request for early processing lifts the processing ban, so it is then no longer possible to claim the right to the full 31-month period for complying with any requirement under Rule 159(1), or any other requirement that must be complied with within that period (e.g. Rule 163, A-XIII, 1.1) if the time limit set under the EPC for such requirements expires earlier. The same applies in respect of the one-month time limit for filing a request for restoration of

priority under Rule 49ter PCT. This means that such a request must be filed within one month of the effective date of the request for early processing (A-XV, 5).

Rule 90bis PCT

Furthermore, as from the date the request is effective, the international phase is terminated in respect of the EPO as designated/elected Office (J 18/09, reasons 13). This means that, as from that date, any subsequent withdrawal under Rule 90bis PCT will have no effect in respect of the procedure in the European phase (Rule 90bis.6(a) PCT). Moreover, a divisional application may be filed as from the date the request is effective (J 18/09) (A-XIII, 9.1.2; A-IV, 1).

If the EPO establishes that no request for early processing has been received but all requirements for entry into the European phase have been complied with before expiry of the 31-month period and

- EPO Form 1200 is filed before expiry of 30 months or,
- if it is filed after 30 months but before expiry of the 31-month time limit, EPO Form 1200 is filed together with an indication that the applicant wishes any other form of expedited processing set out in A-XII, 7.2 to 7.4,

it may inform the applicant that no request for early processing has been received.

Similarly, in cases where, on the date a request for early processing is filed, any minimum requirement has still not been met, the EPO will inform the applicant that the request will become effective only from the date on which all requirements have been complied with.

Art. 133(2)

Art. 150(2)

Art. 153(2))

Applicants having neither a residence nor their principal place of business within the territory of one of the contracting states must act through a professional representative entitled to practise before the EPO (Rule 163(5)). They may, however, act on their own behalf until the date the request for early processing becomes effective because processing before the EPO does not start until then (A-XII, 6.2). In other words, once early processing takes effect, such applicants can no longer act on their own behalf.

To process the application, the EPO will need all documents on which the processing in the European phase is to be based. This means that if the IB has not yet transmitted a copy of the international application, the ISR and the IPRP, the applicant may – e.g. at the time of filing a request for early processing – file a request with the IB asking it to send these documents to the EPO under Art. 20 PCT. Such a request is not required if the documents are available to the EPO, e.g. because it has been selected as ISA, or if they can be retrieved via ePCT ("Office-to-Office"). The same applies if the EPO is acting as elected Office and the IB has not yet sent it a copy of the international application, the ISR, the IPRP or the IPER with its annexes.

Pursuant to Art. 153(6) the EPO will defer performing search and substantive examination if the ISR is expected but not yet received. This is the case where the international phase has not ended in respect of all other designated/elected Offices. However, if the application was deemed withdrawn before establishment of the ISR, the start of the search will be deferred by waiting for the international application to be forwarded by the IB under Art. 20 PCT, not by waiting for the ISR.

Furthermore, if international preliminary examination has not started or the IPER has not yet been published at the time the request for early processing becomes effective, the EPO will not defer search and examination. It will consider the fulfilment of the requirements for the request for early of processing as the clear wish of the applicant that a European patent be granted without delay. This means that it will take the IPER into account only if it is received before the grant of the European patent.

The automatic debiting procedure may be used to pay the fees falling due on filing the request for early processing (Annexes A.1 and Annex A.2 to the ADA, Supplementary publication 2, OJ EPO 2024). However, automatic debiting can only be performed if the EPO can establish whether a page fee needs to be included as part of the filing fee (A-III, 13.2). This is only possible if the EPO has access to the international application, i.e. if:

Art. 20 PCT
Rule 47.4 PCT

- the EPO is the receiving Office, or
- the international application has already been published at the time the request for early processing is received and has been forwarded under Art. 20 PCT,
- the EPO is acting as (S)ISA or IPEA.

If the EPO has no access to the application documents on the day the request for early processing is filed, applicants are advised to choose another means of payment because the page fee cannot be established. If the applicant chooses automatic debiting, the fees due will be debited on the date of receipt of the documents referred to in Art. 20 PCT from the IB (Rule 47.4 PCT) and the date on which the request for early processing takes effect will be postponed to that date.

On the applicable procedure for applications corrected by the receiving Office under Rule 20.5bis(d) PCT, see A-XIII, 4.1.2, C-III, 1.3 and A-XV, 6.

Rule 20.8(c) PCT
Rule 82ter.1 PCT

The EPO as designated/elected Office will issue the communication under Rules 161 and 162 directly after it has established that the request for early processing is effective and on condition that the ISR has already been established. The applicant may waive the right to receive this communication (A-XII, 7.2).

If a certificate of exhibition has to be filed under Rule 159(1)(h) but has not yet been received by the date the request for early processing is filed, this

will not prevent the request from taking effect, but it will affect the prior art that the EPO will take into account in the European phase (A-XIII, 11.6).

Rule 70(1)
Rule 162(2)

Claims fees for any claims in excess of 15 need to be paid before expiry of the period under Rule 162 (A-XIV, 2.2.). Their payment is therefore not a requirement for a request for early processing to take effect. On cases where the applicant also wished to waive the right to receive the communication under Rules 161 and 162, see A-XII, 7.2 and A-XIII, 11.8.

If the EPO acted as (S)ISA and the applicant wishes not only the processing of the application before the EPO as designated/elected Office, but also examination of the application to start without delay, they must file a valid request for examination (including payment of the examination fee) even if the time limit under Rule 70(1) has not yet expired at the date of entry into the European phase, since examination can begin only if a request for examination has been validly filed.

Where a request for examination is filed before the EPO has sent, where applicable, the supplementary European search report to the applicant, the applicant may wish to consider waiving the right to receive the communication under Rules 70(2) and 70a(2) (A-XII, 7.3, A-XIV, 5.2).

For further details, see the notice from the EPO dated 21 February 2013 (OJ EPO 2013, 156).

Rule 161
Rule 162

7.2 Waiving the right to the communication under Rules 161 and 162

The EPO must respect the six-month period laid down in Rules 161 and 162 for making amendments and paying any claims fees due (A-XIV, 2.2). It therefore cannot start drawing up the supplementary European search report (A-XIV, 5) or start substantive examination (A-XIV, 6) before expiry of the six-month period under Rules 161 and 162. However, in order to expedite the European grant proceedings, applicants may consider waiving their right to the communication under Rules 161 and 162 (OJ EPO 2011, 354). Under the conditions set out in A-XII, 7.2.1, the right to benefit from the remainder of the six-month period may also be waived.

Waiving any rights – in this case the right to file (further) amendments and pay (further) claims fees after the effective date of the waiver – must be explicit. The waiver may be filed by selecting the appropriate box in EPO Form 1200. If the waiver is effective, no communication under Rules 161 and 162 is issued and, after formalities examination, the application proceeds directly to search (A-XIV, 5) or to examination (A-XIV, 6). In addition, as set out below, applicants may also waive their right to the remainder of the six-month period after the communication has been issued.

For the waiver to be effective, the applicant must have fulfilled all requirements under Rule 161 and Rule 162 for the application to proceed to the next phase of the European grant procedure without the communication being issued. This means that the applicant must have:

- filed a substantive response to the WO-ISA, SISR or IPER established by the EPO if, in the absence of such a response, the EPO would issue an invitation to do so under Rule 161(1) (mandatory response) (A-XIV, 3), and
- paid any claims fees due under Rule 162 for the last set of amendments indicated as the basis for the European grant proceedings at the time the waiver is filed (A-XIV, 2.2).

Applicants must not pay any claims fees by automatic debit order as they will then not be debited and considered paid until the last day of the six-month period under Rule 162(2). Instead, they must already pay them by another payment method on entry into the European phase, including, in cases of a request for early entry, on that earlier entry.

Where these requirements are fulfilled, the EPO can establish that the applicant is not interested either in filing (further) amendments under Rule 161 or paying (further) claims fees for amendments made up to the expiry of the time limit in Rule 162(2) (A-XIV, 2.2).

Where the right to the communication under Rules 161 and 162 has not been validly waived, this communication will be issued and the application will not be processed until after expiry of the six-month period, even if a request under the PACE programme has been filed (A-XII, 7.4; E-VIII, 4). See also OJ EPO 2015, A94.

7.2.1 Waiving the remainder of the six-month period

Furthermore, if after the communication under Rule 161 and 162 is issued, the applicant wishes the EPO to start substantive examination or, if applicable, supplementary European search, they must explicitly declare that they waive their right to file further amendments and to pay claims fees for the rest of the six-month period and request that the EPO start the proceedings as if the six-month period had expired.

7.3 Waiving the right to the invitation under Rule 70(2) to confirm wish to proceed with examination

In most cases, including the cases where a supplementary European search report is to be drawn up, applicants will have to file the request for examination, and pay the examination fee, within the 31-month period (Rule 159(1)(f)) (A-XIII, 7). After drawing up the supplementary European search report (where applicable), the EPO will invite the applicant to confirm within a six-month period that they wish to proceed further with their application (Rule 70(2)). Where they must also respond to any deficiencies noted in the search opinion, their response is required within this same period (Rule 70a(2)) (A-XIV, 5).

Rule 70(2)
Rule 70a(2)

In order to expedite the European grant proceedings, applicants may waive their right to be asked whether they wish to proceed further with the application, e.g. by selecting the appropriate checkbox in EPO Form 1200 (OJ EPO 2017, A74). In that case, no search opinion will be issued, and the application will proceed directly to examination after the supplementary European search report has been transmitted to them (A-XIV, 5.2). The

examining division will then either issue a communication under Art. 94(3), replacing the search opinion, or a communication under Rule 71(3) if the application is ready for grant (B-XI, 7; C-VI, 3).

7.4 Request for PACE

A request for early processing does not automatically lead to accelerated prosecution under the PACE programme. Applicants who also want to request such accelerated prosecution of their application in the European phase must therefore submit a separate online request under the PACE programme. Accelerated examination can be requested at any time once responsibility for the application has passed to the examining division. For Euro-PCT applications for which no supplementary European search is carried out because the EPO acted as (S)ISA, accelerated examination can, in principle, be requested at any time, for example on entry into the European phase or together with any response to the WO-ISA, IPER or SISR required under Rule 161(1) (OJ EPO 2015, A94). For more information, see E-VIII, 4.

Chapter XIII – Examination of minimum and further requirements for entry into the European phase – legal consequences – remedies

1. General

Due to their different legal nature, the individual acts required under Rule 159(1) do not form a unitary procedural step but are legally independent and subject to independent time limits (A-XII, 4.1). This means that there are differences in the circumstances in which these requirements apply, the legal consequences of (non-)compliance and the available remedies. Each minimum requirement is therefore dealt with individually, together with the associated legal consequence of (not) complying with it and the particular remedy available (A-XIII, 3 to 8). Full or partial compliance or non-compliance with the applicable minimum requirements has legal consequences for the following:

- provisional protection (A-XIII, 9.1.1)
- filing a divisional application (A-XIII, 9.1.2)
- the status of a Euro-PCT application as prior art under Rule 165 (A-XIII, 9.1.3).

A-XIII, 9.2 deals with the cumulative effect of non-compliance with more than one minimum requirement in terms of requesting further processing or re-establishment of rights.

For general guidance on the payment of fees, see A-X. On the reduction and refunds of fees in respect of Euro-PCT applications, see A-X, 9.2 to A-X, 9.5 and A-X, 10.2.

The further requirements (A-XII, 4.4) are dealt with in A-XIII, 11.

2. Overview of the minimum requirements

In order to initiate the European phase and prevent the application from being deemed withdrawn, the applicant must perform the following acts within the 31-month period:

- supply the translation if the Euro-PCT application was not published in one of the EPO's official languages (Rule 159(1)(a))
- pay the filing fee provided for in Art. 78(2), including the additional page fee for applications with more than 35 pages (Rule 159(1)(c))
- pay the designation fee (and any extension or validation fees) if the period under Rule 39 has expired earlier (Rule 159(1)(d))
- pay the search fee if a supplementary European search report is to be drawn up (Rule 159(1)(e))

- file the request for examination and pay the examination fee if the period under Rule 70(1) has expired earlier (Rule 159(1)(f))

The applicant must also pay the renewal fee for the third year if the period under Rule 51(1) has expired earlier (Rule 159(1)(g)). As set out in A-XII, 2, non-compliance with this requirement does not block the start of the processing in the European phase since the application is not deemed withdrawn (A-XIII, 8). However, given its importance for all Euro-PCT applications and the fact that the remedy of further processing is not available if the renewal fee plus the additional fee is not paid in due time, there are good reasons to draw attention to it as a “minimum requirement”, in line with the heading of Rule 159 EPC.

Where fees are paid before expiry of the 31-month period but early processing is not explicitly requested (see A-XIII, 7), they will be retained by the EPO on the assumption that the applicant does indeed wish to pursue the European phase processing of the application on expiry of the 31-month period (see A-III, 13.1).

3. Translation of the international application and further documents that are part of the international publication

Art. 22(1) PCT
Art. 39(1) PCT
Rule 49.2 PCT
Art. 14(2) and (3)
Art. 153(4)
Rule 159(1)(a)

Where the international application was not published in an official language of the EPO, the applicant is required, in accordance with Art. 153(4) and Rule 159(1)(a) in conjunction with Art. 14(2), to furnish a translation of the published application within the 31-month period. Also, a change of language is not allowed if the applicant filed with the EPO as IPEA a translation of the application into an official language of the EPO under Rule 55.2(a) PCT.

The translation required for entry into the European phase under Art. 153(4) and Rule 159(1)(a) implements the right of the EPO as designated/elected Office to require a translation under Art. 22(1) and Art. 39(1) PCT.

The language of the translation determines the language of the proceedings before the EPO. A translation is not necessary, and will not be accepted by the EPO, if the international application was published by the IB in an official language of the EPO (A-XII, 5.1).

Art. 27(1) PCT
Rule 11 PCT
Rule 49.5(j) PCT

As regards the formal requirements, every application must meet the requirements of Rule 11 PCT (A-XII, 5.5). A translation, whether filed on entry into the European phase under Art. 153(4) and Rule 159(1)(a) or in the international phase under Rule 12.3 or 12.4 PCT, may always be brought into conformity with the application as filed. The conditions set out in A-VII, 7 apply.

Art. 28(3) PCT
Art. 41(3) PCT
Rule 3(2)
Art. 153(2)
Art. 150(2)

If, on entry into the European phase, amendments are filed with the EPO as designated/elected Office under Rule 161 (A-XIV, 2) which were not filed earlier in the international phase, the applicant will be informed that they will only serve as the basis for the European phase if they are filed in the language of the proceedings in the European phase (A-XII, 5.1; A-XII, 5.3.1). If amendments were filed in the international phase under Art. 19

PCT or for international preliminary examination under Art. 34 PCT, see A-XIII, 3.1.

The requirements as regards the translation to be filed are more extensive in cases where the EPO will be acting as elected Office in the European phase. Furthermore, a translation of some documents must always be filed, whereas a translation of other documents need only be filed if the applicant wishes the processing to be based on these documents (A-XIII, 3.1). Moreover, the legal consequences of non-compliance vary depending on whether the document is required or only optional for the European phase proceedings (A-XII, 5; A-XIII, 3.2).

For the available remedies in cases of a loss of rights, see A-XIII, 3.3.

3.1 Translation requirements if the EPO acts in its capacity as designated or elected Office

If the EPO acts in its capacity as designated Office, the translation must include the following:

(i)	the description as originally filed and, if applicable, the title as established by the ISA under Rule 37.2 PCT	<i>Rule 49.5(a) and (k) PCT</i>
(ii)	the claims as originally filed	<i>Rule 49.5(a) PCT</i>
(iii)	any text matter in the drawings as originally filed, except for the expression "Fig."	<i>Rule 49.5(a), (d) and (f) PCT</i>
(iv)	the abstract as published.	<i>Rule 49.5(a) PCT</i>

The translation to be filed with the EPO as designated Office must also include:

(v)	any published request for rectification under Rule 91.3(d) PCT	
(vi)	any language-dependent free text contained in the sequence listing part of the description, unless the free text is also available in English or in the EPO official language in which the international application was published. For further details, see OJ EPO 2021, A97. Any translation must be furnished in the form of the complete sequence listing complying with WIPO Standard ST.26. For text matter contained in ST.25 sequence listings, see the April 2025 edition of the Guidelines, E-IX, 2.1.4, item (vi).	<i>Rule 12.1(d) PCT Rule 49.5(a bis) PCT</i>
(vii)	any references to deposited biological material furnished separately.	<i>Rule 49.3 and 49.5(h) PCT</i>
- If the applicant wishes the amended claims under Art. 19 PCT to form the basis for further proceedings:
- | | | |
|--------|---|---|
| (viii) | the amendments under Art. 19 PCT in the form of a translation of the complete set of claims furnished under that provision and the statement under Art. 19(1) PCT, if submitted to the IB, and, | <i>Art. 19 PCT
Rule 46.5(b) PCT
Rules 49.3, 49.5(a)(ii) and (c bis) PCT,
Rules 3 and 137(4)</i> |
|--------|---|---|

- (ix) the accompanying letter indicating the basis for the amendments in the application as filed (Rule 46.5(b) PCT), to enable the examiner to understand the amendments and take them into account.

If the EPO acts in its capacity as elected Office, the translation must include all of the above documents that need to be filed with the EPO as designated Office and:

Art. 39(1) PCT
Art. 36(2)(b) PCT
Art. 36(3)(b) PCT
Rule 66.8 PCT
Rule 70.16 PCT
Rule 74.1(a) PCT
Rule 76.5(iv) PCT

- (x) all annexes to the IPER, i.e. any replacement sheets and accompanying letters referred to in Rule 70.16 PCT that enable the examiner to understand the amendments, regardless of whether protection is sought for the same version of the application documents as was the subject of the IPER, and
- (xi) any amendments made to the claims under Art. 19 PCT (cf. item (viii) above), if the applicant wishes these amendments to form the basis for further proceedings and they are not annexed to the IPER, for instance because they were considered reversed by an amendment under Art. 34 PCT.
- (xii) the accompanying letter indicating the basis for the amendments in the application as filed (Rule 46.5(b) PCT), to enable the examiner to understand the amendments and take them into account.

In relation to items (i) to (iii) above: if erroneously filed elements or parts are corrected by the receiving Office under Rule 20.5bis(d) PCT in an international application with a filing date of 1 November 2022 or later, the translation must include both the erroneously filed application documents and the correct application documents with an indication as to which pages relate to the correct and which to the erroneously filed application documents. For applications filed before that date, see the April 2025 edition of the Guidelines. See also A-XV, 6; A-II, 4.1.5 and 6; C-III, 1.3.

3.2 Legal consequence if the translation is not filed

The legal consequences of non-compliance vary depending on which documents were not filed in due time:

If the applicant does not furnish the translation of any of items (i) and (ii) in A-XIII, 3.1 within the 31-month period, the application is deemed to be withdrawn under Rule 160(1).

Art. 153(5)
Art. 54(3)
Rule 165

If the applicant does not furnish the translation of any of items (i) to (iv) in A-XIII, 3.1 within the 31-month period, the application will not be considered to be comprised in the state of the art under Art. 54(3) (A-XIII, 9.1.3; G-IV, 5.2).

Rule 49.5(c bis) PCT
Rule 49.5(d), (g), (h) PCT

If the applicant does not furnish the translation of any of items (iii) to (ix) in A-XIII, 3.1 within the 31-month period, the EPO will invite them to furnish the translation within a two-month period from notification of the related communication under Rule 159(1)(a). The same applies in relation to items (i) to (iii) in A-XIII, 3.1 if correct elements or parts were incorporated

by the receiving Office under Rule 20.5bis(d) PCT (A-XV, 4; C-III, 1.3) but translations of the erroneously filed elements or parts, which also remain in the application, have not been filed. If the applicant does not comply with this invitation:

- as regards items (iii) to (vii) in A-XIII, 3.1, the application is deemed to be withdrawn Art. 24(1)(iii) or 39(2) PCT
Rule 49.5(a) PCT
Rule 160(1)
- as regards translations of erroneously filed application documents falling under items (i) to (iii) in A-XIII, 3.1 in cases where erroneously filed elements or parts were corrected by the receiving Office under Rule 20.5bis(d) PCT, the application is deemed to be withdrawn
- as regards the replacement sheets referred to in item (x) in A-XIII, 3.1 the application is deemed to be withdrawn Art. 39(2) PCT
Rule 160(1)
- as regards the replacement sheets referred to in item (viii) in A-XIII, 3.1, the EPO will disregard the amendments under Art. 19 PCT Rule 49.5(c bis) PCT
Rule 3(2)
- as regards the accompanying letter and the statement referred to in item (ix) in A-XIII, 3.1, the EPO will disregard that letter and that statement and may proceed under Rule 137(4) where applicable Rule 49.5(c) PCT
Rule 3(1)
- as regards the accompanying letters referred to in item (xi and xii) in A-XIII, 3.1 the EPO will disregard those letters and may proceed under Rule 137(4) where applicable. Rule 49.5(c) PCT
Rule 3(1)

3.3 Remedy if the translation is not filed

Where the application is deemed to be withdrawn under Rule 160(1), Rule 112(2) applies *mutatis mutandis*. The loss of rights is deemed not to have occurred if, within two months of notification of the communication, the translation and a valid request for further processing, including the payment of the requisite fee, are filed (E-VIII, 2).

Art. 121
Rule 112
Rule 135

If the time limit for requesting further processing has been missed, a request for re-establishment of rights in respect of the period under Rule 135(1) may be filed (E-VIII, 3).

Art. 122

Furthermore, if the translation is not filed in due time, reinstatement of rights under Rule 49.6 PCT in respect of the 31-month period is available as an alternative remedy for further processing. Given the fact that the fee is higher and stricter requirements apply, this remedy has no advantages if requesting further processing under Rule 135(1) is still available.

Rule 49.6 PCT

However, the remedy provided for in Rule 49.6 PCT may be an important alternative to a request for re-establishment of rights under Art. 122 if the time limit under Rule 135(1) has expired, since the fee to be paid is the same and (all) due care is to be proven in both cases (Art. 2(1), item 13, RFees, Rule 49.6(d)(i) PCT, Rule 136). In choosing between the two legal bases for remedying the loss of rights, it should be borne in mind that a request for reinstatement under Rule 49.6 PCT in respect of the 31-month period may not have the same result as a request for re-establishment in

respect of the time limit for requesting further processing under Rule 135(1): this is the case when it can be proven that the 31-month period was missed although all due care was taken, but due care cannot be proven in respect of the missed time limit for filing a request for further processing in respect of the missed 31-month period. Therefore, if both time limits are still running at the time the applicant becomes aware of the omission, they are advised to apply for re-establishment under both provisions, invoking the one expected to be more successful as the legal basis for their main request. The remedy in Rule 49.6 PCT is available only for non-compliance with the requirements mentioned in Art. 22(1) and Art. 39(1) PCT, i.e. filing of the translation and payment of the national fee (Rule 159(1)(a) and (c)). Since the search fee, the designation fee and the examination fee to be paid for the request for examination to be valid do not form part of the national (filing) fee under Art. 22(1) and Art. 39(1) PCT, applicants cannot request reinstatement of rights under Rule 49.6 PCT if the application is deemed withdrawn because one of those fees was not paid and/or examination was not requested in due time.

4. Filing fee and additional fee

Under Rule 159(1)(c), applicants must pay the filing fee, including any additional fee for pages in excess of 35, within the 31-month period. This implements the right of the EPO as a designated/elected Office to require payment of a "national fee" under Art. 22(1) and Art. 39(1) PCT. This fee is therefore a "filing fee" only in terms of the amount; since it is in fact paid as a "national fee", it is not reduced under the language arrangements (A-X, 9.3.2).

Pages of amendments filed after the additional fee's payment date (as a rule within the 31-month time limit) and, in particular, during the six-month period under Rules 161(1) and 161(2), are not taken into account (A-XIV, 2.1). Consequently, if amendments filed at this stage reduce the number of pages already paid for, no refund will be made.

The basic filing fee is lower where EPO Form 1200 is filed online (Art. 2(1), item 1, RFees).

For general guidance on the payment of fees, see A-X.

4.1 Additional fee for Euro-PCT applications

This section relates only to Euro-PCT applications entering the European phase on or after 1 April 2009. For these applications the additional fee is payable as part of the filing fee within the 31-month period. See also the notice from the EPO dated 26 January 2009 (OJ EPO 2009, 118) and its supplement (OJ EPO 2009, 338).

In general, the additional fee is calculated on the basis of the international application as published, regardless of the language of publication. The pages of the description, claims and drawings are counted, as well as one page for the bibliographic data with abstract. Any amendments under Art. 19 PCT and/or Art. 34 PCT are also considered part of the international publication and are taken into account for calculating the additional fee unless the applicant indicates that the procedure in the European phase is

Art. 22(1) PCT
Art. 39(1) PCT
Rule 159(1)
Art. 2(1), item 12,
RFees

Rule 38(2), (3)
Art. 2(1), item 1a,
RFees
Rule 49

not to be based on them. The indications made in EPO Form 1200 should be clear so that the EPO can readily identify the pages for which the additional fee is payable (A-XII, 5.3).

The pages of EPO Form 1200 itself and those forming part of a standard-compliant sequence listing under Rule 30(1) are not counted.

4.1.1 Amended application

If amendments are filed on entry into the European phase, the basis for calculating the additional fee depends on the language in which the international application was published, i.e. one of the EPO's official languages or another language, e.g. Chinese.

(i) International publication is in an EPO language

The additional fee is based on the application as published, except that any amended pages replace the corresponding pages of the application as published.

If the claims have been amended, the applicant must submit the entire set, even if the amendment concerns only some of them. The additional fee is then based on the entire set of claims as amended.

(ii) International publication is not in an EPO language

If no amendments are filed on entry into the European phase, the application as published in a non-EPO language (e.g. Chinese) is taken as the basis for calculating the additional fee. However, if pages are amended, the translation of the application as required under Art. 153(4) and Rule 159(1)(a) is taken as the basis instead. This is because the replacement pages are in a different language to the published pages, which would make a proper calculation of the additional fee impossible.

Therefore, if the description or drawings are amended, the translation of the description or drawings is taken as the basis for calculating the additional fee. In this case, the amended pages replace the respective pages of the description or drawings as translated. If only the claims are amended, the additional fee is based on the description and drawings as published in Chinese plus the entire set of claims as amended in the EPO language. If the claims are not amended, the additional fee is based on the claims as published in Chinese.

If the applicant explicitly states that application documents filed on entry into the European phase have merely been reformatted (to reduce the number of pages subject to payment of an additional fee) rather than substantively amended, the EPO disregards these reformatted application documents and does not accept them as the basis for calculation of the additional fee (notice from the EPO dated 26 January 2009, OJ EPO 2009, 118, and Supplement to OJ EPO 2/2009; OJ EPO 2009, 338).

Example 1:

International application, published in English, containing 100 pages:

Abstract	1
Description	50
Claims	20
Drawings	20
claims, Art. 19 PCT	9

Total pages **100**

Amended claims (EP entry) 10

On entry into European phase, within the 31-month period, 10 pages of amended claims are filed to replace previous pages of claims, as indicated by the applicant in EPO Form 1200.

-> number of pages on which calculation is based: 100 - 20 (original claims) - 9 (Art. 19 PCT) + 10 (amended claims on EP entry) - 35 (fee-exempt)

-> number of pages to be paid for: 46

Example 2:

International application, published in Chinese, containing 75 pages:

	Number of pages in Chinese (ZH)	Number of pages in English (EN), translation filed on entry into the European phase
Abstract	1	1
Description	40	50
Claims	15	25
Drawings	19	19
Total number of pages	75	95
Amended description of the translation	-	3

On entry into the European phase, the translation into English is filed within the 31-month period. Three pages of the translated description as originally filed are replaced by three amended pages, as indicated by the applicant in EPO Form 1200.

-> number of pages on which calculation is based: 35 (abstract, claims and drawings in ZH) + 47 (EN translation of description - 3) + 3 (amended description of the translation) - 35 (fee-exempt)

-> number of pages to be paid for: 50

If in the above example only the claims are amended, the additional fee is based on the description, drawings and abstract as published in Chinese and the translation of the entire set of claims as amended.

If the additional fee is not paid on time, the application is deemed withdrawn. The EPO will notify the applicant of the loss of rights in accordance with Rule 112(1), and the applicant can request further processing in accordance with Art. 121 and Rule 135. If the basic filing fee under Art. 2(1), item 1, RFees was paid on time, it is not taken into account in calculating the amount of the further processing fee in respect of the additional fee.

4.1.2 Erroneously filed application documents

In application of the general principles described in A-XIII, 4.1.1, for international applications comprising both erroneously filed application documents and correct application documents incorporated by reference (Rule 20.6 PCT in conjunction with Rule 20.5bis(d) PCT), irrespective of their date of filing (OJ EPO 2020, A81, and OJ EPO 2022, A71) (A-XV, 6; A-II, 4.1.5, A-II, 6; C-III, 1.3), the additional fee must be paid for all application documents contained in the international publication unless any are replaced by amendments filed on entry into the European phase, as specified by the applicant.

Rule 20.8(c) PCT

Rule 82ter.1 PCT

For international applications with an international date of filing on or before 31 October 2022, see the April 2025 edition of the Guidelines, C-III, 1.3 and A-III, 13.2.

4.2 Legal consequence and remedy if the filing fee, including the additional fee, is not paid

If the filing fee, including any page fee due, is not paid in due time, the Euro-PCT application will be deemed to be withdrawn and the applicant will be informed of the loss of rights (Rule 160(2)). The communication under Rule 160(2) and the communication under Rule 112(1) are sent together in the same communication.

Rule 160

The loss of rights may be remedied by a request for further processing under Art. 121 (E-VIII, 2). The further processing fee is calculated on the basis of the number of pages on file at the relevant period's expiry and for which the additional fee, calculated as set out in A-XIII, 4.1.2, has not been paid. If there was an error only in paying the correct page fee and the basic fee was duly paid, that basic fee is not relevant for establishing the fee for further processing.

Art. 121

If the time limit for requesting further processing has been missed, a request for re-establishment of rights under Art. 122 in respect of the period under Rule 135(1) may be filed (E-VIII, 3).

Art. 122

Furthermore, if the filing fee is not paid in full, including any page fee due, the international application will not be considered comprised in the state of the art under Art. 54(3) pursuant to Art. 153(5) and Rule 165 (A-XIII, 10.2; G-IV, 5.2).

Art. 153(5)

Rule 165

Art. 54(3)

Rule 49.6 PCT

If the filing fee is not paid in full, including any page fee due, reinstatement of rights under Rule 49.6 PCT in respect of the 31-month period is available as an alternative remedy to a request for further processing. Given the fact that the fee is higher and stricter requirements apply, this remedy has no advantages if requesting further processing under Rule 135(1) is still available, but it may be an important alternative if the time limit under Rule 135(1) has expired, as is set out in A-XIII, 3.3.

Rule 159(1)(d)
Rule 39(1)**5. Designation, extension and validation fee**

Pursuant to Rule 159(1)(d) the (flat) designation fee must be paid within 31 months of the date of filing or, if priority has been claimed, of the earliest priority date, if the time limit specified in Rule 39(1) has expired earlier. So the due date for payment of the designation fee is also deferred by virtue of the processing ban (A-XII, 3.1) if the fee became due before expiry of the 31-month period. The time limit under Rule 159(1)(d) in combination with Rule 39(1) for payment of the designation fee therefore starts from the date of the publication of the ISR under Art. 21 PCT (A-VI, 2).

Rule 4.9 PCT

Since, on filing of the PCT request, all PCT contracting states are automatically designated for both a national and, where applicable, a regional patent (Rule 4.9 PCT) (A-XII, 2.1), the payment of the designation fee on entry into the European phase confirms the (regional) designation of the EPC contracting states designated in the PCT request, unless the applicant has withdrawn the designation of one or more EPC contracting states during the international phase (A-XII, 2.1). If, prior to the date on which the processing in the European phase started, the regional designation of all contracting states of the EPC is withdrawn, the international application, in so far as it is deemed to be a European application pursuant to Art. 153(2) and Art. 11(3) PCT, is deemed to be withdrawn. Thus, the international application is no longer a Euro-PCT application.

Rule 39(2a)
Rule 160(3)

Where the applicant or one of the applicants is a Russian national, a natural person residing in Russia or a legal person, entity or body established in Russia, the designation of those EPC contracting states that are member states of the European Union will be deemed to be withdrawn on entry into the European phase, in accordance with Rule 39(2a) (see OJ EPO 2024, A105), and payment of the designation fee will thus have no legal effect in respect of these states (see A-XIII, 5.1).

See A-X for general guidance on the payment of fees. To support small entities and micro-entities, applicants fulfilling certain criteria are eligible for fee reductions (for the eligibility criteria, see A-X, 9.2 and 9.4)

5.1 Designation fee

Payment of the designation fee will (only) confirm the designation of EPC contracting states that were both EPC and PCT contracting states on the date of filing. Since all EPC contracting states are currently also contracting states to the PCT, the EPO is by default a designated Office for an international application filed under the PCT in respect of all PCT contracting states that were also contracting states to the EPC on the filing date of the international application (A-XII, 2.1).

Payment of the designation fee will not confirm any designation of an EPC contracting state designated in the PCT request if, at the time the European phase processing starts (or should start), the EPO is no longer a designated Office for the contracting state(s) concerned (set out in detail in [A-XII, 2.1](#)).

Furthermore, payment of the designation fee will have no legal effect in respect of the designation of EPC contracting states that are contracting states of the European Union where the applicant, or one of the applicants, is a Russian national, a natural person residing in Russia or a legal person, entity or body established in Russia. The reason is that these designations are deemed withdrawn in accordance with [Rule 160\(3\)](#) and [Rule 39\(2a\)](#) (OJ EPO 2024, A105 and A106). [Rule 160\(3\)](#) applies to international patent applications entering the European phase before the EPO on or after 25 June 2024. The filing date of these applications is therefore not decisive. [Rule 160\(3\)](#)

5.2 Extension and validation

Within the time limit for payment of the designation fee, the applicant must take a decision on the extension or validation states for which extension or validation of the European patent is sought and pay the applicable fees.

Extension or validation is possible and deemed requested for any international application entering the European phase in respect of any state designated in the international application with which an extension or validation agreement was in force at the filing date. However, such a request is deemed to be withdrawn in respect of each extension or validation state for which no extension or validation fee is paid in due time. A fee has to be paid for each single extension and validation state; there is no flat fee. For general guidance on the payment of fees, see [A-X](#).

Thus, the automatic designation of the EPO in the PCT request may – via extension or validation – result in a national patent for a state that was not an EPC contracting state but (only) a PCT contracting state on the filing date of the international application ([A-III, 12.1](#), [A-XII, 3.2](#)).

For further information on the requirements for extension or validation of a Euro-PCT application to states for which an extension agreement or a validation agreement with the EPO has entered into force, see [A-III, 12](#).

5.3 Legal consequence and remedy if the designation fee and/or an extension or validation fee is not paid

The application is deemed withdrawn if the designation fee is not paid on time. The EPO will inform the applicant of this in a (combined) communication under [Rules 160\(2\)](#) and [112\(1\)](#). In response to this notification of a loss of rights, the applicant can request further processing ([E-VIII, 2](#)).

If an extension or validation fee is not paid within the prescribed time, the request for extension or validation is deemed withdrawn for the state(s) concerned. For information on the remedies available, see [A-III, 12](#).

There is no possibility to remedy the deemed withdrawal under Rule 160(3) of the designation of all EPC contracting states that are member states of the European Union where the applicant, or one of the applicants, is a Russian national, a natural person residing in Russia or a legal person, entity or body established in Russia. Irrespective of whether the designation fee was paid or not (A-XII, 5.2), on entry into the European phase, the designation in a Euro-PCT application of those contracting states that are member states of the European Union will be deemed to be withdrawn in accordance with Rule 39(2a) (A-III, 11.2.4).

6. Search fee

Art. 153(7)
Rule 159(1)(e)
Art. 2(1), item 2,
RFees

Pursuant to Rule 159(1)(e), where a supplementary European search report needs to be drawn up in accordance with Art. 153(7), a search fee must be paid within the 31-month period and a supplementary European search report and search opinion will be issued accordingly (A-XIV, 5).

The supplementary European search report is dispensed with, and so no search fee must be paid under Rule 159(1)(e), if the EPO has drawn up either the ISR or a SISR. This includes cases where a declaration under Art. 17(2)(a) or, in the case of a SISR, a declaration under Rule 45bis.5(c) PCT has been issued (OJ EPO 2009, 594) (A-XIV, 5).

Art. 153(7)

By decision of the Administrative Council under Art. 153(7), the search fee for a supplementary European search report is reduced by a fixed amount only for international applications for which the patent office of Austria, Finland, Spain, Sweden or Türkiye, the Nordic Patent Institute or the Visegrad Patent Institute has acted as (S)ISA (A-X, 9.3.1).

Rule 164(1)

Where the requirements for a fee reduction are fulfilled, the fee reduction is granted only once, i.e. for the supplementary search fee paid under Rule 159(1)(e). The reduction applies irrespective of whether the first invention in the claims was searched by the (S)ISA in the international phase. Any further search fee (to be) paid under Rule 164(1) does not qualify for a fee reduction under Art. 153(7) (A-XIV, 5.2; A-XIV, 6.2). Therefore, if lack of unity is determined in the international phase, applicants are advised to consider amending their application in view of the possibility that the EPO will agree with the (S)ISA's finding (A-XIV, 5.1).

To support small entities and micro-entities, applicants fulfilling certain criteria are entitled to a 30% reduction in the fee for supplementary European search (A-X, 9.4).

Art. 9(2) RFees

If the supplementary European search report is based on an earlier search report drawn up by the EPO, or if the application claims the priority of a previous application for which a search was carried out by the EPO, (a part of) the fee paid for the supplementary European search may be refunded in accordance with Art. 9(2) RFees (OJ EPO 2009, 99; OJ EPO 2024, A6). The level of the refund depends on the type of earlier search and the extent to which the EPO benefits from the earlier search report when carrying out the supplementary European search (A-X, 10.2.1).

6.1 Legal consequence and remedy if the search fee is not paid

If the search fee is not paid on time, the Euro-PCT application will be deemed to be withdrawn, and the applicant will be informed accordingly in a communication under [Rules 160\(2\)](#) and [112\(1\)](#). The loss of rights is deemed not to have ensued if, within two months of notification of this communication, further processing under [Art. 121](#) is requested by payment of the further processing fee, which amounts to 50% of the search fee, together with the missing search fee ([E-VIII, 2](#)).

[Art. 121](#)
[Art. 122](#)
[Rule 160](#)

If the time limit for requesting further processing has been missed, a request for re-establishment of rights in respect of the period under [Rule 135\(1\)](#) may be filed in accordance with [Art. 122](#) ([E-VIII, 3](#)).

[Art. 122](#)

The remedy in [Rule 49.6 PCT](#) is not available for the reasons set out in [A-XIII, 3.3](#).

[Art. 22\(1\) PCT](#)
[Art. 39\(1\) PCT](#)
[Rule 49.6 PCT](#)

7. Request for examination

Pursuant to [Rule 159\(1\)\(f\)](#), if the time limit specified in [Rule 70\(1\)](#) has expired before expiry of the 31-month period, the written request for examination must be filed and the examination fee must be paid within the 31-month period. In accordance with [Art. 153\(6\)](#), the ISR – or the declaration under [Art. 17\(2\)\(a\)](#) replacing it – and its international publication take the place of the European search report and the mention of its publication in the European Patent Bulletin. The time limit under [Rule 159\(1\)\(f\)](#) in combination with [Rule 70\(1\)](#) for filing the request for examination therefore starts from the date of the publication of the ISR under [Art. 21 PCT](#) ([A-VI, 2](#)).

[Art. 153\(6\)](#)
[Art. 150\(2\)](#)
[Art. 94](#)
[Rule 159\(1\)\(f\)](#)
[Rule 70\(1\)](#)

However, owing to the deferring effect of the processing ban ([A-XII, 3.1](#)), the time limit under [Rule 70\(1\)](#) in respect of any Euro-PCT application will not expire before the 31-month period under [Rule 159\(1\)\(f\)](#) expires. Consequently, as a rule, and unless the ISR was published more than 25 months after the date of filing or the earliest priority date, the request for examination must be filed and the examination fee paid within the 31-month period. This means that, where a supplementary European search must be performed, applicants will have to file the request for examination before the supplementary European search report is transmitted to them ([A-XIV, 5](#)).

The request for examination may have to be filed earlier if there is an effective request for early processing ([A-XII, 7.1](#)).

The required written request for examination is automatically made if EPO Form 1200 for entry into the European phase is filed in due time because the appropriate checkbox is preselected in the form ([A-XII, 4.1](#)). The request for examination is effective only if the examination fee has been paid ([C-II, 1.2](#)).

Even if a request for examination is effective, examination under [Art. 94](#) will only start once any required supplementary European search report is available to the examining division ([A-XIV, 5](#); [B-II, 4.3.2](#); [A-XIV, 5.2](#)).

For further information on the request for examination, see [A-VI, 2](#).

In respect of the examination fee payable under [Rule 159\(1\)\(f\)](#), the following fee reductions may apply:

[Art. 14\(2\)](#)
[Rule 7](#)

Under the language arrangements, applicants fulfilling certain criteria are eligible for a 30% reduction of the examination fee ([OJ EPO 2024, A8](#)). For the categories of eligible applicants, see [A-X, 9.3.1](#). For this reduction to apply, the request for examination must be filed in an admissible non-EPO language and its translation must not be filed earlier than the request in an admissible non-EPO language ([G 6/91](#)). EPO Form 1200 provides for the possibility to submit the request for examination in an admissible non-EPO language and to provide the declaration under [Rule 7b\(1\)](#). If the applicant has done so, the filing of a translation of the written request for examination is not necessary, because the request for examination in the three EPO official languages is preselected in EPO Form 1200.

Where the written request for examination in an admissible non-EPO language is filed after EPO Form 1200, a translation of the request for examination into one of the official languages must be refiled ([G 6/91](#)). Wordings for the request for examination in the admissible non-EPO languages are available from a dropdown menu in EPO Forms 1200 and 1038 in Online Filing 2.0 and are also listed on the EPO website (epo.org).

The request for examination in the admissible non-EPO language and its translation must be filed no later than the date of payment of the examination fee for the reduction to apply.

Furthermore, applicants fulfilling certain criteria are eligible for fee reductions under the fee reduction scheme specifically for micro-entities ([A-X, 9.4](#)). These reductions apply to fee payments made on or after 1 April 2024 for Euro-PCT applications irrespective of their date of filing ([OJ EPO 2024, A3](#), and [OJ EPO 2024, A8](#)).

If a Euro-PCT application was searched by the EPO in its capacity as (S)ISA, the examination fee may be reduced twice under the micro-entity scheme: first by a reduction of the examination fee and then, additionally, by a reduction of the amount previously paid for the international search but taking account of any refund or reduction already applied to that fee ([A-X, 9.4](#)).

[Art. 14\(2\) RFees](#)

Moreover, where the EPO in its capacity as IPEA has drawn up an IPER for the application, the examination fee to be paid under [Rule 159\(1\)\(f\)](#) is reduced by 75% ([Art. 14\(2\) RFees](#); [A-X, 9.5.2](#)). This reduction does not apply to divisional applications for whose parent application the EPO has drawn up the IPER, nor does it apply if the applicant requests examination of parts of the international application that are exceptionally not covered in the IPER.

If the conditions for a reduction under either the language arrangements or the scheme for micro-entities are also fulfilled, the examination fee is first reduced by 75%, then by a further 30%, i.e. the total reduction is 82.5%,

and the amount payable is 17.5%, of the full fee (OJ EPO 2024, A3, and OJ EPO 2024, A8).

If the applicant is eligible for a reduction under Art. 14.2 RFees, the language arrangements and the scheme for micro-entities, the three reductions are applied sequentially, i.e. the examination fee is first reduced by 75%, then by 30% under the language arrangements and then again by 30% under the scheme for micro-entities (OJ EPO 2024, A8, which includes examples). Under certain circumstances, this calculation can result in a negative amount, meaning no fee is payable. A negative amount is not offset against other fees paid.

For general guidance on payment of the examination fee, see A-X.

7.1 Legal consequence and remedy if the examination fee is not paid or the request for examination not filed

If the examination fee is not paid and/or the request for examination not filed in due time, the Euro-PCT application will be deemed to be withdrawn and the applicant will be informed accordingly in a (combined) communication under Rules 160(2) and 112(1).

Rule 160

In the case of a loss of rights under Rule 160, further processing under Art. 121 is available. If both actions were not performed, the fee for further processing amounts to the sum of the flat fee and 50% of the examination fee (Art. 2(1), item 12, first and third indents, RFees) (E-VIII, 2).

Art. 121

If the time limit for requesting further processing has been missed, a request for re-establishment of rights in respect of the period under Rule 135(1) may be filed (E-VIII, 3).

Art. 122

The remedy in Rule 49.6 PCT is not available for the reasons set out in A-XIII, 3.3.

Rule 49.6 PCT

8. Renewal fees

The renewal fees for a Euro-PCT application are due in respect of the third and each subsequent year, as calculated from the date of filing of the Euro-PCT application accorded by the receiving Office (Art. 11 PCT) unless that date is reviewed (A-XV, 1.3, 4 and 6).

Rule 159(1)(g) provides that, if the renewal fee in respect of the third year has fallen due earlier, applicants must pay it within the 31-month period. This means that if the third-year renewal falls due in accordance with Rule 51(1) before expiry of the 31-month period, the due date is deferred by virtue of the processing ban (A-XII, 3.1) and the fee may be paid without surcharge up to expiry of the 31-month period.

Renewal fee payments initiated via a deposit account before the permissible prepayment periods are not valid. Where the third year renewal fee is paid too early, i.e. before the permissible prepayment period of six months, e.g. in the 29th month for an application claiming the full 12-month priority period, the fee will be automatically rejected at source under ADA 9.1 and 9.2 (OJ EPO 2024, A81; OJ EPO 2024, A82). If a debit order

for a renewal fee is included in a batch filed via Central Fee Payment before the earliest valid payment dates under [Rule 51\(1\)](#), it will be rejected at source by the validation functionality ([A-X, 4.2.3](#)).

For the calculation of the due date of renewal fees in general, i.e. where the third-year renewal fee is due only after expiry of the 31-month period, see [A-X, 5.2.4](#).

For general guidance on the payment of fees, see [A-X](#). To support small entities and micro-entities, applicants fulfilling certain criteria are eligible for fee reductions (for the eligibility criteria, see [A-X, 9.2](#) and [9.4](#)).

8.1 Remedy if the third-year renewal fee is not paid by expiry of the 31-month time limit

If the renewal fee for the third year is due under [Rule 159\(1\)\(g\)](#) and [Rule 51\(1\)](#), but not paid within the 31-month period, it may still be paid within six months of the due date ("grace period"), provided it is paid with the additional fee, i.e. a 50% surcharge ([Rule 51\(2\)](#); see [A-X, 5.2.4](#)). The applicant is informed by a separate notice that draws attention to the possibility of paying the renewal fee with the additional fee within the six-month period under [Rule 51\(2\)](#). The omission of this notification may not be invoked. If the due date for payment is the date of expiry of the 31-month period, an extension of that period pursuant to [Rule 134](#) affects the due date for payment of the additional fee ([A-XII, 4.1](#)). If the renewal fee is not paid within the six-month grace period, the application is deemed to be withdrawn and the applicant is informed of this in a communication under [Rule 112\(1\)](#). As a means of redress, the applicant may file a request for re-establishment of rights under [Art. 122](#) in respect of the period for paying the renewal fee and the additional fee ([E-VIII, 3](#)).

9. General aspects of full and partial compliance and non-compliance with the minimum requirements

General aspects of full or partial compliance with the applicable minimum requirements for entry into the European phase are dealt with in [A-XIII, 9.1](#). These concern the requirements for provisional protection under [Art. 67](#), for filing a divisional application and for a Euro-PCT application to become part of the state of art under [Art. 54\(3\)](#).

The legal consequences of non-compliance are dealt with for each of the minimum requirements in [A-XIII, 3](#) to [8](#). The general aspects of non-compliance with more than one minimum requirement for entry into the European phase are dealt with in [A-XIII, 9.2](#).

9.1 Effects of full or partial compliance

Provided all applicable requirements are complied with and entry into the European phase is therefore effective, the processing of a Euro-PCT application as a pending European patent application will start on expiry of the 31-month period or on receipt of a request for early processing ([A-XII, 3](#) and [4](#)). As a rule, the EPO will inform the applicant in the communication under [Rule 161/162](#) of the start, unless the right to receive that communication is waived ([A-XII, 7.3](#)). However, if it is established that a request for early processing is effective the applicant is notified by separate

communication of its effective date. The EPO proceeds as set out in A-XII, 7.2, if the intentions of the applicant are unclear.

As set out in A-XIII, 9.1.1, entry into the European phase does not confer provisional protection under Art. 67.

A significant consequence of effective entry into the European phase is that, as from the effective date, a divisional application may be filed; see A-XIII, 9.1.2.

Furthermore, if within the 31-month period, (only) the filing fee is paid and, where applicable, the translation filed (A-XIII, 3.2 and 4), the application will not become pending before the EPO as designated/elected Office, but the application will be considered part of the state of the art under Rule 165 in combination with Art. 54(3) (A-XIII, 9.1.3).

The EPO makes information about all Euro-PCT applications that have validly entered the European phase, that have suffered a (final) loss of rights or that fulfil (only) the requirements under Rule 165 available in the European Patent Bulletin (A-XIII, 10). The EPO will not republish any applications which have entered the European phase and for which processing as a pending European application before the EPO as designated/elected Office has started, unless the international publication was not published by the IB in an official language of the EPO (A-XIII, 10).

9.1.1 Provisional protection under Art. 67

Pursuant to Art. 153(3), the international publication of a Euro-PCT application in an official language of the EPO takes the place of the publication of the European patent application and will be mentioned in the European Patent Bulletin on entry into the European phase. Consequently, a Euro-PCT application published by the IB in an official language of the EPO enjoys, subject to the provisions of Art. 67(3), provisional protection as provided for in Art. 67(1) and (2) as from the date of the international publication in all EPC member states. The mention of the publication in the European Patent Bulletin on entry into the European phase is thus not a condition for the provisional protection to ensue.

Art. 29 PCT
Art. 153(3) and (4)
Rule 159
Art. 67

If the international publication of the Euro-PCT application is in a language other than an official language of the EPO, the EPO will publish the mandatory translation into one of the official languages filed on entry into the European phase (A-XIII, 3). In that case, the provisional protection provided for in Art. 67 (1) and (2) is, subject to Art. 67(3), effective only as from the date of publication of the translation by the EPO.

9.1.2 Divisional applications

There is no provision in the PCT for filing divisional applications. One or more European divisional applications may be filed in accordance with Art. 76 in respect of subject-matter contained in a pending Euro-PCT application as earlier application, but not before that application has effectively entered the European phase (A-IV, 1.1), i.e. not before the time limit under Rule 159(1) has expired (G 1/09, Reasons 3.2.5), and on condition that any requirement of Art. 22(1) PCT or Art. 39(1) which must

Art. 76
Rule 36

be fulfilled within that time limit for the application concerned is met (J 18/09). This means that divisional applications may be filed as from the date the applicant has filed an effective request for early processing.

The requirements of Rule 36 for filing a divisional application must be complied with (A-IV, 1). The divisional application must be filed in the language specified in Rule 36(2) (A-IV, 1.3.3).

To prevent the Euro-PCT application from being deemed withdrawn at the time a divisional application is filed, the various requirements of Rule 159(1) must be fulfilled within the relevant time limits.

9.1.3 Prior-art effect under Rule 165

Art. 153(5)

Rule 165

Rule 49.5(a), (d), (f),
and (k) PCT

It follows from Art. 153(5), in conjunction with Rule 165, that an international application is included in the state of the art for the purposes of Art. 54(3) if the PCT applicant has paid the filing fee under Rule 159(1)(c) and supplied a translation under Rule 159(1)(a) in cases where the application has not been published by the IB in one of the official languages of the EPO (A-XIII, 3). Thus, for a Euro-PCT application to be considered a conflicting European application under Art. 54(3), not all minimum requirements must be met and the EPO will provide information about it in the European Patent Bulletin even though it has not entered the European phase (A-XIII, 10). For general information on Art. 54(3), see G-IV, 5.2.

Moreover, the translation required for the prior-art effect under Rule 165 does not need to fulfil the same requirements as the translation required for effective entry into the European phase (A-XIII, 3). The translation under Rule 165 (only) needs to contain the following:

- the description (as originally filed; if applicable, the title as established by the ISA under Rule 37.2 PCT)
- the claims (as originally filed)
- any text matter in the drawings as originally filed, except for the expression "Fig."
- the abstract.

9.2 Remedies in the case of non-compliance with more than one of the applicable minimum requirements

Non-compliance with the applicable minimum requirements for entry into the European phase will result in a loss of rights. However, if a request for early processing has been filed, the EPO will inform the applicant that the request is not (yet) effective and that they have the right to comply with any requirement within the 31-month period (A-XII, 7.2).

Art. 121

Art. 2(1), item 12,

RFees

Due to their different legal nature, the individual acts required under Rule 159(1) do not form a unitary procedural step but are legally independent and subject to independent time limits (A-XII, 4.1). Information on the remedies available for non-observance of the time limits under Rule 159(1)

is therefore provided for each minimum requirement in A-XIII, 3-8. As a rule, non-compliance with one or more of the applicable minimum requirements may be remedied by a request for further processing in accordance with Art. 121. For omitted procedural acts (e.g. late filing of a translation), the further processing fee is a flat rate. For late payments, the further processing fee amounts to 50% of the late-paid fee.

Furthermore, if the time limit for requesting further processing has been missed, a request for re-establishment of rights in respect of the period under Rule 135(1) may be filed under the conditions set out in E-VIII, 2. On the alternative remedy available under R 49.6 PCT in cases of non-compliance with Rule 159(1)(a) and/or (c) (filing a translation and payment of the filing fee), see A-XIII, 3.3 and 4.2.

Art. 122

Rule 49.6 PCT

The principles regarding unitary and independent procedural acts (E-VIII, 2) have important consequences for the number of fees for further processing and re-establishment of rights in the case of non-compliance with the time limit under Rule 159(1) if several required acts for entry into the European phase have not been performed. In that case, a fee for further processing, or for re-establishment of rights, must be paid for each requirement not met. However, for each set of acts treated as forming a unitary procedural act, only one fee for re-establishment is due.

An example provided in E-VIII, 3.1.3, including a table, illustrates the fees for further processing and re-establishment to be paid in such cases. The table lists in box I the number of independent unobserved time limits. Box II of the table gives the fee for further processing corresponding to each unobserved time limit. Box III shows the fee for re-establishment of rights in respect of each unobserved time limit.

10. Publication and file inspection

The public is informed in the European Patent Bulletin of all applications that either have effectively entered the European phase or are deemed withdrawn for non-compliance with the minimum requirements (A-XIII, 11.1 and 11.2).

The EPO also provides in the European Patent Bulletin a list of all Euro-PCT applications that have not entered the European phase but have fulfilled (only) the requirements referred to in Art. 153(5) and Rule 165 and thereby have become part of the prior art under Art. 54(3) (OJ EPO 2021, A51). These applications are mentioned in section I.2(2) of the European Patent Bulletin as a separate category under the heading "International applications considered as comprised in the state of the art under Rule 165 and Art. 54(3) EPC". On the requirements under Art. 153(5) and Rule 165, see A-XIII, 9.1.3.

If the examiner retrieves relevant intermediate and/or conflicting Euro-PCT applications for which it is not yet clear if they will become prior art under Art. 54(3) in conjunction with Art. 153(5) and Rule 165 (G-IV, 5.2), the examiner will defer issuing a communication concerning the intention to grant until there is certainty on whether the application concerned may or may not enter the European phase or fulfil the requirements under Rule

165 (C-IV, 7.1). Full clarity on the status of a Euro-PCT application under the EPC is thus available at the latest when the European Patent Bulletin provides information on whether a Euro-PCT application has entered the European phase, been deemed withdrawn for non-compliance with Rule 159, or, alternatively, has fulfilled (only) the requirements under Rule 165.

10.1 Publication of the international application

Art. 153(3) and (4)
Rule 159

Pursuant to Art. 153(3) the international publication of a Euro-PCT application in an official language of the EPO takes the place of the publication of the European patent application and will be mentioned in the European Patent Bulletin.

Art. 67

A Euro-PCT application published by the IB in an official language of the EPO enjoys, subject to the provisions of Art. 67(3), provisional protection as from the date of the international publication (A-XIII, 9.1.1). If the international publication of the Euro-PCT application is in a language other than an official language of the EPO, a translation into one of the official languages must be filed under Rule 159(1)(a) in combination with Art. 153(4), and Art. 22(1) PCT and Art. 39(1) PCT (A-XIII, 3). The EPO will publish that translation shortly after the start of the European phase processing. In that case, the provisional protection is, subject to Art. 67(3), effective only as from the date of publication of the translation by the EPO (A-XIII, 9.1.1).

Rule 48.2 PCT

The translation of the international application is published together with the bibliographic data as an A-document and includes all documents that were part of the international publication as originally published in accordance with Rule 48.2 PCT:

- a standardised front page in accordance with Rule 48.2(b) PCT
- the description as originally filed
- the claims as originally filed
- any claims amended under Art. 19 PCT, including any related statement of which a translation has been filed (A-XII, 3.1, items (viii) and (ix))
- any drawings, in the same format as originally filed, i.e. in black and white or with colour or greyscale content(*)
- the sequence listing forming part of the description
- the abstract
- any appendices to the application
- any correct parts or elements incorporated by reference under Rule 20.6 PCT in conjunction with Rule 20.5bis(d) PCT

- any erroneously filed parts or elements, where correct parts or elements were incorporated by reference under Rule 20.6 PCT in conjunction with Rule 20.5bis(d) PCT
- any late-filed missing parts incorporated by reference under Rule 20.6 PCT in conjunction with Rule 20.5(a) PCT
- any certificate(s) of the deposit of biological material
- the translation of the international search report (Rule 44bis.3 PCT).

(*) For Euro-PCT applications entering the European phase on or after 1 October 2025, the publication will contain drawings in colour or greyscale on condition that they were filed in this format, are available on PATENTSCOPE and the international publication mentions this (see the notice from the EPO dated 5 September 2025, OJ EPO 2025, A57, and A-VI, 1.3).

If Rule 20.5bis(d) PCT applies, the publication will comprise a translation of both the erroneously filed application documents and the correct application documents. The front page of the publication will mention that the notification of incompatibility under Rule 20.5bis(d) PCT applies to the application if it was filed between 1 July 2020 and 31 October 2022. The notification of incompatibility was withdrawn with effect from 1 November 2022 and is no longer mentioned for applications filed on or after that date (see the April 2025 edition of the Guidelines, A-III, 13.2; see also C-III, 1.3).

Rule 20.5bis(d) PCT

10.2 Information on the publication of the ISR and the supplementary European search report

Pursuant to Art. 153(6), the ISR takes the place of the European search report and is not republished. Once the international application is published, the ISR is available via file inspection, given that the EPO either already has it because it acted as (S)ISA or has received it from the IB in its capacity as designated/elected Office under Art. 20 PCT (A-XII, 5.2). The communication under Art. 20 PCT is issued shortly before the end of the international phase unless it was requested earlier (A-XII, 7.1; A-XV, 2 and 3).

Art. 20 PCT

Art. 153(6)

The European Patent Bulletin will mention the date of dispatch of any supplementary European search report drawn up in accordance with Art. 153(7) (A-XIV, 5). The report is not published but is available via file inspection (A-XI, 2.2; A-XIII, 10.3).

Art. 153(7)

10.3 Inspection of files

In its capacity as designated Office, the EPO also allows access to its files pertaining to the international phase, provided that international publication has taken place.

Art. 30(2) PCT

Rule 94.2 PCT

The above applies *mutatis mutandis* to the communication of information from the files.

Art. 38 PCT

Rule 94.2 PCT

Rule 94.3 PCT

In its capacity as elected Office the EPO allows access to its files pertaining to the international phase – including the files relating to international preliminary examination in respect of which the EPO acted as IPEA – but only for applications filed on or after 1 July 1998, and only provided international publication has taken place and, as far as the PCT Chapter II file is concerned, the IPER has been completed (OJ EPO 2003, 382).

The above applies *mutatis mutandis* to the communication of information from the files (A-XI, 2 and A-XI, 3).

11. Examination of further formal requirements – non-compliance

As set out in A-XII, 4.4, certain minimum requirements must be fulfilled within the 31-month period for entry into the European phase in accordance with Rule 159. However, depending on the characteristics of the application and the characteristics of the processing in the international phase (A-XII, 1.4), the applicant may also have to fulfil one or more "further requirements" within the 31-month period.

Non-compliance with any of the further requirements – unlike non-compliance with the minimum requirements – does not prevent the application from entering the European phase and the applicant from being given a further opportunity to comply with these requirements in accordance with Rule 51*bis* PCT and/or Art. 150(2) (A-XII, 4.3).

It is nevertheless advisable to comply with the further requirements within the 31-month period. Non-compliance with most further requirements will result either in the refusal of the application after the start of the European phase proceedings or another loss of rights. Non-compliance may also delay the start of the processing because the formalities officer will refer the file to the search division for the drawing up of the supplementary European search report or to the examining division for examination only on condition that the file can be dealt with (A-XII, 4.4).

Rule 159(1)(b)

Although Rule 159(1)(b) states that the applicant must specify the documents on which they wish the European phase processing to be based within the 31-month period, non-compliance with this further requirement does not result in a direct loss of rights and also has no legal consequences later in the proceedings, and it is therefore not dealt with in this section. See, however, A-XII, 5.3 on the importance of specifying the documents for the European phase processing in good time.

The following sections set out the legal consequences of non-compliance and the remedies available for each of the further requirements listed below.

Rule 163(1)

– file the designation of the inventor (A-XIII, 11.1)

Rule 163(2)

– furnish the file number or a certified copy of the application(s) from which priority is claimed (A-XIII, 11.2)

Rule 163(3)

– furnish a sequence listing complying with the standard (A-XIII, 11.3)

- furnish any details mentioned in Rule 163(4) that are missing for any applicant (A-XIII, 11.4) Rule 163(4)
- appoint a professional representative, if required (A-XIII, 11.5) Rule 163(5)
Art. 133(2)
- where applicable, file the certificate of exhibition mentioned in Art. 55(2) (A-XIII, 11.6) Rule 159(1)(h)
- furnish a copy of the results of any search carried out by or on behalf of the authority with which the priority application was filed (A-III, 6.12; A-XIII, 11.7) Rule 141
- pay any claims fees due (A-XIII, 11.8; A-XIV, 2.2) Rule 162(1)

11.1 Missing designation of inventor

Pursuant to Art. 81 and Art. 150(2) in combination with Art. 27 and Rule 51bis.1(a) PCT, where the applicant is not the inventor or not the sole inventor, the inventor must be designated within the 31-month period. A designation need not be filed if the data concerning the inventor were submitted in the international phase (A-III, 5). If that is not the case, the applicant may still comply with this requirement in the European phase in accordance with Rule 163(1) and Rule 51bis.3 PCT.

Art. 4(1)(v) PCT
Art. 22(1) PCT
Art. 27(2) PCT
Art. 39(1) PCT
Rule 51bis.2 and 3 PCT
Rule 4.1(a)(iv) PCT
Art. 81

Under Rule 163(1), the applicant is invited to file the designation of inventor within a period of two months set in the invitation. A failure to file it in time leads to the refusal of the application under Rule 163(6). The applicant will be notified accordingly.

Rule 19
Rule 163(1)
Rule 163(6)

The refusal may be remedied by a request for further processing. The request will be granted on condition that the missing data are filed and the fee for further processing is paid within two months of notification of the decision (E-VIII, 2).

Art. 121

Where an inventor has been named in the PCT request, they cannot waive their right to be mentioned in the published application.

11.2 Missing file number or copy of priority claim

Pursuant to Rule 163(2), if the applicant did not ensure that a certified copy of the priority document or, where a copy need not be filed, the file number of the application from which priority is claimed was made available to the EPO during the international phase, they must provide that document or file number within the 31-month period unless an exception applies. The copy is deemed filed (A-I, 4.1.3.1; A-III, 6.7.2) if priority is claimed from a European patent application or an international application filed with the EPO as receiving Office, unless a copy of the previous application cannot be retrieved (OJ EPO 2021, A83).

Rule 53
Rule 163(2)

If no exception applies, the EPO invites the applicant to furnish a certified copy and/or number within a period of two months set in the invitation under Rule 163(2). This time limit cannot be extended. If the certified copy and/or the file number is not submitted within the time limit set in the

invitation, the priority right is lost. The applicant will be notified accordingly of the loss of the right of priority in a communication under Rule 112(1) (A-III, 6.11). The effect of the loss is that any intermediate document(s) found will become relevant for the assessment of patentability under Art. 54(2) or Art. 54(3), as applicable.

Art. 121

The loss of the priority right may be remedied by a request for further processing under Art. 121. The request will be granted on condition that the certified copy of the previous application and/or the file number is filed and the fee for further processing is paid within two months of notification of the loss of rights (E-VIII, 2).

Rule 17.1 PCT

Rule 17.2(a) PCT

However, where the applicant has complied with Rule 17.1(a), (b) or (b-bis) PCT, the EPO as a designated/elected Office will not necessarily invite them to furnish it with a copy of the priority document (Rule 17.2(a), second sentence, PCT). Thus, where a priority document has not been received from the IB and is missing on PATENTSCOPE, but the applicant has requested the receiving Office to forward the priority document(s) to the IB or requested the IB to obtain the certified copy of the previous application(s) from DAS, no loss of rights will occur (F-VI, 2.1). In this case, substantive examination may begin, but the decision to grant will not be taken until the priority document is furnished. The applicant is informed accordingly.

Furthermore, if the priority document is not on file, substantive examination may be started, provided that no intermediate documents under Art. 54(2) or Art. 54(3) have been found which cause the patentability of the subject matter claimed to depend on the validity of the priority right. However, no European patent may be granted until such time as the priority document is received. In this case, the applicant is informed that the decision to grant will not be taken as long as the priority document is missing. On the other hand, the application may be refused without the priority document being on file, provided that the relevant prior art for the assessment of patentability of the invention claimed is not a document under Art. 54(2) or under Art. 54(3). For more details of the processing of such cases in examination, see F-VI, 3.4.

General information on priority claims in the procedure before the EPO as designated/elected Office is provided in A-XII, 5.4.

11.2.1 Translation of a priority document for a Euro-PCT application

Rule 51bis.1(e)(ii)

PCT

Art. 88(1)

Rule 53(3)

Following entry into the European phase, the EPO may invite the applicant in accordance with Rule 53(3) to file a translation of the previous application, if the priority document on file is not in English, French or German and the validity of the priority claim is relevant for determining whether the invention concerned is patentable (A-III, 6.8 and A-III, 6.10). Where a translation of the priority document is required, an invitation under Rule 53(3) to submit it may be sent (only) by the examining division after expiry of the six-month period under Rules 161 and 162 (F-VI, 3.4).

If a translation is already available to the EPO, it will not issue an invitation. The translation available does not need to be in the language of the proceedings as long as it is in English, French or German.

Where the international application is a complete translation of the previous application, a declaration to that effect is sufficient and no invitation to file a translation will be issued (EPO Form 1200, Section 7.3). This means that if the priority application is, for instance, a national application filed in Spanish, the applicant may declare that the international application filed in, for instance, English is a complete translation of the Spanish priority application. A translation from Spanish into an official language of the EPO is not required in that case. A translation of the priority document may also be requested where the application was filed (in part) on the basis of incorporation by reference.

11.3 Missing sequence listing

If a sequence listing in electronic form complying with the applicable WIPO standard is not available to the EPO on expiry of the 31-month time limit, the applicant will be invited to furnish the sequence listing and pay the late furnishing fee within a non-extendable period of two months in accordance with Rules 163(3) and 30(3).

Rule 30(3)
Rule 163(3)

If the required sequence listing is not filed and the late furnishing fee is not paid within the time limit set, the application will be refused. The refusal may be remedied by filing the standard-compliant sequence listing, paying the late furnishing fee and filing a request for further processing under Art. 121. Two fees for further processing are due for the omitted acts: a flat fee for late filing of the standard-compliant sequence listing and 50% of the late furnishing fee for the late payment.

11.4 Missing information for any applicant

In accordance with Rule 163(4), the applicant must ensure that any information missing for any applicant is filed within the 31-month period (A-XII, 6.1). This applies to any application for which the address, nationality or state of residence or principal place of business of any applicant was not provided in the international phase (A-III, 2; A-III, 16).

Rule 163(4)

If the EPO establishes that any such information is missing from the file on expiry of the 31-month period, the EPO invites the applicant to furnish the information within a period of two months set in the invitation under Rule 163(4). Failure to rectify this deficiency in time leads to the refusal of the application under Rule 163(6). Applicants will be notified accordingly.

The refusal may be remedied by a request for further processing. The request will be granted on condition that the missing data are filed and the fee for further processing is paid within two months of notification of the decision (E-VIII, 2).

Art. 121

11.5 Missing appointment of a representative

The requirements as regards representation in the proceedings before the EPO as designated/elected Office are set out in A-XII, 6.2. If a professional

Rule 163(5)

representative must be appointed, they must be appointed within the 31-month period, in accordance with Rule 163(5).

Until the EPO is informed of the (valid) appointment of a professional representative, where this is required, any procedural step taken by the applicant will be deemed not to have been taken, except for any steps taken before expiry of the 31-month period (A-XII, 6.2). See A-XII, 7.1 on cases where there is a request for early processing.

Art. 121
Rule 163(6)

If the deficiency is not corrected in time, the application will be refused pursuant to Rule 163(6). The omission may be remedied by a request for further processing under Art. 121, which will be granted if the representative is appointed and the fee for further processing is paid within two months of notification of the decision (E-VIII, 2).

11.6 Certificate of exhibition

Art. 54
Art. 55(2)
Rule 25
Rule 159(1)(h)

Pursuant to Rule 159(1)(h), any required certificate of exhibition must be filed within the 31-month period for entry into the European phase (A-IV, 3).

If the certificate is not filed in due time, the applicant is informed of this in a communication under Rule 112(1). The omission may be remedied by a request for further processing, which will be granted if it is filed and the fee for further processing is paid within two months of notification of the communication (E-VIII, 2).

If the certificate is not filed, this will affect the prior art that the EPO takes into account in the European phase proceedings to the extent that the applicant's disclosure at the relevant exhibition will be taken into account for the purposes of establishing whether the invention claimed is new under Art. 54. The relevant exhibitions falling within the terms of the EPC are published on the EPO website (epo.org).

11.7 Search results of a priority application (Rule 141)

The applicant must, on entry into the European phase, file the results of any search carried out by or on behalf of the office of first filing for each application whose priority is claimed (A-III, 6.12). If these results are not available on entry into the European phase, they should be filed without delay after they have become available to the applicant (Rule 141(1)). The obligation under Rule 141(1) exists as long as the application is pending before the EPO, but only if the Euro-PCT application was filed on or after 1 January 2011 (OJ EPO 2009, 585).

See A-III, 6.12 for the cases where a copy is deemed duly filed in accordance with Rule 141(2).

Where the results are not provided to the EPO before the examining division assumes responsibility, the procedure is as set out in C-II, 5 and C-III, 6.

11.8 Payment of claims fees under Rule 162(1)

According to Rule 162(1), claims fees for a Euro-PCT application must be paid within the 31-month period under Rule 159(1). However, in view of Rule 162(2), a failure to pay them within that 31-month period has no consequences. For amendments made both before and after expiry of the 31-month period, Rule 162(2) provides that any claims fees may be paid up to expiry of the six-month period under Rules 161 and 162. There is therefore no loss of rights under Rule 163(3) if any claims fees are paid (only) within this period referred to in Rule 162(2). See A-XIV, 2.2 for further information on claims fees and the procedure under Rule 162. Rule 162(1) is important in cases where the applicant wishes to waive the right to receive the communication under Rules 161 and 162 (A-XII, 7.2).

Rule 162
Art. 2(1), item 15.
RFees

Chapter XIV – Amendments and claims fee under Rules 161 and 162 – Supplementary European search – Examination – Search under Rule 164

1. General

The EPO as designated/elected Office will first check whether all formal requirements for the start of the European phase processing are met: it will establish both its competence to process the application (A-XII, 3) – at the latest on expiry of the 31-month period (A-XII, 3.2) – and compliance with the applicable minimum requirements for entry into the European phase (A-XII, 4.3). It will then issue the combined communication under Rules 161 and 162 – usually referred to in the following as "the communication under Rules 161 and 162" – inviting the applicant to file amendments and to pay any claims fees due within a set six-month period.

A-XIV, 2.1 contains general information on the right to amend under Rule 161(1) and (2) respectively. In its sub-sections the following aspects are discussed: the difference between voluntary and mandatory amendments (A-XIV, 2.1.1), the formal requirements for amendments (A-XIV, 2.1.2), and the further possibilities of amending the application at a later stage in the grant proceedings (A-XIV, 2.1.3).

The EPO issues different versions of the communication under Rules 161 and 162 depending on whether it is based on Rule 161(1) or Rule 161(2) and, for those issued under Rule 161(1), whether the WO-ISA, SISR or IPER was positive or negative (A-XIV, 2.1.2).

A-XIV, 2.2 deals with the right to pay claims fees under Rule 162.

A-XIV, 3 sets out the procedure under Rule 161(1), which applies where the EPO acted as (S)ISA and, if a demand for this was filed, as IPEA. In these cases, a European supplementary search is dispensed with (A-XIV, 1.1). This means that, so long as no formal requirement stands in the way, the application is forwarded to the examining division for substantive examination (A-XIV, 6) on expiry of the six-month period under Rules 161(1) and 162. An invitation under Rule 164(2) will not be issued for any claimed invention or group of inventions within the meaning of Art. 82 that was searched by the EPO in its capacity as (S)ISA or for which a declaration under Art. 17(2) PCT or Rule 45bis.5(g) PCT was issued. However, the applicant may file arguments or amendments to overcome these reasons up to expiry of the six-month period under Rules 161(1) and 162, and thereby obtain an additional search as further set out in A-XIV, 3.

A-XIV, 4 sets out the procedure under Rule 161(2), which applies in all cases where a supplementary European search report must be drawn up, i.e. for any Euro-PCT application for which the EPO did not act as (S)ISA (A-XIV, 1.1). If a supplementary European search has to be performed, payment of the search fee under Rule 159(1)(c) is a minimum requirement for effective entry into the European phase (A-XIII, 6). If on expiry of the six-

month period under Rules 161(2) and 162, the formalities officer finds that no formal requirement stands in the way, the application is forwarded to the search division for search (A-XIV, 5).

Rule 164 provides the applicant with an opportunity to pay, on invitation and within a two-month period, a further search fee for any claimed invention or group of inventions within the meaning of Art. 82 which has not been searched by the EPO as (S)ISA in the international phase but which is claimed in the set of claims available to the EPO on expiry of the six-month period for filing amendments under Rules 161 and 162. This opportunity is available both where a supplementary European search is to be carried out under Rule 164(1) and where the supplementary European search is dispensed with in the examination proceedings under Rule 164(2). See A-XIV, 5.1 for the procedure under Rule 164(1) and A-XIV, 6.2 for the procedure under Rule 164(2) in examination.

1.1 Exemption from European supplementary search

Art. 153(6) and (7)
Rule 70(2)

Pursuant to Art. 153(6) the ISR – or the declaration replacing it under Art. 17(2)(a) PCT – and its international publication take the place of the European search report and the mention of its publication in the European Patent Bulletin.

The effect of considering the ISR and its publication under Art. 153(6) to be equivalent to a European search report and its publication is, however, limited by Art. 153(7), which provides that a supplementary European search report must be drawn up for every Euro-PCT application unless it is dispensed with by decision of the Administrative Council. The Council may also decide that the search fee under Rule 159(1)(c) is reduced (A-XIII, 6). Pursuant to a decision of the Administrative Council under Art. 153(7), a supplementary European search is dispensed with, and so no search fee is payable under Rule 159(1)(c) (A-XIII, 6), if the EPO acted as ISA or as SISA in the international phase (OJ EPO 2009, 594; OJ EPO 2010, 316). The same applies if a declaration under Art. 17(2)(a) PCT and, in the case of an SISR, the declaration under Rule 45bis.5(c) PCT have been issued, since these declarations are treated as taking the place of the ISR and, where applicable, the SISR (Art. 153(6)) (B-II, 4.3.1 and B-II, 4.3.2).

A supplementary European search is also dispensed with for applications filed before 1 July 2005 for which the Swedish Intellectual Property Office, the Austrian Patent Office or the Spanish Patent and Trademark Office was the ISA (OJ EPO 1979, 248; OJ EPO 1995, 511; OJ EPO 2012, 212 and 219).

2. General – amendments and claims fees under Rules 161 and 162

2.1 Amendments under Rule 161(1) and (2)

Art. 28(1) PCT
Art. 41(1) PCT
Rule 161

In the procedure before the EPO as designated/elected Office, Rule 161 implements the right of applicants under the (higher-ranking) PCT to make amendments on entry into the national/regional phase (Art. 28(1) and Art. 41(1) PCT) (A-XII, 1.1).

Under no circumstances may any amendment filed with the EPO as designated/elected Office or in the international phase go beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed. The EPO is not bound by an amendment accepted in the international phase in breach of Art. 28(2) PCT or Art. 41(2) PCT and Art. 123(2).

Art. 27(5) PCT

Art. 28(2) PCT

Art. 41(2) PCT

Art. 123(2)

The communication under Rules 161 and 162 is issued promptly after the EPO has become competent to process the application (A-XII, 3), once it has established compliance with the applicable minimum requirements for entry into the European phase. Its issue will be delayed if the EPO has not yet received the ISR.

The period under Rules 161 and 162 for filing (further) amendments and paying any claims fees due is six months. This six-month period cannot be extended (E-VIII, 1.6). However, further processing is available both for paying unpaid claim fees and for addressing any deficiency noted in the WO-ISA, SISR or IPER established by the EPO (A-XIV, 2.2 and 3). The communication also informs the applicant that the application has entered the European phase.

The communication under Rules 161 and 162 will be issued in all circumstances. This means that it is issued regardless of whether the EPO acted as (S)ISA or IPEA in the international phase, and regardless of whether the EPO or another International Authority arrived at any negative finding in the WO-ISA, SISR or IPER (A-XIV, 2.1.1). It is also issued where the applicant has already filed, together with EPO Form 1200 or later, amendments and/or comments intended to form the basis for the proceedings in the European phase (A-XII, 5.3.1). The only exception is where the applicant has validly waived the right to receive the communication (A-XII, 7.2).

Applicants who do not want to use the entire six-month period under Rules 161 and 162 for filing further amendments can shorten it and request the immediate start of either the supplementary European search or substantive examination, as applicable, by explicitly waiving their right to use the remainder of the six-month period under the same conditions as apply to the waiver filed at the time of entry into the European phase (A-XII, 7.2).

If the applicant files several sets of amendments with the EPO as designated/elected Office, the EPO will proceed on the basis of the last set of amendments filed within the six-month period under Rules 161 and 162, provided that any claims fees due for that final set have been duly paid (A-XIV, 2.2). Any unpaid claims fees will result in a partial loss of rights that may be remedied by a request for further processing (A-XIV, 2.2).

For the reasons set out in A-XII, 5.3, it is advantageous for both the EPO and the applicant if any amendments that the applicant wishes to serve as the basis for the European phase processing are filed together with EPO Form 1200. This avoids payment of an incorrect amount of the filing fee, including the additional (page) fee (A-XII, 5.3; A-XIII, 4).

2.1.1 Voluntary and mandatory comments and amendments

In accordance with their right under the PCT (Art. 28(1) PCT in combination with Rule 52 PCT and Art. 41(1) PCT in combination with Rule 78.1(b) PCT), and irrespective of whether Rule 161(1) or (2) applies, applicants are entitled to file any comments and amendments to the application documents (the claims, the description and the drawings) they wish for the purposes of the European grant proceedings. Under these PCT provisions, as implemented by Rule 161, applicants are entitled to submit (further) comments on any finding and to file (further) amendments as they see fit within the six-month period under Rules 161 and 162, regardless of whether the EPO acted as (S)ISA or IPEA in the international phase, and regardless of whether the EPO or another International Authority arrived at any negative finding in the WO-ISA, SISR or IPER. If under Rule 161 any comments or amendments are filed in accordance with Art. 28(1) PCT or Art. 41(1) PCT, i.e. without any obligation to do so, they are referred to as "voluntary" comments and amendments (OJ EPO 2010, 316 and 406; OJ EPO 2009, 533).

Rule 161(1) applies to applications for which the EPO acted as (S)ISA and, if a demand for this was filed, as IPEA (A-XIV, 3). If the EPO acting as (S)ISA or IPEA issued a negative opinion, applicants are obliged to file (also) a reply, i.e. comments and/or amendments, to the deficiencies noted by the EPO in the WO-ISA, SISR or IPER within the time limit under Rules 161 and 162. In other words, the comments and amendments filed in response to a negative opinion are mandatory.

Rule 161(2) applies to applications for which the EPO did not act as (S)ISA (A-XIV, 4). In these cases, any comments and amendments filed under Rule 161(2), whether or not in response to any results of the international phase processing, are always voluntary.

2.1.2 Application of Rule 137(4)

Rule 137(4)

Both voluntary and mandatory amendments under Rule 161 which are intended to form the basis for further examination must comply with the requirements under Rule 137(4) before expiry of the six-month period under Rules 161 and 162. This means that the amendments must be identified, together with their basis in the application as filed. If the requirements under Rule 137(4) have not been fulfilled for any amendments already filed, the required information must be provided before expiry of the six-month period under Rules 161 and 162. If the applicant has still not fulfilled them by expiry of that period, the examining division may invite them in a communication under Rule 137(4) to provide the information within a period of one month.

Art. 94(4)

Art. 121

Failure to respond to the communication in due time will lead to the application being deemed to be withdrawn under Art. 94(4) (H-III, 2.1.1). This loss of rights can be remedied by requesting further processing under Art. 121.

The examining division may send a Rule 137(4) communication before sending a communication under Art. 94(3) and Rule 71(1), (2) or (3). The communication under Rule 137(4) can only be issued by the examining

division, and not by the search division drawing up a supplementary European search report (B-XI, 2; H-III, 2.1.1).

2.1.3 Further possibilities for amending the application

After expiry of the six-month period under Rules 161 and 162, further possibilities for amending the application are limited. *Rule 137(3)*

If a supplementary European search is carried out, the applicant is always invited to submit amendments on receipt of the European search report. If the opinion was negative, amendments are mandatory (A-XIV, 5). It is at the examining division's discretion whether to accept any further amendment at a later stage of the proceedings.

A reduction in the search fee in accordance with the decision of the Administrative Council under Art. 153(7) does not apply to any further search fee (to be) paid under Rule 164(1). *Art. 153(7)*
Rule 159(1)(c)

By way of exception, the applicant will have a further opportunity to submit amendments without requiring the consent of the examining division in cases where the supplementary European search is dispensed with (A-XIII, 3) and the examining division considers that a claimed invention or group of inventions within the meaning of Art. 82 was not searched by the EPO in its capacity as (S)ISA (A-XIV, 6.2). In these cases, the examining division must invite the applicant to pay a further search fee under Rule 164(2) for each invention that was not searched. On condition that a further search fee is paid, a further search is carried out (Rule 164(2)(a)). In response to the communication of the results of the further search(es), the applicant may amend the application in accordance with Rule 164(2)(b) (C-III, 3.1). *Rule 164(2)*

2.2 Payment of claims fees under Rule 162

If the application documents on which the European grant procedure is to be based contain more than 15 claims, a claims fee is due in respect of the 16th and each subsequent claim, and a higher claims fee is payable in respect of the 51st and each subsequent claim. *Rule 162*
Art. 2(1), item 15.
RFees

Rule 162(1) states that any claims fees for a Euro-PCT application must be paid within the 31-month period under Rule 159(1) (A-XIII, 11.8). However, Rule 162(2) relaxes this obligation to pay within that 31-month period by allowing – for amendments made both before and after expiry of the 31-month period – any claims fees to be paid up to expiry of the six-month period under Rules 161 and 162.

See A-XII, 7.2 for the procedure to follow if the applicant wants to waive the right to receive the communication under Rules 161 and 162: for the waiver to be valid, the right under Rule 162(2) must be waived and any claims fees must thus be paid under Rule 161(1), i.e. within the 31-month time limit.

Rule 162(2), first sentence, covers the situation in which the applicant does not file amendments after expiry of the 31-month period and before expiry of the six-month period under Rule 161. In this case, the applicant must ensure that any claims fees for the set of claims filed within the 31-month

period that were not paid within that period are paid before expiry of the six-month period under Rule 161.

Example 1:

A Euro-PCT application X contains 27 claims on expiry of the 31-month period. The applicant paid five claims fees within this period, meaning that they must ensure that seven claims fees are paid before expiry of the six-month period under Rule 161(2).

Rule 162(2), second sentence, covers the situation in which the applicant files an amended set of claims after expiry of the 31-month period and before expiry of the six-month period under Rule 161. In this case, the applicant must calculate the number of claims fees due on the basis of the claims on file on expiry of the six-month period. Before expiry of this period, they must ensure that any claims fees are paid for the number of claims on file on expiry of this period which exceeds the number of claims for which claims fees were paid within the 31-month period.

Example 2:

A Euro-PCT application Y contains 27 claims on expiry of the 31-month period. The applicant paid five claims fees within the 31-month period. After expiry of the 31-month period and before expiry of the six-month period under Rule 161, they file an amended set of 32 claims. The applicants must calculate the number of claims fees on the basis of the claims on file on expiry of the six-month period, i.e. $32 - 15 = 17$. Since they have already paid five claims fees, 12 claims fees ($17 - 5 = 12$) are to be paid before expiry of the six-month period under Rule 161.

The amount of the claims fee varies according to a two-tier system. A claims fee must be paid for the 16th and each further claim. However, for any claim over 50, a higher amount is due (A-XIII, 11.8). The claims fees are calculated on the basis of the number of claims in the application documents specified in accordance with Rule 159(1)(b), e.g. as specified in EPO Form 1200. For the procedure where the application documents have not been specified, see A-XII, 5.3.

Rule 162(3)

Where the number of claims specified under Rule 159(1)(b) changes as a consequence of a (further) amendment submitted within the six-month time limit under Rules 161 and 162, the new number is decisive for calculating the amount of the claims fees to be paid. This means that, if the number of claims forming the basis for the further procedure is reduced as a result of amendments made under Rule 161, any claims fees overpaid will be refunded (Rule 162(3)).

Rule 162(4)

If there are more than 15 claims on file on expiry of the six-month period under Rule 161, any of the 16th and each subsequent claim for which no claims fees have been paid is deemed to be abandoned under Rule 162(4) and the applicant is duly notified (OJ EPO 2016, A103). A loss of rights may be remedied by a request for further processing under Art. 121 (E-VIII, 2).

Features of a claim deemed to have been abandoned pursuant to Rule 162(4), and which are not otherwise to be found in the description or drawings, cannot subsequently be reintroduced into the application and, in particular, not into the claims.

3. EPO was (S)ISA – Rule 161(1)

The communication under Rule 161(1) is always issued, i.e. irrespective of whether the EPO drew up a positive or negative opinion in the WO-ISA, SISR or IPER in the international phase (A-XIV, 2.1). Whether an opinion is positive or negative is determined according to the same principles as apply for a European search opinion (B-XI, 3.9). Where the EPO acted as (S)ISA and, if a demand for this was filed, as IPEA, the ISR including the WO-ISA, or the SISR including the explanations under Rule 45bis.7(e) PCT, and – if the EPO also acted as IPEA – the IPER will have been transmitted to the applicant during the international phase. If the EPO issued a negative WO-ISA or, where it also acted as IPEA, a negative IPER, or, where it acted as SISA, raised objections in the explanatory notes on the SISR, a response to the objections raised is mandatory. The communication under Rules 161(1) and 162 will make this explicitly clear and is worded differently depending on the case in question (Forms 1226AA and 1226BB).

Rule 161(1)

If deficiencies are established by the EPO in the WO-ISA, the explanations under Rule 45bis.7(e) PCT in the SISR or, where applicable, the IPER drawn up by the EPO, the applicant must respond to the negative opinion in the form of (mandatory) comments and/or amendments (A-XIV, 2.1.2). Failure to submit a mandatory response to a negative WO-ISA, SISR or IPER leads to the application being deemed to be withdrawn under Rule 161(1), last sentence. The loss of rights for non-compliance with Rule 161(1) may be remedied by a request for further processing under Art. 121 (E-VIII, 2). If the loss of rights is successfully remedied, the latest set of comments and amendments on file after expiry of the time limit under Rule 161(1) will be taken into account when drafting the first communication or when issuing the invitation under Rule 164(2) (A-XIV, 6.2; C-III, 3.1).

Beyond the mandatory response, i.e. the response to any deficiencies raised, the applicant may file (further) voluntary comments and amendments in relation to the negative or positive opinion established by the EPO within the six-month period under Rules 161 and 162 (A-XIV, 2.1.1). Where the WO-ISA, any SISR or, where applicable, the IPER drawn up by the EPO is positive, any comments and amendments filed are voluntary (A-XIV, 3.1).

An invitation under Rule 164(2) will be issued only if any claimed invention or group of inventions within the meaning of Art. 82 is identified that was not searched by the EPO in its capacity as (S)ISA. This means that, if the claims on entry into the European phase belong to the same invention under Art. 82, no invitation under Rule 164(2) will be issued if the EPO as (S)ISA issued a declaration under Art. 17(2)(a) PCT or Rule 45bis.5(g) PCT. If, however, the applicant provides, within the six-month period under Rules 161 and 162, convincing arguments or amendments overcoming the reasons for limiting the search or issuing the declaration of no search in the

international phase, the examiner will perform an additional search in examination at no extra cost, since the search fee paid in the international phase covers the invention concerned (C-IV, 7.3). If the reasons for limiting the search or issuing the declaration of no search are still present in the claims, the examiner will object under the relevant provision of the EPC, e.g. Rule 43(2), as set out in A-XIV, 6.2.

3.1 Exceptions where a response to the Rule 161(1) invitation is not required

A response is not required where the WO-ISA, SISR or, where applicable, the IPER drawn up by the EPO was positive: in this case, filing a reply is always voluntary (A-XIV, 3).

By contrast, a response to a negative opinion is not required only if comments and/or amendments filed at an earlier stage can be considered a valid response. This is the case in the following situations:

- (i) If the applicant filed new amendments and/or comments on entry into the regional phase before the EPO, provided that
 - the applicant indicated on entry into the European phase – preferably in Box 6 of EPO Form 1200 – that these amendments and/or comments are to form the basis for further prosecution of the application (A-XII, 5.4), and
 - they constitute a valid response (B-XI, 8).
- (ii) If the applicant filed amendments under Art. 19 PCT and/or Art. 34 PCT in the international phase, and if the EPO prepared either the WO-ISA in its capacity as ISA or the SISR in its capacity as SISA but did not draw up an IPER, either because the applicant did not file a demand under PCT Chapter II or because the IPEA was an office other than the EPO, then these amendments are considered to constitute a response to the WO-ISA or SISR, provided that the applicant
 - indicated on entry into the European phase that these amendments are maintained,
 - has provided a copy of the amendments filed under Art. 34 PCT with the IPEA other than the EPO, as well as any necessary translations into the language of the proceedings (A-XIII, 3).

Amendments filed under Art. 19 PCT or Art. 34 PCT that have already been taken into consideration by the EPO acting as IPEA when drawing up the IPER are not considered to constitute a (mandatory) response to a negative IPER as required by Rule 161(1). In such cases, the applicant must therefore respond to the IPER within the six-month period under Rule 161(1).

4. EPO was not (S)ISA – Rule 161(2)

Where the EPO did not act as (S)ISA in the international phase, and a supplementary European search must be performed (A-XIV, 1.1; B-II, 4.3.2), a communication under Rules 161(2) and 162 will be issued (Form 1226CC). Any comments and amendments submitted under Rule 161(2) are voluntary (A-XIV, 2.1.1).

Rule 161(2)

Since the right to comment and amend is provided for in the PCT, any comments and amendments, including any made in response to an (S)ISR and/or IPER drawn up by an authority other than the EPO, must be duly taken into account in drawing up the supplementary European search report (A-XIV, 2.1; B-II, 4.3; B-XI, 2).

5. Supplementary European search

A supplementary European search is dispensed with only for applications for which the EPO acted as (S)ISA in the international phase and for a very limited group of applications filed before 1 July 2005 (A-XIV, 1.1).

Art. 153(6), (7)

Rule 62

Rule 62a

Rule 63

For all other Euro-PCT applications, the EPO will therefore perform a supplementary European search and issue the European search report and search opinion, or a declaration of no search, accordingly (B-II, 4.3; B-XI, 1 and 2). The first communication is issued as set out in C-III, 4. Once the supplementary European search report has been drawn up, the European Patent Bulletin will mention the date of its dispatch in Part I.1(4). The supplementary European search report itself is not published but is available via public file inspection (A-XIII, 11.3). See A-XIV, 5.1 on cases where the application documents which are to serve as the basis for the supplementary European search do not comply with the requirement of unity of invention. All amendments and comments filed with the EPO as designated/elected Office up to expiry of the six-month period under Rule 161(1) will be taken into account in drawing up the supplementary European search report and the search opinion. If several sets of amendments are filed as the basis for the European phase processing, the supplementary European search will be based on the last set of claims filed up to expiry of this period (A-XIV, 2.1). Any claims for which a claim fee due has not been paid will not be searched (A-XIV, 2.2).

Like any other European search report, the supplementary European search report is accompanied by an opinion under Rule 62 (ESOP) on whether the application and the invention to which it relates meet the requirements of the EPC. The procedures under Rules 62a and 63 also apply where a supplementary European search is performed (OJ EPO 2009, 533; OJ EPO 2017, A106) (B-II, 4.3; B-VIII, 3.4).

For the procedure in respect of a categorical request for examination, as provided for in Rule 10(4), where the applicant waives the right to the communication under Rule 70(2), see A-XIV, 5.2.

If third-party observations were filed during the international phase and forwarded by the IB to the EPO as designated/elected Office, they will be considered in the (extended) supplementary European search report, provided they are substantiated and meet all formal requirements.

Furthermore, provided they were not filed anonymously, and the third party has explicitly so requested, the EPO will expedite the issuing of the first office action in examination (OJ EPO 2017, A86).

See B-X for more information on the supplementary search report and B-XI for general information on the search opinion.

5.1 Non-unity – Rule 164(1)

Rule 164(1)

If the application documents which are to serve as the basis for the supplementary European search do not comply with the requirement of unity of invention, applicants are invited under Rule 164(1)(b) to pay a further search fee for each invention other than the first invention mentioned in the claims. If they wish to pay further search fees in response to the invitation under Rule 164(1)(b), they must do so within the time limit of two months set in the invitation. This period cannot be extended. It is also excluded from further processing under Rule 135(2).

Where applicants use automatic debiting, all search fees to be paid under Rule 164 EPC will be automatically debited on the last day of the two-month period set in the invitation. If they do not wish to pay these fees, or wish to pay only some of them, they must therefore notify the EPO accordingly (ADA, Annex A.1, point 4, and Annex A.2, items I and I.2):

Together with the invitation to pay further search fees, a partial supplementary European search report is transmitted on the invention or group of inventions first mentioned in the claims (Rule 164(1)(a)) (OJ EPO 2017, A20).

On expiry of the two-month time limit for paying further search fees in response to the invitation under Rule 164(1)(b), the supplementary European search report is drawn up for the parts of the application relating to inventions for which search fees have been paid in accordance with Rule 164(1)(c).

Although the EPO is in no way bound by the opinion of the (S)ISA on the issue of whether the application meets the requirement of unity, the EPO will in many cases share any finding of lack of unity, given that the practices of the (S)ISAs are based on the same guidelines, i.e. Chapter 10 of the ISPE Guidelines. Where the (S)ISA considered that the requirement of unity was not met, the applicant is therefore advised to amend the application before expiry of the period under Rule 161(2) in such a way that the invention on which they wish the supplementary European search and the examination to be based is the one first mentioned in the claims. This ensures that, if the EPO agrees with the (S)ISA's finding of lack of unity, this invention will then be searched on the basis of the search fee paid under Rule 159(1)(e), without the need to pay any additional search fees under Rule 164(1), which do not qualify for a fee reduction under Art. 153(7) (A-XIII, 6).

Rule 164(5)

If an applicant has paid a further search fee following an invitation under Rule 164(1) and the examining division finds, on request, that this was not

justified, the further search fee will be refunded (Rule 164(5)) (A-X, 10.2.2; C-III, 3.1).

In response to the accompanying search opinion, the applicant must select, from all inventions searched by the EPO, a single invention to be prosecuted in the European grant proceedings (A-XIV, 6; C-III, 3.2). For the other inventions, the applicant may file divisional applications.

5.2 The communication under Rules 70(2) and 70a(2) after supplementary European search

If the applicant validly filed a request for examination before the European search report was transmitted to them, the EPO invites them in a communication under Rules 70(2) and 70a(2) to comment on both the report and the search opinion and to file amendments to the description, claims and drawings within the period specified in this communication. The communication is issued promptly after transmittal of the supplementary European search report.

Rule 137(2)

Rule 70(2)

Rule 70a(2)

The applicant is given a time limit of six months from notification of this communication for filing the confirmation required under Rule 70(2) that they wish to proceed further with their application (A-VI, 2.2) (J 8/83).

If applicants do not wish to proceed further to examination, they may actively withdraw their application or else allow it to lapse by simply not filing a reply within the time limit set in the communication under Rules 70(2) and 70a(2). In the latter case, the application will be deemed withdrawn under Rule 70(3). This loss of rights may be remedied by a request for further processing under Art. 121 (E-VIII, 2).

Rule 70(3)

Responding to the search opinion in the form of comments and/or amendments is voluntary where the search opinion, which is part of the supplementary European search report, is positive (voluntary reply). By contrast, the applicant must respond to the search opinion within the time limit under Rule 70(2) if it is negative (mandatory reply) (A-XIV, 2.1.1; C-II, 1.1). If the applicant fails to submit comments and/or amendments as a substantive response to the objections in the search opinion in due time, the application will be deemed withdrawn in accordance with Rule 70a(3) (OJ EPO 2009, 533) (B-XI, 8). This loss of rights may be remedied by a request for further processing under Art. 121 (E-VIII, 2).

Rule 70a(2)

However, no search opinion under Rule 62 will be issued where the applicant filed the request for examination in accordance with Rule 159(1)(f) (A-XIII, 7) and waived their right to be asked under Rule 70(2) EPC whether they wish to proceed further with the application before the supplementary European search report has been transmitted to them in accordance with Rule 10(4). This can be done by selecting the appropriate checkbox in section 12.2 of EPO Form 1200 (OJ EPO 2017, A74). In that case, no search opinion will be issued, and the application proceeds directly to examination after the supplementary European search report has been drawn up (A-XIV, 5.2). The examining division will then either issue a communication under Art. 94(3) EPC, which replaces the search opinion, or a communication under Rule 71(3) EPC if the application is ready for grant

(B-XI, 7; C-V). See A-XII, 7.3 for the further requirements for this waiver to be effective and C-VI, 3 for the procedure to be followed in such cases of a "categorical request for examination", as provided for in Rule 10(4).

Art. 11(a) and (b)
RFees

Where the application is withdrawn, refused or deemed withdrawn before substantive examination has begun, the examination fee is refunded in full in accordance with Art. 11(a) RFees (OJ EPO 2016, A48 and A49; OJ EPO 2019, A82). If applicants actively withdraw their application after substantive examination has begun but before expiry of the time limit for replying to the first invitation issued by the examining division under Art. 94(3) or, if no such invitation has been issued, before the date of the communication under Rule 71(3), the examination fee is refunded at a rate of 50% in accordance with Art. 11(b) RFees (OJ EPO 2019, A82). For details of the procedure under Art. 11 RFees, see A-VI, 2.2 and 2.5.

6. Substantive examination of a Euro-PCT application

Substantive examination starts in different ways depending on whether a supplementary European search was performed or dispensed with.

If a supplementary European search is performed, the application will proceed to substantive examination on condition that either the confirmation required under Rule 70(2) was duly filed or the right to a communication under Rule 70(2) was duly waived and that, where applicable, a reply to the written opinion was received in due time (A-IV, 5.2).

If a supplementary European search is dispensed with (A-XIV, 1.1) and the formalities officer finds that no formal requirement stands in the way, the application is forwarded to the examining division for substantive examination on expiry of the six-month period under Rules 161(1) and 162.

6.1 At least one communication in examination

If there are still deficiencies in the application after the applicant has filed the mandatory response under Rule 161(1), the examining division will generally issue at least one communication under Art. 94(3) in combination with Rule 71(1) and (2) at the start of substantive examination proceedings. The examiner will then consider the applicant's reply to it before issuing a decision or a summons to oral proceedings. This applies regardless of whether a communication under Rule 164(2)(a) has been issued (as described in more detail in A-XIV, 6.2). In exceptional cases, a summons to oral proceedings may be issued as the first action in examination proceedings (see C-III, 5).

When drawing up the first communication in examination for such cases, the examiner may have to consider the ISR (with the IPRP) or the IPER, any supplementary international search report (including explanations under Rule 45bis.7(e) PCT), any supplementary European search report and accompanying search opinion drawn up by the EPO (B-II, 4.3; B-XI, 8) and any comments or amendments filed by the applicant in response (C-II, 3.1).

Where a translation of the priority document is required, an invitation under Rule 53(3) to submit the document may be sent (only) by the examining division after expiry of the six-month period under Rules 161 and 162 (A-XIII, 11.2.1; F-VI, 3.4).

Where the EPO acts as elected Office, the IPER and the documents attached to it must be considered in accordance with A-XIV, 6.3.

6.2 Rule 164(2) – No examination of multiple inventions

An invitation to pay further search fees under Rule 164(2) will be issued only if any claimed invention or group of inventions within the meaning of Art. 82 is identified that was not searched by the EPO in its capacity as ISA or SISA.

Art. 82

Rule 164(2)

This means that, if the claims on entry into the European phase belong to the same invention under Art. 82 as that for which search was limited or for which a declaration of no search under Art. 17(2)(a) PCT was issued by the EPO as (S)ISA, no invitation under Rule 164(2) will be issued. Applicants may, however, proceed as set out in A-XIV, 3 to obtain an additional search in examination at no extra cost (C-IV, 7.3).

The invitation under Rule 164(2) can be combined with or followed by an invitation under Rule 62a or 63. A further search fee must be paid within the period set in the invitation. This period is not extendable. It is also excluded from further processing under Rule 135(2).

Where applicants use automatic debiting, all search fees to be paid under Rule 164 EPC will be automatically debited on the last day of the two-month period set in the invitation. If they do not wish to pay these fees, or wish to pay only some of them, they must therefore notify the EPO accordingly (ADA, Annex A.1, point 4, and Annex A.2, items I and I.2):

In cases where protection is sought for an invention not covered by the (S)ISR or the supplementary European search report, or by a search carried out under Rule 164(2), because the (further) search fee due was not paid, the examining division must invite the applicant to limit the application to one invention covered by one of these searches. The procedure under Rule 164(2) is set out in detail in C-III, 3.1. If the applicant has paid a further search fee following an invitation under Rule 164(2) and the examining division finds, either of its own motion or in view of comments made by the applicant, that the invitation under Rule 164(2) was not justified, the further search fee will be refunded (Rule 164(5)) (A-X, 10.2.2; C-III, 3.1).

Rule 164(5)

Only one invention will be examined in the European phase, even if, under PCT Chapter II, the EPO as IPEA may have examined multiple inventions on payment of further fees (unless, exceptionally, the examiner chose not to invite the applicant to pay further fees).

If after receipt of the (supplementary) European search report or, where applicable, after a communication under Rule 164(2)(b) the applicant files amended claims relating to an invention which differs from any of the

Rule 137(5)

originally claimed inventions and which does not combine with these inventions to form a single inventive concept, an objection under Rule 137(5) is raised (F-V, 7; H-IV, 4).

6.3 Substantive examination of a Euro-PCT application accompanied by an IPER

Art. 36 PCT

Rule 70.16 PCT

Rule 73.2 PCT

If an IPER was drawn up for the Euro-PCT application during the international phase, substantive examination is conducted in the same way as for any other application. Where the EPO acted as IPEA, the IPER will usually have been drawn up by the examiner responsible for examining the Euro-PCT application in the European phase.

As set out in A-XIV, 3, substantive examination can start only once the six-month-period under Rules 161 and 162, which implements the applicant's right under the PCT to amend the application in the proceedings before the designated/elected Office, has ended.

Art. 36(3)(a) PCT

Rule 72.1(a) PCT

If the EPO acted as IPEA, the application will be accompanied by an IPER drawn up in one of the official languages of the EPO. If the EPO did not act as IPEA, any IPER not drawn up in an EPO official language will be accompanied by its translation into English (Art. 36(3)(a) PCT in combination with Rule 72.1(a) PCT) (A-XII, 5.2 and 5.3). The IB will communicate the IPER to the EPO as elected Office together with any annexes in their original language. It is up to the applicant to prepare and submit a translation of these annexes if this is required for the proceedings before the EPO (Art. 36(3)(a) and (b) PCT in combination with Rule 159(1)(a)) (A-XII, 5.2 and A-XIII, 3).

Art. 36(4) PCT

Where new documents are cited in the IPER that were not cited in the ISR, they may be attached as an annex to the IPER in their original language (Art. 36(4) PCT, Art. 20(3) PCT).

Art. 42 PCT

Pursuant to Art. 42 PCT, the EPO cannot require that the applicant furnish copies, or information on the contents, of any papers connected with the examination of the same application by another elected Office.

6.3.1 Comparative test results

Where the EPO drew up the IPER and referred in it to the submission of test reports, applicants are taken to agree to the use of these reports as the basis for proceedings before the EPO when they use the standard form for entry into the European phase before the EPO as elected Office, i.e. EPO Form 1200. If they do not use that form or if the IPER referring to the test reports was drawn up by another IPEA, they are invited to submit these reports for the proceedings in the European phase before the EPO as designated/elected Office.

6.3.2 Basis for substantive examination

In many cases, the documents indicated in the IPER as forming its basis also form the basis for substantive examination in the European phase. Amended documents (i.e. amendments to the claims, description and/or drawings) submitted during the international preliminary examination and replacing the previously filed application documents will be attached to the

IAPER in their original language. If a translation of the annexes is required for the proceedings before the EPO as elected Office, it is up to the applicant to prepare and submit it (Art. 36(3)(a) and (b) PCT in combination with Rule 159(1)(a)) (A-XII, 5.2 and 5.3; A-XIII, 3).

The applicant may also have made an explicit or implicit request for the examination to be based on the documents in the international application as published or on amendments made in the period between entry into the European phase (A-XII, 5.3.1) and expiry of the six-month time limit in the communication under Rules 161 and 162 (A-XIV, 2.1). If any declaration of the applicant in this respect is unclear at the time substantive examination starts, the examiner will have to clarify the situation.

6.3.3 Consideration of the contents of the IAPER

If the IAPER has been drawn up by the EPO, it must be regarded as an opinion for purposes of examination, and generally the first communication will be based on this opinion and any response to it filed by the applicant in accordance with Rule 161(1) (A-XIV, 3). The opinion expressed in the IAPER may be departed from if new facts relevant to assessing patentability come to light (e.g. if further prior-art documents are to be cited or if evidence is produced of unexpected effects), where the substantive patentability requirements under the PCT and the EPC are different or where, in their response to the IAPER in accordance with Rule 161(1), applicants provide convincing arguments, appropriate amendments or relevant counter-evidence or, conversely, amendments which introduce further deficiencies.

Examination reports drawn up by other IPEAs must be examined carefully. If the reasons put forward in the IAPER are sound, they must not be disregarded.

Chapter XV – Review and correction of errors and omissions

1. General

The formalities examination at the start of processing in the European phase encompasses all checks required to verify whether both the minimum and the further requirements have been met (A-XII, 4.2). If the EPO establishes any error either during or after this formalities examination, it will inform the applicant accordingly. As a rule, it is up to the applicant to request a correction, but there are a few cases in which the EPO will correct an error of its own motion (A-XV, 1.1).

1.1 Review and correction on request and of the EPO's own motion

As regards the formalities examination, the EPO as designated/elected Office will, as a rule, process an application in the European phase on the basis of the outcome of its processing by the receiving Office in the international phase. This means that it will normally accept what the receiving Office has done as a correct application of the higher-ranking PCT provisions on formal requirements (A-XII, 1.1; A-XII, 1.4). This is crucial for the smooth functioning of the PCT system.

The EPO is bound by the PCT, but not by the way it has been applied where that application is clearly in breach of the PCT. If the EPO as designated/elected Office finds that a decision, act or omission of the receiving Office is in breach of the PCT, it is therefore open to it to apply the PCT provisions correctly and to require that the applicant make the correction necessary to comply with the PCT requirements. This general competence is reflected in certain PCT provisions explicitly allowing the EPO to review a decision of the receiving Office, for instance Art. 25 PCT (A-XV, 2) and Rule 82ter.1 PCT (A-XV, 6.3).

Art. 24 PCT
Rule 49ter.1 PCT
Rule 82ter.1 PCT

Some PCT provisions regulate this competence of the designated/elected Office to carry out a review. An example is Rule 49ter.1(c) PCT, which allows the designated/elected Office to establish that the requirements of Rule 26bis.3 PCT for granting a request for restoration of priority were not met, and to declare accordingly that the grant decision by the receiving Office has no effect in the proceedings before it. However, such a finding requires that the designated/elected Office have "reasonable doubt" about compliance with the requirements, while the applicant must be given an opportunity to make observations (Rule 49ter.1(d) PCT). See also A-XV, 5 on restoration of priority.

Irrespective of whether the EPO acts on request or of its own motion, it must ensure that the EPC provisions are applied to the Euro-PCT application in the same way as to a Euro-direct application. This follows from Art. 11(3) PCT, according to which the international application has the effect of a national/regional application as from the filing date. This means, for instance, that the applicant may also request a correction under Rule 139 under the same conditions as a Euro-direct applicant in the European grant proceedings.

Art. 11(3) PCT

Art. 26 PCT

Art. 26 PCT deals more specifically with the effect of Art. 11(3) PCT in cases where the designated/elected Office finds that the applicant has not complied with a PCT requirement. It provides that the designated/elected Office may not reject an international application on the grounds of this non-compliance without first giving the applicant the opportunity to correct the application to the extent and according to the procedure provided by its law for the same or comparable situations. Several other PCT provisions contain more specific rules on how the principles laid down in Art. 11(3) and Art. 26 PCT must be applied by the designated/elected Offices: Art. 24 PCT (A-XV, 2), Art. 25 PCT (A-XV, 3), Art. 48 PCT (A-XV, 3), Rule 82bis PCT (A-XV, 3) and Rule 82ter PCT (A-XV, 4).

Art. 48(2) PCT
Rule 82bis PCT

Art. 48(2) PCT provides in addition that any designated/elected Office must excuse, for reasons admitted under its national law, any delay in meeting any time limit. Rule 82bis.1 PCT makes it clear that this applies to any kind of time limit, irrespective of its legal basis, that the applicant was required to meet in the international phase. Rule 82bis.2 PCT defines the word "excuse" in Art. 48(2) PCT as referring to all remedies and any other provisions allowing for the extension of time limits or for excusing a delay in meeting them. All these higher-ranking principles apply in the proceedings in the European phase in accordance with Art. 150(2) in combination with Art. 153(2) and Art. 125 (A-XII, 1.1).

Art. 27(4) PCT

A special situation is dealt with in Art. 27(4) PCT. It provides that the designated/elected Office may apply national/regional provisions (including formal requirements) that, from the applicant's viewpoint, would be more favourable, unless the applicant insists that the PCT requirements be applied to the application. It follows from this provision that, even without any request and/or remedy, an act, omission or situation in breach of the PCT may be considered overcome by virtue of Art. 11(3) PCT and Art. 153(2). For example, if an international application is filed by a person not entitled to do so under Art. 9 PCT, the EPO as designated/elected Office may consider it a valid application by virtue of Art. 58 alone (A-XII, 6).

1.2 Role of the applicant in initiating review or correction

The EPO as designated/elected Office may only process the application once it has become competent (A-XII, 4) and, as a rule, will only consider a correction at the applicant's request. It is therefore the applicant's responsibility to consider whether there is a need to remedy a loss of rights or to correct an error or omission that occurred in the international phase and what options are available for this under the provisions of the EPC.

Applicants are advised to consider this as soon as they become aware of any loss of rights, error and/or omission. In some cases, they may need to request early processing to be able to invoke a remedy under the EPC or the PCT, e.g. for any request under Rule 56 or 56a (A-XII, 5.2). It is noted that, in general, the time limits set in provisions that provide for remedies are not deferred as a result of the processing ban, since such provisions provide only for certain rights and do not require the applicant to act (A-XII, 3.1).

In other cases, the remedy must be requested within a short deadline set in the PCT, e.g. the one-month time limit for requesting restoration of priority under Rule 49ter PCT (A-XV, 5) and the two-month time limit from the date a loss of rights was notified by the IB (Rule 51 PCT in combination with Art. 25(2) PCT (A-XV, 2)).

1.3 Review of filing date and priority claims considered void

The date of filing of a Euro-PCT application is that accorded under the PCT by the PCT authority which acted as the receiving Office, unless it is corrected as a consequence of a review by the EPO as designated/elected Office under Art. 24 (A-XV, 3), Art. 25 PCT (A-XV, 2) or Rule 82ter.1(a) PCT (A-XV, 4). Rule 82ter.1(a) PCT also allows the applicant to request a review if a priority claim was erroneously considered void by the receiving Office.

Art. 24 PCT

Art. 25 PCT

Rule 82ter PCT

Rule 49ter.1(c) PCT

Certain PCT provisions allow the EPO as designated/elected Office to review the filing date and/or the priority date in specific circumstances. For instance, Rule 49ter.1(c) PCT permits it to review the grant of a request for restoration of the right of priority by the receiving Office, which may (also) have an impact on the relevant priority date (A-XV, 5).

Rule 49ter.1(c) PCT

Furthermore, if the EPO as designated/elected Office is of the opinion that the relevant PCT provisions were not complied with, it may, acting of its own motion in accordance with Rule 82ter.1(b) PCT, review the filing date accorded by the receiving Office under Rule 20.3(b)(ii) PCT, 20.5(d) PCT or 20.5bis(d) PCT on the basis of incorporation by reference of an element or part under Rules 4.18 PCT and 20.6 PCT (A-XV, 6.3).

Rule 82ter.1(b) PCT

2. Review under Article 25 PCT

At the request of the applicant, the EPO may review a refusal by the receiving Office to accord a filing date, a declaration by the receiving Office that an international application or designation of a state is considered withdrawn or a finding by the IB under Art. 12(3) PCT that the record copy did not reach it in due time. The outcome of the requested review will be in the applicant's favour if the EPO finds that the loss of rights was the result of an error or omission on the part of the authority concerned.

Art. 25 PCT

Rule 51 PCT

Rule 82ter PCT

Rule 159(2)

If the outcome of the review is positive, the proceedings for the grant of a European patent can continue and the international application is treated as if the error or omission had not occurred.

To obtain a review by the EPO as designated/elected Office under Art. 25 PCT, applicants must take the following steps:

- request within the two-month time limit under Rule 51.1 PCT that the IB send copies of documents in the files promptly to the EPO as designated/elected Office,
- request that the EPO review the decision of the receiving Office under Art. 25(2)(a) PCT, pay the filing fee under Rule 159(1)(c) (A-XIII, 4) and, where required, furnish a translation of the application

(A-XIII, 3), all within the same two-month time limit (Art. 25(2) PCT, Rule 51.3 PCT).

It is recommended that applicants comply with the other applicable minimum requirements for effective entry into the European phase under Rule 159(1) at the same time, preferably together with making a request for early processing (A-XII, 7.1).

Art. 24(2) PCT

If the outcome of a review under Art. 25 PCT is negative, the EPO will check whether a positive review is possible under Art. 24(2) PCT. Applicants are therefore advised not to limit their request and arguments to the remedy under Art. 25 PCT, but also to cover the remedies available under Art. 24(2) in conjunction with the other PCT and EPC provisions that allow for remedying a loss of rights in such cases, such as Art. 121 and 122 EPC in conjunction with Art. 48(2) PCT (A-XV, 3).

The formalities officer acting on behalf of the examining division is competent to take decisions in relation to these applications (OJ EPO 2014, A6). The Receiving Section will transfer any documents received from the IB in the circumstances referred to in Art. 25(1)(a) PCT to the examining division. Where it is decided that the application can proceed as a European application, search and examination are carried out as for other Euro-PCT applications, with the date on which the international application was originally filed with the PCT receiving Office being treated as the date of filing and account also being taken, where applicable, of any priority date claimed.

3. Review under Article 24 PCT and excuse of delays under Article 48(2) PCT

Art. 24(2) PCT
Art. 48(2) PCT
Rule 82bis PCT
Art. 122
Art. 121

Pursuant to Art. 24(2) PCT, the EPO as designated/elected Office may maintain the application as a European application even if this is not required by virtue of Art. 25(2) PCT (OJ EPO 1984, 565, Reasons 4).

Applicants filing a request for review under Art. 24(2) PCT must meet the same requirements as for a request for review under Art. 25(2) PCT, except that the two-month time limit under Rule 51.1 and 51.3 PCT does not apply (J 19/16). This means that the time limit for making a request under Art. 24(2) PCT is governed by the applicable EPC provisions.

Art. 24(2) PCT
Art. 48(2) PCT
Art. 121
Art. 122

Art. 24(2) PCT may be applied where the international application was withdrawn or is deemed to be withdrawn due to an error or oversight on the applicant's part. In particular, it can be applied in combination with Art. 48(2) PCT, which requires that the EPO as designated/elected Office excuse, for reasons admitted under its law, any delay in meeting any time limit (A-XV, 1.3). The request may have to be combined with a request for the grant of a remedy under the EPC, such as a request for further processing (Art. 121) or for re-establishment of rights (Art. 122). The applicant must decide what remedies are most appropriate for overcoming the loss of rights, considering it as if it were the result of non-observance of the (most comparable) time limit under the EPC.

The review procedure under Art. 24(2) PCT may also be used where a PCT requirement is not also a requirement under the EPC. A-XII, 6.1 gives the example of where an international application was not accorded a filing date, because the applicant was not entitled to file an international application under Art. 9 PCT, whereas there are no equivalent entitlement requirements under the EPC (Art. 58). Another example is the case where an international application was filed without any claims: under Art. 11 PCT, the application cannot be accorded a filing date until such time as at least one claim is filed, whereas a lack of any claims does not preclude the accordance of a filing date under the EPC (Rule 40).

Art. 9 PCT
Art. 11 PCT
Art. 58
Rule 40

The remedies available in the proceedings before the EPO as designated/elected Office include not only further processing (Art. 121) and re-establishment of rights (Art. 122) but also any others whereby time limits can be extended or delays in meeting them can be excused, for instance under Rules 133 and 134(5) EPC (Rule 82bis.2 PCT) (A-III, 6.6, E-VIII, 2-3, 5, 1.6.2.2 and 6).

4. Review of filing date and priority claims considered void under Rule 82ter.1(a) PCT

For a request for review in relation to the filing date or a priority claim to be successful, the applicant must prove to the satisfaction of the EPO that the receiving Office erroneously accorded an incorrect filing date, or erroneously did not accord a filing date, or that it erroneously considered a priority claim not to have been made, and the EPO must then find that, had it made the error itself, it would rectify it under the EPC. If those requirements are met, the EPO must rectify the error and treat the international application as if it had been accorded the rectified international filing date or as if the priority claim had not been considered not to have been made.

Rule 82ter.1(a) PCT

5. Restoration of priority and review of the grant of a request for restoration of the priority right

If an international application was filed outside the 12-month priority period, a request for restoration of the right of priority may be filed both in the international phase before the receiving Office (Rule 26bis.3 PCT) and on entry into the European phase before the EPO as designated or elected Office (Rule 49ter.2(b)(i) PCT).

Rule 49ter PCT

In accordance with its practice under Art. 122, the EPO applies only the "due care" criterion (Rule 49ter.2(a)(i) PCT, OJ EPO 2007, 692). Consequently, a request for restoration of a priority right which was granted by a receiving Office (only) under the "unintentional" criterion has no effect before the EPO as designated/elected Office (Rule 49ter.1(b) PCT). In such cases, the request must be refiled with the EPO as designated/elected Office.

Art. 122

If, on the other hand, the priority right was restored by the receiving Office under the "due care" criterion, no new request need be filed with the EPO as designated/elected Office, since the EPO will normally recognise the decision of the receiving Office (A-XV, 1.1). If, however, the EPO has reasonable doubt that the requirements for granting restoration were met, it

will notify the applicant accordingly. In its communication, it will state the reasons for its doubts and set a time limit within which the applicant may submit comments.

The EPO does not apply the discretionary provision in Rule 49ter.1(f) PCT. This means that it will not consider a request for restoration of priority under Rule 49ter.2 PCT to be duly filed if it rejected such a request under Rule 26bis.3 PCT when acting as receiving Office during the international phase processing.

Rule 49ter.1(d) PCT

Rule 49ter.2(e) PCT

Rule 49ter.1(b) PCT

Consequently, if the applicant wants the priority claim to be valid in the proceedings before the EPO as designated/elected Office, a request for restoration must always be filed if, in the proceedings before the receiving Office:

- no request for restoration of priority right was filed
- a request for restoration of priority right was rejected
- a request for restoration of priority right was granted under the "unintentional" criterion.

The EPO as designated/elected Office will grant a request for restoration of priority right under Rule 49ter PCT if the following requirements are met:

- (i) the filing date is within two months of the date of expiry of the priority period (Rule 26bis.2(c)(iii) PCT)
- (ii) the failure to claim the right of priority within the priority period occurred in spite of all due care required by the circumstances having been taken (Rule 49ter.2(a) PCT, Art. 122)
- (iii) a request for restoration of priority is filed within one month of the date on which the 31-month time limit for entry into the European phase expired or of the effective date of a request for early processing (A-XII, 7.1); where the application is deemed withdrawn under Rule 160(1) for failure to comply with a requirement under Rule 159(1), the request for restoration of priority may still be filed together with a request for further processing (filed in due time) in respect of the 31-month period or with a request for re-establishment of rights (filed in due time) in respect of the period for requesting further processing
- (iv) the fee for restoration of priority is duly paid within the time limit mentioned under point (iii) (Rule 49ter.2(b)(iii) PCT and Rule 49ter.2(d) PCT, Rule 136(1), Art. 2(1), item 13, RFees); the further considerations in point (iii) also apply to this fee
- (v) the request is accompanied by a statement of reasons for the failure to file the international application within the priority period, and preferably also by any declaration or other evidence in support of the statement of reasons (Rule 49ter.2(b) PCT and Rule 136(2)).

6. Missing parts and correction of erroneously filed application document or parts

In any case where it is established that parts of the application are missing and/or application documents were erroneously filed, the applicant may invoke the remedies available in the PCT and the EPC.

Rule 20.5(a) PCT

Rule 20.5bis(a) PCT

Rule 56

Rule 56a

As regards the provisions on filing missing parts and on the correction of erroneously filed application documents or parts, Rule 56 and Rule 56a apply in the proceedings before the EPO as designated/elected Office. Similar options exist under the PCT in the proceedings before the receiving Office in the international phase under Rule 20.5 to 20.8 PCT.

6.1 Application of Rules 56 and 56a by the EPO as designated/elected Office in order to maintain the original filing date

For a request under Rule 56(3) or Rule 56a(4) to be allowed by the EPO as designated/elected Office, it must be filed, together with the documents and the declaration that the missing or correct parts are completely contained in the priority document, as required under Rule 56(3) or Rule 56a(4), within two months of either the date of filing or a communication from the receiving Office under Rule 20.5(a) PCT or Rule 20.5bis(a) PCT (Rule 56(2) and Rule 56a(3)). This means that the applicant must have effectively requested early processing before expiry of the two-month period under Rule 56(2) or Rule 56a(3) (A-XII, 7.1) because, as a rule, the remedies under the EPC can be applied only once processing in the European phase has started.

6.2 Determination of filing date in cases of erroneously filed elements or parts of the international application

Rule 20.5bis PCT, which entered into force on 1 July 2020, allows applicants to correct an erroneously filed element (description or claims) or part of the description, claims or drawings (including all drawings) contained in an international application in the proceedings before the receiving Office. In particular, it allows this correction to be made by incorporating the correct element or part by reference to a priority application, on condition that it is completely contained in that priority application, which must have been validly claimed on the date of filing. Rule 56a, which governs erroneously filed application documents, entered into force on 1 November 2022, and the notification of incompatibility of Rule 20.5bis PCT with the EPC legal framework filed by the EPO under Rule 20.8(b-bis) PCT was withdrawn with effect from then. This means that requests for incorporation by reference that were granted by the receiving Office under Rule 20.5bis(d) PCT will have effect for Euro-PCT applications filed on or after 1 November 2022.

Rule 20.5bis

Rule 20.8(b-bis) PCT

In these cases, the initially accorded international filing date is maintained, and the international application as filed therefore contains both the erroneously filed application documents and the correct application documents in the proceedings before the EPO as designated/elected Office. See also OJ EPO 2022, A71 and A-XIII, 3.1 and 3.2 for details of the requirements as to the translation under Rule 159(1)(a). On the requirements as regards the payment of the additional fee as part of the

filing fee under Rule 159(1)(c), see the April 2025 edition of the Guidelines, A-III, 13.2.

For international applications filed between 1 July 2020 and 31 October 2022, the limitation under the procedure described in C-III, 1.3 remains unchanged (see also the April 2025 edition of the Guidelines, A-III, 13.2). This means that, if the receiving Office considered the correct application documents to be incorporated by reference under Rule 20.5bis(d) PCT, i.e. without changing the filing date, this incorporation will not have any effect in the proceedings before the EPO as designated/elected Office. For the general procedure for establishing the filing date and the application documents forming the basis of the proceedings, see A-XIII, 3.1, 3.2 and C-III, 1.3.

6.3 Review of filing date under Rule 82ter.1(b) PCT

If a receiving Office accorded the filing date on the basis of incorporation by reference, the EPO will review of its own motion whether the requirements of Rule 82ter.1(b)(i) to (iii) PCT have been complied with.

If the EPO does not agree with the finding of the receiving Office, it will notify the applicant that it intends to consider the (later) date on which the element or part was furnished as the filing date for the purposes of the proceedings in the European phase. In its notification, the EPO will give the applicant a two-month time limit in which to comment and/or to request that the element or part concerned be disregarded in the proceedings for the grant of a European patent. In that case, the element or part will be considered not to have been furnished and the EPO will treat the international application as if the international filing date had not been corrected. For international applications filed on or after 1 November 2022, the procedure under Rule 82ter.1(d) PCT also applies to applications containing correct elements or parts incorporated by reference in accordance with Rule 20.5bis(d) PCT (A-XIII, 3.1, 3.2).

Art. 11(1)(iii)(d), (e)
PCT

Rule 4.18 PCT

Rule 20.6 PCT

Rule 82ter.1(b), PCT

PCT

Part B

Guidelines for Search

Contents

Chapter I – Introduction I-1

1.	Scope of Part B	I-1
2.	Search division	I-1
2.1	Consultation with other examiners	I-1
2.2	Searches covering different technical fields	I-1
2.2.1	Where claimed unitary subject-matter covers more than one technical field	I-2
2.2.2	Further searches in a different technical field for a non-unitary application	I-2

Chapter II – General II-1

1.	Search and substantive examination	II-1
1.1	Contact between the applicant and the search division	II-1
2.	Aim of the search	II-1
3.	Search documentation	II-1
4.	Search report	II-1
4.1	European searches	II-2
4.2	Additional European searches	II-2
4.3	Supplementary European searches	II-2
4.3.1	Dispensing with the supplementary European search report	II-3
4.3.2	A supplementary European search report is required	II-3
4.3.3	Application documents for the supplementary European search report	II-4
4.4	International (PCT) searches	II-4
4.5	International-type searches	II-4
4.6	Searches on national applications	II-4

Chapter III – Characteristics of the search III-1

1.	Opinions of the search division	III-1
1.1	Opinions in relation to the search report	III-1

1.2	Opinions on matters relating to limitation of the search	<u>III-1</u>
2.	Scope of the search	<u>III-1</u>
2.1	Completeness of the search	<u>III-1</u>
2.2	Effectiveness and efficiency of the search	<u>III-2</u>
2.3	Search in neighbouring fields	<u>III-2</u>
2.4	Internet searches	<u>III-3</u>
3.	The subject-matter of the search	<u>III-3</u>
3.1	Basis for the search	<u>III-3</u>
3.2	Interpretation of claims	<u>III-3</u>
3.2.1	Claims with explicit references to the description or drawings	<u>III-4</u>
3.2.2	Using the description and/or drawings to identify the technical problem	<u>III-4</u>
3.2.3	Using the description and/or drawings to define unclear terms not defined in the claims	<u>III-4</u>
3.2.4	Using the description and/or drawings to define clear terms given a definition different from their usual meaning	<u>III-5</u>
3.2.5	Ascertaining whether there is a fallback position	<u>III-6</u>
3.3	Amended claims, missing parts (Rule 56) or erroneously filed application documents or parts (Rule 56a)	<u>III-6</u>
3.3.1	General considerations	<u>III-6</u>
3.3.2	Specific rules applicable to Euro-PCT applications	<u>III-6</u>
3.4	Abandoned claims	<u>III-7</u>
3.5	Anticipation of amendments to claims	<u>III-7</u>
3.6	Broad claims	<u>III-7</u>
3.7	Independent and dependent claims	<u>III-8</u>
3.8	Search on dependent claims	<u>III-9</u>
3.9	Combination of elements in a claim	<u>III-9</u>
3.10	Different categories	<u>III-9</u>
3.11	Subject-matter excluded from search	<u>III-10</u>
3.12	Lack of unity	<u>III-10</u>
3.13	Technological background	<u>III-10</u>

Chapter IV – Search procedure and strategy **IV-1**

1.	Procedure before searching	IV-1
1.1	Analysis of the application	IV-1
1.2	Formal deficiencies	IV-1
1.3	Documents cited or supplied by the applicant	IV-2
2.	Search strategy	IV-3
2.1	Subject-matter of the search; restrictions	IV-3
2.2	Devising a search strategy	IV-3
2.3	Carrying out the search; types of documents	IV-4
2.4	Redefining the searched subject-matter	IV-5
2.5	Closest prior art and its effects on the search	IV-6
2.6	End of search	IV-6
3.	Procedure after searching	IV-6
3.1	Drawing up the search report	IV-6
3.2	Documents discovered after completion of the search	IV-7
3.3	Errors in the search report	IV-7

Chapter V – Preclassification, IPC and CPC classification of European patent applications **V-1**

1.	Definitions	V-1
2.	Preclassification (for file routing and allocation)	V-1
2.1	Incorrect preclassification	V-1
3.	IPC classification of the application	V-1
3.1	IPC classification of late-published search reports	V-2
3.2	IPC classification where the scope of the invention is unclear (e.g. a partial search)	V-2
3.3	IPC classification in cases of lack of unity of invention	V-2
3.4	Verification of the IPC classification	V-3
4.	CPC classification of the application	V-3

Chapter VI – The state of the art at the search stage	<u>VI-1</u>
1. General	<u>VI-1</u>
2. Oral disclosure, use, exhibition, etc. as state of the art	<u>VI-1</u>
3. Priority	<u>VI-1</u>
4. Conflicting applications	<u>VI-1</u>
4.1 Potentially conflicting European and international applications	<u>VI-1</u>
4.1.1 Published European patent applications as "E" documents	<u>VI-2</u>
4.1.2 Published international applications (WO) as "E" documents	<u>VI-2</u>
4.2 National prior rights	<u>VI-3</u>
5. Relevant date for documents cited in the search report; filing and priority date	<u>VI-3</u>
5.1 Verification of claimed priority dates	<u>VI-3</u>
5.2 Intermediate documents	<u>VI-3</u>
5.3 Doubts about the validity of the priority claim; widening of the search	<u>VI-4</u>
5.4 Documents published after the date of filing	<u>VI-5</u>
5.5 Non-prejudicial disclosures	<u>VI-5</u>
5.6 Doubts about the state of the art	<u>VI-5</u>
6. Contents of prior-art disclosures	<u>VI-6</u>
6.1 General remark	<u>VI-6</u>
6.2 Citation of documents corresponding to documents not available or not published in one of the EPO's official languages	<u>VI-6</u>
6.3 Conflict between abstract and source document	<u>VI-7</u>
6.4 Insufficient prior-art disclosures	<u>VI-7</u>
6.5 Incorrect compound records in online databases	<u>VI-7</u>
7. Internet disclosures – technical journals	<u>VI-8</u>

Chapter VII – Unity of invention **VII-1**

1.	General remarks	VII-1
1.1	Partial European search report	VII-1
1.2	Invitation to pay further search fees	VII-1
1.2.1	General	VII-1
1.2.2	Cascading non-unity	VII-2
1.2.3	The applicant has not paid all further search fees	VII-3
1.3	Documents relevant only to other inventions	VII-3
1.4	Assessment and possible review of the unity requirement	VII-3
2.	Procedures in cases of lack of unity	VII-3
2.1	Request for refund of further search fees	VII-3
2.2	Complete search despite lack of unity	VII-4
2.3	Supplementary European search	VII-4
3.	Lack of unity and Rule 62a or Rule 63	VII-4

Chapter VIII – Subject-matter to be excluded from the search **VIII-1**

1.	General remarks	VIII-1
2.	Considerations relating to specific exclusions from and exceptions to patentability	VIII-1
2.1	Methods for treatment of the human or animal body by surgery or therapy and diagnostic methods practised on the human or animal body	VIII-1
2.2	Subject-matter excluded from patentability under Art. 52(2) and (3)	VIII-2
2.2.1	Computer-implemented business methods	VIII-2
3.	No meaningful search possible	VIII-3
3.1	Invitation to indicate subject-matter for search	VIII-5
3.2	Reply to the invitation under Rule 63(1)	VIII-5
3.2.1	No or late reply	VIII-5
3.2.2	Reply in time	VIII-5
3.3	Content of the extended European search report (EESR)	VIII-6

3.4	Applications falling under Rule 63 and lacking unity	VIII-7
4.	More than one independent claim per category (Rule 62a)	VIII-8
4.1	Invitation to indicate which independent claim to search	VIII-8
4.2	Reply to the invitation under Rule 62a(1)	VIII-8
4.2.1	Failure to reply in time	VIII-8
4.2.2	Reply filed in time	VIII-8
4.3	Content of the extended European search report (EESR)	VIII-9
4.4	Cases under Rule 62a where claims fees have not been paid	VIII-9
4.5	Applications falling under Rule 62a and lacking unity	VIII-9
4.6	Handling of dependent claims under Rule 62a	VIII-10
5.	Invitation under both Rule 62a(1) and Rule 63(1)	VIII-10
6.	Claims contravening Art. 123(2) or Art. 76(1)	VIII-11

Chapter IX – Search documentation **IX-1**

1.	General	IX-1
1.1	Organisation and content of the documentation available to the search divisions	IX-1
1.2	Means of searching systematically	IX-1
2.	Patent documents arranged for systematic searching	IX-1
2.1	PCT minimum documentation	IX-1
2.2	Unpublished patent applications	IX-1
2.3	Search reports	IX-1
2.4	Patent family system	IX-2
3.	Non-patent literature arranged for systematic access	IX-2
3.1	Periodicals, records, reports, books, etc.	IX-2

4.	Non-patent literature arranged for library-type access	<u>IX-2</u>
4.1	Content	<u>IX-2</u>
5.	Access to EPO documentation for the national patent offices	<u>IX-2</u>

Chapter X – Search report **X-1**

1.	General	<u>X-1</u>
2.	Different types of search report drawn up by the EPO	<u>X-2</u>
3.	Form and language of the search report	<u>X-2</u>
3.1	Form	<u>X-2</u>
3.2	Language	<u>X-3</u>
3.3	Search summary	<u>X-3</u>
3.4	Record of search strategy	<u>X-3</u>
4.	Identification of the European patent application and the search report type	<u>X-3</u>
5.	Classification of the European patent application	<u>X-3</u>
6.	Technical fields searched	<u>X-4</u>
7.	Title, abstract and figure to be published with the abstract (as indicated on supplemental sheet A)	<u>X-4</u>
8.	Restriction of the searched subject-matter	<u>X-5</u>
9.	Documents found in the search	<u>X-6</u>
9.1	Identification of documents in the search report	<u>X-6</u>
9.1.1	Bibliographic data	<u>X-6</u>
9.1.2	"Corresponding documents"	<u>X-6</u>
9.1.3	Language of the documents cited	<u>X-8</u>
9.1.4	Supplementary European search report	<u>X-9</u>
9.2	Categories of documents (X, Y, P, A, D, etc.)	<u>X-9</u>
9.2.1	Particularly relevant documents	<u>X-9</u>
9.2.2	Documents defining the state of the art and not prejudicing novelty or inventive step	<u>X-10</u>
9.2.3	Documents which refer to a non-written disclosure	<u>X-10</u>
9.2.4	Intermediate documents	<u>X-10</u>
9.2.5	Documents relating to the theory or principle behind the invention	<u>X-10</u>

9.2.6	Potentially conflicting patent documents	X-11
9.2.7	Documents cited in the application	X-11
9.2.8	Documents cited for other reasons	X-11
9.3	Relationship between documents and claims	X-11
9.4	Identification of relevant passages in prior-art documents	X-12
10.	Authentication and dates	X-12
11.	Copies to be made available with the search report	X-13
11.1	General remarks	X-13
11.2	Electronic version of cited document	X-13
11.3	Patent family members; the "&" sign	X-13
11.4	Reviews or books	X-13
11.5	Summaries, extracts or abstracts	X-13
11.6	Citation of video and/or audio media fragments available on the internet	X-14
12.	Transmittal of the search report and search opinion	X-14
Chapter XI – The search opinion		XI-1
1.	Search opinion is part of the EESR	XI-1
1.1	The search opinion	XI-1
1.2	Position of the examining division	XI-1
2.	Basis for the search opinion	XI-1
2.1	Application documents filed under Rule 56 EPC, Rule 56a EPC, Rule 20.5 PCT or Rule 20.5 <i>bis</i> PCT	XI-2
2.2	Applications containing claims filed after the accorded date of filing	XI-3
3.	Analysis of the application and content of the search opinion	XI-3
3.1	The search division's dossier	XI-3
3.2	Reasoning	XI-4
3.2.1	Reasoned objections	XI-4

3.2.2	Positive statements	<u>XI-4</u>
3.3	Comments and amendments in response to the search opinion	<u>XI-4</u>
3.4	Scope of first analysis for generally deficient applications	<u>XI-4</u>
3.5	Contribution to the known art	<u>XI-5</u>
3.6	EPC requirements	<u>XI-5</u>
3.7	Search division's approach	<u>XI-5</u>
3.8	Making suggestions	<u>XI-5</u>
3.9	Positive opinion	<u>XI-6</u>
4.	Priority claim and the search opinion	<u>XI-6</u>
4.1	Use of "P" and "E" documents in the search opinion	<u>XI-7</u>
5.	Unity in relation to the search opinion	<u>XI-7</u>
6.	The search opinion where the search was limited	<u>XI-8</u>
7.	No search opinion is issued	<u>XI-8</u>
8.	Response to the extended European search report (EESR)	<u>XI-8</u>
9.	Art. 124 and the utilisation scheme	<u>XI-10</u>

Chapter I – Introduction

1. Scope of Part B

Part B is about European searches, i.e. searches the EPO search divisions perform for European patent applications. They also carry out other types of search (see B-II, 4.4 to B-II, 4.6). These include searches under the Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT), which are dealt with in the PCT Search and Examination Guidelines and in Part B of the Guidelines for Search and Examination at the EPO as PCT Authority.

2. Search division

The search division is responsible for:

Art. 17

Art. 18

- drafting extended European search reports, i.e. European search reports under Art. 92 and accompanying search opinions under Rule 62(1)
- drafting all of the different types of search report referred to in B-I, 1 and B-II, 4
- issuing any invitation under Rule 62a(1) (see also B-VIII, 4) to clarify – or, where necessary, limit the subject-matter to be searched
- issuing any invitation under Rule 63(1) (see B-VIII, 3.1).

In cases of lack of unity, it also draws up a partial search report and a provisional opinion on the patentability of the invention or unitary group of inventions first mentioned in the claims (see F-V, 3.4), which includes the reasons for the non-unity findings, and issues an invitation to pay further search fees under Rule 64(1) or Rule 164(1) (see B-VII, 1.2 and B-XI, 5).

The member of the search division responsible for the search on a European application is normally also the first member of the examining division for that application.

2.1 Consultation with other examiners

The search division may consult other examiners for advice on various issues, for example:

- (i) searching in databases it is not familiar with
- (ii) understanding aspects of the claimed invention outside its area of technical expertise
- (iii) devising a search strategy (see also B-I, 2.2)
- (iv) assessing the relevance of a prior-art document for determining the patentability of claimed subject-matter (see B-X, 9.2).

2.2 Searches covering different technical fields

Where the nature of the invention makes it necessary to search in very different specialist fields, for example because the "person skilled in the art"

in the relevant technical field has to be regarded as being more than one person (see [G-VII, 3](#)), the search division may comprise members from different technical fields.

This may also happen where subject-matter covering different technical fields is found to lack unity.

When the search division is enlarged this way, all the documents found in the various technical fields by its different members are included in the same search report. However, only one member draws up the search opinion, albeit in consultation with the members with expertise in the other technical fields where necessary.

2.2.1 Where claimed unitary subject-matter covers more than one technical field

Exceptionally, where the subject-matter of an application covers two or more technical fields which are so different that a member trained to carry out searches in one field cannot reasonably be expected to search all of them, two or possibly even more members may share responsibility for drawing up the search report.

The skills needed to carry out a satisfactory search in a particular technical field include:

- (a) the technical knowledge and training required to properly understand the claimed subject-matter
- (b) expertise in using the appropriate search tools.

If the subject-matter of the application extends over different technical fields, it may be appropriate to enlarge the search division to include a second and possibly even more members who are specialised in those fields.

In all the above cases, the search report and search opinion (if applicable – see [B-XI, 7](#)) are usually issued by one member only.

2.2.2 Further searches in a different technical field for a non-unitary application

Cases where subject-matter in different technical fields is found to lack unity are handled as follows:

- (a) The first member carries out a search on the invention first mentioned in the claims (see [F-V, 3.4](#)) in one technical field and draws up a search opinion (if applicable – see [B-XI, 7](#)) on this first invention and the reasons for the lack of unity. The applicant is sent a partial search report (see [B-VII, 1.1](#)), along with an invitation to pay further search fees for the inventions that are in another technical field.
- (b) The applicant pays further search fees for the inventions they want to have searched (see [B-VII, 1.2.1](#)).

- (c) A second member specialised in the relevant technical field searches the other inventions for which fees were paid.
- (d) The second member adds an opinion on the additionally searched inventions to the first member's opinion on unity and the first invention.

In very exceptional cases, more than one other member (i.e. also a third or possibly even more members) will be needed to search the other invention or inventions for which fees have been paid, but the procedure followed is the same.

Chapter II – General

1. Search and substantive examination

The procedure a European patent application goes through from its filing to the grant of a patent (or the refusal of the application) has two separate main stages, i.e. the search and substantive examination. *Art. 17*
Art. 18

1.1 Contact between the applicant and the search division

Consultations with the search division can only take place after the application has entered the examination stage, except in the cases mentioned in B-VIII, 3.2.2 and 4.2.2, and for issues related to the timing of the search report. The search division must not consent to earlier consultations (see also B-XI, 8) and must instead tell applicants that any issues they wish to raise will be dealt with in examination. For the procedure at the examination stage, see C-VII, 2.5.

2. Aim of the search

The search is aimed at identifying the state of the art relevant for determining whether, and if so to what extent, the claimed invention is new and involves an inventive step. *Rule 61(1)*

It is not usually aimed at finding disclosures of potential interest to the applicant, but documents not directly relevant for assessing the patentability of the claimed invention may be cited in the search report in certain circumstances (see B-X, 9.2.2 and 9.2.5).

Both the content of the search opinion and the later substantive examination depend on the outcome of the search as it establishes what state of the art is to be taken as the basis for assessing the patentability of the invention. The search must therefore be as complete and effective as possible, within the limitations necessarily imposed by unity of invention and other factors (see B-III, 2, B-VII and B-VIII).

3. Search documentation

The search is carried out in in-house or external document collections or databases. Their contents can be accessed systematically, e.g. using keywords, classification symbols or indexing codes. The available documentation consists largely of patent documents but also includes non-patent literature, such as articles from periodicals (see B-IX).

4. Search report

The search report contains the results of the search and, in particular, identifies the documents forming the relevant state of the art (see B-X, 9). *Art. 92*
Rule 61(1)

It informs the applicant, the EPO examining divisions and – once published – the public of the relevant state of the art. *Art. 92*
Art. 93(1)

It is accompanied by a search opinion (see B-XI; except in the cases mentioned in B-XI, 7) and, together, they make up the extended European search report (EESR).

4.1 European searches

Art. 17

The main task of the EPO's search divisions is to carry out searches and draw up search reports for European patent applications. However, they may also be called on to perform the various other types of search listed below.

4.2 Additional European searches

An additional search may be necessary once a European patent application reaches the examination stage, for example because:

Rule 63

Art. 17(2) PCT

(i) the claims have been amended and now encompass subject-matter not covered by the original search (see, however, C-III, 3.2.1 and H-II, 6.1 on claims not searched because of a lack of unity and H-IV, 4.1.2 on amendments introducing subject-matter from the description and so resulting in claims defining subject-matter which is not linked to the originally searched subject-matter by a single general inventive concept).

(ii) the deficiencies which resulted in an incomplete search or the issue of a declaration replacing a search report under Rule 63 or a declaration under Art. 17(2)(a) or (b) PCT (see B-VIII and C-IV, 7.3) have been overcome by amendments or been rebutted during substantive examination.

Rule 64

Rule 62a

(iii) the examining division has reversed the search division's opinion on novelty or lack of inventive step (see B-III, 1.1) or on other issues (see B-III, 1.2), in particular lack of unity of invention (see B-VII), subject-matter to be excluded from the search (see B-III, 3.11 and B-VIII) or Rule 62a.

(iv) the original search was limited or suffered from imperfections.

The examining division will use any new documents found in an additional search if it considers them relevant for examining the application. It must then make copies available to the applicant (Art. 113(1)).

Similarly, an additional search may be needed if a granted European patent is opposed (see D-VI, 5).

4.3 Supplementary European searches

Art. 153(2),

(6) and (7)

An international (PCT) application for which the EPO acts as designated Office or elected Office and which has been accorded an international filing date is deemed to be a European patent application. Where an international (PCT) search report is already available, it will replace the European search report. The search division will then draw up a supplementary European search report or issue a declaration replacing it under Rule 63 except in cases where the Administrative Council has decided that it can be dispensed with (see B-II, 4.3.1).

The (S)ISA/IPEA (other than the EPO) will have given opinions on the novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability of the claimed invention under Art. 33(1) PCT and possibly also on unity of invention under

Art. 34(3) PCT and any subject-matter to be excluded from the international search/preliminary examination under Art. 17(2)/Art. 34(4) PCT. The search division will consider these opinions but is free to diverge from them in its supplementary European search report and its search opinion (if applicable – see B-XI, 7).

The search division can use the documents cited in the international search report to support its findings (e.g. lack of novelty) in the search opinion (if applicable – see B-XI, 7).

4.3.1 Dispensing with the supplementary European search report

The Administrative Council has decided that no supplementary European search report is to be drawn up for an international application if:

- (i) the EPO was the ISA or the SISA (OJ EPO 2009, 594; OJ EPO 2010, 316)
- (ii) the Swedish Intellectual Property Office, the Austrian Patent Office or the Spanish Patent and Trademark Office was the ISA and it was filed before 1 July 2005 (OJ EPO 1979, 248; OJ EPO 1995, 511; OJ EPO 2012, 212 and 219).

The search fee may be reduced in these cases (see A-X, 9.5.1).

If no supplementary European search report is drawn up, the application, upon effective entry into the European phase, immediately falls within the competence of the examining division and will, after formalities examination, be passed on for substantive examination on condition that a request for examination has been validly filed.

4.3.2 A supplementary European search report is required

If a supplementary European search report is required (see B-II, 4.3.1), the supplementary European search will generally be carried out in the same way as a European search. The procedures under Rules 62a and 63 apply correspondingly (see B-VIII). Any limitation is left to the search division's discretion; a fixed approach to this is not possible since the search practices at other ISAs are not fully harmonised with those of the EPO and the documentation available to them may differ too.

The EPO generally aims to avoid any unnecessary duplication of work and so relies on the efficiency and quality of the international searches as far as possible. If the international search report has not yet been drawn up when the application enters the European phase, the EPO will wait until it is available before starting to process the application. The EPO as designated Office requests the ISA or the SISA to supply, together with the international search report, copies of the documents cited in it (Art. 20(3) PCT, see also Rule 44.3(a) PCT or Rule 45bis.7(c) PCT). If a cited document is not in one of the EPO's official languages and the search division needs a translation into one of them, it provides this itself (e.g. a patent family member or an abstract of the document in an official language, see B-VI, 6.2) unless it can obtain it from another source, e.g. the applicant or the ISA.

4.3.3 Application documents for the supplementary European search report

Rule 159(1)(b)
Rule 161

The European grant procedure, including the supplementary European search, is based on the application documents specified by the applicant when the application enters the European phase (Rule 159(1)(b)). However, if the applicant amends the application within a non-extendable period of six months from notification of a communication under Rule 161(2) (see A-XIV, 2.1 and 4), the amended application will be taken as the basis for the supplementary European search instead (see also B-XI, 2). The supplementary European search is based on the last set of claims filed up to expiry of the period set under Rule 161(2) for which any claims fee due is paid. For procedures relating to Euro-PCT applications where no supplementary European search report is drawn up by the EPO, see A-XIV, 2.1, 2.1.1, 2.1.3, 3, 3.1.

4.4 International (PCT) searches

For the practice as regards international (PCT) searches, see the PCT International Search and Preliminary Examination Guidelines and the PCT-EPO Guidelines.

4.5 International-type searches

Under the PCT, the EPO, as an ISA, may be entrusted with carrying out "international-type searches" for national patent applications (Art. 15(5) PCT). These searches are by definition similar to international searches, and the same considerations apply, except where the national application searched is found to lack unity of invention, in which case no reasoned statement on this finding is included in the search report and no invitation to pay further search fees is issued. However, it may be possible for applicants to pay these fees directly to the national offices. Where a written opinion is issued, it is drafted in accordance with EPO practice under PCT Chapter I and does include a reasoned statement on any potential lack-of-unity objection.

4.6 Searches on national applications

Prot. Centr. I(1)(b)

The EPO search divisions also carry out searches on national applications for some of the EPC contracting states. These Guidelines are not necessarily fully applicable to these national searches and do not always give details of how they differ from European searches. However, national and European searches are largely identical and at any rate compatible.

Chapter III – Characteristics of the search

1. Opinions of the search division

1.1 Opinions in relation to the search report

The aim of the search is to identify the state of the art relevant for assessing novelty and inventive step (see B-II, 2). Decisions on novelty and inventive step are the responsibility of the examining divisions, but the search division already gives the applicant a reasoned assessment of whether the application and the claimed invention meet the EPC requirements in the search opinion (if applicable – see B-XI, 7). The applicant can then reply to this in the examination proceedings (Art. 113(1) and B-XI, 8). The categories the search division assigns to the documents cited in the search report (see B-X, 9.2) similarly amount to implicit opinions on patentability and are subject to review by the examining division at the examination stage (see B-II, 4.2(iii) and B-XI, 1.2), in particular in the light of the applicant's reply (see B-XI, 8). *Rule 61(1)*

The assessment of patentability at the search stage can have a direct bearing on how the search itself is carried out: see B-III, 3.8 (on searching the subject-matter of dependent claims), B-III, 2.3 (on searching in neighbouring technical fields) and B-IV, 2.6 (on stopping the search when only trivial subject-matter remains).

1.2 Opinions on matters relating to limitation of the search

Occasionally, matters of substantive examination other than novelty or inventive step have a direct bearing on how the search is carried out and may result in its limitation. The search division's opinions on these matters are likewise subject to review by the examining division (see T 178/84 and T 631/97, and B-II, 4.2(iii) and B-XI, 1.2), in particular in the light of the applicant's reply to the search opinion (see B-XI, 8).

See B-VII (Unity of invention) and B-VIII (Subject-matter to be excluded from the search) for examples.

2. Scope of the search

2.1 Completeness of the search

A European search is essentially a thorough, all-encompassing search carried out to a high quality standard. Nevertheless, a search of this kind cannot always be 100% complete, in particular because all information retrieval systems, however they are operated, are inevitably imperfect. The search is carried out in a way that minimises the risk of overlooking complete anticipations of any claims, or other highly relevant prior art. Given the sheer amount of material on less relevant prior art that is available in the document collection, it is acceptable if not all of it is found (however, see also B-III, 2.3). For limitations of the subject-matter searched, see B-VIII.

The scope of the international search is defined in Art. 15(4) PCT, which states that the ISA must endeavour to discover as much of the relevant prior art as its facilities permit and must, in any case, consult the minimum

documentation specified in Rule 34 PCT. It follows from this definition ("as much ... as its facilities permit") that international searches must be equivalent in scope to a European search and must be carried out to the same high quality standard. This means that, if the EPO carried out the international search or the supplementary international search, it does not need to draw up a supplementary European search report and its international search report can replace the European search report (Art. 153(6) EPC, see OJ EPO 2010, 316, and OJ EPO 2011, 616; see also B-II, 4.3).

2.2 Effectiveness and efficiency of the search

The effectiveness and efficiency of any search for relevant documents (Rule 61(1)) depend on the degree of order which is inherent in, or which can be applied to, the searched document collection as it is this order that enables the search division to determine which parts of the documentation to consult. The basic means of creating order in a document collection are words, classification units, indexing codes or bibliographical links. The order can be permanent, as with indexing words or codes and classification symbols, or it can be created on demand by a search strategy judiciously using the basic means mentioned above to identify the parts of the documentation that are likely to contain material relevant to the invention. To ensure its resources are deployed as efficiently as possible, the search division, drawing on its knowledge of the technology in question and the available search tools, uses its judgement to omit parts of the documentation in which it is unlikely that any relevant documents will be found, for example parts containing documents from before the area of technology in question began to develop. Similarly, it only needs to consult one member of a patent family unless it has good reason to suppose that, in a particular case, there are relevant substantial differences in the content of different members of the same family (see B-IX, 2.4).

2.3 Search in neighbouring fields

The search division carries out the search in document collections and databases in which it can expect to find material covering all the technical fields directly relevant to the invention. The search strategy determines which parts of this documentation should be consulted. The scope of the search may then have to be extended to parts covering neighbouring fields, but it is for the search division to decide in each individual case whether this is necessary in view of what it has already found in the initially consulted parts (see B-III, 3.2).

When deciding which technical fields are to be regarded as neighbouring in a particular case, the search division has to consider what appears to be the invention's essential technical contribution and not only the specific functions expressly mentioned in the application.

It is left to the search division's discretion whether to widen its search to include fields not mentioned in the application. In deciding on this, it does not put itself in the inventor's shoes and does not try to imagine every single possible application of the invention. The most important question guiding its decision is whether searching in neighbouring fields is likely to

uncover material on which a reasonable inventive-step objection could be based (see T 176/84, T 195/84 and G-VII, 3).

2.4 Internet searches

The search can also cover internet sources, including online technical journals, online databases or other websites (see OJ EPO 2009, 456). The scope of any search on the internet will depend on the specific case, but there are some technical fields, especially in the area of information or software technology, where the most relevant prior art is unlikely to be found without systematically searching there. The search division may use the internet even when searching unpublished applications but must bear its duty to keep them confidential in mind and take great care to ensure that its search terms do not inadvertently disclose any confidential information about the invention. It is up to the search division to select suitable keywords that will enable it to search the invention effectively without disclosing it. This means, for example, not entering long portions of a claim's wording as a search term.

On the dating of internet citations, see G-IV, 7.5.

3. The subject-matter of the search

3.1 Basis for the search

The search is carried out on the basis of the claims, with due regard to the description and any drawings (Art. 92). The claims determine the extent of the protection the European patent will confer if granted (Art. 69(1)).

Art. 92
Art. 69(1)
Rule 43(6)

3.2 Interpretation of claims

The search is not restricted by the literal wording of the claims but also not broadened to include everything that a person skilled in the art might envisage from considering the description and drawings. The principles of claim interpretation as set out in F-IV, 4.2 apply. In particular, the search division must consult the contents of the description and/or drawings when performing the search in order to:

Art. 92

- (i) identify the technical problem and its solution
- (ii) define unclear terms not defined in the claims
- (iii) define clear terms given a definition different from their usual meaning
- (iv) ascertain whether there is a fallback position.

The aim of the search is to identify prior art which is relevant to novelty and/or inventive step (see B-II, 2). The search covers what appear to be the invention's essential features and is adapted to take account of any changes in the (objective) technical problem solved by the invention that may later arise in view of the prior art found so far (see B-IV, 2.3 and 2.4 and G-VII, 5.2).

When interpreting claims for the purpose of the search, the search division will also consider any prior art comprising technical features which are well-known equivalents of the technical features of the claimed invention and which may mean it lacks inventive step (see G-VII, Annex, 1.1(ii)).

3.2.1 Claims with explicit references to the description or drawings

Although explicit references in the claims to features elucidated in the description or in the drawings are only permissible where "absolutely necessary" (Rule 43(6) – see also B-III, 3.5 and F-IV, 4.17), claims containing such references are still searched if these features are unambiguously defined by specific parts of the description.

However, where the reference does not clearly identify which subject-matter of the description and/or drawings is to be regarded as included in the claim, an invitation under Rule 63(1) is issued. In the special case of an "omnibus claim" (e.g. one reading: "The invention substantially as herein described"), no invitation under Rule 63(1) is issued, and the search report will subsequently be treated as complete. This means that this kind of subject-matter will be dealt with only during examination.

The same procedure is followed regardless of whether or not the reference to the drawings and/or the description is allowable under Rule 43(6). In either case, the claim will have the same scope: if the reference is not allowable, the applicant will be asked to copy the definition of the technical feature from the description and/or drawings into the claim; if it is allowable, the claim will stay as it is.

However, where the reference does not appear to be allowable under Rule 43(6), the search division will object to it in the search opinion (if applicable – see B-XI, 7).

3.2.2 Using the description and/or drawings to identify the technical problem

Rule 42(1)(c) states that the description must (at least implicitly) mention the technical problem the invention is intended to solve (see also F-II, 4.5). This means the technical problem can be identified even if it is not immediately apparent from the claims.

However, the technical problem may change in view of the prior art found (see G-VII, 5.3, H-V, 2.4 and T 39/93, OJ EPO 1997, 134; see also G-VII, 5.2, T 184/82, OJ EPO 1984, 261, and T 732/89).

3.2.3 Using the description and/or drawings to define unclear terms not defined in the claims

Sometimes, the terms used to define claimed technical features are unclear and so the scope of the claims cannot be determined unambiguously. The search division then uses the description and/or drawings to interpret what these terms mean (see F-IV, 4.2).

For example:

Claim 1: Pneumatic tyre comprising a wide groove disposed in a tread portion, characterised in that the wide groove is provided on the groove bottom with at least one longitudinal rib extending in the longitudinal direction of the wide groove.

Description: The term "wide", as used in the context of the present invention, means not less than 20mm wide.

The term "wide" in claim 1 is unclear because it is a relative term with no well-defined meaning in the technical field, and so the scope of the claim is also unclear (F-IV, 4.6, Art. 84). However, the description unambiguously defines "wide" as meaning "not less than 20mm wide". The search division takes this definition into account during the search (and subsequently objects to the clarity of the term "wide" under Art. 84, second sentence, in the search opinion). The definition of "wide" in the description is also a fallback position (see B-III, 3.2.5).

3.2.4 Using the description and/or drawings to define clear terms given a definition different from their usual meaning

The meaning given to a technical term in the description and/or the drawings sometimes differs from the one commonly accepted in the relevant technical field. The meaning given can make the term (and so the scope of the claim) broader (see Example 1) or narrower (see Example 2).

Example 1

Claim 1: Halide salt of compound A

"Halide salt" normally means fluoride, chloride, bromide or iodide salt.

Description: In the context of the present invention the term halide salt means fluoride, chloride, bromide, iodide or tosylate salt.

Here, the claim at first appears to be clear because it uses a technical term ("halide salt") that has a clear and well-established meaning in the relevant technical field. However, the description gives this term a broader meaning than its well-established definition (i.e. it also includes tosylate salt).

Example 2

As in Example 1, except that the description defines "halide salt" as meaning fluoride, chloride or bromide salt.

Here, the meaning of "halide salt" is narrower than its well-established definition (i.e. it does not cover iodide salt).

In both cases, the search will take into account both the term's generally accepted definition in the relevant technical field and its definition in the application itself.

3.2.5 Ascertaining whether there is a fallback position

Claims sometimes contain an unclear and undefined term for which a clear preferred embodiment (i.e. a "fallback position"; see B-III, 3.2(iv)) is given only in the description and/or drawings (see B-III, 3.2.3). The search will then be based on the broadest technically sensible interpretation of the term. However, if the term's meaning is so unclear that a meaningful search cannot be carried out, it is justified to limit the scope of the search under Rule 63.

3.3 Amended claims, missing parts (Rule 56) or erroneously filed application documents or parts (Rule 56a)

3.3.1 General considerations

Where a European application does not derive from an earlier international application, the applicant is not allowed to amend the claims before receiving the European search report (Rule 137(1)). This means that the search is carried out on the basis of the claims in the European application as originally filed or of any set of claims filed under Rule 57(c) or 58.

Search and examination will be based on the date of filing and the application documents established during the procedure under Rule 56 or 56a. These documents are considered the documents as originally filed within the meaning of Art. 123(2). If they contain missing parts of the description and/or missing drawings filed under Rule 56(3), the application including the missing parts will form the basis for the search. In cases where erroneously filed documents and correct documents are both part of the application as filed (i.e. in cases under Rule 56a(4) of corrections without a change in the date of filing), the search will be performed as usual, and the procedures under Rule 63 or 64 applied where appropriate. If the EPO has already begun to draw up the search report when correct documents are filed, the applicant will be invited to pay a further search fee (Rule 56a(8)) (see A-II, 6.7).

In addition, when the search division expects the application to be redated by the examining division later on in the proceedings (see C-III, 1), it checks whether the Receiving Section's assessment of the "completely contained" criterion was correct (see H-IV, 2.2.2). If the Receiving Section wrongly considered that the missing parts and/or elements or the correct parts and/or elements were completely contained in the priority document, the search will be widened to include documents which would be relevant if the application were to be redated (such documents can be cited as "L" documents in the European search report (see also B-XI, 2.1)). The same applies to Euro-PCT applications which contain missing parts of the description, drawings or claims and/or missing elements filed under Rule 20.6 PCT.

3.3.2 Specific rules applicable to Euro-PCT applications

Where a European application derives from an earlier international application, the applicant may have amended the international application in the international phase, either after receiving the international search report (Art. 19(1) PCT) or during international preliminary examination (Art. 34(2)(b) PCT). Under Rule 159(1)(b), the applicant can then choose

Rule 56

Rule 56a

Rule 137(1)

Rule 159(1)(b)

Rule 161

whether to enter the European phase with these amended application documents (including claims) or with the ones originally filed. The EPO also gives them an opportunity to amend the application documents (including the claims) within a set time limit (Rule 161(2), see A-XIV, 2.1 and 4). The application as amended is then taken as the basis for any supplementary European search to be carried out under Art. 153(7) (see B-II, 4.3 and B-XI, 2).

See B-VIII, 6 for the procedure followed where the claims of an international application entering the European (regional) phase are amended in such a way that they contravene Art. 123(2).

3.4 Abandoned claims

Claims in a European patent application that are deemed to have been abandoned because the fees for them were not paid must be excluded from the search. The claims which have actually been searched are specified in the search report. This applies both to searches on directly filed European patent applications and to supplementary European searches on Euro-PCT applications entering the European phase (see B-II, 4.3).

Rule 45(3)

Rule 162(4)

3.5 Anticipation of amendments to claims

In principle, and in so far as possible and reasonable, the search covers all the subject-matter to which the claims are directed or to which they might reasonably be expected to be directed if they are amended (see, however, B-VII, 1.3 on cases of lack of unity and H-IV, 4 on the ambit of Rule 137(5)).

Example

Where an application relating to an electric circuit contains one or more claims directed only to the function and manner of operation, and the description and drawings include an example detailing a non-trivial transistor circuit, the search includes this circuit.

However, it is not sufficient for the application as filed to contain one broadly worded independent claim covering several embodiments, and no dependent claims, for the applicant to be entitled to a search of all the features of those embodiments (see T 1679/10).

3.6 Broad claims

The search division does not have to make any special effort to search unduly wide or speculative claims beyond the subject-matter that is sufficiently disclosed in the application (Art. 83) and supported by the description (Art. 84).

Art. 83

Art. 84

Example 1

If the claims in an application that relates to an automatic telephone exchange and describes it in detail are directed to an automatic communication switching centre, the search is not widened to include automatic telegraph exchanges, data switching centres, etc. merely because the claims are broadly worded but only if it is probable that it will

then produce a document on which a reasonable novelty or inventive-step objection could be based.

Example 2

If a claim is directed to a process for manufacturing an "impedance element" but the description and drawings relate only to the manufacture of a resistor element, and do not indicate how other types of impedance element could be manufactured by the claimed process, widening the search to include, say, the manufacture of capacitors is normally not justified.

Example 3

If the main claim relates to the chemical treatment of a substrate, but it appears from the description or all the examples that the problem to be solved depends solely on the nature of natural leather, the search is normally not widened to cover the fields of plastics, fabrics or glass.

Example 4

If the description and drawings are directed to a lock with a safety cylinder but the claims refer to a device allowing the indexation of the angular position of a first element with respect to two other rotating elements, then the search is limited to locks.

In exceptional cases where there is such a lack of disclosure or support that a meaningful search over the whole scope of the claims is impossible, it may make sense to follow the procedure under Rule 63 and issue either a partial search report or a declaration replacing the search report (see B-VIII, 3).

3.7 Independent and dependent claims

Rule 43(4)

The search carried out in the documentation to be consulted for the independent claim or claims must also cover all dependent claims (for cases not complying with Rule 43(2), see B-VIII, 4). Dependent claims are ones which are restricted by all the features of the claim or claims on which they depend. So, where the subject-matter of an independent claim is novel, that of its dependent claims will also be novel (see, however, F-VI, 2.4.3). When the patentability of the subject-matter of the independent claim is not in doubt after the search, there is no need to carry out a further search or cite documents for the subject-matter of the dependent claims as such (see, however, B-II, 4.2(iii) and B-XI, 1.2).

Example 1

An application relating to cathode ray oscilloscope tubes has an independent claim directed to specific means along the edge of the front of the tube for illuminating the screen and a dependent claim directed to a specific connection between the front and the main part of the tube. When searching in the parts of the documentation consulted for the illumination means, the search division will also look for material relating to the connecting means, whether in combination with the illumination means or

not. But, if its search in these parts of the documentation does not cast any doubt on the patentability of the illuminating means, it will not continue the search on the connecting means in other parts of the documentation which are likely to contain material relevant to or dealing specifically with these connections.

Example 2

An application dealing with a pharmaceutical composition for treating nail infections has an independent claim relating to specific combinations of the active ingredients. The patentability of this claim's subject-matter is not in doubt after the search, so there is no need to continue the search in relation to dependent claims dealing with the use of a specific volatile organic solvent as a carrier in the composition.

3.8 Search on dependent claims

However, where there is doubt about whether the independent claim's subject-matter is patentable, the search may have to be continued in other parts of the documentation, e.g. in one or more additional classification units, in order to assess whether the subject-matter of the dependent claim as such is novel and involves an inventive step. No special search is carried out for features that seem *prima facie* trivial or are generally known in the art. However, a handbook or other document showing that a feature is generally known can be cited if it can be found quickly (see G-VII, 6(iii)). A dependent claim that adds another feature (instead of providing more detail on something already in the independent claim) has to be considered in combination with the features in the independent claim and is dealt with accordingly (see F-IV, 3.4).

3.9 Combination of elements in a claim

For claims characterised by a combination of elements (e.g. A, B and C), the search is aimed at finding prior art relating to the combination. However, when searching the parts of the documentation selected for this, the search division should also search them for sub-combinations, including the elements individually (e.g. A and B, A and C, B and C, and also A, B and C separately). Other parts of the documentation are searched either for sub-combinations or for individual elements of the combination only if this is still necessary for establishing the novelty of the element in order to assess whether the combination involves an inventive step.

3.10 Different categories

If the application contains different categories of claims, the search must cover all of them (for cases not complying with Rule 43(2), see B-VIII, 4). However, if a product claim clearly seems to be both new and non-obvious, the search division will not carry out any special search on claims for a process which inevitably results in the manufacture of that product or for use of the product (see F-IV, 3.8 and G-VII, 13). When the application contains only claims of one category, it may make sense to include other categories in the search. For example, it can generally be assumed, i.e. unless the application contains contrary information, that, in a claim directed to a chemical process, the starting products form part of the state of the art and need not be searched. The intermediate products will only be

searched if they are the subject-matter of one or more claims. The final products on the other hand will always have to be searched unless they are clearly known.

3.11 Subject-matter excluded from search

Rule 63

Rule 62a

The search division can decide to exclude certain subject-matter from its search. It may do this where the subject-matter falls under one of the exceptions to patentability laid down in the EPC or cannot be considered susceptible of industrial application (see B-VIII, 1 and 2). It may also do this where the application falls so short of other EPC requirements that it is impossible to carry out a meaningful search on some or all of the claims or part of a claim (following the procedure set out in B-VIII, 3) or where the application does not comply with Rule 43(2) (following the procedure set out in B-VIII, 4).

3.12 Lack of unity

Rule 64

Where the claims do not relate to a single invention only – or to a group of inventions that are so closely linked that they form a single general inventive concept – the search will normally be restricted to the invention or linked group of inventions first mentioned in the claims (see B-VII and F-V, 3.4). If the search is restricted this way, the applicant will be informed in a communication accompanying the partial search report (see B-VII, 1.2).

3.13 Technological background

It makes sense to widen the scope of the search to include the following "technological background" to the invention:

- the preamble to the first claim, i.e. the part coming before the expression "characterised by" or "characterised in that"
- any state of the art which the introductory part of the description says is known but which is not identified by specific citations
- the general technological background to the invention (often called "general state of the art").

Chapter IV – Search procedure and strategy

1. Procedure before searching

Starting the workflow for a European search report, a European search opinion or a clarification request under [Rule 62a](#) and/or [63\(1\)](#) triggers a pre-search algorithm that generates a list of documents to be inspected by the search division. This creates a marker in the file showing that the search division has started the search. The date when the search started will be relevant if the search fee has to be refunded because the application is withdrawn, refused or deemed to be withdrawn (see [A-X, 10.2.1](#)).

1.1 Analysis of the application

The search division first of all studies the application to determine the subject-matter of the claimed invention (see [B-III, 3](#)) and critically analyses the claims in the light of the description and drawings to establish whether they are potentially open to any objection. In particular, it studies the content of the claims, description and drawings in enough detail to identify the problem the invention is intended to solve, the inventive concept leading to its solution, the features essential to the solution, as found in the claims, and the results and effects obtained (see, however, [B-III, 3.5](#)). If, according to the description, technical features not included in the claims are essential to solving the stated problem, these features are included in the search (see [F-IV, 4.3\(ii\)](#) and [T 32/82](#)).

1.2 Formal deficiencies

If the search division notices any formal shortcomings which have been overlooked by the Receiving Section, it issues an internal communication bringing them to the attention of the Receiving Section (or of the examining division, where it has requested an additional search), which then takes appropriate action. However, the search division does not redo the Receiving Section's work and does not make any time-consuming enquiries into the formalities. Deficiencies it might notice in an application include:

[Art. 90](#)
[Art. 92](#)
[Art. 78](#)
[Art. 53\(a\)](#)
[Rules 30 to 34, 40 to 45, 47 to 50 and 55 to 58](#)
[OJ EPO 2025, A49](#)

- (i) physical deficiencies (see [A-III, 3.2](#)), including:
 - (a) no electronic sequence listing ([Rule 30\(1\)](#), [OJ EPO 2011, 372](#), [OJ EPO 2013, 542](#))
 - (b) incorrect sequence and/or positioning of page numbering and/or failure to use Arabic numerals to number pages ([Art. 2\(5\)](#) of the decision of the President of the EPO dated 7 July 2025, [OJ EPO 2025, A49](#))
 - (c) drawings in the description and/or claims ([Art. 2\(8\)](#) of the decision of the President of the EPO dated 7 July 2025, [OJ EPO 2025, A49](#))
 - (d) erasures and/or alterations in the application documents that cast doubt on the authenticity of their content and/or are not conducive to good reproduction ([Art. 2\(11\)](#) of the decision of the President of the EPO dated 7 July 2025, [OJ EPO 2025, A49](#)).

Art. 53(a)
Rule 48(1)(a) and
(b)

- (ii) prohibited matter, i.e. content which:
 - (a) is contrary to "*ordre public*" (see A-III, 8.1, F-II, 7.2 and G-II, 4.1, 4.1.1 and 4.1.2) or
 - (b) amounts to a disparaging statement (see A-III, 8.2) (as opposed to permissible "fair comment" – see F-II, 7.3).

Rules 31 to 33

- (iii) non-compliance with the provisions on depositing biological material (see A-IV, 4), in particular any failure to properly identify the depositary institution and the accession number it assigned to the biological material (Rule 31(1)(c); see G 2/93 and A-IV, 4.2).
- (iv) a failure to correctly identify the application as a divisional application within the meaning of Art. 76(1) (Rule 41(2)(e); see A-IV, 1.3.2).
- (v) text in two different EPO official languages (Art. 14).

1.3 Documents cited or supplied by the applicant

Rule 66
Rule 141

Under the utilisation scheme (see Rule 141(1) and B-XI, 9, as well as OJ EPO 2010, 410), applicants whose application claims a priority are expected to file a copy of the results of any search carried out by the office of first filing (for more details, see A-III, 6.12).

If the prior-art information found by the office of first filing is made available before the search has been completed, the search division will check the citations and assess whether they are relevant for examination and for defining the search strategy.

The search division will also look at documents cited in the application if they are referred to as the starting point of the invention, as showing the state of the art or as providing alternative solutions to the problem concerned or if the application's content cannot be properly understood without them. But it can disregard them if they clearly relate only to details not directly relevant to the claimed invention.

In the exceptional case that the application cites a document that has not been published or is otherwise unavailable to the search division, and it appears to be so essential to properly understanding the claimed invention that a meaningful search on at least part of it would not be possible without knowing what is in it, the search division will send an invitation under Rule 63 (see B-VIII, 3) that specifies:

- (i) which document is needed
- (ii) why it is needed
- (iii) what will happen if it is not submitted in time (see below).

The applicant can respond by:

- (a) either submitting a copy of the document

- (b) or arguing why the document is not needed for a meaningful search and/or indicating a part of the application whose subject-matter can be searched without knowing what is in the document.

If the applicant does not submit a copy of the document – or convince the search division that it is not needed for a meaningful search – within the time limit under Rule 63(1), the search division will issue a partial search report or, where applicable, a declaration replacing the search report under Rule 63 (see B-VIII, 3.2.1) on the following grounds:

- (1) because the document was not available, the claimed invention had to be regarded as insufficiently disclosed within the meaning of Art. 83 and
- (2) the invention was so insufficiently disclosed that it was impossible to carry out a meaningful search on at least part of it (see B-VIII, 3).

If the applicant submits the document after the search report and the search opinion (if applicable – see B-XI, 7) have been drawn up, the examining division may later carry out an additional search on the originally excluded subject-matter in view of the correction of the deficiency which led to the incomplete search (see C-IV, 7.3).

However, applicants should bear in mind that information in documents referred to in their application can only be taken into account for sufficiency of disclosure under Art. 83 in the circumstances described in F-III, 8.

2. Search strategy

2.1 Subject-matter of the search; restrictions

Once the search division has determined the subject-matter of the invention as outlined in B-IV, 1.1, its first step is to define its approach to the search – in terms of what concepts, classes, keywords, etc. it plans to use – as precisely as possible. Often, one or more of the claims themselves can be used for this, but they may have to be generalised in order to cover all aspects and embodiments of the invention. At this point, the search division should also think about whether there is any non-patentable subject-matter (see B-VIII, 1 and 2) or any lack of unity of invention (see B-VII, 1.1). It may also have to restrict the search because claims have to be regarded as abandoned (see B-III, 3.4), because the application falls so short of the EPC requirements that a meaningful search is impossible (see B-VIII, 3) or because the application does not comply with Rule 43(2) (see the procedure described in B-VIII, 4). If the search is restricted, this must be mentioned in the search report or the declaration replacing it under Rule 63. The declaration must indicate the reasons for any restrictions under Rule 63 (see B-X, 8(iii)). The declaration or the partial search report is then treated as the search report for the purposes of the subsequent proceedings.

Rule 63
Rule 62a

2.2 Devising a search strategy

The search division next starts the search process by devising a search strategy, i.e. a plan consisting of a series of search statements reflecting

the subject-matter to be searched and determining the parts of the documentation to be consulted. A search strategy will initially be made up of one or more combinations of the basic search means mentioned in [B-III, 2.2](#). But the search process is interactive and iterative in the sense that the search division will revise its initial search statements depending on how useful it considers the information it has found so far (see [B-III, 1.1](#) and [B-IV, 2.4](#) and [2.6](#)). When using classification groups, the search division selects not only ones in all directly relevant fields but also ones in neighbouring fields.

If appropriate, the search division will also consult other classification (e.g. FI) or indexing (e.g. F-terms) schemes. It can also consult colleagues working in a similar technical field or in fields possibly related to the content of the application (see [B-I, 2.1](#)).

If in doubt about the right fields to search, the search division can ask a classification expert.

There are usually various possible search strategies, and the search division, drawing on its experience and knowledge of the available search tools, will use its judgement to select the one most appropriate in the case in hand. The search division prioritises search strategies leading to those parts of the documentation where relevant documents are most likely to be found. It will usually give the main technical field of the application priority, first of all using the basic search means (see [B-III, 2.2](#)) most relevant to the specific examples and preferred embodiments of the claimed invention. It will always consider the results already obtained in deciding whether it needs to widen the search to include other, less relevant parts of the documentation.

2.3 Carrying out the search; types of documents

The search division then carries out the search, focusing on documents relevant for novelty and inventive step.

It also notes any documents that may be important for other reasons, such as:

- (i) conflicting documents (see [B-VI, 4](#)), i.e.:
 - (a) published European patent applications under [Art. 54\(3\)](#) (see [G-IV, 5.1](#) and [5.1.1](#))
 - (b) published international applications under [Art. 54\(3\)](#) and [Art. 153\(3\)](#) and (5) (see [G-IV, 5.2](#))
 - (c) published national applications of EPC contracting states under [Art. 139\(2\)](#) (see [G-IV, 6](#) and [H-III, 4.4](#))
 - (d) any document published during the priority interval of the application which may become relevant under [Art. 54\(2\)](#) if the priority date turns out to be invalid.

If the applications listed above were published within the searched application's priority interval, they will be cited in the search report as "P" documents (see [B-X, 9.2.4](#)); if they were published on or after the European or international filing date, they will be cited as "E" documents (see [B-X, 9.2.6](#)).

- (ii) documents that cast doubt on the validity of any priority claimed (see [B-VI, 3](#) and [F-VI, 1.4.1](#)), which are cited in the search report as "L" documents (see [B-X, 9.2.8\(a\)](#)).
- (iii) documents that help to understand the claimed invention better or to understand it correctly, which are cited in the search report as "T" documents (see [B-X, 9.2.5](#)).
- (iv) documents illustrating the technological background, which are cited in the search report as "A" documents (see [B-X, 9.2.2](#)).
- (v) European patent applications that have the same filing or priority date as the searched application, were filed by the same applicant and relate to the same invention and that are therefore relevant to the issue of double patenting (see [G-IV, 5.4](#)), which are cited in the search report as "L" documents (see [B-X, 9.2.8 \(c\)](#)).
- (vi) documents indicating or establishing the publication date of a document found on the internet (see [G-IV, 7.5](#)), which are cited in the search report as "L" documents (see [B-X, 9.2.8 \(b\)](#)).
- (vii) documents found on the internet which do not have any publication date but which the search division nonetheless wants to cite to inform the applicant or third parties (see [G-IV, 7.5.4](#)), which are also cited in the search report as "L" documents (see [B-X, 9.2.8](#)).

However, the search division does not spend a lot of time searching for these documents or considering any related matters unless it has a special reason for doing so in a particular case (see [B-VI, 5.3](#) and [B-XI, 4](#)).

2.4 Redefining the searched subject-matter

Throughout its search, the search division continuously evaluates the results obtained so far and, based on the outcome, uses its judgement to decide whether to redefine the searched subject-matter. For example, the results may show that it needs to change the classification units selected for search or the order of searching them. They may also show that it needs to approach the search documentation in a different way, e.g. by consulting:

- (i) documents cited in relevant documents found during the search, for example cited in the description or search report of a patent document, or
- (ii) documents citing a relevant document found during the search

or that it needs to turn to documentation not available to it in-house (see [B-IX](#)). When searching external document collections for material relating to unpublished subject-matter using non-secure connections, e.g. on the internet, the search division must choose its search strategies extremely carefully to ensure it does not unwittingly reveal confidential material – i.e. any part of the unpublished patent application (see [B-III, 2.4](#)).

2.5 Closest prior art and its effects on the search

Sometimes the search division does not find any documents published before the earliest priority date which prejudice the novelty or the inventive step of the claimed invention. Wherever possible, it will then cite in the search report at least that prior art found which discloses a solution to the same subjective problem as the one dealt with by the claimed invention and whose known solution comes technically closest to the claimed solution. This prior art is cited as an "A" document in the search report (see [B-X, 9.2.2](#)).

If it cannot find such a document, the search division will instead cite as the closest prior art a document which discloses a solution to a problem closely related to the one dealt with by the claimed invention and whose solution is technically the most similar to the one in the searched application.

The search division proceeds in the same way where it finds documents which are accidentally prejudicial to the novelty of the claimed invention (cited as "X" documents) but which do not affect inventive step once the application has been amended appropriately, and does not retrieve any other documents prejudicing inventive step.

Where a European application is derived from an international application and undergoes a supplementary European search after entering the European phase ([Art. 153\(7\)](#) – see [B-II, 4.3](#)), the search division sometimes does not uncover any relevant prior-art documents other than the ones already cited by the ISA in its international search report. When this happens, it is permissible for its supplementary European search report not to cite any additional relevant documents (see [B-X, 9.1.4](#)).

2.6 End of search

Efficiency dictates that the search division use its judgement to end its search once the probability of discovering any more relevant prior art becomes very low in comparison to the work involved. It can also stop its search once it has found documents which clearly demonstrate that the entire subject-matter of the claimed invention and its embodiments in the description lack novelty, except for features which are trivial or common general knowledge in the relevant field and whose application would not involve any inventive step. As to the search for conflicting applications, see [B-VI, 4](#).

3. Procedure after searching

3.1 Drawing up the search report

Once it has ended its search, the search division selects the documents to be cited in the search report from among those it has found. These always

include the most relevant ones (which will be specially labelled in the report, see [B-X, 9.2.1](#)). Less relevant documents are only cited when they concern aspects or details of the claimed invention not found in the documents already selected for citation. If there is some doubt about novelty or inventive step, the search division will cite rather more readily to enable the examining division to consider the matter more fully (see [B-III, 1.1](#)).

The search division does not cite more documents than necessary in the search report and so, if there are several equally relevant documents, it normally cites only one of them. The search report is anyway accompanied by an automatically generated annex listing the available patent documents belonging to the same patent family. When selecting which of these documents to cite, the search division should think about what language is the most convenient, and should preferably cite (or at least note) documents in the same language as the application (see [B-X, 9.1.2](#)).

3.2 Documents discovered after completion of the search

The search division occasionally discovers other relevant documents after completing the search report (e.g. in a later search for a related application). These documents can be used in examination (see [C-IV, 7.5](#)).

3.3 Errors in the search report

If an editorial error is found in a search report before it has been published, a new search report will be drawn up to replace it. Where the search report has already been sent to the applicant in accordance with [Rule 65](#) but has not yet been published, the applicant is notified of the error immediately. If a serious error is discovered after publication, a corrigendum is published in the European Patent Bulletin, and the applicant and the examining division are informed accordingly. If a different document from the one cited has been made available to the applicant by mistake, the right one is made available.

Chapter V – Preclassification, IPC and CPC classification of European patent applications

1. Definitions

"Preclassification" is a first stage of classification using appropriate classification symbols to broadly identify the subject-matter of the claimed invention (or the invention first claimed if there is more than one) for the purposes of internal application (file) routing and allocation.

"IPC classification" involves assigning the appropriate classification symbols under the International Patent Classification (IPC) scheme published by WIPO. See the WIPO website for the IPC edition currently in force, and the "Guide to the IPC", which explains the principles and rules of IPC classification.

"CPC classification" involves assigning the appropriate classification symbols under the Cooperative Patent Classification (CPC) scheme published by the EPO and the USPTO. See the CPC website for the CPC edition currently in force, and the "Guide to the CPC", which complements the "Guide to the IPC" in that it deals with the differences between the CPC and the IPC.

2. Preclassification (for file routing and allocation)

Applications have to be preclassified to ensure they are allocated to the right search division. The preclassification is assigned using IPC and/or CPC symbols and entered on the electronic file. Based on a cursory read of the application, this initial level of classification is kept as general as possible but should still be specific enough to avoid the need for any further preclassification of the file before it can be properly allocated. In the rare case that this is necessary, arrangements should be made for the file to be redistributed as quickly as possible.

2.1 Incorrect preclassification

If the search division finds that an application has been incorrectly preclassified and so wrongly allocated to it, it will reallocate it to the right search division by making the appropriate changes on the electronic file. This is normally agreed beforehand with the other search division, but there is sometimes disagreement or uncertainty over classification boundaries, or the search division to which the application was initially allocated may be unsure how to preclassify it correctly. In such cases, it does not spend time trying to resolve the matter but instead forwards the file to a classification specialist.

3. IPC classification of the application

The IPC classification of a patent application is assigned by the search division.

The IPC classification identifies all features relevant to the technical subject-matter of the claimed invention (or of each of the claimed inventions if there is more than one) as precisely and comprehensively as possible under the IPC scheme.

The IPC classification consists of "invention information" symbols and "additional information" symbols (the latter include IPC indexing codes) which are assigned according to the IPC rules set out in the "Guide to the IPC". If more than one symbol has to be assigned for the invention itself, the symbol which, in the search division's opinion, best identifies it – or, if that is not straightforward, the one identifying it for which most information is given – is indicated first. The IPC classification should preferably be assigned after the search division has studied the content of the application to decide how to carry out the search. However, if the application is due to be published before the search report is drawn up, it will have to study it in enough detail to decide on the IPC classification at this earlier stage (see B-X, 5).

The IPC classification relates to what is disclosed in the published application, i.e. the application as filed, and so is determined without taking into consideration what the application could potentially contain if it is later amended. If, however, the search division's understanding of the invention, or of the content of the application as filed, changes significantly during the search (e.g. as a result of prior art found or because obscure points have been clarified) and the preparations for publication have not yet been completed, it will amend the classification accordingly.

3.1 IPC classification of late-published search reports

Where the search report is published separately from the application because it was not available in time and the search division finds it necessary to amend the assigned IPC classification for the reasons given in B-V, 3, last paragraph, it will specify the new IPC classification on the search report and point out that it replaces the one on the published application (which then becomes merely the "classification for publication"). It will only change the IPC classification if it is quite certain that it is necessary.

Where a European patent application is classified and published without the European search report (A2 publication), the European search report is drawn up and published separately at a later stage (A3 publication). It can happen that a new edition of the IPC is published in the meantime. The search division will then use the IPC edition which was in force when the application was published for the search report.

3.2 IPC classification where the scope of the invention is unclear (e.g. a partial search)

Where the scope of the invention is unclear, the IPC classification has to be based on what appears to be the invention in so far as this can be understood. It will then have to be amended if the search clears up the obscure points (see B-V, 3, last paragraph).

3.3 IPC classification in cases of lack of unity of invention

If the search division finds that the application lacks unity of invention, each of the different inventions claimed must be classified as set out in B-V, 3 to 3.2 because they will all be disclosed in the published application.

3.4 Verification of the IPC classification

As a general rule, applications are not systematically scrutinised after leaving the search division to verify whether it assigned the correct IPC classification. However, the EPO may carry out any spot-checks it considers necessary to ensure that the IPC is applied correctly and uniformly. It is for line managers to decide, based on the search division members' level of experience, whether such checks are needed and, if so, to arrange for them to be carried out before the applications leave their units.

4. CPC classification of the application

Besides assigning an IPC classification, the search division also classifies a patent application under the CPC. In practice, the CPC classification is assigned first, and the relevant IPC symbols are then generated from the CPC ones by one-to-one concordance (see the CPC to IPC Concordance List, published on the CPC website).

The CPC classification should be as precise and comprehensive as possible under this classification scheme. The CPC comprises "invention information" symbols and "additional information" symbols. Additional information symbols include CPC indexing codes. If more than one CPC classification symbol has to be assigned for the invention itself, the symbol which, in the search division's opinion, best identifies it – or, if that is not straightforward, the one identifying it for which most information is given – is indicated first.

Like the IPC classification, the CPC classification should preferably be assigned after the search division has studied the content of the application to decide how to carry out the search.

Again like the IPC classification, the CPC classification relates to what is disclosed in the published application, i.e. the application as filed, and so is determined without taking into consideration what the application could potentially contain if it is later amended.

However, if the search division's understanding of the invention, or of the content of the application as filed, changes significantly during the search, it will change the CPC classification accordingly, using the appropriate classification tools. Unlike a change to the IPC classification (see [B-V.3](#) above), this change can be made even after the preparations for publication have been completed.

If the scope of the invention is unclear (e.g. a partial search is necessary) or if there is a lack of unity of invention, the principles described in [B-V.3.2](#) and [3.3](#) for the IPC classification apply equally to the CPC classification.

Chapter VI – The state of the art at the search stage

1. General

General considerations applying to the state of the art and patentability, especially in the context of assessing novelty and inventive step, are set out in [G-IV](#).

2. Oral disclosure, use, exhibition, etc. as state of the art

Under [Art. 54 EPC](#), a public oral description, use, exhibition, etc. is also considered to be prior art. The search division cites such an oral disclosure as prior art only if it is convinced that the facts can be proved, for example if a document confirming the oral disclosure is available. Written confirmation can be accepted as proof even if it was published after the date of filing of the searched application as it is the date of the oral disclosure which is decisive under [Art. 54\(2\)](#). The search division then gives the date of the non-written disclosure as the relevant date (see [G-VI, 3](#)) but must also indicate the date of the subsequent written disclosure.

[Rule 61\(4\)](#)

However, such instances of oral disclosure, prior public use, disclosure by sale, etc. are more usually brought up by opponents in opposition proceedings (see [G-IV, 7.1 to 7.4](#)).

3. Priority

If the claimed priority dates cannot be verified at the search stage and it is therefore uncertain whether they are valid, the search for conflicting applications will be widened to cover all published applications with an earliest claimed priority date up to the searched application's date of filing (not its claimed priority date or dates) (see [B-IV, 2.3](#) and [B-XI, 4](#)).

4. Conflicting applications

4.1 Potentially conflicting European and international applications

Where the search is carried out less than 18 months after the application's European or international filing date (i.e. its date of filing under [Art. 80](#) and not its claimed priority date or dates), it will generally not have been possible to search for all potentially conflicting European and international applications, and so the examining division will have to complete this search at the examination stage (see [C-IV, 7.1](#)). However, if the search division does find any potentially conflicting published documents, it will cite them in the search report.

[Art. 54\(3\)](#)

Patent documents, regardless of their state or region of origin, which have a date of filing or valid priority date before the date of filing of the searched application (not its priority date) but were published on or after that date of filing and which contain novelty-destroying subject-matter for at least one independent claim of the application are referred to as "E" documents (see [B-X, 9.2.6](#)).

"E" documents cited in a European search report can be other European or international (WO) patent applications with an earlier priority date

(Art. 54(3)) which are relevant because they anticipate the novelty of the subject-matter claimed in the searched application.

An "E" document is novelty-destroying prior art under Art. 54(3) no matter where it discloses the subject-matter in question, i.e. whether it is in the claims, description or drawings.

4.1.1 Published European patent applications as "E" documents

- (a) European patent applications filed between 1 July 1997 and 12 December 2007 were published with all EPC contracting states automatically designated (OJ EPO 1997, 160) because the designation fees were not payable until after publication (Art. 79(2) EPC 1973). However, the automatic designations made on publication were retroactively invalidated under Rule 23a EPC 1973 for the purposes of Art. 54(3) and (4) EPC 1973 if the relevant designation fees were not then paid on time.

This means that, when a European patent application is found which is potentially relevant as an "E" document because it contains novelty-destroying subject-matter and claims earlier priority rights, and it was filed after the rule on the designation of states changed (i.e. as from 1 July 1997) but before the entry into force of EPC 2000, it is not immediately apparent from the published document which contracting states were validly designated. Nevertheless, such an application is always cited as an "E" document on the assumption that it has validly designated states in common with the searched application.

- (b) Any European patent application filed on or after 13 December 2007 which has an earlier date of filing than the searched application and was published on or after that application's date of filing is potentially state of the art for the purposes of Art. 54(3), regardless of whether the same states are designated.

4.1.2 Published international applications (WO) as "E" documents

- (a) According to Art. 158(1) EPC 1973, a conflicting PCT application will constitute prior art within the meaning of Art. 54(3) and (4) EPC 1973 only if before 13 December 2007:
- it designates the EPO,
 - where necessary, the applicant supplied the EPO with a translation into an official EPO language and
 - the applicant paid the EPO's national basic fee (the same as the filing fee) under Rule 107(1)(c) EPC 1973 and the EPO's designation fees under Rule 107(1)(d) EPC 1973.

- (b) According to Rule 165, a conflicting PCT application will constitute prior art within the meaning of Art. 54(3) only if on or after 13 December 2007 (see G-IV, 5.2):
- it designates the EPO,
 - where necessary, the applicant has supplied the EPO with a translation into an official EPO language required under Art. 153(4) and Rule 159(1)(a) and
 - the applicant has paid the filing fee under Rule 159(1)(c).

Even if it is not possible to verify any of the above requirements based on the published international (WO) application (in particular because the 31-month time limit for meeting them under Art. 22 PCT and Art. 39 PCT has not yet expired for the international application at the time of the search), the application should still be treated as potentially relevant under Art. 54(3) and so be cited as an "E" document in the search report (see also B-X, 9.2.6).

4.2 National prior rights

National applications may have been filed in one or more of the contracting states designated in the European patent application before its filing or priority date and then published as national applications or patents on or after that date. Such applications do not prevent granting a European patent, but are a potential ground for revocation in the state or states concerned, and so they are important for the applicant (see H-III, 4.4). If any are found during the search, they will be mentioned in the search report for information (see B-X, 9.2.6).

Art. 139(2)

5. Relevant date for documents cited in the search report; filing and priority date

5.1 Verification of claimed priority dates

Where the validity of a priority claim cannot be verified at the search stage (see B-XI, 4), the date of filing of the European patent application accorded by the Receiving Section must be taken as the relevant date for the search. (However, see B-VI, 3 on the relevant date for the search for conflicting applications.)

Art. 80

Rule 40

Art. 90(3)

Art. 54(2)

5.2 Intermediate documents

The search division takes documents published between the priority date and the date of filing of the searched application into account and labels them as such in the search report (see B-X, 9.2.4). For identifying what documents can be considered when an application has more than one priority date, the earliest date applies. When selecting which documents to cite in the search report, the search division refers to these dates and preferably chooses a document published before the priority date. For example, if there are two equally relevant documents, one published before the priority date and the other after that date but before the date of filing, the search division will choose the former (see B-IV, 3.1, second paragraph).

5.3 Doubts about the validity of the priority claim; widening of the search

The examining division is responsible for checking whether and to what extent the priority claim is justified. However, if its search uncovers intermediate state of the art (see B-VI.5.2) or potential state of the art under Art. 54(3), the search division will, if possible, check the validity of the priority claim (see B-XI.4, F-VI.1.2 to F-VI.1.5 and F-VI.2). Similarly, if it finds a document showing that a priority claim might not be justified (e.g. an earlier application or patent belonging to the same applicant and suggesting that the application from which priority is claimed may not be the first application for the invention concerned), it will cite this document in the search report (see B-X.9.2.8). However, it will not normally carry out any special search for such documents and will do so only if it has a particular reason, e.g. when the priority application is a "continuation-in-part" of an earlier application from which no priority is claimed (see B-IV.2.3 and F-VI.2.4.4). Sometimes the fact that the applicant's country of residence is different from the priority application's country of filing can also be an indication that it is not a first filing and so justify widening the search to some extent.

If the search is widened this way, it will cover:

- (i) published patent documents filed earlier than the claimed priority date

Example 1 (assuming that the applicant is the same for all applications)

Date	Application	Subject-matter
01.03.98	GB1 filed	A
30.05.98	GB2 filed	A
30.05.99	EP1 filed (claiming priority of GB2)	A
10.09.99	GB1 published	A
During the search for EP1, the search division found published application GB1. GB1 was filed earlier than GB2 and so may prejudice the priority claim of EP1. The search division therefore cites published GB1 in the search report as an "L" document (see B-X.9.2.8(a)).		

- (ii) published patent documents which claim priority from an application filed before the searched application's priority date

Example 2 (assuming that the applicant is the same for all applications)

Date	Application	Subject-matter
01.03.98	GB1 filed	A
30.05.98	GB2 filed	A
01.03.99	US1 filed (claiming priority of GB1)	A

30.05.99	EP1 filed (claiming priority of GB2)	A
15.04.00	US1 published	A

The publication US1 was found during the search on EP1. GB1 was filed earlier than GB2 and so may prejudice the priority of EP1. The search division therefore cites US1, which claims priority from GB1, in the search report as an "L" document (see B-X, 9.2.8(a)).

5.4 Documents published after the date of filing

The search normally does not cover documents published after the date of filing of the application accorded by the Receiving Section.

However, documents published after the date of filing can sometimes be relevant, for example written confirmation of an oral disclosure (see B-VI, 2), a later document setting out the principle or theory behind the invention and so helping to understand it better or a later document showing that the reasoning or the facts behind the invention are incorrect (see B-X, 9.2.5). The search is not specially widened to include documents of this kind, but the search division may choose to cite any it knows of in the search report.

If priority is validly claimed (see B-VI, 5.1), the search also does not normally cover documents published after the earliest validly claimed priority date as that date counts under Art. 89 as the application's date of filing. However, the search may have to be widened this way to some extent for specific purposes (see B-VI, 3, B-VI, 4 and B-VI, 5.3).

5.5 Non-prejudicial disclosures

Disclosures of the invention are disregarded if they happened less than six months before the European patent application was filed (see G 3/98 and G 2/99) and if they were due either to an evident abuse in relation to the applicant or the legal predecessor or due to display at an official, or officially recognised, international exhibition. Nevertheless, the search division does cite in the search report any documents it has reason to believe fall within one of the categories mentioned in B-X, 9.2.8. For these documents too, the relevant date for the search will be the date of filing of the application (see B-VI, 5.1 and B-XI, 4). Since abuse will generally only be asserted after the search report and search opinion (if applicable – see B-XI, 7) have been sent, and disclosure at an exhibition involves the question whether the displayed invention and the claimed invention are identical, both matters will be investigated by the examining division.

Art. 55(1)(a) and (b)
Rule 25

5.6 Doubts about the state of the art

It is the examining division, not the search division, that ultimately decides on novelty (see B-III, 1.1), and so the search division does not disregard highly relevant documents because it has doubts about, for instance, when exactly they were published or made publicly available (e.g. standards or related preparatory documents, see G-IV, 7.6) or, where they refer to an oral disclosure, exhibition, etc., what exactly was said or displayed. It tries to remove any such doubts but always cites the documents in the search report anyway, while continuing its search as though they had not been found. It can also cite additional documents providing evidence on the

matters in doubt (see [B-X, 9.2.8](#)). It will explain any such matters in detail in the search opinion.

Any date of publication indicated in a document is accepted as correct unless there is good reason to challenge it, e.g. where the search division can show it was published earlier or where the applicant can show in examination proceedings that it was published later. If the indicated date of publication is not precise enough (e.g. because only a month or year is given) to establish whether it was published before the relevant date for the search, the search division will try to determine the exact date or at least narrow it down with enough precision to establish this. A date of receipt at the EPO stamped on the document or a reference in another document, which must then be cited (see [B-X, 9.2.8](#)), can help with this. Whether a document was publicly available may be investigated when the search opinion is drawn up and during substantive examination (see [C-IV, 1](#)). Where, despite the search division's attempts, the date is still not precise enough for it to know whether or not the document was published before or after the priority or date of filing, it will cite it as though it had been published on the earliest possible date. For instance, if only the month and year of publication are known, the search division will cite it as having been published on the first day of that month.

6. Contents of prior-art disclosures

6.1 General remark

As a general rule, the search division cites only documents which are available in the search documentation or which it can access in some other way.

6.2 Citation of documents corresponding to documents not available or not published in one of the EPO's official languages

In certain circumstances, the search division can cite a document without having verified its content if it has good reason to assume that it is identical in content to another document which it has inspected. Both documents are then mentioned in the search report as described at the end of [B-X, 9.1.2](#). For example, where a document published in a non-EPO language before the date of filing has been selected for citation, the search division may instead have inspected a corresponding document in an official EPO language (e.g. another member of the same patent family or a translation of an article) and possibly published after the date of filing. Unless the contrary is explicitly stated, it can also be assumed that an abstract's contents are included in the original document, just as it is normally assumed that what is said in a report of an oral presentation matches what was presented.

Before citing a document written in a language it is not familiar with, the search division must make sure it is relevant (e.g. by using a machine translation, a translation by a colleague, a corresponding document or an abstract in a familiar language, by referring to a drawing or chemical formula in the document to be cited or by consulting database indexes relating to that document's technical content (see [B-X, 9.1.3](#))).

6.3 Conflict between abstract and source document

Where there is a problem with an abstract, either because it appears to conflict with its source document or because it conflicts with other abstracts of the same source document, the search division will proceed as follows:

- (i) it will cite the source document if it is in a language it can readily understand (especially one of an EPC contracting state) and either directly available to it or easy to obtain.
- (ii) it will cite the abstract if the source document is in a language it cannot readily understand (e.g. Russian, Japanese, Korean or Chinese) and/or is difficult to obtain. If more than one abstract is available, it will cite the one most relevant to the claimed invention even if it conflicts with the other abstracts or the source document.

The source document will be mentioned in the search report as the "&" document of the cited abstract. Where it is available but is in a language the search division cannot readily understand (e.g. Japanese), both it and the abstract will be made available to the applicant and included in the file (see B-X, 9.1.2). The search division must explain in the search opinion why it thinks there is a conflict.

Where an abstract conflicts with the source document to such an extent that it is incorrect, it is not treated as prior art, and the source document is considered to be the state of the art instead (T 77/87). However, for the purposes of the search report and opinion, an abstract is assumed to truly reflect the source document's content unless the discrepancy between the two is obvious. Since the abstract, the source document and a machine translation of the source document are all made available (see B-X, 9.1.3 and 12), the applicant can compare their disclosures and form an opinion on whether the abstract is technically accurate. They will still have an opportunity to refute the above assumption at the examination stage (e.g. by providing a translation of the source document).

6.4 Insufficient prior-art disclosures

The search division generally assumes that any technical subject-matter in a prior-art document is sufficiently disclosed and so part of the state of the art. Even if there is some doubt about this, it will still be cited in the search report as normal and relied on as a basis for an objection in the search opinion. It will be disregarded only if its disclosure is obviously insufficient (see G-IV, 2).

6.5 Incorrect compound records in online databases

If the search division finds a compound when searching a database created by abstracting source documents (e.g. patents, journal articles or books) and identifying the chemical compounds disclosed in them but, on reading the source document, cannot find the compound, this does not automatically mean that there has been a mistake and that the compound is not disclosed in the document. For example, compounds which are named but whose structures are not drawn are still part of the disclosure and will be abstracted. In addition, database providers use standard nomenclature in their database records, whereas authors of technical

literature frequently do not, and so the database record may use a different nomenclature for the compound from the source document.

However, if the search division really is unable to find the compound in the source document, but the compound is relevant for assessing patentability, it may write to the database provider to ask why the compound was included in the abstract and where it is disclosed in the source. If the database provider has not replied by the time the search report is drafted, the document will be cited in the search report and in the search opinion on the assumption that it does disclose the compound, but the search division will also continue the search as though the compound did not exist.

7. Internet disclosures – technical journals

For some technical journals, the publisher's website displays the date when they were published online, especially if it differs from the date when they were published on paper (OJ EPO 2009, 456). There are various possible scenarios where a journal was published online (see G-IV, 7.5.3.1). In all cases, the search division makes a copy of the journal web page where the (electronic and paper) publication and pre-publication date or dates of the article or issue are mentioned and then cites it in the search report as an "L" document. It is best to do so as soon as the evidence is found and not leave it until later, since the information may be moved or removed from the website in the time between search and substantive examination.

Chapter VII – Unity of invention

1. General remarks

The requirement of unity of invention has a regulatory function and is intended to promote an efficient procedure up to grant (T.110/82 and F-V. 6). It would be unfair to treat applications as meeting this requirement where, because of their diverse content, they cost much more than average to process, especially in terms of search, since some of this extra cost would have to be covered by fees paid for other applications. Another aspect is that an application's content should be readily understandable, which will not always be the case where its subject-matter is very diverse.

On the other hand, the general purpose of dealing with linked substantive issues in a single procedure would not be achieved if the provisions on unity of invention were applied too strictly, and so interconnected subject-matter must not be split up needlessly (see F-V).

1.1 Partial European search report

If the search division considers that a European patent application lacks unity of invention (see F-V. 1), it must carry out a search, and draw up a partial European search report under Rule 64(1), for those parts which relate to the invention (or unitary group of inventions) first mentioned in the claims (see F-V. 3.4). The partial European search report is accompanied by a list of the separate inventions identified.

Rule 64

For more on the search opinion in cases where there is a lack of unity of invention, see B-XI. 5.

1.2 Invitation to pay further search fees

The search division will inform the applicant of the lack of unity of invention in a communication accompanying its partial search report and invite them to pay a further search fee for each invention other than the one first mentioned in the claims if they want the search to cover these inventions as well. Together with this invitation, the applicant will receive a provisional opinion on the patentability of the invention or unitary group of inventions first mentioned in the claims (see F-V. 3.4) and the reasons for the non-unity findings. This provisional opinion is for information only and the applicant does not need to reply to the points raised in it. If the applicant nevertheless submits a reply, the search division will not take it into account when drawing up the extended European search report (see the notice from the EPO dated 3 March 2017, OJ EPO 2017, A20).

Rule 64(1).

Point 6.1 AAD

1.2.1 General

The further search fees must be paid within two months (Rule 64(1)). Applicants using the automatic debiting procedure must inform the EPO within this period if they do not want some or even any of the other inventions to be searched, because otherwise further search fees for all of them will be debited automatically on the last day.

- (a) If the applicant does not pay any further search fees in time, there will be no further search and the partial search report will become the final search report, which is accompanied by the search opinion.

Nevertheless, the final decision on unity of invention is taken by the examining division or – in the event of an appeal – ultimately by the board of appeal (B-VII, 1.4 and C-III, 3.2.1).

- (b) If the applicant pays further search fees for any of the remaining inventions or groups of inventions in time, a further search will be carried out on those inventions. The final search report will then be drawn up for all inventions for which search fees have been paid, i.e. the first one and the ones included in the further search. If the application does not meet the EPC requirements as regards any of the inventions for which further search fees have been paid, this will be mentioned in the search opinion. For example: invention 1 was searched and the applicant paid a further search fee for invention 3. The subject-matter of invention 3 was found to lack novelty. The search opinion will then cover invention 1 and object to a lack of novelty for the subject-matter of invention 3.

1.2.2 Cascading non-unity

If a European patent application is found to lack unity at the search stage, the invention first mentioned in the claims (see F-V, 3.4) will be searched and the applicant will be invited to pay further search fees for the others. They will also be warned that, even if a lack of unity "*a posteriori*" is later detected, no further invitation to pay additional fees will be issued.

If the applicant pays further search fees for any of the other inventions, a search is carried out for those inventions.

If this further search reveals that one or more of these inventions also lack unity "*a posteriori*", only the first invention in each group of inventions is searched. The applicant will not be invited to pay another set of further search fees.

The search division will draw up the search opinion, setting out the reasons for its finding of non-unity and giving an opinion on the patentability of the searched inventions (see B-XI, 5).

Divisional applications can be filed for any inventions that have not been searched (see C-IX, 1.2).

Example

The search division raises a lack of unity objection and identifies four different inventions A, B, C, D. The first invention A is searched and the applicant is invited to pay further search fees for inventions B, C and D. The warning mentioned above is given.

The applicant pays two further search fees for inventions B and C. During the further search, B is found to lack unity "*a posteriori*" and is divided into groups of inventions B1, B2 and B3.

In this case only B1 and C are searched. The European search opinion must fully explain why the claims of the application were divided into A, B,

C and D and why B was then subdivided into B1, B2 and B3 and offer a view on whether A, B1 and C are patentable.

Examination of the application in the European phase will be based on either A, B1 or C (see C-III, 3.2.2). The claims relating to inventions B2, B3 and D can be filed as divisional applications (see C-IX, 1.2).

1.2.3 The applicant has not paid all further search fees

The applicant always has to clearly state which inventions the further search fees have been paid for. If the applicant pays only some, but not all, of the requested further search fees and does not indicate which inventions these fees are for, the search division will attempt to find out which inventions are to be covered by its further search or searches.

1.3 Documents relevant only to other inventions

The search on the invention first mentioned in the claims may also uncover documents that are relevant only to the other inventions. These documents do not necessarily have to be included in the partial European search report unless they are the basis for an objection to lack of unity "*a posteriori*" (see F-V, 5 and 7).

1.4 Assessment and possible review of the unity requirement

A search division dealing with unity at the search stage applies the same criteria as are used in substantive examination (see F-V). In particular, it will not raise an objection of lack of unity merely because the inventions claimed are classed in separate classification groups, or simply as a way of restricting the search to certain parts of the documentation, for example certain classification groups (but see B-V, 3.3).

The assessment of unity at the search stage is not definitive. Normally, the search division will have formed a first impression even before it carries out the search, but it will necessarily have done so *prima facie*, based on the common general knowledge in the relevant field and the prior art mentioned in the application. It will revisit this initial assessment during and after the search in the light of the documents found. Its findings will be reviewed again when substantive examination begins and even the position taken then may be changed later on in the proceedings in the light of new facts and evidence.

However, as a general rule, a position already taken on unity of invention is maintained unless there are sound reasons for changing it. The final decision on the matter is taken by the examining division or – in the event of an appeal – ultimately by the board of appeal. So any previous finding on unity is basically always open to review.

2. Procedures in cases of lack of unity

2.1 Request for refund of further search fees

At the examination stage, the applicant may challenge the finding of non-unity and request a refund of one or more of the further search fees paid. If the examining division finds that the challenge is justified, the fee or fees in question will be refunded (see, however, B-XI, 1.2).

Rule 64(2)

Rule 164(5)

2.2 Complete search despite lack of unity

In some exceptional cases – especially where the lack of unity was not immediately apparent and is detected "*a posteriori*" and the different inventions identified are conceptually very close – the extra work and cost involved in carrying out a complete search and drawing up a search opinion (where applicable – see B-XI.7) for all the inventions is only negligible. In such cases, the search division carries out the search on the other inventions at the same time as the one on the invention first mentioned in the claims and includes all the results in a single search report, in which it objects to the lack of unity and identifies the different inventions. It will also point out that it did not invite the applicant to pay further search fees because it was able to search all the claims without the extra work that would justify them. However, the search opinion (if applicable – see B-XI.7) will still raise the objection to the lack of unity of invention (see B-XI.5).

2.3 Supplementary European search

If a lack of unity of invention comes to light during a supplementary European search following an international (PCT) search, a partial supplementary European search report is drawn up on the invention or group of inventions first mentioned in the claims (see F-V.3.4) on which the supplementary European search was based (Rule 164(1)(a)), irrespective of the ISA's findings on unity of invention. Together with this partial search report, the applicant will be invited to pay a further search fee for each invention other than the one first mentioned in the claims (Rule 164(1)(b)), i.e. the same procedure is followed as for the non-unity invitation issued under Rule 64(1) for direct European patent applications (see B-VII.1.2). The applicant will also receive a provisional opinion on the patentability of the invention or unitary group of inventions first mentioned in the claims, which will include the reasons for the non-unity findings.

3. Lack of unity and Rule 62a or Rule 63

The procedures for dealing with cases of lack of unity in which Rule 63 or Rule 62a applies are dealt with in B-VIII.3.4 and 4.5 respectively.

Art. 153(7)
Rule 164(1)

Chapter VIII – Subject-matter to be excluded from the search

1. General remarks

The subject-matter listed in Rule 39.1 PCT can be regarded as excluded from the scope of a European search under the EPC too, i.e. on the basis that it is not susceptible of industrial application (Art. 57), is excluded from patentability under Art. 52(2) and (3) in so far as the European patent application relates to it as such or falls under one of the exceptions to patentability in Art. 53(b) and (c). The claims are not searched in so far as they relate to such subject-matter (for the procedure for limiting the search under Rule 63, see B-VIII, 3.1 to 3.4). For the specific case of compositions for use in methods of treatment of the human or animal body by surgery or therapy, or diagnostic methods practised on the human or animal body, see B-VIII, 2.1 below.

Art. 52(2) and (3)

Art. 53

Art. 57

Rule 63

The examining division is responsible for taking a final decision on whether the subject-matter is patentable, but the search division will also form a view on this for the purpose of drafting the search opinion (if applicable – see B-XI, 7) and also in considering whether or not it needs to limit the search and apply the procedure under Rule 63(1) (see B-VIII, 3.1 to 3.4). This means that it too has to consider the patentability requirements other than novelty and inventive step (see G-II and G-III).

Art. 52

It may be that potentially non-patentable subject-matter is found in only some of the claims or only part of a claim. This will then be indicated in the invitation under Rule 63(1) and in any subsequent partial search report or declaration replacing the search report under Rule 63(2).

Rule 63

2. Considerations relating to specific exclusions from and exceptions to patentability

2.1 Methods for treatment of the human or animal body by surgery or therapy and diagnostic methods practised on the human or animal body

Even where a claim is drafted as a method of medical treatment (see G-II, 4.2) and is therefore not directed to patentable subject-matter, a meaningful search may be possible if the determinant technical feature is the effect of the substance, which can be searched. The procedure under Rule 63 (see B-VIII, 3.1 to 3.4) will then be unnecessary. For example, method claims can be worded as follows:

"A method of treating dementia by administering a compound of formula X to a patient"

or

"A method of diagnosis of disease Y practised on the human/animal body, comprising steps A, B and C"

These method claims are excluded from patentability under Art. 53(c), but the applicant will usually be able to reword them in an allowable form during the examination proceedings (see G-II, 4.2). They are therefore searched since they are usually characterised by the effect of substance X, by one or more of steps A, B and C not directly practised on the human or animal body or by the use of reagents rather than by the act of therapy or diagnosis on the human/animal body.

If, however, a claim includes specific method features (e.g. a combination of pharmaceutical and physical treatment), a meaningful search may not be possible. If in doubt, the search division will issue an invitation under Rule 63(1) (see B-VIII, 3.1). But, regardless of whether such claims are searched or not, the applicant will be informed in the search opinion (if applicable – see B-XI, 7) that the subject-matter in question is excluded from patentability (see B-XI, 3).

2.2 Subject-matter excluded from patentability under Art. 52(2) and (3)

Subject-matter or activities listed in Art. 52(2), when taken as such (Art. 52(3)), are considered non-technical (G-II, 1 and 2). If a claim contains a mix of technical and non-technical features, the search division identifies which features contribute to the technical character of the claimed subject-matter (see G-VII, 5.4) and its search covers all those features.

Features that appear to be non-technical when taken in isolation may still contribute to the technical character of a claimed invention if, in the context of that invention, they help to produce a technical effect that has a technical purpose. Merely implementing effects that are inherent in the excluded subject-matter (T 1543/06) or that result from circumventing the technical problem rather than contributing to its technical solution does not qualify as a technical effect (T 258/03). Examples of how to evaluate contribution to technical character for each of the items listed in Art. 52(2) are provided in G-II, 3.1-3.7.

Claimed features are analysed in the light of the description and drawings to determine whether they produce a technical effect and contribute to a technical solution to a technical problem (see B-III, 3.2 and B-IV, 1.1). In particular, specific embodiments disclosed in the description and drawings – to which the claims might reasonably be expected to be limited (see B-III, 3.5) – are taken into account since they could confer technical character on the claimed features.

If the search division considers that some claim features do not contribute to the technical character of the claimed invention, it will state this in the search opinion. If it objects to a lack of inventive step and at least some of the distinguishing features are found not to have a technical effect contributing to the solution of a technical problem (see G-VII, 5.4), it will substantiate this finding.

2.2.1 Computer-implemented business methods

If the features contributing to the technical character of the subject-matter of claims directed to computer-implemented business methods are so

well-known that their existence at the relevant date cannot reasonably be disputed (T 1411/08, Reasons 4.1 and 4.2, and T 690/06, Reasons 13), the search division does not have to cite any documentary evidence of the relevant state of the art in the search report, because they then amount to "notorious" knowledge, for which no such evidence is needed. "Notorious knowledge" is not to be confused with the skilled person's common general knowledge, which is something that generally can be reasonably challenged (G-VII, 2 and 3.1). In such exceptional cases, a search report with no cited documents may be issued under Rule 61 (OJ EPO 2007, 592). This is not the same thing as issuing a declaration of no search or a partial search report under Rule 63(2).

3. No meaningful search possible

In addition to the reasons discussed in B-VIII, 1, an invitation under Rule 63(1) may be issued and the search subsequently limited under Rule 63(2) because the application falls so short of the relevant EPC requirements that it is impossible to carry out a meaningful search on all or some of the claims or part of a claim. The search division then applies the procedure under Rule 63 (see B-VIII, 3.1 to 3.4 and OJ EPO 2009, 533). Rule 63

Rule 63 relates only to whether the search is practicable and not to whether its results are likely to be relevant in the later examination proceedings. Even if a search will not produce any result that could be used in examination proceedings, it cannot be refused on the basis of Rule 63 (see T 1242/04).

What is or is not "*meaningful*" is a question of fact to be answered by the search division. Its finding may change in the light of any reply from the applicant to the invitation under Rule 63(1) (see B-VIII, 3.2). How the search division exercises its discretion will depend on the facts of the case. A restriction of the search must be carefully considered. There are cases where a search is impossible in practice in view of the failure to meet the EPC requirements, for example a fundamental lack of clarity or the absence of any technical character whatsoever. However, the word "*meaningful*" must always be construed reasonably, i.e. Rule 63 cannot be invoked simply because a search is difficult or does not produce results relevant for subsequent examination proceedings.

As there is no legal provision requiring that applicants draft their application in a way that makes searching easier, "procedural economy" cannot be used as a reason, or part of a reason, for issuing a partial search report (see also T 1020/98).

The following – non-exhaustive – examples illustrate where Rule 63 can apply:

- (i) claims lacking support; insufficient disclosure

An example is a claim so broadly formulated that its scope is at least to some extent speculative, i.e. not supported by the disclosure of the application. It is then so broad that a meaningful search cannot be carried out over its whole scope but only on the basis of the

narrower, disclosed invention. In extreme cases, this may mean a search covering only (one or more of) the specific examples disclosed in the description. The procedure under Rule 63(1) can then be applied (see B-VIII, 3.1 to B-VIII, 3.4) on the basis of a failure to meet the requirements of sufficiency of disclosure and support set out in Art. 83 and 84 (see F-III, 1 and 2, and F-IV, 6). However, the search division needs to bear in mind that whether these requirements are met has to be assessed from the point of view of the person skilled in the art.

(ii) claims lacking conciseness

An example is where there are so many claims, or so many possibilities within a claim, that it is unduly burdensome to determine the subject-matter for which protection is sought (however, see B-VIII, 4 on multiple independent claims in the same category). A complete search (or even any search at all) may then be impossible in practice. Again, it may be appropriate to apply Rule 63 and then issue a partial search report (following the procedures described in B-VIII, 3.1 to 3.3) or a declaration of no search, on the grounds that the claims are so lacking in conciseness that a meaningful search is impossible (see Art. 84; F-IV, 5).

(iii) claims lacking clarity

An example is where the parameter chosen by the applicant to define the invention makes a meaningful comparison with the prior art impossible, for example because the prior art did not use the same parameter or did not use any parameter at all. The applicant's parameter may then lack clarity (see Art. 84; F-IV, 4.11) and it may even be so unclear that a meaningful search of the claims, an individual claim or part of an individual claim is impossible. It may then be appropriate to apply Rule 63 and issue a partial search report (or, in exceptional cases, no search report at all) under Rule 63(2) (following the procedures described in B-VIII, 3.1 to 3.3) after restricting the search to the worked examples, in so far as they can be understood, or to the way in which the desired parameter is obtained (any reply from the applicant to the invitation under Rule 63(1) would then be taken into account as described in B-VIII, 3.2 to determine the subject-matter to be searched).

(iv) claims contravening Art. 76 or Art. 123(2)

Rule 63 may also apply in the following cases of claims containing added subject-matter (see B-VIII, 6):

- claims in divisional applications contravening Art. 76
- applications for which the claims were filed after the date of filing and which contravene Art. 123(2) or

- Euro-PCT applications for which amended claims were filed as a basis for the supplementary European search and which contravene Art. 123(2).

These examples are not exhaustive (see also B-VIII, 6). The basic principle is that it needs to be clear and transparent for both the applicant and third parties what has and has not been searched.

How these Rule 63 cases are handled in subsequent examination proceedings is dealt with in H-II, 5 and H-IV, 4.1.1.

3.1 Invitation to indicate subject-matter for search

If the search division considers that the application falls so short of the EPC requirements that it cannot carry out a meaningful search into the state of the art on the basis of all or some of the subject-matter claimed (see B-VIII, 1, 2 and 3), it will invite the applicant to file, within two months, a statement indicating the subject-matter to be searched. The invitation will also give the reasons for this finding and may additionally indicate the claimed subject-matter on which the search division considers it feasible to base a meaningful search.

Rule 63(1), (2)

In the particular case of medical method claims, the search division issues a complete search report only when the claims can easily be reworded to comprise patentable subject-matter (see B-VIII, 2.1). If, on the other hand, it plans to issue a partial search report (or a declaration of no search), it must first send an invitation (e.g. for the claims that cannot easily be reworded).

3.2 Reply to the invitation under Rule 63(1)

3.2.1 No or late reply

If applicants do not reply to the invitation under Rule 63(1) in time, the search division will take its own decision on what to search. It will then draw up a partial search report for what it searched or, in exceptional cases, issue a declaration of no search. As the limitation of the search has consequences in examination (see H-II, 5 and H-IV, 4.1.1), any late-filed reply will be included in the file for consideration at that stage because it may be useful for reviewing the search division's arguments for carrying out an incomplete search.

Given that the search report should be published with the application, applicants cannot request further processing if they miss the two-month period under Rule 63, but they can request re-establishment of rights (see OJ EPO 2009, 533).

3.2.2 Reply in time

If applicants reply to the invitation under Rule 63(1) in time and the search division considers it possible to carry out a meaningful search based on the subject-matter they have indicated, it will search that subject-matter.

Rule 63(2)

If applicants reply to the invitation under Rule 63(1) in time but the indicated subject-matter still cannot be fully searched, the search division will take its own decision on what to search, but will keep to what was indicated in the

applicant's reply as far as possible. In exceptional cases, it may find that no meaningful search is possible at all.

Statements consisting of reworded claims filed in reply to an invitation under Rule 63(1) are not considered amended claims within the meaning of Rule 137(1) but treated merely as explanations of the originally filed claims. The applicant must formally introduce these reworded claims into the proceedings by confirming that this is what they want within the time limit under Rule 70(1) or (2). The confirmation can be filed either together with the reply to the extended European search report (Rule 70a(1) and (2)) or, where applicable, when complying with the requirements under Rule 70(1) or (2). As far as possible, the search division will draw up the search report in the light of these explanations. Both the search report and the search opinion must clearly indicate what has been searched.

Instead of indicating the subject-matter to be searched, applicants can reply to the invitation under Rule 63(1) by simply arguing why they believe a meaningful search can be carried out on all of the subject-matter claimed. If the search division is convinced by the applicant's arguments, it will issue a full search report. The search will therefore not be limited and there will be none of the associated consequences in examination. But if it is not convinced, or is only partially convinced, it will take its own decision on what to search and then issue a partial search report or, in exceptional cases, a declaration of no search. The examining division has final responsibility for deciding whether it was appropriate to send an invitation under Rule 63 and issue a declaration of no search or a partial search report at the search stage and it may find that it has to carry out an additional search (see C-IV, 7.3).

Applicants can also reply to an invitation under Rule 63 by arguing against the findings there and – as a main request – asking the search division to fully search the claims as filed and – as an alternative, in case the search division is still not convinced – indicating specific subject-matter they would like to have searched (see also H-III, 3.2).

A consultation may take place if the applicant phones the search division to enquire about the course of action after an invitation under Rule 63 has been sent. The consultation is limited to formal issues concerning the content of the invitation and the options available to the applicant. The search division writes minutes of the consultation and sends them to the applicant (without setting any time limit) for information only. The consultation itself does not count as a valid reply to the invitation and so the applicant still has to file a written reply within the time limit set there.

3.3 Content of the extended European search report (EESR)

In the two parts of the EESR, i.e. the search report (or the declaration of no search replacing it) and the search opinion, the search division will explain why it found under Rule 63 that it could not carry out a meaningful search on some or all of the claimed subject-matter and specify what subject-matter it did search (if any) following the procedures described in B-VIII, 3.2. In the search opinion, it will also invite the applicant to limit the claims to this searched subject-matter (in order to comply with Rule 63(3)).

The documents cited in the search report and referred to in the search opinion will relate only to this subject-matter. Even if the searched subject-matter meets the EPC requirements (in particular in that it is novel, inventive and industrially applicable, but also in that it meets the other conditions, such as clarity under Art. 84), the search opinion will still be negative, because the claims do not meet these requirements across their whole scope.

Similarly, if the applicant replies to the invitation under Rule 63(1) by disputing the finding that a meaningful search is impossible (see B-VIII, 3.2) but the search division still disagrees, it will explain why in the search opinion, referring directly to the applicant's reply if necessary.

3.4 Applications falling under Rule 63 and lacking unity

There are cases where the application not only falls so short of the EPC requirements that it is impossible to carry out a meaningful search into the state of the art based on some of the subject-matter claimed (B-VIII, 1, 2 and 3) but also lacks unity of invention under Art. 82 and Rule 44. Sometimes it is enough for the search division to raise only unity of invention and send an invitation under Rule 64(1) (see B-VII, 1.1 and 1.2), for example where a large number of claims results in a serious lack of conciseness but this can be resolved by splitting the claims up into the different inventions.

In other cases, however, the search division may need to apply the procedures under both Rule 64(1) (i.e. invite the applicant to pay further search fees for inventions other than the one first mentioned in the claims) and Rule 63(1) (i.e. invite the applicant to indicate the subject-matter to be searched). If so, it will send the applicant the Rule 63(1) invitation first. Where the lack of unity is already apparent, this invitation will also identify the invention (or group of inventions) first mentioned in the claims ("first invention" – see F-V, 3.4) and the claims which relate to it, either in full or in part, and ask the applicant to clarify what to search in this respect.

If the applicant has not replied by expiry of the time limit under Rule 63(1), any subject-matter to be searched for the first invention will be determined according to the procedures described in B-VIII, 3.2. A partial search report (or exceptionally a declaration of no search) will then be drawn up on this first invention and sent to the applicant, along with an invitation to pay further search fees under Rule 64(1) for the other inventions and a provisional opinion on the first invention's patentability that includes the reasons for the non-unity findings. Where appropriate, the invitation under Rule 64(1) may also include an invitation under Rule 63(1) asking the applicant to clarify the subject-matter to be searched for any other inventions for which they later pay further search fees.

Where these exceptional circumstances arise in cases of supplementary Rule 164 European search reports for Euro-PCT applications, the procedure is the same, except that a Rule 164(1) invitation is sent instead of a Rule 64 invitation.

Rule 164

Rule 63 also applies to searches performed under Rule 164(2) (see C-III, 3.1). As for searches on directly filed European patent applications, any Rule 63 objection relating to an invention for which a search fee has to be paid must be included in the invitation to pay that fee.

4. More than one independent claim per category (Rule 62a)Rule 62a(1)**4.1 Invitation to indicate which independent claim to search**

If the search division considers that the claims as filed do not comply with Rule 43(2) (see F-IV, 3.2), it has the discretion either to invite the applicant to indicate, within two months, compliant claims on which the search can be based or to carry out a full search on all the claims and raise the objection under Rule 43(2) only in the search opinion. In the latter case, the claims will have to be amended to comply with the requirement of Rule 43(2) if the objection persists in examination (F-IV, 3.3).

4.2 Reply to the invitation under Rule 62a(1)**4.2.1 Failure to reply in time**

If the applicant does not indicate the claims to be searched in time, the search will be based on the first claim in each category. In either case, a partial search report will be drawn up. As the limitation of the search has consequences in examination (see H-II, 5 and H-IV, 4.1.1), any late-filed reply is included in the file for consideration at that stage, in the same way as is done for a late-filed reply to a Rule 63 invitation (see B-VIII, 3.2.1).

Since the search report should be available when the application is published, Rule 62a requires that the applicant reply within two months and rules out further processing. However, a request for re-establishment of rights may be granted if the relevant conditions are met.

4.2.2 Reply filed in time

If applicants reply to the invitation under Rule 62a(1) in time by indicating an independent claim in a particular category that they want to have searched, the search division will carry out the search based on this claim.

It is also open to applicants to indicate more than one independent claim in the same category if these claims fall within the exceptions in Rule 43(2) (see F-IV, 3.2). However, if the search division then finds that the indicated independent claims do not in fact fall within these exceptions, it will search only the one that comes first in numerical order.

Example

An invitation under Rule 62a(1) is sent for an application that contains independent product claims 1, 10 and 15. The applicant replies that independent product claims 10 and 15 fall within the exceptions in Rule 43(2) and indicates that these two claims should be searched. The search division disagrees, and so only claim 10 is searched.

See B-VIII, 3.2.2 for the procedure followed where the applicant tries to file amendments.

Instead of indicating the independent claim or claims to be searched, applicants can reply to the invitation under Rule 62a(1) by simply arguing why they believe that the claims comply with Rule 43(2) (i.e. why the multiple independent claims in the same category fall within one or more of the exceptions in Rule 43(2)). If the search division is convinced by the applicant's arguments, it will issue a search report based on all the claims, and the consequences a limited search has at the examination stage will not apply. But if it is not convinced, it will issue a search report based only on the first independent claim in the category. The examining division has final responsibility for deciding whether an invitation under Rule 62a was appropriate.

Applicants can also reply to an invitation under Rule 62a by arguing against the findings there and – as a main request – asking the search division to search all the claims as filed and – as an alternative, in case the search division is still not convinced – indicating the independent claims they would like to have searched (see also H-III, 3.2).

The procedure where applicants phone the search division to enquire about the course of action after an invitation under Rule 62a has been sent is as described above for the invitation under Rule 63 (see B-VIII, 3.2.2).

4.3 Content of the extended European search report (EESR)

The search opinion will invite the applicant to limit the application to the claims which have been searched (Rule 62a(2)). If the applicant replied to the invitation under Rule 62a(1) by disputing the finding under Rule 43(2) (see B-VIII, 4.2) but the search division still disagrees, it will explain why in the search opinion.

4.4 Cases under Rule 62a where claims fees have not been paid

If an independent claim has been deemed to be abandoned under Rule 45(3) or Rule 162(4) because the claims fee has not been paid (see A-III, 9), the applicant cannot indicate it in reply to the invitation under Rule 62a(1), because it is no longer eligible for search (see B-III, 3.4). If such a claim is indicated, the search division will ignore this, instead applying Rule 62a(1), last sentence, and searching the first independent claim in the category in question for which claims fees **have** been paid.

If all the independent claims in the category in question have been deemed to be abandoned because the fees were not paid, no invitation under Rule 62a(1) will be issued and none of them will be searched.

4.5 Applications falling under Rule 62a and lacking unity

There are cases where the application not only does not comply with Rule 43(2) (see B-VIII, 4.1 and F-IV, 3.2) but also lacks unity of invention under Art. 82 and Rule 44. Sometimes it is enough for the search division to raise only the issue of unity of invention and send an invitation under Rule 64(1) (see B-VII, 1.1 and 1.2).

In other cases, however, the search division may need to apply the procedures under both Rule 64(1) (i.e. invite the applicant to pay further search fees for inventions other than the one first mentioned in the claims)

and Rule 62a(1) (i.e. invite the applicant to indicate the independent claims to be searched). It will then send the applicant the invitation under Rule 62a(1) first.

Where the lack of unity is already apparent when the invitation under Rule 62a(1) is sent, it will also identify the invention (or group of inventions) first mentioned in the claims ("first invention" – see F-V, 3.4) and the claims which relate to it, either in full or in part, and ask the applicant to indicate which claims to search. If the applicant has not replied by expiry of the time limit under Rule 62a(1), the claims to be searched for the first invention will be determined according to the procedures described in B-VIII, 4.2. A partial search report will then be drawn up on this first invention and sent to the applicant, along with an invitation to pay further search fees under Rule 64(1) for the other inventions and a provisional opinion on the first invention's patentability that includes the reasons for the non-unity findings. Where appropriate, this invitation under Rule 64(1) may also include an invitation under Rule 62a(1) asking the applicant to clarify the claims to be searched in respect of any other inventions for which they later pay further search fees.

However, it can also happen that, after the invitation under Rule 62a(1) has been sent for all claims, the claims which comply with Rule 43(2) and so are searched (as determined according to the procedures in B-VIII, 4.2) are found to be open to an objection of lack of unity *a posteriori*. An invitation to pay further search fees under Rule 64(1) will then be sent, but only in relation to the subject-matter of the claims determined by the applicant's reply (or lack of reply) to the invitation under Rule 62a(1).

Rule 164

Where these exceptional circumstances arise in cases of supplementary European search reports on Euro-PCT applications, the procedure is the same, except that a Rule 164(1) invitation is sent instead of a Rule 64 invitation.

Rule 164

Rule 62a also applies to searches performed under Rule 164(2) (see C-III, 3.1). As for searches on directly filed European patent applications, any Rule 62a objection relating to an invention for which a search fee has to be paid must be included in the invitation to pay that fee.

4.6 Handling of dependent claims under Rule 62a

Claims depending – whether directly or only indirectly via other dependent claims – on an independent claim excluded from the search in accordance with Rule 62a(1) (see B-VIII, 4.2) are likewise excluded from the search. Conversely, if a dependent claim depends on more than one preceding claim and not all of them were searched, it will be searched but only in so far as it depends on a claim or claims which **were** searched in accordance with Rule 62a(1).

5. Invitation under both Rule 62a(1) and Rule 63(1)

It is sometimes necessary to send an invitation under both Rule 63 (see B-VIII, 3.1) and Rule 62a(1) (see B-VIII, 4.1), for example where clarifying which claim or claims to search under Rule 62a will not necessarily help to clarify what subject-matter to search, because the

application contains several independent claims in the same category and none or only some of them can be meaningfully searched over their whole scope. The invitations under Rule 62a(1) and Rule 63(1) are then sent jointly in a single communication setting the same two-month time limit for replying under both rules. Applicants wishing to reply to both invitations should do so at the same time.

The independent claims indicated in reply to the invitation under Rule 62a(1) and the subject-matter indicated in reply to the invitation under Rule 63(1) must be compatible. If the applicant's indications are incompatible, the search division can choose, depending on the circumstances, either (i) to search the claims indicated by the applicant under Rule 62a(1) and, where necessary, limit the subject-matter searched for those claims by applying Rule 63(2) by analogy or (ii) to search that subject-matter defined in the first independent claim in a particular category which is compatible with the subject-matter indicated by the applicant under Rule 63(1) by applying Rule 62a(1), last sentence, by analogy.

Although sent in the same communication, the invitations under Rule 62a(1) and Rule 63(1) are still legally separate. Applicants are therefore free to reply to only one of them. If they reply only to the Rule 62a(1) invitation, option (i) above applies. If they reply only to the Rule 63(1) invitation, option (ii) above applies.

6. Claims contravening Art. 123(2) or Art. 76(1)

If the claims on which the search is to be based were filed after the date of filing or under Rule 58, they are not part of the application documents "as originally filed". Similarly, the supplementary European search on a Euro-PCT application is sometimes based on amended claims (see B-III, 3.3.1). In either case, before starting the search, the search division checks whether or not these claims add any subject-matter that goes beyond what was in the application "as originally filed" (see also A-III, 15). For Euro-PCT applications, this means the PCT application as originally filed.

Art. 123(2)
Rule 58

If the claims contravene Art. 123(2), the search division will face one of the following situations:

- (a) there are doubts about whether an objection can be raised (e.g. the amendment relies on common general knowledge and the search division is unsure whether the introduced term can be based on this) and/or the amendment does not significantly change the scope and subject-matter of the search: the search division then searches the claims as they are.
- (b) there are certain individual features in the claims that clearly contravene Art. 123(2): the search division then ignores these features when carrying out the search.
- (c) there are substantial non-allowable amendments in the claims: the search division may then need to issue an invitation under Rule 63(1) before starting the search (see B-VIII, 3(iv)). Depending on the reply

to the invitation, it may issue a partial search report or even a declaration replacing the search report under Rule 63. In deciding what to include in the search and what to exclude from it, it refers to how the invention is defined in the description.

A similar problem can also arise when a divisional application is filed and the amended claims do not meet the requirements of Art. 76(1): the same criteria as described in steps (a) to (c) above are then applied.

In any case, the search opinion will include an objection under Art. 123(2) or Art. 76(1) and give the reasons for limiting the scope of the search.

Chapter IX – Search documentation

1. General

1.1 Organisation and content of the documentation available to the search divisions

The search documentation consists mainly of a collection of patent documents that can be systematically accessed in a way that facilitates searching. It also includes non-patent literature – such as periodicals and other technical publications – that can be accessed via in-house and external databases, with some items also available for consultation in a virtual library. Particularly relevant items of non-patent literature are selected for inclusion in the systematically accessible documentation. The systematically accessible part of the search documentation includes the minimum documentation that an International Searching Authority must consult under Rules 34 and 36.1(ii) PCT but goes beyond these minimum requirements.

1.2 Means of searching systematically

The search documentation can be searched using the Cooperative Patent Classification (CPC), which is based on the International Patent Classification (IPC) but comprises finer internal subdivisions, or using other classification systems and/or words.

2. Patent documents arranged for systematic searching

2.1 PCT minimum documentation

The systematically accessible search documentation includes the national patent documents belonging to the PCT minimum documentation specified in Rule 34.1(b)(i) and (c) PCT.

It also includes published international (PCT) and regional (e.g. European) patent applications, patents and inventors' certificates (Rule 34.1(b)(ii) PCT).

A complete list of the contents of the PCT minimum documentation is available on the WIPO website.

2.2 Unpublished patent applications

Since it is for the examining division to complete the search for any conflicting applications that were still not published at the time of the initial search, unpublished patent applications are not among the documents which can be cited in the search report and so are not in the search documentation (see B-VI, 4.1).

2.3 Search reports

The official European and international (PCT) search reports are normally published together with the European and international applications and are included in the search files together with these applications. The official search reports for national applications are also included in these files where they are publicly available, as are any unofficial search reports. Search reports that are not normally or not yet publicly available in the form

of a published document are available to the search division separately from the state-of-the-art documents, but it is not compulsory to search them for all applications.

2.4 Patent family system

The EPO keeps a patent family system based on application and priority data of the patent documents stored in its databases. Normally, just one representative document of a patent family is displayed on screen, but there will be links to the other family members.

3. Non-patent literature arranged for systematic access

3.1 Periodicals, records, reports, books, etc.

The systematically accessible search documentation includes relevant articles from the list drawn up by the competent WIPO body of periodicals belonging to the minimum documentation under the PCT and from other periodicals the search divisions consider useful. Copies of the articles selected as relevant for search purposes are generally added to the EPO search databases with a fictitious country code "XP" and scanned for inclusion in the electronic "BNS" collection.

The EPO also subscribes to many other periodicals, including abstract journals, and obtains records of conference proceedings, reports, books, standards, etc. in all three of its official languages and covering the various technically important geographical areas. Individual items are selected for inclusion in the online documentation if they are useful additions to the state of the art.

4. Non-patent literature arranged for library-type access

4.1 Content

In addition to the non-patent literature mainly used for search purposes (see [B-IX, 3](#)), the non-patent literature arranged for library-type access also includes literature which the search division can use as sources of information and for professional development and which covers not only general and background technical information but also new technical developments. The collection also includes reports, pamphlets, etc. Internet-based document delivery services of publishing companies are available to the search division members via an electronic virtual library (EVL).

5. Access to EPO documentation for the national patent offices

The EPO provides the national offices of its member states with access to its electronic search documentation described in [B-IX, 2.1](#) to [2.3](#).

Access to the EPO's other documentation may be limited if it is delivered by commercial database providers. This depends on the conditions of data delivery agreed between the EPO and the individual data provider. However, national offices may also have their own separate agreements with data providers.

Chapter X – Search report

1. General

The search report records the results of the search. Its scope is limited in the following cases:

- (i) claims are treated as abandoned because the claims fees were not paid (Rule 45(3), see B-III, 3.4)
- (ii) no search was possible and so a declaration under Rule 63 is issued instead (see B-VIII)
- (iii) a partial search report is issued under Rule 63 and/or Rule 62a (see B-VIII)
- (iv) a partial European search report is issued owing to a lack of unity under Rule 64(1)
- (v) a supplementary European search report under Art. 153(7) is incomplete for the reasons given in (i) or (iii) (Rule 162(4) applies if there are unpaid claims fees) or is replaced by a declaration for the reason in (ii).

The search reports issued in cases (i) – (iii) (and (v) where incomplete for one of the reasons in (i) – (iii)) are sent to the applicant, published and used as a basis for the examination by the examining division. A partial search report issued under Rule 64(1) (case (iv)) is also transmitted to the applicant, but not published; however, it can still be inspected by the public as it is included in the electronic file accessible via the European Patent Register (see A-XI, 2).

Except in the cases mentioned in B-XI, 7, European search reports and supplementary European search reports are accompanied by a search opinion giving the search division's view on whether the application and the invention concerned seem to meet the requirements of the EPC (see B-XI, 1.1). Together, the European search report or supplementary European search report and the search opinion make up the extended European search report (EESR). *Rule 62(1)*

The search division is responsible for drawing up the European search report. It is also responsible for drafting international search reports and search reports on behalf of the industrial property offices of some EPC contracting states (see B-X, 2 and B-II, 4.4 to 4.6).

This chapter provides the information the search division needs to properly draw up the search report.

A search report must not contain anything, in particular any expressions of opinion, reasoning, arguments or explanations, beyond what has to be entered on the form used and the opinions mentioned in B-III, 1.1 and 1.2 or B-X, 9.2.8. However, this does not apply to the search opinion (see B-XI, 3).

2. Different types of search report drawn up by the EPO

The EPO search divisions draw up the following types of search report:

- (i) European search reports (see B-II, 4.1)
- (ii) supplementary European search reports on PCT applications (see B-II, 4.3)
- (iii) "search results under Rule 164(2)" (see C-III, 3.1)
- (iv) international search reports under the PCT (see B-II, 4.4)
- (v) international-type search reports (see B-II, 4.5)
- (vi) search reports for national offices (see B-II, 4.6)
- (vii) search reports produced as part of special activities.

The results of any additional searches carried out at the examination stage (see B-II, 4.2) are also recorded but are not published. However, the documents found may be used in the examination proceedings (see C-IV, 7.3).

This chapter sets out the requirements for search reports of types (i) to (v) only. Nevertheless, all search reports drawn up by the EPO search divisions should be as similar as possible.

3. Form and language of the search report

3.1 Form

The standard search report has a main page used for all searches to record the most important information, including:

- (i) the application number
- (ii) the application's classification
- (iii) the technical fields searched
- (iv) the relevant documents found in the search
- (v) the name of the search division member who carried out the search

plus supplemental sheet A and, in certain cases, also supplemental sheet B.

Supplemental sheet A is used for recording whether the title, the abstract as filed by the applicant and the figure to be published with the abstract were approved or amended and for providing the translation of the title into the other two official languages (see B-X, 7).

Supplemental sheet B has to be filled in if the search was restricted, i.e. when claims were not searched because the claims fees had not been paid (see [B-III, 3.4](#)), when there is a lack of unity of invention (see [B-VII](#)), when a meaningful search was not possible and so the search report is either incomplete or replaced entirely by a declaration under [Rule 63](#) (see [B-VIII, 3](#)) or when the search was limited under [Rule 62a](#) (see [B-VIII, 4](#)).

Dates are given in the format specified in WIPO standard ST.2.

3.2 Language

The search report or the declaration accompanying or replacing it under [Rule 63](#) is drawn up in the language of the proceedings.

[Art. 14\(3\)](#)

[Rule 61\(5\)](#)

3.3 Search summary

For in-house quality assurance purposes, the search division summarises all the information needed by the auditors to understand what has been searched (see [B-III, 3](#)), where (see [B-III, 2](#)) and how (see [B-IV, 2](#)). This summary of the search is not made publicly available.

3.4 Record of search strategy

An "Information on Search Strategy" sheet is automatically added to all EPO search reports. It lists the databases searched, classification symbols used and keywords reflecting the searched subject-matter.

4. Identification of the European patent application and the search report type

The European patent application concerned is identified on the main page and supplemental sheets by its application number.

The search report type is also specified.

Where the application and the search report are published together, the main page of the report is marked A1 (WIPO Standard ST.16). If the application is published before the search is carried out, the main page is marked A2 (WIPO Standard ST.16). The later search report is drawn up on a new main page marked A3 (WIPO Standard ST.16). If it is a supplementary European search report for an international application, the new main page is marked A4 (WIPO Standard ST.16).

[Art. 153\(7\)](#)

5. Classification of the European patent application

The main page of the search report shows the IPC classification symbol or symbols assigned to the European patent application (see [B-V, 3](#)).

If the application is published before the search report has been drawn up (A2 publication, see [B-X, 4](#)), the search division will fill in supplemental sheet A in time for its publication, entering all the necessary information mentioned in [B-X, 7](#) and the application's IPC classification (see [B-V, 3.3](#) on cases where the application lacks unity).

The IPC classification is shown again on the separately published search report (A3 publication, see [B-X, 4](#)). If, in the meantime, the search division

has changed the IPC classification initially assigned and shown on the A2 publication, it is the new classification that will appear on the later published search report (see [B-V, 3.1](#)).

6. Technical fields searched

Although not required by the EPC, the European search report includes the technical fields searched in the form of a list of IPC symbols describing them down to the sub-class level.

Where the search report is based entirely or partly on a previous search carried out for an application relating to similar subject-matter, the report displays the parts of the documentation consulted for this previous search as the ones consulted for the application in question, again by using the appropriate IPC symbols.

7. Title, abstract and figure to be published with the abstract (as indicated on supplemental sheet A)

The search division fills in supplemental sheet A before publication of the application, regardless of whether it is going to be published with the search report (A1 publication) or without it (A2 publication), because the information entered there is needed to publish the application.

On supplemental sheet A, the search division indicates:

[Rule 47\(1\)](#)
[Rule 66](#)

- (i) approval or amendment of the abstract's wording, which is communicated to the applicant under [Rule 66](#) (see [A-III, 10](#)). The search division does not study the abstract beyond ensuring that it relates to the application and does not conflict with the invention's title or the application's classification. Since the abstract has to relate to the application as filed, the search division will consider it and decide on its final wording before carrying out the search, in order to avoid being inadvertently influenced by the search results.

If the search report is published separately (A3 publication), no information about the abstract is given on supplemental sheet A. The information sent to the applicant includes the invention's title and any figure of the drawings to be published with the abstract.

In exceptional cases, the search division may change the abstract after the search but, if the application has already been published (A2 publication), supplemental sheet A will not be reissued.

[Rule 41\(2\)\(b\)](#)

- (ii) approval or amendment of the invention's title (see [A-III, 7](#))

[Rule 47\(4\)](#)

- (iii) approval, change or omission of any figure selected by the applicant to accompany the abstract (see [F-II, 2.3\(vi\)](#) and [2.4](#))

[Art. 14\(7\)\(a\)](#)

- (iv) the translation of the European patent application's title into the two other official languages.

The European Patent Bulletin is published in all three of the EPO's official languages ([Art. 14\(7\)\(a\)](#)) and contains the entries made in the European

Patent Register. These entries include the invention's title (Rule 143(1)(c)) and so it must be available in all three official languages.

The above applies equally to applications published with the search report (A1 publication) and those published without it (A2 publication). In an A2 publication, supplemental sheet A also shows the application's IPC classification (see B-X, 5). In an A1 publication, the IPC classification appears only on the search report (Rule 61(6)).

Supplemental sheet A also specifies whether it relates to an A1 or an A2 publication.

In the case of a supplementary European search report on an international application, supplemental sheet A is marked A4. The search division does not decide on the title, abstract or figure to be published with the abstract, as the ISA will already have decided on them under Rules 37.2, 38 and 8.2 PCT, respectively.

8. Restriction of the searched subject-matter

In the following cases, the search report, the declaration of no search or the partial search report will state that the search was restricted and which claims have or have not been searched:

- (i) claims above the number of fifteen for which no additional fee has been paid (see B-III, 3.4). This only applies to European and supplementary European search reports. Rule 45(1) and (3)
Rule 162(1) and (4)
- (ii) lack of unity of invention (see B-VII). The partial search report (see B-VII, 1.1) points out that it has been drawn up for the invention first mentioned in the claims and is accompanied by a list of the different inventions identified which specifies their subject-matter and the claims or parts of claims that relate to them (see Rule 44(2)). This applies regardless of whether the lack of unity is detected "*a priori*" or "*a posteriori*". Any search report later drawn up for all the inventions for which search fees have been paid will specify the different inventions searched (and the related claims or parts of claims). Rule 64(1)
- (iii) claims for which no meaningful search or only an incomplete search could be carried out (see B-VIII). The search division then declares: Rule 63
Art. 52(2)
Art. 53
 - (a) that a meaningful search could not be carried out for any of the claims (this declaration replaces the search report) or
 - (b) that a meaningful search could not be carried out for one or more of the claims or parts of them. The claims concerned are specified in this declaration, which is issued together with the partial search report.

In both cases (a) and (b), the reasons for not carrying out the search or for restricting it must be given (e.g. subject-matter not patentable; insufficiently clear claims). If necessary, full reasoning is provided in

the search opinion; see B-VIII, 3.3 for the content of the EESR in these cases.

Rule 62a

- (iv) claims not searched because they do not comply with Rule 43(2) (see B-VIII, 4.2).

9. Documents found in the search

9.1 Identification of documents in the search report

9.1.1 Bibliographic data

All documents cited in the search report must be clearly identified by indicating the necessary bibliographic data. All citations in the search report normally comply with the recommendations in WIPO Standards ST.14 (for including references cited in patent documents), ST.3 (for two-letter codes) and ST.16 (for identifying different kinds of patent documents), but there can be exceptions where strictly adhering to them would entail a lot of extra work and cost and is not necessary to enable a document to be clearly and easily identified.

9.1.2 "Corresponding documents"

The search division will often come across "corresponding" documents (see B-VI, 6.2), i.e. documents which have the same or substantially the same technical content. These are usually either patent documents from the same patent family or abstracts.

- (i) Patent documents in the same patent family

These are patent documents which are from the same country or from different countries and share at least one claimed priority.

If a cited patent document belongs to a patent family, the search division does not cite all the other family members it knows of and can understand, as they are anyway mentioned in the annex to the search report. However, it may choose to mention one or more members in addition to the one cited (see B-IV, 3.1). These documents are identified by naming the office they originate from, specifying their type and number and placing them after an ampersand sign (&). There are various possible reasons why the search division may wish to draw attention in the search report to more than one document in the same patent family:

- (a) One document in the patent family was published before the earliest priority date of the application but in a non-EPO language, whereas another member of the same patent family was published in an EPO language (see Art. 14(1)) but after the earliest priority date of the application.

Example

A European application claims a priority of 3 September 1999. The search on this application uncovers a relevant document

WO 99 12395 A, which was published in Japanese on 11 March 1999 and so in time to qualify as prior art under Art. 54(2). There is also the European family member published as an English translation under Art. 153(4) on 1 March 2000. That is too late for it to be prior art under Art. 54(2), but it can be cited in the search report as an "&" document of the Japanese-language WO publication and made available to the applicant (see B-X, 11.3). It will then be used to interpret the content of the Japanese WO publication when the application is examined (see G-IV, 4). In the search report, these documents would be cited as shown below (on the linking of cited documents to the claims they relate to – here: claims 1-10 – see B-X, 9.3).

X	WO 99 12395 A (SEKI SHUNICHI; KIGUCHI HIROSHI (JP); SEIKO EPOSON CORP (JP))	1-10
	11 March 1999 (1999-03-11)	
	* figure 1 *	
	& EP 0 982 974 (SEIKO EPSON CORP)	
	1 March 2000 (2000-03-01)	
	* figure 1 *	
	* claim 1 *	

- (b) There are several different documents in the same patent family and each one contains relevant technical subject-matter not found in the other family members.
- (c) The application cites a family member drafted in a non-EPO language but there is another family member in an EPO language, and both were published before the application's earliest priority date.

Example

Y	WO9001867 A (WIDEGREN LARS (SE))	1-10
	8 March 1990 (1990-03-08)	
	* claim 1 *	
D,Y	& SE461824 B (WIDEGREN LARS (SE))	1-10
	2 April 1990 (1990-04-02)	

By citing the relevant SE document, which is a family member of the relevant WO document, in the application, the applicant has already met the requirement that the state of the art be mentioned in the description (Rule 42(1)(b)). It is important to make the examining division aware of this by mentioning it in the search report (see F-II, 4.3).

- (ii) Abstracts (see B-VI, 6.2)

Abstracts are provided by several database providers (e.g. Chemical Abstracts or Derwent) and cover many different types of disclosure (e.g. patent documents, journal articles, PhD theses, books). They

summarise the most important aspects of the original document's technical content. Most abstracts cited are in English. Whenever citing an abstract in the search report, the search division must always enter the original document to which it relates after the "&" sign.

Example

X	DATABASE WPI Week 200961 Thomson Scientific, London, GB; AN 2009-N01904 & WO 2009/104990 A1 (VALEXPHARM CO LTD) 27 August 2009 (2009-08-27) * abstract *	1-5

There are various reasons why the search division may choose to cite the abstract rather than the original document (in which case the original document must instead be mentioned as an "&" document). For instance, the original document may not be readily available to it (e.g. a PhD thesis) or it may be in a non-EPO language (e.g. a journal article in Russian) and there is no corresponding document. The original document is made available to the applicant only if it has been earmarked for this by the search division (see B-X, 12).

If the search division wants to refer to a published Japanese or Korean patent application (with kind code A), it cites the Japanese or Korean publication in the search report. If an English abstract is available in the EPO databases (Patent Abstracts of Japan or Patent Abstracts of Korea), both the Japanese or Korean publication and the English abstract are made available to the applicant. A machine translation is also made available (see B-X, 9.1.3 and 12, and G-IV, 4.1).

9.1.3 Language of the documents cited

Members of the same patent family are often published in various different languages. The search division therefore has a choice as to the language in which it wishes to cite such a document in the search report. If the relevant technical content of the various family members is the same and they were all published before the earliest priority date of the application, they are all equally relevant to the application. The search division chooses which one of them to cite by looking at the languages they were published in and applying the following order of preference:

- (1) an official EPO language (i.e. English, French or German (Art. 14(1)))
- (2) an official language of an EPC contracting state under Art. 14(4) (see A-VII, 1.1) – the document can usually be read by a colleague if the search division member in charge is not familiar with this language (see B-VI, 6.2)
- (3) a language other than those of the EPC contracting states.

In cases (2) and (3), the search division might consider citing an abstract in an official EPO language instead of the original document.

If the original document is in a language the search division cannot readily understand (e.g. Chinese or Russian), it is best to cite the abstract. It is possible to obtain a machine translation of a patent document into an official EPO language. This machine translation must be made available to the applicant (see [B-X, 12](#) and [G-IV, 4](#)).

Alternatively, if only a specific paragraph of the machine translation is needed, the search division may copy that paragraph into the search opinion, but the full machine translation will be made available to the applicant as well.

Non-official translations (i.e. translations with no legal value) of publications in a language the search division cannot readily understand (e.g. Russian, Japanese, Korean or Chinese) will not be cited in the search report.

9.1.4 Supplementary European search report

In certain circumstances, it is permissible not to cite any documents at all in a supplementary European search report under [Art. 153\(7\)](#) (see [B-IV, 2.5](#)). The search report will then include the phrase "No further relevant documents disclosed", but the search opinion (if applicable – see [B-XI, 7](#)) will give an opinion on whether the claimed invention seems to be patentable over the state of the art cited in the international search report ([B-XI, 1.1](#)).

Even if the search division disagrees with the ISA's opinion on the relevance of a document cited in the international search report for assessing the novelty and/or inventive step of the claimed invention, it normally does not cite the document again in the supplementary European search report with a new, corrected document category. The exception to this is where it wants to combine a first document falling under category Y (see [B-X, 9.2.1](#)) and not found until its supplementary European search with another document already cited in the international search report: it may then choose to cite the other document from the international search report again in its supplementary European search report as a "Y" document in combination with the first document. Where this recategorising of the document does not affect all the claims, this is clarified in the supplementary European search report in order to ensure consistency with the European search opinion.

9.2 Categories of documents (X, Y, P, A, D, etc.)

All documents cited in the search report are assigned to one of the categories explained in more detail below by placing the relevant letter in the first column of the citation sheets. Categories can be combined if necessary.

9.2.1 Particularly relevant documents

Where a document cited in the search report is particularly relevant, it is labelled with the letter "X" or "Y". Category "X" applies where a document

[Art. 52\(1\)](#)

[Art. 54](#)

[Art. 56](#)

shows **on its own** that a claimed invention cannot be considered novel or to involve an inventive step.

Art. 52(1)
Art. 56

Category "Y" applies where a document suggests that a claimed invention cannot be considered to involve an inventive step when the document is combined with one or more other documents of the same category and this combination is obvious to a person skilled in the art. However, if a document (called a "primary document") explicitly refers to another document as providing more detailed information on certain features (see G-IV, 8) and the combination of these documents is considered particularly relevant, the primary document is labelled with the letter "X", i.e. not "Y", and the document it refers to (the "secondary document") is labelled with "X" or "L" as appropriate.

9.2.2 Documents defining the state of the art and not prejudicing novelty or inventive step

Where a document cited in the search report represents state of the art that does not prejudice the novelty or inventive step of the claimed invention, it is labelled with the letter "A" (see, however, B-III, 1.1).

9.2.3 Documents which refer to a non-written disclosure

Rule 61(4)

Where a document cited in the search report refers to a non-written disclosure (e.g. conference proceedings), it is labelled with the letter "O" (see B-VI, 2). For oral disclosures that took place at an officially recognised exhibition (Art. 55(1)(b)), see B-VI, 5.5. The document category "O" is always accompanied by one of the letters explained in B-X, 9.2.1 and 9.2.2 to indicate its level of relevance. So e.g. "O, X", "O, Y" or "O, A".

9.2.4 Intermediate documents

Rule 61(3)

Documents published between the priority date claimed in the searched application – or the earliest priority date if there is more than one (see B-VI, 5.2 and B-XI, 4) – and its date of filing are labelled with the letter "P". The letter "P" is also used for a document published on the very day of the earliest priority date claimed. The document category "P" is always accompanied by one of the letters explained in B-X, 9.2.1 and 9.2.2 to indicate its level of relevance. So e.g. "P, X", "P, Y" or "P, A".

9.2.5 Documents relating to the theory or principle behind the invention

Where a document cited in the search report may be useful for a better understanding of the principle or theory behind the invention or shows that the reasoning or the facts behind it are incorrect, it is labelled with the letter "T".

In the latter case, the "T" document is evidence within the meaning of Art. 117(1)(c) rather than prior art within the meaning of Art. 54(2) and so it does not matter whether it was published before or after the searched application's priority or date of filing.

For example: an applicant claims a group of chemical compounds and the description gives a generically defined process for their production. The search division finds a document published after the priority date which

clearly shows that the generically defined process cannot produce all of the compounds covered by the claims. It can then cite it as a "T" document and use it to raise an Art. 84 objection that the claims are not supported by the description (see F-IV, 6.3).

9.2.6 Potentially conflicting patent documents

Any patent document which has a date of filing or a priority date before the searched application's date of filing (not its priority date – see B-VI, 3 and B-XI, 4) but was published on or after that date and whose content could potentially constitute prior art relevant to novelty (Art. 54(1)) is labelled with the letter "E". This label is also assigned where the patent document and the searched application have the same date of filing (see G-IV, 5.4). However, patent documents claiming the same priority as the searched application do not fall in this category and are not cited.

Art. 54(3)

Art. 139(2)

9.2.7 Documents cited in the application

When the search report cites documents already mentioned in the searched application's description, these are labelled with the letter "D" (see B-IV, 1.3).

Rule 42(1)(b)

9.2.8 Documents cited for other reasons

Where the search report cites a document for reasons other than those referred to above (in particular as evidence – see B-VI, 5.6), for example because it:

Art. 117(1)(c)

- (a) casts doubt on a priority claim (see B-VI, 5.3)
- (b) establishes the publication date of another citation (see B-VI, 5.6)
- (c) is relevant to the issue of double patenting (see B-IV, 2.3(v) and G-IV, 5.4),

it is labelled with the letter "L" and brief reasons for citing it are given. In the special case that the search division considers the claimed subject-matter to be notorious and so no documentary evidence is needed (see B-VIII, 2.2), it will give the reasoning behind not citing any prior-art documents in the search opinion.

A citation of an "L" document does not need not be linked to any of the claims (see B-X, 9.3) unless the evidence it provides relates only to particular claims (e.g. it shows the priority claim is invalid for only some claims), in which case the claims affected must be specified.

9.3 Relationship between documents and claims

Each document cited in the search report is accompanied by an indication of the claims to which it relates, unless it falls in category "L" (see B-X, 9.2.8). The same document can be cited in different categories for different claims, but the specific claims it relates to in each category must be indicated.

Rule 61(2)

Example

X	WO9001867 A (WIDEGREN LARS (SE)) 8 March 1990 (1990-03-08)	1
Y	* column 3, line 27 – line 43; figure 1 *	2-5
A	* figure 2 *	6-10

The document cited in the above example discloses subject-matter which prejudices the novelty or inventive step of the subject-matter of claim 1 and, when the document is combined with another one cited in the search report, the inventive step of the subject-matter of claims 2 to 5 and which also represents non-prejudicial state of the art for the subject-matter of claims 6 to 10. The passages or figures are not necessarily relevant to the claims and the category indicated on the same line.

Generally speaking, all claims are mentioned in the search report at least once in relation to at least one document published before the earliest priority date (unless a particular claim was not searched because the search was restricted as described in [B-X, 8](#)) (see [B-IV, 2.5](#)).

9.4 Identification of relevant passages in prior-art documents*Rule 61(2)*

The search division will identify the parts (e.g. claim, example, figure, table, text passage on a particular page, or a specific time or time range in a video and/or audio media fragment) which contain the technical subject-matter closest to (or coinciding with) the searched invention. This is particularly important where the document is relied on to support objections to novelty or inventive step. If that is the case, the search opinion will include specific references to the relevant parts of the state of the art together with reasoned objections (see [B-XI, 3.2.1](#)).

Where the search division relies on a translation of a prior-art document, it will indicate the relevant passages in the original document whenever possible.

It makes sense to cite not only those parts of the document describing the same or similar technical subject-matter but also those parts or passages relating to the problem solved by that subject-matter. This makes it easier to assess inventive step in examination and also gives the applicant a better idea of how the document may be used during the proceedings.

10. Authentication and dates

The search report shows the date on which it was drawn up, i.e. the date it was drafted by the search division member who carried out the search.

The member's name must also appear on the search report.

11. Copies to be made available with the search report

11.1 General remarks

The search report is sent to the applicant and transmitted to the examining division. Copies of all the cited documents are made available to the applicant as described below (see also [B-IV.3.3](#)), except for those documents appearing in the search report after the "&" symbol which the search division has not earmarked for this (see [B-X.11.3](#)). MyEPO users receive all cited documents electronically in their Mailbox. Applicants not having opted for electronic notification via Mailbox receive paper copies of non-patent literature and translations of cited patent literature by post. Digital copies of cited patent literature documents are accessible in Espacenet (worldwide.espacenet.com/).

Rule 65
OJ EPO 2024, A68
OJ EPO 2025, A27,
OJ EPO 2025, A28

These cited documents are then used to assess the patentability of the claimed invention (see [B-XI.3](#)) both in the search opinion (if applicable – see [B-XI.7](#)) and in the examination proceedings.

11.2 Electronic version of cited document

In the case of patent documents, a complete copy is made available electronically either via MyEPO or in Espacenet (worldwide.espacenet.com/).

MyEPO users receive copies of cited non-patent literature and translations of cited patent literature in their Mailbox.

11.3 Patent family members; the "&" sign

In the case of patent families, only a copy of the family member actually cited is normally made available. The other members are mentioned in an automatically generated annex produced for information only (see [B-X.9.1.2](#)). However, in certain circumstances one or more other patent documents in the same patent family may be mentioned on the search report after the "&" sign (see [B-X.9.1.2\(i\)](#)). The search division may decide that copies of these patent documents should also be made available to the applicant (they will then be included in the examination file too, and can be referred to in any search opinion).

11.4 Reviews or books

In the case of a review or a book, copies of the relevant pages are made available to the applicant. The relevant bibliographic information has to be clear from these copies.

MyEPO users receive copies of relevant pages electronically in their Mailbox; applicants not having opted for electronic notification via Mailbox receive them on paper.

11.5 Summaries, extracts or abstracts

Where a document cited is a summary, extract or abstract of another, separately published document, a copy of the summary, extract or abstract is made available to the applicant.

If, however, the search division considers that the whole source document is needed, that document must be cited and a copy must be made available to the applicant (see B-X, 9.1.2(ii)).

When an online search in a database (e.g. CAS References, CAS Registry, COMPENDEX, INSPEC, NTIS) is performed and the original document referred to in the database is not available at the EPO when the search report is drafted, the extract is added to the file instead of the original.

11.6 Citation of video and/or audio media fragments available on the internet

Video and/or audio media fragments available on the internet are converted into a non-patent literature citation. The bibliographic data include the URL of the original location on the internet.

If these citations cease to be available on the internet, a copy will be made available to the applicant on request (see G-IV, 7.5.6).

12. Transmittal of the search report and search opinion

The EPO forwards the search report and the search opinion (if applicable – see B-XI, 7) to the applicant and makes copies of all cited documents available to them (see B-X, 11.1), including any machine translations (see B-X, 9.1.3) and any documents appearing after the "&" sign that the search division has earmarked for this (see B-X, 11.3).

Rule 65

Rule 61(1)

OJ EPO 2024, A68

Chapter XI – The search opinion

1. Search opinion is part of the EESR

The extended European search report (EESR) is made up of two items: *Rule 62(1)*

- (i) the European search report or the supplementary European search report (see *B-X*)
- (ii) the search opinion.

1.1 The search opinion

For European patent applications filed as of 1 July 2005 and international applications filed as of that date that enter the European phase, European search reports and supplementary European search reports will be accompanied by an opinion on whether the application and the invention dealt with seem to meet the EPC requirements.

This does not apply in the cases referred to in *B-XI, 7*.

The findings in the search opinion must be in line with the document categories assigned in the search report and with any other issues raised there, such as lack of unity of invention or any limitation of the search.

1.2 Position of the examining division

The examining division will consider any objections raised in the search opinion and the applicant's response to them (see *B-XI, 8*) when examining the application. It may change the position taken in the search opinion after receiving arguments, amendments and other submissions from the applicant in response to the search opinion or subsequently in examination proceedings. Irrespective of any such submissions, it may also alter the position if it finds *Art. 54(3)* state of the art when carrying out a top-up search or if it is made aware of additional state of the art either by the applicant or in observations filed by third parties under *Art. 115* (see also *B-IV, 3.2, C-IV, 7.3 and 7.4*).

The examining division can also reverse the findings in the search opinion for other reasons (see *B-III, 1.1*), but this is rare.

2. Basis for the search opinion

Where a European patent application is not based on an international application, the applicant cannot amend it before receiving the search report. This means that the search opinion will always deal with the application documents as originally filed although it will also take account of any reply from the applicant to an invitation under *Rule 63(1)* (see *B-VIII, 3.4*). *Art. 123(1)*
Rule 137(1)

However, if it is based on an international application and undergoes a supplementary European search under *Art. 153(7)* (see *B-II, 4.3*), the applicant will have had an opportunity to amend it both in the international phase and on entry into the European phase. The search opinion will then be based on the application documents which the applicant has most recently asked to be processed (this may involve cancelling previously filed *Rule 161(2)*
Rule 159(1)(b)
Art. 19 PCT
Art. 34(2)(b) PCT

amendments and reverting to parts or all of an earlier set of application documents). The supplementary European search report will also relate to these application documents (see B-II, 4.3 and B-III, 3.3.2).

Where the search opinion and supplementary European search report deal with amended application documents but the requirements in Rule 137(4) have not been met (see H-III, 2.1), a communication asking the applicant to meet these requirements (see B-VIII, 6 and H-III, 2.1.1) cannot be sent yet (i.e. before the search opinion is drawn up) because the examining division is still not responsible for the application (see C-II, 1). Once it does take charge of the application, it can send this communication, but only if the amendments in question have not since been withdrawn or superseded (see H-III, 2.1.1) and only if the application is of one of the types listed in H-III, 2.1.4.

2.1 Application documents filed under Rule 56 EPC, Rule 56a EPC, Rule 20.5 PCT or Rule 20.5bis PCT

If the Receiving Section decided not to redate the application under Rule 56(2) or (5) or under Rule 56a(3) or (6), but the search division considers that the subsequently filed missing parts or correct application documents or parts are not "completely contained" in the priority document and/or the requirements of Rule 56(3) or Rule 56a(4) are not met, its search will also take into account prior art which would potentially become relevant for assessing novelty and inventive step of the subject-matter claimed if the application were redated under Rule 56(2) or (5) or under Rule 56a(3) or (6). The search opinion must include a warning that the application seems not to meet the requirements in Rule 56 or Rule 56a for keeping the accorded date of filing, a statement of reasons as to why this is the case and an indication that a formal decision on whether to redate the application will be taken by the examining division at a later stage. If appropriate, the search opinion can also comment on the effect redating would have on the priority claim and/or the status of the prior-art documents cited in the search report.

A similar procedure is followed for a Euro-PCT application. If the search division finds when carrying out a supplementary European search that the subsequently filed missing parts under Rule 20.5(d) PCT or, for international applications filed on or after 1 November 2022, correct application documents or parts under Rule 20.5bis(d) PCT are not "completely contained" in the priority document, even though the receiving Office did not redate the application, the search opinion must include a warning that the application does not seem to meet the requirements of Rule 20.6 PCT (Rule 82ter.1(c) PCT), a statement of reasons as to why this is the case and an indication that a formal decision on whether to redate the application will be taken by the examining division at a later stage.

Conversely, if the application has been redated by the Receiving Section or the receiving Office, but the search division has reason to believe that it does meet the requirements of Rule 56(3) or Rule 56a(4) (or Rule 20.6 PCT), it must indicate in the search opinion that the examining division may reconsider the decisions of the Receiving Section (or the

receiving Office) at a later stage unless it is bound by a decision of the board of appeal.

2.2 Applications containing claims filed after the accorded date of filing

If the application documents contain any claims filed after the accorded date of filing (Rules 40(1), 57(c) and 58), the search division has to examine whether those claims meet the requirements of Art. 123(2), i.e. do not go beyond the technical content of the application documents as they were at the date of filing. If it finds that they do not meet the requirements, it will carry out the search as described in B-VIII, 6.

Where the search opinion and search report are based on late-filed claims but the requirements in Rule 137(4) have not been met (see H-III, 2.1), a communication asking the applicant to meet these requirements (see H-III, 2.1.1) cannot be sent yet (i.e. before the search opinion is drawn up) because the examining division is still not responsible for the application (see C-II, 1). Once it does take charge of the application, it can send this communication, but only if the late-filed claims have not since been superseded (see H-III, 2.1.1) and only if the application is of one of the types listed in H-III, 2.1.4.

3. Analysis of the application and content of the search opinion

If the search division takes the view that the application and/or the invention do not meet the EPC requirements, then it will raise objections in the search opinion.

As a general rule, the search opinion covers all objections to the application (but see B-XI, 3.4). These objections can relate to substantive matters (e.g. the subject-matter is not patentable) or to procedural matters (e.g. one or more of the requirements in Rules 41 to 43, and 48 to 50 are not met; see Arts. 1 and 2 of the decision of the President of the EPO dated 7 July 2025, OJ EPO 2025, A49), or even to both.

Where claims relating to a method of treatment of the human or animal body or methods of diagnosis practised on the human or animal body have been searched because it can already be envisaged at this stage that they will be reworded in an allowable format (see B-VIII, 2), the search opinion will nonetheless object to these claims as relating to subject-matter that is not patentable. Art. 53(c)

3.1 The search division's dossier

The search division's first step is to study the description, any drawings and the claims. For this, it will have access to the documents making up the European application and a complete history of the proceedings up to the start of search although the priority documents and any translations may not yet be available at this stage (see B-XI, 4). Rule 62

3.2 Reasoning

3.2.1 Reasoned objections

For each objection, the search opinion must clearly specify which part of the application is deficient and which EPC requirement is not met, for instance by referring to specific articles or rules. It must also give the reason for the objection where this is not immediately apparent. For example, where a prior-art document is cited but only part of it is relevant, the specific passage relied on should be specified. If the cited prior art shows a lack of novelty or inventive step in the independent claim or claims and there is lack of unity between dependent claims as a result (see [F-V, 7](#)), the applicant is informed of this situation (see [C-III, 3](#)). Substantive matters are normally set out first. The search opinion should be drafted in a way that facilitates later examination of the amended application and, in particular, prevents the need to read it all again in depth (see [C-IV, 2](#)).

In general, all claims are referred to, and all documents cited as "X" or "Y" against certain claims are referred to in the search opinion with a related objection. For dependent claims, it may not always be necessary to give detailed reasoning in the search opinion, but it at least needs to be apparent what the reason for the objection is.

3.2.2 Positive statements

Where applicable, the search division also comments positively on patentability in the search opinion. The amount of detail given should be enough to help applicants make their decisions. There is therefore no need to give such detailed reasoning as for an objection, but simply making a positive statement without explaining it will only be enough if the reason behind is anyway immediately apparent.

3.3 Comments and amendments in response to the search opinion

The applicant generally has to respond to the search opinion although there are some exceptions (see [B-XI, 8](#)).

3.4 Scope of first analysis for generally deficient applications

Where an application is found to be generally deficient, the search division does not analyse it in detail, but sends the applicant a search opinion informing them of its view, mentioning the major deficiencies and saying that, when the application moves on to the examination stage, further examination will be deferred until the application has been amended to overcome them. There are cases where, although a meaningful analysis is possible, a fundamental objection arises, e.g. it is clear that certain claims lack novelty and that the statement of claim will have to be drastically recast, or there are substantial amendments (to an international application entering the European phase – see [B-XI, 2](#)) which are not allowable either because they add new subject-matter that was not in the application as filed ([Art. 123\(2\)](#)) or because they introduce other deficiencies (e.g. the amendment makes the claims unclear – [Art. 84](#)). It may then be more appropriate to deal with this objection before making a detailed analysis. For instance, if the claims need to be recast, it may not make sense to object to the clarity of some dependent claims or to a passage in the

description which may anyway have to be amended or even deleted in examination proceedings as a result. However, if there are other major objections, these should be addressed. Generally speaking, the search division should try to deal with as many deficiencies as possible in the search opinion to help make the decision-making process in the later examination proceedings as efficient as possible. As regards positive statements on patentability in the search opinion, see B-XI, 3.2.2.

3.5 Contribution to the known art

When analysing the application, the search division concentrates on trying to understand what technical contribution the invention defined in the claims makes to the known art. This should normally be sufficiently clear from the application as filed. If it is not, the search division will raise an objection in the search opinion (see F-II, 4.5), but only if it is convinced it is necessary, because it might lead the applicant to add subject-matter in breach of Art. 123(2) (see H-IV, 2 and H-V).

Rule 42(1)(c)

3.6 EPC requirements

Although the search division must bear all the EPC requirements in mind, the ones it is most likely to have to deal with are: sufficiency of disclosure (see F-III); clarity and support in the description, especially for the independent claims (see F-IV, 4 and 6); novelty (see G-VI); and inventive step (see G-VII).

3.7 Search division's approach

The search division does not require or suggest amendments simply because it thinks they would improve the wording of the description or claims. It should not take a pedantic approach; what is important is that the meaning of the description and claims is clear. However, any serious inconsistencies between the claims and the description as filed are objected to (see F-IV, 4.3).

3.8 Making suggestions

It is not for the search division to tell applicants to amend their application in a particular way to overcome an objection. It is the applicants' own responsibility to draft their application and they are free to amend it any way they choose as long as the amendment removes the deficiency and is otherwise in keeping with the EPC. However, it can sometimes help if the search division suggests, at least in general terms, an acceptable form of amendment, but it then has to make it clear that the suggestion is merely to help the applicant and that other forms of amendment will still be considered in the examination proceedings. Although not obliged to do so, it will point out amendments which would overcome the objections raised to the applicant if there is a clear way out.

When suggesting an acceptable way of amending the claims, the search division will also invite the applicant to adapt the description to bring it into line with the amended claims (see F-IV, 4.3).

However, the applicant remains responsible for deciding how to word the application and in particular for defining the subject-matter for which protection is sought (Art. 113(2) EPC).

3.9 Positive opinion

After analysing the application as described in B-XI, 3.1 to 3.8, the search division may conclude that it and the claimed invention both satisfy the EPC requirements and it will then express a general positive opinion on the application documents in the search opinion. However, if a full search for all potentially conflicting applications under Art. 54(3) could not be carried out at this stage (see B-VI, 4.1), a top-up search will be needed at the examination stage (see C-IV, 7.1) and so the application remains open to any objections under Art. 54(3) raised then.

A positive search opinion can be issued even where minor amendments would have to be made to the application documents for the application to be granted. So long as no prior art within the meaning of Art. 54(3) is found in any subsequent top-up search, the examining division can issue the Rule 71(3) communication and propose these minor amendments there (see C-V, 1.1).

The applicant does not have to respond to a positive search opinion (see B-XI, 8).

It is not possible at the search stage to officially designate an examining division, because the Receiving Section is still responsible for the application (Art. 16). However, the prospective members of the examining division will already be known and the search division will consult them to check that they agree to the issue of a positive search opinion.

4. Priority claim and the search opinion

When it is not possible to check the validity of the priority claim at the search stage, because:

- (i) the search is carried out before the date by when the priority document has to be supplied (up to 16 months from the earliest claimed priority – Rule 53(1))
- (ii) a translation of the priority document is required but not available to the search division when drafting the search opinion (Rule 53(3), see A-III, 6.8 and its subsections, and F-VI, 3.4),

the priority claim will usually be assumed to be valid for the purposes of the search opinion. Where the only objections which could be raised against the application at this stage depend on the priority being invalid, and the priority document (or its translation) is not available, the search division will issue an entirely positive search opinion without any objections. In case (ii) above, a communication under Rule 53(3) may be issued (see A-III, 6.8.1) and the priority's validity may later be reviewed in examination proceedings.

However, if a priority claim's validity has to be assessed as a result of intermediate prior art or potential state of the art under Art. 54(3), and evidence against its validity is already available, then this needs to be brought up in the search opinion. For example, where the priority document is available when the search opinion is drafted and the technical features of the claims are not in the priority document, the search division may be able

to do this even without a required translation if it is familiar with the language of the priority document (see also [B-VI, 5.3](#)).

4.1 Use of "P" and "E" documents in the search opinion

Where the search division refers to a document potentially amounting to prior art under [Art. 54\(3\)](#) in the search opinion, there are two possibilities, depending on whether or not it can conclusively establish that the prior-art document has an earlier relevant date than the application: if so, it will raise a novelty objection under [Art. 54\(3\)](#); if not, it will assume that any priority which cannot be checked is valid. This leads to two different scenarios:

- (i) The prior-art document belongs to the state of the art under [Art. 54\(3\)](#). The search division therefore raises a novelty objection in the search opinion and specifies which priorities have been assumed to be valid.
- (ii) The prior-art document does not belong to the state of the art under [Art. 54\(3\)](#). If the search opinion raises other kinds of objection in the search opinion, it will refer to the document potentially falling under [Art. 54\(3\)](#) (and its relevant passages) and will explain which priorities have been assumed valid.

Where "P" documents are also cited in the search report and they are not potential prior art under [Art. 54\(3\)](#) (because they are not international or European patent applications), they may be prior art under [Art. 54\(2\)](#) and so be relevant for the assessment of novelty and inventive step in so far as the application's priority is invalid. If its priority can be checked, the search division will do so. If it finds that the priority is not valid, it will raise objections in the search opinion on the basis of the "P" documents. If the priority cannot be checked, it will assume it is valid and will not raise any objection in the search opinion.

The issue of whether the priority claim or claims are valid then needs to be reviewed in examination (see [F-VI, 2](#)).

5. Unity in relation to the search opinion

Where the search division finds that the claimed invention lacks unity ([Art. 82](#) and [Rule 44\(1\)](#) and [\(2\)](#)), it will send the applicant an invitation to pay further search fees and a partial search report on the invention or unitary group of inventions first mentioned in the claims (see [B-VII, 1.1](#), [1.2](#) and [1.3](#) and [Rule 64\(1\)](#)). It will also send a provisional opinion on the patentability of that invention or unitary group of inventions and the reasons for its non-unity findings (see [B-VII, 1.2](#)).

After the time limit for paying the further search fees has expired, ([Rule 64\(1\)](#)) the applicant will be sent a search report on the invention or unitary group of inventions first mentioned in the claims and all other claimed inventions or unitary groups of inventions for which further search fees were paid. This search report will be accompanied by a search opinion setting out:

- (i) the reasoning behind the finding of a lack of unity

- (ii) an opinion on whether the first invention or unitary group of inventions mentioned in the claims is patentable
- (iii) an opinion on whether all inventions or unitary groups of inventions for which further search fees have been paid are patentable.

For supplementary European search reports on Euro-PCT applications lacking unity of invention, the same procedure is followed (Rule 164(1) – see B-VII, 2.3).

6. The search opinion where the search was limited

Any arguments and objections set out in the search opinion must be consistent with how and why the search was limited. This applies to limitations for reasons of non-patentability (e.g. business methods – Art. 52(2)(c), see B-VIII, 1), for reasons of severe deficiencies preventing a meaningful search (Rule 63, see B-VIII, 3) or due to a contravention of Rule 43(2) (Rule 62a, see B-VIII, 4). In these cases, the search opinion will also contain the information mentioned in B-VIII, 3.3 and 4.3.

Where claims were not searched because the applicant had not paid the claims fees for them and so they were deemed abandoned (Rule 45 or Rule 162), this will be pointed out to the applicant in the search opinion.

7. No search opinion is issued

Where an applicant has filed a request for examination under Rule 70(1) before being sent the search report and has waived the right to a communication under Rule 70(2) (see C-II, 1(ii)), the examining division becomes responsible for the application as soon as the search report is sent (Art. 18(1) and Rule 10(2)).

If the application is deficient, the examining division will issue a communication under Art. 94(3) in place of the search opinion. If the applicant does not respond to this communication, the application will be considered withdrawn under Art. 94(4) (see C-III, 4.2).

If the application is ready for grant, the procedure is as follows:

- (i) Where the search for conflicting applications under Art. 54(3) was complete, the examining division will issue a communication under Rule 71(3).
- (ii) Where the search for conflicting applications under Art. 54(3) was not complete, the applicant will be informed that the application can be granted so long as no state of the art under Art. 54(3) is found during the top-up search (see B-XI, 3.9). This is purely for information and the applicant does not have to respond.

8. Response to the extended European search report (EESR)

Applicants have to respond to the search opinion within the time limit for filing the request for examination under Rule 70(1) (see C-II, 1 and A-VI, 2.1).

Rule 70a(1)

However, where applicants filed a request for examination (which under Art. 94(1) means also paying the examination fee) before the search report and the search opinion were transmitted to them, they are sent a communication under Rule 70(2) asking them to confirm that they wish to continue with the application and setting a period for this (see C-II, 1(i)). They then also have to respond to the search opinion within that period. This is generally what happens for Euro-PCT applications for which a supplementary European search report and search opinion have to be drawn up (see B-II, 4.3 and A-XIV, 5), unless the applicant has waived the right to a communication under Rule 70(2) (see C-II, 1(ii)), in which case the procedure under B-XI, 7 applies.

Rule 70a(2)

If applicants do not respond to the search opinion in time, their application will be deemed to be withdrawn and they will be notified of this loss of rights accordingly. They can then request further processing in accordance with Art. 121 and Rule 135.

Rule 70a(3)

Rule 112(1)

Applicants are not required to respond to the European or supplementary European search report where it was drawn up before 1 April 2010, where it is not accompanied by a search opinion (see B-XI, 1.1 for applications for which a search opinion is drawn up) or where the search opinion was positive (see B-XI, 3.9). However, they **may** still respond to it under Rule 137(2) if they so wish, in which case they are encouraged to do so before the application moves on to the examination stage (see C-II, 1).

Applicants can respond to the search opinion by filing amended application documents under Rule 137(2) (see C-II, 3.1) (where amended claims are filed before publication, see A-VI, 1.3, paragraph 3) or by filing observations on the objections raised, or even by filing both. Such amendments and observations will only be examined by the examining division if the application moves on to the examination stage.

Making a procedural request, e.g. for a consultation or for oral proceedings, or simply disagreeing with the search opinion is not a valid response if done without commenting on any of the objections raised. Where such a request or simple disagreement is the only response received by expiry of the set time limit, the application deemed to be withdrawn under Rule 70a(3). The same applies where a request is filed that cannot be granted at this stage (e.g. for a decision according to the state of the file).

If an applicant does not respond to a search opinion issued for an application for which the search report was drawn up before 1 April 2010 and the application moves on to the examination stage (see C-II, 1 and 1.1), the examining division will issue a communication referring to the search opinion and setting a time limit for a response as the first communication under Art. 94(3) (see C-III, 4). If the applicant does not respond to this communication in time, the application will be deemed to be withdrawn under Art. 94(4).

Where an applicant files amendments in response to the search opinion but not in the way required under Rule 137(4) (see H-III, 2.1), the examining division may issue a communication under Rule 137(4) (see H-III, 2.1.1) relating to these amendments, but this can only happen after the examining

division has become responsible for the application (see C-II, 1) and only if the application is one of the types listed in H-III, 2.1.4.

9. Art. 124 and the utilisation scheme

Art. 124

Rule 141

When drafting the search opinion, the search division will consider any prior-art document provided by the applicant under Rule 141(1) or by the office of first filing under Rule 141(2) (see OJ EPO 2011, 62, OJ EPO 2012, 540, OJ EPO 2013, 216, OJ EPO 2015, A2, OJ EPO 2016, A18, OJ EPO 2019, A55, OJ EPO 2021, A38, and OJ EPO 2021, A39) if it is already available at the time (see A-III, 6.12 and B-IV, 1.3). Requests for information on prior art under Rule 141(3) cannot be made until the application has entered the examination phase (see C-III, 5).

Part C

Guidelines for Procedural Aspects of Substantive Examination

Contents

Chapter I – Introduction I-1

1.	General remark	I-1
2.	The work of examiners	I-1
3.	Overview	I-1
4.	Purpose of examination	I-1

Chapter II – Formal requirements to be met before the division starts substantive examination II-1

1.	Request for examination	II-1
1.1	Confirmation of the intention to proceed further with the application	II-1
1.2	Euro-PCT applications	II-2
1.2.1	Euro-PCT applications with a supplementary European search report	II-3
1.2.1.1	Acceleration of the proceedings by waiving the right to the communication under Rules 161(1) and 162	II-3
1.2.2	Euro-PCT applications without a supplementary European search report	II-3
1.2.2.1	Acceleration of the proceedings by waiving the right to the communication under Rules 161(1) and 162	II-4
1.3	Invention to be examined	II-4
2.	Allocation of the application	II-5
3.	Response filed before first communication in examination	II-5
3.1	Response to the search opinion	II-5
3.2	Response to PCT actions prepared by the EPO	II-6
3.3	The invitation under Rule 70a(1)	II-6
4.	Designation fees, extension and validation fees	II-7
5.	Priority documents and search results	II-7

Chapter III – The first stage of examination	<u>III-1</u>
1. Missing parts or elements	<u>III-1</u>
1.1 European patent applications	<u>III-1</u>
1.1.1 Application documents filed under Rule 56 or Rule 56a	<u>III-1</u>
1.1.2 Claims filed after accordance of a date of filing	<u>III-2</u>
1.2 Euro-PCT applications – missing elements and parts filed under Rule 20.5 and 20.6 PCT	<u>III-3</u>
1.3 Euro-PCT applications – erroneous elements filed under Rule 20.5 <i>bis</i> PCT	<u>III-3</u>
2. Amendments made by applicants of their own volition	<u>III-5</u>
2.1 Amendments made in response to the search opinion	<u>III-6</u>
2.2 Amendments made in response to the WO-ISA, IPER or supplementary international search report	<u>III-6</u>
3. Unity of invention	<u>III-6</u>
3.1 Searches under Rule 164(2)	<u>III-6</u>
3.2 Relation to unity in search; limitation to searched invention	<u>III-9</u>
3.2.1 No additional search fees paid	<u>III-10</u>
3.2.2 Additional search fees paid	<u>III-10</u>
3.2.3 Invitation to pay additional search fees combined with invitation to restrict the scope of the search	<u>III-11</u>
3.2.4 Re-evaluation of the unity requirement in examination	<u>III-11</u>
3.3 Excision of other inventions; filing divisional applications	<u>III-12</u>
3.4 Refund of additional search fees	<u>III-12</u>
3.5 Changing from one searched invention to another	<u>III-14</u>
4. First communication	<u>III-14</u>
4.1 Reasoning	<u>III-15</u>
4.1.1 Reasoned objections	<u>III-15</u>
4.1.2 Positive statements/suggestions	<u>III-15</u>
4.1.3 Consideration of the contents of the IPER	<u>III-15</u>
4.2 Invitation to file comments and amendments	<u>III-16</u>
5. Summons to oral proceedings as the first action in examination	<u>III-16</u>

6.	Requesting information on prior art (not confined to priority)	III-17

7.	Evaluation of prior-art documents cited in the search report and late priority claim	III-18

Chapter IV – Examination of replies and further stages of examination

IV-1

1.	General procedure	IV-1

2.	Extent of examination of replies	IV-1

3.	Further action upon examination of replies	IV-1

3.1	Further action where a request for a translation of the priority application was sent earlier in examination proceedings	IV-3

4.	Later stages of examination	IV-3

5.	Examination of amendments	IV-3

6.	Admissibility of amendments made by the applicant	IV-3

7.	Search-related issues in examination	IV-4

7.1	Search for conflicting European patent applications	IV-4

7.2	National prior rights	IV-5

7.3	Additional searches during examination	IV-5

7.4	Search at the examination stage	IV-6

7.5	Citing documents not mentioned in the search report	IV-6

8.	New submissions in reply to a summons	IV-7

Chapter V – The final stage of examination

V-1

1.	Communication under Rule 71(3)	V-1

1.1	Text for approval	V-1

1.2	Grant and publishing fee	V-2

1.3	Translations of the claims	V-3

1.4	Claims fees due in response to Rule 71(3) communication	V-3

1.5	Other information in the communication under Rule 71(3)	<u>V-3</u>
2.	Approval of the proposed text – grant of a patent	<u>V-4</u>
2.1	Request for unitary effect	<u>V-5</u>
3.	No reply in time – application deemed withdrawn	<u>V-5</u>
4.	Request for amendments or corrections in reply to the Rule 71(3) communication	<u>V-6</u>
4.1	No payment of fees or filing of translations necessary	<u>V-6</u>
4.2	Crediting of fees paid voluntarily	<u>V-6</u>
4.3	Amendments or corrections should be reasoned	<u>V-7</u>
4.4	Admissibility of amendments	<u>V-7</u>
4.5	Adaptation of the description	<u>V-7</u>
4.6	Amendments/corrections admitted and allowable – second Rule 71(3) communication sent	<u>V-8</u>
4.6.1	Second Rule 71(3) communication reversing the amendments proposed by the examining division in first Rule 71(3) communication	<u>V-8</u>
4.6.2	Second Rule 71(3) communication based on higher-ranking request initially rejected in first Rule 71(3) communication	<u>V-8</u>
4.6.3	Examining division proposes amendments in second Rule 71(3) communication	<u>V-8</u>
4.7	Amendments not admitted and/or not allowable, examination resumed	<u>V-9</u>
4.7.1	Communications/oral proceedings/refusal after resumption	<u>V-9</u>
4.7.1.1	Higher-ranking request not admissible and/or not allowable	<u>V-9</u>
4.7.2	Agreement reached on a text - second Rule 71(3) communication	<u>V-10</u>
4.7.3	No agreement reached on a text - refusal	<u>V-10</u>
4.8	Fees to be paid within the second Rule 71(3) period	<u>V-10</u>
4.8.1	Claims fees	<u>V-10</u>
4.8.2	Fee for grant and publishing	<u>V-11</u>
4.9	Reply explicitly disapproving with the proposed text without indicating an alternative text	<u>V-11</u>
4.10	Amendments/corrections filed in second Rule 71(3) period	<u>V-12</u>
5.	Further requests for amendment after approval	<u>V-13</u>

6.	The examining division resumes examination after approval of the text	<u>V-13</u>
6.1	When does the examining division resume examination after approval?	<u>V-13</u>
6.2	A further communication under Rule 71(3)	<u>V-14</u>
6.3	Crediting of fees under Rule 71a(5)	<u>V-14</u>
7.	Correction of errors in the decision to grant	<u>V-14</u>
8.	Further processing	<u>V-14</u>
9.	Refund of the fee for grant and publishing	<u>V-14</u>
10.	Publication of the patent specification	<u>V-14</u>
11.	Withdrawal before publication of the patent specification	<u>V-15</u>
12.	Certificate	<u>V-15</u>
13.	European Patent Bulletin	<u>V-15</u>
14.	Refusal	<u>V-15</u>
15.	Decision according to the state of the file	<u>V-16</u>
15.1	The request for a decision according to the state of the file	<u>V-17</u>
15.2	Decision by means of a standard form	<u>V-17</u>
15.3	Issuing a self-contained decision	<u>V-18</u>
15.4	Issuing a further communication (no refusal)	<u>V-18</u>
Annex	Standard marks for indicating amendments or corrections by the divisions	<u>V-19</u>

Chapter VI – Time limits and acceleration of examination **VI-1**

1.	Time limits for response to communications from the examiner	<u>VI-1</u>
1.1	General considerations	<u>VI-1</u>
1.2	Special circumstances	<u>VI-1</u>
2.	Influencing the speed of examination proceedings – PACE	<u>VI-1</u>

3. Further ways to accelerate examination VI-1**Chapter VII – Other procedures in examination VII-1****1. General remark VII-1****2. Consultations VII-1**

2.1 General VII-1

2.2 Persons participating in the consultation VII-2

2.3 Informal nature of consultations VII-3

2.4 Minutes of a consultation VII-4

2.5 Minutes as the first communication in examination VII-5

2.6 Real-time interaction on a document – Shared area VII-6

2.6.1 Process of a consultation using the Shared area VII-7

2.6.2 Minutes of a consultation using the Shared area VII-8

3. Use of email VII-8

3.1 Initiation of exchanges by email VII-9

3.2 Confidentiality VII-9

3.3 Inclusion in the file of any email exchange VII-9

4. Taking of evidence VII-10

4.1 General remark VII-10

4.2 Producing evidence VII-10

4.3 Written evidence VII-10

5. Oral proceedings VII-10**6. Examination of observations by third parties VII-11****Chapter VIII – Work within the examining division VIII-1****1. General remarks VIII-1****2. Recommendation to grant VIII-1****3. Recommendation to refuse VIII-2****4. Tasks of the other members of the examining division VIII-2**

5.	Further communication with the applicant	VIII-2
5.1	When can a summons to oral proceedings be issued in substantive examination?	VIII-3
6.	Decision	VIII-3
7.	Enlargement of the examining division; consultation of a legally qualified member	VIII-3

Chapter IX – Special applications

1.	Divisional applications (see also A-IV, 1)	IX-1
1.1	General remarks	IX-1
1.2	Voluntary and mandatory division	IX-1
1.3	Abandonment of subject-matter	IX-1
1.4	Examination of a divisional application	IX-1
1.5	Description and drawings	IX-2
1.6	Claims	IX-3
2.	Applications resulting from a decision under Art. 61	IX-3
2.1	General remarks	IX-3
2.2	Original application no longer pending	IX-4
2.3	Partial entitlement	IX-4
2.4	Entitlement for certain designated states only	IX-4
3.	Applications where a reservation has been entered in accordance with Art. 167(2)(a) EPC 1973	IX-4
4.	International applications (Euro-PCT applications)	IX-4

Chapter I – Introduction

1. General remark

Chapters C-II to IX set out the general procedure for examination and provide guidance on specific matters, where necessary. They do not include detailed instructions on matters of internal administration. *Art. 18*

2. The work of examiners

Completing examination files already started is prioritised over beginning work on new files, and grants are expedited once a positive search opinion has been issued.

The attitude of the examiner is very important. Examiners should always strive to be constructive and helpful and focus on objections and suggestions that influence the progress of the proceedings. They should bear in mind that, subject to the requirements of the EPC, the drafting of the description and claims of a European patent application is the responsibility of the applicant or their authorised representative.

Examiners should note in particular the instruction in section 4 of the General Part of the Guidelines. This applies not only in relation to other EPO departments. It also means, for example, that the other members of an examining division should not attempt to repeat the work of the first member (see C-VIII, 4).

3. Overview

Part C of the Guidelines deals with matters of examination procedure (see C-II to IX).

Matters of substantive law, i.e. the requirements that a European patent application must fulfil, are dealt with in Parts F, G and H.

4. Purpose of examination

The purpose of preparing the search opinion (see B-XI) and of the subsequent examination proceedings is to ensure that the application and the invention to which it relates meet the requirements set out in the relevant articles of the EPC and the rules of its Implementing Regulations. The prime task of the examining division is to deal with the substantive requirements; the criteria by which an examiner judges whether they have been met are dealt with in detail, in so far as appears necessary, in Parts F, G and H. As for the formal requirements (see Part A), these are initially the responsibility of the Receiving Section. *Art. 94(1)*
Art. 164(1)
Rule 62(1)

The examination is to be carried out in accordance with Art. 94(3) and (4), Art. 97, Rule 71(1) to 71(7), Rule 71a(1) to 71a(6) and Rule 72. The examiner's first step is to study the description, drawings (if any) and the claims of the application. However, as they will normally have already done this when they carried out the search (see B-XI, 3), they should concentrate on any amendments and/or comments filed by the applicant in response to the search opinion (see B-XI, 8). Where the applicant has made amendments without identifying them and/or their basis in the application as filed (see H-III, 2.1) and the application is one of those mentioned in *Rule 70(2)*

H-III, 2.1.4, the examining division may send the applicant a communication under Rule 137(4) requesting this information (see H-III, 2.1.1).

Chapter II – Formal requirements to be met before the division starts substantive examination

1. Request for examination

For examination of a European patent application to begin, the applicant must file a request for examination and pay the examination fee. The request for examination, which is not deemed filed until after the examination fee's payment, may be filed in the period between the application's date of filing and the last day of the six months after the date on which the European Patent Bulletin mentions the European search report's publication (see A-VI, 2.1). If the request for examination is not filed within this period, the application is deemed withdrawn. However, in such a case, the applicant can file a request for further processing pursuant to Art. 121. The amount of the further processing fee to be paid depends on how many and which of the actions required for a valid request for examination have been omitted (see E-VIII, 2). According to Rule 70(1), the request for examination may not be withdrawn.

Art. 94
Art. 121
Rule 70
Art. 122(4)
Rule 136(3)

Subject to certain exceptions, the applicant must also respond to the search opinion within the above period for filing the request for examination (see B-XI, 9 and C-II, 3.1) unless the EPO invites them to confirm an early request for examination according to Rule 70(2), in which case they must respond to the search opinion within the period provided for under Rule 70(2) (see C-II, 1.1).

Rule 70a(1) and (3)

Responsibility for examining the application passes from the Receiving Section to the examining division when a request for examination is filed. This is subject to two exceptions:

Rule 10
Rule 70(2)

- (i) if the applicant files a request for examination before the European search report is sent to them, then the examining division is responsible only from the time when the EPO receives the applicant's response to the invitation to confirm under Rule 70(2)
- (ii) if the applicant, having waived the right to receive an invitation to confirm under Rule 70(2) (see C-VI, 3), files a request for examination before the European search report is sent to them, then the examining division is responsible only from the time when the search report is sent to the applicant.

1.1 Confirmation of the intention to proceed further with the application

If the applicant files a request for examination before the search report is sent to them, the EPO will invite them to confirm, within a six-month period, that they wish to proceed with their application. This six-month period is calculated from the mention of the European search report's publication in the European Patent Bulletin. Where the applicant also has to respond to the search opinion, their response is required within this same period (see B-XI, 8 and C-II, 3.1). In such a case, the applicant's response to the search opinion is interpreted as the confirmation required by Rule 70(2),

Rule 70(2) and (3)
Art. 121
Art. 11 RFees
Rule 70a(2) and (3)

even where not explicitly expressed as such. If they fail to confirm their wish to proceed with the application in due time in reply to this invitation, the application will be deemed withdrawn. In this case, however, the means of redress provided for in Art. 121 (further processing of the application) will apply (see A-VI, 2.3 and E-VIII, 2). For the conditions applicable to a refund of the examination fee if the application is withdrawn, refused or deemed withdrawn, see A-VI, 2.5.

1.2 Euro-PCT applications

For applications filed via the PCT route (Euro-PCT application), the six-month period under Rule 70(1) begins with the publication of the PCT search report or the declaration under Art. 17(2)(a) PCT. However, as is laid down in Art. 150(2), the time limit for requesting examination of a Euro-PCT application does not expire before the time prescribed in Art. 22 PCT and Art. 39 PCT (i.e. not before the time limit of Rule 159(1)(f), namely 31 months from the date of filing of the application or, if priority has been claimed, from the priority date). Therefore, as a rule and unless the PCT search report was published or a declaration under Art. 17(2)(a) PCT was issued more than 25 months after the date of filing or the earliest priority date, the request for examination must be filed and the examination fee paid within the 31-month time limit. The time limit will not be affected by whether a supplementary European search pursuant to Art. 153(7) needs to be made or whether a translation of the international application is published by the EPO pursuant to Art. 153(4).

If the request for examination of a Euro-PCT application has not been filed within the time limit, the application is deemed withdrawn under Rule 160(1). In such a case, however, the applicant can file a request for further processing pursuant to Art. 121 (see E-VIII, 2).

Art. 153(4), (6) and (7)

Art. 150(2)

Rule 159(1)(f)

Art. 121

Rule 136(3)

Rule 160(1)

1.2.1 Euro-PCT applications with a supplementary European search report

Where the Euro-PCT application is subject to the preparation of a supplementary European search report (see B-II, 4.3), the day of dispatch of the report will be indicated in the European Patent Bulletin. While the report itself is not published, it is available for file inspection. Once this report has been dispatched, a communication under Rule 70(2) is sent to the applicant inviting them to confirm the request for examination within six months of that communication's notification. Within that six-month period, the applicant can file amendments and/or comment on both the report and the search opinion. If the search opinion accompanying the supplementary European search report is positive (see B-XI, 3.9), the response of the applicant is voluntary (see OJ EPO 2009, 533). However, if deficiencies resulting in a negative opinion are noted, a response is required under Rule 70a(2). If the required response is not submitted within the specified period, the application is deemed withdrawn under Rule 70a(3). In such cases, the applicant may file a request for further processing pursuant to Art. 121.

Rule 161(2)

1.2.1.1 Acceleration of the proceedings by waiving the right to the communication under Rules 161(1) and 162

To proceed directly to the supplementary European search without having to wait until the six-month time limit under Rule 161(2) expires, applicants may explicitly waive their right to a communication pursuant to Rules 161(2) and Rule 162. No communication under Rule 161(2) or Rule 162 is issued if, in addition to the waiver, the applicant has already paid any claims fees due (see the notice from the EPO dated 5 April 2011, OJ EPO 2011, 354). If not, the communication will be issued and the application will be processed only after expiry of the six-month period. See also A-XII, 7.2.

1.2.2 Euro-PCT applications without a supplementary European search report

Where the EPO has drawn up an international search report (ISR) or a supplementary international search report (SISR) or has issued a declaration under Art. 17(2)(a) PCT, no supplementary European search report is prepared (see the decision of the Administrative Council of 28 October 2009, OJ EPO 2009, 594, and B-II, 4.3.1 and B-II, 4.3.2). In these cases, a written opinion of the ISA (WO-ISA) or a supplementary international search report (SISR) with explanations under Rule 45bis.7(e) PCT and – if the EPO was also IPEA – an international preliminary examination report (IPER) will already have been transmitted to the applicant during the international phase. The application then immediately falls within the competence of the examining division upon effective entry into the European phase and will, after formalities examination, be passed on for substantive examination on condition that a request for examination has been validly filed.

The applicant is required to respond to the WO-ISA or SISR prepared by the EPO or, where applicable, to the IPER prepared by the EPO as IPEA. This does not apply where amendments or observations have already been filed within the 31-month time limit and can be considered to be a reply

Rule 161(1)

(subject to certain requirements, see A-XIV, 3.1). Whether or not a response is mandatory is clearly stated in the communication, which is therefore worded differently depending on the case (EPO Forms 1226AA and 1226BB).

The communication under Rule 161(1) is issued promptly after expiry of the time limit for entry into the European phase and on condition that the international search report (ISR) is available to the EPO. This means that it is also issued if the applicant has already filed, with EPO Form 1200 or later, amendments and/or comments to form the basis for the procedure in the European phase. The communication under Rule 161(1) is combined with the communication under Rule 162(2) inviting the applicant to pay any claims fees due (see A-XIV, 2.2).

The time limit for response is six months from the invitation under Rule 161(1) and is not extendable. Where a translation of the priority document is required (see A-III, 6.8 and F-VI, 3.4), an invitation to file it under Rule 53(3) may be sent by the examining division only after the period under Rule 161(1) has expired (see A-III, 6.8.2).

Failure to respond to the WO-ISA, SISR or IPER within this period (by filing amendments and/or comments) leads to the application being deemed withdrawn in accordance with Rule 161(1) unless one of the exceptions described in A-XIV, 3.1 applies. Further processing is available for this loss of rights (see E-VIII, 2). In all cases, the latest filed request on file after expiry of the time limit under Rule 161(1) will then be taken into account when drafting the first communication (see C-II, 1.2, A-XIV, 6.3.2) or when issuing the invitation under Rule 164(2) (see C-III, 3.1), provided that the application is not deemed withdrawn.

1.2.2.1 Acceleration of the proceedings by waiving the right to the communication under Rules 161(1) and 162

In order to proceed with the examination of the application without having to wait until the expiry of the six-month time limit for response, the applicant may explicitly waive their right to a communication pursuant to Rules 161(1) and Rule 162. Provided that, on entry into the European phase, they have also already responded, where required, to the WO-ISA, the IPER or the SISR and paid the claims fees, no communication under Rules 161 and Rule 162 will be issued (see the notice from the EPO dated 5 April 2011, OJ EPO 2011, 354). If this is not the case, the communication will be issued and the application will be processed only after expiry of the six-month period. See also A-XII, 7.2.

1.3 Invention to be examined

Where the search report and the search opinion have been drawn up to cover several inventions lacking unity, the applicant is free to select the invention to be examined in the application under consideration (see also C-III, 3.2).

The others will be subject to objections of lack of unity and may be divided out according to Rule 36 (see C-III, 3.3 and C-IX, 1.3).

2. Allocation of the application

Dossiers are normally allocated to an examining division that is responsible for examining applications in the technical field in which the particular application was classified by the search division or ISA that carried out the search. It is usual for the first member entrusted with the examination of the application in accordance with Art. 18(2) to be the same person who prepared the (supplementary) European search report and search opinion or, where the EPO was the ISA or the authority specified for the supplementary international search, the international search report and WO-ISA or the supplementary international search report.

There may, however, be instances where it is appropriate to allocate the application to an examining division comprising examiners who are not normally responsible for the indicated part of the International Patent Classification (IPC) and who might not have been involved at the search stage. There are a number of possible reasons for this: e.g. to make it possible, where appropriate, that a parent and a divisional application are dealt with by the same examining division (this could sometimes be more efficient, even when the two applications are classified in different technical fields); or if the classification of the published application does not correspond to the subject-matter of the application in the form in which it reaches the substantive examiner (e.g. because the application has been amended after receipt of the search report and search opinion).

3. Response filed before first communication in examination

3.1 Response to the search opinion

Following receipt of the search report and search opinion, and prior to the first communication from the examining division, the applicant must (subject to certain exceptions) respond to the search opinion by filing amendments to the description, claims or drawings and/or filing observations on the objections raised in the search opinion (see B-XI, 8 for details, in particular as to the exceptions where no reply is required). To avoid delays, care should be taken to comply with the requirements of Rule 137(4) when filing such amendments (see OJ EPO 2009, 533, point 7). Any amendments filed at this stage are made voluntarily by the applicant in accordance with Rule 137(2) (for more details, see C-III, 2.1).

Rule 137(2)

Rule 70(2)

Rule 70a

The applicant's response to the search opinion required by Rule 70a (or filed voluntarily in response to search opinions not requiring a response) will be taken into account by the examining division when drafting the first communication. Failure to respond to this communication in due time will result in the application being deemed withdrawn according to Art. 94(4), although this loss of rights is subject to further processing (see E-VIII, 2). With regard to what constitutes a valid response, see B-XI, 8.

Art. 94(3) and (4)

Rule 62(1)

If the applicant accepts a search division's suggestion regarding an acceptable form of amendment of the claims to overcome the objections raised (see B-XI, 3.8), they are requested to adapt the description to the claims on file and delete or amend any statements or expressions throwing doubt on the scope of protection (see F-IV, 4.3).

In exceptional cases, the examining division may decide to issue a summons to oral proceedings as the first action in examination proceedings (see C-III, 5). In such a case, the applicant's response to the search opinion will be taken into account when drafting the annex to the summons.

If the European search report or supplementary European search report was accompanied by a search opinion but was drawn up before 1 April 2010 (such that a reply to the search opinion was not mandatory, see B-XI, 8) and the applicant did not reply to it, a communication referring to the search opinion and setting a time limit for reply is issued as the first communication under Art. 94(3). Failure to respond to this communication in due time results in the application being deemed withdrawn according to Art. 94(4).

The procedure explained in the above paragraphs also applies to Euro-PCT applications for which the EPO prepares a supplementary European search report and a search opinion (see B-II, 4.3 and B-XI, 1.1).

3.2 Response to PCT actions prepared by the EPO

Rule 161(1)

For Euro-PCT applications where the EPO acted as the International Searching Authority (ISA) and, where a demand under Art. 31 PCT was filed, also as the International Preliminary Examining Authority (IPEA) or the Supplementary International Searching Authority (SISA), the applicant will already have responded to a negative WO-ISA, IPER or supplementary international search report prepared by the EPO.

This response may comprise amendments and/or observations filed in response to the communication under Rule 161(1) (or possibly filed earlier – see A-XIV, 2.1).

If the applicant accepts the search division's suggestion regarding an acceptable form of amendment of the claims to overcome the objections raised (see PCT-EPO Guidelines, B-XI, 3.3), they are requested to adapt the description to the claims on file and delete or amend any statements or expressions throwing doubt on the scope of protection (see F-IV, 4.3).

Any amendments filed at this stage are made voluntarily by the applicant in accordance with Rule 137(2) (for more details see C-III, 2.2). This response will be taken into account by the examining division when drafting the first communication under Art. 94(3) or, in exceptional cases, the annex to the summons to oral proceedings (C-III, 5). For more details, see A-XIV, 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3.

3.3 The invitation under Rule 70a(1)

Under Rule 70a(1), the applicant is invited to respond to the European search opinion (ESOP) within the period referred to in Rule 70(1) or, where applicable, the period referred to in Rule 70(2) (see B-XI, 8) unless they have waived their right to receive the communication under Rule 70(2) (see C-VI, 3).

Where the request for examination (including payment of the examination fee) is filed after the search report has been transmitted to the applicant,

the applicant must respond to the ESOP within the period referred to in Rule 70(1). In such cases, the invitation under Rule 70a(1) is sent in a combined communication with the communication under Rule 69(1) (see A-VI, 2.1). This communication under Rule 70a(1) and Rule 69(1) is issued shortly after the mention of the European search report's publication in the European Patent Bulletin (in general, this is approximately one week later).

Where the request for examination (including payment of the examination fee) is filed before the search report has been transmitted to the applicant, the applicant must respond to the ESOP within the period referred to in Rule 70(2). In such cases, the invitation under Rule 70a(1) is sent in a combined communication with the communication under Rule 70(2). With regard to how the period referred to in Rule 70(2) is calculated for these cases, see C-II, 1.1 for Euro-direct applications and C-II, 1.2 for Euro-PCT applications for which a supplementary European search report is prepared.

4. Designation fees, extension and validation fees

Under Rule 39(1), the designation fees can be validly paid up to the same time limit as the examination fee and therefore will be generally paid at the same time as the examination fee. The examination of whether and to what extent a designation fee has been validly paid has been entrusted to the formalities officer under Rule 11(3); see the decision of the President of the EPO dated 12 December 2013, OJ EPO 2014, A6; OJ EPO 2015, A104. The same applies to the examination of whether extension or validation fees have been paid; see A-III, 12.2.

Rule 39(1)

Art. 90(3)

5. Priority documents and search results

Where a translation of the priority document into one of the official languages of the EPO is required, it must be filed on request from the EPO in accordance with Rule 53(3) (see A-III, 6.8 and subsections and 6.10).

Art. 88(1)

Rule 53(3)

The priority document does not need to be on file for the substantive examination to be started, provided that neither intermediate documents (published in the priority period) nor Art. 54(3) documents exist which cause the patentability of the subject-matter claimed to depend on the validity of the priority right. However, no European patent may be granted until such time as the priority document is on file. In such a case, the applicant is informed that the decision to grant will not be taken as long as the priority document is missing.

On the other hand, the application may be refused without the priority document being on file, provided that the relevant prior art is neither an intermediate document nor an Art. 54(3) document, the relevance of which depends on the validity of the priority right. For more details on the treatment of such cases in examination, see F-VI, 3.4.

If, when the examining division assumes responsibility, the EPO notes that a copy of the results of a search on the claimed priority or priorities as referred to in Rule 141(1) has not been filed by the applicant and is not deemed duly filed under Rule 141(2) (see A-III, 6.12), it invites the applicant

Rule 70b(1)

to file, within a period of two months, the copy or a statement that the results of the search referred to in Rule 141(1) are not available to them. This requirement applies to European or Euro-PCT applications filed on or after 1 January 2011 (see OJ EPO 2009, 585). This communication is also sent in cases where the priority in question has since been withdrawn or has lapsed.

Rule 70b(2)

Failure to reply to this invitation in due time results in the application being deemed withdrawn. Further processing is available for this loss of rights (see E-VIII, 2).

The search results provided by the applicant will be included in the file and will be open to file inspection (see A-XI).

Chapter III – The first stage of examination

1. Missing parts or elements

1.1 European patent applications

1.1.1 Application documents filed under Rule 56 or Rule 56a

Where the applicant has supplied missing drawings or parts of the description after the accordance of a date of filing (see A-II, 5) under Rule 56 and the Receiving Section has determined that the missing drawings or parts of the description are "completely contained" in the claimed priority application, the application is not redated to the date on which the missing drawings or parts of the description were supplied. The same applies to correct application documents or parts filed after the accordance of a date of filing (see A-II, 6) under Rule 56a.

Rule 56
Rule 56a

The examining division may review the findings of the Receiving Section on the applicability of Rule 56(3) and Rule 56a unless there has been a decision of a board of appeal.

Normally this review will have been initiated at the search stage (see B-III, 3.3.1 and B-XI, 2.1). However, it can still be started during substantive examination.

For the criteria for determining whether the "completely contained" requirement of Rule 56(3) and Rule 56a is satisfied, see A-II, 5.4.2 and A-II, 6.4.1 respectively.

Should the examining division conclude, contrary to the original finding of the Receiving Section, that the missing elements are not "completely contained" in the priority document, it will raise an objection under Rule 56 or Rule 56a in the first communication under Art. 94(3), presenting detailed arguments as to why the "completely contained" requirement is not satisfied. In addition, it will warn that non-compliance with the requirements of Rule 56(3) or Rule 56a(4) as applicable can result in redating, which in turn can lead to loss of a priority right if the redating causes the date of filing to be more than 12 months after the claimed priority date.

Note that if the review was initiated at the search stage and an objection under Rule 56 or Rule 56a was raised in the extended European search report (EESR), the applicant may already have submitted a response to the search opinion (required by Rule 70a or filed voluntarily in response to a search opinion not requiring a response). The examining division will treat this response in the same manner as the reply to the first communication.

If the applicant replies by withdrawing the missing parts or the subsequently filed correct application documents or parts, the examination will continue as normal with the original date of filing, but without the missing parts or the correct application documents or parts (see also A-II, 5.5 and F-III, 10).

If the applicant succeeds in arguing in their reply that the "completely contained" requirement is satisfied, the examination will continue as normal

with the missing parts or the subsequently filed correct application documents or parts, as the case may be, and with the original date of filing.

If the applicant maintains the missing parts or the subsequently filed correct application documents or parts and their arguments do not succeed, the examining division will issue a further communication under Art. 94(3) informing them of the application's impending redating to the date on which the EPO received the missing parts or the correct application documents or parts. This communication gives the applicant a further opportunity to withdraw the subsequently filed missing parts or the correct application documents or parts within a time limit of two months (Rule 132(2)) so as to restore the original date of filing or to request an appealable decision on the redating. It indicates the reasons why the "completely contained" requirement is not met and also deals with any counter-arguments presented by the applicant.

If the applicant does not reply to the above communication in due time, the application is deemed withdrawn (Art. 94(4)).

If the applicant opts to withdraw the subsequently filed missing parts or the correct application documents or parts, the redating of the application will be deemed not made (see also B-XI, 2.1). The examiner will continue the examination procedure as normal with the original date of filing but without missing parts and/or the correct application documents or parts (see also F-III, 10).

Rule 111

If the applicant does not agree with the finding, they may (within two months (Rule 132(2))) request an appealable decision on the matter. In this case, the examining division will issue a reasoned decision informing them of the new date of filing, the reasons for the redating and (where appropriate) the detrimental effect of the redating on the claimed priority right. This decision will allow a separate appeal according to Art. 106(2).

Once the period for filing an appeal has expired without an appeal being filed, the examiner will resume examination on the basis of the new date of filing. Note that the EESR may contain documents that could become relevant as a result of the redating.

If the applicant files an appeal in due time, the file passes to a board of appeal to review the decision on the accordance of the date of filing. The examining division will not continue substantive examination while the case is pending before the board. Once the board has issued a decision, the file will be returned to the examining division, which will be bound on this point by the board's decision (Art. 111(2)). It will then resume examination on the basis of the date of filing fixed by the board.

1.1.2 Claims filed after accordance of a date of filing

Art. 123(2)

If the claims were not present at the application's date of filing, the examining division must check whether the subsequently filed claims satisfy the requirements of Art. 123(2). If the basis for these subsequently filed claims in the application as filed has not been indicated by the applicant (see H-III, 2.1) and the application is one of those mentioned in

H-III, 2.1.4, the examining division may send the applicant a communication under Rule 137(4) requesting this information (see H-III, 2.1.1).

1.2 Euro-PCT applications – missing elements and parts filed under Rule 20.5 and 20.6 PCT

In the case of PCT applications, missing drawings and parts of the description, but also missing claims, may have been filed at the receiving Office for international applications under Rules 20.5 and 20.6 PCT, and its finding can be reviewed in accordance with Rule 82~~ter~~.1 PCT. The examining division will review this finding in all cases in which the date of filing was retained on the basis of the "completely contained" requirement using the same criteria as applied when assessing compliance with Rule 56(3) (see A-II, 5.4.2).

If either the EPO acted as the ISA or a supplementary EESR has been issued, this review will normally have been initiated at the search stage (see B-III, 3.3.1 and B-XI, 2.1). However, it can still be started during substantive examination. The procedure is the same as for European patent applications (see C-III, 1.1.1).

1.3 Euro-PCT applications – erroneous elements filed under Rule 20.5bis PCT

Rule 20.5bis PCT allows applicants to correct an erroneously filed element (description or claims) or part of the description, claims or drawings (including all drawings) contained in an international application.

Incorporations by reference by the receiving Office under Rule 20.5bis(d) PCT, i.e. without changing the date of filing, are effective before the EPO as designated or elected Office for international applications filed on or after 1 November 2022. For details, see the notice from the EPO dated 23 June 2022, OJ EPO 2022, A71. On entry into the European phase, the procedure is followed on the basis that the correct and erroneously filed parts are part of the application as filed.

For international applications filed between 1 July 2020 and 31 October 2022, the provisions under Rule 20.5bis(d) PCT remain not fully applicable (see the notice from the EPO dated 14 June 2020, OJ EPO 2020, A81). The EPO adopts the following practice in respect of those applications: corrections accepted by the receiving Office during the international phase under either Rule 20.5bis(b) PCT or Rule 20.5bis(c) PCT – i.e. where it accorded the date of receipt of the correct application documents or a later date as the date of filing of the application or shifted the initial date of filing of the application to the date of receipt of the correct application documents – will be effective in proceedings before the EPO as designated/elected Office (see OJ EPO 2020, A81).

However, if the receiving Office considered the correct application documents to be incorporated by reference under Rule 20.5bis(d) PCT, i.e. without changing the date of filing, this incorporation will not be effective in proceedings before the EPO as designated/elected Office. In such cases, the EPO will, on entry into the European phase, consider the date of filing of the application to be the date on which the correct application documents

were received (Rule 20.8(c) PCT and Rule 20.5bis(b) or (c) PCT). Furthermore, it will consider the application as filed to include the correct application documents but not the erroneously filed ones. The EPO will inform the applicant about this in a communication under Rules 20.8(c) PCT and 82ter.1(c) and (d) PCT, setting a time limit of two months for reply.

- (i) If, within the time limit, the applicant requests that the correct application documents be disregarded under Rule 82ter.1(d) PCT, the EPO will issue an interlocutory decision changing the date of filing to the date initially accorded by the receiving Office and confirming that the procedure before the EPO as designated/elected Office will be based on the application documents as filed on that date.
- (ii) If the applicant files observations with regard to the communication under Rule 20.8(c) PCT and Rule 82ter.1(c) and (d) PCT within the time limit set, the EPO will also issue an interlocutory decision taking into account the observations made.
- (iii) If the applicant does not file observations and does not request that the correct application documents be disregarded, an interlocutory decision will not be issued. In this case, the EPO will stick to its findings.

Applicants interested in avoiding this procedure, namely the issuing of the communication under Rules 20.8(c) PCT and 82ter.1(c) and (d) PCT and the setting of a time limit of two months for reply, may make use of the abridged procedure. According to it, they may, within the 31-month time limit under Rule 159(1), at the time of validly requesting early processing or, at the latest, before the communication under Rules 20.8(c) and 82ter.1(c) and (d) PCT is issued:

- (a) request that the EPO disregard the correct application documents. In that case, no such communication but an interlocutory decision will be issued. This decision will confirm that the application maintains the initial date of filing and that the correct application documents will be disregarded in the procedure before the EPO as designated/elected Office.
- (b) confirm that they wish to pursue the application with the date of filing corresponding to the date of receipt of the correct application documents and with those correct application documents. In that case, no invitation and no interlocutory decision will be issued. The EPO will correct the date of filing and consider the erroneously filed application documents not to have been filed. The applicant will be informed accordingly.

Once the procedure described above has been finalised, a communication under Rules 161 and 162 will be issued and the applicant may amend the application within the scope of the disclosure on the date of filing as determined in this procedure.

As a consequence of the procedure described above, it may happen that the application documents as originally filed differ from those forming the basis for the search in the international phase. If the EPO acted as ISA, the examiner has to check carefully whether the invention forming the basis for the European phase was covered by a search in the international phase. If this is not the case, an invitation under Rule 164(2) will be issued (see C-III, 3.1).

If the subject-matter forming the basis for European phase processing is covered by the international search report, then examination continues as usual but taking into account that the potential change of the date of filing might have an impact on intermediary documents cited in the international search report and that the priority might not be valid anymore.

For more details and examples, see OJ EPO 2020, A81.

2. Amendments made by applicants of their own volition

Any amendment, including any made by the applicant of their own volition, must satisfy the following conditions:

- (i) it must not add subject-matter to the content of the application as filed (see H-IV, 2.3 and H-V, 1 to H-V, 7); Art. 123(2)
- (ii) it must not itself cause the application as amended to be objectionable under the EPC, e.g. the amendment must not introduce a lack of clarity into the claims (Art. 84);
- (iii) it must comply with Rule 137(5) (see H-IV, 4.1); and
- (iv) it must comply with the requirements under Rule 49(2) as determined by the President in the decision dated 7 July 2025 on the presentation of application and other documents (OJ EPO 2025, A49).

If the amendments do not meet these conditions, the applicant should be told that the amended application cannot be allowed. Apart from the amendments referred to in C-III, 2.1 and 2.2, which are admissible under Rule 137(2), the applicant may correct obvious errors at any time (see H-VI, 2.2.1).

If the applicant makes amendments but does not identify them and/or indicate their basis in the application as filed (see H-III, 2.1) and the application is one of those mentioned in H-III, 2.1.4, the examining division may send the applicant a communication under Rule 137(4) requesting this information (see H-III, 2.1.1).

If the applicant accepts a search division's suggestion regarding an acceptable form of amendment of the claims to overcome the objections raised (see B-XI, 3.8), they are requested to adapt the description to the claims on file and delete or amend any statements or expressions throwing doubt on the scope of protection (see F-IV, 4.3).

2.1 Amendments made in response to the search opinion

Rule 137(2) and (3)

The amendments referred to in C-II, 3.1 are made by the applicant of their own volition (the applicant is required to respond to the search opinion in the EESR but does not necessarily have to respond by filing amendments; they can also respond by filing observations on the search opinion – see B-XI, 8). This means that the applicant is not restricted to amendments necessary to remedy a defect in the application. Further amendments may be made only with the consent of the examining division (see H-II, 2.3).

2.2 Amendments made in response to the WO-ISA, IPER or supplementary international search report

Rule 137(2)

For Euro-PCT applications where the EPO acted as ISA or SISA, any amendments filed in response to the communication under Rule 161(1) are made by the applicant of their own volition (see A-XIV, 2.1.1). This means they may be submitted to overcome objections raised in the WO-ISA, IPER or supplementary international search report or they may be suggested for some other reason, e.g. to remedy some lack of clarity that the applicant has noted in the original documents. In order to avoid delays, care should be taken to comply with the requirements of Rule 137(4) when filing such amendments. Furthermore, the applicant may also file observations in place of or in addition to amendments.

3. Unity of invention

3.1 Searches under Rule 164(2)

Rule 164(2)

For Euro-PCT applications where the EPO acted as ISA or as SISA, the examining division assesses the application documents under Rule 164(2). The assessment takes place upon expiry of the six-month time limit set in the communication under Rule 161 and Rule 162. During that period, the application documents may have been amended. For any claimed invention or group of inventions within the meaning of Art. 82 not searched by the EPO in its capacity as ISA or SISA, the examining division issues an invitation to pay search fees within a non-extendable period of two months in order for those claimed inventions or group of inventions to be covered by a further search. Those search fees are not subject to the reduction under Art. 153(7) and cannot be validly paid until the invitation pursuant to Rule 164(2) has been issued.

The application documents as amended may contain claims directed to a non-searched invention in situations other than where the application documents that are to serve as the basis for examination do not meet the requirement of unity of invention.

For instance, the amended application may contain just one invention, but it may be an invention that was claimed but not searched by the EPO as (S)ISA in the international phase. In this case, there is no non-unity objection for this set of claims and the reasoning in the invitation needs only to refer to the non-unity objection in the WO-ISA and to the fact that no additional fee was paid for this invention during the international phase.

It may well be that an invention in the application documents was not even claimed in the application documents that served as the basis for the

procedure in the international phase and has been imported from the description (see F-V, 7.1(iv)). In such a case, an invitation to pay search fees under Rule 164(2) for any non-searched invention is to be issued by the examining division, irrespective of whether lack of unity persists in the claims. The invitation under Rule 164(2) must state that – and why – this is a new invention not searched in the international phase. If there are other inventions present in the claims that were also not searched (but were claimed in the PCT phase), the applicant must also be invited by way of the same invitation to pay further search fees in respect of those inventions. In assessing whether or not subject-matter present in amended claims constitutes a previously unclaimed invention imported from the description (for which an invitation under Rule 164(2) is to be sent), the principles laid down for assessing compliance with Rule 137(5) (see in H-IV, 4.1.2) are to be taken into account.

The application documents forming the basis for the European phase may also cover inventions or groups of inventions not searched in the (supplementary) international search report as a result of the procedure for erroneously filed elements under Rule 20.5bis PCT (see C-III, 1.3). In this case too, an invitation to pay search fees under Rule 164(2) is to be issued by the examining division.

The invitation under Rule 164(2) must be sent before any communication under Art. 94(3). For Rule 164(2) to apply, the claims must be sufficiently clear to allow the identification of a non-searched invention triggering the procedure under Rule 164(2). If the claims are so unclear that a non-searched invention cannot be identified, the first action must be to issue a communication under Art. 94(3) setting out the objections under Art. 84. Should it turn out later in the procedure that amended claims are indeed directed to a non-searched invention, the applicant must file a divisional application for any such subject-matter. Recourse to Rule 164(2) is not provided for if, as a result of further amendments or clarification, (further) non-searched inventions are identified, since the procedure under Rule 164(2) applies to the application documents as submitted by the applicant as the basis for examination.

If auxiliary requests are submitted before a search under Rule 164(2) is performed, only the main request is taken into account for the purpose of the search (notwithstanding the exceptions relating to cases under Rule 62a or Rule 63 where main and auxiliary requests are both considered at the search stage, see B-VIII, 3.2.2 and B-VIII, 4.2.2).

If any search fees are paid in due time, the results of the searches are communicated to the applicant by the examining division as an annex to a communication under Art. 94(3) and Rule 71(1) and (2) or under Rule 71(3), as set out in Rule 164(2)(b). This annex is entitled "Search result according to Rule 164(2)". If the examining division has not found any deficiencies, the results will be annexed to a communication under Rule 71(3) informing the applicant of the text in which it intends to grant the patent and of the related bibliographic data. If the examining division has found deficiencies, the results will be annexed to a communication under Art. 94(3) and Rule 71(1) and (2) inviting the applicant to comment on those

deficiencies and, where appropriate, amend the application. The applicant must limit the application to a single searched invention to be prosecuted in the patent grant procedure.

If the applicant pays the search fees in due time under Rule 164(2) and at the same time files a new set of claims, the search will be carried out and the written opinion issued for the claims on file upon expiry of the period under Rule 161 for which the invitation to pay was sent and the requested fees paid. The amended documents may, however, informally be taken into account by the examiner carrying out the search, where this appears appropriate. Applicants will have the opportunity to file amendments of their own volition after receiving the results of the search under Rule 164(2) annexed to the communication under Art. 94(3) (see H-II, 2.3).

If search fees are not paid in due time under Rule 164(2), a communication under Art. 94(3) and Rule 71(1) and (2) or under Rule 71(3) will be issued and the examining division will require deletion from the claims of any subject-matter that was not searched either because a search fee under Rule 164(2) was not paid (see H-II, 6) or for a different reason (see H-IV, 4). Before the patent is granted, this subject-matter should be either deleted from the description and drawings or indicated as not forming part of the claimed invention (see F-IV, 4.3(iii)).

A communication under Rule 164(2)(b) deals with all objections for each of the inventions searched in accordance with Rule 164(2). For claims relating to inventions already searched by the EPO in the international phase that have been amended but still lack unity, it is sufficient to argue in detail why lack of unity is still present. The communication, where appropriate, further requests the applicant to limit the application to a single searched invention (see Rule 164(2)(c)).

It follows from Rule 164(2)(b) and (c) that the special procedure under Rule 164(2) as set out in H-II, 2.3 ends upon expiry of the time limit set in the communication issued under Rule 164(2)(b). This means that the applicant's right to make amendments of their own volition ends upon expiry of that time limit.

Furthermore, the special procedure as set out in F-V, 7.1(iv), which exempts amendments from the requirements of Rule 137(5), first sentence, ends upon expiry of the time limit under Rule 161(1). Such amendments will result in an invitation under Rule 164(2)(a) and allow the applicant to obtain a search of unsearched subject-matter referred to in Rule 137(5). However, any amendments submitted after expiry of the time limit under Rule 161(1) are subject to the requirements of Rule 137(5), first sentence (see H-IV, 4.1.2).

The EPO's obligations under Rule 164(2) are fulfilled and the applicant's rights under this rule are exhausted once a single communication under Rule 164(2) has been sent. It follows that in cases of cascading non-unity no (further) invitation under Rule 164(2) is sent. The same applies if, during the examination procedure, claims are added or existing claims amended so that they relate to non-searched inventions.

Exceptional cases may arise where the following sequence of events has occurred in the international phase:

- (i) The EPO acted as ISA in the international phase
- (ii) The EPO acting as ISA invited the applicant to pay one or more additional international search fees in accordance with Art. 17(3)(a) PCT and Rule 40 PCT (due to a lack of unity according to Rule 13 PCT)
- (iii) The applicant paid at least one such additional search fee
- (iv) The additional search or searches led to a further objection as to a lack of unity *a posteriori* (a cascading lack of unity), resulting in one of the inventions identified in the invitation under Art. 17(3)(a) PCT and Rule 40 PCT being further subdivided and resulting in sub-inventions not originally identified in that invitation
- (v) The EPO did not search all such sub-inventions.

In the above case, the EPO will invite the applicant to pay search fees for any such unsearched sub-inventions in the claims that are to form the basis for examination on expiry of the six-month period under Rule 161(1), in accordance with Rule 164(2).

Where the EPO acted as SISA in accordance with Rule 45bis.9 PCT, it may make a finding of a lack of unity of the international application according to Rule 45bis.6(a) PCT. However, in the procedure before the SISA, the applicant cannot pay additional supplementary international search fees, and the supplementary international search report will be directed only to the invention or unitary group of inventions first mentioned in the claims (Rule 45bis.6(a) PCT). Where such an application contains unsearched inventions in the claims that are to form the basis for examination on expiry of the six-month period under Rule 161(1), a communication under Rule 164(2) is issued allowing the applicant to have these inventions searched upon payment of search fees and to pursue one of them in the examination proceedings.

Rule 164(2)(b) provides for a right to amend the application in response to the results of any search under Rule 164(2). This means that applicants may make amendments of their own volition once in response to the communication under Art. 94(3) to which the search results under Rule 164(2) are annexed (H-II, 2.3).

3.2 Relation to unity in search; limitation to searched invention

An objection of lack of unity of invention, if applicable, should already have been raised at the search stage. If such an objection was not raised, but the examining division nevertheless considers that the requirements of Art. 82 are clearly not met, the question of lack of unity will be addressed as early as possible during examination (see F-V, 7.1 and H-II, 6.3).

Art. 82

When raising a finding of lack of unity or upholding an earlier one objected to by the applicant on the basis of unconvincing reasons, the examining division will invite the applicant to limit the application to one invention or group of inventions. In response to such an invitation, applicants must clearly indicate which searched invention they wish to prosecute further. If the response is unclear, the examining division must seek clarification before continuing with the examination (see T.736/14).

3.2.1 No additional search fees paid

Rule 64

Rule 164(1) and (2)

If applicants have not availed themselves of the opportunity to have the search results on the other inventions included in the search report because they have paid no additional search fees in response to the invitation under Rule 64(1) (see B-VII.1.2) or 164(1) (see B-VII.2.3), they will be assumed to have elected to proceed with the application on the basis of the searched invention (see G.2/92) and will be requested to delete any unsearched inventions or group of inventions within the meaning of Art. 82 from the claims (see F-V.5.1 and H-II.6.1). In cases where a communication under Rule 164(2) has been sent (see C-III.3.1), Rule 164(2)(c) also requires the applicant to delete all unsearched inventions from the claims.

Final responsibility for establishing whether the application meets the requirement of unity of invention ultimately rests with the examining division (see T.631/97). When considering the issue of unity, the examining division will consider both the reasons given in the search opinion and the applicant's response (see B-XI.8 for details of when a response to the search opinion is required); for Euro-PCT applications where no supplementary European search report is prepared, the examining division will consider the reasons given in the WO-ISA, IPER or supplementary international search report prepared by the EPO and the applicant's response as required by Rule 161(1) (see A-XIV.3). In the absence of any convincing response from the applicant to the issue of unity as raised earlier, the examining division will normally initially uphold the position taken earlier (see B-XI.1.2) and will then require deletion of all the inventions other than that which has been searched. If the examining division is convinced, e.g. by arguments from the applicant, that the opinion on unity at the search stage was incorrect, then an additional search is performed for that part of the subject-matter that is judged to be unitary with an invention that was searched (see B-II.4.2(iii) and C-IV.7.3) and the examination is carried out on those claims that comply with the requirement of unity of invention. The applicant may file a divisional application for any excised subject-matter (see C-III.3.3).

3.2.2 Additional search fees paid

If the applicant has taken the opportunity to have other inventions searched, they may decide that the application is to proceed on the basis of one of these inventions and to delete the others. If the applicant has not yet done so and if the examining division maintains the objection of lack of unity (see C-III.3.2), it should invite the applicant at the beginning of substantive examination to state which invention the prosecution of the application should be based on and to limit the application accordingly by

excising those parts belonging to the other inventions. For the latter inventions, the applicant may file divisional applications (see C-III, 3.3).

3.2.3 Invitation to pay additional search fees combined with invitation to restrict the scope of the search

In exceptional cases, an invitation to pay additional search fees under Rule 64(1), Rule 164(1) or Rule 164(2) may be combined with an invitation to restrict the scope of the search under Rule 62a(1) and/or Rule 63(1).

When the application enters the examination phase or, in the case of Rule 164(2), after the reply to the first communication, the examiner will check whether the claims on which substantive examination is based meet the requirement of unity of invention (Art. 82) and cover only subject-matter that has been searched. If the claims lack unity of invention, the applicant will be invited to limit the claims to one searched invention and to exclude all unsearched subject-matter from the scope of the claims. If, in reply to the objection raised by the examiner, the applicant fails to respond adequately (either by amending the claims or by submitting convincing arguments) and the non-unity objection can be maintained, the application may be refused under Art. 97(2) in conjunction with Art. 82 (see H-II, 6.3 and 6.4), provided that the right to be heard, which includes the right to oral proceedings if so requested (Art. 116(1)), has been respected.

If the original set of claims has been amended before entering the examination phase or, in the case of Rule 164(2), in reply to the first communication such as to meet the requirements of Art. 82 but includes subject-matter that was excluded from the search following an invitation under Rule 62a(1) and/or Rule 63(1), the examiner will either (i) invite the applicant to limit the set of claims to the searched subject-matter under Rule 62a(2) and/or Rule 63(3) or (ii) raise an objection under Rule 137(5) against the claims concerned (see H-IV, 4.1.2). In cases under Rule 164(2), if the first communication already included the relevant objections/invitations and the right to be heard has been respected, the application may be refused.

If, in reply to the invitation under Rule 62a(2) or 63(3), the applicant fails to respond adequately (either by amending the claims or by submitting convincing arguments), the application may be refused under Art. 97(2), provided that the right to be heard has been respected (see F-IV, 3.3).

3.2.4 Re-evaluation of the unity requirement in examination

The procedures described in this section relate to substantive examination of applications filed directly at the EPO (Euro-direct applications) and for Euro-PCT applications for which either a supplementary search report was prepared under Rule 164(1) or a search under Rule 164(2) was carried out.

The examining division is required to review the finding underlying the invitation to pay additional fees under Rule 64(1) or Rule 164(1) or (2) for three possible reasons.

- (a) For applications for which a (supplementary) European search report or search results under Rule 164(2) were prepared and the applicant

paid one or more additional search fees in response to an invitation under Rule 64(1) or Rule 164(1) or (2), the examining division is required to review the validity of the finding of lack of unity and, on request, to refund any such fees for which the finding of the search division (or, in the case of Rule 164(2), the examining division) was invalid (Rule 64(2) or Rule 164(5) – see C-III, 3.4).

- (b) In cases in which the (supplementary) European search report or the search results under Rule 164(2) were restricted because the applicant, in response to an invitation under Rule 64(1) or Rule 164(1) or (2), did not pay all the additional fees and has argued that the restriction was unjustified, the examining division should review whether the finding which was the basis for that restriction was valid and, if it concludes that the finding was unjustified, arrange for an additional search to be carried out.
- (c) If in response to the invitation to pay additional fees the applicant either paid no such fees, or paid some but not all of them so that not all of the claims were searched, and unsearched claims are maintained in the substantive examination phase, then the examining division should review the finding on which the invitation was based and only require the applicant to excise the unsearched subject-matter if it concludes that the finding was justified.

When carrying out this review, the correct application of the principles set out in decision G 2/92 (OJ EPO 1993, 591) is essential. If the objection of lack of unity raised at the search stage or under Rule 164(2) was not justified on the basis of the claims as originally filed, then the applicant should not be required to file divisional applications for the unsearched subject-matter (i.e. the subject-matter in respect of which no further search fees have been paid), and thus incur the financial consequences in circumstances where the previous conclusions on unity were not justified.

Moreover, it is essential to bear in mind that the review is restricted to a reconsideration of the validity of that original finding under the circumstances existing at the time when it was made by taking into account only the prior art which was available when the finding was made.

3.3 Excision of other inventions; filing divisional applications

Rule 36

The applicant may file divisional applications for inventions deleted in accordance with C-III, 3.2.1 or 3.2.2.

A divisional application may only be filed if the application being divided is still pending (see A-IV, 1.1.1).

3.4 Refund of additional search fees

Rule 64(2)

Rule 164(5)

If the applicant disagrees with the finding of lack of unity and has paid further search fees in response to an invitation from the search division under Rule 64(1) or 164(1) or from the examining division under Rule 164(2), they may request the examining division to review this finding under Rule 64(2) or 164(5) and to refund the further search fees. In such

cases, the examining division is required to review the validity of the finding of lack of unity (see also F-V, 4 to F-V, 7).

A refund request should be handled promptly. If the examiner concludes that it should not be granted, the applicant is informed of the examining division's preliminary opinion in a communication under Art. 94(3). This preliminary opinion takes into account the arguments put forward by the applicant in their reply to the search opinion. The applicant is informed that they may request an interlocutory decision on the refund, allowing a separate appeal under Art. 106(2). If there is a pending request for oral proceedings, the applicant is also invited in the communication to clarify whether this request also applies to the issuing of the interlocutory decision on the request for refund. If the applicant confirms this to be the case, oral proceedings will have to be held before a negative decision on the request for refund can be issued.

An interlocutory decision should be issued at the earliest opportunity, subject to the requirements of Art. 113(1), and not left until the final decision on the application. Of course, if the stage in the procedure when the examiner is in a position to issue the decision on the refund coincides with the issuing of either a Rule 71(3) communication or a decision refusing the application, then, in the former case, the interlocutory decision can be issued with the Rule 71(3) communication; in the latter case, the decision on the refund can be included in the decision refusing the application. The examiner ensures that the interlocutory decision issued on this matter clearly states that a separate appeal under Art. 106(2) is allowed.

The same procedure applies to the refund of search fees paid under Rule 164(1) and (2).

Rule 164(5) provides for a refund of any search fee paid under Rule 164(1) or (2) in line with Rule 64(2) (see A-X, 10.2.2). Where the applicant pays a search fee in response to the Rule 164(2) invitation and at the same time contests the basis for requiring payment of a search fee and requests its refund under Rule 164(5), the examining division may deal directly with this issue in the communication under Art. 94(3) and Rule 71(1) or (2) that accompanies the search results under Rule 164(2). Such an immediate review of the applicant's request is not possible in cases under Rules 64(1) and 164(1) until the examining division assumes responsibility for the application.

The review under Rule 64(2) or 164(5) is restricted to a reconsideration of the validity of the original finding under the circumstances existing at the time the Rule 64(1), 164(1) or (2) invitation was sent, taking into account only the prior art that was available at that time. For more details on the assessment of unity of invention, see F-V.

The issue of refunds of additional **international** search fees paid to the EPO acting as ISA in response to an invitation under Art. 17(3)(a) PCT, however, does not arise in the European phase because these fees were paid in the international phase, which is closed by this stage of the procedure. The applicant may contest the payment of additional

international search fees to the EPO acting as ISA by paying these under protest according to Rule 40.2(c) PCT. However, this must be done in the **international** phase (see also the decision of the President of the EPO dated 9 June 2015, OJ EPO 2015, A59, and the notice from the EPO dated 24 March 2010, OJ EPO 2010, 322).

3.5 Changing from one searched invention to another

Once the applicant has limited the claims to one searched invention, the examining division will refuse to admit amendments involving switching to a different searched invention (for further information, see H-II, 6.1).

4. First communication

If deficiencies persist in the application even after the applicant has filed their response to the search opinion, WO-ISA, supplementary international search report or IPER (as required by Rule 161(1)), the examining division will issue a communication under Art. 94(3) and Rule 71(1), Rule 71(2) in subsequent examination proceedings and will consider the applicant's reply before issuing a negative decision or a summons to oral proceedings. For the exceptional case where a summons to oral proceedings is issued as the first action in examination proceedings, see C-III, 5.

Invitations under Rules 161, Rule 162 and Rule 70a are sent before the examining division starts its substantive work and are therefore not regarded as the first communication from the examining division. Likewise, the following communications are not considered substantive actions in examination proceedings and thus are not regarded as the first communication from the examining division:

- the search opinion of an EESR or a supplementary search (ESOP)
- an opinion or report from the PCT procedure (WO-ISA, SISR, IPRP or IPER)
- an invitation under Rule 62a or 63
- a communication under Rule 137(4)
- a request under Rule 53(3)
- a request under Art. 124 and Rule 141
- an invitation under Rule 164(2)(a).

When drawing up such a communication (or exceptionally the summons to oral proceedings), the examining division will take into account the documents (if any) cited in the search report and any further documents found as a result of the search referred to in C-IV, 7.1 as well as any amendments proposed or comments made by the applicant in reply to the search opinion (see B-XI, 8) or the Rule 161(1) communication (see A-XIV, 2.1.1). The examiner should identify in this communication any EPC requirements that, in their opinion, the application does not satisfy. The communication will give reasons for any objections raised and invite the

Rule 71(1) and (2)
Rule 132
Art. 94(3)

applicant within a specified period to file observations or submit amendments. The filed application documents are not sent back to the applicant although a copy of the description and claims may be sent in appropriate cases (see H-III, 2). The examiner will re-examine the application once the applicant has replied.

If no search opinion has been issued (see C-VI, 3, F-V, 7.1(ii) and B-XI, 1.1), the examiner's first communication under Art. 94(3) will, as a general rule (see B-XI, 3) and by analogy with the search opinion, cover all objections to the application (see B-XI, 3.4 for exceptional cases where not all objections are raised). A summons will not be issued as the first office action in examination proceedings in such a case.

4.1 Reasoning

4.1.1 Reasoned objections

As with the search opinion, for each objection, the communication should indicate the part of the application that is deficient and the EPC requirement not met, either by referring to specific articles or rules or by other clear indication; it should also give the reason for any objection where not immediately apparent (for more details see B-XI, 3.2).

Rule 71(2)

The burden of proof and the onus to present the relevant facts about patentability requirements lie initially with the examining division, which must provide evidence and facts to support its objection (see T 655/13). Accordingly, prior-art documents forming the basis for novelty or inventive step objections must be cited in such a way that these conclusions can be checked without difficulty (see E-IX, 2.6).

4.1.2 Positive statements/suggestions

Where appropriate, the communication should also contain positive statements on patentability where some of the claims meet the patentability requirements (see B-XI, 3.2.2). In this phase of the proceedings, the examiner should make such statements in particular where the claims for which a positive conclusion is reached have not yet been commented on.

Concerning making suggestions on how to overcome objections, see B-XI, 3.8. When suggesting an acceptable form of amendment to the claims, the examining division will also invite the applicant to adapt the description to bring it into line with the amended claims (see F-IV, 4.3).

4.1.3 Consideration of the contents of the IPER

If the international preliminary examination report has been drawn up by the EPO, it is to be regarded as an opinion for purposes of examination, and generally the first communication will be based on the opinion expressed in the IPER and the applicant's response to it filed in accordance with Rule 161(1) (if applicable, see A-XIV, 3.1). Such an opinion may be departed from if new facts relevant to assessing patentability are in evidence (e.g. if further prior-art documents are to be cited or if evidence is produced of unexpected effects), where the substantive patentability requirements under the PCT and the EPC are different, where applicants

Rule 159

Rule 161(1)

provide convincing arguments, appropriate amendments or relevant counter-evidence in their response to the IPER according to Rule 161(1), or conversely where the applicant provides amendments in response to the IPER which introduce further deficiencies.

Examination reports drawn up by other International Preliminary Examining Authorities must be examined carefully. If the reasons put forward in the international preliminary examination report are sound, they must not be disregarded.

4.2 Invitation to file comments and amendments

The communication should include an invitation to the applicant to file observations, correct any deficiencies and, if necessary, submit amendments to the description, claims and drawings. It must also state the period within which the applicant must reply. Failure to reply in due time will cause the application to be deemed withdrawn (see C-VI, 1 and E-VIII, 1). Further processing is available for this loss of rights (E-VIII, 2).

Rule 71(1) and (2)
Art. 94(3) and (4)

5. Summons to oral proceedings as the first action in examination

In exceptional cases, the examining division may decide to issue a summons to oral proceedings as the first action in examination. It may do so only if:

- in its opinion, there is no prospect of a grant, even taking into account the applicant's reply to the search opinion
- the content of the claims on file is not different in substance from that of the claims that served as a basis for the search
- one or more of the objections raised in the search opinion and crucial to the outcome of the examination procedure still apply.

In addition, in examination of a divisional application, the examining division may exceptionally issue a summons to oral proceedings as the first action if:

- the parent application was refused or withdrawn and there is no prospect of a grant for the divisional application, even taking into account the applicant's reply to the search opinion
- the content of the claims on file is substantially the same as or broader than the subject-matter of claims that were examined for the refused or withdrawn parent application or that served as a basis for the search of the divisional application
- one or more of the objections that are crucial to the outcome of the examination procedure and that were raised in either the search opinion established for the divisional application, the parent's refusal or a communication issued for the withdrawn parent still apply.

The annex to the summons issued as the first action in examination must deal with the applicant's requests in their entirety and be as detailed as a

communication under Art. 94(3) (see in particular C-III, 4.1). It must not include any new objections or cite new documents that were neither included in the search opinion nor, in the case of a divisional application, in the refusal of the parent application or in a communication issued for the withdrawn parent application. All objections to the application must be covered and substantiated by giving the essential legal and factual reasons. In addition, it must include the reasons for the decision to directly summon to oral proceedings as the first action in examination. The division may inform the applicant in a telephone call if it is considering issuing a summons to oral proceedings as the first action in examination (C-VII, 2.5).

In order to allow the applicant sufficient time to prepare any submissions ahead of the oral proceedings, the summons should be issued with at least six months' notice.

In accordance with the principles applicable to the summons to oral proceedings, applicants may avail themselves of the possibility to submit any arguments and amendments by expiry of the deadline set under Rule 116(1). Requests filed after the date set under Rule 116(1) are not to be treated as late-filed (H-II, 2.7) in the case of a summons to oral proceedings issued as first action in examination.

Should the applicant's submissions contain a genuine effort to overcome the examining division's objections, oral proceedings may be cancelled or postponed. Otherwise, a decision on the substance of the application will in principle be taken during the oral proceedings, even if the applicant does not attend them (see E-III, 6 and E-III, 8.3.3.3).

6. Requesting information on prior art (not confined to priority)

The EPO may invite the applicant to submit, within a period of two months, information on prior art taken into consideration in national or regional patent proceedings and concerning an invention to which the European patent application relates. This in particular encompasses search results with respect to applications for patents or utility models whose priority is not being claimed. The EPO may by the same means request the copy of the search results on the priority or priorities referred to in Rule 141(1), where those results were not available to the applicant when requested under Rule 70b(1) (see the notice from the EPO dated 28 July 2010, OJ EPO 2010, 410). Failure by the applicant to comply with this invitation results in the application being deemed withdrawn under Art. 124(2). Further processing is available for this loss of rights (see E-VIII, 2).

Art. 124

Rule 141(3)

Given the considerable work such invitations can entail for applicants, further requests under Rule 141(3) will be issued only in individual cases where there are cogent reasons to suspect the existence of additional, relevant prior art.

This invitation is an independent communication and the above-mentioned time limit is non-extendable. The invitation can be sent by itself or at the same time as an Art. 94(3) communication. If sent at the same time, the time limits set in both communications are independent of one another. Any

information on prior art provided by the applicant will be included in the file and will be open to file inspection (see [A-XI](#)).

7. Evaluation of prior-art documents cited in the search report and late priority claim

As explained in [A-III, 6.5.1](#) and [A-III, 6.5.2](#), the applicant has the right to correct or introduce a priority claim within 16 months of the earliest priority (with a minimum of four months from the European date of filing in the case of corrections). If this happens before finalisation of the search report, the examiner may review the draft search report to take into account the change in the application's effective date. In cases where the search report was issued on the basis of the original priority status (i.e. addition or correction of a priority claim is effected after the search report is drawn up), the examiner at the substantive examination stage should reevaluate the relevance of the documents cited in the search report. Where it appears that the prior art available to the examiner is unlikely to reflect the state of the art in a sufficiently complete way for the purpose of a patentability assessment, the examiner should then conduct an additional search (see [C-IV, 7.3](#)). No further search report will be issued in these cases: the applicant will be informed of any newly found documents in a communication under [Art. 94\(3\)](#) (with copies of such documents annexed to that communication).

Chapter IV – Examination of replies and further stages of examination

1. General procedure

Following the applicant's reply to the search opinion (see B-XI, 8), WO-ISA, IPER or supplementary international search report prepared by the EPO (see A-XIV, 2.1.1) or to the first communication, the examiner must examine the application, taking into account observations or amendments made by the applicant.

Where the application is one of those mentioned in H-III, 2.1.4, Rule 137(4) requires that any amendments made by the applicant in reply to the search opinion, WO-ISA, IPER or supplementary international search report be identified and their basis in the application as filed indicated. Failure to do so may result in the examining division sending a communication under Rule 137(4). For more details of the procedure, see H-III, 2.1.1 and 2.1.2.

In the case of one or more auxiliary requests directed to alternative texts for grant of a patent, every such request qualifies as a text submitted or agreed by the applicant within the meaning of Art. 113(2) and therefore must be dealt with in the order indicated or agreed to by the applicant, up to and including the highest-ranking allowable request, if any (see also H-III, 3 and C-V, 1.1). For the types of application mentioned in H-III, 2.1.4, Rule 137(4) must also be complied with in respect of auxiliary requests, which may also be subject to a communication under Rule 137(4).

2. Extent of examination of replies

After the first examination stage, provided that the:

- search opinion
- WO-ISA (when prepared by the EPO)
- explanation accompanying the supplementary international search report under Rule 45bis.7(e) PCT (when prepared by the EPO, see the notice from the EPO dated 24 March 2010, OJ EPO 2010, 316, point 6)
- IPER (when prepared by the EPO)
- first communication (see B-XI, 1.1 and 8)

was comprehensive and clear (see B-XI, 3 and C-III, 4 and 4.1), the examiner will not normally need to completely re-read the application but rather should concentrate on the amendments themselves, the related passages and the deficiencies previously noted.

3. Further action upon examination of replies

Examiners should be guided at this stage by the overriding principle that a final position (grant or refusal) should be reached in as few actions as possible, and should conduct the procedure with this always in mind. The

Art. 94(3)

EPC provides that the process of communicating with the applicant described in C-III, 4 is repeated "as often as necessary".

In most cases, the applicant will have tried to deal with all the examiner's objections. A letter of reply from the applicant does not have to be substantively complete or cogent to qualify as a reply within the meaning of Art. 94(4). For the application not to be deemed withdrawn, it is enough for the applicant to comment on, even incompletely, or to file amendments in reply to at least one of the objections raised in the Art. 94(3) communication. In contrast, purely formal requests, such as for extension of the time limit under Art. 94(3) or for a consultation, do not qualify as replies under Art. 94(4) (see also B-XI, 8 and E-VIII, 2). A request for a decision according to the state of the file (see C-V, 15), however, qualifies as a reply within the meaning of Art. 94(4).

If the only outstanding objection is the need to amend the description, see C-VI, 1.1.

Art. 113(1)

If examination of the applicant's reply shows that despite their submissions objections persist, and provided that at least one communication has been sent in examination proceedings (see C-III, 4 and A-XIV, 6.1) and the applicant has been given the right to be heard (Art. 113(1)), i.e. the decision is based solely on grounds they have had an opportunity to comment on, the examiner will consider recommending to the other members of the examining division that the application be refused (see T 201/98). However, where there is a reasonable prospect that an additional invitation to overcome the objections could lead to a grant, the examiner will send a further written communication or contact the applicant by telephone. The examiner may also make suggestions on how to overcome the raised objections (see C-III, 4.1.2).

If the examining division is considering refusing the application immediately because the applicant has not dealt with all the main objections and there is no prospect of overcoming them, due care should be taken to verify that there is no pending request for oral proceedings on file. The applicant's silence on the matter cannot be interpreted as withdrawal of the request for oral proceedings. If there is no clearly expressed intention to withdraw a request for oral proceedings on file, oral proceedings must be held (J 12/15).

If examination of the applicant's reply shows that they have not dealt with all the main objections in their reply, it may be appropriate to draw the deficiencies to their attention, e.g. by telephone. But if no positive reaction is to be expected, the examiner should consider recommending to the other members of the examining division that the application be refused immediately (again provided that at least one communication has been sent in examination proceedings).

If substantial differences of opinion exist, the issues are generally best dealt with in writing. If, however, there seems to be confusion about points in dispute, e.g. the applicant seems to have misunderstood the examiner's arguments or the applicant's own arguments are unclear, then a

consultation may be useful. A consultation may also expedite the procedure if the matters to be resolved are minor. Consultations do not constitute oral proceedings (see E-III) and are more fully considered in C-VII, 2.

3.1 Further action where a request for a translation of the priority application was sent earlier in examination proceedings

In cases where an invitation under Rule 53(3) to file a translation of one or more priority applications was sent earlier in examination proceedings (either separately or at the same time as an Art. 94(3) communication – see A-III, 6.8.2), a subsequent communication (under Art. 94(3) or Rule 71(3) or a summons to oral proceedings) cannot be sent until the translation is filed or the period for further processing has expired (see also C-VIII, 5.1). This also applies in cases where the Rule 53(3) invitation was sent at the same time as a previous Art. 94(3) communication and the applicant has already replied to that communication (e.g. by filing amendments) but not yet provided the translation and the original time limit or the period for further processing is still running.

Rule 53(3)

4. Later stages of examination

The considerations explained in C-IV, 3 also apply to later stages of examination given that, having regard to the principle stated in C-IV, 3, the greater the number of actions performed, the more likely it is that the most appropriate course of action is to refer the application to the other members of the examining division for a decision. Where this decision is to refuse the application, particular care should be taken to ensure that the decision does not offend against Art. 113(1).

5. Examination of amendments

Amendments must satisfy the conditions listed in C-III, 2. When they were effected must also be established. If amended application documents do not comply with the requirements of items (i) to (iii), the applicant will be invited to remedy any deficiencies within a period specified in E-VIII, 1.2, by issuing a communication under Art. 94(3).

For any deficiencies under item (iv), the period is two months. If any deficiencies are not remedied in due time, the application is either deemed withdrawn or refused, depending on the case. If there is still a pending request for oral proceedings in the file, the applicant has to be summoned (again) to oral proceedings before the application is refused.

This procedure also applies to amendments filed in reply to a communication under Rule 71(3).

6. Admissibility of amendments made by the applicant

For matters relating to the admissibility of amendments made in examination proceedings, see H-II, 2.

Rule 137(2) and (3)

7. Search-related issues in examination

7.1 Search for conflicting European patent applications

The examiner should make a search for any additional conflicting European patent applications falling within the area defined by [Art. 54\(3\)](#) unless this was already covered by the search report.

This is because, in general, the search files will not be complete in respect of such material at the time of the main search. Since priority dates claimed (if any) may not be accorded to all or part of the application but may be accorded to the appropriate part of a conflicting application (see [F-VI.2.1](#)), this search should be extended to cover all European patent applications published up to eighteen months after the filing of the application under consideration.

If the examiner is unable to complete this top-up search when preparing the search opinion or the first communication under [Art. 94\(3\)](#), they should ensure that it is completed before the application is reported to be in order for the grant of a patent. In the rare cases where the application is found to be in order before this search can be completed (e.g. due to a request for accelerated prosecution of an application not claiming priority, "PACE", see the notice from the EPO dated 16 December 2025, [OJ EPO 2025, A69](#)), the grant of a patent should be postponed until the top-up search can be completed.

If the top-up search is performed at the earliest 18 months from the date of filing of the application under examination, the priority situation needs to be checked only if intermediate documents and/or conflicting applications are retrieved.

The top-up search may exceptionally be performed at the earliest 18 months after the priority date on condition that the priority claim is valid for the whole content of the patent application under examination.

In addition to retrieving [Art. 54\(3\)](#) documents not available at the time of the original search, the top-up search takes into consideration potentially relevant prior art cited by other patent offices on applications belonging to the same patent family as the application under examination at the EPO and therefore needs to be performed for any file at the start and end of examination.

The examiner may retrieve relevant intermediate and/or conflicting Euro-PCT applications for which it is not yet clear if they will become prior art under [Art. 54\(3\)](#) alone or in conjunction with [Rule 165](#) (see [G-IV.5.2](#)). In these cases, the examining division cannot issue an intention to grant before it can be established if these documents are prior art under [Art. 54\(3\)](#). The examiner will first check if the Euro-PCT application has entered the European phase at 31 months after the earliest priority date of the application. If not, it may still constitute conflicting prior art under [Art. 54\(3\)](#) if the PCT applicant has paid the required filing fee under [Rule 159\(1\)\(c\)](#) and has supplied the PCT application in any official EPO language. The examiner will then verify if the application has become prior

art under Art. 54(3) in conjunction with Rule 165. Since August 2021, the EPO publishes these cases in section I.2(2) of the European Patent Bulletin under the heading "International applications considered as comprised in the state of the art under Rule 165 and Art. 54(3) EPC".

For the refund of examination fees (see A-VI, 2.5), the launch of a top-up search is triggered at the start of examination. This creates a marker that serves as evidence in the file that the examining division has started its substantive work.

7.2 National prior rights

In view of the importance of national prior rights (see B-VI, 4.2) for applicants in proceedings before the Unified Patent Court, the examiner expands the top-up search scope at the grant stage (see C-IV, 7.1) to include national applications and patents of all contracting states in so far as they are present in the EPO's databases.

The division informs the applicant about the outcome of the top-up search for national prior rights. Those that appear *prima facie* relevant for the application are communicated to the applicant.

7.3 Additional searches during examination

An additional search will sometimes be required either at the first stage of amendment or subsequently. This may arise for a number of reasons.

An additional search may be necessary:

- (i) where a partial search report – or a declaration that a meaningful search was not possible – has been issued at the search stage after an invitation under Rule 63(1) (see B-VIII, 3, B-VIII, 3.1 and B-VIII, 3.2) and the deficiencies rendering a meaningful search impossible under Rule 63 have been subsequently corrected by amendment complying with Rule 137(5) (see H-IV, 4.1.1) or successfully refuted by the applicant
- (ii) where the applicant successfully argues that a plurality of independent claims in the same category, which led to a limitation of the search report in accordance with Rule 62a (see B-VIII, 4.1 and 4.2), is in fact allowable according to the exceptions provided for in Rule 43(2) (see F-IV, 3.2)
- (iii) where a particular part of the application has not been searched because of an objection of lack of unity of invention and the arguments advanced by the applicant have convinced the examining division that unity is given
- (iv) where the claims have been so amended that their scope is no longer covered by the original search
- (v) where a search report under Rule 61 was issued containing no prior-art documents because the technical features were considered

notorious (see [B-VIII, 2.2.1](#)) and the examining division does not share this opinion

- (vi) where no prior-art document was cited for features that were considered part of the common general knowledge and the examining division does not share this opinion or the common general knowledge is challenged by the applicant (see [G-VII, 2](#) and [3.1](#))
- (vii) exceptionally, where the applicant states that a mistake was made in the acknowledgement of prior art (see [G-VII, 5.1](#)) or the examiner believes that material relevant to obviousness might be found in technical fields not taken into account during the search
- (viii) where the applicant has introduced a new priority claim after the date of filing (see [C-III, 6](#)).

[Art. 153\(6\) and \(7\)](#)

If the application was filed under the PCT, the search report will be the international search report issued under the PCT and will be accompanied by a supplementary European search report unless the Administrative Council decides that that is to be dispensed with (see [A-XIV, 1.1](#)). Both of these reports will have to be considered by the examiner when deciding whether any additional search is required.

In the case of a Euro-PCT application for which the EPO acting as ISA or SISA issued an incomplete search report or a declaration of no search (see [PCT-EPO Guidelines, B-VIII, 1](#)), an additional search may be necessary if the deficiencies underlying the limitation of the search have been corrected by amendment or successfully refuted by the applicant (see [B-II, 4.2\(ii\)](#)). Otherwise, the examining division will object to claims relating to subject-matter not searched by the EPO acting as ISA, referring to the EPC provision invoked for the limitation of the search, e.g. [Art. 84, Rule 137\(5\)](#), second sentence, cannot be invoked in that context.

For searches under [Rule 164\(2\)](#), see [C-III, 3.1](#).

7.4 Search at the examination stage

Although all search work (other than for [Art. 54\(3\)](#) material) should as a rule be done at the search stage, in exceptional circumstances examiners are not barred from looking for a relevant document whose existence they know of or have reason to suspect, provided they can retrieve that document in a short time.

7.5 Citing documents not mentioned in the search report

A copy of any document cited by the examiner but not mentioned in the search report, for example one found in a search under [C-IV, 7.1](#), [7.2](#) or [7.3](#), is made available to the applicant. MyEPO users receive all cited documents electronically in their Mailbox. Applicants not having opted for electronic notification via Mailbox receive paper copies of non-patent literature and translations of cited patent literature by post. Digital copies of cited patent literature documents are accessible in Espacenet (worldwide.espacenet.com/).

8. New submissions in reply to a summons

New requests filed in reply to a summons to oral proceedings will normally be discussed at the oral proceedings. As a rule, there is no provision for detailed discussion before the oral proceedings.

However, informal consultation to discuss the new requests may be allowed by the first member (see C-VII, 2), in particular if there is a reasonable prospect that the consultation could lead to an agreed allowable claim set.

The examining division strives to review newly filed requests in good time before oral proceedings so the proceedings can be cancelled if necessary, in particular where a newly filed main request is considered patentable.

For cases where the newly filed main request is not considered patentable but one of the auxiliary requests is, see E-IX, 2.9.

Chapter V – The final stage of examination

1. Communication under Rule 71(3)

1.1 Text for approval

Once the examining division decides that a patent can be granted, it must inform the applicant of the text it intends to use for the grant. This text may include amendments and corrections that the examining division made on its own initiative and can reasonably expect the applicant to accept. If in doubt as to whether the applicant will agree to the proposed amendments, the examining division should contact them by telephone or via an official communication. The applicant's agreement to such amendments during a consultation will usually be recorded in the communication under Rule 71(3) (see C-VII, 2.4). Rule 71(3)

Examples of amendments not requiring consultation with the applicant:

- (a) amendment of a statement of invention in the description to bring it into conformity with the claims
- (b) deletion of vague general statements in the description (see F-IV, 4.4) or of obviously irrelevant matter (see F-II, 7.4)
- (c) insertion of values in SI units (see F-II, 4.13)
- (d) insertion of reference numerals in claims unless the applicant is known to object to this or has previously objected to this
- (e) introduction of a summary of background art that clearly represents the prior art closest to the invention (see F-II, 4.3)
- (f) amendments that, despite changing the meaning or scope of an independent claim, are very clearly necessary and so assumed acceptable to the applicant (see for example G-VI, 6.1.2, G-VI, 6.1.3 and G-VI, 6.1.4)
- (g) correction of linguistic and other minor errors
- (h) reformulation of method-of-treatment claims into an allowable format (see G-II, 4.2).
- (i) deletion of redundant claims (e.g. claims that the applicant has not deleted despite having incorporated their features into other claims) and omnibus claims (see B-III, 3.2.1).

Examples of amendments that may not be proposed without consulting the applicant:

- (i) amendments that significantly change the meaning or scope of a claim when there are several different ways to amend it and the examiner cannot predict which amendment the applicant will agree to

- (ii) deletion of entire claims, with the exception of redundant claims and omnibus claims, as discussed above in point (i)
- (iii) combining of claims to overcome a novelty or inventive step objection.

The above list is designed to avoid changes likely to be rejected by the applicant and thus to help avoid delays in the conclusion of examination proceedings. For the standard marks used by the division to indicate amendments and corrections using the in-house electronic tool, see C-V, Annex.

The text is communicated to the applicant via a Rule 71(3) communication, which includes an invitation to pay the fee for grant and publishing (see C-V, 1.2) and to file a translation of the claims in the two official EPO languages other than the language of the proceedings (see C-V, 1.3) within a non-extendable period of four months. If the applicant pays the fees and files the translations in time (and files or requests no corrections or amendments to the text proposed in the Rule 71(3) communication, see C-V, 4.1), they will be deemed to have approved the text intended for grant (Rule 71(5)).

If, during examination proceedings, a main request and auxiliary requests have been filed (see C-IV, 1 and E-IX, 2.9) and one of the requests is allowable, the communication pursuant to Rule 71(3) is to be issued on the basis of the (first) allowable request unless there is a higher ranking request for oral proceedings (see E-IX, 2.2). The communication pursuant to Rule 71(3) must briefly indicate the essential reasons for the non-allowability of the subject-matter of the higher-ranking requests or their inadmissibility (see also H-III, 3). The examining division should provide sufficient information about the objections raised to enable the applicant to comment on them.

Handwritten amendments by the applicant to the description, claims and abstract, unless they involve graphic symbols and characters and chemical or mathematical formulae, are no longer accepted in strict compliance with Rule 50(1) in conjunction with Rule 49(2) (Art. 2(7) of the decision of the President of the EPO dated 31 July 2025, OJ EPO 2025, A49) (see OJ EPO 2013, 603, and A-III, 3.2). For the procedure to follow in oral proceedings, see E-III, 8.7.

1.2 Grant and publishing fee

The communication under Rule 71(3) also invites the applicant to pay the fee for grant and publishing within a non-extendable four-month period. For European patent applications filed before 1 April 2009 and international applications entering the regional phase before that date, the fee for grant and printing may include an element depending on the number of pages, but for applications filed or entering the regional phase on or after that date, this additional element is payable as part of the filing fee (see A-III, 13.2).

1.3 Translations of the claims

The communication under Rule 71(3) also invites the applicant to file a translation of the claims in the two official EPO languages other than the language of the proceedings within a non-extendable four-month period.

If the application contains different sets of claims for particular contracting states (see H-III, 4), a translation of all the sets of claims must be filed.

Only one copy of the translation needs to be filed.

Examiners should not concern themselves with the quality of the translation filed.

The translation should meet the requirements pursuant to Rule 50(1).

Rule 50(1)

1.4 Claims fees due in response to Rule 71(3) communication

If the text of the European patent application serving as the basis for grant contains more than fifteen claims, the examining division requests the applicant to pay, within the period under Rule 71(3), claims fees in respect of each claim in excess of that number unless they have already done so under Rule 45(1) or Rule 162(1) and (2) (see A-III, 9). Where there is more than one set of claims, fees are incurred under Rule 45(1), Rule 162(1) and (2), or Rule 71(4) only for the set with the highest number of claims.

Rule 71(4)

Rule 45(1)

Rule 162(1) and (2)

If the text on which the Rule 71(3) communication is based contains fewer claims than the set in respect of which claims fees were paid on filing under Rule 45 or on entry into the European phase under Rule 162, no refund of claims fees will be made.

Where the communication under Rule 71(3) is based on an auxiliary request, the number of claims in the request determines the claims fees due in response to the communication. However, if the applicant replies by requesting a grant based on a higher-ranking request, no claims fees need to be paid in response to the communication (see C-V, 4.1).

1.5 Other information in the communication under Rule 71(3)

An annex to the Rule 71(3) communication indicates the contracting states validly designated as well as the extension and validation states for which the corresponding fees have been paid, the title of the invention in the three official languages, the international patent classification, the application's date of filing, any priorities claimed, the designated inventors and the applicant's registered name.

The Rule 71(3) communication also states that, where a renewal fee falls due between the communication's notification and the proposed date of the mention of the grant's publication, publication will be effected only after the renewal fee and any additional fee have been paid (see C-V, 2).

Where the examining division changes its opinion after an earlier negative communication, it will communicate its reasons for this unless they are clear from the applicant's reply, from a communication or from the minutes of a consultation.

During the grant procedure an applicant may submit further technical information, for example:

- comparative tests
- further examples
- statements concerning the effects and/or advantages of the invention.

Technical information extending beyond the content of the application as filed, however, cannot be included in the application by way of amendment (Art. 123(2), H-IV and H-V). Such information is added to the file, which is open to inspection (Art. 128(4)), and its existence is indicated on the cover page of the patent specification.

All further documents that were neither cited in the application as filed nor mentioned in the search report but that were cited during the examination procedure are to be indicated, even if they have not been used in an objection concerning novelty or inventive step. This also applies to documents cited to show, for instance, a technical prejudice.

2. Approval of the proposed text – grant of a patent

Rule 71(5)
Art. 97(1)

If an applicant pays the fee for grant and publishing along with any claims fees due under Rule 71(4) and files the translation of the claims within the specified period (and files or requests no corrections or amendments to the text proposed for grant in the Rule 71(3) communication, see C-V. 4.1), they are deemed to have approved the text intended for grant.

The above also applies where the Rule 71(3) communication was based on an auxiliary request, provided that the applicant does not reply to the Rule 71(3) communication by requesting that a grant be based on a higher-ranking request. This means that, in the absence of any indication to the contrary, the above acts imply approval of the auxiliary request text upon which the Rule 71(3) communication was based as well as the abandonment of all higher-ranking requests.

The above also applies where the Rule 71(3) communication included the examining division's proposals for amendments or corrections to the text intended for grant (see C-V. 1.1). Consequently, provided the applicant does not reject these proposals in their reply, completion of the above acts constitutes approval of the text amended or corrected by the examining division.

Rule 71a(1)

Once all the requirements set out in C-V. 1.1 to 1.4, are met, the decision to grant the European patent is issued, provided that renewal fees and any additional fees already due have been paid.

Rule 71a(4)
Art. 86(1)

If a renewal fee falls due after the Rule 71(3) communication's notification but before the next possible date for publication of the mention of the European patent's grant, the decision to grant is not issued and the mention of the grant is not published until the renewal fee has been paid. The

applicant is informed accordingly. If the renewal fee or any additional fee is not paid in time, the application is deemed withdrawn (see A-X, 5.2.4).

In rare cases where examination was accelerated to such an extent that the Rule 71(3) communication is issued before the designation fee falls due, the decision to grant will not be issued and the mention of the grant will not be published until the designation fee has been paid. The applicant is informed accordingly. For European patent applications filed before 1 April 2009 or international applications entering the regional phase before that date, publication will not take place until the designation fees have been paid and the designation of states for which no designation fees have been paid has been withdrawn (see also A-III, 11.1 and 11.3). *Rule 71a(3)*

The decision to grant does not take effect until the date on which the grant is mentioned in the European Patent Bulletin. *Art. 97(3)*

2.1 Request for unitary effect

Requests for unitary effect must be filed with the EPO no later than one month after the mention of the European patent's grant is published in the European Patent Bulletin (Rule 6 of the Rules relating to Unitary Patent Protection). To offer flexibility, users can file requests after the decision to grant the European patent is issued (EPO Form 2006A), see Supplementary publication 3, OJ EPO 2023. Requests for unitary effect filed early will not be processed by the EPO before the date on which the mention of the European patent's grant is published in the European Patent Bulletin and will appear in the Register for unitary patent protection only from that date.

3. No reply in time – application deemed withdrawn

If the applicant fails to pay the fee for grant and publishing or the claims fees or to file the translation within the period under Rule 71(3), the application is deemed withdrawn unless, within the same period, the applicant files or requests corrections or amendments to the text proposed for grant in the Rule 71(3) communication (see C-V, 4.1). *Rule 71(7)*

If the applicant fails to meet the time limit under Rule 71(3), further processing may be requested under Art. 121 (see E-VIII, 2). In such a case, the omitted act to be completed would be either: *Art. 121*

- (i) all of the following acts referred to in Rule 71(3) and Rule 71(4):
 - (a) payment of the fee for grant and publishing
 - (b) payment of any claims fees due
 - (c) filing of the translations of the claims; or
- (ii) one or more of the following acts:
 - (a) filing amendments and/or corrections to the application documents

- (b) rejecting amendments proposed by the examining division in the Rule 71(3) communication
- (c) requesting the grant to be based on a higher-ranking request than the auxiliary request on which the Rule 71(3) communication was based.

4. Request for amendments or corrections in reply to the Rule 71(3) communication

Rule 71(6)

If the applicant, within the period under Rule 71(3), requests reasoned amendments or corrections to the communicated text (see C-V. 4.3 for the reasoning required), the examining division will issue a new Rule 71(3) communication if it gives its consent (i.e. if it finds the amendments admissible and allowable; see C-V. 4.6); otherwise it will resume the examination proceedings (see C-V. 4.7). This also applies in the following cases:

- if the applicant requests the reversal of amendments proposed by the examining division in the Rule 71(3) communication (see C-V. 4.6.1)
- if the Rule 71(3) communication was based on an auxiliary request and the applicant replies by requesting that a grant be based on a higher-ranking request (see C-V. 4.6.2 and 4.7.1.1)
- if the Rule 71(3) communication was based on wrong application documents and the applicant points this out in the reply.

In this and sections C-V. 4.1 to 4.10, unless otherwise stated, the terms "amendments" and "corrections" refer only to amendments or corrections of the application documents and not of other documents (e.g. bibliographic data, the designation of the inventor, the title or its translations, etc.).

4.1 No payment of fees or filing of translations necessary

In the case referred to in C-V. 4, the applicant will not be required to pay the fee for grant and publishing or any claims fees in reply to the first Rule 71(3) communication, nor will they be required to file any translations of the claims within the relevant period. This applies irrespective of whether the examining division subsequently finds these amendments or corrections to be admissible and allowable and whether the amendments or corrections are reasoned (see C-V. 4.3).

This also applies if the applicant requests the reversal of amendments proposed by the examining division in the Rule 71(3) communication (see C-V. 1.1). And it applies if the Rule 71(3) communication was based on an auxiliary request and the applicant replies by requesting that a grant be based on a higher-ranking request.

4.2 Crediting of fees paid voluntarily

Although the applicant is not required to pay fees in response to the Rule 71(3) communication when requesting amendments or corrections in their reply (see C-V. 4.1), they can do so voluntarily. In that case, the amount of the fees paid will be credited to the payment of the same fees in

response to a subsequent Rule 71(3) communication (issued either directly or after resumption of examination – see C-V, 4.6 and 4.7.2 respectively).

This crediting will be dealt with according to the procedures explained in A-X, 11. This is subject to the following: if the amount of the claims fees due in response to the second Rule 71(3) communication is less than the amount voluntarily paid in response to the first Rule 71(3) communication, a refund will be made of the excess paid since the higher claims fees were not due when paid in response to the first Rule 71(3) communication.

If, after such voluntary payment, the application is withdrawn, deemed withdrawn or refused, a refund of the voluntarily paid fee for grant and publishing will be possible under the conditions explained in A-X, 10.2.5. Furthermore, since the claims fees were paid when they were not due, they will also be refunded under the same conditions.

4.3 Amendments or corrections should be reasoned

The reasoning accompanying amendments or corrections filed in response to the Rule 71(3) communication should indicate respectively:

- why the applicant considers that the amended application documents comply with the EPC, in particular the patentability requirements, Art. 123(2) and Art. 84
- why the applicant considers that the errors and their proposed corrections are evident according to Rule 139.

If, within the period under Rule 71(3), the applicant files amendments or corrections that are **not** reasoned, no payment of the fee for grant and publishing or claims fees is necessary, nor is the filing of translations (see C-V, 4.1). However, the absence of any reasoning means that such amendments or corrections are more likely to result in a resumption of the examination procedure (see C-V, 4.7).

4.4 Admissibility of amendments

The criteria for assessing the admissibility of amendments are dealt with in detail in H-II, 2.5 and subsections. Rule 137(3)

By way of exception, in cases where the Rule 71(3) communication was also the first communication in examination proceedings, amendments filed in response **must** be admitted into the proceedings under Rule 137 in cases (i) to (iii) mentioned in H-II, 2.2. However, where a **further** Rule 71(3) communication is sent in respect of such cases (see C-V, 4.6 and 4.7.2), any amendments filed in response must be consented to by the examining division according to Rule 137(3) (see H-II, 2.5).

4.5 Adaptation of the description

If the amendments or corrections filed by the applicant in the Rule 71(3) period concern the claims, the applicant should consider the need to adapt the description. To avoid potential delays in cases where adaptation is necessary, the applicant should provide an adapted description when filing amended claims in the Rule 71(3) period.

If no such adapted description is filed, the examining division may adapt the description by itself and propose these amendments in the second Rule 71(3) communication (see C-V, 4.6.3). Alternatively, it may resume examination (see C-V, 4.7) and send the applicant a communication under Art. 94(3) requesting the adapted description before issuing a second Rule 71(3) communication (see C-V, 4.7.2).

4.6 Amendments/corrections admitted and allowable – second Rule 71(3) communication sent

Rule 71(6)

If the amendments and/or corrections filed within the period under Rule 71(3) are admitted under Rule 137(3) and also comply with the EPC, the examining division will send a second communication under Rule 71(3) based on them.

4.6.1 Second Rule 71(3) communication reversing the amendments proposed by the examining division in first Rule 71(3) communication

A second communication under Rule 71(3) is also sent if the applicant requests reversal of amendments proposed by the examining division in the first Rule 71(3) communication and the examining division overturns its previous opinion, finding that the amendments proposed earlier were not necessary, possibly as a consequence of arguments or evidence provided by the applicant in their reply to the first Rule 71(3) communication (in the absence of such convincing arguments or evidence, examination will normally be resumed; see C-V, 4.7).

4.6.2 Second Rule 71(3) communication based on higher-ranking request initially rejected in first Rule 71(3) communication

In cases where the first Rule 71(3) communication was based on an auxiliary request (see H-III, 3, in particular H-III, 3.1 and 3.3 and subsections), the first communication under Rule 71(3) would have been accompanied by an indication of why the examining division did not consider the higher-ranking requests admissible or allowable (see C-V, 1.1). If the applicant replies to this first Rule 71(3) communication indicating their wish to base a grant on one of those higher-ranking requests (see C-V, 1.1), that reply will normally lead to examination being resumed (see C-V, 4.7 and 4.7.1.1). The examining division may reverse its opinion, for example due to convincing arguments or evidence filed by the applicant with their reply to the first Rule 71(3) communication. If the applicant is successful in this regard, the examining division will send a second communication under Rule 71(3) based on the higher-ranking request.

4.6.3 Examining division proposes amendments in second Rule 71(3) communication

As with the first Rule 71(3) communication, the examining division may propose amendments to the applicant's latest request forming the basis for the second Rule 71(3) communication (this request includes amendments or corrections filed in response to the first Rule 71(3) communication). The types of amendment that may or may not be proposed by the examining division in the second Rule 71(3) communication are the same as those mentioned in C-V, 1.1. However, in the second Rule 71(3) communication, the examining division cannot repropose amendments already rejected by

the applicant. Where the examining division considers that such an amendment is necessary to overcome an objection, it should consider resuming examination (see C-V, 4.7).

4.7 Amendments not admitted and/or not allowable, examination resumed

The examining division may resume the examination proceedings at any time up to the decision to grant the European patent. Rule 71a(2)

4.7.1 Communications/oral proceedings/refusal after resumption

If the examining division finds the amendments submitted by the applicant in reply to the Rule 71(3) communication either inadmissible or not allowable, it will resume the examination proceedings. Art. 94(3)
Rule 71(1) and (2)

The next action may be a communication under Art. 94(3) or a consultation with the applicant (see C-VII, 2). The examining division may also issue a summons to oral proceedings or the application may be refused directly if the following criteria are satisfied: Art. 97(2)

- (a) the grounds leading to the finding that the requests filed in response to the Rule 71(3) communication are inadmissible or not allowable have already been formally dealt with in examination proceedings (Art. 113(1)), for example in a communication under Art. 94(3) and Rule 71(1) and Rule 71(2) (see C-III, 4, E-IX, 1.1); and
- (b) the applicant's right to oral proceedings on request has been respected (Art. 116(1)).

If one of the following situations applies, the examining division will have to arrange for the holding of oral proceedings before issuing a decision to refuse (see C-V, 4.7.3): Art. 116(1)

- (i) oral proceedings have been requested but have not yet been held
- (ii) oral proceedings have been held, but:
 - the subject of the proceedings has changed such that a right to subsequent oral proceedings arises under Art. 116(1) (e.g. as a result of the amendments filed in response to the Rule 71(3) communication) and
 - the applicant has requested subsequent oral proceedings.

Requests for oral proceedings must be allowed as long as proceedings before the EPO are still pending, i.e. until the decision to grant has been handed over to the internal post (see G 12/91 and T 556/95, especially reasons for the decision 4.4).

4.7.1.1 Higher-ranking request not admissible and/or not allowable

If the applicant replies to the Rule 71(3) communication by requesting that a grant be based on a higher-ranking request but the examining division is not convinced by the arguments and evidence filed with their reply, the

examining division resumes examination following the procedure in C-V, 4.7.1. The examining division may also directly refuse the application providing a full reasoning under the proviso that:

- the short indication of the essential reasons given in the Rule 71(3) communication for the non-allowability of the subject-matter of the higher-ranking requests or the inadmissibility of these requests (see C-V, 1.1 and C-V, 4.6.2) provides sufficient information about the objections raised by the examining division to enable the applicant to comment on them (such that the applicant is not taken by surprise, in particular where amendments or corrections have been filed together with their disagreement; see C-V, 4.7.1) and
- the applicant's right to oral proceedings on request has been respected (Art. 116(1)) (see also H-III, 3.3.2).

For the purposes of determining whether the reasons not to grant the higher-ranking requests given in the Rule 71(3) communication allow the division to issue a refusal, a general indication such as "Auxiliary request 3 is not clear because an essential feature is missing" is not sufficient. Rather, a more detailed statement is needed to ensure that the applicant's right to be heard is properly respected. For example, the division may provide the applicant with an explanation such as: "Auxiliary request 3 is not inventive in view of D1 (see col. 5, lines 25-46; fig. 4) because the skilled person, wishing to avoid friction between the cable and the carpet, would make the clip recess deeper than the cable diameter".

4.7.2 Agreement reached on a text - second Rule 71(3) communication

Rule 71(6)

If the resumption of examination described in C-V, 4.7.1 results in an allowable and admissible text being filed or in the applicant convincing the examining division that the text already filed in response to the Rule 71(3) communication is in fact admissible and allowable, a second Rule 71(3) communication is sent based on this agreed text. Such cases are dealt with in the same way as described in C-V, 4.6.

4.7.3 No agreement reached on a text - refusal

Art. 97(2)

If no agreement can be reached on a text after examination is resumed, the application is refused (see C-V, 14). For details on conducting resumed examination proceedings before issuing such a decision, see C-V, 4.7.1.

4.8 Fees to be paid within the second Rule 71(3) period

Where the applicant files amendments or corrections in response to the first communication under Rule 71(3), they do not have to pay either the fee for grant and publishing or the claims fees (see C-V, 4.1). A second Rule 71(3) communication may then be issued either immediately (where the amended/corrected text is allowable, see C-V, 4.6) or after examination is resumed and an allowable text is agreed on (see C-V, 4.7.2).

4.8.1 Claims fees

For the text on which the second Rule 71(3) communication is based to be deemed approved according to Rule 71(5), the applicant must pay any

claims fees due in response to the communication, thus also avoiding deemed withdrawal of the application under Rule 71(7). For the calculation of claims fees due at this stage, see C-V, 1.4.

Since no claims fees would normally have been paid in response to the first Rule 71(3) communication, the number of claims in the text on which this first communication was based plays no role in calculating the amount of the claims fees due in response to the second Rule 71(3) communication. However, in cases where the applicant paid the claims fees voluntarily in response to the first Rule 71(3) communication, the amount paid is credited according to Rule 71a(5) (see C-V, 4.2 and A-X, 11.2).

4.8.2 Fee for grant and publishing

For the text on which the second Rule 71(3) communication is based to be deemed approved according to Rule 71(5), the applicant must pay the fee for grant and publishing in response to the communication, thus also avoiding deemed withdrawal of the application under Rule 71(7).

For European patent applications filed before 1 April 2009 or international applications entering the European phase before that date, the fee for grant and publishing incorporates a fee for each page of the application in excess of 35 (see C-V, 1.2 and A-III, 13.2). If the number of pages of such an application changes between the first and second Rule 71(3) communication, it is the number of pages on which the second Rule 71(3) communication is based that is used to calculate the fee amount. Where the applicant paid the fee voluntarily in response to the first Rule 71(3) communication, the amount paid will be credited according to Rule 71a(5) (see C-V, 4.2 and A-X, 11.1).

Art. 2(2), No 7.2
RFees

4.9 Reply explicitly disapproving with the proposed text without indicating an alternative text

If the applicant replies to the communication under Rule 71(3) by simply disapproving with the text proposed for grant, not indicating an alternative and not paying any fees or filing the translations of the claims, the following will apply:

- (1) If the text proposed for grant was based on the main request submitted by the applicant (without any amendments or corrections proposed by the examining division), the application will be refused, provided that the criteria in C-V, 4.7.1 are met. The basis for the refusal in this case is the absence of an application text agreed to by the applicant (Art. 113(2)).
- (2) If amendments or corrections were proposed by the division in the Rule 71(3) communication, the applicant's disagreement is interpreted as a rejection of the proposal and the procedure continues as described in C-V, 4.6.1.
- (3) If the communication under Rule 71(3) was based on an auxiliary request, the applicant's disagreement is interpreted as a request to base the grant on a higher-ranking request. The procedure continues as described in C-V, 4.6.2 and 4.7.1.1. If it is not clear which higher-

ranking request the applicant wishes to pursue, the examining division must request clarification of this in resumed examination proceedings.

If the applicant first files only their disagreement with the text and then (still within the Rule 71(3) period) a request for amendment or correction, this is interpreted as a desire to proceed with the application as amended or corrected. The procedure in C-V, 4 applies.

4.10 Amendments/corrections filed in second Rule 71(3) period

In cases where a second Rule 71(3) communication is sent (see C-V, 4.6 and 4.7.2) and the applicant replies within the second Rule 71(3) period by doing one or more of the following, the procedures explained in C-V, 4.1 to 4.9 apply *mutatis mutandis*:

- (i) filing further amendments or corrections
- (ii) rejecting amendments proposed by the examining division in the second Rule 71(3) communication
- (iii) reverting to a higher-ranking request (where the second Rule 71(3) communication is based on an auxiliary request).

In particular, in such cases the applicant will be required neither to pay the fee for grant and publishing or any claims fees, nor to file translations of the claims within this second period under Rule 71(3). If the examining division agrees to a text (either with or without resumption of examination), a third communication under Rule 71(3) is then sent.

Furthermore, if the applicant replies to the second Rule 71(3) communication by rejecting amendments proposed by the examining division in the first Rule 71(3) communication (where these have not been superseded), the procedures described in C-V, 4.1 to 4.9 likewise apply *mutatis mutandis* (no need to pay fees or file translations, etc.).

In respect of repeated requests for amendments in response to the second or subsequent Rule 71(3) communication, the division may exercise its discretion under Rule 137(3) not to admit such amendments (H-II, 2.5.1). If the division intends not to admit the amendments, it will resume the examination proceedings, e.g. by summoning the applicant to oral proceedings. For this purpose, the procedure outlined below may be followed:

A summons to oral proceedings is sent with at least two months' notice. The communication annexed to the summons specifies the following:

- the amendments are not admitted under Rule 137(3) for the reasons explained in H-II, 2.5.1
- if new amendments are filed, it is the intention of the division to use its discretion not to admit them under Rule 137(3) unless the amendments fulfil the criteria defined in H-II, 2.5.1.

Unless the applicant switches back to the set of claims originally proposed for grant or convinces the division that any new set of claims fulfils the criteria defined in H-II, 2.5.1, the application will be refused at the oral proceedings due to the lack of an agreed text (Art. 113(2)). Otherwise, the oral proceedings are concluded by announcing that a new Rule 71(3) communication will be issued.

If the applicant again files amended application documents in response to the new Rule 71(3) communication, and if these new amendments were already dealt with and considered inadmissible at the oral proceedings (i.e. if the subject of the oral proceedings has not changed), the application can be refused immediately (C-V, 4.7.1).

5. Further requests for amendment after approval

The criteria for assessing the admissibility of such amendments are dealt with in detail in H-II, 2.6. The procedure for dealing with such late-filed amendments is explained in C-V, 6.

Rule 137(3)

6. The examining division resumes examination after approval of the text

6.1 When does the examining division resume examination after approval?

Following the applicant's approval in response to the Rule 71(3) communication (see C-V, 2), the examining division may resume the examination procedure at any time up to the moment the decision to grant is handed over to the EPO's internal postal service for transmittal to the applicant (see G 12/91). This will seldom occur, but may be necessary if:

Rule 71a(2)

- the applicant files further prior art necessitating further substantive examination
- the examining division becomes aware of very relevant prior art following observations by third parties under Art. 115
- the applicant files amendments or corrections (having already approved the text)
- the examining division becomes aware in some other way of circumstances that cause the subject-matter claimed to fail to comply with the EPC.

The resumption of examination after approval is subject to the same considerations as resumption due to amendments filed in the Rule 71(3) period (see C-V, 4.7.1). The next action issued after resumption of examination must however indicate that the proceedings have been resumed as well as the substantive reasons that led to the resumption. In particular, the applicant's right to comment (Art. 113(1)), the right to at least one communication under Art. 94(3) and Rule 71(1) and (2) in examination proceedings (see C-III, 4) and the right to oral proceedings on request (Art. 116(1)) must be respected.

Rule 137(3)

The criteria applied in assessing the admissibility of amendments or corrections filed by the applicant after approval are dealt with in H-II, 2.6.

6.2 A further communication under Rule 71(3)Rule 71(6)

A second Rule 71(3) communication is issued if the resumed examination results in a text on the basis of which a patent can be granted (substantive amendments directed to resolving the issues which gave rise to the resumption of examination are possible).

If the translations of the claims have already been filed (see C-V, 1.3) and the fees paid (see C-V, 1.2 and 1.4) in reply to a previous Rule 71(3) communication, e.g. in the case of resumption of examination after approval (see C-V, 6 and Rule 71(6)), the applicant must express agreement as to the text to be granted (Rule 71a(1)) within the non-extendable four-month period mentioned in the further Rule 71(3) communication (e.g. by approving the text and verifying the bibliographic data, by confirming that grant proceedings can continue based on the documents on file and/or by stating which translations of the claims already on file are to be used). This also applies if a further Rule 71(3) communication was sent.

6.3 Crediting of fees under Rule 71a(5)Rule 71a(5)

If, in response to an invitation under Rule 71(3), the applicant has already paid the fee for grant and publishing or the claims fees, the amount paid will be credited if a further such invitation is issued. For more details, see A-X, 11.

7. Correction of errors in the decision to grant

Under certain circumstances, a decision to grant a European patent may be corrected. For more details, see H-VI, 3.

8. Further processing

If the applicant fails to meet the time limit under Rule 71(3), further processing may be requested under Art. 121 (see E-VIII, 2). The procedure to follow is explained in C-V, 3.

9. Refund of the fee for grant and publishingRule 71a(6)

If the application is refused, withdrawn prior to notification of the decision on the grant of a European patent or, at that time, deemed withdrawn, the fee for grant and publishing will be refunded (for more details, see A-X, 10.2.5).

10. Publication of the patent specification

The decision to grant contains the date of the mention of the European patent's grant and is sent to the applicant when the technical preparations for printing the patent specification have been completed.

Art. 98Rule 73Art. 14(6)

As soon as possible after the mention of the grant is published in the Bulletin, the EPO publishes the patent specification containing the description, claims (in the three official languages) and any drawings. The front page of the published specification shows, in particular, the contracting states still designated at the time of grant (or whose designation

has been withdrawn after completion of the technical preparations for printing). Regarding the form in which the publication takes place, see the decision of the President of the EPO dated 12 July 2007, Special edition No. 3, OJ EPO 2007, D.3.

Mistakes in a European patent specification made during its production have no effect on the content of the patent granted. For this, only the text on which the decision to grant is based is decisive (see H-VI, 4). If necessary, the EPO may arrange for correction to be made public as soon as any mistake in a specification is discovered. This is done by means of a note in the European Patent Bulletin and publication of a corrigendum, the sole purpose being to bring the specification into line with the content of the decision to grant (see Rule 143(2) and the decision of the President of the EPO dated 15 July 2014, OJ EPO 2014, A86, Art. 1(2)).

11. Withdrawal before publication of the patent specification

The European patent specification is not published if the application is withdrawn before termination of the technical preparations for publication. If, after termination of the technical preparations, the application is withdrawn to avoid publication, non-publication cannot be guaranteed. The EPO will, however, try (in accordance with the principles of J 5/81) to prevent publication on a case-by-case basis if the stage reached in the publication procedure permits this reasonably easily. The application may be withdrawn by means of a signed declaration, which should be unqualified and unambiguous (see J 11/80). The applicant is bound by an effective declaration of withdrawal (see J 25/03, J 4/97 and J 10/87) (see also E-VIII, 8).

Rule 73

12. Certificate

As soon as the European patent specification has been published, the EPO issues the proprietor with a certificate attesting that the European patent has been granted to the person named on the certificate. Where there is more than one proprietor, each of them is issued with a certificate. Proprietors may request that a certified copy of the certificate with the specification attached be supplied to them upon payment of an administrative fee. For further details see the decision of the President of the EPO dated 17 December 2021, OJ EPO 2021, A94, and the notice from the EPO dated 17 December 2021, OJ EPO 2021, A95.

Rule 74

13. European Patent Bulletin

If no notice of opposition is recorded in the dossier of the European patent within nine months of publication of the mention of grant, the patent proprietor is informed and an appropriate entry is published in the European Patent Bulletin (Art. 1(1) of the decision of the President of the EPO dated 15 July 2014, OJ EPO 2014, A86). If it subsequently emerges that an opposition was filed in due time, the proprietor is again informed and a correction is published in the Bulletin.

Art. 129(a)

14. Refusal

A decision to refuse the application cannot be issued without a first communication in examination having been sent (see C-III, 4 and A-XIV, 6.1) or oral proceedings having been held (see C-III, 5).

Consequently, the examining division may not refuse the application directly after the reply to the search opinion under Rule 70a(1) or directly after the reply to the WO-ISA under Rule 161(1), even if the objections raised in the search opinion or WO-ISA remain the same and there is no pending request for oral proceedings. The examining division may also not refuse the application if the only communication issued is under Rule 137(4).

Art. 97(2)
Art. 113(1)
Rule 111
Art. 109
Art. 111(1) and
Art. 111(2)

If, despite the applicant's submissions, i.e. amendments or counter-arguments, objections persist after the applicant's reply to the first communication under Art. 94(3) in examination, then a refusal can be issued. If there is a pending request for oral proceedings, oral proceedings must be held and the decision to refuse will, where appropriate, be announced at the end of them. Similarly, if a summons was issued as the first action in examination, the decision to refuse will, where appropriate, be announced at the end of the oral proceedings.

If a refusal is envisaged, the first member should bring the application before the other members of the examining division, who may then decide to refuse the application. In any event, the first member will always consult the other members of the division at some stage to establish whether an application should be refused or a patent granted. If the division intends to refuse the application, a written reasoned decision is necessary and this will normally be prepared by the first member (see E-IX. 2.3 and E-IX. 2.6). In preparing the decision, the first member must take care to abide by the general principles set out in Art. 113(1), i.e. the decision must be based on grounds or evidence that the applicant has had the opportunity to comment on (see E-IX. 1.1 and E-IX. 1.2).

In addition, the applicant's attention must be directed to the provisions for appeal laid down in Art. 106 to Art. 108. If oral proceedings take place (see E-III), the decision may be given orally but must subsequently be notified in writing, the time limit for appeal then running from the date of such notification.

Art. 109

If the applicant appeals against the decision and the examining division considers, in the light of the applicant's statement, that the appeal is admissible and well-founded, it should rectify its decision accordingly within three months after receipt of the statement of grounds. Otherwise, the appeal will be considered by a board of appeal. If a decision to refuse a patent is reversed on appeal, the application may be referred back to the examining division for further examination. In such a case, the further examination will normally be entrusted to the examiner who performed the original examination. The examining division is bound by the reasoning of the board of appeal in so far as the facts are the same.

15. Decision according to the state of the file

A special case is where the applicant does not file comments or amendments in reply to the examiner's communication but requests a decision "according to the state of the file" or "on the file as it stands", meaning that the applicant wishes to close the debate and a decision is taken on the basis of the current status of the application and any

supporting arguments. The decision, which may be appealed, may only be based on grounds and evidence that the applicant has had an opportunity to comment on (Art. 113(1)).

15.1 The request for a decision according to the state of the file

An applicant may file a request for a decision according to the state of the file at any stage during examination proceedings, provided that at least one communication in examination has been sent (see also C-V, 15.4). The request should be in writing (see C-VII, 2.3) and should be explicit and unambiguous, preferably using the wording "according to the state of the file" or "on the file as it stands".

If the request is not clear in this respect, the examiner should solve the ambiguity with an enquiry to the applicant.

If, at the time the applicant files a request for a decision according to the state of the file, a request for oral proceedings is pending, the examining division will interpret the request for a decision as equivalent to the applicant's implicit withdrawal of the pending request for oral proceedings. If an applicant requests a decision according to the state of the file during oral proceedings, the request will be interpreted as implying that the applicant does not wish to make any further submissions.

15.2 Decision by means of a standard form

If the applicant has filed an explicit and unambiguous request for a decision according to the state of the file (see C-V, 15.1) in their latest reply, the examiner may be in a position to refuse the application using a standard form referring to the previous communication. To comply with the requirement that such a decision be reasoned (Rule 111(2)), a number of conditions have to be met:

- (i) the previous communication must properly identify the application documents on file, be well-reasoned and complete with respect to the grounds and the reasons for the refusal of the current request and address all the arguments raised by the applicant
- (ii) no new arguments or amendments have been submitted by the applicant since the previous communication
- (iii) all objections raised in the previous communication referred to must still apply.

If, in its reply to the last communication from the examining division, the applicant has submitted new arguments that are at least likely to be effective, these arguments cannot be ignored even if, in the same reply, the applicant has explicitly requested a decision according to the state of the file. In this case, the division must consider these freshly presented arguments either by issuing a regular reasoned decision (see C-V, 15.3) or by issuing a further communication (see C-V, 15.4).

A decision according to the state of the file by means of a standard form can be based on minutes of a consultation if they contain a full exposition of

all the legal and factual reasons for refusing the application, e.g. the minutes of a consultation issued as the first communication in examination, and present the matters discussed with the same level of information and structure as an Art. 94(3) communication (see C-VII, 2.5).

Examining divisions are not to refer to the minutes of oral proceedings in decisions by means of a standard form.

Although it is possible by way of exception to refer to more than one communication in the standard form, the examiner should carefully consider the requirements of Rule 111(2). In particular, if the different communications deal with different sets of claims, such that it is not clear which of the reasons given by the examining division in its communications might be essential to the decision to refuse, a fully reasoned decision should be issued instead (see C-V, 15.3).

15.3 Issuing a self-contained decision

If the conditions set out in C-V, 15.2 are not met, a self-contained decision to refuse must be issued to comply with Rule 111(2). This is necessary, for example, where the numerous objections raised in the previous communications with respect to different sets of claims render unclear the grounds and the reasons for the refusal. This also applies if the applicant has made further submissions (including amendments) since the previous communication, where these do not cause the subsequent decision to be based on grounds or evidence on which the applicant has not had the opportunity to present comments. In all cases, the requirements of Art. 113(1) should be carefully considered (see also E-IX, 1).

15.4 Issuing a further communication (no refusal)

If it appears that the previous communications were insufficiently reasoned or incomplete, or if the applicant has filed amendments and/or arguments since the previous communication, the examiner should carefully consider Art. 113(1) and Rule 111(2) before issuing a refusal (see E-IX, 1). A further communication may have to be issued with sufficient reasoning unless oral proceedings are to be held (see E-III, 2), in which case the reasoning would be given in the summons (Rule 116(1)). In the communication or summons the applicant should be informed that the request for a decision according to the state of the file could not be followed.

Annex**Standard marks for indicating amendments or corrections by the divisions****1. Insertion of letters and words**

Any insertion made using the in-house electronic tool is done in the text itself. No separate marks are needed in the margins or at the top or bottom of the page.

In the PDF file created from the working copy of the document prepared for the printer ("Druckexemplar"), the tool will insert change bars to the right of amendments and indicate amended pages as such. The tool also adds pairs of insertion signs to mark the beginning and end of each insertion:

Mark	Explanation
	Denotes the beginning of text inserted
	Denotes the end of text inserted

"No break", "line break" or "paragraph break" signs precede and follow the signs above to indicate whether the inserted text should be kept in the same line or if a new line or paragraph should start before or after the inserted text:

Mark	Explanation
	No breaks: inserted text is kept on the same line (this is the default)
	Line break: starts a new line (must be set if needed)
	Paragraph break: starts a new paragraph (must be set if needed)

If inserting an entire newly filed page, e.g. a page numbered "1a", the instruction [insert page 1a] is used.

Chapter VI – Time limits and acceleration of examination

1. Time limits for response to communications from the examiner

1.1 General considerations

The general considerations relating to time limits are set out in [E-VIII](#). The time limit for response to a communication from the examiner should in general be between two and four months in accordance with [Rule 132](#). The period to be allowed will be determined by the examiner taking all the factors relevant to the particular application into account. These include the language normally used by the applicant or their representative; the number and nature of the objections raised; the length and technical complexity of the application; the proximity of the EPO to the applicant or, if they have one, their representative and the distance separating the two.

If the only outstanding objection is the need to amend the description, the examiner may invite the applicant to amend the description by issuing a communication under [Art. 94\(3\)](#) with a two-month time limit to reply. Alternatively, the examiner may consult the applicant informally, e.g. by telephone, explain the objection and set a one-month time limit documented in the minutes of the consultation referring to this objection (unless a shorter limit is agreed during the consultation).

This time limit can be extended if the applicant so requests before it expires (see [E-VIII, 1.6](#)). Failure to respond to a communication under [Art. 94\(3\)](#) and [Rule 71\(1\)](#) and (2) in due time results in the application being deemed withdrawn. This loss of rights is subject to further processing (see [E-VIII, 2](#)).

[Art. 94\(1\) and \(4\)](#)
[Rule 132](#)

1.2 Special circumstances

In certain special circumstances the examiner may allow a time limit of up to six months. The six-month period may be appropriate, for instance, if the applicant resides a long way from the representative and the language of the proceedings is not one to which the applicant is accustomed; or if the subject-matter of the application or the objections raised are exceptionally complicated (for more information see [E-VIII, 1.2](#)).

The search opinion is not a communication under [Art. 94\(3\)](#).

2. Influencing the speed of examination proceedings – PACE

With a request for accelerated examination under the programme for accelerated prosecution of European patent applications (PACE), the applicant can speed up the proceedings at the examination stage (see the notice from the EPO dated 16 December 2025, [OJ EPO 2025, A69](#)). For further information, see [E-VIII, 4.1](#).

3. Further ways to accelerate examination

Where the applicant files a request for examination before the search report is transmitted to them, they may also dispense with the need to comply with the invitation pursuant to [Rule 70\(2\)](#) and file a categorical request for examination whatever the search result may be, thereby also accelerating

[Rule 70\(2\)](#)
[Art. 11\(b\) RFees](#)
[Rule 62\(1\)](#)

the procedure (see the notice from the EPO dated 30 November 2015, OJ EPO 2015, A94). In this case, confirmation that they desire to proceed further with their application is deemed given when the search report is transmitted to them so that in accordance with Rule 62(1) the search report is not accompanied by a search opinion. Under these circumstances, if the application is not in order for grant, a communication under Art. 94(3) and Rule 71(1) and (2) is transmitted to the applicant. Own-volition amendments under Rule 137(2) may in that case be submitted by the applicant in reply to this communication (see C-III, 2).

If the application is in order for grant, the subsequent procedure will depend on whether it is possible at that time to carry out the search for conflicting European patent applications according to Art. 54(3) (see C-IV, 7.1 and B-XI, 7). If it can, and assuming no conflicting applications are identified, then the communication under Rule 71(3) is transmitted to the applicant. If it cannot yet be carried out, then the communication from the examining division will be postponed until the said search is completed. If the European patent application is subsequently withdrawn before the substantive examination has begun, the examination fee will be refunded in full. If substantive examination has already begun, withdrawal of the application may still result in a refund of 50% of the examination fee in the cases laid down in Art. 11(b) RFees (for more details, see A-VI, 2.5 and OJ EPO 2016, A49).

The applicant can also accelerate the processing of Euro-PCT applications by waiving the right to the communication under Rule 161 and Rule 162 (see A-XIV, 2.1) or by filing an explicit request for early processing of an international application by the EPO as designated/elected Office (see A-XII, 7.1).

Chapter VII – Other procedures in examination

1. General remark

In this chapter, the term "applicant" is intended to mean "representative" where the applicant has appointed one. Where this is the case, the procedures described here should be conducted with that representative.

2. Consultations

2.1 General

There are instances where personal consultation with the applicant can be helpful in advancing the procedure. Such a consultation will preferably be held by videoconference so that, where necessary, documents can be presented, other persons participate and the identity of those attending verified (see [C-VII, 2.2](#)). The Shared area in MyEPO provides a space for applicants and examiners to upload documents and informally discuss changes (see [OJ EPO 2023, A59](#), and [C-VII, 2.6](#)). Consultations can also be held by telephone at the request of the applicant, if the situation so requires.

The consultation may take place at the initiative of either the applicant or the examiner or formalities officer. However, the decision on whether it is to be held is up to the formalities officer or examiner. A consultation request from the applicant should usually be granted unless the nature of the issue to be discussed requires formal proceedings or the examiner believes that no useful purpose would be served by such a discussion. For example, where substantial differences of opinion exist in examination, written procedure or oral proceedings are normally more appropriate.

Typical situations in which the applicant may want a consultation are:

- (i) to enquire about a procedural issue such as how to proceed in particular circumstances (note however that the examiner is not normally in charge of formal issues such as extensions of time limits and payment of fees); for enquiries as to the processing of files, see [E-VIII, 7](#)
- (ii) where there appears to be an error in the communication or in the applicant's reply making it difficult for them or the examiner to prepare the next reply/communication (e.g. wrong document cited, communication based on wrong set of claims, new submissions referred to but not included).

Typical situations in which the examiner may consider it appropriate to consult the applicant are:

- (iii) where there appears to be confusion about certain points in dispute, e.g. the applicant seems to have misunderstood the examiner's arguments – or vice versa – so that the written procedure is leading nowhere

- (iv) where the application seems to be ready for grant except that the examiner needs to clarify some minor issues with the applicant or would like to discuss a proposal for amendments to overcome the objections raised
- (v) where amendments or corrections requested by the applicant after the Rule 71(3) communication have been submitted but the examiner cannot agree to them.

For consultations in response to the EESR before the application has entered the examination phase, see B-XI, 8.

Telephone conversations held for the sole purpose of arranging a date for a consultation or oral proceedings do not in and of themselves constitute a consultation within the meaning of this section. Therefore, no minutes need to be prepared (C-VII, 2.4) unless so required where the applicant agrees to a notice period of less than two months for oral proceedings (E-III, 6).

2.2 Persons participating in the consultation

The person consulted must be entitled to act for the applicant before the EPO. If the applicant is a natural or legal person having either residence or place of business in a contracting state, consultations may only be conducted with:

- (a) the applicant (see A-VIII, 1.1)
- (b) a professional representative (see A-VIII, 1.2)
- (c) a duly authorised employee of the applicant (see A-VIII, 1.5) or, to the extent defined in Art. 134(8), a legal practitioner (see A-VIII, 1.3).

Regarding (c), see also A-VIII, 1.6.

If the applicant is a natural or legal person having neither residence nor place of business in a contracting state, consultations may only be conducted with:

- a professional representative (see A-VIII, 1.2)
- a legal practitioner (see A-VIII, 1.3 and A-VIII, 1.6).

The person entitled to act before the EPO, i.e. one of those listed above, may be accompanied by other persons, such as the inventor, a non-European representative or an employee of the applicant. At the request of the entitled person, such other persons may be allowed to take part in the consultation if their participation is relevant to the proceedings. Where the consultation is held by videoconference, these persons may connect from a different location than the entitled person.

If there is any doubt as to the identity of any of the persons participating in the consultation or if the consulted person so requests, the examiner or formalities officer will check the identity of the person or persons

concerned. This can be done by inviting them to show an official identity document to the camera in the case of a videoconference or to send a copy of the document by email. For data protection reasons, the copy of the identity document sent by email will not be included in the file (see also [E-III, 8.3.1](#)).

If it is ascertained during a consultation that the person spoken to is not entitled to act before the EPO, the examiner should merely hear that person's statements without going into the details of the case and request that any procedural steps be taken by a written declaration signed by a person who is entitled to act.

No information must be given to third parties before publication of the application.

From the examining division, only the first member dealing with the case will normally be present. However, there is no objection to one or even both of the other members participating in the consultation.

When the inventor or an expert is attending the consultation, it is recommended that the chair of the examining division at least should also attend. However, the applicant or representative does not have the right to demand the presence of additional division members. If a request is made for a consultation with all three members, it will usually be advisable to arrange for the holding of oral proceedings instead.

2.3 Informal nature of consultations

A consultation is not a formal procedure (for formal oral proceedings before the examining division, see [E-III](#)), and the character of the minutes of the consultation depends on the nature of the matters discussed. It should always be made clear to the applicant that any agreement reached is ultimately subject to the views of the other members of the examining division. A decision cannot be taken during a consultation.

Oral statements made during a consultation as well as documents in the Shared area must be confirmed in writing in order to be procedurally effective. Indeed, such statements or uploaded documents are not normally legally binding and they cannot, for instance, be effective to meet a time limit (see, however, [C-VII, 2.4](#)). For the purpose of the European grant procedure, except in oral proceedings, only written statements are effective and only from the date on which they are received by the EPO. Oral statements or documents in the shared area which substantively address the objections raised in an earlier communication may however lead the examiner to cancel any pending time limit (see [C-VII, 2.4\(iv\)](#)). Furthermore, documents validly submitted by email during the consultation (see [C-VII, 3](#)) may indeed be effective to meet a pending time limit (see [C-IV, 3](#)).

If a fresh objection of substance is raised during a consultation and no amendment to meet it is agreed at the time, the objection must be confirmed by a communication of the minutes of the consultation, giving the applicant a fresh period within which to reply (see [C-VII, 2.4\(iii\)](#)).

2.4 Minutes of a consultation

Minutes should always be taken. The minutes should indicate at the beginning the means by which the consultation took place, e.g. by telephone or by videoconference.

The minutes of a consultation should list the participants, summarise the main results and state any oral requests. They must be signed by the examiner. Documents filed by email during a consultation (see [C-VII, 3](#)), such as new claims or an amended description, must be attached to the minutes. Relevant parts of documents uploaded to MyEPO's Shared area (see [C-VII, 2.6.2](#)) will be cited in or annexed to the minutes.

The minutes should always indicate whether the next action is due to come from the applicant or the examiner. In this regard, the minutes when dispatched to the applicant may:

- (i) be issued for information only, in which case if a time limit is still pending, it should be observed; if no time limit is pending, no action is required from the applicant
- (ii) be issued such as to extend a pending time limit, in which case the applicant must reply within that extended time limit
- (iii) be issued such as to set a new time limit for response, in which case the applicant must reply within this new time limit
- (iv) be issued such as to cancel a pending time limit
- (v) be issued such as to reflect the decision to cancel scheduled oral proceedings where an agreement on an allowable set of claims can be reached during the consultation. Cancellation of the oral proceedings is communicated to the applicant orally during the consultation and noted in the minutes. No separate communication regarding the cancellation of the oral proceedings is issued
- (vi) be issued for information only where the applicant makes procedural declarations orally during the consultation, such as withdrawing a higher ranked request or announcing that they do not intend to attend oral proceedings. The applicant is informed that such oral statements must be confirmed in writing to be procedurally effective (see [C-VII, 2.3](#)).

Where the consultation is concerned with the clarification of obscurities, the resolution of uncertainties (for example, clarifying the ranking of the request for oral proceedings with respect to the auxiliary requests on file, see [E-IX, 2.2](#)) or putting the application in order by clearing up a number of minor points, it will usually be sufficient for the examiner to make a note in the minutes of the matters discussed and the conclusions reached or amendments agreed unless a time limit is set for reply (see below).

Where the consultation involves the discussion of weightier matters, such as questions of novelty, inventive step, unity or whether the amendment

introduces added subject-matter, a fuller note of the topics raised will be made in the minutes. In particular, the minutes will specify in concrete terms the topics discussed, together with any amendments agreed, any opposing views, the reasons for any change of opinion and any conclusions drawn unless these are clear from other documents in the dossier. Furthermore, the reasons for any amendments required by the examiner should be clearly indicated.

It is important to avoid statements that are unclear, ambiguous or universally applicable in the minutes. For example, statements such as "Amendments to the claims were proposed to take account of the prior art cited in the search report" are of no assistance to members of the public, other members of the division or indeed the first member at later stages of the procedure. The same applies to conclusions worded in a generalised manner.

If the minutes are sent as a first communication in examination, see C-VII, 2.5.

The minutes are placed in the dossier, made available for file inspection (including all documents filed by an applicant or representative during the consultation) and sent to the applicant or their representative, even where the consultation merely changes/confirms/cancels the time/date of a proposed consultation.

However, by way of exception, consultations relating to amendments agreed immediately prior to completing the Rule 71(3) communication may be reflected in that communication, provided that there is no uncertainty for the public as to what was agreed. The amendments must be identified as precisely as possible.

2.5 Minutes as the first communication in examination

A consultation may be used as the first action in examination provided that:

- minutes are issued
- the minutes present the matters discussed with the same level of information and structure as an Art. 94(3) communication
- the minutes are issued with a time limit for reply not shorter than four months unless agreed otherwise with the applicant.

Matters (e.g. objections or reasoning) not discussed during the consultation itself may be included in such minutes. However, it must be made clear that they were not discussed during the consultation.

If the above criteria are met, minutes issued as the first action in examination replace the first communication under Art. 94(3) and Rule 71(1), (2) (see C-III, 4).

Where the examining division is considering issuing a summons to oral proceedings as the first action in examination (see C-III, 5), the examiner

may inform the representative of this in a call. Instead of issuing separate minutes, a remark regarding the call may be included in the summons. If, however, the examining division decides not to issue summons at that stage, minutes must be issued.

2.6 Real-time interaction on a document – Shared area

MyEPO provides a secure space where the first member and applicant can jointly edit an uploaded document during a consultation, facilitating discussions on how to amend the application documents to overcome objections (see [OJ EPO 2023, A59](#)). The applicant or representative accesses the Shared area from MyEPO, which provides them with a view similar to that of the examiner. Both the applicant and the examiner can upload documents to the Shared area and make changes prior to and in preparation for the consultation. The Shared area provides access to the latest version of the text, enabling real-time interaction between both sides while maintaining confidentiality.

The use of the Shared area is to be seen in the context of a personal consultation and not as a standalone functionality. The legal and procedural framework for consultations using the Shared area remains the same as that applicable to all personal consultations (see [C-VII, 2.1 to 2.5](#)). Accordingly, the consulted person must be a person entitled to act for the applicant before the EPO (see [C-VII, 2.2](#)). Any agreement reached is ultimately subject to the views of the other members of the examining division, and any changes and statements made before and during a consultation must be confirmed in writing to be procedurally effective. Otherwise, they are not legally binding and not effective for meeting a time limit (see also [C-VII, 2.3](#)). Changes made by the examiner are merely suggestions to assist the applicant and are not binding ([B-XI, 3.8](#)). The responsibility for determining the text of an application and defining the subject-matter for which protection is sought remains with the applicant ([Art. 113\(2\)](#)).

The examiner may propose a consultation involving the use of the Shared area in the following procedural scenarios in particular:

- Consulting the applicant before proposing amendments in a [Rule 71\(3\)](#) communication (see [C-V, 1.1](#))
- Where the examiner has particular wording suggestions to overcome objections: the suggested wording may be incorporated in the document, together with a short reasoning in comments or the chat, and shared with the applicant ahead of the consultation. Even if the applicant does not adopt the suggestion, the wording and the reasoning may help them to understand the objections better and enable them to provide a more informative response explaining why they consider other matter to be patentable or feel entitled to have a broader scope of protection than suggested. As usual, it is recommended to discuss the suggestion with at least the chair before the consultation.

- Where submissions in response to the summons are close to an acceptable form but changes are still needed before cancelling the oral proceedings and the examiner has specific suggestions for this.

Instead of sending a document with amendment proposals by email in preparation for the consultation, the document could be uploaded to the Shared area.

2.6.1 Process of a consultation using the Shared area

If the examiner intends to initiate a consultation using the Shared area, they must first ask the applicant if they are a MyEPO user. If not, the examiner may refer them to the dedicated EPO website. An applicant who is not an MyEPO user cannot use the Shared area during the consultation unless they register as a user in the period before the consultation. The applicant may decline to use the Shared area, in which case other ways of working on a document, such as screen sharing, can be used.

The process of using the Shared area during a consultation is therefore initiated by a prior contact, either at the instigation of the examiner or the applicant, to schedule a consultation, to mutually agree on the use of the Shared area and on who will upload the document to be discussed. As a preparation for the consultation, the applicant or the examiner may upload and edit a .docx or .pdf document in advance. This replaces sending the proposed amendments by email prior to the consultation. The applicant and the examiner can and indeed are actively encouraged to use the **Notification** function in the Shared area to inform each other when a document has been uploaded or edited there.

Any user who is authorised to access the application in MyEPO may edit a shared document. If the shared document already comprises amendments by the applicant, the examiner must ask during the consultation if the documents as amended are to serve as a basis for the consultation.

Consultation may involve co-editing with the aim of reaching an agreement. If an agreement is reached, the applicant will normally respond to the minutes of the consultation (C-VII.2.6.2) by officially submitting the amended application documents via the EPO's online filing tools, or if the applicant so wishes, they may download the edited document and submit it by email during the consultation, in which case it will be treated as an officially filed application document (C-VII.3). Alternatively, the examiner may propose the agreed amendments in a subsequent communication under Rule 71(3) (see C-V.1.1).

Consultations relating to amendments agreed immediately prior to completing the Rule 71(3) communication may be reflected in that communication either by citing the relevant parts of the agreed amendments from the Shared area or, subject to the applicant's explicit agreement, by annexing the corresponding parts of the document from the Shared area to the communication.

2.6.2 Minutes of a consultation using the Shared area

Generally, minutes of the consultation must be issued in the same manner as described in C-VII, 2.4. In particular, it must be clear from the minutes what was discussed during the consultation and, if an agreement was reached, any agreed amendments must be identified as precisely as possible. However, the minutes must not include any details of new substantive information discussed during the consultation or anything that is not relevant to the application. Identifying agreed amendments may be done by quoting the relevant parts of the final edited/commented documents from the Shared area in the minutes. Only with the applicant's explicit agreement may the relevant parts of those documents be annexed to the minutes.

The minutes must list the persons who were present during the consultation. Authors or editors of the document who were not present during the consultation are not mentioned in the minutes. The date for the purpose of minutes is the date the consultation was held, even if the document was edited before then.

The minutes must specify who will perform the next action. Depending on whether or not an agreement is reached and on the procedural situation, the minutes can be sent for information only or they can set a new time limit, extend or cancel a pending time limit or indicate the cancellation or maintenance of scheduled oral proceedings (see C-VII, 2.4(i)-(v) and 3.3).

3. Use of email

At present, email is an admissible filing means only for the submission of subsequently filed documents as referred to in Rule 50 during consultations and during oral proceedings held by videoconference (for details, in particular on signature and format of attachments, see the decision of the President of the EPO dated 13 May 2020, OJ EPO 2020, A71, and E-III, 8.5.2).

Other than in the above-mentioned cases, email has no legal effect in proceedings under the EPC and thus cannot be used to validly perform any procedural act and, in particular, to comply with time limits (see OJ EPO 2000, 458, and A-VIII, 2.5). If, for instance, shortly before oral proceedings, the applicant would like to submit new requests and/or amended documents, they should do so by electronic filing. Documents submitted via electronic filing are normally visible in the electronic file on the same day.

Examples of situations where exchanges by email may be useful are:

- (i) to arrange a date for a consultation
- (ii) when, during a consultation where the Shared area is not used, possible amendments to claims are being discussed and the applicant wants to communicate them immediately without submitting them formally

- (iii) shortly before oral proceedings to send an electronic copy of amended claims in addition to the official submission made; this ensures that the examining division gets the documents well in time to prepare for the oral proceedings.

Emails cannot replace an official communication under Art. 94(3).

3.1 Initiation of exchanges by email

Except in cases where it is a valid filing means (see C-VII, 3 and E-III, 8.5.2), neither the examiner nor the applicant should use email without having previously agreed to this, e.g. during a consultation. There must be mutual agreement between the examiner and the applicant to such use if the content of the email goes beyond simply arranging of a date for a consultation or oral proceedings. Furthermore, the mere fact that an email address is indicated on a letter head does not mean that the examiner can use it for file-related matters.

If, on the other hand, an examiner receives an email from an applicant concerning procedural requests or addressing substantive issues without previous agreement, this email cannot simply be ignored, but must be dealt with, ensuring that the content is put in the official file (see also T 599/06). A reply should be sent making clear that email is not an official means of communication and that requests should be filed by permitted means (see A-II, 1.1, A-II, 1.2 and A-II, 1.3).

3.2 Confidentiality

For non-published applications, confidentiality must be carefully maintained, and substantive matters should not form part of any email correspondence about such applications.

3.3 Inclusion in the file of any email exchange

If email is used, it is essential to ensure that email exchanges are properly documented in the file by sending the result of the consultation to the applicant for information with no time limit. This ensures that the exchange is included in the public part of the file and that the applicant is aware of this.

Submissions filed by email during a consultation or during oral proceedings held by videoconference, including all attachments, should be annexed to the minutes (see E-III, 8.5.2 for details). Documents submitted during personal consultations do not need to contain a date.

As a rule, it is not necessary to remove personal data (such as email addresses, postal addresses or telephone numbers) from emails annexed to the minutes of personal consultations unless there is an explicit request.

Where the submitted document requires a signature, e.g. if the email comprises amended application documents, the signature may be applied to the attached document or to the text of the accompanying email. In both cases, the signature may be a typewritten (text-string) signature (i.e. a typed name and position of the sender) or a facsimile signature (i.e. a reproduction of a manual signature).

If a valid signature is included in the submitted document, it is not necessary to annex the email to the minutes. If the signature is only included in the email, the email needs to be annexed to the minutes to document the authenticity of the submission and for compliance with Rule 50(3). When there is a request to exclude personal data from the file inspection, the party should be encouraged to sign the submitted document so it is not necessary to annex the email to the minutes.

4. Taking of evidence

4.1 General remark

The general considerations relating to the taking of evidence are set out in E-IV. This section deals only with the kind of evidence most likely to arise in pre-grant proceedings (i.e. written evidence).

4.2 Producing evidence

An examining division does not, as a general rule, require evidence to be produced. The primary function of the examiner in proceedings before grant is to point out to the applicant any ways in which the application does not meet the requirements of the EPC. If the applicant does not accept the examiner's view, then it is for them to decide whether they wish to produce evidence in support of their case and, if so, what form that evidence should take. The examining division should afford the applicant a reasonable opportunity to produce any evidence that is likely to be relevant.

However, this opportunity should not be given where the examining division is convinced that it would serve no useful purpose or result in undue delay.

4.3 Written evidence

Written evidence can include the supply of information or the production of a document or a sworn statement.

For example, to rebut an examiner's allegation of lack of inventive step, the applicant might supply information as to the technical advantages of the invention. Or they might produce a sworn statement, either from themselves or from an independent witness, purporting to show that workers in the art have been trying for a long time unsuccessfully to solve the problem with which the invention is concerned or that the invention is a completely new departure in the relevant art.

5. Oral proceedings

If a request for oral proceedings, even conditional, was filed before the examining division became responsible for the application (see C-II, 1), the division must honour the request, even if it was not repeated in examination.

On dealing with new requests filed in reply to a summons to oral proceedings, see C-IV, 8.

As a rule, oral proceedings in examination proceedings are held by videoconference unless the direct taking of evidence is required or if there are other serious reasons for not doing so, e.g. where an impediment

prevents an applicant or representative from participating in oral proceedings held by videoconference. Sweeping objections against the reliability of videoconferencing technology or the non-availability of videoconferencing equipment will, as a rule, not qualify as serious reasons in this regard, nor will the need to consider written evidence (see E-III, 1.3, OJ EPO 2020, A134 and A40).

The general considerations relating to oral proceedings are set out in E-III.

6. Examination of observations by third parties

The general considerations relating to observations from third parties are set out in E-VI, 3.

Chapter VIII – Work within the examining division

1. General remarks

An examining division will normally consist of three technical examiners. *Art. 18(2)* However, within the examining division responsible for the application, one member (the first member) will, as a general rule, be entrusted to carry out all substantive examination work up to the point of a decision to grant a patent, issue a summons to oral proceedings or refuse the application. While acting on behalf of the examining division in all communications with the applicant up to that point, this examiner may confer informally with the other members of the division at any time on specific points of doubt or difficulty. The term "examiner" as used in this part of the Guidelines is normally understood to mean the "first" member.

As stated above, the first member may seek the advice of other members of the examining division at any stage in the examination. However, there will come a point when it becomes appropriate for them to refer the case formally to the other members of the examining division. This will be when they consider the case to be in order to proceed to grant or, alternatively, where there seems no possibility of an amendment to overcome their objections or where the applicant has not overcome these objections, and when they consider the case to be in order to proceed to refusal. There are also other circumstances in which reference to the examining division is appropriate, e.g. oral proceedings may be suggested by the examiner or requested by the applicant because an impasse has been reached. In considering whether to refer the application to the division, the examiner should be guided by the principle stated in C-IV, 3.

The first member should also bear in mind that when they issue a communication they do so in the name of the division, and the applicant is entitled to assume that if the examiner had doubts as to the views of the rest of the division, they would have discussed the matter with them beforehand.

Although the examining division assumes ultimate responsibility for an application as soon as that application passes to it under Rule 10, formal matters are normally dealt with by a formalities officer (see the decision of the President of the EPO dated 12 December 2013, OJ EPO 2014, A6; OJ EPO 2015, A104). Examiners should not spend time checking the work of the Receiving Section or the formalities officer. However, they should refer an application to the formalities officer for further consideration if they believe the formalities report to be incorrect or incomplete.

If required by specific circumstances (e.g. sickness), an application may be reallocated to another examiner/examining division. In such cases, the decision to reallocate will be taken by the line manager.

2. Recommendation to grant

If the examiner considers that the application satisfies the requirements of the EPC and is thus in order to proceed to grant, they should make a brief

written report (the "votum"). As a general rule, the examiner will list in this report the reasons why, in their opinion, the subject-matter as claimed in the application is not obvious having regard to the state of the art. They should normally comment on the document reflecting the nearest prior art and the features of the claimed invention that make it patentable, although there may be exceptional circumstances where this is not necessary, e.g. where patentability is based on a surprising effect. They should also indicate how any apparently obscure but important points have ultimately been clarified, and if there are any borderline questions that the examiner has resolved in favour of the applicant, they should draw attention specifically to these.

3. Recommendation to refuse

When referring an application that is not in order for the grant of a patent to the examining division, the first member should confer with the other members of the division, bringing to their attention the points at issue, summarising the case history to the extent necessary to enable them to obtain a quick grasp of the essential facts and recommending the action to be taken, e.g. refusal, or grant conditional upon certain further amendments. As the other members will need to study the case themselves, there is no need for a detailed exposition. It will be useful, however, to draw attention to any unusual features or points not readily apparent from the documents themselves. If the first member recommends refusal and the issue seems clear-cut, they may have a draft reasoned decision ready for issue by the examining division (see C-V, 14); if the issue is not clear-cut, the drafting of the reasoned decision should be deferred until the division has discussed the case.

4. Tasks of the other members of the examining division

When an application is referred to the other members of the division, they will first consider the case individually and each will indicate their opinion on the course of action to be taken. If there is complete agreement with the first member's recommendation, no further consultation will be necessary. Any further action needed will be entrusted to the first member. If, initially, there is not complete agreement with the first member, or at least one member of the division wishes to discuss the case further, further consultation will be arranged. In such discussions, the division should strive for unanimity, but where this seems unlikely, the difference of opinion must be resolved by voting. When the division is enlarged to four members (see C-VIII, 7), the chair has a casting vote, where necessary.

The other members of the division should bear in mind that their function is not to completely re-examine the application. If, following a discussion, the first member's conclusions are generally considered to be reasonable, the other members should accept them.

5. Further communication with the applicant

If, in the opinion of the examining division, the application can be amended to bring it into a form that meets the requirements of the EPC, then the first member should be entrusted with informing the applicant of the division's opinion that the application should be refused on certain grounds unless satisfactory amendments are submitted within a stated period (see C-VI, 1).

Art. 18(2)

If, within the time limit, satisfactory amendments are made, the examiner will then report back to the division recommending that the application should proceed to grant. If not, they should report back recommending refusal.

5.1 When can a summons to oral proceedings be issued in substantive examination?

At the beginning of substantive examination, if the examining division is of the opinion that the application cannot be granted directly, at least one substantive communication within the meaning of Art. 94(3) will generally be sent before the division issues a summons to oral proceedings (see C-III, 4). *Art. 116(1)*

Exceptionally, a summons to oral proceedings may be issued as the first action in examination proceedings, provided that the criteria set out in C-III, 5 are met.

In examination proceedings, where the applicant has been invited to provide a translation of the priority application according to Rule 53(3) (see A-III, 6.8.2 and F-VI, 3.4), no summons to oral proceedings will be issued until either the translation is provided or the period for further processing in respect of the time limit according to Rule 53(3) has expired.

6. Decision

All decisions are issued by the examining division as a whole and not by an individual examiner. All members therefore sign the written decision, irrespective of whether it was unanimous. If, exceptionally, one or more division members cannot sign the decision, one of the other members – normally the chair – may sign it on their behalf, subject to the conditions defined in E-IX, 2.3. A seal may replace the signature. *Rule 113*

7. Enlargement of the examining division; consultation of a legally qualified member

If the examining division deems it necessary given the nature of a decision, it is enlarged to include a legally qualified member. The decision to enlarge or to set aside an enlargement lies with the examining division. *Art. 18(2)*

The participation of a legally qualified member or at least internal consultation of Directorate Patent Law and Processes, the unit responsible for providing legally qualified members for examining and opposition divisions, will be required in the event of a difficult legal question not yet solved by the Guidelines or jurisprudence.

The applicant is informed of the division's enlargement in the communication accompanying and/or the annex to the summons or the decision following enlargement, as appropriate. Once the division has been enlarged, communications or decisions must be signed by all four members.

If the examining division has been enlarged to four members, the chair will have a casting vote. As a rule, enlargement will be required in cases involving technical opinions (Art. 25 – see E-XII, 3.1) and where evidence

has to be taken according to Rule 117 (including the giving of evidence by witnesses – see E-IV). It is also to be considered in the case of oral proceedings.

Where an examining division has been enlarged pursuant to Art. 18(2) but the case is decided in a three-member composition, there should be clear evidence in the public file that a decision to set aside enlargement was taken by the division in its four-member composition prior to the final decision.

Therefore, if enlargement is considered no longer necessary, the examining division will set it aside. This decision is not separately appealable. The applicant is informed about the setting aside of the enlargement in the communication accompanying and/or the annex to the summons or the decision following the setting aside of the enlargement.

Depending on the nature of the problem, as an alternative to enlarging the examining division, it may be sufficient to consult a legally qualified member in Directorate Patent Law and Processes. For instance, doubts may arise whether an application concerns an invention within the meaning of Art. 52(2) or whether the claimed invention is excluded from patentability by virtue of Art. 53. Such consultation may also be appropriate where legal considerations predominate in a decision, as in proceedings following a request for re-establishment of rights according to Art. 122. Formalities officers may also consult Directorate Patent Law and Processes within the scope of the duties conferred to them under Rule 11(3) (see the decision of the President of the EPO dated 12 December 2013, OJ EPO 2014, A6).

Chapter IX – Special applications

1. Divisional applications (see also A-IV.1)

1.1 General remarks

A divisional application may be filed subsequent to the filing of a European patent application or on a Euro-PCT application's entry into the European phase. The divisional application is accorded the same date of filing as the parent application, which must be pending when the divisional application is filed (A-IV.1.1.1), and benefits from any right of priority of the parent application in respect of subject-matter contained in the divisional application. A European patent application may give rise to more than one divisional application, and a divisional application may itself give rise to one or more divisional applications. *Art. 76(1)*

Divisional applications are to be treated the same as ordinary applications and are subject to the same requirements unless specific EPC provisions, in particular Art. 76 or Rule 36, require something different (G 1/05, G 1/06).

Furthermore, as soon as the requirements of Rule 36 and Art. 76(1) are fulfilled, the proceedings for grant of a divisional application become separate and independent from the proceedings concerning the parent application (G 4/98). Pending opposition or appeal proceedings concerning the parent application (or any member of that family of applications) do not constitute grounds for staying the examination proceedings for a divisional application, either by the EPO on its own initiative or on request. Reasons for a stay or interruption of proceedings are set out in E-VII.1 to E-VII.3.

1.2 Voluntary and mandatory division

Applicants may file a divisional application of their own volition (voluntary division). The most common reason, however, for filing a divisional application is to meet an objection under Art. 82 due to lack of unity of invention (mandatory division). If the examiner raises an objection due to lack of unity, the applicant is allowed a period (see C-VI.1) in which to limit their application to a single invention. The limitation of the parent application has to be clear and unconditional. The communication inviting the applicant to limit the application due to lack of unity should therefore indicate that if not limited within the set time limit the application may be refused. *Art. 82*

1.3 Abandonment of subject-matter

The mere deletion of subject-matter in the parent application is not prejudicial to the later filing of a divisional application. When deleting subject-matter, the applicant should, however, avoid any statements that could be interpreted as abandonment with substantive effect, thereby impeding the valid filing of a divisional application for that subject-matter (see also H-III.2.4, last paragraph).

1.4 Examination of a divisional application

The substantive examination of a divisional application should in principle be carried out in the same way as for any other application. However, there *Art. 76(1)*

are a number of special points to be considered (see also C-III, 5). The claims of a divisional application need not be limited to subject-matter already claimed in the parent application's claims. Furthermore, no abuse of the system of divisional applications can be identified in the mere fact that the claims of the application on which the examining division had then to decide had a broader scope than the claims granted in relation to the parent application (see T 422/07).

However, under Art. 76(1), the subject-matter may not extend beyond the content of the parent application as filed. The principles to be applied in this respect are the same as the principles applied under Art. 123(2) for assessing whether an amended application contains subject-matter which extends beyond the content of the application as filed (see G 1/05 and H-IV, 2 and H-V). If a divisional application as filed contains subject-matter additional to that contained in the parent application as filed, it can be amended later so that its subject-matter no longer extends beyond the earlier content, even at a time when the earlier application is no longer pending (see G 1/05). If the applicant is unwilling to remedy the defect by removing that additional subject-matter, the divisional application must be refused under Art. 97(2) for failure to comply with Art. 76(1).

The divisional application cannot be converted into an independent application taking its own date of filing. Moreover, a further divisional application for this additional subject-matter should also be refused under Art. 97(2) for failure to comply with Art. 76(1).

Art. 123(2)

Amendments made to a divisional application subsequent to its filing must comply with the requirements of Art. 123(2), i.e. they may not extend the subject-matter beyond the content of the divisional application as filed (see G 1/05 and T 873/94). If the amendments have not been identified and/or their basis in the application as filed not indicated by the applicant (see H-III, 2.1) and the application is one of those mentioned in H-III, 2.1.4, the examining division may send a communication under Rule 137(4) requesting the applicant to provide this information (see H-III, 2.1.1).

If the subject-matter of a divisional application is restricted to only a part of the subject-matter claimed in the parent application, this part must be directly and unambiguously derivable from the parent application as being a separate part or entity, i.e. one that can be used even outside the context of the invention of the parent application (see T 545/92).

In the case of a sequence of applications consisting of a root (originating) application followed by divisional applications, each divided from its predecessor (see A-IV, 1.1.2), it is a necessary and sufficient condition for a divisional application of that sequence to comply with Art. 76(1), second sentence, that anything disclosed in that divisional application be directly and unambiguously derivable from what is disclosed in each of the preceding applications as filed (see G 1/06).

1.5 Description and drawings

The description and drawings of the parent application and the/each divisional application should in principle be confined to matter that is

relevant to the invention claimed in that application. However, amendment of the description should be required only where absolutely necessary. Thus, the repetition in a divisional application of matter in the parent application need not be objected to unless it is clearly unrelated to or inconsistent with the invention claimed in the divisional application. As for the matter of cross-references, there is no need for the examiner to check in the description since, under present practice, cross-references are always made between the parent and divisional applications. These appear on the front page of the respective application and patent published after receipt of the divisional application unless the technical preparations for publication have already been completed.

1.6 Claims

Parent and divisional applications may not claim the same subject-matter, even in different words (for further information, see [G-IV, 5.4](#)). The difference between the claimed subject-matter of the two applications must be clearly distinguishable. As a general rule, however, one application may claim its own subject-matter in combination with that of the other application. In other words, if the parent and divisional applications claim separate and distinct elements – A and B respectively – that function in combination, one of the two applications may also include a claim for A plus B.

2. Applications resulting from a decision under [Art. 61](#)

2.1 General remarks

In certain circumstances, before a patent has been granted on a particular application, it may be adjudged by a final decision of a national court that a person other than the applicant is entitled to the grant of a patent on it. In this event the third party may either:

- (i) prosecute the application as their own application in place of the applicant [Art. 61\(1\)\(a\)](#)
- (ii) file a new European patent application in respect of the same invention [Art. 61\(1\)\(b\)](#)
- (iii) request that the application be refused. [Art. 61\(1\)\(c\)](#)

If the first of these options is chosen, the third party becomes the applicant in place of the former applicant and the prosecution of the application is continued from the position at which it was interrupted (see also [A-IV, 2](#)).

If, however, the third party files a new application under [Art. 61\(1\)\(b\)](#), the provisions of [Art. 76\(1\)](#) apply to this new application *mutatis mutandis*. This means that the new application is treated as though it were a divisional application i.e. it takes the date of filing and benefit of any priority right of the original application (see also [A-IV, 1.2](#)). The examiner must therefore ensure that the subject-matter content of the new application does not extend beyond that of the original application as filed. The original application is deemed withdrawn on the new application's date of filing for the designated states concerned. [Art. 61\(1\) and \(2\)](#)
[Rule 17\(1\)](#)

2.2 Original application no longer pending

In cases where the original application has been withdrawn, refused or deemed withdrawn and is thus no longer pending, Art. 61(1)(b) is applicable, allowing the third party to still file a new European patent application in respect of the same invention (see G 3/92).

2.3 Partial entitlement

Rule 18(1)

If, by a final decision, it is adjudged that a third party is entitled to the grant of a European patent in respect of only part of the matter disclosed in the European patent application, then the above considerations apply only to that part. In such a case, option (i) mentioned in C-IX, 2.1 is not open to the third party and, regarding option C-IX, 2.1(ii), the new application must be confined to that part of the original subject-matter to which the third party has become entitled. Similarly, the original application must, for the designated states concerned, be confined to the subject-matter to which the original applicant remains entitled. The relationship between the new application and the amended original application will be similar to that between two divisional applications, and the relationship between each of those and the original application will be similar to that between divisional applications and the application from which they are divided. The guidance set out in C-IX, 1.4, 1.5 and 1.6 is therefore applicable to this situation.

2.4 Entitlement for certain designated states only

Rule 18(2)

Where the final decision on entitlement applies to only certain designated states, the original application may contain different description, claims and drawings for those states compared with the others (see H-III, 4.1, last paragraph, and 4.3).

If the sole result of the application of Art. 61(1) is to divide the right to the grant between the original applicant and the third party so that each may apply for the entire subject-matter for different designated states, each application should be examined in the normal way without regard to the other, with the proviso that the subject-matter of each application must not extend beyond that of the original application.

3. Applications where a reservation has been entered in accordance with Art. 167(2)(a) EPC 1973

See H-III, 4.4.

4. International applications (Euro-PCT applications)

For more details on these, see A-XII and A-XIV.

Part D

Guidelines for Opposition and Limitation/Revocation Procedures

Contents

Chapter I – General remarks I-1

1.	The meaning of opposition	I-1
2.	Opposition after surrender or lapse	I-1
3.	Territorial effect of the opposition	I-1
4.	Entitlement to oppose	I-1
5.	Intervention of the assumed infringer	I-2
6.	Parties to opposition proceedings	I-2
7.	Representation	I-3
8.	Information to the public	I-3

Chapter II – The opposition division II-1

1.	Administrative structure	II-1
2.	Composition	II-1
2.1	Technically qualified members	II-1
2.2	Legally qualified members	II-1
2.3	Chair	II-1
3.	Allocation of duties and appointment of members of the opposition division	II-1
4.	Tasks of the opposition divisions	II-1
4.1	Examination of oppositions	II-1
4.2	Decision concerning the awarding of costs by the opposition division	II-2
4.3	Ancillary proceedings	II-2
5.	Allocation of tasks to members	II-3
6.	Duties and powers of members	II-3
7.	Allocation of individual duties	II-4

Chapter III – Opposition **III-1**

1.	Time allowed for filing notice of opposition	III-1
2.	Opposition fee	III-1
3.	Submission in writing	III-1
3.1	Form of the opposition	III-1
3.2	Notices of opposition filed electronically	III-1
3.3	Notices of opposition filed by fax	III-1
3.4	Signature of the notice of opposition	III-1
4.	Derogations from language requirements	III-2
5.	Grounds for opposition	III-2
6.	Content of the notice of opposition	III-3

Chapter IV – Procedure up to substantive examination **IV-1**

1.	Examination for deficiencies in the notice of opposition and communications from the formalities officer arising from this examination	IV-1
1.1	Forwarding of the notice of opposition to the formalities officer	IV-1
1.2	Examination for deficiencies in the notice of opposition	IV-1
1.2.1	Deficiencies which, if not remedied, lead to the opposition being deemed not filed	IV-1
1.2.2	Deficiencies which, if not remedied, lead to the opposition being rejected as inadmissible	IV-2
1.2.2.1	Deficiencies under Rule 77(1)	IV-2
1.2.2.2	Deficiencies under Rule 77(2)	IV-5
1.3	Issue of communications by the formalities officer as a result of examination for deficiencies	IV-6
1.3.1	Communication in the event of deficiencies as described in D-IV, 1.2.1 which, if not remedied, will lead to the opposition being deemed not filed	IV-6
1.3.2	Communication in the event of deficiencies as described in D-IV, 1.2.2 which, if not remedied, will lead to rejection of the opposition as inadmissible	IV-6
1.3.3	Extent of the formalities officer's obligation to issue the above communications	IV-6

1.4	Subsequent procedure in the event of deficiencies which may no longer be remedied	IV-7
1.4.1	Deficiencies which may no longer be remedied, as a result of which the opposition is deemed not filed	IV-7
1.4.2	Deficiencies which may no longer be remedied in accordance with Rule 77(1) and Rule 77(2), resulting in the opposition being rejected as inadmissible	IV-7
1.5	Notifications to and observations by the patent proprietor	IV-8
1.6	Subsequent procedure	IV-8
2.	Activity of the opposition division	IV-8
3.	Rejection of the opposition as inadmissible by the opposition division, the patent proprietor not being a party	IV-8
4.	Termination of opposition proceedings in the event of inadmissible opposition	IV-9
5.	Preparation of substantive examination	IV-9
5.1	Inadmissibility at a later stage	IV-9
5.2	Invitation to the patent proprietor to submit comments and communication of opposition to the other parties concerned by the formalities officer	IV-10
5.3	Filing of amended documents in reply to the notice of opposition	IV-10
5.4	Communication of observations from one of the parties to the other parties	IV-11
5.5	Decision concerning the admissibility of an opposition, the patent proprietor being a party	IV-11
5.6	Examination of the admissibility of an intervention and preparations in the event of an intervention	IV-12

Chapter V – Substantive examination of opposition

V-1

1.	Beginning of the examination of the opposition	V-1
2.	Extent of the examination	V-1
2.1	Extent to which the patent is opposed	V-1
2.2	Examination of the grounds for opposition	V-1

3.	Non-patentability pursuant to Arts. 52 to 57	<u>V-3</u>
4.	Insufficient disclosure of the invention	<u>V-3</u>
5.	Clarity of claims and support by the description	<u>V-3</u>
6.	Subject-matter of the European patent extending beyond the original disclosure	<u>V-5</u>
6.1	Basis of this ground for opposition	<u>V-5</u>
6.2	Distinction between allowable and unallowable amendments	<u>V-5</u>

Chapter VI – Procedure for the examination of the opposition

VI-1

1.	General remarks	<u>VI-1</u>
2.	Adherence to the text of the European patent submitted or approved by the patent proprietor	<u>VI-2</u>
2.1	Basis for the examination	<u>VI-2</u>
2.2	Revocation of the patent	<u>VI-2</u>
3.	Invitation to file observations	<u>VI-2</u>
3.1	Opposition division's communications	<u>VI-2</u>
3.2	Summons to oral proceedings	<u>VI-2</u>
4.	Communications from the opposition division to the patent proprietor	<u>VI-3</u>
4.1	Communications from the opposition division; reasoned statement	<u>VI-3</u>
4.2	Invitation to file observations	<u>VI-3</u>
5.	Additional search	<u>VI-3</u>
6.	Examination of the opposition during oral proceedings	<u>VI-4</u>
7.	Preparation of the decision	<u>VI-4</u>
7.1	General remarks	<u>VI-4</u>
7.2	Preparation of a decision to maintain a European patent in amended form	<u>VI-6</u>
7.2.1	Procedural requirements	<u>VI-6</u>

7.2.2	Decision on the documents on the basis of which the patent is to be maintained	VI-7
7.2.3	Request for translations and a formally compliant version of amended text passages	VI-8

8.	Request to stay opposition proceedings	VI-9

Chapter VII – Details and special features of the proceedings

VII-1

1.	Sequence of proceedings	VII-1

1.1	Basic principle	VII-1

1.2	Exceptions	VII-1

2.	Request for documents	VII-1

3.	Unity of the European patent	VII-2

3.1	Basic principle	VII-2

3.2	Factors affecting the unity of the European patent	VII-2

4.	Procedure where the patent proprietor is not entitled	VII-3

4.1	Stay of proceedings	VII-3

4.1.1	Date of the stay of proceedings	VII-3

4.1.2	Legal character and effect of the stay of proceedings	VII-3

4.2	Continuation of proceedings	VII-3

4.2.1	Continuation after a final decision	VII-4

4.2.2	Continuation regardless of the stage reached in national proceedings	VII-4

4.3	Interruption of time limits	VII-4

4.4	Department responsible	VII-5

5.	Continuation of the opposition proceedings in the cases covered by Rule 84	VII-5

5.1	Continuation in the case of surrender or lapse of the patent	VII-5

5.2	Continuation on the death or legal incapacity of the opponent	VII-5

5.3	Continuation after the opposition has been withdrawn	VII-6

6.	Intervention of the assumed infringer	VII-6

7.	Publication of a new specification of the patent	<u>VII-8</u>
8.	Transitional provisions for Art. 54(4) EPC 1973 and Art. 54(5) EPC	<u>VII-8</u>

Chapter VIII – Decisions of the opposition division **VIII-1**

1.	Final decisions on an admissible opposition	<u>VIII-1</u>
1.1	General remarks	<u>VIII-1</u>
1.2	Revocation of the European patent	<u>VIII-1</u>
1.2.1	Revocation on substantive grounds	<u>VIII-1</u>
1.2.2	Revocation for failure to file a translation or to file a formally compliant version of amended text passages	<u>VIII-1</u>
1.2.3	Revocation for failure to notify the appointment of a new representative	<u>VIII-2</u>
1.2.4	Revocation in the event of requirements not being met until after expiry of time limits	<u>VIII-2</u>
1.2.5	Revocation of the patent in the event that the patent proprietor no longer wishes the patent to be maintained as granted	<u>VIII-2</u>
1.3	Rejection of the opposition	<u>VIII-2</u>
1.4	Maintenance of the European patent as amended	<u>VIII-2</u>
1.4.1	Taking of a final decision	<u>VIII-2</u>
1.4.2	Statement in the decision of the amended form of the European patent	<u>VIII-3</u>
2.	Other decisions	<u>VIII-3</u>
2.1	Decision on the inadmissibility of an opposition or intervention	<u>VIII-3</u>
2.2	Decisions which do not terminate proceedings	<u>VIII-3</u>
2.3	Decision on a notified loss of rights at the request of the person concerned	<u>VIII-3</u>
2.4	Decision on re-establishment of rights	<u>VIII-3</u>
2.5	Decision on closure of the opposition proceedings	<u>VIII-3</u>

Chapter IX – Costs **IX-1**

1.	Charging of costs	<u>IX-1</u>
1.1	General principle	<u>IX-1</u>
1.2	Decisions on the apportionment of costs	<u>IX-1</u>

1.3	Costs to be taken into consideration	IX-1
1.4	Principle of equity	IX-2
2.	Procedure for the fixing of costs	IX-3
2.1	Fixing of costs by the opposition division	IX-3
2.2	Appeal against the fixing of costs by the opposition division	IX-3
3.	Enforcement of the fixing of costs	IX-3

Chapter X – Limitation and revocation procedure

1.	Introduction	X-1
2.	Examination for deficiencies in the request	X-1
2.1	Deficiencies which lead to the request being deemed not filed	X-1
2.2	Deficiencies which, if not remedied, lead to the request being rejected as inadmissible	X-2
3.	Decision on request for revocation	X-2
4.	Substantive examination (limitation)	X-3
4.1	Department responsible	X-3
4.2	Basis for the examination	X-3
4.3	Scope of the examination	X-3
4.3.1	Limitation of the claims	X-3
4.3.2	Art. 123	X-4
4.3.3	Art. 84	X-4
4.3.4	Points to be disregarded	X-4
4.4	Further stages of the examination	X-5
4.5	Third-party observations during the examination	X-5
5.	Formal procedure for limitation when the request is allowable	X-6
6.	Rejection of the request	X-6
7.	Relation to opposition proceedings	X-7
7.1	Precedence of opposition proceedings	X-7

7.2	Filing of opposition after decision on limitation	<u>X-7</u>
8.	Legal status of decisions	<u>X-7</u>
9.	Withdrawal of the request	<u>X-8</u>
10.	Different sets of claims	<u>X-8</u>
10.1	Limitation results in the claims becoming different in different contracting states	<u>X-8</u>
10.2	Limitation is different for different contracting states because the claims as granted were different for different contracting states	<u>X-8</u>
11.	Multiple requests	<u>X-9</u>

Chapter I – General remarks

1. The meaning of opposition

The public may oppose a granted European patent on the basis of one or more of the grounds mentioned in [Art. 100](#). The grounds on which the opposition is based may arise for example from circumstances the EPO was not aware of when the patent was granted (e.g. prior use or a publication not contained or not found among the material available to the EPO). Opposition is therefore a means by which any person (but see [D-I, 4](#)) may obtain the limitation or revocation of a wrongly granted patent.

2. Opposition after surrender or lapse

An opposition may be filed even if the European patent has been surrendered or has lapsed for all designated states. This is relevant in that in such cases the rights acquired with the patent remain in existence during the period up to surrender or lapse and claims arising from such rights may subsist after that date.

[Rule 75](#)

3. Territorial effect of the opposition

The opposition applies to the European patent in all the contracting states in which it has effect. Thus, the opposition has, in principle, to be in respect of all the designated states. If an opposition is filed in respect of only some of the designated states, it will be treated as if it were in respect of all the designated states.

[Art. 99\(2\)](#)

Nevertheless, the effect of an opposition may differ as between contracting states. This may arise where the patent contains different claims for different contracting states in accordance with [Rule 18\(2\)](#) (see [C-IX, 2.4](#)) or where the claims must take account of different art under the provisions of [Art. 54\(3\)](#) and [\(4\) EPC 1973](#) (see [D-VII, 8](#)). Amendments may also be occasioned by national rights of earlier date within the meaning of [Arts. 139\(2\)](#) and [140](#) (see [H-II, 3.3](#) and [H-III, 4.4](#)). Thus, the patent may be differently amended in respect of different contracting states and may be revoked in respect of one or more contracting states and not in respect of others.

[Art. 61](#)

[Art. 139\(2\)](#), [Art. 140](#)

4. Entitlement to oppose

"Any person" may give notice of opposition without specifying any particular interest. "Any person" is to be construed in line with [Art. 58](#) as meaning any natural person (private individual, self-employed persons, etc.), any legal person or any body assimilated to a legal person under the law governing it. "Any person" does not include the patent proprietor (see [G 9/93](#), reversing [G 1/84](#)).

[Art. 99\(1\)](#)

Notice of opposition may also be filed jointly by more than one of the persons mentioned above. In order to safeguard the rights of the patent proprietor and in the interests of procedural efficiency, it has to be clear throughout the procedure who belongs to the group of common opponents. If a common opponent (including the common representative) intends to withdraw from the proceedings, the EPO must be notified accordingly by the common representative or by a new common representative

determined under Rule 151(1) in order for the withdrawal to take effect (see also G 3/99).

Oppositions are not assignable but may be inherited or succeeded to as part of an overall succession in law, e.g. in the event of the merger of legal persons (see G 4/88). Acquiring companies may also take over oppositions filed by acquired companies. However, a legal person who was a subsidiary of the opponent when the opposition was filed and who carries on the business to which the opposed patent relates cannot acquire the status of opponent if all its shares are assigned to another company (see G 2/04).

The EPO has to examine the validity of a claimed transfer of opponent status to a new party *ex officio* at all stages of the proceedings (see T 1178/04).

5. Intervention of the assumed infringer

Art. 105(1) and (2)
Rule 89

Under certain conditions (see D-VII, 6), third parties who prove that proceedings for infringement of the opposed patent have been instituted against them or that they have been requested by the patent proprietor to cease alleged infringement of the patent and that they have instituted proceedings for a court ruling that they are not infringing the patent may, after the opposition period has expired, intervene in the opposition proceedings. If the notice of intervention is filed in good time and in due form, the intervention is to be treated as an opposition (see D-IV, 5.6). For accelerated processing of oppositions on request, see D-VII, 1.2 and E-VIII, 5.

6. Parties to opposition proceedings

Art. 99(3)
Art. 105(2)
Art. 115

The patent proprietor, the opponent(s) and, where applicable, the intervener(s) will be parties to the opposition proceedings. However, an opponent who has withdrawn their opposition or whose opposition has been rejected as inadmissible will remain a party to the proceedings only until the date of such withdrawal or the date on which the decision of rejection has become final. The same will apply in the case of interveners. Third parties who have presented observations concerning the patentability of the invention in respect of which an application has been filed are not parties to opposition proceedings (see E-VI, 3).

Art. 118

Where the patent proprietors are not the same in respect of different designated contracting states, they are to be regarded as joint patent proprietors for the purposes of opposition proceedings (see D-VII, 3.1 concerning the unity of the European patent).

Art. 99(4)
Art. 61(1)(a)

Where evidence has been provided that in a contracting state, following a final decision, a person has been entered in the patent register of that state instead of the previous patent proprietor, this person is entitled on request to replace the previous patent proprietor in respect of that state. In this event, by derogation from Art. 118, the previous patent proprietor and the person making the request are not deemed to be joint patent proprietors unless both so request. The aim of this provision is to afford new patent proprietors the opportunity to defend themselves against the opposition as

they see fit (see [D-VII, 3.2](#) as regards the conduct of the opposition proceedings in such cases).

The Legal Division is responsible for decisions in respect of entries in the Register of European Patents (see the decision of the President of the EPO dated 21 November 2013, [OJ EPO 2013, 600](#)). [Art. 20\(1\)](#)

If a person files two different notices of opposition to the same granted patent, they acquire party status as opponent only once ([T 9/00](#)). Two filings by the same opponent within the opposition period that individually are not admissible but taken together comply with [Art. 99\(1\)](#) and [Rule 76](#) are considered as one admissible opposition ([T 774/05](#); for a joint opposition, see [D-I, 4](#)).

Multiple oppositions are dealt with in the same proceedings (see [E-III, 6](#)). When there are multiple opponents and/or proprietors as parties to the same opposition proceedings, it is normally appropriate to deal with all relevant issues (including e.g. admissibility of one of the oppositions, see [D-IV, 5.5](#)) when taking the final decision, e.g. during the oral proceedings (also see [E-III, 6](#)). The legal framework is defined by the sum of the statements of the extent to which the patent is opposed and by the grounds for opposition submitted and substantiated in the notices of opposition provided by each opponent. If one of the oppositions is admissible but is later withdrawn, prejudicial grounds put forward in said opposition are generally examined by the opposition division of its own motion. If one of the oppositions is inadmissible, and provided at least one admissible opposition has been filed, the opposition division will consider of its own motion any *prima facie* relevant art cited in the inadmissible opposition (see [D-V, 2.2](#)).

7. Representation

As regards the requirements relating to representation of opponents and patent proprietors, see [A-VIII, 1](#). Deficiencies in the representation of an opponent when filing the opposition and their remedy are dealt with in [D-IV, 1.2.1\(ii\)](#) and [1.2.2\(iv\)](#).

8. Information to the public

As soon as an opposition has been received, its date of filing is entered in the Register of European Patents and published in the European Patent Bulletin. The same applies to the date on which opposition proceedings are concluded and the outcome of the proceedings (see also [A-XI, 4](#)).

Chapter II – The opposition division

1. Administrative structure

Each opposition division is assigned to an EPO directorate dedicated to conducting opposition proceedings. *Rule 11(1).*

2. Composition

2.1 Technically qualified members

An opposition division consists of three technically qualified members, at least two of whom must not have taken part in the proceedings for grant of the patent to which the opposition relates. *Art. 19(2)*
Rule 62a
Rule 63
Rule 64

Participation in the said proceedings includes, in particular, collaborating on the A2 publication, performing the search or a procedural act such as issuing a communication (including a communication under *Rules 62a, 63 or 64*) or signing a summons to oral proceedings. However, taking part in the proceedings of a patent family member, e.g. a parent or priority application of the opposed patent, is not considered as participation in the proceedings for grant of the patent to which the opposition relates for the purposes of *Art. 19(2)* (see also *C-IX, 1.1*).

2.2 Legally qualified members

If the opposition division considers that the nature of the decision so requires, it is enlarged by the addition of a legally qualified member who has not taken part in the proceedings for grant. *Art. 19(2)*

The principles established by the examining division for including a legally qualified member and consulting the Directorate Patent Law and Processes (the department responsible for providing legally qualified members for examining and opposition divisions) apply *mutatis mutandis* to the opposition division (see *C-VIII, 7*). Difficult legal questions may also arise when examining whether an opposition is to be rejected as inadmissible. In addition, consultation of a legally qualified member is to be considered in cases where it is questionable whether a disclosure by means other than a document was made available to the public.

2.3 Chair

The chair must be a technically qualified member who has not taken part in the grant proceedings (see *D-II, 2.1*).

3. Allocation of duties and appointment of members of the opposition division

C-II, 2 applies *mutatis mutandis*. *Rule 11(1).*

4. Tasks of the opposition divisions

4.1 Examination of oppositions

The opposition divisions are responsible for examining oppositions against European patents. *Art. 19(1)*

The examination of newly submitted documents for compliance with physical requirements will essentially be the task of the competent formalities officer (see D-II, 7, A-I, 2, A-III, 3.2 and C-VIII, 1).

Opposition proceedings are *inter partes*. It follows that the principle of impartiality of the opposition division extends to refraining from giving one-sided assistance to any party. In particular, the division may not require a specific kind of evidence (see E-IV, 4.4) or propose claim amendments.

This does not, however, affect the principle under Art. 114(1) that the opposition division may examine facts of its own motion (see D-V, 2.2).

4.2 Decision concerning the awarding of costs by the opposition division

Art. 104(2)

Rule 88(3) and (4)

The opposition division will decide on requests to have the costs fixed by the formalities officer reviewed (see D-II, 7 and D-IX, 2.1).

4.3 Ancillary proceedings

Art. 122(2)

Rule 136(4)

Rule 112(2)

The opposition division will be responsible for conducting ancillary proceedings arising in the course of opposition proceedings. Such ancillary proceedings may relate, for example, to a request for re-establishment of rights in respect of a time limit not observed vis-à-vis the EPO during the opposition proceedings, a request for a decision concerning a finding arrived at by the formalities officer that a right had been lost or a request for exclusion from file inspection. Additional tasks may be entrusted to the opposition divisions by the President of the EPO in accordance with Rule 11(2).

Rule 144

As regards exclusion from file inspection pursuant to Rule 144 in conjunction with the decision of the President of the EPO dated 12 July 2007, Special edition No. 3, OJ EPO 2007, J.3, see A-XI, 2.1. Documents having a substantive and/or procedural bearing on opposition proceedings can only be excluded from file inspection by way of exception (T 1691/15). Communications dealing with a request for exclusion from file inspection are excluded from file inspection and are issued separately from communications dealing with other issues. Depending on its content, a document (provisionally) excluded from file inspection and any communication concerning a request for its exclusion from file inspection may be forwarded to the other party or parties (Rule 81(2)). As the public must be informed of the grounds prejudicing or supporting the maintenance of an opposed patent, only documents or parts thereof not (provisionally) excluded from file inspection can be used as evidence to prove or to refute a ground for opposition.

If a party requests that the EPO exclude an otherwise public non-patent literature document from file inspection for reasons of copyright, the opposition division will interpret this as a request not to make the document available to third parties in the public part of the file. This request, in the above interpretation, is normally granted if the copyright of the document in question is not owned by a party to the proceedings and the document in question is relatively easily retrievable, including against payment. For example, a scientific article is usually easily retrievable, and its copyright is

assigned to the editor. In contrast, a third-party company brochure is not easily retrievable. If the copyright of such company brochure is owned by a party to the proceedings, the request is refused by the opposition division and the document is made available via file inspection.

Where the request not to make a document available via file inspection for reasons of copyright is acceded to by the opposition division, the page(s) carrying the bibliographic details of the non-patent literature document (normally the cover page) will nonetheless be made available via file inspection in order to ensure that members of the public are in a position to retrieve the entire document. The non-patent literature document is not considered as being excluded from file inspection within the meaning of Rule 144 and can be used as evidence in the opposition proceedings.

5. Allocation of tasks to members

An opposition division will normally entrust one of its members with the examination of the opposition up to when the final decision is taken (see also D-IV.2), though not with the conduct of oral proceedings. If need be, the same member may also be entrusted with the examination of the evidence adduced (see E-IV.1.3). This member will be referred to as the first member.

Art. 19(2)

Rule 119(1)

6. Duties and powers of members

The first member will conduct the examination of the opposition. If oral proceedings have been requested, they are normally arranged as the first action, possibly in conjunction with the taking of evidence (see E-III.1 to E-III.4 and E-IV.1.6.1). The first member will prepare the communication accompanying the summons to oral proceedings and submit it to the other members. If the first member considers it necessary to send communications to the parties before the summons to oral proceedings, these communications will be submitted to the opposition division before dispatch.

If there are differences of opinion within the opposition division, the first member will confer with the other members to discuss the points at issue. The chair will preside at the meeting and, following a discussion, take a vote on the decision or the further course of the procedure.

Voting will be on the basis of a simple majority. In the event of a tie, the chair will have the deciding vote.

Art. 19(2)

Any further measures necessary will be entrusted as a rule to the first member. If no further measures are necessary, the first member will draft a decision on the opposition and distribute the draft to the other members of the opposition division for examination and signature. If any changes are proposed by a member and there are differences of opinion on such changes, the chair must arrange a meeting.

Where reference is made hereafter to the opposition division, this is to be taken to mean the first member where such a member has been appointed and in so far as the EPC entitles an opposition division member to act alone.

7. Allocation of individual dutiesRule 11(3)

The President of the EPO may entrust employees who are not technically or legally qualified with the execution of individual duties falling to the examining divisions or the opposition divisions and involving no technical or legal difficulties. In so far as such duties affect the public, their allocation will be notified in the Official Journal of the EPO (see decisions of the President of the EPO dated 12 December 2013, OJ EPO 2014, A6, and 23 November 2015, OJ EPO 2015, A104).

The formalities officers entrusted with these duties are also in charge of fixing the amount of the costs (see D-IX, 2.1).

Chapter III – Opposition

1. Time allowed for filing notice of opposition

Notice of opposition has to be given to the EPO in Munich, The Hague or Berlin within nine months of the publication of the mention of the grant of the European patent. *Art. 99(1)*

For expiry of the time limit see E-VIII, 1.4. Opponent are not eligible to request re-establishment of rights in respect of unobserved time limits for opposition (see, however, E-VIII, 3.1.2).

2. Opposition fee

The amount of the opposition fee specified in the Rules relating to Fees under the EPC must be paid before expiry of the time limit for opposition. *Art. 99(1)*

An opposition filed jointly by two or more persons, which otherwise meets the requirements of Art. 99 and Rules 3 and 76, is admissible on payment of only a single opposition fee (see G 3/99).

As regards the legal consequences and the procedure where the fee is not paid in good time, see D-IV, 1.2.1(i) and 1.4.1.

3. Submission in writing

3.1 Form of the opposition

The notice of opposition must be filed in writing and must be typewritten or printed, with a margin of about 2.5 cm on the left-hand side of each page. Where possible, the notice of opposition should also satisfy the requirements laid down in Rule 49(2) in conjunction with the decision of the President of the EPO dated 7 July 2025 (OJ EPO 2025, A49). *Rule 86*
Rule 50(2)
Rule 49(2)
Rule 76(1)

3.2 Notices of opposition filed electronically

Without prejudice to other means of filing, notices of opposition may be filed in electronic form using Online Filing 2.0 or the EPO Contingency Upload Service (OJ EPO 2025, A52).

3.3 Notices of opposition filed by fax

Since 1 July 2024, notices of opposition may not be filed by fax (see the decision of the President of the EPO dated 22 April 2024, OJ EPO 2024, A41). Any documents transmitted to the EPO by fax are deemed not to have been received. *Rule 2*

3.4 Signature of the notice of opposition

The notice of opposition must be signed by the person responsible, i.e. the opponent or, where appropriate, the representative (see also D-IV, 1.2.1(ii) and A-VIII, 1). *Rule 50(3)*
Rule 2

Initials or other abbreviated forms will not be accepted as a signature.

Where the notice of opposition is filed in electronic form, the signature may take the form of a facsimile signature or a text string signature (i.e. a type-

written signature that is preceded and followed by a forward slash (/); see OJ EPO 2025, A52).

If the signature is omitted, the formalities officer must invite the party, or where appropriate the representative, to affix their signature within a time limit to be laid down by the formalities officer. If signed in due time, the document retains its original date of receipt; otherwise, it is deemed not to have been received (see D-IV, 1.2.1(ii) and 1.4.1).

4. Derogations from language requirements

Derogations from language requirements for written opposition proceedings are dealt with in A-VII, 3 (for documents filed as evidence, see A-VII, 3.4) and for oral opposition proceedings in E-V.

5. Grounds for opposition

A written reasoned statement of the grounds for opposition must be filed within the opposition period.

Opposition may only be filed on the grounds that:

- (i) the subject-matter of the European patent is not patentable under Arts. 52 to 57, because it
 - is not new (Arts. 52(1), 54 and 55)
 - does not involve an inventive step (Arts. 52(1) and 56)
 - is not susceptible of industrial application (Arts. 52(1) and 57)
 - is not regarded as an invention under Art. 52(1) to (3) or
 - is not patentable under Art. 53
- (ii) the European patent does not disclose the invention in a manner sufficiently clear and complete for it to be carried out by a person skilled in the art (see Art. 83)
- (iii) the subject-matter of the European patent extends beyond the content of the application as filed (see Art. 123(2)) or, if the patent was granted on a divisional application or on a new application filed under Art. 61 (new application in respect of the invention by the person adjudged in a final decision to be entitled to the grant of a European patent), beyond the content of the earlier application as filed (see Art. 76(1)).

(See also D-V, 3, D-V, 4 and D-V, 6.)

Note that each individual condition mentioned above forms a separate legal basis for objection to the maintenance of the patent. Consequently, each such condition is to be regarded as a distinct ground for opposition (see G 1/95 and G 7/95).

Art. 99(1)
Rule 76(1)

Art. 100

Art. 100(a)

Art. 100(b)

Art. 100(c)

The following allegations, for example, do not constitute grounds for opposition:

- that national rights of earlier date exist, calling into question the patentability of the invention (see, however, H-III, 4.4)
- that the patent proprietor is not entitled to the European patent
- that the subject-matter of the patent lacks unity
- that the claims are not supported by the description (unless it is also argued that the claims are so broadly worded that the description in the specification does not sufficiently disclose the subject-matter within the meaning of Art. 100(b))
- that the form and content of the description or drawings of the patent do not comply with the provisions as to formal requirements set forth in Rules 42 and 49(2) in conjunction with the decision of the President of the EPO dated 7 July 2025 (OJ EPO 2025, A49) or
- that the designation of the inventor is incorrect.

Nor does the simple allegation that priority has been wrongly claimed constitute a ground for opposition. However, the matter of priority must be subjected to substantive examination in the course of opposition proceedings if prior art is invoked in connection with a ground for opposition under Art. 100(a) in relation to which the priority date is of decisive importance (see G-IV, 3 and F-VI, 2). The prohibition on double patenting under Art. 125 does not constitute a ground for opposition either.

6. Content of the notice of opposition

The notice of opposition, filed in a written reasoned statement, must contain:

- (i) the name, address and nationality of the opponent and the state in which the opponent's residence or principal place of business is located. Names of natural persons must be indicated by the person's family name and given name(s), the family name being indicated before the given name(s). Names of legal entities, as well as companies considered to be legal entities by reason of the legislation to which they are subject, must be indicated by their official designations. Addresses must be indicated in such a way as to satisfy the customary requirements for prompt postal delivery at the indicated address. They must comprise all the relevant administrative units, including the house number, if any. Opponents (whether natural or legal persons) whose residence or principal place of business is in an EPC contracting state and who act without a professional representative can use an address for correspondence other than their residence. The address for correspondence must be the opponent's own address. Post cannot be sent to a different (natural or legal) person, since that requires a valid form of

Rule 76(2)(a)

Rule 41(2)(c)

representation under Arts. 133 and 134. It is recommended that the telephone number be indicated (see D-IV, 1.2.2.2(i) and 1.4.2)

- Rule 76(2)(b) (ii) the number of the European patent against which opposition is filed, the name of the patent proprietor and the title of the invention (see D-IV, 1.2.2.2(ii) and 1.4.2)
- Rule 76(1)
Rule 76(2)(c) (iii) a statement of the extent to which the European patent is opposed and of the grounds on which the opposition is based as well as an indication of the facts and evidence presented in support of these grounds (see D-IV, 1.2.2.1(iii) to 1.2.2.1(v) and 1.4.2). The requirement under Rule 76(1) that notice of opposition must be filed in a written reasoned statement also implies presenting arguments. However, in order to streamline the opposition procedure, it is recommended that a single copy of any written evidence be submitted as soon as possible and ideally with the notice of opposition (see D-IV, 1.2.2.1(v), last two paragraphs)
- Rule 76(2)(d) (iv) if the opponent has appointed a representative, the representative's name and address of place of business in accordance with the provisions of subparagraph (i) as set out above (see D-IV, 1.2.2.2(iii) and 1.4.2).

D-IV, 1 sets out further details and explains how to deal with the opposition if one of these requirements is not fulfilled.

Chapter IV – Procedure up to substantive examination

1. Examination for deficiencies in the notice of opposition and communications from the formalities officer arising from this examination

1.1 Forwarding of the notice of opposition to the formalities officer

The notice of opposition must be forwarded directly to the formalities officer, who then places it in the electronic file of the European patent concerned in accordance with the relevant administrative instructions and communicates it without delay to the patent proprietor for information. If a notice of opposition is received prior to the publication of the mention of the grant of the European patent, the formalities officer informs the sender that their document cannot be treated as an opposition. This document becomes part of the file and, as such, is also available for inspection under [Art. 128\(4\)](#), and is brought to the attention of the applicant or the patent proprietor as an observation by a third party in accordance with [Art. 115](#) (for details, see [E-VI, 3](#)). If an opposition fee has been paid, it will be refunded.

Examinations, observations, communications and, where appropriate, invitations to the parties will be the responsibility of the formalities officer, who has been entrusted with duties falling to the opposition division (see [D-II, 7](#)).

1.2 Examination for deficiencies in the notice of opposition

After notice of opposition has been given, the formalities officer examines whether any deficiencies exist.

1.2.1 Deficiencies which, if not remedied, lead to the opposition being deemed not filed

The following deficiencies fall into this category:

- (i) The opposition fee has not been paid within the opposition period or the amount paid is insufficient ([Art. 99\(1\)](#); see also [G 1/18](#)). However, if all but a small amount of the opposition fee has been paid (e.g. due to the deduction of bank charges) within the opposition period, the formalities officer examines whether the shortfall can be overlooked where this is justified. If they conclude that the shortfall can be overlooked, the opposition fee is deemed paid and there is no deficiency in the present sense. [Art. 7 RFees](#)
[Art. 8 RFees](#)
- (ii) The document giving notice of opposition is not signed and this is not rectified within the period set by the formalities officer, which is fixed at two months as a rule (see [E-VIII, 1.2](#)) ([Rule 50\(3\)](#)).

For cases covered by [Art. 133\(2\)](#) (see also [D-IV, 1.2.2.2\(iv\)](#)), a professional representative first has to be appointed within the prescribed time limit. The above applies if the appointed representative then fails to remedy such deficiency either by signing the notice or by approving it in writing.

- (iii) Where a notice of opposition is filed by the representative or employee of an opponent, and the authorisation, where required (see A-VIII, 1.6 and the decision of the President of the EPO dated 7 July 2025, OJ EPO 2025, A45), is not supplied in due time (Rule 152(1) to (3) and (6)).
- (iv) The opposition is submitted within the opposition period but not in an official language of the EPO, as specified in Rule 3(1), or if Art. 14(4) applies to the opponent, the translation of the elements referred to in Rule 76(2)(c) is not submitted within the opposition period (see also A-VII, 2, G 6/91 and T 193/87). This period is extended where the one-month period as required under Rule 6(2) expires later. This deficiency exists if the opposition is not filed in English, French or German or if, for example, an opponent from Belgium files an opposition in time in Dutch but fails to file the English, French or German translation of the essential elements within the above-mentioned time limits.

For oppositions which, upon submission, are deemed not filed because of deficiencies as described above, see the subsequent procedure as described in D-IV, 1.3.1, 1.3.3 and 1.4.1.

1.2.2 Deficiencies which, if not remedied, lead to the opposition being rejected as inadmissible

Only such oppositions as are deemed filed will be examined for deficiencies under Rule 77(1) and (2).

If the formalities officer is not sure whether the opposition in question contains a deficiency under Rule 76(2)(c), they will submit the file to the opposition division for checking. They will do this in particular if the opposition alleges non-patentability under Art. 52, 54 or 56 and the relevant prior art has been made available to the public by means other than by written description, or if taking of evidence has been requested in accordance with Rule 117.

In this connection the opposition division will also examine the extent to which it is necessary for the formalities officer to invite the opponent to submit evidence (see D-IV, 1.2.2.1(v)).

1.2.2.1 Deficiencies under Rule 77(1)

The following deficiencies fall into this category:

- (i) The notice of opposition is not filed in writing with the EPO in Munich, The Hague or Berlin within the nine-month opposition period, calculated from the date of publication of the mention of the grant of the European patent in the European Patent Bulletin (Art. 99(1)).

Accordingly, the opposition is deficient if, for example, notice of opposition is submitted to the EPO belatedly, i.e. after expiry of the nine-month period, or where the opposition is notified within the opposition period but only verbally in a telephone call officially noted in the files. This category of deficiency also includes oppositions

which, notwithstanding Art. 99(1), are filed with the central industrial property office of a contracting state or a subordinate authority and not forwarded by these offices either at all or in time for them to be received by the EPO before the expiry of the opposition period. There is no legal obligation upon these offices or authorities to forward oppositions to the EPO.

- (ii) The notice of opposition does not provide sufficient identification of the European patent against which opposition is filed.

Such a deficiency exists if the EPO is unable to identify the relevant patent on the basis of the particulars in the notice of opposition; for example, if the notice mentions only the proprietor of the contested patent and perhaps the title of the invention for which the patent was granted. Such particulars on their own do not constitute an adequate description of the contested European patent unless the patent proprietor who alone is named possesses only one patent or, where they possess several patents, the subject-matter of only one fits the title of the invention given in the notice of opposition, being clearly distinct from the subject-matter of the other patents held by this proprietor. Simply indicating the number of the contested European patent in the notice of opposition constitutes sufficient identification of the patent concerned provided that no conflicting information is given, e.g. an inconsistent name for the patent proprietor, and the conflict cannot be resolved from the information given.

- (iii) The notice of opposition contains no statement of the extent to which the European patent is opposed. Rule 76(2)(c)

Such a deficiency exists if it is not clear from the requisite statement whether the opposition is directed against the entire subject-matter of the patent or only a part of it, i.e. whether it is directed against all the claims or only one or a part of one claim, such as an alternative or embodiment,

- (iv) The notice of opposition contains no statement of the grounds on which the opposition is based. Rule 76(2)(c)

A notice of opposition contains such a deficiency if it does not mention at least one of the grounds for opposition referred to in Art. 100 (see D-III, 5). If non-patentability is given as a ground for opposition, the statement of grounds must at least implicitly indicate which conditions for patentability (Arts. 52 to 57) are considered not to have been fulfilled.

- (v) The notice of opposition is not adequately substantiated. Art. 99(1)
Rule 76(2)(c)

According to Rule 76(2)(c), a notice of opposition has to contain a statement of the extent to which the European patent is opposed, the grounds on which the opposition is based, as well as an indication of the facts and evidence presented in support of these grounds for opposition.

The wording of Rule 76(2)(c) clearly indicates that there is a difference between the grounds for opposition, i.e. the legal basis for revocation of the patent (e.g. Art. 100(a)), and the facts and evidence presented in support of these grounds. Where the facts and evidence are entirely absent or so vague as not to allow a proper understanding of the case, the opposition is considered to contain only a mere allegation, which is not sufficient to render the opposition admissible.

Therefore, the opponent has to substantiate the grounds for opposition by adducing facts, evidence and arguments for at least one of those grounds. The opponent has to establish the legal and factual framework on which the opposition rests to pave the way for a substantive assessment. As a consequence, the division and the patent proprietor need to be able to understand, without further investigation of their own, the issues that need to be decided. For an opposition to be admissible, a final decision does not have to be able to be taken without further investigation. In other words, it is not a question of admissibility but of substantive examination whether the facts on which the opponent relies in comprehensibly explaining a ground for opposition are or can be proven.

Where the grounds comprise an allegation of a prior use or an oral disclosure prior to the date of filing or the priority date, the opposition division must be supplied with an indication of the facts, evidence and arguments necessary to determine:

- (a) the date on which the alleged use occurred ("when")
- (b) what was used ("what")
- (c) and the circumstances relating to the use ("where, how, by whom") (G-IV, 7.2 and 7.3).

Where there are multiple grounds for opposition, if the facts, evidence and arguments for one ground are sufficiently indicated, the opposition is admissible even if the facts, evidence and arguments in support of the other grounds are submitted belatedly. Such belated facts, evidence and arguments are in that event dealt with in accordance with E-VI, 2. Owing to the length of the opposition period (nine months), however, in order to expedite the opposition proceedings, it is recommended that a single copy of any written evidence indicated in the notice of opposition be submitted as soon as possible and ideally with the notice of opposition.

Rule 76(2)(c)
Rule 83

Otherwise, if the opposition is admissible, the opponent will be invited to supply such evidence as soon as possible and as a rule within two months. If the documents thus requested are neither enclosed nor filed within the time limit set, the opposition division may decide not to take into account any arguments based on them. (As regards facts or evidence not submitted in due time and arguments presented at a late stage, see E-VI, 2.)

As far as the admissibility of an opposition is concerned, it is immaterial whether and to what extent the facts, evidence and arguments submitted in due time actually warrant revocation of the contested European patent or its maintenance in amended form. On the one hand, an unconvincing ground for opposition may have been substantiated (making the opposition admissible), whereas on the other hand a deficient submission may have been rejected as inadmissible even though, if properly drafted, it could have succeeded (see also T 222/85).

The substantiation of the grounds for opposition thus has to be clearly distinguished from the actual assessment of the evidence, which is part of the process of ascertaining whether the opposition is well-founded in substance, i.e. proven. Subject to the admissibility of the opposition, this has to be established by the opposition division.

- (vi) The opposition does not indicate beyond any doubt the identity of the person filing the opposition (Art. 99(1) and Rule 76(2)(a)). Art. 99(1)
Rule 76(2)(a)

1.2.2.2 Deficiencies under Rule 77(2)

The following deficiencies fall within this category:

- (i) The notice of opposition does not specify the name, address and nationality of the opponent and the state in which the opponent's residence or principal place of business is located in the prescribed manner (see D-III, 6(i)). Rule 76(2)(a)
- (ii) The number of the European patent against which the opposition is filed or the name of the patent proprietor or the title of the invention is not indicated. Rule 76(2)(b)

Each of the particulars listed in (ii) above must be supplied within the time limit set by the formalities officer (see D-IV, 1.3.2), even if the contested European patent may be identified by means of one of these or other particulars within the opposition period (see D-IV, 1.2.2.1(ii)). If the name of the patent proprietor as indicated by the opponent is not the same as that recorded in the Register, the formalities officer will inform the opponent of the patent proprietor's correct name.

- (iii) Where the opponent has appointed a representative, their name or the address of their place of business is not indicated in the notice of opposition in the prescribed manner (see D-III, 6(iv)). Rule 76(2)(d)
- (iv) The opponent has neither residence nor principal place of business in one of the contracting states (Art. 133(2)) and has not communicated the appointment of a professional representative (Art. 134). In the communication requesting remedy of such deficiency the opponent must also be asked to arrange for the signature or approval of the notice of opposition by the representative to be appointed.

Rule 86

- (v) The notice of opposition fails to satisfy further formal requirements other than those mentioned in Rule 77(1). For instance, it may fail to comply with the provisions of Rule 50(2) without due justification.

1.3 Issue of communications by the formalities officer as a result of examination for deficienciesArt. 14(4)Rule 2(1)Rule 3(1)Rule 6(2)Rule 50(3)Rule 77(1) and (2)Rule 152(1) to (3)

If, in the course of the examination as described in D-IV, 1.2, the formalities officer notes deficiencies which may still be remedied, and if there are no deficiencies which may no longer be remedied, they will issue the communications described in D-IV, 1.3.1 and/or 1.3.2 to the opponent, if possible in a single communication. For the procedure in the event of deficiencies which may no longer be remedied, see D-IV, 1.4.

1.3.1 Communication in the event of deficiencies as described in D-IV, 1.2.1 which, if not remedied, will lead to the opposition being deemed not filed

The communication will indicate the deficiencies noted in accordance with D-IV, 1.2.1 and will state that the opposition will be deemed not filed unless the deficiency or deficiencies are remedied within the time limits indicated in D-IV, 1.2.1.

1.3.2 Communication in the event of deficiencies as described in D-IV, 1.2.2 which, if not remedied, will lead to rejection of the opposition as inadmissible

The communication will indicate the deficiencies noted in accordance with D-IV, 1.2.2.1 or 1.2.2.2 and will state that the opposition will be rejected as inadmissible unless the deficiencies as described in D-IV, 1.2.2.1 are remedied within the opposition period and unless the deficiencies as described in D-IV, 1.2.2.2 are remedied within the period stipulated by the formalities officer.

1.3.3 Extent of the formalities officer's obligation to issue the above communications

Although not obliged to do so, the formalities officer may notify the opponent of the deficiencies described in D-IV, 1.2.1(i) and D-IV, 1.2.2.1 in good time before expiry of the time limits within which remedial action is still possible. The opponent can seek no legal remedy against failure to issue these communications as they are provided strictly as a courtesy, largely to help the opponent avoid any adverse legal consequences. In contrast, the formalities officer is required to officially notify the opponent of the deficiencies described in D-IV, 1.2.1(ii) and 1.2.2.2, since this is a statutory requirement. Should this communication inadvertently be omitted notwithstanding the existence of such deficiencies in the notice of opposition, the opponent may submit the missing particulars on their own initiative at any time, even after the expiry of the opposition period, without suffering adverse legal consequences.

1.4 Subsequent procedure in the event of deficiencies which may no longer be remedied

1.4.1 Deficiencies which may no longer be remedied, as a result of which the opposition is deemed not filed

If the formalities officer establishes that the deficiencies referred to in D-IV.1.2.1 have not been remedied within the time limits laid down in the EPC or by the EPO, they will inform the opponent in accordance with Art. 119 that the notice of opposition is deemed not filed and that a decision may be applied for under Rule 112(2) (see E-VIII.1.9.3). If no such application is made within the prescribed period of two months after notification of this communication, and if there is no other valid opposition pending, the proceedings are closed and the parties informed accordingly. Any opposition fees which have been paid are refunded.

Rule 112(1)

Documents submitted with a notice of opposition which is deemed not filed will form part of the file and will thus be available for inspection in accordance with Art. 128(4). They will be regarded as observations by third parties under Art. 115 (see in this regard D-V.2.2 and E-VI.3). If a further admissible opposition is pending, the proceedings are continued in respect of it.

1.4.2 Deficiencies which may no longer be remedied in accordance with Rule 77(1) and Rule 77(2), resulting in the opposition being rejected as inadmissible

If there are no deficiencies of the type referred to in D-IV.1.4.1 but a notice of opposition which is deemed filed reveals deficiencies under Rule 77(1) (see D-IV.1.2.2.1) which may no longer be remedied and which have not been communicated to the opponent(s) in accordance with D-IV.1.3.2 (because the opposition period has already expired), the formalities officer must, by virtue of Art. 113(1), notify the opponent(s) of these deficiencies, allowing them time in which to submit comments (normally two months), and point out to them that the notice of opposition is likely to be rejected as inadmissible.

If the opponent:

- does not successfully refute the opinion expressed by the formalities officer on the existence of deficiencies under Rule 77(1) that may no longer be corrected or
- has failed to remedy in good time deficiencies that may be corrected (Rule 77(2)) and that were communicated to them pursuant to D-IV.1.3.2,

the formalities officer will reject the notice of opposition as inadmissible, except in the case mentioned in D-IV.1.2.2.1(v) (for which the opposition division is competent to decide, see the decisions of the President of the EPO dated 12 December 2013 and 23 November 2015 concerning the entrustment to non-examining staff of certain duties incumbent on the examining or opposition divisions, OJ EPO 2014, A6, and OJ EPO 2015, A104). As regards the form of the decision, see E-IX.2.3 and 2.6.

However, if the opponent has requested oral proceedings or a further admissible opposition is pending, the formalities officer will submit the opposition documents to the directorate responsible for the European patent in suit (for designation of an opposition division, see D-IV, 2).

The decision declaring the opposition inadmissible under Rule 77(1) or (2) can be taken without the participation of the patent proprietor in accordance with Rule 77(3). However, for reasons of procedural economy, the substantive examination is in fact initiated if at least one further admissible opposition is pending. The patent proprietor may also comment on the admissibility of the former opposition in the course of that examination.

When the decision declaring the opposition inadmissible becomes final the opponent concerned is no longer considered a party to the proceedings.

1.5 Notifications to and observations by the patent proprietor

The patent proprietor is also notified of communications and decisions on whether the opposition is deemed filed and admissible for information. They in turn may file observations on such communications on their own initiative.

1.6 Subsequent procedure

For the subsequent procedure in the event of one or more oppositions with no deficiencies, see D-IV, 5.2.

2. Activity of the opposition division

Art. 19(2)

Formalities officers submit the file to the directorate in question on dispatch of the invitation to the proprietor to submit comments in the cases referred to in D-IV, 5.2; in all other cases (see D-IV, 1.4.2) they submit it immediately.

The director responsible will then designate the three technical members of the competent opposition division. The opposition division will decide whether one of its members – and if so, which – is to be entrusted with the examination of the opposition up to the taking of a decision (see D-II, 5). The technical members of the division will not be designated if the opposition is rejected as inadmissible by the formalities officer and no further admissible opposition has been filed (see D-IV, 1.4.2).

3. Rejection of the opposition as inadmissible by the opposition division, the patent proprietor not being a party

(For rejection of the opposition as inadmissible at a later stage, the patent proprietor being a party, see D-IV, 5.1 and 5.5.)

In cases of insufficient substantiation, where the formalities officer is not competent to decide on the inadmissibility (see D-IV, 1.2.2.1(v)), the opposition division will either:

- (i) issue the decision rejecting the opposition as inadmissible (when the formalities officer has already informed the opponent of this deficiency pursuant to D-IV, 1.3.2) or

- (ii) consider the opposition admissible and continue with examination of the opposition (see D-V) or
- (iii) communicate its findings to the opponent(s) in question and at the same time invite them to submit observations.

If the opponent does not successfully refute the opinion expressed by the opposition division on the existence of deficiencies that may no longer be corrected, the opposition division will reject the notice of opposition as inadmissible, possibly after holding oral proceedings. As regards the form of the decision, see E-IX, 2.3 and 2.6.

The decision will be communicated to the other parties. An inadmissible opposition or documents produced in support of an inadmissible opposition will be placed in the file and will therefore be available for inspection in accordance with Art. 128(4). As regards the possibility of taking them into consideration as observations by third parties, see D-V, 2.2 and E-VI, 3. If there are further admissible oppositions, for reasons of procedural economy this decision to reject the opposition as inadmissible will normally be taken at the end of the procedure together with the decision on the admissible oppositions.

For the possibility of appeal by the opponent and other possible means of redress, see E-XI, 1 and 7.

4. Termination of opposition proceedings in the event of inadmissible opposition

Under Art. 101(1) and Rule 79(1), the examination as to whether the European patent can be maintained can only be performed if at least one admissible opposition has been filed. This means that the opposition division has to refrain from commenting on the substantive merits of the opposition when expressing an opinion on its inadmissibility if there is no further admissible opposition (see T 925/91). Opposition proceedings are terminated if all notices of opposition filed against a European patent have been rejected as inadmissible and the last decision in this respect has become final. This will be communicated to the parties.

5. Preparation of substantive examination

5.1 Inadmissibility at a later stage

The admissibility of the opposition must be examined *ex officio* in every phase of the proceedings. In particular, the opposition division examines whether the notice of opposition is adequately substantiated (see D-IV, 1.2.2.1(v)).

Since the admissibility of an opposition is always open to challenge from the patent proprietor, no separate communication that the opposition is admissible will be sent to the opponent or the patent proprietor. Where deficiencies likely to render the opposition inadmissible but not brought to the attention of the opponent by the formalities officer are discovered by the opposition division either in the opposition documents submitted or when the patent proprietor points to them during the proceedings, the opposition

division will inform the parties about its reservations in a communication and at the same time invite the opponent in question to submit observations. If deficiencies within the meaning of Rule 77(2) are involved, it is sufficient to specify a period for the opponent to remedy such deficiencies.

If the opponent does not successfully refute the opinion expressed by the opposition division on the existence of deficiencies that may no longer be corrected or fails to remedy in good time deficiencies that may be corrected, the opposition division will reject the opposition as inadmissible, possibly after having held oral proceedings. As regards the form of the decision, see E-IX, 2.3 and 2.6. For subsequent procedure, see the last two paragraphs of D-IV, 3.

5.2 Invitation to the patent proprietor to submit comments and communication of opposition to the other parties concerned by the formalities officer

Rule 79(1) and (2)

If the formalities officer considers that for at least one opposition no *ex officio* objection remains either to the admissibility or to a deficiency mentioned in D-IV, 1.2.1, they will invite the patent proprietor to file observations concerning the oppositions communicated earlier and to file amendments, where appropriate, to the description, claims and drawings. This invitation will be sent immediately after expiry of the opposition period or the period laid down by the formalities officer for the remedying of the deficiencies in accordance with Rule 77(2) (see D-IV, 1.2.2.2) or for the presentation of evidence (see D-IV, 1.2.2.1(v)). It will normally be issued with a four-month time limit for reply (see E-VIII, 5 for accelerated processing of oppositions). Extension of the time limit will only be granted in exceptional cases on the basis of a duly substantiated request (see E-VIII, 1.6 and the notice from the EPO dated 31 May 2016, OJ EPO 2016, A42).

If several notices of opposition have been filed, the formalities officer will communicate them to the other opponent(s) at the same time as the communication provided for in the previous paragraph. This will not be combined with an invitation to file observations or the setting of a time limit.

However, copies of all documents annexed to notices of opposition, which are available for inspection and for download via the Register, will no longer be automatically transmitted (see A-XI, 2 and the notice from the EPO dated 9 March 2022, OJ EPO 2022, A28).

5.3 Filing of amended documents in reply to the notice of opposition

In so far as relevant at the stage reached in the procedure, amended documents must be as complete as possible and drawn up in such a way as to allow the European patent, where appropriate, to be maintained without further delay in the amended version.

These considerations apply also to auxiliary requests in which the patent proprietor proposes amendments for consideration by the opposition division only if the division is unable to grant the main request, for example that the opposition is to be rejected. In both cases, however, it will be more

convenient in certain circumstances to determine first the form of the claims, leaving purely consequential amendments in the description to be dealt with later (see [D-V, 5](#)).

Care must be taken to ensure that no amendment contravenes [Art. 123\(2\)](#) and (3) (see [D-V, 6](#) and [H-V, 2](#) and [3](#)). For this reason, the patent proprietor should indicate the basis for any amendments in the original application documents and, if applicable, in the claims of the granted patent. It is also necessary to check that the patent, by virtue of the amendments **themselves**, does not contravene the requirements of the EPC (with the exception of [Art. 82](#) and [Rule 43\(2\)](#), see [D-V, 2.2](#)). The patent proprietor should therefore file their substantive observations regarding the allowability of the subject-matter of the patent as amended, in particular taking account of the grounds for opposition mentioned in the notice of opposition.

Amendments to the description in opposition should be made by submitting amended paragraphs replacing specific numbered paragraphs of the B publication of the patent. This allows the opposition division and the opponents to verify the amendments efficiently. For reasons of procedural economy, the filing of a completely retyped description should be avoided (see [H-III, 2.3](#)). See also [H-III, 2.2](#) to [2.4](#) for the form of amended documents.

Observations and any amendments made by of the patent proprietor are communicated without delay by the formalities officer to the opponent(s) for information. No time limit for reply is set.

5.4 Communication of observations from one of the parties to the other parties

The formalities officer will, at any stage in the procedure, immediately communicate the observations of any of the parties to the other parties for information. However, copies of all documents annexed to letters (including amendments), which are available for inspection and for download via the Register, will no longer be automatically transmitted (see also [D-IV, 5.2](#), [A-XI, 2](#) and the notice from the EPO dated 9 March 2022, [OJ EPO 2022, A28](#)).

[Rule 79\(3\)](#)

[Rule 81\(2\)](#)

If the opposition division considers that observations are called for in the course of the subsequent procedure, a separate invitation is issued and a period is fixed (normally four months), with or without a communication stating the grounds.

5.5 Decision concerning the admissibility of an opposition, the patent proprietor being a party

If the patent proprietor, when replying to the notice of opposition, contends that the opposition is inadmissible pursuant to [Rule 77\(1\)](#) and (2) because of deficiencies they themselves specified, the opponent concerned must be given the opportunity to submit comments within a period fixed by the formalities officer (normally two months).

If the opposition division concludes that the opposition is inadmissible, it must as a rule first take a reasoned decision, possibly after having held oral proceedings. This decision is appealable. If, on the other hand, on the basis of another – admissible – opposition against the same patent, a final decision with regard to all substantive issues can be taken, the decision on admissibility is to be taken together with this final decision.

If, despite the observations of the patent proprietor, the opposition division concludes that the opposition is admissible, the decision on admissibility is normally to be taken together with the final decision, especially where at least one other admissible opposition exists (see D-I, 6). If the opposition division is of the opinion that all oppositions are inadmissible, a reasoned decision is to be taken. This decision is appealable.

An opponent whose opposition has been definitively rejected as inadmissible ceases to be a party to the proceedings as soon as the decision becomes final.

5.6 Examination of the admissibility of an intervention and preparations in the event of an intervention

Rule 79(4)

When examining whether an intervention is admissible, the formalities officer and the opposition division will proceed as for the examination as to admissibility of an opposition (see D-IV, 1, 3 and 5.5) but on the basis of the requirements for intervention under Art. 105 and Rule 89.

Rule 86

Paragraphs D-IV, 5.2 and 5.4, may, however, be disregarded in the case of an intervention in opposition proceedings.

Accordingly, particularly in the case of proceedings which are at an advanced stage, the formalities officer will inform third parties having intervened of the progress of the proceedings and invite them to indicate within one month whether they will also require the documents received from the parties in accordance with Rule 79(1) to (3), together with the communications from the opposition division and the observations of the parties under Rule 81(2), for the preceding period. If so, the formalities officer will send them with the relevant communications from the opposition division or the formalities officer to the intervening third party.

Chapter V – Substantive examination of opposition

1. Beginning of the examination of the opposition

Once the preparations for the examination of the opposition have been completed pursuant to [Rule 79](#), the opposition division examines whether the grounds for opposition (see [D-III, 5](#)) laid down in [Art. 100](#) prejudice the maintenance of the European patent. The examination may also begin if the single admissible opposition has been withdrawn in the interim (see [D-VII, 5.3](#)). If the opponent has died or is legally incapacitated, the examination may begin even without the participation of the heirs or legal representatives (see [D-VII, 5.2](#)). [Art. 101\(1\)](#)

2. Extent of the examination

2.1 Extent to which the patent is opposed

In the unusual case where an opposition is limited to only a certain part of the patent, the opposition division has to limit its examination to the part opposed. In particular, the opposition division cannot decide on the revocation of the patent beyond the extent to which it was opposed in the notice of opposition. However, if the opposition is directed only to an independent claim, the dependent claims are considered to be implicitly covered by the extent of the opposition and may be examined by the opposition division, provided their validity is *prima facie* in doubt on the basis of the information already available (see [G 9/91](#)). Similarly, if only a process claim is opposed, a product-by-process claim making reference to the same process is considered to be implicitly covered by the extent of opposition and may be examined under the same conditions as above (see [T 525/96](#)).

2.2 Examination of the grounds for opposition

Opposition proceedings are not a continuation of examination proceedings. Hence, as a general rule, the opposition division will confine its examination to those grounds for opposition brought forward by the opponent. If, for example, the opposition is filed only on the grounds that the subject-matter of the European patent is not sufficiently disclosed or that it extends beyond the content of the patent application as filed, the opposition division will examine the patentability of the subject-matter of the European patent pursuant to [Arts. 52 to 57](#) only if facts have come to its notice which, ***prima facie***, wholly or partially prejudice the maintenance of the patent (see [G 10/91](#)).

A document indicated in the patent specification as the closest or important prior art for the purposes of elucidating the technical problem set out in the description forms part of the opposition proceedings even if not expressly cited within the opposition period. The same applies to any relevant documents cited in the patent specification which do not constitute the closest prior art but whose contents are nevertheless important for understanding the problem underlying the invention within the meaning of [Rule 42\(1\)\(c\)](#) ([T 536/88](#), in particular point 2.1).

Rule 81(1)
Art. 114

Once proceedings for examining the opposition(s) have been initiated because an admissible opposition has been filed (although it may have been withdrawn in the interim), there may be reason to believe that other grounds exist which, *prima facie*, in whole or in part prejudice the maintenance of the European patent. If that is the case, these grounds will generally be examined by the opposition division of its own motion pursuant to Rule 81(1). Such other grounds may result from facts emerging from the search report or the examination procedure, the personal knowledge of the division's members or observations presented by third parties pursuant to Art. 115 (see also E-VI, 3). Such grounds may also have been put forward in another opposition which has been rejected as inadmissible, or in another opposition deemed not filed. They may also be any grounds submitted belatedly (see E-VI, 1.1 and 2). Under Art. 114(1), such prejudicial grounds put forward in an opposition which has been withdrawn will also generally be examined by the opposition division of its own motion. In carrying out such examination the opposition division will, however, take the interests of procedural expediency into account (see E-VI, 1.2). If the decision is to be based on grounds to be taken into account pursuant to Art. 114(1) or Rule 81(1), the parties must be given the opportunity to comment (see E-IX, 1).

If, during examination of the opposition, an allegation about a relevant fact seems plausible, it may be taken into account without further evidence if it is not challenged by the other party.

If a fact is contested or not plausible, the party making the allegation about it must prove it. If the parties to opposition proceedings make contrary factual assertions which they cannot prove and the opposition division is unable to establish the facts of its own motion, the patent proprietor is normally given the benefit of the doubt (see T 219/83, Headnote I).

However, if the opponent raises an objection under Art. 100(b) and provides experimental evidence, for example, that the claimed process cannot be realised, and the patent proprietor replies that the process can be carried out without undue burden by the skilled person taking common general knowledge also into consideration (T 281/86, Reasons 6; OJ EPO 1989, 202), the patent proprietor has to provide proof of what was common general knowledge at the date of filing (or the date of the earliest priority if priority has been claimed).

Pursuant to Art. 100, the absence of unity of invention is not a ground for opposition (see D-III, 5).

Art. 82

Since unity of invention under Art. 82 is only required for the European patent application, the unity of the subject-matter of the European patent may not be examined by the opposition division, even of its own motion. In particular, where the facts, evidence and arguments which come to light in the opposition proceedings lead to the maintenance of the European patent in amended form, there will be no further examination as to whether the remaining subject-matter of the patent contains a single invention or more than one. Any lack of unity must be accepted (see G 1/91).

Similarly, where amendments occasioned by a ground for opposition (see H-II, 3.1) contain multiple independent claims in the same category and are still covered by the independent claim as granted, compliance with Rule 43(2) will not be examined further.

The grounds for opposition laid down in Art. 100 are examined in greater detail below.

3. Non-patentability pursuant to Arts. 52 to 57

The same substantive requirements regarding patentability pursuant to Arts. 52 to 57 apply in opposition as in examination. G-I to VII will therefore also be applied in opposition proceedings. However, it will be more common in opposition proceedings than in examination for the examination as to patentability to be based on the state of the art as made available to the public not by written description but "by means of an oral description, by use, or in any other way" (see Art. 54(2) and G-IV, 7). Art. 100(a)

4. Insufficient disclosure of the invention

Determination of whether the disclosure of an invention in a European patent application is sufficient is dealt with in F-III, 1 to 3.

The principles set out there will also apply *mutatis mutandis* to the opposition procedure. The overriding consideration in this context is the disclosed content of the European patent specification, that is to say what a person skilled in the art is able to derive directly and unambiguously from the explicit and implicit disclosure in the patent claims, description and drawings, if any, without using inventiveness. Pursuant to Art. 100(b), the patent has to disclose the invention in a manner sufficiently clear and complete for it to be carried out by persons skilled in the art. If the patent specification does not disclose the invention sufficiently clearly to enable it to be carried out over the full scope of the claim in accordance with Art. 100(b), this may be remedied, provided the original documents contained a sufficient disclosure, but subject to the condition that, as required under Art. 123(2), the subject-matter of the European patent does not extend beyond the content of the application as filed and, as required under Art. 123(3), the protection conferred is not extended. Art. 100(b)

The skilled person wishing to implement the claimed invention reads the claims in a technically sensible manner. An objection of insufficient disclosure of the invention is therefore not to be based on embodiments that are meaningless and not consistent with the teaching of the application as a whole (see T 521/12).

There is normally no deficiency under Art. 100(b) if a feature which is essential for performing the invention is missing from the claim but is disclosed in the description and/or drawings. However, unduly broad claims may be objected to under Art. 56 (see T 939/92).

5. Clarity of claims and support by the description

Clarity is not a ground for opposition. Opposition proceedings are not designed as a procedure for generally amending (or revoking) patents that contain any kind of defect, and therefore opposition proceedings are not to Art. 100

be regarded as a continuation of examination proceedings. As a general rule this means that a granted claim has to be lived with even if new facts (e.g. new prior art) demonstrate that the claim is unclear (G 3/14).

Art. 101(3)

In considering whether, for the purpose of Art. 101(3), a patent as amended meets the requirements of the EPC, the claims of the patent may be examined for compliance with the requirements of Art. 84 only when, and then only to the extent that, an amendment introduces non-compliance with Art. 84 (G 3/14, confirming the case law as illustrated by T 301/87). A lack of compliance with Art. 84 cannot be seen as having been introduced by an amendment if a clarity problem already present in the claims as granted is only brought to light, highlighted or made visible by the amendment.

According to G 3/14, the amendment of one claim or part of a patent cannot lead to a re-examination of other parts of the patent which have not been amended. Thus, the deletion of an independent claim with its dependent claims or the deletion of a dependent claim leaving the independent claims and other dependent claims intact does not permit examination of the remaining claims for compliance with Art. 84.

A claim amended during opposition proceedings is not subject to examination for compliance with Art. 84 if it results from:

- (i) inserting a complete dependent claim as granted into an independent claim
- (ii) combining one of several alternative embodiments of the dependent claim as granted with the independent claim as granted
- (iii) deleting wording from a granted claim (whether independent or dependent), whereby its scope is narrowed but a pre-existing lack of compliance with Art. 84 is left intact (as exemplified by T 301/87) or
- (iv) deleting optional features from a granted claim (whether independent or dependent).

However, an amended claim is to be examined for compliance with Art. 84:

- (v) if features are taken from the description and inserted into a granted claim by way of amendment or
- (vi) if a feature from a dependent claim as granted is introduced into an independent claim as granted and this feature was previously connected with other features of that dependent claim and an alleged lack of compliance with Art. 84 is introduced by the amendment.

Correspondingly, the description of the patent may be examined for compliance with the requirements of Art. 84 only when, and then only to the extent that, an amendment of the patent introduces non-compliance with Art. 84. In particular, inconsistencies between the description and the claims resulting from amendments during opposition proceedings and casting doubt on the subject-matter for which protection is sought must be

avoided (see [F-IV.4.3](#) for examination of inconsistencies between the description and the claims in general).

Other amendments of the description not resulting from amendments of the claims during opposition proceedings may be allowed under the conditions laid down in [H-II.3.2](#).

6. Subject-matter of the European patent extending beyond the original disclosure

6.1 Basis of this ground for opposition

This ground for opposition under [Art. 100\(c\)](#) refers back to [Art. 123\(2\)](#) and stipulates that the subject-matter of a European patent may not extend beyond the content of the application as filed. In the case of a patent granted on the basis of a European divisional application ([Art. 76\(1\)](#)), two criteria apply: the subject-matter must not extend beyond the content of the earlier application as filed ([Art. 76\(1\)](#)), and it must not extend beyond the content of the divisional application as filed ([Art. 123\(2\)](#)) (see T 873/94). Similar considerations apply to applications filed under [Art. 61](#). In the case of a patent granted on an application filed in a language other than an official language of the EPO either in accordance with [Art. 14\(2\)](#) or in accordance with [Rule 40](#) (see [Rule 40\(3\)](#)), the original text will, as provided for in [Art. 70\(2\)](#), constitute the basis for determining whether the subject-matter of the European patent extends beyond the content of the application as filed. However, unless the opponent adduces proof to the contrary, for example, the opposition division may, under [Rule 7](#), assume that the translation referred to in [Art. 14\(2\)](#) or [Rule 40\(3\)](#) is in conformity with the original text of the application. [Art. 100\(c\)](#)

6.2 Distinction between allowable and unallowable amendments

The distinction between allowable amendments to the content of a European patent application and amendments which are at variance with [Art. 123\(2\)](#) or [Art. 76\(1\)](#) is set forth in [H-IV.2](#) and [C-IX.1.4](#). These guidelines will be applied *mutatis mutandis* in the course of opposition proceedings to determine whether the subject-matter of the European patent as granted or as amended during the opposition proceedings extends beyond the content of the application as filed.

Chapter VI – Procedure for the examination of the opposition

(Oral proceedings: see [E-III](#); taking and conservation of evidence: see [E-IV](#).)

1. General remarks

The opposition division will first of all endeavour to reach a decision in written proceedings. Taking account of the investigations usually conducted beforehand by the first member (see [D-II, 5](#) and [6](#)), the opposition division will base its decision on the written submissions of the parties and, where appropriate, on other written evidence obtained, in particular, through the production of documents, requests for information and sworn statements in writing.

The parties in *inter partes* cases are subject to a particular duty to facilitate due and swift conduct of the proceedings, in particular by submitting all relevant facts, evidence, arguments and requests as early and completely as possible (see [D-IV, 1.2.2.1](#) and [E-IV, 1.2](#)). Furthermore, any ground, fact and evidence filed by the opponent(s) after the expiry of the opposition period are considered as late-filed unless they are due to a change in the subject of the proceedings; see [E-VI, 2](#) and subsections for more details. Admissibility of amendments by the proprietor is treated in detail in [H-II, 3](#) to [3.5](#), [E-VI, 2.2.2](#) and [2.2.3](#).

[Art. 114\(2\)](#)
[Rule 76\(2\)\(c\)](#)
[Rule 80](#)

If the opposition division considers it expedient, or if any party requests oral proceedings, oral proceedings in accordance with [Art. 116\(1\)](#) will be held before the opposition division after suitable preparation (see [D-VI, 3.2](#)). In the oral proceedings, the parties may state their cases and make submissions in order to clarify outstanding questions. Members of the opposition division may put questions to the parties.

[Art. 116](#)

In special, less common cases it will occasionally prove necessary in opposition proceedings for oral evidence to be taken or an inspection to be carried out by the opposition division as part of oral proceedings or for the conservation of evidence, or by the first member outside the oral proceedings. The opposition division is not obliged to take oral evidence or to carry out an inspection if it does not consider it necessary, even if a party has so requested. Oral evidence may be taken, where appropriate under oath, before the competent court in the country of residence of the person to be heard. A member of the opposition division may, at the request of the opposition division, attend such court hearings (see [E-IV, 1.3](#)).

[Rules 117 to 120](#)

The principal means of taking oral evidence will be the hearing of witnesses and parties (see [E-IV, 1.6](#)).

Only in exceptional cases will evidence be obtained at the initiative of the opposition division by means of oral and/or written reports by experts (see [E-IV, 1.8.1](#)). In view of the specialised knowledge of the members of the opposition division – and of the costs involved – such means will be used only as a last resort.

2. Adherence to the text of the European patent submitted or approved by the patent proprietor

2.1 Basis for the examination

Art. 113(2)

If the patent proprietor submits amendments to the description, claims or drawings after the notice of opposition has been communicated to them (see H-II, 3), the opposition division must take as a basis for its examination the text of the European patent submitted by the patent proprietor. This principle, that the opposition division must concern itself solely with the text most recently "submitted or agreed by the patent proprietor", also applies to the rest of the opposition procedure. (As regards the possibility of amending texts, see H-IV, 3.1, second paragraph.)

2.2 Revocation of the patent

Where it is stated that the patent proprietor no longer approves the text in which the patent was granted and no amended text is submitted, the patent must be revoked. This also applies when the patent proprietor requests that the patent be revoked.

3. Invitation to file observations

3.1 Opposition division's communications

Art. 101(1)

Rule 81(2)

In examining the opposition, the opposition division will invite the parties, as often as is necessary, to clarify the substance of the case, to file observations on communications from another party or issued by itself (see E-II, 1) and, where appropriate, to adduce evidence in respect of matters under dispute. Rule 81(2) does not require the opposition division to set a period for replying to this invitation. Such a period will, however, be set whenever the opposition division considers this expedient. As regards the length of the period see E-VIII, 1.2; as regards the extension of a period see E-VIII, 1.6; and as regards late submission of observations see E-VIII, 1.7 and 1.8, as well as Art. 114(2).

Rule 81(2)

Communications from the opposition division and all replies received must be communicated to all parties.

3.2 Summons to oral proceedings

Art. 116(1)

Rule 115(1)

If oral proceedings have to be arranged, the parties must be summoned to them as quickly as possible at reasonable notice (see E-III, 6). If the first action of the opposition division is to summon the parties, the first substantive communication of the opposition division under Art. 101(1) is annexed to the summons to oral proceedings. For the form of oral proceedings, see E-III, 5, 1.2 and 1.3.

Rule 116(1)

Together with the summons, the opposition division will draw attention to and in the annexed communication explain the points which in its opinion need to be discussed for the purposes of the decision to be taken; where this has already been done sufficiently in a prior communication, it is appropriate to refer to that communication. Normally, the annexed communication will also contain the provisional and non-binding opinion of the opposition division on the positions adopted by the parties and in particular on amendments filed by the patent proprietor. At the same time, a

date will be fixed up to which written submissions may be made or amendments may be filed. Normally this date will be two months before the date of the oral proceedings. As this date is not a time limit, Rule 132 does not apply and the parties cannot request that it be postponed.

The summons to oral proceedings and the annexed communication do not constitute decisions within the meaning of Art. 106(1) and can thus only be appealed together with the final decision (see T 1954/14) unless either of them allows a separate appeal to be filed (see E-IX, 3).

4. Communications from the opposition division to the patent proprietor

4.1 Communications from the opposition division; reasoned statement

Where necessary, any communication to the patent proprietor must contain a reasoned statement. The same applies to any communication to other parties, which is communicated to the patent proprietor for information purposes only. A reasoned statement will usually not be required if the communication concerns only matters relating to form or if it contains no more than self-explanatory proposals. Where appropriate, all the grounds against the maintenance of the European patent are to be given in the communication.

Rule 81(3).

4.2 Invitation to file observations

If the opposition division considers that the European patent cannot be maintained in an unamended form, it must inform the patent proprietor accordingly, stating the grounds, and give them the opportunity to amend, in appropriate cases, the description, claims and drawings. As regards the time limit here, see E-VIII, 1.2. Where necessary, the description adjusted in line with the new claims (see D-IV, 5.3 and D-V, 5) will also deal with the state of the art as set out in the opposition proceedings, the technical purpose and the advantages of the invention as it will then stand. However, if the patent proprietor has neither requested oral proceedings nor filed amendments (including any auxiliary requests), the patent can be revoked directly on the basis of the grounds, evidence and arguments on file (see also D-VI, 7.1, E-IX, 1.1).

Rule 81(2) and (3).

Proposals for amendment filed at a late stage in the proceedings may be disregarded (see E-VI, 2).

For the form of amended documents, see D-IV, 5.3 and H-III, 2.2 to 2.4.

5. Additional search

In exceptional cases, the opposition division, like the examining division, may on its own initiative cite new material relating to the state of the art and take it into account in its subsequent decision (see C-IV, 7.4). In the normal course of events, however, since the grant of the patent will have been preceded by a search into the subject-matter of the application by the search division, by the examining division and generally by the opponent(s), no additional search will be made. Only in exceptional cases will an additional search by the opposition division be set in train. Such a

case might arise, for example, if in the opposition the main subject covered by the patent shifts to:

- elements of a dependent claim which were originally of subsidiary importance
- elements which were previously not set out in the claims but only in the description
- individual features of a combination or
- sub-combinations,

and there are grounds for believing that the original search did not extend to such elements or features and if no relevant document can be found quickly in the circumstances set out in C-IV, 7.4.

6. Examination of the opposition during oral proceedings

For details regarding the examination shortly before and during oral proceedings and the conduct of such proceedings, see E-III, 8.

7. Preparation of the decision

7.1 General remarks

Art. 116(1)
Rule 117

If the opposition division does not consider it expedient to schedule oral proceedings of its own motion (see E-III, 4 and below) or the taking of evidence even where the latter is requested (see E-IV), and if no admissible request for oral proceedings has been received from a party (see E-III, 2), the decision must be reached on the basis of written proceedings. In this case there is no obligation to schedule oral proceedings before a decision is reached.

If the case is decided on the basis of written proceedings, submissions filed after the decision has been handed over for notification by the EPO to the parties can no longer be considered, as from that moment the division cannot amend the decision (see G 12/91) except to the limited extent provided for in Rule 140 (see H-VI, 3.1).

The decision, whether or not preceded by oral proceedings or the taking of evidence, may be to revoke the patent (see D-VIII, 1.2), to reject the opposition (see D-VIII, 1.3) or to maintain the patent as amended (see D-VIII, 1.4).

A decision can and will be taken immediately if all the following conditions are fulfilled:

- (a) the relevant facts need no further inquiries
- (b) all parties have had adequate opportunity to comment on the points material to the decision (cf. E-IX, 1.1)

- (c) there is no request for oral proceedings from a party adversely affected by the envisaged decision
- (d) there is no time limit running (e.g. for filing observations, comparative tests, etc.)
- (e) there are no other special circumstances which would make an immediate decision impossible, e.g. a pending request for transfer of the patent.

Examples where an immediate decision is possible

The opposition division can issue an immediate decision revoking the patent if all the following conditions are fulfilled:

- (i) the proprietor was invited to file observations in accordance with Rule 79(1) (see D-IV.5.2)
- (ii) the proprietor has not filed amendments (including any auxiliary requests)
- (iii) the proprietor has not requested oral proceedings
- (iv) the opposition division, based on facts, evidence and arguments on file, fully agrees with at least one ground for opposition in the notice of opposition
- (v) there are no other special circumstances which would make an immediate decision impossible.

In the case of a direct revocation, the proprietor's right to be heard will have been respected as long as the opposition division only uses facts, evidence and arguments contained in the notice of opposition as a basis for the decision to revoke the patent. In that case, the proprietor:

- (a) was informed of the grounds for opposition and supporting facts, evidence and arguments based on which the patent was to be revoked, and
- (b) was given the possibility to comment on them.

A decision to immediately reject the opposition can be issued if all of the following conditions are fulfilled:

- (i) The opponent has been given an adequate opportunity to reply to the proprietor's observations. In general, this condition is met if at least two months have passed since receipt of the proprietor's observations, provided that the opponent has not announced the intention to submit a (more) substantive reply to the proprietor's observations; the condition is also met if the opponent has already replied to the proprietor's observations of their own motion

- (ii) The opponent has not requested oral proceedings
- (iii) The proprietor has requested the rejection of the opposition as their main request (i.e. the proprietor has not filed amended patent documents as their main request)
- (iv) The opposition division, based on facts, evidence and arguments on file, fully agrees with the proprietor that none of the grounds for opposition in the notice of opposition prejudice the maintenance of the patent
- (v) There are no other special circumstances which would make an immediate decision impossible.

Examples where an immediate decision is not possible:

- (a) As a result of the analysis in a parallel case the division concludes that a document mentioned in the specification of the opposed patent, but not cited by the opponent, is clearly novelty-destroying; the decision to revoke the patent may only be based on this document if the parties have been given an opportunity to comment (cf. E-IX, 1.1)
- (b) The opposition division is of the opinion that none of the grounds for opposition cited by the opponent prejudice the maintenance of the patent; however, at least one new fact that has not been mentioned by the proprietor needs to be introduced by the division (e.g. the fact that a document cited by the opponent does not constitute prior art).

In both cases, the opposition division will summon the parties to oral proceedings and present its position in the annex to the summons.

7.2 Preparation of a decision to maintain a European patent in amended form

7.2.1 Procedural requirements

Art. 113

A decision to maintain the patent in amended form may be delivered only when the patent proprietor has approved the new text on the basis of which the opposition division intends to maintain the patent and the opponent has had sufficient opportunity to comment on the proposed new text.

Both prerequisites can be fulfilled during oral proceedings at which the opposition division establishes the text including the amended description and, if necessary, the amended figures. In written proceedings, the necessary opportunity to comment on the new text on the basis of which the opposition division intends to maintain the patent is given to the opponent when a communication is issued to the parties. Once these requirements have been met, a separate communication under Rule 82(1) is neither necessary nor appropriate (see G 1/88).

If the patent can be maintained in the amended form, the opposition division tries to obtain the patent proprietor's approval of the text in which

the patent can be maintained and gives the opponent an opportunity to comment on it. An interlocutory decision can then be delivered.

If these requirements have still not been met and no oral proceedings are being held, a communication under Art. 101(1) must be issued. This also applies when it has been established in principle that the patent can be maintained in a particular form but a complete text expressly approved by the patent proprietor is not yet available.

The patent proprietor's approval of an amended version of the patent need not be given in a separate, express declaration; it may also be apparent from the circumstances, in particular from the fact that an amended version was filed or requested. This applies equally to versions which have been filed as an auxiliary request. (For the wording of documents in oral proceedings, see E-III, 8.11 and 8.11.1.)

The patent proprietor's approval can also be obtained through a communication under Rule 82(1) in which the opposition division informs the parties that it "intends to maintain the patent as amended" and invites them to "state their observations within a period of two months if they disapprove of the text in which it is intended to maintain the patent". If no objections are filed to the text thus notified, the patent proprietor is considered to approve of it.

Rule 82(1)

A communication under Rule 82(1) can also be sent if the opposition division considers that the complete document expressly approved by the patent proprietor, on which the opponent has been able to comment, still requires amendments. However, these must not go beyond such editorial changes to the wording as appear absolutely necessary by comparison with the text most recently submitted or approved by the patent proprietor. The opposition division will draw attention to such amendments and state why they are required if they are not self-explanatory.

If the patent proprietor objects to the text in which the patent is to be maintained within the period specified in the communication or, where applicable, in a communication under Rule 82(1), the proceedings are continued. The European patent can be revoked in the subsequent proceedings if the patent proprietor objects to the text and fails to submit new, properly amended documents despite having been requested to do so.

If any opponent objects to the text communicated to them in which it is intended to maintain the patent, the opposition division will continue examining the opposition if it considers that the EPC prejudices the maintenance of the patent in the text initially envisaged.

7.2.2 Decision on the documents on the basis of which the patent is to be maintained

If the opposition division considers that the patent can be maintained on the basis of the text submitted or approved by the patent proprietor, and the opponent has had sufficient opportunity to comment on this text – either in writing or during oral proceedings – as well as on the reasons decisive to

the patent's maintenance, the opposition division will issue an interlocutory decision to the effect that the patent and the invention to which it relates meet the requirements of the EPC following the amendments made by the patent proprietor during the opposition proceedings.

If the patent can only be maintained on the basis of an auxiliary request, the decision has to contain a reasoned statement of why the version of the main request (and any higher-ranking auxiliary request) does not meet the requirements of the EPC (see E-IX, 2.9, H-III, 3.4.1 and 3.4.2).

A separate appeal under Art. 106(2) is allowed against this decision, which must be reasoned having regard to the grounds for opposition maintained by the opponent or taken up by the opposition division. The decision is delivered in all cases where a European patent is maintained in amended form, even if the opponent has approved of the text communicated by the opposition division or has not commented on it. In the former case, the decision is fairly brief, merely noting that in the light of the amended text the opponent no longer maintains the original grounds for opposition. If this decision is not contested, it becomes final and as a result the documents can no longer be amended.

This interlocutory decision is intended to save the patent proprietor unnecessary translation costs arising from an amendment to the text in appeal proceedings. It nevertheless qualifies as a grant decision in the sense of G 1/10 and corrections can only be requested in the narrow ambit provided for in Rule 140 (see H-VI, 3.1).

7.2.3 Request for translations and a formally compliant version of amended text passages

Rule 82(2)

Once the interlocutory decision becomes final or the amended text in which the patent is to be maintained has been drawn up in opposition appeal proceedings, the formalities officer invites the patent proprietor:

- to file, within three months, translations of any amended claims in the two official languages of the EPO other than the language of the proceedings and
- to file a formally compliant verbatim version of amended text passages if in oral opposition proceedings the interlocutory decision of the opposition division under Arts. 101(3)(a) and 106(2) or the board of appeal decision under Art. 111(2) has been based on documents not complying with Rule 50(1) (see E-III, 8.7). If the European patent in the amended form contains different claims for different contracting states, a translation of all sets of claims – in the text communicated to the patent proprietor – into all official languages other than the language of the proceedings must be filed.

Rule 82(2) and (3)

If the request under the first paragraph above is not complied with "in due time", the acts may still be validly performed within two months of notification of a communication pointing out the failure to observe the time limit. If any of the acts is not performed within the period of grace, the

formalities officer will issue a decision for revocation of the patent in accordance with Rule 82(3).

8. Request to stay opposition proceedings

If a party requests a stay of opposition proceedings for the sole reason of pending appeal or opposition proceedings of a patent family member (e.g. a parent application), the request will not be granted. The party will receive a communication from the opposition division indicating the reasons for its intention not to grant the request. This communication does not constitute an appealable decision under Art. 106(1) or (2).

If oral proceedings take place and the request is maintained, the opposition division will address it at oral proceedings, giving the parties an opportunity to comment. After the oral discussion on the stay, the opposition division will take a decision on the request.

Reasons for a stay or interruption of proceedings are set out in E-VII, 1 to 3.

Chapter VII – Details and special features of the proceedings

1. Sequence of proceedings

1.1 Basic principle

Examination of the admissibility of the opposition and preparation of the examination of the opposition will begin as soon as the notice of opposition is received by the formalities officer or the opposition division (see D-IV, 1 and 3 and D-V, 1 and 2).

1.2 Exceptions

Oppositions are to be given priority if:

- (i) the earlier examination proceedings took far longer than usual
- (ii) the opposition proceedings have already taken considerably longer than usual
- (iii) an infringement or revocation action in respect of the opposed European patent has been instituted before the Unified Patent Court or a national court or competent authority of a contracting state (see E-VIII, 5 for further details) or
- (iv) the next procedural step can be dealt with relatively quickly.

2. Request for documents

Documents referred to by a party to opposition proceedings must be filed together with the notice of opposition or the written submissions. A single copy of these documents is sufficient. If such documents are neither enclosed nor filed in due time upon invitation by the formalities officer, the opposition division may decide not to take any arguments based on them into account.

Rule 83

In implementing this provision, the desired aim of speeding up the procedure will be borne in mind as much as the common interest in taking obviously relevant submissions into account.

Rule 53(3)

If during the opposition proceedings it becomes apparent that the previous application from which the opposed patent claims priority is not in an official EPO language and the validity of the priority claim is relevant to the determination of the patentability of the subject-matter of the patent concerned, the opposition division will invite the patent proprietor to file a translation of that application into one of the official languages within a period to be specified. Alternatively, a declaration may be submitted that the European patent application on the basis of which the opposed patent was granted is a complete translation of the previous application. For the procedure for inviting the patent proprietor to file such a translation or declaration, see A-III, 6.8 and F-VI, 3.4. Such an invitation is not to be issued if the translation of the previous application or the declaration was available to the EPO and is to be included in the file of the European patent application under Rule 53(2).

Failure by the patent proprietor to supply a required translation or declaration in due time will lead to the priority right being lost. This will have the effect that the intermediate document(s) will become prior art under Art. 54(2) or (3), as applicable, and therefore relevant for the assessment of patentability (see A-III, 6.8.3). The patent proprietor will be notified of this loss of rights (see A-III, 6.11). As a means of redress, the patent proprietor may request either re-establishment of rights under Art. 122 and Rule 136 (see E-VIII, 3) or a decision under Rule 112(2) (see E-VIII, 1.9.3).

3. Unity of the European patent

3.1 Basic principle

Art. 118

Having different patent proprietors for different designated contracting states will not affect the unity of the European patent in opposition proceedings, since such persons are to be regarded as joint proprietors (see D-I, 6, second and third paragraphs).

In particular, the text of the European patent will be uniform for all designated contracting states unless otherwise provided for in the EPC (see D-VII, 3.2 and H-III, 4).

3.2 Factors affecting the unity of the European patent

The unity of the European patent in opposition proceedings will be affected if the previous patent proprietor and the person replacing them pursuant to Art. 99(4) in respect of a particular contracting state are not deemed to be joint patent proprietors (see D-I, 6). In this event, the opposition proceedings involving the different patent proprietors must be conducted separately. Since different requests may be submitted by the two patent proprietors (e.g. as regards amendments to the claims), the two sets of opposition proceedings may lead to different conclusions, e.g. as regards the text of the European patent or the scope of protection.

4. Procedure where the patent proprietor is not entitled

4.1 Stay of proceedings

If, during opposition proceedings or during the opposition period, a third party provides the EPO with proof, e.g. a certificate from the court concerned, that they have opened proceedings against the patent proprietor for the purpose of obtaining a decision within the meaning of Art. 61(1), opposition proceedings will be stayed by the Legal Division in accordance with Rule 14(1) unless they consent to their continuation. The third party's consent must be communicated in writing to the EPO and is irrevocable. However, the proceedings will be stayed only if the opposition division has deemed the opposition admissible.

Rule 78(1)

If proceedings within the meaning of Art. 61(1) are instituted during the opposition period, a stay of proceedings will be possible only if a notice of opposition has been filed. Accordingly, the third party might have to file an opposition itself in order to benefit from a stay of proceedings under Rule 78.

The dates of stay and resumption of proceedings will be entered in the European Patent Register. The parties to the opposition proceedings are to be informed of the order staying the proceedings.

4.1.1 Date of the stay of proceedings

The proceedings are stayed on the date on which the EPO receives evidence that proceedings against the patent proprietor have been instituted. The requirements for valid institution of relevant proceedings are determined by national law (J 7/00).

4.1.2 Legal character and effect of the stay of proceedings

Stay of proceedings is a preliminary procedural measure *sui generis* which takes immediate effect as a preventive measure to preserve the third party's possible rights (J 28/94; J 15/06).

The patent proprietor will not be heard but may file a request for an appealable decision on the stay of proceedings.

Stay of proceedings means that the legal status quo existing at the time of ordering is maintained, i.e. neither the EPO nor the parties may validly perform any legal acts (J 38/92).

An automatic debit order ceases to be effective on the day on which a stay of the proceedings takes effect (see point 11.1(c) AAD, Annex A.1 to the ADA, Supplementary publication 2, OJ EPO 2024, page 34). If the automatic debiting procedure is to be used again after resumption of the proceedings, a new automatic debit order is to be filed.

4.2 Continuation of proceedings

The date of the continuation of the proceedings and the legal basis for their continuation are to be communicated to the parties to the opposition proceedings.

4.2.1 Continuation after a final decision

Rule 14(2)
Rule 78(1)

Proceedings are resumed when evidence is provided that a final decision within the meaning of Art. 61(1) has been taken. If the decision is in favour of the third party, the proceedings may not be resumed earlier than three months after the decision has become final unless the third party requests resumption.

4.2.2 Continuation regardless of the stage reached in national proceedings

Rule 14(3)
Rule 78(1)

When giving a decision on the stay of proceedings or thereafter, the Legal Division may set a date on which it intends to continue the proceedings regardless of the stage reached in the national proceedings.

Unlike the decision on staying the proceedings, it is at the discretion of the Legal Division to decide whether proceedings are to be resumed. In exercising this discretion, the Legal Division has to take into account the impact of a further suspension or the continuation of the proceedings on each of the parties (J 33/03). It also has to consider the duration of the stay and the outcome of first instance proceedings before national courts as well as whether delaying tactics are being employed by the third party.

4.3 Interruption of time limits

Rule 14(4)
Rule 78(1)

The time limits in force at the date of stay are interrupted by the stay of proceedings. The time which has not yet elapsed begins to run from the date on which proceedings are resumed; however, the time still to run after the resumption of the proceedings must not be less than two months.

Example

A communication under Rule 82(2) maintaining the patent in amended form is dispatched by the EPO on 7 November 2023. Under Rule 126(2) and Rule 131(2), this communication is deemed delivered on the date it bears, i.e. on 7 November 2023 (OJ EPO 2023, A29). The three-month period to file the translation of any amended claim starts running on the day following delivery of the communication, i.e. on 8 November 2023, and it ends on 7 February 2024.

If the Legal Division stays proceedings on 30 November 2023 under Rule 78(1), the three-month period will already have been running for 22 days, i.e. from 8 November 2023 to 29 November 2023, before the date of stay, leaving eight days and two months of the original three-month period remaining. Since the remaining period exceeds two months, it will start to run again after the proceedings are resumed in accordance with Rules 78(1) and 14(4).

Hence, if the Legal Division resumes the proceedings on 23 February 2024, the period for filing the translation of the claims will run until 2 May 2024 for the following reasons:

- (i) The day the Legal Division resumes the proceedings (23 February 2024) is the first day on which the remaining period starts running again (Rule 131(2) does not apply).

- (ii) The remaining days are added first and then the remaining months: in the example, eight days from and including 23 February 2024 results in 1 March 2024, and the addition of another two months results in the remaining period expiring on 1 May 2024.
- (iii) Since Rule 134(1) applies also to the remaining period and since on the 1 May 2024 no mail is delivered in Munich and Berlin (public holiday), the time limit is extended until 2 May 2024.

4.4 Department responsible

The Legal Division is responsible for the procedure where the patent proprietor is not entitled (see the decision of the President of the EPO dated 21 November 2013, OJ EPO 2013, 600).

Art. 20

5. Continuation of the opposition proceedings in the cases covered by Rule 84

5.1 Continuation in the case of surrender or lapse of the patent

If the European patent has been surrendered or has lapsed for all the designated states, the opposition proceedings must be continued at the opponent's request, which must be filed within two months of the date on which the opposition division informed the opponent of the surrender or lapse. Evidence of the lapse must generally be provided by submitting extracts from the patent registers of the designated contracting states.

Rule 84(1)

Surrender or lapse has immediate non-retroactive effect (i.e. patent protection ceases on the date of surrender or lapse), whereas a revoked patent is deemed to have had no effect from the outset (Art. 68). So the opponent may still have an interest in the revocation of a lapsed or surrendered patent.

If, in the case of a request for continuation of the proceedings, the patent proprietor has renounced before the competent authorities in the designated states all rights conferred by the patent with *ab initio* and universal effect, or if no request for continuation has been received within the time limit, the opposition proceedings will be closed. The decision to close the proceedings will be communicated to the parties.

A statement by the patent proprietor making it unambiguously clear that they no longer wish their patent to be maintained is considered to be a request for its revocation, irrespective of the wording used (T.237/86). For details of the procedure to be followed, see D-VIII, 1.2.5.

5.2 Continuation on the death or legal incapacity of the opponent

In the event of the death or legal incapacity of an opponent, the opposition proceedings may be continued by the opposition division of its own motion, even without the participation of the opponent's heirs or legal representatives, for example if the legal proceedings in connection with the will or the appointment of a new legal representative would unduly prolong the opposition proceedings. This provision will apply not only where only one opposition has been filed; it will also apply in cases where not all those who have filed opposition are deceased or legally incapacitated.

Rule 84(2)

The opposition division will continue the proceedings if, for instance, the patent proprietor has submitted amendments to the patent in response to the notice of opposition (see T 560/90). The opposition division will also continue the proceedings if it considers that the stage reached in the opposition proceedings is such that they are likely to result in a limitation or revocation of the European patent without further assistance from the opponent(s) concerned and without the opposition division itself having to undertake extensive investigations (see T 197/88).

The patent proprietor and any other parties are to be informed that the proceedings will be continued. Otherwise the proceedings are closed and the decision to close the proceedings is communicated to the parties.

5.3 Continuation after the opposition has been withdrawn

Rule 84(2)

The opposition proceedings can be continued even if every opposition has been withdrawn. The principles set forth in D-VII, 5.2 apply *mutatis mutandis* in deciding whether the proceedings are to be continued or closed.

6. Intervention of the assumed infringer

Art. 105

Rule 89

The assumed infringer of a patent (see D-I, 5) may file notice of intervention in the opposition proceedings within three months of the date on which infringement proceedings were instituted against them or on which they instituted proceedings for a court ruling that they are not infringing the patent. Notice of intervention must be filed in a written reasoned statement. It is not deemed filed until the opposition fee has been paid in the amount prescribed in the Rules relating to Fees under the EPC.

Intervention is permissible as long as opposition or appeal proceedings are pending. A third party can become a party to the proceedings during the period for filing an appeal only if a party to the proceedings in which the decision was given files an appeal pursuant to Art. 107; otherwise the decision of the opposition division will become final on expiry of the appeal period (see G 4/91 and G 1/94).

A properly filed and admissible intervention is treated as an opposition, which may be based on any ground for opposition under Art. 100 (see G 1/94). This means that, when intervening at any stage of first-instance proceedings, the intervener enjoys essentially the same rights as any other party to the proceedings. If the intervener introduces new facts and evidence which appear to be crucial, the proceedings may need to be prolonged to enable them to be adequately considered. In all other cases the opposition division must ensure that the intervention does not delay the proceedings.

Rule 79(4)

If the notice of intervention is filed at a late stage of the proceedings, for example when oral proceedings have already been scheduled, the opposition division may dispense with issuing communications under Rule 79(1) to (3). The introduction of a new ground for opposition at such a late stage may lead to a postponement of the date set for oral proceedings.

For accelerated processing of oppositions and accelerated processing before the boards of appeal on request, see E-VIII, 5 and 6.

The notice of intervention, filed in a written reasoned statement, must contain: *Rule 89(2)*

- (i) a statement of the grounds for intervention and corresponding evidence. The proceedings providing the grounds for intervention must be directed towards establishing an infringement (or its absence) as a final legal result. Proceedings directed at the preservation of evidence to enable a party to initiate separate infringement proceedings are not sufficient in this regard (see T 439/17). *Art. 105(1)*
- (ii) the name, address and nationality of the assumed infringer and the state in which the assumed infringer's residence or principal place of business is located. Names of natural persons must be indicated by the person's family name and given name(s), the family name being indicated before the given name(s). Names of legal entities, as well as companies considered to be legal entities by reason of the legislation to which they are subject, must be indicated by their official designations. Addresses must be indicated in such a way as to satisfy the customary requirements for prompt postal delivery at the indicated address. They must comprise all the relevant administrative units, including the house number, if any. Assumed infringers (whether natural or legal persons) whose residence or principal place of business is in an EPC contracting state and who act without a professional representative can use an address for correspondence other than their residence. The address for correspondence must be the assumed infringer's own address. Post cannot be sent to a different (natural or legal) person, since that requires a valid form of representation under Arts. 133 and 134. It is recommended that the telephone number be indicated (see D-IV, 1.2.2.2(i) and 1.4.2). *Rule 76(2)(a)*
Rule 41(2)(c)
- (iii) the number of the European patent at issue in the opposition proceedings in which intervention is made, the name of the patent proprietor and the title of the invention (see D-IV, 1.2.2.2(ii) and 1.4.2). *Rule 76(2)(b)*
- (iv) a statement of the extent to which the European patent at issue is opposed by way of intervention and of the grounds on which the opposition by way of intervention is based, as well as an indication of the facts and evidence presented in support of these grounds, together with a statement of reasons, i.e. arguments (see D-IV, 1.2.2.1(iii) to 1.2.2.1(v) and 1.4.2). *Rule 76(1)*
Rule 76(2)(c)
- (v) if the assumed infringer has appointed a representative, the representative's name and address of place of business in accordance with subparagraph (ii) as set out above (see D-IV, 1.2.2.2(iii) and 1.4.2). *Rule 76(2)(d)*

Rule 77(1) D-IV.1 sets out further details and explains how to deal with the intervention if one of these requirements is not fulfilled.

Art. 103 **7. Publication of a new specification of the patent**
If a European patent is maintained in an amended form, the EPO must, as soon as possible after it publishes the mention of the opposition decision, publish a new specification of the European patent containing the description, the claims and any drawings, in the amended form.

Rule 87 Rule 74 applies *mutatis mutandis* to the new specification of the European patent.

8. Transitional provisions for Art. 54(4) EPC 1973 and Art. 54(5) EPC
Art. 54(4) EPC 1973 and Rule 23a EPC 1973 continue to apply to patents granted in respect of patent applications filed before 13 December 2007. Consequently, in such cases, the designated countries need to be taken into consideration when assessing the novelty of documents according to Art. 54(3) EPC (see H-III, 4.2).

Art. 54(5) EPC applies only to patents for which the decision to grant was taken on or after 13 December 2007 (Special edition No. 1, OJ EPO 2007, 197). If the decision to grant was taken before that date (the date of entry into force of EPC 2000), only "Swiss type" claims are allowed for any second or further medical use (provided these claims meet with all the other requirements of the EPC).

Where the subject-matter of a claim is rendered novel only by a new therapeutic use of a medicament, that claim may no longer take the form of Swiss-type claim for European or international patent applications having a date of filing or earliest priority date of 29 January 2011 or later (see G 2/08, OJ EPO 2010, 514, and G-VI, 6.1).

Examples

Date of entry into force of EPC 2000: 13.12.2007.

The decision to grant for patent EP1 mentions the date of 13.12.2007 in the top box and the date of 07.12.2007 in the bottom line.

EP1 has three claims.

Claim 1: Product X.

Claim 2: Product X for use in medicine.

Claim 3: Product X for use in the treatment of asthma.

Notice of opposition is duly filed in 2008 citing prior-art document D1 under Art. 54(2) EPC which reveals product X and its therapeutic use in the treatment of pain and more specifically headache.

The situation is as follows:

According to G 12/91 and J 7/96, published in OJ EPO 1999, 443, the date the decision to grant the patent was taken is the date the decision to grant was handed over to the EPO postal service, that is 07.12.2007.

This means that, as regards medical use-related claims, EP1 is treated under the system applicable before EPC 2000's entry into force on 13.12.2007. Thus, Art. 54(5) EPC does not apply to EP1.

Therefore, in the opposition proceedings for EP1, claims 1 to 3 are no longer acceptable. Claims 1 and 2 are not novel and claim 3 is not in the required "Swiss-type" format for a second medical use (G 5/83). The proprietor of patent EP1 would then need to abandon claims 1 and 2 and reformulate claim 3 as: "Use of product X for the manufacture of a medicament for the treatment of asthma".

Note that if the date of handing the decision to grant over to the EPO postal service had been 13.12.2007 or later, then Art. 54(5) EPC would have been applicable and in the current example claim 3 of EP1 could have been maintained as granted.

Example of conflicting prior art

The mention of grant for a patent EP1 filed on 10.12.2007, designating FR, DE, GB, IT and ES and claiming no priority, is published in the Bulletin in May 2012, and nine months later notice of opposition is filed. One of the novelty objections is raised under Art. 54(3) with regard to a European patent application EP2 published on 18.12.2007, having a valid priority date of 16.06.2006 and validly designating FR, DE and GB. Oral proceedings in this case are held during 2013.

The situation is as follows:

EP1 was granted in respect of a patent application filed before the date of EPC 2000's entry into force (i.e. 10.12.2007). Consequently, as regards Art. 54(3) EPC, the provisions in force before that date apply. So in this case, Art. 54(4) EPC 1973 and Rule 23a EPC 1973 still apply (in 2013). Therefore, EP2 is relevant for novelty only for the designations FR, DE and GB but not for the designations IT and ES.

Note that if EP1 had in this case been filed on 13.12.2007, Art. 54(4) EPC 1973 and Rule 23a EPC 1973 would no longer be applicable when assessing novelty under Art. 54(3) EPC. Consequently, EP2 would be prior art against the novelty of EP1 as a whole, regardless of any common designations.

Chapter VIII – Decisions of the opposition division

General remarks on decisions appear in [E-IX](#).

1. Final decisions on an admissible opposition

1.1 General remarks

The opposition division has to take a final decision on the opposition, by either revoking the European patent, rejecting the opposition or ruling that the European patent is to be maintained as amended. If the only admissible opposition or all the admissible oppositions are withdrawn and the opposition division takes the view that as the case stands there is no reason for the EPO to continue the proceedings of its own motion, the proceedings are closed by means of a formal decision ([Rule 84\(2\)](#), second sentence).

1.2 Revocation of the European patent

1.2.1 Revocation on substantive grounds

If the opposition division is of the opinion that at least one ground for opposition as set out in [Art. 100](#) prejudices the maintenance of the European patent, it will revoke the patent under [Art. 101\(2\)](#), first sentence. Similarly, if the opposition division is of the opinion that the patent as amended during the course of the opposition proceedings does not meet the requirements of the EPC, it will revoke the patent under [Art. 101\(3\)\(b\)](#). If one of the requests is to maintain the patent as granted and a further request is to maintain the patent as amended during opposition proceedings and neither of the requests meets the requirements of the EPC, then the patent is revoked under [Art. 101](#), preferably citing [Art. 101\(2\)](#) and [\(3\)\(b\)](#).

[Art. 101\(2\)](#)

[Art. 101\(3\)\(b\)](#)

For revocation because the patent proprietor has not agreed to the text, see [D-VI, 2.2](#) and [D-VIII, 1.2.5](#).

1.2.2 Revocation for failure to file a translation or to file a formally compliant version of amended text passages

Under [Rule 82\(2\)](#) in conjunction with [Rule 82\(3\)](#), if the patent proprietor fails in due time to:

[Rule 82\(3\)](#)

- (i) file a translation of the amended claims in the two official languages of the EPO other than the language of the proceedings (see [D-VI, 7.2.3](#)) or
- (ii) file a formally compliant verbatim version of the amended text passages (see [E-III, 8.7.3](#)),

the European patent will be revoked.

1.2.3 Revocation for failure to notify the appointment of a new representative

Rule 142(3)(a)

If opposition proceedings are interrupted according to Rule 142(1)(c) and the patent proprietor, who is not resident in one of the contracting states, does not forward notification of the appointment of a new representative within the two-month period laid down in Rule 142(3)(a) (see E-VII.1.4(i)), the European patent will be revoked.

1.2.4 Revocation in the event of requirements not being met until after expiry of time limits

In the cases referred to in D-VIII.1.2.2 and 1.2.3, the European patent will be revoked even if the omitted acts have been completed during the period between expiry of the time limit and the taking of a final decision unless a request for re-establishment of rights has been filed, in which case a decision must first be given on the request.

1.2.5 Revocation of the patent in the event that the patent proprietor no longer wishes the patent to be maintained as granted

If a patent proprietor states that they no longer approve the text in which the patent was granted and does not submit an amended text, the patent must be revoked pursuant to Art. 101 (see T 203/14 and T 2405/12). This also applies when the patent proprietor requests that the patent be revoked.

If the patent proprietor unambiguously declares to the EPO that they surrender (or abandon or renounce) their patent, this is interpreted as equivalent to a request for the patent's revocation (see T 237/86). If the request is not unambiguous, the patent proprietor is given the opportunity to request the patent's revocation or to declare that they no longer approve of the patent being maintained as granted. This results in the patent being revoked.

1.3 Rejection of the opposition

Art. 101(2)

If the opposition division is of the opinion that the grounds for opposition mentioned in Art. 100 do not prejudice the maintenance of the European patent in unamended form, it will reject the opposition.

1.4 Maintenance of the European patent as amended

1.4.1 Taking of a final decision

Art. 101(3)(a)

Rule 82(1) and (2)

If the opposition division is of the opinion that, taking into consideration the amendments made by the patent proprietor during the opposition proceedings, the patent and the invention to which it relates meet the requirements of the EPC, it will issue an interlocutory decision to maintain the European patent as amended.

The procedure specified in D-VI.7.2.1 to 7.2.3 will precede the final decision.

1.4.2 Statement in the decision of the amended form of the European patent

The decision must state which amended text of the European patent forms the basis for maintaining it. *Rule 82(4)*

2. Other decisions

2.1 Decision on the inadmissibility of an opposition or intervention

See D-IV, 3 and 5.5 with reference to the notice of opposition and D-IV, 5.6 and D-VII, 6 for the intervention of an assumed infringer.

2.2 Decisions which do not terminate proceedings

Such decisions are dealt with in E-IX, 3.

See D-VI, 7.2.2 with reference to the maintenance of a patent with amended documents.

2.3 Decision on a notified loss of rights at the request of the person concerned

This decision is dealt with in E-VIII, 1.9.3. *Rule 112(2)*

2.4 Decision on re-establishment of rights

This decision is dealt with in E-VIII, 3.3.

2.5 Decision on closure of the opposition proceedings

This decision is dealt with in D-VII, 5 and D-VIII, 1.1.

Chapter IX – Costs

1. Charging of costs

1.1 General principle

Each party to the proceedings must bear the costs they have incurred. However, an opposition division may, for reasons of equity, order a different apportionment of such costs, which may have been incurred during the taking of evidence, in oral proceedings or under other circumstances.

Art. 104(1)

Rule 88

The phrase "taking of evidence" refers generally to the receiving of evidence by an opposition division, whatever the form of such evidence. It includes the production of documents and sworn statements in writing as well as hearing witnesses (see T 117/86).

1.2 Decisions on the apportionment of costs

Apportionment of costs must be dealt with in the decision on the opposition. This apportionment will form part of the main decision and will be incorporated in the operative part of the decision.

Rule 88(1)

The decision will deal only with the obligation on the party or parties concerned to bear costs. The actual amounts to be paid by one party to another must be dealt with in the decision on the fixing of costs (see D-IX.2).

A statement that the parties will bear their own costs may be incorporated in the grounds for the decision on the opposition and must be included in cases where one of the parties to the proceedings has submitted a request for a decision on the apportionment of costs but the opposition division does not consider it justified.

A decision to apportion costs may be made by the opposition division of its own motion, even if no application for the apportionment of costs has been made.

In the absence of an express decision on the apportionment of costs, each of the parties concerned must bear their own costs.

1.3 Costs to be taken into consideration

Apportionment of costs may relate only to those expenses necessary to assure proper protection of the rights involved.

Rule 88(1)

Examples of such expenses are:

Art. 104(1)

- (i) expenditure incurred in respect of witnesses and experts, together with other costs arising in connection with the taking of evidence
- (ii) remuneration of the representatives of the parties in respect of oral proceedings or the taking of evidence

- (iii) remuneration of the representatives of the parties in respect of undue delaying of the procedure by one of the parties or in respect of the late filing of documents and
- (iv) expenditure incurred directly by the parties, i.e. their travel expenses in coming to oral proceedings or the taking of evidence.

Costs incurred in respect of superfluous or irrelevant evidence, etc. cannot be apportioned.

In the order of apportionment as part of its decision, the opposition division will state the kind of costs to be differently apportioned and reimbursed to the receiving party as clearly and precisely as possible.

1.4 Principle of equity

Reasons of equity will require an opposition division to decide on issuing an order to apportion costs when the costs arise in whole or in part as a result of conduct by one party which is not in keeping with the care required to assure proper protection of the rights involved, in other words when the costs are culpably incurred as a result of irresponsible or even malicious actions. Each party may of course defend their rights or interests (e.g. the proprietor their patent) by any legally admissible means within the framework of the opposition proceedings; they may, for example, request oral proceedings or the taking of evidence.

Accordingly, costs incurred as a result of default or of inappropriate legal means used by either party may be charged to the party responsible, even if that party has been successful in the opposition proceedings. Situations resulting from *force majeure* (such as absence at oral proceedings due to a sudden serious illness) do not in general lead to the apportionment of costs.

The following are examples where the principle of equity may be applied:

The costs incurred by the opponent in preparing oral proceedings which have been appointed may be charged to the patent proprietor if the latter surrenders the patent just before the date appointed for the oral proceedings, although it was clear when the proceedings were being arranged, from a document put forward by the opponent, that the patent proprietor had no case and that they alone were therefore liable for their irresponsible conduct.

If an aspect of the state of the art is adduced as an argument at a late stage and it can be shown, or it is evident, that the party concerned knew of it earlier, e.g. in that the party in question had made prior use of it, the additional costs of further oral proceedings unnecessarily incurred by the other parties may be charged to the party having caused them by submitting this argument at such a late stage.

If relevant facts or evidence are submitted by a party only at a late stage of the proceedings without any good reason and if, as a consequence,

unnecessary costs are incurred by another party, the opposition division may decide on the apportionment of costs.

2. Procedure for the fixing of costs

2.1 Fixing of costs by the opposition division

The formalities officer is entrusted with fixing the amount of the costs to be paid to the beneficiary at the request of at least one party. The request from a party to the proceedings to fix the costs is admissible only if the decision in which the apportionment of costs was ordered has become final. *Art. 104(2)*
Rule 88(2)

A list of costs, with supporting evidence in respect of each amount involved, must be attached to the request. Costs may be fixed once their credibility is established. *Rule 88(2)*

The parties will be notified of the costs as fixed by the formalities officer acting for the opposition division. *Art. 119*

For an explanation of the duties entrusted to the formalities officer, see D-II, 7.

2.2 Appeal against the fixing of costs by the opposition division

The communication in which the formalities officer has fixed the costs may be reviewed at the request of one of the parties to the proceedings. The opposition division will then issue an appealable decision.

The request for such a decision, stating the reasons on which it is based, must be filed with the EPO in writing within one month after the date of notification of the communication in which the costs have been fixed. This request is not deemed filed until the fee for requesting a decision by the opposition division on the costs as fixed has been paid at the rate prescribed in the Rules relating to Fees under the EPC. *Rule 88(3)*

The opposition division will take a decision on the request without oral proceedings. *Rule 88(4)*

This final decision by the opposition division can be appealed by each party adversely affected. The appeal will only be admissible if the amount fixed exceeds the appeal fee. *Rule 97(2)*

3. Enforcement of the fixing of costs

Any final decision of the EPO fixing the amount of costs must be dealt with, for the purpose of enforcement in the contracting states, in the same way as a final decision given by a civil court of the state in the territory of which enforcement is to be carried out. Verification of any such decision must be limited to its authenticity. *Art. 104(3)*

"Decision" as referred to above also covers the final fixing of costs by the opposition division.

Chapter X – Limitation and revocation procedure

1. Introduction

The limitation and revocation procedures are centralised *ex parte* proceedings which take place before the EPO and allow the patent proprietor either to have the claims of the granted patent limited or to have the whole patent revoked for all the designated states. More particularly, the limitation procedure offers an opportunity to obtain a limitation of a European patent in a short and straightforward procedure.

Unlike in the opposition procedure, there is no restriction on the period between the grant of the patent and the filing of the request. Accordingly, the request can be filed at any time after grant, after opposition proceedings or even after expiry of the patent.

The examining division is competent to decide on requests for limitation and revocation. However, certain aspects of this procedure are entrusted to formalities officers (see decisions of the President of the EPO dated 12 December 2013, OJ EPO 2014, A6, and 23 November 2015, OJ EPO 2015, A104). Rule 91

2. Examination for deficiencies in the request

2.1 Deficiencies which lead to the request being deemed not filed

On receipt of a request for revocation or limitation of a patent, the formalities officer will examine whether: Art. 105a

- (i) the request is filed with the EPO (Art. 105a(1))
- (ii) opposition proceedings in respect of the patent are not pending at the time of filing the request (Art. 105a(2) and Rule 93(1))
- (iii) the relevant fee is paid (Art. 105a(1) and Art. 2(1), item 10a, RFees)
- (iv) where the request is filed in a language according to Art. 14(4), the translation has been filed in due time (Rule 6(2))
- (v) where the requester is required by Art. 133(2) to appoint a representative, this was done in due time (Rule 152 (3) and (6)).

If any of these requirements are not met, the request is deemed not filed. The requester is notified of this finding (Art. 119) and the fee is refunded.

Otherwise, the request is considered to have been filed and the limitation/revocation procedure commences.

2.2 Deficiencies which, if not remedied, lead to the request being rejected as inadmissible

Rule 92

The formalities officer will furthermore examine whether:

- (i) the request is filed in writing (Rule 92(1))
- (ii) the request includes the particulars of the requester required by Rule 92(2)(a), referring to Rule 41(2)(c)
- (iii) the request indicates the contracting states where the requester is the patent proprietor (Rule 92(2)(a))
- (iv) the request indicates the number of the patent to be limited or revoked (Rule 92(2)(b))
- (v) the request indicates the contracting states where the patent has taken effect, even if it has meanwhile lapsed in one or more of those contracting states (Rule 92(2)(b))
- (vi) in cases (iii) and (v), and if the requester is not the patent proprietor for all these contracting states, the requester provides the names and addresses of the other patent proprietors and evidence of entitlement to act on their behalf (Rule 92(2)(c)); due to the retroactive effect of a limitation/revocation (Art. 68), such evidence is also required if the patent has meanwhile lapsed in one or more of the contracting states referred to under (v); note that in the case of joint patent proprietors, whether for the same or different contracting states, the requirements of Rule 151 for appointment of a common representative also apply in the limitation or revocation procedure (see A-VIII, 1.5)
- (vii) where limitation is sought, the request includes the complete version of the amended claims (and of the description and drawings where applicable) (Rule 92(2)(d))
- (viii) if the requester has appointed a representative, the particulars according to Rule 41(2)(d) (Rule 92(2)(e)) have been filed.

Rule 94

If any of the above requirements are not met, the requester is invited to correct the deficiencies within a period to be specified.

If the deficiencies are not corrected within this period, the request is to be rejected as inadmissible. The requester is notified of this decision (Art. 119). Re-establishment of rights under Art. 122 is, however, available. The decision rejecting the request is open to appeal (Art. 106(1)).

Otherwise, the request is deemed admissible.

3. Decision on request for revocation

Art. 105b(2)

Rule 95

If the request is for revocation and is admissible, the examining division will revoke the patent and communicate this to the requester (Art. 105b(2) and Rule 95(1)). The decision takes effect on the date on which it is published in the Bulletin (Art. 105b(3)). In accordance with Art. 68, the effect of the

decision is that the patent is revoked *ab initio*, conferring no rights under Art. 64 or 67. As stated in Art. 105b(3), the decision applies to all contracting states in respect of which the patent was granted. It is not possible for the patent to be revoked only for some contracting states and not for others.

4. Substantive examination (limitation)

4.1 Department responsible

If a request for limitation is deemed admissible, then the file will be forwarded to the examining division as the department responsible for the examination of the request.

Rule 91

4.2 Basis for the examination

The basis for the examination is the patent as granted or amended in opposition or limitation proceedings (Rule 90). In cases in which there have already been both opposition and limitation procedures, or more than one limitation procedure, the basis for the examination is the patent as amended in the most recent of those procedures.

Rule 90

The requester may provide information (with the request or later in the procedure) as to why the request is allowable and/or its purpose, but there is no obligation to do so. The purpose underlying the request is of no relevance to the question whether it is allowable.

4.3 Scope of the examination

Limitation is not an opportunity to re-examine the whole patent. The scope of the examination is limited by Rule 95(2). The examining division is required to decide only whether the amended claims of the request constitute a limitation with respect to the claims as granted or amended (i.e. those referred to in D-X, 4.2), and whether the amended claims comply with the requirements of Arts. 84 and 123(2) and (3). What needs to be considered is whether the requested amendments introduce a deficiency within the meaning of those provisions. Claims as granted or as maintained are not examined anew.

Rule 95(2)

Rule 95(2) requires only the amended claims to be examined in limitation proceedings. If, however, for the purpose of limitation an amended description and/or drawings are presented together with the claims, these are to be checked, but only for compliance with the requirements of Arts. 84 and 123(2) and (3) (see D-X, 4.3.2 and D-X, 4.3.3 for details).

Auxiliary requests may be filed together with a main request (see H-III, 3).

4.3.1 Limitation of the claims

The term "limitation" is to be interpreted as meaning a reduction in the extent of protection conferred by the claims. Mere clarifications or changes made to protect a different subject ("*aliud*") are not to be considered as limitations.

More particularly, the limitation of a dependent claim only, without any independent claim being limited, is acceptable. However, it is not

permissible to introduce non-limiting amendments in the description or in the claims that are not a consequence of the limitation of the claims (for example tidying up unclear claims, making amendments to improve the patent or cosmetic changes). Likewise, adding dependent claims in limitation is not permissible if not directly caused by the limitation introduced in the claims.

4.3.2 Art. 123

Art. 123

Amendments in a claim leading to a scope of protection which is smaller but falls partly outside the extent of protection conferred by the claim previously on file must be dealt with cautiously. Even if the amendment constitutes a limitation, such a claim would generally contravene Art. 123(3) (see also H-V, 7 for Art. 123(3) in the case of a change of category of a claim).

Art. 69(1)

The description and drawings are used to interpret the claims in accordance with Art. 69(1) and its Protocol on Interpretation. Amendments made to these parts might therefore introduce matter contrary to Art. 123(3) (see H-IV, 3.1 and 3.3).

4.3.3 Art. 84

Art. 84

Clarity of the claims and support by the description are only examined to the extent that an amendment introduces non-compliance with Art. 84. Otherwise, the usual standards apply for interpreting the requirements of Art. 84 in limitation proceedings (see F-IV, 4, 5 and 6).

In particular, the examining division checks whether the amendments introduce inconsistencies between the description and the claims that cast doubt on the subject-matter for which protection is sought (see F-IV, 4.3 for examination of inconsistencies between the description and the claims in general). If this is the case, in accordance with Rule 95(2), the proprietor is requested to amend either the description or the claims in order to comply with Art. 84. In this context, it is pointed out that the examining division may not adapt the description of its own motion.

Note that amendments made to the claims or description solely to improve the patent, or cosmetic changes not occasioned by the limited claims, cannot be allowed. In particular, mere clarifications made to the claims, particularly dependent claims, cannot be allowed unless they are occasioned by the limitation(s) introduced elsewhere in the claims (see also D-X, 4.3.1).

Rule 139

For the admissibility of a request for correction under Rule 139 of the documents making up the patent, see H-VI, 2.1.1.

4.3.4 Points to be disregarded

In limitation proceedings, there is no examination as to why a request for limitation was filed or whether the goal of the limitation has been achieved, for example if the amended and limited claims are truly novel vis-à-vis a particular prior-art document.

In general, there is no need to verify whether the limited claims contravene any of Arts. 52 to 57. It may however happen that limitation results in *prima facie* non-compliance with the patentability criteria, e.g. Art. 53, in which case the examining division will communicate this non-compliance to the requester.

Example

A granted claim directed to a generic plant is limited to a specific plant variety. As the amended claim then relates to a plant variety *per se*, it is excluded from patentability under Art. 53(b) (G. 1/98).

4.4 Further stages of the examination

If the examination under D-X. 4.3 above leads to the conclusion that the request is allowable, then the next stage of the procedure – i.e. the establishment of the formal requirements for limitation as described under D-X. 5 – can begin. Otherwise, in accordance with Rule 95(2), a communication must be sent to the requester identifying the deficiencies and giving the opportunity to correct them within a period to be specified. The normal period is two months (Rule 132(2)). It is extendable in principle, but only under exceptional circumstances.

The division may not adapt the description of its own motion (see D-X. 5). In the case of discrepancy between the claims and the description, an objection will always be raised.

If the requester responds in due time in a manner such that no objections remain, then the procedure continues as in D-X. 5.

Rule 95(2) provides for only one opportunity to make amendments during limitation. However, if the response to the communication under Rule 95(2) overcomes the objections raised in that communication, but gives rise to new objections, the fundamental principle of the right to be heard under Art. 113(1) will normally make a further communication necessary in order to communicate the new objections to the requester before the decision to reject the request for limitation is issued (see D-X. 6). Normally, no further amendments may be made in reply to that communication.

Rule 95(2) specifies that the examining division must give the requester one opportunity to correct the deficiencies. However, any request for oral proceedings according to Art. 116 will be granted if the division does not consider the request for limitation to be allowable. No further amendments may be submitted during oral proceedings if the opportunity to make amendments has already been taken.

4.5 Third-party observations during the examination

Art. 115 explicitly covers all proceedings before the EPO, not just pre-grant proceedings. Accordingly, its provisions also apply in principle to revocation and limitation proceedings. Patentability under Art. 115 is to be interpreted in a broader sense so that issues relating to Arts. 84 and 123(2) may also be taken into consideration. Requesters could, when responding to an invitation under Rule 95(2), introduce further restrictions intended to

Art. 115

Rule 114

address such observations. If they wish to do this, and no invitation under Rule 95(2) is issued, their only option is to file a further request for limitation.

5. Formal procedure for limitation when the request is allowable

Rule 95(3)

If the request for limitation is allowable, then according to Rule 95(3) the examining division must communicate this to the requester and invite them to file translations of the amended claims into the other two official languages within a period of three months.

The nature of the communication under Rule 95(3) inviting the requester to file translations of the claims is different from the communication of the intention to grant during examination proceedings under Rule 71(3). During limitation, the text filed by the requester is deemed approved, whereas at this stage in examination the text is a version proposed to the applicants and subject to their approval.

Once the communication under Rule 95(3) is received, the requester can only file the translations or have the request rejected for failure to do so. Therefore, the examining division may not, with the communication under Rule 95(3), make amendments of its own motion to the claims of a request for limitation in order to render them allowable or adapt the description of its own motion to bring it into line with the limited claim(s). The provisions of Art. 113 would not be met, since the requester does not have an opportunity to contest or comment on the amendments made.

As in opposition proceedings, the requester benefits from a two-month period of grace for reply. Re-establishment of rights is available.

Art. 105b(2) and (3)

If the requester files the required translations in due time, the examining division will decide to limit the patent (Art. 105b(2) and Rule 95(3), last sentence). This takes effect on the date on which the mention of the decision is published in the Bulletin.

Art. 105c

As soon as possible after this, the amended specification will be published by the EPO. The form of publication of the amended patent specification is defined in Rules 96, 73(2) and (3) and 74. The procedure for this is the same as in opposition proceedings.

Art. 68

As for revocation (see D-X, 3), the effect of the decision to limit the patent is that the patent is limited *ab initio*.

6. Rejection of the request

If the requester:

- (i) does not respond in due time to the invitation under Rule 95(2) (see D-X, 4.4 above) or
- (ii) responds in due time, but the request is still not allowable or
- (iii) fails to file the translation according to Rule 95(3) (see D-X, 5 above),

then the examining division will reject the request (Art. 105b(2), last sentence and Rule 95(4)), provided the requirements of Art. 113(1) are met (see D-X, 4.4).

The requester will be notified of the decision to reject the request in accordance with Art. 119.

In case (ii), the decision is a reasoned decision taken by the examining division and is subject to appeal.

Rule 111(2)

Art. 106(1)

7. Relation to opposition proceedings

7.1 Precedence of opposition proceedings

The case in which opposition proceedings are already pending when the request for revocation or limitation is filed has been mentioned in D-X, 2.1. In the opposite case, i.e. where an opposition is filed while revocation or limitation proceedings are pending, the procedure depends on whether the pending proceedings relate to a request for revocation or for limitation.

Rule 93(1)

According to Rule 93(2), if the pending proceedings relate to a request for limitation, the examining division will terminate those proceedings and order the reimbursement of the limitation fee. The limitation procedure is terminated on the day the decision on the limitation procedure is handed over for notification by the EPO. The opposition procedure will then continue in the normal manner.

Rule 93(2)

The requester is notified of the decision to terminate the limitation proceedings (Art. 119).

Rule 93(2) is restricted to limitation proceedings. Therefore, in the case of revocation proceedings, there is no precedence of opposition. Revocation proceedings continue after an opposition is filed, and the case proceeds to opposition only if the request for revocation is deemed not filed, is rejected as inadmissible or is withdrawn. Otherwise, if the patent is revoked, the opponent(s) will be informed of this situation and the opposition proceedings will be terminated.

7.2 Filing of opposition after decision on limitation

On rare occasions, it may happen that the limitation procedure is finished and the decision to limit published in the European Patent Bulletin before the opposition is filed within the nine-month opposition period. In such cases, the opponent does not benefit from a new nine-month period, since the opposition period runs only once from publication of the mention of the grant of the patent. Accordingly, the opponent will not have a full nine-month period to formulate the opposition for the patent as limited.

8. Legal status of decisions

The decisions rejecting the request for limitation or revocation as either inadmissible or not allowable (see D-X, 2 and 6) are open to appeal as they are decisions of the examining division terminating a procedure. They are listed as such in Art. 21(3)(a).

Art. 106(1)

9. Withdrawal of the request

In the absence of any provision to the contrary and in accordance with normal legal principles, the requester may withdraw the request for limitation or revocation at any time, provided that the request is still pending. In this case, however, the limitation or revocation fee will not be refunded.

10. Different sets of claims

Art. 105b(3)

Art. 105b(3) specifies that the decision to limit or revoke will apply to the patent in all contracting states for which it has been granted. There is thus a single decision covering all contracting states, but it may include different sets of claims for different contracting states or determine that the limitation is in other ways different for different contracting states. Such situations could arise in two different sets of circumstances.

10.1 Limitation results in the claims becoming different in different contracting states

The limitation could result in the claims becoming different in different contracting states if the requester wishes to restrict the claims with respect to one or more, but not all, contracting states in order to avoid conflict with national prior rights. Such different sets of claims can be allowed, provided that the substantive requirements are met for all sets for which the requester is seeking an amendment.

Rule 138

It follows from Rule 138 that a prerequisite for the introduction of different claims for different contracting states during the limitation procedure is that the requester informs the EPO of the existence of the national prior rights when filing the different sets of claims. If they file different sets of claims without informing the EPO of the national prior rights, then the request is to be refused under Art. 105b(3) and Rule 138.

Art. 54(3)

For applications filed on or after 13 December 2007, different sets of claims can no longer be justified on the basis of prior art under Art. 54(3) (for transitional provisions, however, see D-VII, 8).

10.2 Limitation is different for different contracting states because the claims as granted were different for different contracting states

The limitation may be different for different contracting states if the claims forming the basis of the limitation procedure were different for the different contracting states. This situation would occur where the patent has different claims for different contracting states, e.g. because of national prior rights or prior art under Art. 54(3) (for patents granted before 13 December 2007 or for patents granted in respect of European patent applications pending at that time) or where under Art. 61 a partial transfer of rights has taken place (Rule 18(2)).

The requester might wish to apply a limitation already introduced for one or more contracting states to the other contracting states or to bring the claims into line with each other for a different reason. If this results in a single set of claims for all contracting states and the substantive requirements are met separately for each different set of original claims, then the request would be allowable.

Note that it would also be possible for the circumstances of this paragraph and of paragraph D-X, 10.1 to coexist in a single request.

11. Multiple requests

Rule 90 defines that the basis for the request can be the claims as amended in limitation proceedings, thus providing for multiple subsequent requests, i.e. a request for limitation or revocation following one or more earlier requests for limitation. *Rule 90*

Part E

Guidelines on General Procedural Matters

Contents

Chapter I – Introduction I-1

Chapter II – Communications and notifications II-1

1.	Communications	II-1
1.1	General remarks	II-1
1.2	Number of communications	II-1
1.3	Form of decisions, communications and notices	II-1
2.	Notification	II-1
2.1	General remarks	II-1
2.2	Method of notification	II-2
2.3	Electronic notification	II-2
2.4	Notification by postal services	II-3
2.5	Notification to representatives	II-3
2.6	Irregularities in the notification	II-4

Chapter III – Oral proceedings III-1

1.	General	III-1
1.1	Introduction	III-1
1.2	Format of oral proceedings	III-1
1.3	Request for oral proceedings to be held on EPO premises	III-2
1.4	Request to hold on-site oral proceedings at a particular site	III-2
2.	Oral proceedings at the request of a party	III-2
2.1	Request for oral proceedings by an opponent whose opposition is to be rejected as inadmissible or is deemed not to have been filed	III-3
3.	Request for further oral proceedings	III-3
4.	Oral proceedings at the instance of the EPO	III-3

5.	Preparation of oral proceedings	III-4
5.1	When can a summons to oral proceedings be issued in substantive examination?	III-4
6.	Summons to oral proceedings	III-4
7.	Change of date, cancellation or maintenance of oral proceedings	III-6
7.1	Changing the date of oral proceedings	III-6
7.1.1	Requests for a different date of oral proceedings	III-6
7.1.2	Change of date of oral proceedings at the instigation of the division	III-7
7.1.3	Change of date of oral proceedings – defined notice period	III-7
7.2	Cancellation or maintenance of oral proceedings	III-7
7.2.1	General	III-7
7.2.2	Withdrawal of the request for oral proceedings	III-8
8.	Conduct of oral proceedings	III-8
8.1	Admission of the public to proceedings	III-8
8.2	Conduct of oral proceedings	III-9
8.2.1	Participation of parties and their representatives from different locations	III-9
8.2.2	Participation of members of the division from different locations	III-9
8.2.3	Technical problems	III-9
8.2.4	Recording	III-10
8.3	Opening of oral proceedings; non-appearance of a party	III-10
8.3.1	Checking the identity and authorisations of participants at oral proceedings	III-10
8.3.2	Opening the oral proceedings	III-12
8.3.3	Late arrival, non-appearance and failure to connect	III-12
8.3.3.1	General	III-12
8.3.3.2	Procedure in opposition proceedings	III-13
8.3.3.3	Procedure in examination proceedings	III-14
8.4	Opening of the substantive part of the proceedings	III-14
8.5	Submissions by the parties	III-14
8.5.1	Use of computer-generated slideshows in oral proceedings	III-15
8.5.1.1	Opposition proceedings (<i>inter partes</i>)	III-16
8.5.1.2	Examination proceedings (<i>ex parte</i>)	III-16
8.5.2	Written submissions during oral proceedings by videoconference	III-17

8.6	Facts, evidence or amendments introduced at a late stage	III-18
8.7	Handwritten amendments in oral proceedings	III-18
8.7.1	General principles	III-18
8.7.2	Procedure in examination proceedings	III-18
8.7.3	Procedure in opposition proceedings	III-19
8.8	Use of Rule 137(4) for amendments filed during oral proceedings in examination	III-20
8.9	Discussion of the facts and of the legal position	III-20
8.10	Right of the other members of the division to put questions	III-21
8.11	Closure of oral proceedings	III-21
8.11.1	Requesting postponement during oral proceedings	III-22
8.11.2	Adjournment of oral proceedings due to lack of time	III-22
9.	Delivery of the decision	III-23
10.	Minutes of oral proceedings	III-23
10.1	Formal requirements	III-24
10.2	Language	III-24
10.3	Subject-matter of minutes	III-25
10.4	Request for correction of minutes	III-26

Chapter IV – Taking and conservation of evidence

IV-1

1.	Taking of evidence by the departments of the EPO	IV-1
1.1	General remarks	IV-1
1.2	Means of evidence	IV-1
1.3	Taking of evidence	IV-3
1.4	Order to take evidence	IV-3
1.5	Summoning of parties, witnesses and experts	IV-4
1.6	Hearing of parties, witnesses and experts	IV-4
1.6.1	General remarks	IV-4
1.6.2	Witnesses and experts not summoned	IV-5
1.6.3	Guidance to persons heard	IV-5
1.6.4	Separate hearings	IV-5
1.6.5	Examination as to personal particulars	IV-5

1.6.6	Examination as to <i>res gestae</i>	IV-5
1.6.7	Entitlement of parties to put questions at hearings	IV-6
1.6.8	Hearing of a witness no longer necessary	IV-6
1.7	Minutes of taking of evidence	IV-6
1.8	Commissioning of experts	IV-7
1.8.1	Decision on the form of the opinion	IV-7
1.8.2	Objection to an expert	IV-7
1.8.3	Terms of reference of the expert	IV-7
1.9	Costs arising from oral proceedings or taking of evidence	IV-7
1.10	Entitlements of witnesses and experts	IV-8
1.10.1	Expenses for travel and subsistence	IV-8
1.10.2	Loss of earnings, fees	IV-8
1.10.3	Details of the entitlements of witnesses and experts	IV-8
1.11	Models	IV-8
1.11.1	When may models be submitted?	IV-8
1.11.2	Procedure	IV-9
1.11.3	Keeping the model	IV-9
1.12	Video recordings	IV-10
2.	Conservation of evidence	IV-10
2.1	Requirements	IV-10
2.2	Request for the conservation of evidence	IV-10
2.3	Competence	IV-10
2.4	Decision on the request and the taking of evidence	IV-11
3.	Taking of evidence by courts or authorities of the contracting states	IV-11
3.1	Legal co-operation	IV-11
3.2	Means of giving or taking evidence	IV-11
3.2.1	Taking of evidence on oath	IV-11
3.2.2	Evidence taken by a competent court	IV-11
3.3	Letters rogatory	IV-12
3.4	Procedures before the competent authority	IV-12
3.5	Costs of taking evidence	IV-12
3.6	Taking of evidence by an appointed person	IV-12

4.	Evaluation of evidence	<u>IV-13</u>
4.1	General remarks	<u>IV-13</u>
4.2	Types of evidence	<u>IV-13</u>
4.3	Examination of evidence	<u>IV-14</u>
4.4	Asking for evidence	<u>IV-14</u>
4.5	Evaluation of the testimony of a witness	<u>IV-14</u>
4.6	Evaluation of the testimony of parties	<u>IV-15</u>
4.7	Evaluation of an expert opinion	<u>IV-16</u>
4.8	Evaluation of an inspection	<u>IV-16</u>

Chapter V – Derogating from the language of the proceedings at oral proceedings

V-1

1.	Use of an official language	<u>V-1</u>
2.	Language of a contracting state or other language	<u>V-1</u>
3.	Exceptions to sections 1 and 2	<u>V-1</u>
4.	Language used in the taking of evidence	<u>V-2</u>
5.	Language used by employees of the EPO	<u>V-2</u>
6.	Language used in the minutes	<u>V-2</u>

Chapter VI – Examination by the EPO of its own motion; facts, evidence or grounds not submitted in due time; observations by third parties

VI-1

1.	Examination by the EPO of its own motion	<u>VI-1</u>
1.1	General remarks	<u>VI-1</u>
1.2	Limits on the obligation to examine	<u>VI-1</u>
2.	Late-filed submissions	<u>VI-1</u>
2.1	General principles in opposition proceedings	<u>VI-2</u>
2.2	Submissions filed in preparation for or during oral proceedings	<u>VI-3</u>
2.2.1	New facts and evidence	<u>VI-3</u>

2.2.2	Amendments filed in preparation for or during oral proceedings	<u>VI-4</u>
2.2.3	Principles relating to the exercise of discretion	<u>VI-5</u>
2.2.4	Right to be heard	<u>VI-6</u>
2.2.5	Costs	<u>VI-7</u>
3.	Observations by third parties	<u>VI-7</u>
4.	External complaints	<u>VI-9</u>

Chapter VII – Interruption, stay and consolidation of the proceedings **VII-1**

1.	Interruption	<u>VII-1</u>
1.1	Cases in which the proceedings may be interrupted	<u>VII-1</u>
1.2	Department responsible	<u>VII-1</u>
1.3	Date of interruption	<u>VII-1</u>
1.4	Resumption of proceedings	<u>VII-1</u>
1.5	Resumption of periods	<u>VII-2</u>
2.	Stay of proceedings under Rule 14 due to pending national entitlement proceedings	<u>VII-3</u>
3.	Stay of proceedings when a referral to the Enlarged Board of Appeal is pending	<u>VII-3</u>
4.	Consolidation of proceedings	<u>VII-3</u>

Chapter VIII – Time limits, loss of rights, further and accelerated processing and re-establishment of rights **VIII-1**

1.	Time limits and loss of rights resulting from failure to respond within a time limit	<u>VIII-1</u>
1.1	Determination of time limits	<u>VIII-1</u>
1.2	Duration of the periods to be specified by the EPO on the basis of EPC provisions	<u>VIII-1</u>
1.3	Time limits which may be freely determined	<u>VIII-2</u>
1.4	Calculation of time limits	<u>VIII-2</u>
1.5	Effect of change in priority date	<u>VIII-3</u>

1.6	Extension of a time limit	<u>VIII-3</u>
1.6.1	Extension of time limits set by the EPO under Rule 132	<u>VIII-3</u>
1.6.2	Extension of periods under Rule 134	<u>VIII-4</u>
1.6.2.1	Extension of periods under Rule 134(1)	<u>VIII-4</u>
1.6.2.2	Extension of periods under Rule 134(2) and Rule 134(5)	<u>VIII-5</u>
1.6.2.3	Scope of application of Rule 134	<u>VIII-5</u>
1.7	Late receipt of documents	<u>VIII-7</u>
1.8	Failure to respond within a time limit	<u>VIII-7</u>
1.9	Loss of rights	<u>VIII-7</u>
1.9.1	Cases of loss of rights	<u>VIII-7</u>
1.9.2	Noting and communication of loss of rights	<u>VIII-8</u>
1.9.3	Decision on loss of rights	<u>VIII-8</u>
2.	Further processing	<u>VIII-8</u>
3.	Re-establishment of rights	<u>VIII-10</u>
3.1	Admissibility of the request	<u>VIII-10</u>
3.1.1	Time limits covered	<u>VIII-10</u>
3.1.2	Entitlement to file the request	<u>VIII-11</u>
3.1.3	Form of the request and applicable time limit	<u>VIII-11</u>
3.1.4	Substantiation of the request	<u>VIII-14</u>
3.2	Merits of the request	<u>VIII-14</u>
3.3	Decision on re-establishment of rights	<u>VIII-17</u>
4.	Accelerated prosecution of European patent applications	<u>VIII-17</u>
4.1	Accelerated examination	<u>VIII-18</u>
4.2	Patent Prosecution Highway (PPH)	<u>VIII-19</u>
5.	Accelerated processing of oppositions	<u>VIII-19</u>
6.	Accelerated processing before the boards of appeal	<u>VIII-20</u>
7.	Enquiries	<u>VIII-21</u>
8.	Renunciation of rights	<u>VIII-21</u>
8.1	Withdrawal of application or designation	<u>VIII-21</u>
8.2	Withdrawal of priority claim	<u>VIII-22</u>
8.3	Statement of withdrawal	<u>VIII-22</u>

8.4	Surrender of patent	VIII-22

Chapter IX – Decisions **IX-1**

1.	Basic principles of decisions	IX-1
1.1	General remarks	IX-1
1.2	Consideration of time limits	IX-1
1.3	Form and content	IX-1
1.3.1	Order	IX-2
1.3.2	Facts and submissions	IX-2
1.3.3	Reasoning	IX-2
2.	Decisions taken by the examining or opposition divisions	IX-3
2.1	Right to be heard	IX-3
2.2	Authoritative text of documents	IX-4
2.3	Requirements as to form	IX-5
2.4	Facts and submissions	IX-5
2.5	Decision on the file as it stands	IX-6
2.6	Reasoning for decisions	IX-6
2.7	Content	IX-7
2.8	Analysing the parties' arguments	IX-7
2.9	Main and auxiliary requests	IX-7
2.10	Late-filed submissions	IX-8
2.11	Refusal to admit amendments under Rule 137(3)	IX-8
3.	Decisions which do not terminate proceedings – interlocutory decisions	IX-9
4.	Binding nature of decisions on appeals	IX-9
5.	Information on means of redress	IX-10
6.	Notification	IX-10
7.	Expiry of the term of the European patent	IX-10

Chapter X – Impartiality of divisions **X-1****Chapter XI – Appeals** **XI-1**

1.	Suspensive effect	XI-1
2.	Appeals after surrender or lapse of the patent	XI-1
3.	Appeals against the apportionment of costs	XI-1
4.	Appeals against the decision of the opposition division on the fixing of costs	XI-1
5.	Persons entitled to appeal and to be parties to appeal proceedings	XI-1
6.	Time limit and form of appeal	XI-1
7.	Interlocutory revision	XI-2
7.1	General remarks	XI-2
7.2	Remittal to the board of appeal	XI-3
7.3	Reimbursement of appeal fees	XI-3
7.4	Examples	XI-4
7.4.1	No amended claims filed with the appeal	XI-4
7.4.2	Amended main/single request filed with the appeal	XI-4
7.4.3	Main and auxiliary requests filed with the appeal	XI-6
7.4.4	Response to communication under Rule 58 filed with the appeal	XI-6
8.	Rules of Procedure of the Boards of Appeal	XI-6
9.	Remittal to the examining or opposition division after appeal	XI-6

Chapter XII – Request from a national court for a technical opinion concerning a European patent **XII-1**

1.	General	XII-1
2.	Scope of the technical opinion	XII-1
3.	Composition and duties of the examining division	XII-2
3.1	Composition	XII-2
3.2	Duties	XII-2

4.	Language to be used	XII-2
5.	Procedure	XII-2
5.1	Formalities check	XII-3
5.2	Preliminary examination	XII-3
5.3	Withdrawal of the request	XII-3
5.4	Establishment and issue of the technical opinion	XII-3
5.5	File inspection	XII-3
5.6	Appearance before the national court	XII-3
Chapter XIII – Registration of changes of name, transfers, licences and other rights		XIII-1
1.	General	XIII-1
2.	Department responsible	XIII-1
3.	Transfer of the European patent application	XIII-1
4.	Transfer of the European patent	XIII-3
5.	Changes of name	XIII-3
6.	Licences and other rights	XIII-3
6.1	Registration	XIII-3
6.2	Cancellation of the registration	XIII-4

Chapter I – Introduction

Part E contains guidelines for those procedural steps which, in so far as the EPC permits, may be taken in much the same form at various stages in the procedure for examining European patent applications and patents. Attention is also drawn to Art. 125, which states: "In the absence of procedural provisions in this Convention, the EPO shall take into account the principles of procedural law generally recognised in the Contracting States".

Chapter II – Communications and notifications

1. Communications

1.1 General remarks

Cases in which communications are sent include where:

- (i) a party has to be informed of deficiencies and, where appropriate, invited to remedy them, e.g. in accordance with Rule 55, 58, 59, 62a, 63, 64(1), 71(1), 77(2), 95(2) or 108(2)
- (ii) a party is to be invited to file observations on particular questions or to submit documents, evidence, etc., to clarify the issues involved
- (iii) the examining or opposition division considers that the patent cannot be granted or maintained in the text requested by the applicant or patent proprietor, but could possibly be granted or maintained in an amended text of more limited scope
- (iv) important procedural information has to be communicated to the parties, e.g. in accordance with Rules 14(2) and (3), 35(4) or 142(2) and (3)
- (v) oral proceedings are being prepared (see E-III, 5)
- (vi) a decision is to be based on grounds on which the parties have not yet had an opportunity to comment (see E-IX, 1).

1.2 Number of communications

Since each communication issued may entail prolonging the proceedings, the proceedings are conducted in such a way as to manage with as few communications as possible. If a communication has to be issued, it will cover all the points which are necessary, or likely to be of importance, for the particular stage of the proceedings, e.g. the preparation of oral proceedings or of a decision.

1.3 Form of decisions, communications and notices

Any decision, communication or notice from the EPO must be signed by and state the name of the employee responsible. Where the employee produces the document on a computer, a seal may replace their signature. Where it is produced automatically by a computer, their name may also be dispensed with. The same applies to pre-printed notices and communications.

Rule 113(1) and (2)

2. Notification

2.1 General remarks

As a matter of course, the EPO notifies those concerned of decisions and summonses and of any notice or other communication which triggers a time limit or of which those concerned must be notified either under the EPC or by order of the President of the EPO. Other communications do not have to be formally notified.

Art. 119

Rule 125

Rule 126

Rule 127

Where exceptional circumstances so require, documents may be notified via the central industrial property offices of the contracting states.

Where notification is required in proceedings before the EPO, the document notified must be:

- the original document
- a copy of the original that has been certified by the EPO or bears the EPO seal
- a computer printout bearing the EPO seal or
- an electronic document containing the EPO seal or certified in some other way.

Copies of documents emanating from the parties themselves do not need to be certified.

2.2 Method of notification

Rule 125(2) and (3)

Documents may be notified by postal services, by delivery on the premises of the EPO, by public notice or, if the addressee agrees, by means of electronic communication. The President of the EPO decides what means may be used for electronic communication and on the conditions for using them. Further details concerning notifications are given in Rules 126 to 129. If a document is notified via the central industrial property office of a contracting state competent to deal with the addressee, this must be done in accordance with the provisions applicable to that office in national proceedings.

2.3 Electronic notification

Rule 127(2)

Where an addressee has agreed to receive communications electronically, the electronic document is deemed to be delivered to them on the date it bears, unless it has failed to reach its destination.

Even if the addressee can access the electronic document before the date of the document, the decisive date for the purpose of the notification fiction under Rule 127(2) is the date of the document.

If there is a dispute about the delivery of the electronic document, it is incumbent on the EPO to establish that it has reached its destination and to establish the date on which it did so.

If the EPO establishes that the document reached its destination more than seven days after the date it bears, the safeguard under Rule 127(2) applies and a period triggered by the deemed receipt of the document will be extended by the number of days by which these seven days were exceeded (see the notice from the EPO dated 6 March 2023, OJ EPO 2023, A29). Rule 134(1) applies only once the period has been extended in accordance with this safeguard. See E-II, 2.4 for an example.

Electronically notified documents are made available in the Mailbox accessible via MyEPO. A list of the decisions, summonses, notices and communications that can be notified electronically is published on the EPO website. For more details, see the decision of the President of the EPO dated 9 February 2024 concerning the web-based online service MyEPO and electronic notification to the Mailbox in proceedings under the EPC and the PCT (OJ EPO 2024, A20) and the notice from the EPO dated 9 February 2024 concerning new features of MyEPO (OJ EPO 2024, A21).

If other means are introduced for electronic notification, the conditions and details of their use will follow from the applicable decisions.

2.4 Notification by postal services

All notifications by postal services must be by registered letter (see also *Rule 126* OJ EPO 2023, A108).

A document notified by postal services is deemed to be delivered to the addressee on the date it bears, unless it has failed to reach them. If there are irregularities, the safeguards set out in *E-II, 2.3* apply. *Rule 126(2)*

Example

An examination report under *Art. 94(3)* is dated 30 January 2024 and sets a time limit of four months. The report is delivered on 3 February 2024, which is four days after the date it bears. This means there will be no extension under the safeguard and the document will be deemed notified on 30 January 2024. The four-month time limit triggered by the notification on 30 January 2024 ends on 30 May 2024, a day on which no mail is delivered in Munich (public holiday). It will therefore be extended under *Rule 134(1)* until 31 May 2024.

By contrast, if the report is delivered on 9 February 2024, i.e. ten days after the date it bears, the time limit will be extended by three days to expire on 2 June 2024 under *Rule 126(2)*. Since 2 June 2024 is a Sunday, it will be extended again under *Rule 134(1)* to expire on 3 June 2024.

Notification is deemed to have been effected even if acceptance of the document has been refused.

The law applicable for settling other matters relating to notification, e.g. whether delivery to a person other than the addressee is an effective notification to the latter, is the law of the state in whose territory the notification took place.

2.5 Notification to representatives

If a representative has been appointed, notifications must be addressed to them. If several representatives have been appointed for a single party, notification to any one of them is sufficient. If several persons are joint applicants for or proprietors of a patent or have acted in common in filing notice of opposition or intervention and have not appointed a common representative, it will again be sufficient to notify one person, namely the person referred to in *Rule 151*. If several parties have a common *Rule 130*

representative, notification of a single document to the common representative is sufficient.

2.6 Irregularities in the notification

Rule 125(4)

Where a document has reached the addressee, if the EPO is unable to prove that it has been duly notified, or if provisions relating to its notification have not been observed, it is deemed to have been notified on the date established by the EPO as the date of receipt. If the EPO is unable to prove the actual date of notification, a letter, for instance, sent by the addressee and indicating the date of receipt, is accepted as proof. If it is evident from a reply from the addressee that they have received the document, even though they do not mention the date of its notification, the date on which that reply was written is to be regarded as the date of notification.

Chapter III – Oral proceedings

1. General

1.1 Introduction

The term "oral proceedings" means formal proceedings within the meaning of Art. 116. It does not include consultations in examination proceedings and limitation/revocation proceedings (see C-VII, 2). In view of Rule 81(2), such consultations are not allowed in opposition proceedings with more than one party unless they concern matters which do not affect the interests of other parties, for example examining the admissibility of an opposition where this involves only the EPO and the opponent in question.

Oral proceedings will take place before the competent body, e.g. before the appointed officer in the Receiving Section and before the whole division during the examination and opposition procedure.

Art. 18(2)

Art. 19(2)

Art. 113

In matters within its competence, oral proceedings can be held before the Legal Division. Such proceedings are non-public in both *ex parte* and *inter partes* proceedings.

The right to oral proceedings is a substantial part of the right to be heard under Art. 113.

1.2 Format of oral proceedings

Oral proceedings are held by videoconference. In exceptional circumstances where there are serious reasons against holding the oral proceedings by videoconference, they may be held on the EPO premises, either at a party's request or at the instigation of the division (OJ EPO 2022, A103, OJ EPO 2022, A106). Examples of serious reasons are, in particular, reasons relating to a participant in the oral proceedings as an individual (e.g. a proven visual impairment that prevents a representative from following oral proceedings on screen) and reasons relating to the nature and subject-matter of the proceedings (e.g. where they involve the demonstration or inspection of an object where the haptic features are essential, to the extent that this is possible in accordance with the applicable provisions). As a rule, sweeping objections to the reliability of videoconferencing technology or the non-availability of videoconferencing equipment will not qualify as serious reasons.

Participants must ensure that their videoconferencing equipment meets the technical requirements specified. They are encouraged to perform a test call well before the oral proceedings take place.

In addition to the summons, participants will receive an email confirming the date, time and the videoconference contact details to be used to establish the connection (in the form of a link or by other suitable means) and containing any other appropriate information, including on the organisation of the videoconference.

1.3 Request for oral proceedings to be held on EPO premises

A request that oral proceedings exceptionally be held on the EPO premises needs to be filed as early as possible, preferably together with the request for oral proceedings. It is at the competent division's discretion whether to grant the request for oral proceedings on the EPO premises.

If the request for oral proceedings on the EPO premises cannot be allowed and is received after the summons to oral proceedings, the division will inform the parties that the oral proceedings will take place by videoconference as set out in the summons and give brief reasons as to why the request cannot be granted. If the request is received before the summons has been issued, the reasons for the refusal will be given in the annex to the summons. In either case, a refusal of this type is not separately appealable.

If a request for oral proceedings on the EPO premises is allowable and is received after the summons to oral proceedings by videoconference has been issued, the parties will be informed that oral proceedings will be held on the EPO premises as requested; where possible, the date of the oral proceedings will remain unchanged.

1.4 Request to hold on-site oral proceedings at a particular site

A request that oral proceedings be held at a particular EPO site is not admissible and a refusal by the competent department to grant it is not open to appeal (see T 1142/12).

2. Oral proceedings at the request of a party

Art. 116(1)

If, in the course of proceedings, a party requests oral proceedings, the competent department must grant this request as further explained in this section. The EPO will not inform parties of this right but will expect them – if they do not obtain satisfaction from the competent department – to request oral proceedings (if they so wish) before a decision is reached.

Under Art. 116(1), parties can request oral proceedings at any time before a decision has been issued. In particular, a request for oral proceedings made before the decision to grant or to limit has been handed over for notification by the EPO to the parties has to be allowed (see T 556/95 and G 12/91).

Art. 116(2)

Oral proceedings will take place before the Receiving Section at the applicant's request only where the Receiving Section considers this to be expedient or where it envisages refusing the European patent application. Where the Receiving Section does not consider it necessary to hold oral proceedings, it must inform the applicant accordingly (see J 16/02).

The competent department will decide on the most appropriate date for the oral proceedings, which will only be held once the issues to be determined are sufficiently clear (see E-III. 5).

If there is a conditional request for oral proceedings, i.e. if any party concerned has indicated that the request for oral proceedings has been made solely as a precaution to cover the eventuality that the case they

have put forward is not accepted, oral proceedings will be held only if a negative decision against the party concerned is envisaged.

If there is an unconditional request for oral proceedings but the competent department considers that a decision on the matter can be reached on the basis of the written evidence on file and intends to take a decision (e.g. in accordance with Art. 97, 101 or 105b) which fully concurs with the case put forward by the party or parties making the unconditional request, the decision may be issued in writing without holding oral proceedings – so long as there is no valid request for oral proceedings from a party adversely affected by the decision envisaged (T. 1050/09).

2.1 Request for oral proceedings by an opponent whose opposition is to be rejected as inadmissible or is deemed not to have been filed

Under Art. 116(1), oral proceedings may be requested only by a party to pending proceedings. If the opposition division notes deficiencies in the notice of opposition under Rule 77(1), any opponent still remains a party to the proceedings until their opposition is rejected as inadmissible. This also applies when deficiencies lead to the opposition being deemed not to have been filed (see D-IV, 1.4.1).

3. Request for further oral proceedings

The EPO may reject a request for further oral proceedings before the same department where the parties and the subject of the proceedings are the same, irrespective of the form in which the oral proceedings were held.

Art. 116(1)

Oral proceedings, particularly in opposition proceedings, are held to give the opportunity to definitively settle all matters raised and are normally terminated with a decision announced orally. The division is bound by that decision, once announced, and it cannot reopen the proceedings to allow further submissions to be filed or to take new facts into account (see the last two paragraphs of E-VI, 2). New submissions can be examined only if the division did not announce a decision at the oral proceedings but instead decided to continue the proceedings in writing. That may be the case e.g. when the examining division indicates that it intends to grant a patent (or to limit a granted patent in limitation proceedings) on the basis of the documents filed during the oral proceedings.

This means that, in examination, limitation or opposition proceedings, there will normally be no justification for further oral proceedings where, for example, one of the parties wishes to revisit a subject a matter already discussed, either before or during the original oral proceedings, from a different point of view. However, if the oral proceedings are not terminated by a decision and the subject of the proceedings subsequently changes, for example where fresh evidence is admitted after the original oral proceedings, then further oral proceedings will generally have to be held if requested (see T. 194/96).

4. Oral proceedings at the instance of the EPO

The competent department of the EPO may arrange for oral proceedings to take place without a request from a party if it considers this to be expedient.

Art. 116(1)

Oral proceedings will normally be expedient only if, after an attempt at written clarification, there are still questions or doubts which have a crucial bearing on the decision to be reached and which may be more efficiently or surely settled by oral discussion with the party or parties, or if evidence has to be taken as part of oral proceedings (see E-IV, 1.3 and 1.6.1). The competent department will also bear in mind the need for procedural economy, since oral proceedings give rise to costs for both the EPO and the party or parties.

5. Preparation of oral proceedings

The purpose of oral proceedings is to settle as far as possible all outstanding questions relevant to the decision. Oral proceedings must therefore be carefully prepared after examination of all the written submissions, and the most appropriate date for holding them is to be chosen with this aim in mind.

When preparing oral proceedings, particularly in opposition, the division considers carefully whether complex legal issues are likely to arise and, if so, it may decide to enlarge the division by adding a legally qualified member (Art. 18(2) and 19(2)).

Where the EPO considers that certain questions relevant to the decision require discussion, it will often make sense for it to inform the party or parties in a communication and possibly also to invite one or more of them to submit written observations and, where appropriate, submit evidence. Parties may also produce evidence in support of their arguments on their own initiative. Where, however, the evidence should have been put forward at an earlier stage, e.g. as described in D-IV, 1.2.2.1(v) and 5.4 in relation to opposition proceedings, it is for the competent body to consider whether to admit the evidence not filed in due time (see E-VI, 2). Any observations should be received in time for them to be communicated to the other parties by one month before the oral proceedings at the latest. The time limit for submitting observations is fixed accordingly, particularly where the invitation to submit them is issued at the same time as the summons to oral proceedings.

5.1 When can a summons to oral proceedings be issued in substantive examination?

See C-VIII, 5.1 for when a summons to oral proceedings can be issued in examination proceedings.

6. Summons to oral proceedings

All parties must be duly summoned to oral proceedings by notification. The summons must state the subject, the date and time and the form of the oral proceedings.

The division schedules a single date for the oral proceedings, i.e. one day or, in special cases, more than one consecutive day. It does not discuss the date with parties beforehand. Oral proceedings may be scheduled for any working day on which the EPO is open at the site in question.

Rule 115(1)
Art. 119

The summons will be accompanied by a communication drawing attention to the points which need to be discussed, and normally containing the division's provisional and non-binding opinion. New documents may be cited in the communication accompanying the summons (T 120/12), together with an explanation of their significance. However, examiners must carefully consider on a case-by-case basis whether citing a new document would introduce a new line of argument. If a new document needs to be cited and the proceedings are still at an early stage, they must consider sending a further communication before issuing any summons. For the additional requirements applying to the accompanying communication if the summons is issued as the first action in examination, see C-III, 5. The summons and the accompanying communication can only be appealed together with the final decision unless a separate appeal is allowed (see E-IX, 3).

Rule 116(1)

The summons will also fix a date up to which written submissions or amendments which meet the requirements of the EPC may be filed (see also D-VI, 3.2).

Rule 115(1) stipulates that at least two months' notice of the summons must be given unless the parties agree to a shorter period. Such agreement must be included in the public part of the file.

Rule 115(1)

Harmonised with the standards applied in the written procedure (E-VIII, 1.2), the practice outlined below is to be followed in setting the date of the oral proceedings, in order to give the parties enough time to prepare and file their submissions:

- (i) Any time limit (even one shorter than two months) may be set if the parties have agreed to it in advance.
- (ii) Normally, the summons to oral proceedings is issued at least four months ahead of the scheduled date in examination and at least six months ahead of the scheduled date in opposition.
- (iii) A summons giving between two and four months' notice can be issued without the parties' advance agreement only in specific circumstances, since it leaves the parties very little time for filing submissions before the date fixed in the summons. Examples of such circumstances are where, in examination, the summons follows an extensive exchange between the first examiner and the applicant, where oral proceedings have been adjourned due to a lack of time or where the oral proceedings are rescheduled for a later date (see also E-III, 7.1.3).
- (iv) Where the summons is issued as the first action in examination, there should be six months between the dispatch of the summons and the date of the oral proceedings (see C-III, 5).

The summons must state that if parties duly summoned do not appear or, in the case of oral proceedings by videoconference, fail to connect, the proceedings may continue without them.

Where multiple oppositions have been filed in opposition proceedings, as a rule a single hearing in oral proceedings is scheduled, even if the oppositions are based on different grounds (see [D-I, 6](#)). This means that all the parties must be summoned to attend them and may comment on all grounds raised.

7. Change of date, cancellation or maintenance of oral proceedings

7.1 Changing the date of oral proceedings

7.1.1 Requests for a different date of oral proceedings

A request for a different date of oral proceedings is allowable only if the party concerned can advance serious reasons which justify the fixing of a new date (see [T 1080/99](#), [T 300/04](#), [J 4/03](#) and [T 178/03](#)). The request for the fixing of another date must be filed as soon as possible after the reasons preventing the party concerned from attending the oral proceedings have arisen. It must be accompanied by a sufficiently substantiated written statement setting out these reasons (see [OJ EPO 2009, 68](#); see also [T 178/03](#)) and by appropriate evidence, where necessary.

Serious reasons to request a change in the date for oral proceedings include:

- a summons to oral proceedings previously notified to the same party in other proceedings before the EPO, the Unified Patent Court or a national court or patent office
 - for the same date or
 - for the preceding or following day or
 - for at least one of the two preceding or two following days where participation in the oral proceedings requires travelling to or from a geographically distant location
- serious illness
- a death within the family
- the marriage of a person whose attendance at oral proceedings is relevant
- military service or other obligatory performance of civic duties
- business trips which have been firmly booked before notification of the summons to oral proceedings
- holidays which have already been firmly booked before notification of the summons to oral proceedings. Where holidays are planned but not yet booked, the representative must indicate the circumstances which prevent them from being rescheduled (e.g. school holidays).

If the reasons for changing the date of the oral proceedings submitted by a party do not meet the above criteria, the division will inform the parties that the oral proceedings will take place as set out in the summons and attach an annex with brief reasons as to why in its view the criteria are not met.

The reasons that can be invoked to change the date only apply to those participants whose presence is essential to the oral proceedings, e.g. the representative or a witness.

If substantive submissions have been made by several representatives of a firm over the course of the proceedings, it must be explained why none of them can present the case at the oral proceedings, i.e. why the representative who cannot attend is essential or why the others are also unable to attend.

In opposition proceedings, especially if more than one opponent is involved, a more strict approach may be applied to prevent a series of changes of date (see T 1102/03).

Reasons which, as a rule, are not acceptable include:

- a summons to oral proceedings before the EPO or a national court that was notified after the summons in question
- excessive work pressure.

As Monday and Friday are normal working days, oral proceedings can be scheduled for these days too. The fact that this may mean having to travel at weekends is not a sufficient reason to change the date of the oral proceedings. If possible, however, the departments of first instance will try to be flexible where a party requests a change in the starting time to enable them to travel on the same day.

7.1.2 Change of date of oral proceedings at the instigation of the division

In exceptional cases, the division itself may have to instigate the change of date of oral proceedings for reasons similar to those mentioned above. However, the date of the oral proceedings will be changed only if a suitable replacement cannot be found.

7.1.3 Change of date of oral proceedings – defined notice period

The notice period defined in Rule 115(1), i.e. at least two months, also applies in the case of a change of date unless the parties have agreed to a shorter period (see also E-III, 6(iii) and E-III, 8.11.1).

7.2 Cancellation or maintenance of oral proceedings

7.2.1 General

In response to submissions made by a party in reply to the summons to oral proceedings, the division may also decide to cancel the oral proceedings and continue the procedure in writing. If it takes such a decision, it notifies the parties accordingly. In the absence of such

notification, the parties must assume that the oral proceedings will be held. However, as an additional service in examination proceedings, if oral proceedings are not cancelled following such submissions, the division informs the applicant that the date and time scheduled for the oral proceedings are maintained.

7.2.2 Withdrawal of the request for oral proceedings

If the request for oral proceedings is explicitly withdrawn, or if a written statement is to be interpreted as equivalent to a withdrawal of the request for oral proceedings (because the party has announced that it will not attend – see T 3/90, T 696/02 and T 1027/03 – or has requested a decision on the basis of the file as it stands – see OJ EPO 2020, A124), it is at the division's discretion to decide whether to maintain or cancel the scheduled oral proceedings.

If the division decides that oral proceedings are nevertheless to be held, this means that there are objections still outstanding that need to be discussed at the oral proceedings. The applicant and/or proprietor can therefore expect that problems relating to the requests filed in reply to the summons to oral proceedings will be dealt with at the oral proceedings.

If any applicant or proprietor decides not to attend the oral proceedings, they are thereby choosing not to make use of the opportunity to comment at the oral proceedings on any of the objections, and to rely instead on the arguments in their written submissions. The decision may be given orally in their absence. However, the procedural principles require that the party to the proceedings not be taken by surprise by the decision (see also E-III, 8.3.3).

8. Conduct of oral proceedings

8.1 Admission of the public to proceedings

Art. 116(3)

Oral proceedings before the Receiving Section, the examining divisions and the Legal Division are not public.

Art. 116(4)

Oral proceedings before the opposition divisions, including delivery of the decision (see E-III, 9), are public unless the opposition division decides otherwise in cases where admitting the public could have serious and unjustified disadvantages, in particular for a party to the proceedings. This could, for example, be the case if any of the parties wishes to give information about sales figures or other commercial secrets in support of their case. Generally, the public will only be excluded while this information is being given. The public is also excluded during discussions about a request for exclusion of a document from file inspection (see D-II, 4.3) and when a decision on this matter is pronounced. The parties that did not make the request, as well as their representatives, may also be excluded as part of the public (e.g. where exclusion of a medical certificate from file inspection is requested).

Members of the public may be granted remote access to opposition oral proceedings via a link provided at their request. See OJ EPO 2022, A106, for details about making a request and the applicable conditions.

8.2 Conduct of oral proceedings

Oral proceedings before the Receiving Section will be conducted by the appointed officer and those before the examining or opposition divisions by the chair of the division concerned. Oral proceedings before the Legal Division will be conducted by a legally qualified member of the Legal Division.

The responsibilities of the person conducting the oral proceedings include keeping order and managing the formal and substantive aspects.

In particular, the person conducting the proceedings must ensure that, where necessary, a list is prepared of all disputed or unclear points relevant to the decision to be reached, that these are discussed and that the party or parties have the opportunity to comment on them. In the case of oral proceedings by videoconference, the person conducting them must also make sure that no technical problems have prevented them from being held in accordance with the right to be heard and the right to oral proceedings (see E-III, 8.2.3).

At the same time, the oral proceedings are to be conducted strictly and efficiently, so that the submissions of the party or parties and the related discussions are not unnecessarily digressive and do not deal with points which are irrelevant to the decision to be reached. Repetition is to be avoided as far as possible. In particular, written material which was submitted to the competent department and to the party or parties in due time and which has already been the subject of proceedings need not be read out *in extenso*, and it may be enough simply to refer to it.

8.2.1 Participation of parties and their representatives from different locations

Parties, their representatives and any persons accompanying the parties or representatives may connect to the videoconference from different locations, as may witnesses and experts.

8.2.2 Participation of members of the division from different locations

The members of the examining and opposition divisions may likewise connect to oral proceedings by videoconference from different locations. They will then deliberate and vote among themselves via a separate communication channel. The venue of oral proceedings will be deemed to be the location where the division is set up.

The applicant or representative will be informed that the members of the division are participating remotely at the beginning of the oral proceedings, once the connection has been established and before they are formally opened.

8.2.3 Technical problems

Where technical problems prevent oral proceedings held by videoconference from being conducted openly and fairly, for example due to a total or partial breakdown in communication, the right to be heard might possibly be violated (Art. 113(1)). As a result of the technical problems, the

OJ EPO 2022, A103

parties may be taken by surprise by grounds for an adverse decision on which they have not had an opportunity to comment.

If the sound or image transmission of any of the participants taking part in the oral proceedings is lost, the chair will stop the proceedings until the transmission is re-established.

If a participant is disconnected for more than a few minutes, a member of the division will contact them to see if they are having technical problems. Any relevant information will be shared with all parties.

If a party reconnects after a temporary connection failure, the chair will make sure that no information has been missed. Some arguments may have to be repeated.

If, despite all efforts of the participants, technical problems prevent the oral proceedings by videoconference from being conducted in accordance with the parties' rights under Art. 113 and Art. 116, the videoconference will be ended. A new summons to oral proceedings will be issued. As a rule, new oral proceedings will be held by videoconference unless there are serious reasons for not doing so (E-III, 1.2).

8.2.4 Recording

It is prohibited to record oral proceedings (see E-III, 10.1), and the chair will remind all participants of this at the beginning of the videoconference.

8.3 Opening of oral proceedings; non-appearance of a party

8.3.1 Checking the identity and authorisations of participants at oral proceedings

The division will check the ID document of one representative or authorised employee of each party unless this person is personally known. For other representatives, authorised employees and accompanying persons (including those who will be making oral submissions, see E-III, 8.5) present for a given party, it is sufficient that their identity is confirmed orally by the person whose ID document was checked or who is personally known to at least one member of the division. This applies regardless of whether a representative is a professional representative or a legal practitioner. Equally, if a party is not represented but personally present together with an accompanying person, it is sufficient to check the ID document of that party.

However, the division checks the ID documents of all parties, witnesses and experts summoned to give evidence before the EPO. Moreover, the division may check ID documents of other attendees where this is considered necessary, e.g. because the identity of an accompanying person is challenged by another party or where the division itself has serious doubts about the person's identity.

The ID document may be presented in one of the following ways:

- If it is an EPO badge, by showing it to the camera at the beginning of the videoconference in the public meeting room.
- If it is a national ID card or passport, by showing it to a member of the division in a separate non-public meeting room.
- By sending a copy to the email address provided to the parties at the beginning of the oral proceedings.
- By using the EPO online filing options up to two days prior to the oral proceedings.

For data protection reasons, copies of ID documents sent by email are deleted and not included in the file; copies submitted via the EPO online filing options are placed in the non-public part of the file.

In order for the division to be able to confirm the identity of the person concerned, their full name (first and last name) and photograph should be visible. All the other information on the ID document can be kept hidden if so wished, as long as it is possible to recognise it as an official ID document.

Professional representatives and legal practitioners need to file authorisations only in exceptional cases (see the decision of the President of the EPO dated 7 July 2025, OJ EPO 2025, A45).

OJ EPO 2025, A45

Authorisations need be checked only if a party is represented by a person whose authorisation is not apparent from the file. If it is established that the person is:

- (i) a professional representative or legal practitioner acting under a sub-authorisation
- (ii) a professional representative or legal practitioner from the same association or law firm as the representative acting in the case or
- (iii) a natural person (e.g. executive director) authorised by law in the party's country of business to act on behalf of that party,

then no further check is required.

If, however, the person is:

- (a) a professional representative or legal practitioner who is neither from the same association or law firm nor acting under a sub-authorisation, and their attendance at the oral proceedings is their first appearance in the proceedings, or
- (b) a party's employee who is not an authorised professional representative or legal practitioner,

then the procedure is as follows:

OJ EPO 2024, A43
OJ EPO 2022, A44
OJ EPO 2020, A71
OJ EPO 2025, A45
OJ EPO 2025, A46
OJ EPO 2025, A47

In case (a), the division will check the file to see whether the previous representative's authorisation has lapsed. A change in representative or the termination of the authorisation of a previous representative may have been communicated electronically via MyEPO (see OJ EPO 2024, A43 and OJ EPO 2024, A44). If the previous representative's authorisation has lapsed, no further action is required. If not, the representative concerned will be asked to file a general or individual authorisation (see A-VIII, 1.7).

In case (b), the division will ask the person concerned to provide a reference to a registered general authorisation or to file – by email in the case of oral proceedings by videoconference (OJ EPO 2020, A71) – an individual authorisation.

Any person without an authorisation will be asked to submit one without delay (see A-VIII, 1.10). If they cannot do so straight away, a time limit of two months will be set. The fact that the authorisation was missing, and any time limit set for submitting it, must be recorded in the minutes. The oral proceedings then continue as normal, except that no decision can be pronounced at the end. Instead, the decision is issued in writing once the missing authorisation has been submitted. At the end of the oral proceedings, the party concerned must be reminded to submit the authorisation.

8.3.2 Opening the oral proceedings

After opening the oral proceedings, the person conducting them will introduce the parties present. They will have the particulars of the persons taking part in the proceedings recorded and will establish in what capacity they are present. Details of these steps and any consequences will be recorded in the minutes (see E-III, 10).

8.3.3 Late arrival, non-appearance and failure to connect

8.3.3.1 General

If an absent party was not duly summoned, this is noted in the minutes and the oral proceedings are closed. A new date must be fixed for further oral proceedings.

Rule 115(2)

If any party who has been duly summoned to oral proceedings does not appear – or, in the case of a videoconference, fails to connect – as summoned, the oral proceedings may be conducted without them, since a party should not be able to delay the issue of a decision by failing to appear or connect.

Any party who appears or connects **before the end** of the oral proceedings has the right to be heard.

If the party does not appear or connect until **after the proceedings** have been closed, the division may reopen them at its discretion, subject to two conditions:

- (a) the division has not pronounced a decision under Art. 97(1) or (2) or Art. 101(2), an interlocutory decision under Art. 106(2) maintaining the patent in amended form in accordance with Art. 101(3) (see also D-VI, 7.2.2) or a decision to reject the request for limitation under Rule 95(4).
- (b) all parties to the proceedings agree to the reopening.

However, if an allowable request for a different date of oral proceedings has been filed (see E-III, 7.1.1), the proceedings are postponed and a new date is fixed. If the filing of the request was delayed due to the carelessness of the party concerned, the proceedings may, depending on the circumstances, still be postponed. If this happens in opposition proceedings, a decision on the apportionment of costs may have to be taken (see D-IX, 1.4). Art. 104(1)

8.3.3.2 Procedure in opposition proceedings

If new facts or evidence are submitted during *inter partes* oral proceedings which a party, although duly summoned, fails to attend, it must first be examined whether these submissions may be disregarded (Art. 114(2); see also E-VI, 2).

According to G 4/92, if new facts are taken into consideration, then a decision based on these facts cannot be taken against the absent party at the end of the oral proceedings. Further, new evidence can only be used against the absent party if it has been previously notified and merely supports the previous assertions of the party who submits it. However, new arguments may be used at any time, so long as they do not change the grounds on which the decision is based.

In other words, what the Enlarged Board of Appeal ruled out in G 4/92 was the possibility of taking decisions against the absent party on the basis of a surprising course of events at the oral proceedings which changes the legal and factual framework of the case in an unforeseeable way (see T 414/94).

An absent party cannot be considered taken by surprise if during oral proceedings the other side attempts to overcome objections raised before the oral proceedings. In particular, a submission during oral proceedings of a more restricted and/or formally amended set of claims with a view to overcoming the objections of the opponent is not considered a "new fact" (see T 133/92 and T 202/92). Nor is it unexpected that amended claims are examined for formal admissibility and for compliance with Art. 123(2) and (3) (see T 341/92).

In the particular case of an absent opponent, any new prior art submitted for the first time during oral proceedings which may be an obstacle to maintaining the opposed patent can be taken into consideration despite the opponent's absence because it is in the opponent's favour (see T 1049/93).

8.3.3.3 Procedure in examination proceedings

Oral proceedings give applicants an opportunity to exercise their rights under Art. 113(1). When applicants file amended claims before oral proceedings which they subsequently do not attend, they must expect that a decision may be taken on the basis of objections to those claims which arose in their absence. A decision can be taken on the basis of facts and arguments presented earlier in the proceedings and/or new but foreseeable arguments (see OJ EPO 2020, A124).

In examination proceedings, the communication accompanying the summons to oral proceedings must include all the objections that are likely to be discussed and indicate that amended claims filed in response will have to be examined at the oral proceedings for compliance with the EPC. This ensures that the applicant's right to be heard (Art. 113(1)) is respected and that the proceedings are not delayed unnecessarily if an applicant does not attend oral proceedings.

Where auxiliary requests are filed before the summons to oral proceedings is issued, these requests must be commented on in terms of both admissibility and allowability. However, the reasoning given in the preliminary opinion is to focus on the main request; only a brief indication of the essential reasons for the non-allowability of the subject-matter or the non-admissibility of the auxiliary requests is to be provided. This brief indication of the essential reasons for not allowing or not admitting the auxiliary requests nevertheless has to be thorough enough to ensure that the applicant has been informed of the objections raised by the examining division and has thus been given the opportunity to comment on them (see C-V, 1, 1 and C-V, 4, 7, 1, 1).

8.4 Opening of the substantive part of the proceedings

Where necessary, the person conducting the oral proceedings will outline the stage reached in the proceedings and will indicate the most important matters in dispute according to the file. In examination or opposition proceedings, this may also be done by the primary examiner.

8.5 Submissions by the parties

After the introduction referred to above, the party or parties will be given the floor in order to put their cases and to make procedural applications and state the grounds for them. Each party will normally have only one opportunity to make a comprehensive statement.

In opposition proceedings, the opponents will generally speak first and the patent proprietor afterwards. Where there are several opponents, it may be expedient to grant the patent proprietor an opportunity to reply directly after the statement of each individual opponent. The opponents and the patent proprietor will be given the opportunity to give a final reply.

The party or parties may prepare their submissions in writing, but they are expected to speak as freely as possible when presenting them. Where passages from documents already on file are referred to again, they may be read out only if their precise wording is relevant.

Submissions by a person who is not qualified under Art. 133 and 134 to represent parties to proceedings before the EPO may be admitted at oral proceedings when this person accompanies a professional representative representing one of the parties. However, such submissions, cannot be made as a matter of right, but only with the permission and at the discretion of the examining or opposition division or the Legal Division. In exercising its discretion, an opposition division will consider whether (see G 4/95):

- (i) the party on behalf of which the person is to speak has filed a request to this effect
- (ii) the party filing the request has indicated the person's name, the subject-matter of their submission and how they are qualified to speak on the matter
- (iii) the request has been filed sufficiently in advance of the oral proceedings
- (iv) in the case of a late-filed request, either there are exceptional circumstances justifying the admission of the submission or all the other parties agree to the making of the submission
- (v) the submissions are made under the continuous responsibility and supervision of the professional representative.

If neither of the alternative conditions mentioned under (iv) are met, a late-filed request will be refused. The date fixed in the summons under Rule 116 is to be applied when deciding whether a request was late-filed.

If a party is represented by an authorised employee rather than a professional representative, the same considerations apply in respect of a person accompanying this employee. As no other party is affected, examining divisions can adopt a more liberal approach than opposition divisions.

Parties to the proceedings are not to be considered accompanying persons within the meaning of G 4/95 (see T 621/98). They have the right to make submissions in oral proceedings by virtue of their status as party.

If written submissions are made during oral proceedings, the division will make sure that requirements such as typewritten form, signature and dating of the submissions are met (T 733/99). See also E-III, 8.7 and OJ EPO 2020, A71.

OJ EPO 2020, A71

8.5.1 Use of computer-generated slideshows in oral proceedings

In oral proceedings a computer-generated slideshow cannot be used as a matter of right, but only with the permission of and at the discretion of the examining or opposition division or the Legal Division (T 1556/06), and, in the case of oral proceedings on the EPO premises, if the necessary equipment is available in the room in which they are held. Generally, screens are available in most meeting rooms, but requests for other equipment such as projectors will be refused.

Presentations of computer-generated slideshows must not adversely affect the efficient conduct of oral proceedings (e.g. interruptions for the technical preparations for the presentation). The same applies to the use of other visual aids (e.g. flipcharts, pictures, screensharing).

8.5.1.1 Opposition proceedings (*inter partes*)

Copies of the material to be presented must be provided in good time before the oral proceedings, i.e. Rule 116 applies. These copies are treated like any other submission made in writing.

The opposition division will decide whether presenting a computer-generated slideshow would facilitate the proceedings after having heard the parties and considered whether allowing or refusing it would be detrimental to any participant.

A balance must be struck between the presenter's interest in defending the case in the most appropriate manner and the other party's need to fully understand the submissions made and to have a true opportunity to respond.

The presentation of computer-generated slideshows at oral proceedings will be allowed if it would be much more difficult to follow the party's submissions without this visual aid. For example, the opposition division may consider that slides showing:

- (a) the structure or functioning of a product which is complex
- (b) complicated reaction schemes
- (c) complex formulae or
- (d) the operation of a complex apparatus

will facilitate the discussion.

If copies of the material to be presented have not been filed in good time, or if the slides contain new matter, the presentation may be disregarded under Art. 114(2) and Rule 116. In deciding on this, the opposition division will apply the same criteria for admissibility as are used for other late-filed facts or evidence (see E-VI, 2).

8.5.1.2 Examination proceedings (*ex parte*)

As no other party is affected, examining divisions may adopt a more liberal approach than opposition divisions. An examining division will therefore consider allowing a computer-generated slideshow to be presented at oral proceedings even if the slides are not submitted in advance, provided that:

- (a) it feels able to deal with this late-filed material without unduly prolonging the proceedings. The same considerations as for other late-filed facts and evidence apply (see E-VI, 2).
- (b) the submissions will help to resolve the questions at issue.

8.5.2 Written submissions during oral proceedings by videoconference

Where oral proceedings are held as a videoconference, documents filed subsequently within the meaning of [Rule 50](#) must be filed by email ([OJ EPO 2020, A71, Art. 1\(1\)](#)). This also applies to authorisations.

Where a filed document has to be signed, the signature should preferably appear in the document itself. Alternatively, it may appear in the text of the accompanying email, which will also be annexed to the minutes. The signature must take the form of a string of characters (such as an email signature with the sender's name and position) or a facsimile signature.

[OJ EPO 2020, A71, Art. 2](#)

The documents are to be sent to the email address indicated during the videoconference by the competent department.

[OJ EPO 2020, A71, Art. 3](#)

Any emails and attached documents filed by a party during oral proceedings with more than one party will be forwarded by the division to the other parties present at the proceedings unless the filing party has already sent them direct to the email addresses indicated by the other parties. Each party must therefore inform the division and, where possible, the other parties at the beginning of the oral proceedings of the email address it wishes to use for receiving copies of such documents. Parties and representatives must ensure that they can immediately take note of any document sent to the email address indicated by them.

[OJ EPO 2022, A106](#)

Amended application documents are to be filed as attachments. These attachments must be in PDF format and must comply with the WIPO Standard for Filing and Processing in Electronic Form (Annex F of the Administrative Instructions under the PCT). Where an attachment is not in PDF format or does not comply with the WIPO Standard or is illegible or incomplete, the party must be promptly informed during the videoconference. Where the deficiencies cannot be remedied during the videoconference or within the time limit set, the document (or the part of it which is illegible or incomplete) is deemed not to have been received.

[OJ EPO 2020, A71, Art. 4](#)

Other attachments may be sent in any format which can be opened by the division and which can be reproduced in a legible form. Otherwise they are deemed not to have been filed.

If an attachment is infected with a computer virus or contains other malicious software, it will be deemed to be illegible. The EPO is not obliged to receive, open or process such attachments.

Paper copies do not need be filed to confirm documents filed by email.

[OJ EPO 2020, A71, Art. 5](#)

All submissions made by email during a videoconference must be annexed to the minutes unless the exceptions under [Rule 144](#) and the decision of the President of the EPO dated 12 July 2007 concerning documents excluded from file inspection apply (see [A-XI, 2.3](#) and [Special edition No. 3, OJ EPO 2007, J.3](#)). A confidentiality note of the kind routinely included in

[OJ EPO 2020, A71, Art. 6](#)

emails is not to be regarded as a request for submissions to be excluded from the public file.

OJ EPO 2022, A106

If the division consents, a party may share its screen for illustrative purposes. An item displayed this way will not be treated as a document submitted by that party.

8.6 Facts, evidence or amendments introduced at a late stage

On facts, evidence or amendments not submitted in due time or arguments presented at a late stage in the proceedings, including during oral proceedings, see E-VI, 2.

8.7 Handwritten amendments in oral proceedings

8.7.1 General principles

*Rules 50(1) and 86
Rule 49(2)
OJ EPO 2025, A49*

As a rule, the requirement in Art. 2(7) of the decision of the President of the EPO dated 25 November 2022 that the description, claims and abstract and the request for grant must be typed or printed also applies to documents replacing application documents and to amended patent specification documents (see also A-III, 3.2).

Responsibility for formally correct submissions and, in particular, for compliance with these requirements lies with the applicant/proprietor.

Deletions, corrections of the numbering of the figures and insertions of reference numbers and associated arrows in drawings are considered typewritten amendments.

If the oral proceedings are held exceptionally on the EPO premises, the parties may use the EPO's technical facilities that allow for compliance with the formal requirements, in particular computers equipped with a word processor and a printer, network printers and copiers enabling documents to be printed from a USB stick, and internet access in public areas via a public wireless network (see OJ EPO 2013, 603).

It is recommended that parties prepare electronic copies of documents likely to be amended. Published patent applications and specifications are available via the European publication server. See D-IV, 5.3 for the preferred way to amend the description in opposition proceedings.

For the procedures in examination and opposition oral proceedings, see E-III, 8.7.2 and 8.7.3 respectively.

8.7.2 Procedure in examination proceedings

OJ EPO 2025, A49

In examination proceedings, the formal requirements prescribed by the President under Rule 49(2) apply equally to application documents submitted during oral proceedings by email or by hand.

Documents containing handwritten amendments will normally be accepted by the division as a basis for discussion during oral proceedings until the final text of the patent has been agreed. However, a final decision granting

a patent may be taken only on the basis of documents which are formally compliant.

The following applies if the applicant is unable to provide formally correct amended application documents during oral proceedings:

- (a) If a decision to refuse a patent application is imminent and formally non-compliant application documents are on file, the examining division will go ahead and issue the decision on the basis of substantive arguments in order to avoid prolonging the proceedings, but it may mention this formal deficiency in the decision.
- (b) If there is agreed patentable subject-matter, the examining division will announce:
 - that the amended application fulfils the requirements of the EPC except for certain formal requirements, e.g. the ones regarding handwritten amendments, and
 - that the procedure will be continued in writing.

After the oral proceedings have been closed, the formalities officer, acting on behalf of the examining division (see A-III, 3.2), will invite the applicant to file formally correct documents within two months. Where the amendments submitted in response differ from the patentable subject-matter agreed at the oral proceedings, the procedure described in C-V, 4.7 is to be applied.

8.7.3 Procedure in opposition proceedings

Rule 82(2), third sentence, provides for one exception to the principle that a decision determining the final text of the patent may be based only on formally compliant documents. It exempts patent proprietors from having to file documents compliant with the requirements of Art. 2(7) of the decision of the President of the EPO dated 25 November 2022 (OJ EPO 2022, A113) at oral proceedings in opposition before an interlocutory decision on the documents forming the basis for maintaining the patent can be taken. The proprietor may choose instead to submit a formally compliant version of the amended text within the time limit under Rule 82(2) (OJ EPO 2016, A22). Proprietors will nevertheless be encouraged to file compliant documents during oral opposition proceedings.

OJ EPO 2025, A49

OJ EPO 2016, A22

In contrast, in written opposition proceedings, an interlocutory decision to maintain the patent as amended may be issued only on the basis of formally compliant documents since the invitation under Rule 82(2) applies only to documents filed during oral proceedings.

If the interlocutory decision issued by the opposition division at oral proceedings was based on documents which do not comply with Art. 2(7) of the decision of the President of the EPO dated 25 November 2022, i.e. which contain handwritten amendments, the opposition division will ask the proprietor in the invitation under Rule 82(2) to file a formally compliant

version of the amended text. The invitation will specify the formally deficient amended paragraphs and/or claims for which replacement paragraphs and/or claims need to be filed. The same applies where a decision of the boards of appeal remits the case to the department of first instance with the order to maintain the patent on the basis of amended documents with handwritten amendments.

In reply to the invitation from the opposition division under Rule 82(2), the proprietor will have to submit replacement paragraphs and/or claims which contain a formally compliant verbatim reproduction of the text as determined by the interlocutory decision (or the decision of the board of appeal). Any discrepancy between the text of the formally deficient paragraphs (and/or claims) specified in the invitation under Rule 82(2) and the text of the replacement paragraphs (and/or claims) will trigger a communication under Rule 82(3). A communication under Rule 82(3) will also be sent if the proprietor does not reply at all or not in time, if the replacement paragraphs and/or claims are incomplete or if the replacement paragraphs and/or claims are again formally deficient.

If a formally compliant version of the verbatim text of the specified amended paragraphs (and/or claims) is not submitted within two months of notification of the communication under Rule 82(3), the patent will be revoked.

8.8 Use of Rule 137(4) for amendments filed during oral proceedings in examination

A communication under Rule 137(4) will not be sent in respect of amendments filed during oral proceedings (see H-III, 2.1.3), since this would unduly delay the procedure. Making a request under Rule 137(4) during oral proceedings would entail staying the proceedings for one month, while waiting for the applicant's answer.

The examining division therefore asks the applicant to provide a basis for any amendments submitted during oral proceedings before any new amendments can be admitted into the proceedings.

In special cases, e.g. where there are many auxiliary requests which are difficult to check for compliance with the requirements of Art. 123(2) and which do not comply with Rule 137(4), the examining division may exercise its discretion not to admit these requests under Rule 137(3) rather than raising an objection under Rule 137(4) (see H-II, 2.3 and H-III, 3.3.2.1).

8.9 Discussion of the facts and of the legal position

A discussion will be held with the party or parties about those technical or legal questions relevant to the decision which, after the parties have made their submissions, do not appear to have been sufficiently clarified or discussed or are seemingly contradictory. Where necessary, it must be ensured that the party or parties file requests which are to the point and that the applicant or proprietor formulates the claims appropriately.

If the examining division finds that some patentable subject-matter would result from amending the claims, it informs the applicant of this and gives them an opportunity to submit amended claims on that basis.

If the competent department intends to depart from a previous legal assessment of the situation with which the parties are familiar or from a prevailing legal opinion, or if facts or evidence already introduced into the proceedings are seen in a different light – e.g. during the deliberations of the examining or opposition division (see [E-III, 8.11](#)) – and the case therefore takes a significant turn, the parties must be informed of this.

8.10 Right of the other members of the division to put questions

The chair must allow any member of the examining or opposition division who so requests to put questions. The chair may determine at which point in the proceedings the questions may be put.

At oral proceedings, questions may be put to the parties about their statements or about the discussion of the facts or the legal position. When evidence is taken as part of oral proceedings, questions may also be put to the witnesses, parties and experts called. On the parties' right to put questions, see [E-IV, 1.6.7](#).

8.11 Closure of oral proceedings

Once the competent department considers that the matter has been discussed sufficiently thoroughly, it must decide on the subsequent procedure to be followed. Where the department consists of several members – as is the case with the examining or opposition divisions – they must, if necessary, deliberate on the matter in the absence of the parties. Where oral proceedings are held by videoconference and the members connect from different locations (see [E-III, 8.2.2](#)), they will deliberate and vote among themselves via a separate communication channel. If new aspects emerge during the discussion that require asking the parties more questions, the proceedings may be restarted. Any person conducting the proceedings may then give the department's decision. Otherwise they inform the party or parties of the subsequent procedure and then close the oral proceedings.

While the department is bound by its decision on substantive matters (see [E-III, 9](#)), it is free, after further reflection, to inform the parties that it intends to follow a different procedure from the one previously announced.

The subsequent procedure may be, for example, that the department issues a further communication, imposes certain requirements on one of the parties or informs the parties that it intends to grant or maintain the patent in an amended form. On delivering a decision in the last-mentioned case, see [E-III, 9](#).

If the patent is to be granted or maintained in an amended form, the final text should be agreed on at the oral proceedings. If, however, by way of exception the examining or opposition division indicates during the oral proceedings that it would be willing to grant or maintain a European patent if certain amendments are made which could not reasonably have been

foreseen from the earlier proceedings, the applicant or patent proprietor will be given a time limit of normally two to four months to submit the amendments. If the applicant or patent proprietor fails to do so, the application will be refused or the patent will be revoked.

8.11.1 Requesting postponement during oral proceedings

Oral proceedings in examination, limitation or opposition are intended to bring the proceedings to a close, and parties are expected to prepare themselves fully.

The division will therefore normally refuse any request from a party that the proceedings be postponed or continued in writing. In exceptional cases, if a new and major objection is unexpectedly introduced shortly before or at the oral proceedings, and the applicant or proprietor cannot reasonably be required to make the necessary amendments there and then, a request for postponement or to continue in writing should be granted.

Even if the description needs to be revised to bring it into line with amended claims, the applicant or proprietor is expected to make the necessary changes either in the oral proceedings or during a break.

8.11.2 Adjournment of oral proceedings due to lack of time

If possible, oral proceedings should not last more than eight working hours. However, they may be extended slightly if an imminent conclusion seems likely. If not, the chair ends the discussions for that day at an appropriate point to allow time for possible arrangement of a new date. Continuing oral proceedings on a day other than the one set out in the summons requires a new summons with a notice period of at least two months in accordance with Rule 115(1) unless all parties agree to a shorter period. See E-III, 6 for the general practice to be followed when setting the date of oral proceedings. The explicit agreement of all parties is necessary and must be recorded in the minutes.

The new summons must indicate the points that still need to be discussed during the upcoming oral proceedings (Rule 116(1)). It is at the discretion of the division whether to mention the points that have already been settled or to provide a provisional opinion on the points that are still outstanding. A new final date for making submissions is not fixed under Rule 116 in the new summons if the subject of the proceedings has not changed (see E-VI, 2.2.2). Otherwise, a new date is fixed under Rule 116 and at least two months' notice is given under Rule 115 unless the parties agree to a shorter period. The minutes of the oral proceedings which took place are to be issued in advance of the upcoming oral proceedings, preferably no later than when the new summons is issued.

If the agreed date is too close for the parties to be able to receive the new summons in time (e.g. the next day or a day in the same week), the parties must waive their right to receive it and their statements on this must also be recorded in the minutes.

9. Delivery of the decision

The decision is delivered after the person conducting the proceedings has announced the operative part (see also E-III, 8.11 and E-IX, 2.3). *Rule 111(1) and (2)*

The operative part may, for example, read as follows:

"The patent application ... is refused." or

"The opposition to the patent ... is rejected." or

"The patent ... is revoked." or

"Taking account of the amendments made by the proprietor in the opposition proceedings, the patent and the invention to which it relates satisfy the requirements of the Convention." or

"The request for limitation of the patent is allowable." or

"The request for limitation of the patent is rejected." or

"Patent grant proceedings relating to European patent application No. ... are interrupted/resumed as from ..."

Once a decision has been pronounced, submissions of the party or parties can no longer be considered and the decision stands, subject to the correction of any errors in accordance with Rule 140. It may only be amended on appeal (see E-XI, 1, E-XI, 7 and E-XI, 8).

There is no need at this point to give the reasons for the decision or mention the possibility of appeal. The examining or opposition division may nevertheless briefly explain the reasons.

The written decision (see E-IX) containing the reasons and information about the right of appeal must then be notified to the parties without undue delay. The period for appeal will only begin to run from the date of notification of the written decision.

Generally speaking, a decision granting a European patent or maintaining it in amended or limited form cannot be given at oral proceedings, because the requirements in Rule 71(3) to (7) have to be fulfilled for a grant, as do the requirements in Rule 82(1) and (2) or Rule 95(3) for maintenance of a patent in amended or limited form.

The division further ensures that the result of oral proceedings in opposition is made available to the public online immediately after the hearing. If the patent is maintained on the basis of amendments filed during oral proceedings, these amendments are made public as well.

10. Minutes of oral proceedings

On the minutes of taking of evidence, see E-IV, 1.7.

10.1 Formal requirements

Rule 124(1)

Minutes of oral proceedings must be drawn up.

The person conducting the oral proceedings must ensure that an employee is available to keep minutes throughout the whole oral proceedings. If necessary, different employees may carry out the task of minute-writing in sequence. The minutes must then make clear which section was drawn up by which employee. The employees in question are normally members of the competent department, e.g. the examining or opposition division. The minutes are formatted after the oral proceedings.

Rule 124(3) and (4)

The minutes must be authenticated by the employee responsible for drawing them up and by the person who conducted the oral proceedings, either by signing them or by other appropriate means. If, exceptionally, the employee responsible cannot sign the minutes, one of the other members of the division may sign them on that employee's behalf, subject to the conditions referred to in E-IX, 2.3. The minutes are not signed by the parties, but a copy must be notified to them as soon as possible after the oral proceedings.

OJ EPO 2025, A32 OJ EPO 2022, A106

Provided the parties have been informed, the EPO may make sound recordings of the oral proceedings. However, no person other than an EPO employee is allowed to make any recording or retransmit any part of the oral proceedings, whether in the form of an image or sound or both (see OJ EPO 2025, A32, OJ EPO 2022, A106).

Sound recordings are made where evidence is taken (E-IV, 1.7). The recording is kept until the end of any possible proceedings before the EPO. Sound recordings are also made when minutes of oral proceedings held by videoconference before examining and opposition divisions are drawn up with the assistance of artificial intelligence (AI) (OJ EPO 2025, A32). These recordings will be deleted once the minutes of the oral proceedings are issued to the parties to the proceedings. Where sound recordings are made of the taking of evidence or for AI-assisted minutes, copies of the recordings are not made available to the parties.

The minutes must first state the date of the oral proceedings, the names of the members of the department, e.g. the opposition division, present and the name or names of the minute-writer or writers. They must also include the details referred to in E-III, 10.3.

10.2 Language

The minutes are normally written in the language of the proceedings under Art. 14(3), i.e. the EPO official language in which the application was filed or into which it was translated. The exceptions are set out in Rule 4(6).

Amendments to the text of the description or claims of the application or patent must be recorded in the minutes in the language of the proceedings under Art. 14(3).

Where the exact wording is important, or if the parties so insist, the minutes must record the following statements, word for word, in the EPO official

language actually used or into which they were translated, as provided for in Rule 4(6):

- (a) requests of the parties
- (b) legally relevant statements by parties, witnesses, experts and division members and
- (c) order of the decision.

The term "statement" within the meaning of Rule 4(6) is to be interpreted narrowly as the exception to the rule of using the language of proceedings in the written proceedings rather than as allowing all arguments made in another official language during the oral proceedings to be recorded in the minutes.

See E-V, 6 on deviating from the language of proceedings.

See E-III, 10.3 on requests for recording specific statements in the minutes.

10.3 Subject-matter of minutes

Minutes have an important function as evidence that the right to be heard has been respected (Art. 113(1)). They must contain the essentials of the oral proceedings and the relevant statements made by the parties, as well as any arguments relevant to the decision that are not in the parties' written submissions. However, the parties' arguments are dealt with in detail in the decision, and therefore are only briefly reported in the minutes.

Art. 113(1)
Rule 124(1)

If the applicant or one of the parties makes a drawing, e.g. on a white board to explain a technical point, and the division considers this important for the decision, there are the following possibilities to reflect this drawing in the minutes. The minute writer can capture an image of the drawing and attach it to the minutes. It may also be sufficient to verbally describe the drawing in the minutes.

Examples of relevant statements are new or amended procedural submissions or the withdrawal of previous submissions, the fresh submission or the amendment or withdrawal of application documents, such as claims, description and drawings, and statements of surrender.

The essentials of the oral proceedings include new statements by the party or parties and by the member or members of the department concerning the subject-matter of the proceedings. In examination and opposition proceedings, the essentials are mainly new statements arguing for or against novelty, inventive step and other patentability criteria. However, the minutes are not expected to be an exhaustive record of everything that was said during the oral proceedings. Rather, they are limited to the essentials and are as brief and concise as possible.

Vague or general statements are to be avoided. Statements crucial to the decision must be correctly recorded. If there is any doubt, the recorded

statements are read out to the parties concerned before the decision is taken and announced, but this is normally not necessary.

Requests from parties that specific statements be recorded are accepted if the statements form part of the essentials of the oral proceedings and are relevant for reaching the decision. Otherwise, they may be refused on the basis that it is not the function of the minutes to record statements that a party considers might be useful in subsequent proceedings. See E-III, 10.2 for the language requirements.

If new facts or evidence are submitted during the oral proceedings, the minutes must make clear that the division has examined them under Art. 114(1). They must also indicate whether or not the division, after having heard the parties, subsequently disregarded them under Art. 114(2).

The minutes briefly summarise the following, where applicable:

- (a) arguments relevant for the decision as submitted by the parties, which, if they are already known from the written procedure, can be referred to as such,
- (b) the substance of any new requests by the parties, preferably in the form of a brief statement referring to documents containing these requests, which must be attached to the minutes, and
- (c) objections, arguments and/or requests addressed to the parties by a member of the division, with the focus placed on points relevant for the decision, which are then dealt with in detail in the grounds for the decision.

The minutes conclude by indicating the decision taken by the division or, if no final decision is taken, the outcome of the proceedings. This part is preceded by a record of the parties' final requests as described in point (b) above.

The minutes must also contain procedural information, such as how the proceedings are to be continued after closure of the oral proceedings or whether the public was excluded for the whole or part of the oral proceedings.

The structure of the minutes mirrors the course of the oral proceedings (see E-III, 8 and sub-points).

If a decision is given (see E-III, 9), it must be reproduced in the minutes.

The minutes with the result reached during the proceedings are communicated to the parties as soon as possible.

10.4 Request for correction of minutes

If a party to oral proceedings considers that the minutes do not fulfil the requirements of Rule 124, they may file a request to that effect, with a

proposed correction, as soon as possible after receipt of the minutes in question.

The examining/opposition division is competent to decide on a request for correction (T 1198/97, T 68/02 and T 231/99). In response, the division will either issue corrected minutes of the oral proceedings or dispatch a communication stating that the minutes already contain the essentials of the oral proceedings and the relevant statements of the parties and giving reasons for this finding (see T 819/96). The division's communication is not open to appeal on its own. If the request for correction is filed within the period for filing the grounds for appeal, the division will make every effort to deal with it as promptly as possible so that the party can refer to the communication in the appeal.

It is at the discretion of the writer of the minutes (and of the chair who authenticates them) to decide what is considered essential and relevant within the meaning of Rule 124(1) (T 212/97). The minutes are corrected when they show deficiencies with regard to these aspects, for example if essential submissions or similarly important procedural statements are missing, or if they are incorrectly reflected in the minutes (T 231/99, T 642/97 and T 819/96).

Chapter IV – Taking and conservation of evidence

1. Taking of evidence by the departments of the EPO

1.1 General remarks

Formal taking of evidence in accordance with Rule 117 will occur mainly in opposition proceedings and hardly ever before the examining division. The following sections of this chapter are therefore based primarily on opposition proceedings. However, they also apply *mutatis mutandis* to other proceedings and particularly to substantive examination.

Art. 117

Rule 117

1.2 Means of evidence

The party or parties may submit evidence in support of alleged facts at any time during proceedings (see E-III, 5, E-IX, 1.2, D-IV, 5.3, D-IV, 5.4 and D-VI, 3) but must do so at the earliest opportunity. When new evidence could have been put forward at an earlier stage, it is for the competent department to consider whether it is expedient to admit it (see E-VI, 2).

Art. 117(1)

It is generally desirable for parties to produce evidence for all the facts alleged in support of their case, e.g. to show whether a particular technique was generally known in industry or whether there was any prejudice against a particular technique.

However, facts alleged by a party will normally be deemed true, even without supporting evidence, if there is clearly no doubt about them, if they do not contradict one another or if they are not contested. In such cases, they need not be supported by evidence.

There will nevertheless be times, particularly in opposition proceedings, when the arguments of the party or parties must be supported by evidence. This will, for example, be the case where reference is made to prior art, for instance in the form of an oral description, a use or perhaps a company publication, and there is some doubt as to whether, and if so when, this prior art was made available to the public.

The means of evidence which are admissible in proceedings before the EPO are (non-exhaustively) listed in Art. 117(1):

- production of documents
- hearing the parties
- hearing witnesses
- sworn statements in writing
- requests for information, for instance from a publisher concerning the date of publication of a book
- opinions by experts (see E-IV, 1.8.1) and

- inspection.

The most appropriate way of obtaining evidence in the individual case depends on the facts which have to be proven and on the availability of the evidence. To prove prior use in opposition, the opponents usually offer to produce documents or suggest hearing witnesses or parties, or they present sworn statements in writing. It is at the opposition division's discretion to evaluate this evidence and there are no fixed rules on how the various categories of evidence are to be assessed (on evaluating evidence, see [E-IV, 4](#)).

If the documents produced (e.g. patent documents) leave no doubt as to their contents and date of availability to the public and are more relevant for the patent in suit than other evidence offered, reasons of procedural efficiency may lead the opposition division to leave the other evidence aside at first.

If the testimony of a witness is offered, the opposition division may decide to hear this person in order to verify the facts for which they are brought forward, e.g. the prior use of the claimed product in an undertaking or the existence of an obligation to maintain secrecy. In order to be adequately substantiated, the notice of opposition must set these facts out clearly, as witnesses are meant to corroborate alleged facts, not to supply these facts in the opponent's place. The same applies to hearing the parties (see also [E-IV, 1.6](#)).

The "sworn statements in writing" referred to in [Art. 117\(1\)\(g\)](#) are unknown in some national legal systems, which instead have their own instruments (see [T 558/95](#)).

Whether a written statement ("affidavit") is made under oath or not is only one of the criteria applied by the opposition division in its evaluation of the evidence adduced. Apart from its relevance for the case, other criteria are the relationship between the person making the statement and the parties to the proceedings, the personal interest of that person, the context in which the statement was made, etc. Such a statement does not go beyond its literal content and does not allow the opposition division to assess the associated or background factors. If the alleged facts are contested by the other party, the opposition division generally does not base its decision on such a statement but, if so offered by the party, instead summons the person making it as a witness. The subsequent hearing of the witness allows the opposition division and the parties to ask them questions and so enables the opposition division to establish the facts on the basis of their testimony. If the person is not offered as a witness, the opposition division will not consider this evidence any further.

Inspection will enable direct observations to be made and direct impressions to be formed of the object or process concerned. It may, for example, involve the demonstration of a product or process requested by the applicant or proprietor of the patent to substantiate the method of operation of the subject-matter of the patent where this is disputed by the examining or opposition division.

Evidence in the form of documents normally stays on the file. Only exceptionally and on reasoned request can documents filed as evidence be returned unconsidered, e.g. if they were third-party statements filed in breach of a confidentiality agreement and the other parties agree to the request (see T 760/89).

1.3 Taking of evidence

In substantive examination and opposition proceedings, the department responsible for taking evidence by hearing of witnesses, parties and experts will be the division before which the taking of evidence as part of oral proceedings would normally take place. If evidence is to be taken, the examining or opposition division will normally have been enlarged to include a legally qualified member. The division may commission one of its members to examine the evidence adduced. This will generally be the primary examiner under Art. 18(2) or 19(2). A member may, for example, be commissioned pursuant to Rule 119(1) to deal with an inspection, e.g. in the form of a demonstration of a process or the investigation of an object, especially if this takes place at a firm located far away.

Art. 117(2)

Rules 118 to 120

A member may also be commissioned to attend a court hearing pursuant to Rule 120(3), and put questions to the witnesses, parties and experts.

The language for taking evidence and writing the minutes is governed by Art. 14(3) (language of the proceedings) and Rule 4 (exceptions to the provisions on the language of the proceedings at oral proceedings); see also E-III, 10.2 and E-V.

Evidence can be taken on the premises of the EPO or by videoconference. For detailed information on taking evidence by videoconference, see OJ EPO 2020, A135.

OJ EPO 2020, A135

1.4 Order to take evidence

Where the competent department of the EPO considers it necessary to hear the oral evidence of parties, witnesses or experts or to carry out an inspection, it must make a decision to this end (order to take evidence), setting out the investigation which it intends to carry out, relevant facts to be proved, the date, time and place of the investigation and whether it will be conducted by videoconference. If a party requests oral evidence of witnesses and experts but does not at the same time name the witnesses and experts they wish to be heard, they are asked, either before the order to take evidence is issued or in the order itself, to make the names and addresses known within a specified time limit. The time limit to be calculated in accordance with Rule 132(2) must be at least two months but not more than four months, since the party concerned will normally know beforehand whom they wish to be heard as a witness or expert.

Rule 117

Art. 119

The order to take evidence must be notified to the parties. It may be appealed only together with the final decision unless it allows separate appeal (see E-IX, 3).

1.5 Summoning of parties, witnesses and expertsArt. 119Rule 118(1) and (2)

The parties, witnesses and experts to be heard must be summoned to appear to give evidence on the date fixed. The summons must be notified and must give at least two months' notice unless the party, witness or expert has agreed to a shorter period. The summons must contain:

Rule 118(2)(a)

(i) an extract from the order to take evidence, indicating in particular the date, time and place of the investigation ordered, whether it will be conducted by videoconference and stating the facts on which parties, witnesses and experts are to be heard

Rule 118(2)(b)

(ii) the names of the parties to the proceedings and particulars of the rights which the witnesses or experts may invoke (see E-IV, 1.10)

Rule 118(2)(c)

(iii) an indication that a party, witness or expert who has been summoned to appear before the EPO on its premises may be heard by videoconference at their request and

Rule 118(2)(d)

(iv) an indication that any party, witness or expert may request to be heard by the competent court of their country of residence and a requirement that they inform the EPO within a time limit to be fixed by the EPO whether they are prepared to appear before it (see E-IV, 3.2.2 (iii) and (iv)).

Rule 119(3)

Even if evidence is not taken at oral proceedings, all parties to the proceedings may attend an investigation. Parties not summoned are informed of the investigation and of their right to attend within the period laid down in Rule 118(2).

1.6 Hearing of parties, witnesses and experts**1.6.1 General remarks**

Where the examining or opposition division holds hearings for the purpose of taking evidence (see E-IV, 1.3) or if the case in question is expected to give rise to particular legal issues, it is advisable to enlarge the division by adding a legally qualified examiner, if this has not already been done (see D-II, 2.2).

OJ EPO 2020, A135

The evidence of witnesses is normally taken at oral proceedings, either on the premises of the EPO or by videoconference. A party, witness or expert can even be heard by videoconference if the oral proceedings are otherwise held on the EPO premises. For details, see OJ EPO 2020, A135.

The hearing will be either public or non-public, depending on the oral proceedings themselves (Art. 116(3) and (4)).

Where a hearing is held in connection with oral proceedings, the considerations set out in E-III, 8.2, E-III, 8.3, E-III, 8.9 and E-III, 8.10 are

directly applicable, and where this is not the case they apply *mutatis mutandis*.

A precondition for hearing an "expert" within the meaning of Rule 117 is a decision to take evidence (see E-IV, 1.4). This is different from hearing oral submissions by a person accompanying the representative during oral proceedings, which can be allowed at the division's discretion (see G 4/95 and E-III, 8.5).

1.6.2 Witnesses and experts not summoned

After opening the proceedings for taking evidence, the official in charge of the taking of evidence, i.e. in substantive examination and opposition proceedings the chair of the division concerned or the member commissioned to take evidence, will determine whether any party requests that any other person present but not summoned be heard. If a party makes such a request, they must briefly state why and to what purpose the person concerned should give testimony. The department in question will then decide whether or not to grant the request (on the admission of facts or evidence not filed in due time, see E-VI, 2).

1.6.3 Guidance to persons heard

Before any party, witness or expert may be heard, they must be informed that the EPO may request the competent court in their country of residence to re-examine their evidence under oath or in an equally binding form.

Rule 119(2)

1.6.4 Separate hearings

Normally, each witness must be heard separately, i.e. any other witnesses to be heard subsequently must not be present. This rule does not apply to experts and to the parties. Witnesses whose statements conflict may be confronted with one another, i.e. each heard in turn in the other's presence. The same applies to experts.

1.6.5 Examination as to personal particulars

The hearing will begin by the persons giving evidence being asked to state their first and last names, age, occupation and address. Witnesses and experts must also be asked whether they are related by blood or marriage to any of the parties and whether they have a material interest in a particular party winning the case.

1.6.6 Examination as to *res gestae*

The examination as to personal particulars will be followed by the examination as to *res gestae* (i.e. on the facts on which the person is to be heard). Any person testifying is to be instructed to give a full and logical account of what they know concerning the subject-matter of the hearing. Further questions may have to be put to clarify and supplement statements and to establish on what the knowledge of the person testifying is based. Such questions may be put by the member commissioned to take evidence (if there is one), the chair or any other member of the department concerned. On the entitlement of other members of the division to put questions, see E-III, 8.10. When formulating questions the same considerations apply as for the parties (see E-IV, 1.6.7).

1.6.7 Entitlement of parties to put questions at hearingsRule 119(3)

The parties may put relevant questions to the testifying parties, witnesses and experts including, e.g. in opposition proceedings, witnesses and experts testifying on behalf of other parties. The official in charge of taking evidence will determine at what point in the proceedings their questions may be put.

It is for the competent department, e.g. the opposition division, to settle any doubts it or a party has about the admissibility of a question. "Leading questions", i.e. questions which already contain the statement which one would like to hear from the witness and practically only requires them to answer with "yes" or "no", must be avoided, because they do not allow the witness' own recollection of the facts to be properly established. Questions also may not be directed to facts which do not require further discussion, which are in no way relevant to the subject-matter for which the taking of evidence has been ordered, or if they aim at establishing facts in respect of which no evidence has been offered. A decision to reject a question cannot be challenged. On the entitlement of other members of the division to put questions, see E-III, 8.10.

1.6.8 Hearing of a witness no longer necessary

A witness summoned to oral proceedings is heard if the facts which their testimony is supposed to corroborate are relevant to the decision (see E-IV, 1.2). This means they are not heard if the facts to be proved are no longer relevant due to developments before or during oral proceedings before they are heard. This may be the case, for example, if the public availability of the relevant prior art has been proven by another means of evidence or if the patent is to be revoked on another ground for opposition and the patent proprietor does not submit any admissible auxiliary requests in relation to which the testimony would still be relevant.

1.7 Minutes of taking of evidenceRule 124(1)

Minutes of the taking of evidence must be drawn up as described in E-III, 10, subject to the following qualifications.

Besides the essentials of the taking of evidence, the minutes must also record the testimony of the parties, witnesses or experts as comprehensively as possible (almost verbatim as far as the main points are concerned).

Rule 124(2)

The minutes will normally be taken by a member of the competent department carrying out the taking of evidence. The most efficient way to record testimony is to dictate it into a dictation machine or using the recording functionality on the videoconferencing tool as follows: the person hearing the testimony will summarise it in small sections, taking into account any objections raised by the persons being heard, and dictate it in this form into a dictation machine or using the recording functionality on the videoconferencing tool. If the dictated passage does not fully correspond to their testimony, the persons being heard must object immediately, as must be pointed out to them at the beginning of their testimony. At the end of their testimony, they will be asked to approve the dictated minutes, which they will have listened to as they were dictated. Their approval or any

objections are to be included in the dictated text. The dictated minutes are typed out and the parties are provided with a copy as soon as possible. It is not necessary to play back the minutes or to obtain approval of them if the testimony has been recorded verbatim and directly by technical means.

Where the taking of evidence includes an inspection, the minutes must record, in addition to the essentials of the proceedings, the results of the inspection.

The taking of evidence may be recorded on sound recording apparatus in the same way as oral proceedings (see E-III, 10.1).

1.8 Commissioning of experts

1.8.1 Decision on the form of the opinion

If the competent department decides of its own motion to obtain an expert opinion (D-VI, 1, sixth paragraph), it will have to decide in what form the expert it appoints is to submit it. The opinion is drawn up in written form only where the competent department considers that this form is adequate in view of the content and if the parties agree to this arrangement. As a rule, in addition to submitting a written opinion and presenting it orally, the expert will also be heard (see E-IV, 1.6).

Rule 121(1)

A copy of the opinion must be submitted to the parties. The copy will be produced by the EPO.

Rule 121(3)

1.8.2 Objection to an expert

The parties may object to an expert. Before commissioning an expert to give an opinion, the competent department therefore informs the parties of the expert whom it intends to ask to draw up an opinion and of the subject-matter of the opinion. The communication to the parties sets a time limit for objecting to the expert. If the parties do object to an expert, the competent department will decide on the objection.

Rule 121(4)

1.8.3 Terms of reference of the expert

The expert's terms of reference must include: a precise description of their task, the period for submitting their opinion, the names of the parties to the proceedings and details of the rights which experts may invoke under the provisions of Rule 122(2) to (4) (on travel and subsistence expenses and fees, see E-IV, 1.10).

Rule 121(2)(a)-(d)

1.9 Costs arising from oral proceedings or taking of evidence

As a rule, the parties to proceedings before the EPO meet the costs they have incurred. In opposition proceedings, the competent body may nevertheless decide for reasons of equity (see D-IX, 1.4) to apportion in some other way the costs arising for the parties in respect of oral proceedings or taking of evidence (see D-IX, 1) and the costs arising for the EPO in respect of witnesses and experts (see E-IV, 1.10). The competent body may make the taking of evidence conditional on the deposit of an amount with the EPO by the party who requested that the evidence be taken. This amount is to be fixed by reference to an estimate of the costs. This procedure is applied where, at the request of a party to grant or

Art. 104(1) and (2)
Rule 122(1) and (2)

opposition proceedings, evidence is to be taken by hearing witnesses or obtaining an expert opinion, unless no costs will arise because the witnesses or experts have waived their right to indemnification. If the party requesting that evidence be taken does not deposit the amount required, the evidence need not be taken. In opposition proceedings, the party requesting the evidence bears the costs of indemnifying witnesses or experts unless the costs are to be apportioned differently under Art. 104(1) in conjunction with Rule 88 for reasons of equity. Any shortfall between the deposit lodged and the amounts payable by the EPO under Rule 122(4), second sentence, is fixed by the EPO of its own motion. Any unused amount of the deposit lodged is refunded. The EPO meets its own internal costs of holding oral proceedings or taking evidence, e.g. any associated staff travel and subsistence costs.

1.10 Entitlements of witnesses and experts

1.10.1 Expenses for travel and subsistence

Rule 122(2)

Witnesses and experts who are summoned by and appear before the EPO are entitled to appropriate reimbursement from the EPO of their travel and subsistence expenses (see E-IV.1.10.3). This applies equally to witnesses and experts summoned by the EPO to appear before it at oral proceedings held by videoconference for the expenses they incur in travelling to the place where they make themselves available for their appearance (e.g. a videoconference facility provided by one of the parties or a venue with a sufficiently stable internet connection).

The same applies even if the witnesses or experts are not heard, e.g. where they are due to give evidence of an alleged prior use but the prior use is substantiated by an already published document shortly before their evidence is taken. Witnesses and experts may be granted an advance on their travel and subsistence expenses. Witnesses and experts who appear before the EPO without being summoned by it but are heard as witnesses or experts will also be entitled to appropriate reimbursement of travel and subsistence expenses.

1.10.2 Loss of earnings, fees

Rule 122(3)

Witnesses entitled to reimbursement of travel and subsistence expenses are also entitled to appropriate compensation by the EPO for loss of earnings, and experts to fees from the EPO for their work (see E-IV.1.10.3). These payments must be made to the witnesses and experts after they have fulfilled their duties or tasks.

1.10.3 Details of the entitlements of witnesses and experts

Rule 122(4)

For detailed information on the entitlements of witnesses and experts set out under E-IV.1.10.1 and E-IV.1.10.2, see OJ EPO 1983, 100. The amounts due must be paid by the EPO.

1.11 Models

1.11.1 When may models be submitted?

The EPC makes no express provision for the submission of models, but there is nothing to stop a party from submitting one. Models are not part of

the application or patent and therefore cannot be used to disclose the invention (Art. 83).

Models may be useful in EPO proceedings if they serve to substantiate the patentability of an invention, e.g. by showing that a given device actually works or does so particularly advantageously. Models may also be filed, e.g. in opposition proceedings, to illustrate the state of the art, especially prior use under Art. 54(2). As items for inspection, models are therefore evidence under Art. 117(1)(f).

1.11.2 Procedure

It is for the competent division to decide whether to take evidence by inspecting a model. If it considers this necessary, it must take a decision in the form of an order to take evidence (see E-IV.1.4), setting out the relevant facts to be proved, as well as the date, time and place of the inspection.

Where possible, the inspection is to be carried out on the premises of the EPO. However, if in view of the characteristics of the model (e.g. form, size, material) or due to security constraints, an inspection cannot be carried out on EPO premises (see also the notice from the EPO dated 20 December 2016, OJ EPO 2017, A6), the model may be inspected at a different location. Especially where the firm at which it is to be inspected is located far away, the division may commission one of its members to carry out the inspection on its behalf (see E-IV.1.3).

In general, any object which can be made available for inspection on the premises of the EPO can also be inspected during oral proceedings by videoconference unless such inspection would put a party at a disadvantage, e.g. where the haptic feel, texture or handling experience of the object is relevant.

In accordance with Rule 124(1), minutes must be taken, including the essential aspects and the result of the inspection.

1.11.3 Keeping the model

Even if the division does inspect the model, the EPO is not obliged to keep it. It is for the division to decide whether a model is to be kept by the EPO. However, as a general rule, models which would require special precautions or security measures if kept at the EPO are returned to the party.

The formalities officer is responsible for implementing the decision to keep or return the model. If the model is to be kept, the formalities officer notes this on a label on the file. If it is to be returned, the formalities officer informs the party which submitted it that it should be preserved in view of possible opposition or appeal proceedings and notes the date of return on the label.

1.12 Video recordings

A party to the proceedings may request that a video recording be shown at the oral proceedings. The request must include the recording as such and specify the type of equipment needed.

If video recordings are submitted, the division decides whether showing them will assist the proceedings. Video data carriers are always kept if the division has looked at them.

2. Conservation of evidence

2.1 Requirements

Rule 123(1)

On request, the EPO may hear oral evidence or carry out an inspection without delay, in order to conserve evidence of facts liable to affect a decision, where there is reason to fear that it might subsequently become more difficult or even impossible to take this evidence. This could be the case, for example, where an important witness is about to emigrate to a distant country or where perishable matter, e.g. a foodstuff, is adduced as involving a use made accessible to the public.

2.2 Request for the conservation of evidence

Rule 123(2)

The request for the conservation of evidence must contain:

Rule 123(2)(a)

(i) the name, address and nationality of the persons filing the request and the state in which their residence or principal place of business is located, in accordance with the provisions of Rule 41(2)(c)

Rule 123(2)(b)

(ii) sufficient identification of the European patent application or European patent in question

Rule 123(2)(c)

(iii) an indication of the facts in respect of which evidence is to be taken

Rule 123(2)(d)

(iv) particulars of the way in which evidence is to be taken and

Rule 123(2)(e)

(v) a statement establishing a *prima facie* case for fearing that it might subsequently become more difficult or impossible to take evidence.

2.3 Competence

Rule 123(3)

The decision on the request and any resulting taking of evidence are a matter for the department of the EPO required to take the decision liable to be affected by the facts to be established.

This means that responsibility for the decision and the taking of evidence will normally lie with:

- (i) the examining division in the period from the date of filing until the date of the decision on the granting of the patent
- (ii) the opposition division in the period from the date of the grant decision until expiry of the time allowed for filing notice of opposition and during opposition proceedings and

- (iii) the board of appeal in the period from the date of a final decision by the opposition division until it becomes legally binding or while appeal proceedings are pending.

2.4 Decision on the request and the taking of evidence

The competent department must decide on the request without delay. If it grants the request, it must also immediately take a decision on the taking of evidence. *Rule 123(1)*
Rule 117

The provisions on the taking of evidence in proceedings before the EPO are applicable. *Rule 123(3)*

The date on which the measures are to be taken must therefore be communicated to the applicant for or proprietor of the patent and the other parties in sufficient time to allow them to attend. They may ask relevant questions. *Rule 123(1)*
Rule 118(2)
Rule 119(3)

3. Taking of evidence by courts or authorities of the contracting states

3.1 Legal co-operation

At the EPO's request ("letter rogatory"), the courts or other competent authorities of contracting states will undertake any necessary enquiries on its behalf and within the limits of their jurisdiction. *Art. 131(2)*

3.2 Means of giving or taking evidence

3.2.1 Taking of evidence on oath

The main case where evidence is taken by a competent court will be the hearing of parties, witnesses or experts. In such cases, the competent department may ask the competent court to take the evidence under oath or in an equally binding form. *Rule 120(3)*

3.2.2 Evidence taken by a competent court

The competent department will, if necessary, request that a competent court take evidence, where appropriate under oath, where: *Rule 120(3)*

- (i) the taking of evidence by that department would entail disproportionately high travelling costs or the taking of evidence by the competent court appears to be appropriate on other grounds

- Rule 120(2)* (ii) the competent department considers it advisable for the evidence of a party, witness or expert it has heard to be re-examined under oath or in an equally binding form (see *E-IV.3.2.1*)
- Rule 120(1)* (iii) there has been no reply to the summons by the expiry of a period fixed by the competent department in the summons (see *E-IV.1.5(iii)*) or
- Rule 120(1)*
Rule 150(3) (iv) a party, witness or expert who has been summoned before the competent department asks it to allow their evidence to be heard by a competent court in their country of residence (as described in *E-IV.1.5(iii)*). If the party, witness or expert simply refuses to be heard by the competent department, they are notified that the competent national court will have the means available under national law for obliging them to appear and to testify.

3.3 Letters rogatory

Rule 150(2) The EPO must draw up letters rogatory in the language of the competent authority or attach a translation into that language to them.

Rule 150(1) Letters rogatory must be addressed to the central authority designated by the contracting state.

3.4 Procedures before the competent authority

Rule 150(5) The EPO must be informed of when and where the enquiry is to take place and must inform the parties, witnesses and experts concerned.

Rule 120(3)
Rule 150(6) At the EPO's request, the competent authority will allow members of the department concerned to attend and to question any person giving evidence, either directly or through the competent authority. Whether the parties may put questions or not will depend on the laws of the contracting state concerned.

3.5 Costs of taking evidence

Rule 150(7) The execution of letters rogatory does not give rise to any reimbursement of fees or costs of any nature. Nevertheless, the state in which letters rogatory are executed has the right to require the European Patent Organisation to reimburse any fees paid to experts and interpreters and the costs incurred as a result of the attendance of members of the competent department during the taking of evidence.

3.6 Taking of evidence by an appointed person

Rule 150(8) If the law applied by the competent authority obliges the parties to secure evidence and the authority is not able itself to execute the letters rogatory, that authority may, with the consent of the competent department, appoint a suitable person to do so. When seeking the consent of the department concerned, the competent authority must indicate the approximate costs of doing this. If the competent department consents, the European Patent Organisation must reimburse any costs incurred; if not, the Organisation is not liable for these costs.

4. Evaluation of evidence

4.1 General remarks

The competent department has the power and the duty to assess whether the alleged facts are sufficiently established based on evidence. The proceedings under the EPC are governed by the principle of free evaluation of evidence. This principle allows, and requires, a competent department to decide at its own discretion and according to its own conviction, after taking into account the entire content of the parties' submissions. There are no firm rules according to which types of evidence are, or are not, convincing. This does not mean that the evaluation of evidence may be arbitrary; rather the evidence must be assessed comprehensively and dutifully. The only decisive factor is whether the department is convinced of the truth of the factual allegation based on all evidence on file. To assess the evidence, the department must consider all the arguments for and against a factual statement, while remaining bound by the laws of logic and by probability based on experience. The department sets out the reasons for reaching its conclusions in the decision (G 2/21).

The principle of free evaluation of evidence may not be used to simply disregard an admissibly submitted piece of evidence that a party has relied on in support of a disputed inference that is decisive for the final decision, e.g. to prove a technical effect. Disregarding it as a matter of principle would deprive the party of a basic legal procedural right enshrined in Art. 113(1) and 117(1). For example, the mere fact that evidence is post-published is not a sufficient reason to disregard it.

The state of the art to be taken into consideration in individual cases for the purposes of Art. 54 is explained in G-IV, 1 to 5 and 7 and G-V.

The competent department is not obliged to take into consideration any facts or evidence not presented by the parties in time, except within the limits specified in E-VI, 2.

4.2 Types of evidence

When evaluating submissions, it is important to distinguish between facts, evidence and arguments.

Example

The opponent asserts that the preamble to claim 1 is described in document A, and the characterising portion in document B (facts). To prove this, documents are submitted (evidence). The opponent then contends that the method claimed does not involve an inventive step, because the skilled person, on the basis of common general knowledge, would have combined the submitted documents in such a way as to arrive at the subject-matter of claim 1 (argument).

Evidence admissible in EPO proceedings is not confined to that listed in Art. 117(1). "Taking of evidence" within the meaning of Art. 117 comprises the submission or gathering of evidence of any kind, particularly the filing of documents.

Pure arguments are not evidence (see [T. 642/92](#)).

4.3 Examination of evidence

When evidence is submitted, the first thing to establish is what fact is being asserted, and then whether that fact is relevant to the decision. If not, the assertion is no longer considered and the evidence is not examined further. If the asserted fact is relevant, the next point is whether the submitted evidence proves it.

The EPC says nothing about how the outcome of taking of evidence must be assessed, and so the principle of free evaluation of evidence applies ([E-IV, 4.1](#)). This means that the content of evidence and its significance for the proceedings are assessed in the light of the particular circumstances of each individual case (e.g. time, place, type of evidence, position of witness in firm, etc.). The principle of free evaluation of evidence also means that EPO departments are empowered to evaluate evidence submitted by the parties in any appropriate manner, or indeed to disregard it as unimportant or irrelevant. In particular, it has to be decided on a case-by-case basis when a particular piece of evidence is sufficient. When parties make conflicting assertions, the division must decide which evidence is the most convincing. When taking a decision, the division must be convinced that the alleged fact is true after taking all evidence into account. If it cannot establish which assertion is true on the basis of the evidence put forward, it must decide on the basis of the burden of proof, i.e. against the party bearing that burden but unable to prove its point convincingly.

4.4 Asking for evidence

When pointing out that it cannot accept a line of argument, because certain facts have not been proven, the division must do so as neutrally and objectively as possible. In particular, it may not

- (a) require a specific kind of evidence (see [T. 474/04](#)) or
- (b) dictate the content of the evidence, e.g. the wording of a sworn written statement (see [T. 804/92](#)).

The taking of evidence in each of the forms listed in [Art. 117](#) is done at the discretion of the EPO department in question, i.e. only if that department considers it necessary, for example because a fact relevant to the decision needs to be proven.

4.5 Evaluation of the testimony of a witness

After the witnesses have been heard, the party or parties must be given an opportunity to make observations. The observations may be made either at oral proceedings after evidence has been taken or, exceptionally, in writing after minutes of the taking of evidence have been transmitted. The competent department will decide on this. The parties may file requests accordingly.

Only when this has been done may the competent department proceed to evaluate the evidence. Where a witness's testimony which is crucial to the decision has been challenged by a party but the department regards it as credible, or where it disregards a witness's oral or written testimony in its decision as not credible, it must state the grounds for its view in its decision.

In evaluating a witness's oral or written testimony, special attention is to be paid to the following:

- (i) What is important is what witnesses can relate on the points at issue on the basis of their own knowledge or views, and whether they have practical experience in the field in question. Second-hand assertions based on something heard from third parties are for the most part worthless on their own. It is also important for the purposes of the evaluation whether the witness was involved in the event or only knows of it as an observer or listener.
- (ii) Where a long time (several years) has passed between the event in question and the testimony, it is to be borne in mind that most people's powers of recollection are limited without the support of documentary evidence.
- (iii) Where testimony appears to conflict, the texts of the statements concerned are to be closely compared with one another.

Apparent contradictions in the testimony of witnesses may sometimes be resolved in this way. For example, a close examination of apparently contradictory statements by witnesses as to whether a substance X was commonly used for a particular purpose may show that there is in fact no contradiction at all, in that while one witness was saying specifically that substance X was not used for that particular purpose, the other witness was saying no more than that substances like X, or a certain class of substances to which X belonged, were commonly used for this particular purpose, without intending to make any statement about substance X itself.

- (iv) An employee of a party to the proceedings can be heard as a witness (see T 482/89). The possible partiality of a witness determines how the evidence is assessed, not whether it is admissible (see T 443/93).

4.6 Evaluation of the testimony of parties

Oral or written evidence given by parties, or their refusal to give evidence, is evaluated in the light of their special interest in the matter. Because of their special interest, it may be that the testimony of parties cannot be evaluated in the same way as that of neutral witnesses. This applies above all where parties were present when witnesses were heard and have been able to ascertain what view the competent department has taken. The considerations set out in E-IV, 4.5 (Evaluation of the testimony of a witness) apply *mutatis mutandis*.

4.7 Evaluation of an expert opinion

The competent department must examine whether the grounds on which an expert opinion is based are convincing. Despite its discretion in the evaluation of evidence, it may not disregard an expert opinion in the absence of grounds based on adequate specialist knowledge of its own or of another expert, irrespective of whether this other expert is an independent expert commissioned under Rule 121 or an expert who testifies at the request of one of the parties.

4.8 Evaluation of an inspection

In the case of a demonstration, a specific test programme under specific conditions is agreed in advance. During the demonstration itself, care must be taken to ensure that the characteristics or conditions of operation claimed for the invention are complied with. Where tests are carried out to compare an invention with an item forming part of the state of the art, as far as possible the same or comparable test conditions must be applied to both.

Chapter V – Derogating from the language of the proceedings at oral proceedings

1. Use of an official language

Any party to oral proceedings before the EPO may use one of the other official languages of the EPO, on condition that they either inform the EPO at least one month before the scheduled date of the oral proceedings or make provision for interpreting into the language of the proceedings. In the former case, it is the EPO's responsibility to provide for interpretation at its own expense.

Rule 4(1) and (5)

Parties must be clear about which official language they wish to use. They then have a right to both speak and hear that language, as long as the conditions of Rule 4 have been fulfilled. However, they do not have a right to speak in one language and hear a different language (see T.774/05).

The language of the proceedings as defined in Art. 14(3) cannot be changed. This means that any amendments to the application or patent have to be filed in the language of the proceedings (Rule 3(2)).

If all parties have indicated that they will use another official language, the division may depart from the language of the proceedings so as to manage without or with fewer interpreters (this question normally arises only in opposition proceedings). The parties' summonses are therefore accompanied by information which encourages them to agree how this can be achieved.

It may be possible to agree to limit the interpreting to "one-way", i.e. from one language into another but not the other way round. If a comment made in one language has clearly been misunderstood, the division may clarify it in another. Under no circumstances, however, can its members officially act as interpreters.

2. Language of a contracting state or other language

Any party may likewise use one of the official languages of the contracting states, other than English, French or German, on condition that they make provision for interpreting into the language of the proceedings. However, if the parties and the EPO agree, any language may be used at oral proceedings without interpreting or prior notice.

Rule 4(1) and (4)

3. Exceptions to sections 1 and 2

The EPO has discretion to permit exceptions to the provisions of Rule 4(1). Clearly, such permission must depend on the circumstances of the individual case. It may happen, for example, that parties are unable to give one month's notice through no fault of their own, and, although they have made arrangements for an interpreter, this interpreter is then unable to attend (e.g. owing to illness). If, in such circumstances, the EPO is unable to provide for interpreting, it will postpone the oral proceedings if they are being held at the examination stage. However, in opposition proceedings, the oral proceedings continue if the parties agree and the EPO employees involved can cope with the language to be used. Otherwise, the EPO

Rule 4(1)

postpones the oral proceedings and any costs incurred by the innocent party as a result of the postponement are a matter for apportionment under Art. 104.

4. Language used in the taking of evidence

Rule 4(3)

Parties, witnesses and experts giving evidence who are unable to express themselves adequately in English, French or German or in any other official language of the contracting states are permitted to use another language. The EPO is responsible for any necessary interpreting into the language of the proceedings if the evidence is taken at the request of the EPO itself. However, if the taking of evidence follows a request by a party to the proceedings, using a language other than English, French or German is allowed only if that party provides for interpreting into the language of the proceedings or, at the discretion of the EPO, into any one of English, French or German. This discretion is exercised in opposition proceedings only if the other parties agree.

5. Language used by employees of the EPO

Rule 4(2)

Employees of the EPO may use an official language of the EPO other than the language of proceedings at oral proceedings. The parties must be informed of this beforehand unless it can be reasonably assumed that they would not object, e.g. because they have likewise asked to use that different official language.

However, employees may not use a different language without good reason. Unless the parties are competent in the language used, the EPO provides for interpreting into the language of the proceedings at its own expense.

6. Language used in the minutes

Where the official language actually used at oral proceedings is not the language of the proceedings under Art. 14(3), the minutes may be drawn up in that other official language if the examining or opposition division or the Legal Division considers it appropriate and all parties concerned explicitly agree.

Before agreeing to this, parties must be informed that the EPO will not provide translations of the minutes into the language of the proceedings as defined in Art. 14(3). This condition, as well as the declaration of agreement of the party or parties, is recorded in the minutes.

Statements made in English, French or German are entered in the minutes of the proceedings in the language used (Rule 4(6)).

Statements made in any other language must be entered in the official language into which they are translated.

Amendments made to the text of the description or claims of a European patent application or European patent during oral proceedings must be entered in the minutes in the language of the proceedings.

Chapter VI – Examination by the EPO of its own motion; facts, evidence or grounds not submitted in due time; observations by third parties

1. Examination by the EPO of its own motion

1.1 General remarks

In proceedings before it, the EPO examines the facts of its own motion; it is not restricted in this examination to the facts, evidence and arguments provided by the parties and the relief sought. The competent department must comply with this principle of examination by the EPO of its own motion during all proceedings pending before it. Thus, once proceedings have been initiated, e.g. once a valid request for examination or an admissible notice of opposition has been filed (although it may subsequently be withdrawn), if there is reason to believe, e.g. from personal knowledge or from observations presented by third parties, that there are facts and evidence not yet considered which completely or partly prejudice the granting or maintenance of the European patent, the EPO must include these facts and evidence in those it examines of its own motion under Art. 114(1). See D-V.2 for the extent of substantive examination of the facts and evidence in opposition proceedings.

Art. 114(1)

1.2 Limits on the obligation to examine

However, the obligation to carry out such examination must be limited in the interests of procedural expediency. For example, in opposition proceedings, an offer to prove that an alleged public prior use took place will not be taken up if the opponent alleging this has ceased to participate in the proceedings and the necessary evidence cannot be easily obtained at a reasonable cost.

The unity of the subject-matter of the European patent is not to be examined in opposition proceedings (G 1/91, see D-V.2.2).

2. Late-filed submissions

The EPO may disregard facts or evidence (e.g. publications) which are not submitted in due time by the parties concerned.

Art. 114(2)

This also applies to grounds for opposition not submitted in due time and the facts and evidence supporting them (see D-V.2.2). Note in this respect that, according to G 1/95 and G 7/95, Art. 100(a) does not constitute one single ground for opposition, but has to be considered a collection of individual grounds for opposition, i.e. individual legal bases for objecting to the maintenance of a patent. This applies not only to distinctly different objections, such as subject-matter which is not patentable (Art. 52(2)) as distinct from subject-matter which is not capable of industrial application (Art. 57), but also to an objection for lack of novelty as opposed to an objection for lack of inventive step.

New arguments based on facts, evidence and grounds already making up the legal and factual framework of the opposition cannot be disregarded.

In deciding whether to admit facts, evidence or grounds for opposition not filed in due time, their relevance to the decision, the procedural stage reached and the reasons for their belated submission are to be considered. If examination of late-filed grounds for opposition, late-filed facts or late-filed evidence reveals without any further investigation (i.e. *prima facie*) that they are relevant, i.e. that they would change the basis for the envisaged decision, then the competent department has to take them into consideration no matter what stage the procedure has reached and whatever the reasons for their belated submission. In that case, the principle of examination by the EPO of its own motion under Art. 114(1) takes precedence over the possibility of disregarding facts or evidence under Art. 114(2) (see T 156/84). However, the limits on the obligation to carry out further examinations referred to in E-VI, 1.2 apply. Otherwise, the department informs the party concerned in the decision, with due regard to Art. 113(1) (see T 281/00), that the facts, evidence and/or grounds for opposition were not submitted in due time and, since they are not relevant to the decision, will be disregarded under Art. 114(2). On the apportionment of any costs arising from the late filing of facts and evidence, see D-IX, 1.4.

The latest date up to which submissions can be considered at all is the date on which the decision is handed over for notification by the EPO to the parties (see G 12/91).

The above applies in written proceedings; in oral proceedings submissions can only be considered up to the pronouncement of the decision (see E-III, 9).

2.1 General principles in opposition proceedings

The rulings of the Enlarged Board of Appeal in G 9/91 and G 10/91 apply when assessing late filing in opposition proceedings. According to these decisions, the opposition is, in principle, to be examined to the extent and on the grounds submitted during the period for opposition. Under Art. 114(1), the opposition division may go beyond this framework if *prima facie* maintenance of the patent is prejudiced. The principles developed by the Enlarged Board with respect to new grounds also apply to late-filed facts and evidence (see T 1002/92). This means that late-filed facts and evidence are to be admitted into the proceedings only if they are *prima facie* relevant, i.e. if they would change the envisaged decision (see E-VI, 2).

If a patent proprietor replies to a notice of opposition by amending the patent, this request for amendment cannot be considered late-filed and has to be admitted into the proceedings (Rule 79(1)).

Where the proprietor limits the patent to the subject-matter of a dependent claim as granted, new facts and evidence submitted by the opponent in reply to this amendment are as a general rule to be treated as late-filed and only to be admitted under Art. 114(1) if they are *prima facie* relevant,

because the opponent must be prepared for this type of amendment and so must provide any related material during the nine-month opposition period.

If the new facts and submissions are not *prima facie* relevant, they are to be disregarded under Art. 114(2). An exception to this rule is where the patent specification as granted contained a large number of dependent claims and the opponent could not reasonably have been expected to deal with all of them in the notice of opposition.

If, however, the proprietor amends the patent at an early stage of the proceedings in a manner not foreseeable by the opponent, e.g. by adding features disclosed in the description, the opponent will have the opportunity to provide new facts and evidence, i.e. possibly even to submit a new ground for opposition and new documents. Such submissions have to be admitted because the subject of the proceedings has changed. At a late stage in the proceedings such unforeseeable amendments are subject to the criterion of "clear allowability" (see H-II, 2.7.1).

2.2 Submissions filed in preparation for or during oral proceedings

If oral proceedings are arranged, the division issues a summons together with an annex drawing attention to the points to be discussed (Rule 116(1)) and normally containing the division's provisional and non-binding opinion (see E-III, 6 and D-VI, 3.2).

2.2.1 New facts and evidence

Rule 116(1) is an implementation of Art. 114(2) which reflects developments in the case law on facts or evidence not filed in due time. It makes it clear that the examining or opposition division has discretion to disregard new facts or evidence on the basis that they have been filed after the date indicated in the summons under Rule 116, unless they have to be admitted because the subject of the proceedings has changed. *Rule 116(1)*

For instance, if the opposition division states in the annex to the summons that the patent is likely to be revoked, and a request for amendment filed in time is admitted but relates to subject-matter not covered by the claims as granted, the subject of the proceedings has changed. Consequently, new facts and evidence submitted by the opponent in response to this request will be admitted, even if they arrive after the final date set under Rule 116.

However, if the proprietor's request relates to amendments based only on claims as granted, new facts and evidence submitted by the opponent will be treated as late-filed even if submitted before the final date, i.e. they will be admitted only if they are *prima facie* relevant unless there are other aspects militating in favour of admitting them, such as a large number of dependent claims in the patent as granted (E-VI, 2.1).

Similarly, if the opposition division concludes in its preliminary and non-binding opinion that maintenance of the patent is not prejudiced by the facts and evidence submitted so far by the opponent, this does not in itself give the opponent the right to have new facts and evidence admitted, even if they are submitted before the final date fixed under Rule 116(1).

When considering exercising its discretion to refuse to admit a further auxiliary request under Rule 116, the opposition division must first review the contents of the request. This is done to ensure that the review includes an assessment of whether the amendments are a fair attempt to overcome the objections and whether the request is *prima facie* allowable.

Refusing any further amendment may be appropriate if there are signs of procedural abuse, for example if it becomes evident after various unsuccessful amendments that the proprietor is not seriously trying to overcome the objections but is only delaying the procedure.

In order to prevent the subsequent filing of various consecutive requests, the division may ask the proprietor to simultaneously present the complete set of requests addressing a specific issue that has already been discussed.

2.2.2 Amendments filed in preparation for or during oral proceedings

Rule 116(2)

Rule 116(2) imposes the same obligations on the applicant or patent proprietor when submitting new documents which meet the requirements of the EPC (i.e. new amendments to the description, claims and drawings) as Rule 116(1) imposes on the parties in submitting new facts and evidence.

The examining or opposition division has discretion to disregard amendments filed after the date set under Rule 116(1) as late-filed, unless they have to be admitted because the subject of the proceedings has changed. As a rule, amendments submitted before the date set under Rule 116(1) cannot be considered late-filed.

The following are examples of what would normally amount to a change in the subject of the proceedings:

- the opposition division admits under Art. 114(1) new facts and evidence or a new ground of opposition because they are *prima facie* relevant
- the examining division cites a further relevant document for the first time (H-II, 2.7)
- the examining or opposition division departs from a previously notified opinion: for example, contrary to its preliminary opinion set out in the annex to the summons, the opposition division concludes during oral proceedings that an objection prejudices the maintenance of the patent.

In these examples, a request for amendment made by the applicant or proprietor in response cannot be rejected as late-filed even if submitted after the date set under Rule 116(1). If, however, after a change in the division's opinion, the applicant or proprietor files a new request that reintroduces subject-matter to which the division has already objected, the division has discretion to disregard the new request on the basis that it is *prima facie* not allowable.

On receipt of amendments filed after the final date set under Rule 116(1), the division therefore first analyses whether the amendments were filed in time in response to a change in the subject of the proceedings. Only if this is not the case does the division have discretion to disregard the amendments. It has to exercise this discretion according to the principles set out in E-VI, 2.2.3. The mere fact that amendments are filed after a given date is not on its own a legal basis for not admitting them.

2.2.3 Principles relating to the exercise of discretion

In exercising its discretion under Art. 114(2) and Rule 116(1) and (2), the division must assess all relevant factors of the case.

Art. 114(2)

Rule 116(1) and (2)

The division first has to consider the relevance of the late-filed facts or evidence (see E-VI, 2) or the allowability of the late-filed amendments on a *prima facie* basis. If these facts or evidence are not *prima facie* relevant, i.e. if they do not appear to affect the outcome of the proceedings (T 320/15), or if these amendments are not clearly allowable (see H-II, 2.7.1), they will not be admitted.

For instance, if the opposition division states in the annex to the summons that the patent is likely to be revoked and the proprietor responds by submitting amendments after the final date set under Rule 116(1), and possibly not until the oral proceedings, the division could, in principle, treat them as late-filed and apply the criterion of "clear allowability" (see H-II, 2.7.1) in assessing whether they can be admitted. However, the division will consider admitting such amendment requests if they relate to the subject-matter of dependent claims as granted.

Convergence of requests is another relevant factor that the division may consider when exercising its discretion (for a definition of convergence, see H-III, 3.3.2.2).

For the purpose of admissibility, a late-filed document's relevance is normally decided relative to the amended claims against which it is cited. Documents that are of limited relevance to an initial set of claims may acquire new relevance as a result of subsequent amendments to those claims (T 366/11).

Before admitting these submissions, the division will next consider procedural expediency, the possibility of abuse of the procedure (e.g. one of the parties is obviously protracting the proceedings) and whether the parties can reasonably be expected to familiarise themselves with the new facts or evidence or the proposed amendments in the time available.

As regards procedural expediency, the division may decide not to admit late-filed facts or evidence where, although they are relevant, admitting them would entail a prolonged adjournment of the proceedings, for example because a witness still has to be found or lengthy tests are still necessary. However, it may also postpone the oral proceedings, but doing this may mean having to consider the apportionment of costs in opposition proceedings (Art. 104). Similarly, if late-filed requests are based on subject-matter not previously covered by the claims, they will normally not

be admitted, again for reasons of procedural efficiency. Admitting such requests could entail postponing oral proceedings and so lead to a decision on apportionment of costs.

Examples of possible abuse of the proceedings are:

- The patent proprietor introduces at short notice a proliferation of auxiliary requests which are not a reaction to the course of the proceedings.
- The opponent knowingly abstains from asserting a public prior use based on its own activities until late in the proceedings, even though the supporting evidence had become fully available earlier (see T 534/89).
- The applicant or patent proprietor presents a large number of requests or incomplete variants of requests and invites the division to choose, shifting the responsibility for determining the content of the application or patent to the division. It is the duty of any party to proceedings to make its own case and to formulate its own requests (see T 446/00).

As to whether the parties can reasonably be expected to familiarise themselves with the new facts or evidence or the proposed amendments in the time available:

- It may not become apparent until the oral proceedings that the pending request submitted to overcome grounds for opposition is not allowable under the EPC. The opponent must always expect to have to discuss subject-matter based on dependent claims as granted if they are reasonable in number.
- The proprietor is in principle free to withdraw previously submitted amendments and defend the patent as granted unless this would amount to an abuse of the proceedings.

2.2.4 Right to be heard

Art. 113(1)

Generally, the parties must be heard before the division decides on whether or not to admit late-filed submissions.

For instance, if the opponent introduces a new ground for opposition during oral proceedings, they must always be granted the right to be heard. This means that the division must give the parties the opportunity to put forward arguments and duly consider them before deciding on the admissibility of the new ground. Similarly, where the opponent files pertinent new material, the patent proprietor must be given a chance to comment and submit amendments. If the opposition division admits new facts or evidence but the other parties have not had sufficient time to study them, it will, where easily comprehensible subject-matter is involved, grant the parties an opportunity to familiarise themselves with it, possibly by briefly interrupting the oral proceedings. If this is not feasible, the other parties must, on request, be given the opportunity to comment in the proceedings

subsequent to the oral proceedings, where appropriate in a further set of oral proceedings. Where possible, however, oral proceedings will not be adjourned.

Where possible, the opposition division and the other parties must be informed in good time beforehand of legal commentaries, decisions (e.g. of a board of appeal) and reports on legal decisions which are to be referred to at the oral proceedings. They may, however, be quoted or submitted for the first time at the oral proceedings themselves if the opposition division agrees after consulting the parties.

The reasons for the decision on the admissibility of late-filed facts, evidence and requests have to be provided in the written decision and must not come as a surprise. A mere reference to the division's discretionary power is not sufficient (E-IX, 2.10). In examination proceedings, reasons only need to be provided if the late-filed facts, evidence or requests are not admitted.

2.2.5 Costs

In opposition, relevant facts and evidence submitted at a late stage of the proceedings – e.g. not until the oral proceedings – could lead to a decision on apportionment of costs (see D-IX, 1.2) if this is requested. As regards the costs which a party may be ordered to bear as a result of late submissions, see also D-IX, 1.4.

3. Observations by third parties

Following publication of the European patent application under Art. 93, any person may present observations concerning the patentability of the invention. Although third-party observations most commonly relate to lack of novelty and/or inventive step, they may also be directed to clarity (Art. 84), sufficiency of disclosure (Art. 83), patentability (Art. 52(2) and (3), 53 or 57) and unallowable amendments (Art. 76(1), 123(2) and 123(3)).

Art. 115

Rule 114(1)

The observations must be filed in writing in English, French or German and must include a statement of the grounds on which they are based. The person filing them must not be a party to the proceedings before the EPO. They should preferably be filed via the online form provided by the EPO (see OJ EPO 2025, A71). They may be filed anonymously.

Documentary evidence and, in particular, publications submitted in support of the arguments may be filed in any language. However, the EPO may request that a translation into one of its official languages be filed within a specified period or else the evidence will be disregarded.

Rule 3(3)

Although third parties are sent acknowledgment of the receipt of their observations (if these were not filed anonymously), the EPO does not specifically inform them of any further action it takes in response to them. However, the outcome of the evaluation by the competent division will briefly be indicated in the related EPO action (e.g. in a communication or in the intention to grant) and will thus be visible to the public.

Rule 114(2)

The observations, including those filed anonymously, are put on file. They are communicated without delay to applicants or proprietors, who may comment on them. If they call into question the patentability of the invention in whole or in part, the examining or opposition division will take them into account in the next EPO action. If the observations relate to alleged prior art available other than from a document, e.g. from use, this is taken into account only if the alleged facts either are not disputed by the applicant or proprietor or are established beyond reasonable doubt.

Observations by third parties received in examination after dispatch of a Rule 71(3) communication but before the decision to grant (EPO Form 2006A) has been handed over for notification to the parties will be considered by the examining division. If they are relevant, the examining division will resume examination. Otherwise, brief substantive feedback will be provided in the file.

Observations by third parties received after the decision has been pronounced in oral proceedings (e.g. in the case of a refusal or in opposition) or issued in written proceedings and handed over for notification to the parties (e.g. in the case of a grant decision or if, in opposition, no oral proceedings were held), will be put on file without any consideration of their content.

Observations by third parties received once proceedings are no longer pending will not be taken into account or made available for file inspection. They will, however, be made available for file inspection and considered if the proceedings before the EPO become pending again, e.g. at the start of any opposition or limitation proceedings.

The EPO will make every effort to issue its next action within three months of receipt of third-party observations under Art. 115 by the examining division, provided the observations are substantiated and have not been filed anonymously. Where the observations are received at a time when a reply from the applicant to a communication is outstanding, this period starts from receipt of the reply at the EPO.

The EPO will generally apply the practice it follows for third-party observations filed in the Euro-direct procedure *mutatis mutandis* to third-party observations filed during the international phase once the Euro-PCT application has entered into the European phase.

Where third-party observations were filed during the international phase, the EPO as designated/elected Office will consider their content once they become available to it after the application's entry into the European phase. The examining division will make every effort to issue its next action within three months of expiry of the period under Rule 161, but only on condition that the third party has clearly expressed a wish for expedited handling in the European phase, that the observation was filed non-anonymously and that it was substantiated. A third party wishing to achieve this result in the European phase must therefore make this clear in the observation or file the observation with the EPO as designated/elected Office.

4. External complaints

External complaints can be made about any of the EPO's services or products and can be submitted by any person, including parties to proceedings before the EPO (for enquiries about the processing of files, see E-VIII.7). Complaints can be submitted using the online form available at epo.org/en/formal-complaint.

Complaints are forwarded to a dedicated EPO department responsible for:

- (i) ensuring that the complaint is dealt with fairly and efficiently and that suitable measures are taken to address it and
- (ii) providing the complaint with a detailed reply.

The complaint handling procedure does not replace the procedures laid down by the EPC; nor does the department responsible for handling complaints take decisions on procedural requests. It is therefore the competent department dealing with specific pending proceedings that decides on:

- (a) complaints submitted by a party to those proceedings about procedural and/or substantive issues arising in the proceedings. All parties to the proceedings will be informed accordingly.
- (b) complaints submitted by a third party in relation to substantive issues while proceedings are pending before the EPO. Such a complaint will be treated as a third-party observation (see E-VI.3).

The department responsible for handling complaints promptly forwards any complaint relating to appeal proceedings to the EPO Boards of Appeal Unit.

Complaints that have a substantive and/or procedural bearing on proceedings before the EPO, and the replies to them from the department responsible for handling complaints, will be excluded from file inspection only in exceptional cases (see D-II.4.3; decision of the President of the EPO concerning documents excluded from file inspection, OJ EPO 2007, Special edition No. 3, J.3).

Art. 128(4)
Rule 144(d)

Chapter VII – Interruption, stay and consolidation of the proceedings

1. Interruption

1.1 Cases in which the proceedings may be interrupted

According to Rule 142(1), proceedings before the EPO are interrupted in the following cases: Rule 142(1)

- (i) in the event of the death or legal incapacity of the applicant for or proprietor of a European patent or of the person authorised by national law to act on their behalf. If the event in question does not affect the authorisation of a representative appointed under Art. 134, proceedings will be interrupted only on application by that representative. Rule 142(1)(a)
- (ii) in the event of the applicant for or proprietor of a European patent, as a result of some action taken against their property, being prevented by legal reasons from continuing the proceedings before the EPO; or Rule 142(1)(b)
- (iii) in the event of the death or legal incapacity of the representative of an applicant for or proprietor of a European patent or of their being prevented for legal reasons resulting from action taken against their property from continuing the proceedings before the EPO. Rule 142(1)(c)

The EPO normally interrupts proceedings pursuant to Rule 142 on its own initiative. In the case of Rule 142(1)(a), last sentence, however, proceedings are interrupted on request only.

1.2 Department responsible

The Legal Division of the EPO is responsible for interrupting and resuming proceedings under Rule 142 (see the decision of the President of the EPO dated 21 November 2013, OJ EPO 2013, 600). Art. 20

1.3 Date of interruption

An interruption is registered (in general retroactively) with legal effect from the date on which the event in question occurred. If proceedings are interrupted on request, the interruption takes effect from the date on which the EPO received the request.

The parties are informed of the interruption of proceedings and the reasons for it. The date of their interruption is recorded in the European Patent Register, as is the date on which they are resumed. Rule 143(1)(t)

1.4 Resumption of proceedings

When, in the cases referred to in Rule 142(1)(a) or (b), the EPO has been informed of the identity of the person authorised to continue the proceedings before the EPO, it notifies that person and, where applicable, any third party, that the proceedings will be resumed as from a specified date. The date is set so as to allow this person to become familiar with the matter. Rule 142(2)

If, three years after the publication of the date of interruption in the European Patent Bulletin, the EPO has not been informed of the identity of the person authorised to continue the proceedings, it may set a date on which it intends to resume the proceedings of its own motion.

This date may be postponed on reasoned request and submission of relevant documentary evidence in the case of a claim of succession in title in respect of the European patent application/European patent concerned.

As a consequence of the *ex officio* resumption, the proceedings will continue with the applicant/proprietor registered in the European Patent Register, and procedural actions may become necessary and/or fees due (see also the notice from the EPO dated 29 May 2020, OJ EPO 2020, A76).

Communications and decisions of the EPO which have been notified during the interruption period are to be regarded as null and void and will be notified again after the department responsible has resumed the proceedings.

Rule 142(3)

In the case referred to in Rule 142(1)(c), the proceedings will be resumed when the EPO has been informed of the appointment of a new representative of the applicant or when the EPO has informed the other parties of the appointment of a new representative of the proprietor of the patent. If the EPO has not been informed of the appointment of a new representative within a period of three months after the beginning of the interruption of the proceedings, it informs the applicant for or proprietor of the patent in a communication:

Rule 142(3)(a)

(i) where Art. 133(2) (mandatory appointment of a representative) applies, that the European patent application will be deemed to be withdrawn or the European patent will be revoked if the information is not submitted within two months after the communication is notified; or

Rule 142(3)(b)

(ii) where Art. 133(2) does not apply, that the proceedings will be resumed with the applicant for or proprietor of the patent as from the date on which the communication is notified.

A copy of the EPO's communication will be forwarded to the other parties.

1.5 Resumption of periods

Rule 142(4)

Periods already running on the date of interruption of the proceedings begin again in full as from the day on which the proceedings are resumed, except for the periods for requesting examination and for paying renewal fees.

If the period for filing the request for examination is in force on the date of interruption of the proceedings, it is suspended (J.7/83; see also E-VIII, 1.4). It then resumes for the time it still has to run, or for at least the two months prescribed by Rule 142(4), second sentence.

Rule 142(4) has to be interpreted as deferring the due date for paying renewal fees falling due during the period of interruption until the date the proceedings are resumed (J 902/87). This means that these renewal fees may be paid without any additional fee on the date of resumption and in the amounts applicable on that date. They may also be paid within six months of the resumption date, provided that an additional fee is also paid within the same period (Rule 51(2)).

If the period for paying renewal fees with the additional fee referred to in Rule 51(2) is running on the date of interruption of the proceedings, it is suspended and begins to run again for the remaining period on the date of resumption.

2. Stay of proceedings under Rule 14 due to pending national entitlement proceedings

If third parties provide evidence that they have instituted proceedings against the applicant for a decision within the meaning of Art. 61(1), the proceedings for grant are stayed unless the third parties communicate to the EPO in writing their consent to the continuation of proceedings. This consent is irrevocable. For more details, see A-IV.2.2 and subsections, and D-VII.4.1. *Rule 14(1).*

3. Stay of proceedings when a referral to the Enlarged Board of Appeal is pending

Where a referral to the Enlarged Board of Appeal is pending and the outcome of examination or opposition proceedings depends entirely on the answer to the referred questions, the proceedings may be stayed by the examining or opposition division on its own initiative or at the request of a party or the parties.

The party or parties will be informed of the intention to stay the proceedings. If they do not reply, or if they explicitly agree, the proceedings will be stayed and they will be informed accordingly. If the party or parties do not agree in writing with the intention to stay, and if the examining or opposition division maintains its opinion, a decision to stay will be dispatched. A decision staying the proceedings or refusing a request to stay them is not separately appealable; it can only be appealed together with the final decision on the application/patent (see E-IX.3).

During the stay of proceedings, a PACE request will have no effect. After proceedings have resumed, they are accelerated again. Where the proceedings are not stayed, they will be decided according to existing practice.

Staying proceedings because they depend on a referral to the Enlarged Board of Appeal is to be distinguished from staying them under Rule 14 (see E-VII.2).

4. Consolidation of proceedings

The examining or opposition division or the Legal Division may consolidate proceedings if this is considered useful in order to expedite proceedings in the specific circumstances of the case (see J 17/92).

Consolidation is considered, in particular, if the parties and the underlying facts of the proceedings are identical. It is for the division responsible to decide whether proceedings are to be consolidated in the interests of procedural efficiency and with a view to expediting proceedings and, if so, for what purpose. Consolidation may concern the entire procedure or only individual procedural steps such as taking evidence or holding oral proceedings.

The parties are to be informed of the consolidation, including its purpose. Where proceedings are consolidated for the taking of evidence, this is to be notified in the order to take evidence and in the annex to the summons to oral proceedings. These must be sent to all parties to the consolidated proceedings. Likewise, submissions from the parties filed in respect of only one set of proceedings which are relevant to the consolidated parts of the proceedings must be included in all the files concerned.

Once its purpose has been achieved, the consolidation is to be set aside and the proceedings are to be continued separately. Again, the parties must be informed accordingly.

A decision to consolidate proceedings is not open to separate appeal but may be appealed only together with the final decision unless the decision allows a separate appeal (see E-IX, 3). The same applies *mutatis mutandis* to a decision setting aside consolidation.

Chapter VIII – Time limits, loss of rights, further and accelerated processing and re-establishment of rights

1. Time limits and loss of rights resulting from failure to respond within a time limit

1.1 Determination of time limits

The EPC imposes time limits on parties to proceedings. In the EPC, a "time limit" is a period of defined duration, calculated in full years, months, weeks or days, by reference to a relevant event (J 18/04), within which an act before the EPO has to be completed.

Art. 120

Rule 131

Some time limits are fixed by the articles of the EPC, e.g. in Art. 87(1) (priority period) and Art. 99(1) (opposition). Others are fixed in the Implementing Regulations, e.g. in Rule 30(3) (payment of late-furnishing fee), Rule 38 (payment of filing and search fee), Rule 39(1) (payment of designation fees), Rule 58 (correction of deficiencies in application documents), Rule 70(1) (request for examination), Rule 71(3) (filing translations of the claims and payment of fees for grant and publishing) and Rule 112(2) (applying for a decision after notification of loss of rights).

Others take the form of a stipulated range, the precise period within this range being at the EPO's discretion.

In other cases, e.g. those dealt with in Rule 3(3) (filing translation of documentary evidence) or Rule 70(2) (invitation to applicants to indicate whether they desire to proceed further with the European patent application), the EPC provides for a period, but not its duration. The duration must then be specified by the EPO in accordance with Rule 132 (see E-VIII, 1.2).

1.2 Duration of the periods to be specified by the EPO on the basis of EPC provisions

In principle, the duration of these periods is based on the amount of work which is likely to be required to perform the act in question (minimum of two months, maximum of four months, exceptionally six months). However, in order to facilitate the work of parties and the EPO, it has been decided, as a general rule, to adopt a uniform practice with respect to time limits. The current practice is as follows:

- (i) if deficiencies to be corrected are only minor or purely formal (for examples, see those mentioned under C-V, 1.1); if simple acts only are requested, e.g. where a party is asked under Rule 83 to file documents they have referred to; or if observations are required on minor amendments only – two months
- (ii) communications from an examining or opposition division on substantive matters – four months
- (iii) communications from the Legal Division – two months.

The following issues raised in communications under Art. 94(3) are typically deemed as raising matters of substance requiring a time limit of four months:

- objections under Art. 52, 53, 54, 56, 82, 83 or Rule 137(3)
- objections under Art. 76, 123(2) or 84 and affecting the claims
- deletion of redundant features in the claims.

The examining division sets a time limit of at least two months for adaptation of the description. However, it has the discretion to set a time limit of four months, depending on the effort involved (C-VI, 1.1).

The same considerations apply to time limits set in minutes of a telephone conversation or an interview because such minutes with time limits are formally issued as communications under Art. 94(3).

Where a communication issued under Art. 94(3) in examination is accompanied by a request for a translation of a priority document (Rule 53(3)), the period set for replying to that communication and for providing the translation is the same and is at least four months, regardless of the severity of the objections raised in the communication (see also A-III, 6.8.2).

Rule 70(2)

A longer time limit of up to six months is set only in the exceptional cases where it is clear that, in the circumstances, a four-month time limit cannot be observed. Each case must be judged on its individual merits and it is difficult to give general guidance, but a six-month time limit may be justified if, for example, the subject-matter of the application or patent or the objections raised are exceptionally complicated. Extending the time limit (i.e. beyond six months) will be allowed only in exceptional cases (E-VIII, 1.6). Where the applicant is invited to submit the indication provided for in Rule 70(2), a six-month time limit running from the publication of the search report is appropriate.

1.3 Time limits which may be freely determined

Time limits for acts for which the setting of a time limit is not explicitly provided for in the EPC are not subject to the restrictions on the duration of time limits laid down in Rule 132. They may be fixed by the EPO at its own discretion.

1.4 Calculation of time limits

Rule 131

Rule 134

Although Rule 131 allows other possibilities, any period fixed by the EPO will usually be specified in full months which will be calculated from the date of notification (see E-II, 2). Rule 131 gives precise details of how the day of expiry of the period is to be determined, whilst Rule 134 covers certain contingencies (see E-VIII, 1.6).

Rule 142

When proceedings have been interrupted because of the death of the applicant or proprietor or for any of the other reasons specified in Rule 142 (see E-VII, 1.1), time limits are governed by Rule 142(4). The time limits for

paying the examination fee and the renewal fees are suspended (see E-VII, 1.5). Any time limits already running on the date proceedings are stayed under Rule 14 due to national entitlement proceedings are interrupted, except for those for paying the renewal fees. Rule 14(4) applies to the calculation of time limits after proceedings have been resumed (see A-IV, 2.2.4).

1.5 Effect of change in priority date

Certain time limits run from the date of priority, or if there are several priorities, from the earliest date of priority. Where this date no longer applies (e.g. the right of priority is lost in accordance with Art. 90(5)), these time limits are to be calculated as from the amended date of priority. This does not restore any rights lost because a time limit had already expired before the loss of priority date. For example, if a request for restoration of a priority right is filed on entry into the European phase on expiry of the 31-month time limit under Rule 159(1) but the request is not granted and the right of priority is lost as a result, the 31-month time limit will not be deferred. Part A of the Guidelines deals with the procedure to be followed (see A-III, 6.9 to 6.11).

Art. 88(2)

1.6 Extension of a time limit

1.6.1 Extension of time limits set by the EPO under Rule 132

Unless the EPC specifies a fixed and non-extendable period, the duration of time limits may be extended on request. The request must be submitted in writing before expiry of the period that has been set. The extended period is to be calculated from the start of the original period.

Rule 132

In opposition proceedings, requests to extend time limits over and above the normal period of four months, both for communications from an opposition division on substantive matters and for communications issued by the formalities officer, or two months for communications requesting an act of a purely formal or only minor character (E-VIII, 1.2), will be granted only in exceptional, duly substantiated cases. For a communication under Art. 101(1) and Rule 79 or Rule 81(2) and (3), all parties to the proceedings can request an extension irrespective of whether they were invited in the communication to submit reply: if the extension is, exceptionally, granted to one of the parties, it automatically applies to all other parties.

In other proceedings, a request for extension, even if filed without reasons, is normally allowed if it is for not more than two months and the total period set does not thereby exceed six months. A request for a longer extension, especially if the total period set exceeds six months, is allowed only exceptionally, when the reasons given are sufficient to show convincingly that it will be impossible to reply within the previously set period. Examples of exceptional circumstances include the fact that representatives or clients are so seriously ill that they cannot deal with the case in time or the need to perform extensive biological experiments or tests. On the other hand, foreseeable or avoidable circumstances (e.g. leave, pressure of other work) are not accepted as a sufficiently exceptional circumstance (see the notice of the Vice-President of Directorate-General 2 of the EPO, OJ EPO 1989, 180).

If the request for an extension is granted, the parties are informed of the new time limit. Otherwise, they are told that the relevant sanction has taken effect or will take effect.

OJ EPO 2025, A69

An application will be removed from the PACE programme (see E-VIII, 4) if the applicant has requested an extension of a time limit (OJ EPO 2025, A69).

In examination proceedings, failure to respond to a communication under Art. 94(3) results in deemed withdrawal of the application (see E-VIII, 1.8 and E-VIII, 1.9.2).

Art. 106(2)

If the request for extension of a time limit filed in good time has been rejected and any applicant considers this unjust, they can only overcome the ensuing loss of rights by requesting a decision under Rule 112(2) and/or further processing under Art. 121(1) and Rule 135(1) (see E-VIII, 2), as applicable. Where a request for reimbursement of the fee for further processing is rejected, this decision is open to appeal, either together with the final decision or separately, as the case may be (see J 37/89).

The failure of a party to reply to a communication from the opposition division within the period set does not have any direct legal consequence. Rather, the opposition proceedings will proceed to the next stage, and this could be a decision under Art. 101(2) or (3).

1.6.2 Extension of periods under Rule 134

1.6.2.1 Extension of periods under Rule 134(1)

Rule 134(1)

Periods that expire on a day on which at least one of the EPO's filing offices (i.e. Munich, The Hague or Berlin) is not open for receipt of documents (e.g. because it is a public holiday at the site in question) or on which mail is not delivered for other reasons (with the exception of a general dislocation in the transmission or delivery of mail, which is governed by Rule 134(2) – see E-VIII, 1.6.2.3) are extended to the first day thereafter on which all the filing offices are open again for receipt of documents and on which mail is delivered.

An extension under Rule 134(1) also applies if any one of the means of electronic filing provided by the EPO under Rule 2(1) is not available, regardless of any restrictions on the documents which may be filed by the means of electronic filing that suffered the outage.

- If a means of electronic filing is unavailable for four hours or more because of scheduled maintenance, Rule 134(1), second sentence, applies. If the unavailability of a means of electronic filing lasts less than four hours and is announced at least two working days in advance, Rule 134(1), second sentence, does not apply.
- In the case of unplanned outages, users who are unable to file a document should contact the EPO's Customer Services. If it is confirmed that the unavailability of the service is attributable to the EPO, these users will not suffer any adverse consequences; they

may also request that the EPO declare under Rule 134(1), second sentence, that the missed period is extended to the date on which the document was filed.

- If a payment period expires on a day on which one of the accepted means of making payment to the EPO for a Euro-direct or Euro-PCT application is unavailable, the payment period is extended to the first working day thereafter on which all the means of making payment are available unless the outage lasts less than four hours and is announced at least two working days in advance.

For more details, see OJ EPO 2020, A120.

OJ EPO 2020, A120

1.6.2.2 Extension of periods under Rule 134(2) and Rule 134(5)

Where there is a general dislocation in the delivery or transmission of mail in a contracting state, any period expiring during this dislocation is extended for parties who are resident in the state concerned or have appointed a representative with a place of business in that state. Where the state concerned is the state in which the EPO is located, the extension applies to all parties and representatives, irrespective of their residence. The beginning and the end of the general dislocation is published in the Official Journal.

Rule 134(2) and (4)

Equally, where an individual party can provide evidence of a dislocation in the delivery or transmission of mail due to an exceptional occurrence inside or outside EPC contracting states (such as, in particular, a natural disaster, war, civil disorder or a general breakdown in any of the means of electronic communication accepted by the EPO for the filing of documents), a late submission or payment will be deemed to be received in due time, provided that:

Rule 134(5)

- the dislocation affected the locality where that party or their representative resides or has their principal place of business,
- the dislocation existed on any of the last ten days of the period at issue, and
- the transmission or payment is effected within five days from the end of the dislocation, together with
- a formal request of the party concerned under Rule 134(5), accompanied by appropriate evidence.

1.6.2.3 Scope of application of Rule 134

An extension under Rule 134 applies to all periods under the EPC (see E-VIII, 1.1), including, in particular:

- the time limits for the filing of submissions, e.g. replies to EPO communications

- the time limit under Rule 37(2) for the onward transmission to the EPO of applications filed with the central industrial property office of a contracting state (see A-II, 1.6)
- the priority period under Art. 87(1) (see A-III, 6.6)
- the opposition period under Art. 99(1)
- the period for entry into the European phase under Rule 159(1)
- the periods for the payment of fees (see A-X, 6.1), including, *mutatis mutandis*, the expiry of the period for paying renewal fees with an additional fee in accordance with Rule 51(2) and the expiry of the periods under Rule 51(3) and (4) (see A-X, 5.2.4).

By contrast, an extension under Rule 134 does not affect:

- the pendency of the earlier application when filing a divisional application (see A-IV, 1.1.1)
- the beginning of the six-month period for the payment of a renewal fee with an additional fee under Rule 51(2) unless the due date for the renewal fee is deferred to the expiry of a period, for instance in the case of Rule 159(1)(g) (see A-X, 5.2.4)
- the due date for the renewal fees for a divisional application and the beginning of the four-month period under Rule 51(3) (see A-IV, 1.4.3)
- the date of the start of the search, which is relevant for the entitlement to a refund of the search fee (see A-X, 10.2.1)
- the date of the start of substantive examination, which is relevant for filing a PPH request (see E-VIII, 4.2) or any entitlement to a refund of the examination fee (see A-VI, 2.5)
- the date on which a request under Rule 22 (registration of transfers) or Rule 54 (certified priority document) is deemed to be filed, where the payment date is decisive, because these requests are deemed to have been filed only when the corresponding administrative fee has been paid.

Strictly speaking, an extension also does not affect the final date for making written submissions in preparation for oral proceedings under Rule 116. However, a general dislocation in the delivery of mail or other exceptional occurrence under Rule 134(5) will be taken into account by an examining or opposition division in exercising its discretion whether to admit submissions filed after the date set under Rule 116 (see E-III, 8.5, sub-item (iv)). Given that the date fixed under Rule 116 is meant to ensure adequate preparation of the oral proceedings, a party making submissions after that date must show that it has taken reasonable measures to submit them as early as reasonably possible.

1.7 Late receipt of documents

If a document received late was delivered to a recognised postal service provider at least five days before expiry of the time limit and was received no later than three months after expiry of the time limit, it will be deemed to have been received in due time under Rule 133. The five days are calendar days, not working days. This legal fiction applies to all time limits to be observed in proceedings before the EPO and/or the national authorities, including the priority period laid down in Art. 87(1). Despite this legal fiction that the time limit has been observed, the filing date of the document remains the day on which it was actually received.

Rule 133(1)

Recognised postal service providers are the designated operators within the meaning of Article 1 of the Universal Postal Convention, plus Chronopost, DHL, Federal Express, flexpress, TNT, SkyNet, UPS and Transworld (see the decision of the President of the EPO dated 11 March 2015, OJ EPO 2015, A29). The document must have been sent as a registered letter or equivalent and, if posted outside Europe, by airmail. At the EPO's request, confirmation of receipt by the postal service provider must be provided as evidence that the document was delivered in time.

1.8 Failure to respond within a time limit

If a party has not acted within a time limit, various sanctions may be applied depending on the circumstances. For instance, under Art. 90(2) and Rule 55 the application will not be dealt with any further; under Art. 90(5) the application will be refused or a right of priority lost; under Rule 5 a document may be deemed not to have been received. If the request for examination has not been filed in time, the application is deemed to be withdrawn (Art. 94(2)), and this sanction may also apply in cases where the applicant fails to meet a time limit set by the EPO (e.g. the time limit for replying to an invitation to amend under Art. 94(3)).

If – in contrast to cases where mandatory legal sanctions are laid down (e.g. revocation of the European patent if the publishing fee is not paid in due time (Rule 82(3)) – there is no specific legal sanction for not observing a particular time limit, submissions and requests made by the parties after expiry of the time limit but before a decision is handed over for notification by the EPO to them are to be treated in the rest of the proceedings as if they had been received in time (see G 12/91). New facts and evidence, on the other hand, are to be treated as not filed in due time (Art. 114(2), see also E-VI, 1.2).

1.9 Loss of rights

1.9.1 Cases of loss of rights

If a party to the proceedings or a third party fails to comply with a time limit laid down in the EPC or fixed by the EPO, this will result in a loss of rights in certain cases specified in the EPC, without any decision concerning the refusal of the European patent application or the grant, revocation or maintenance of the European patent, or the taking of evidence.

Rule 112

1.9.2 Noting and communication of loss of rights

Art. 119
Rule 112(1)

If a right has been lost as described in E-VIII, 1.9.1, a formalities officer will note this and communicate it to the person concerned. The communication will be notified to the person concerned as a matter of course (see also D-IV, 1.4.1).

1.9.3 Decision on loss of rights

Rule 112(2)

If the party concerned considers that the finding of the EPO is inaccurate, they may, within two months of notification of the communication, apply for a decision on the matter by the EPO.

The competent department of the EPO will give a decision only if it does not share the opinion of the person requesting it; otherwise it will inform that person and then continue with the proceedings. Since such decisions are open to appeal, the reasons on which they are based must be stated. Only the person affected by the loss of rights noted will be party to the proceedings.

The option of making a request under Rule 112(2) for a review of the accuracy of the communication under Rule 112(1) is available in parallel to the legal remedies against the loss of rights. It is advisable to apply for the appropriate legal remedy as an auxiliary request to that under Rule 112(2) in order to observe the relevant time limit for that request (see E-VIII, 2 and E-VIII, 3.1.3). The competent department will deal with the request under Rule 112(2) first. If it is allowable, all other requests are redundant and any related fees paid will be refunded. If it is not allowable, the various requests will be dealt with in a single decision in the order in which they were filed. If applicants fail to observe the time limit for requesting a decision under Rule 112(2), they may still apply for re-establishment of rights under Art. 122(1) and Rule 136(1) in respect of that time limit.

2. Further processing

Art. 121(1) and (2)
Rule 135(1) and (3)
Art. 2(1)
item 12, RFees

If the European patent application is to be refused or is refused or deemed to be withdrawn following failure to reply to the EPO within a time limit, the application is allowed to proceed if the applicant makes a request for further processing of the application within two months of the communication concerning either the failure to observe the time limit or a loss of rights. Further processing must be requested by payment of the prescribed fee. The omitted act must be completed within the period for making the request. The request is not deemed to have been filed until the fee has been paid. If the fee has been paid in time but the omitted act has not been completed within the period for making the request, the request is inadmissible.

If several acts have the same legal basis, they form a unitary procedural act and are subject to a unitary time limit (see J.26/95). Further processing in respect of such a time limit is subject to the payment of a single fee for further processing. The amount of the single fee depends on the number and character of the omitted acts forming the unitary procedural act.

Examples

- Requesting examination under Art. 94(1) in conjunction with Rule 70(1) requires filing a written request for examination and paying the examination fee. As both actions have the same legal basis, they form a unitary procedural act with a unitary time limit. If both actions were omitted, the single fee for further processing amounts to the total of the flat fee and 50% of the examination fee (Art. 2(1), item 12, first and third indents, RFees). If only the examination fee was not paid in time, the fee for further processing amounts to 50% of the examination fee (Art. 2(1), item 12, first indent, RFees). If only the written request for examination was omitted, the fee for further processing amounts to the flat fee (Art. 2(1), item 12, third indent, RFees).
- The filing fee and the additional fee due if the application comprises more than 35 pages must be paid within the time limit set by Rule 38(1) and (2). As the additional fee is part of the filing fee, the payment of these two fees forms a unitary procedural act with a unitary time limit, and so one fee for further processing is due. If both fees were not paid in time, the single fee for further processing amounts to 50% of the filing fee and 50% of the additional fee (see Art. 2(1), item 12, first indent, RFees). If only one fee was not paid in time, the single fee for further processing amounts to 50% of that omitted fee (see Art. 2(1), item 12, first indent, RFees).

An exception to the above principle concerns Rule 71(3):

- Approving the text communicated under Rule 71(3) requires paying the fee for grant and publishing and, where applicable, claims fees (Rule 71(4)) and filing the translations of the claims within a four-month period (Rule 71(5)). As these actions have the same legal basis, they form a unitary procedural act with a unitary time limit. As an exception to the principle that the single fee for further processing is calculated on the basis of the number of omitted acts, Art. 2(1), item 12, second indent, RFees stipulates that only one flat fee for further processing is due in the event of late performance of any or all of the acts required under Rule 71(3), i.e. paying the fee for grant and publishing and filing the translations of the claims. If in addition claims fees were not paid in due time, the single fee for further processing amounts to the total of the flat fee **and** 50% of the claims fees (see Art. 2(1), item 12, second and first indent, RFees). If only the claims fees were not paid in due time, the single fee for further processing amounts to 50% of the claims fees (Art. 2(1), item 12, first indent, RFees). For European patent applications filed before 1 April 2009 and international applications entering the European phase before that date, any page fees under Art. 2(2), item 7.2, RFees are part of the fee for grant and printing. Therefore, if only page fees were not paid in time, the fee for further processing amounts to the flat fee (Art. 2(1), item 12, second indent, RFees).

Actions that do not form a unitary procedural act are subject to time limits expiring independently of one another, and missing each one results in the application being deemed withdrawn. If such time limits expire on the same date, the missing of each independent time limit results in the application being deemed withdrawn (see J 26/95). This applies regardless of whether the applicant is informed of the non-performance of procedural acts in one or several communications. In such cases, a fee for further processing is payable for each missed time limit. For an example, see E-VIII, 3.1.3.

A request for further processing may also be filed between expiry of the unobserved time limit and notification of the communication concerning either the failure to observe the time limit or a loss of rights.

The department competent to decide on the omitted act also decides on the request for further processing.

Where the omitted act is a substantive response (e.g. to the extended European search report or to a communication under Art. 94(3)), a mere procedural request (e.g. a request for oral proceedings) does not qualify as completion of the omitted act and further processing therefore cannot be granted on that basis (see B-XI, 8 and C-IV, 3).

Rule 135(2)

As a general rule, further processing is the legal remedy for missing a time limit during proceedings before grant, even where the consequence is a partial loss of rights (e.g. loss of priority right). However, the possibility of requesting further processing is ruled out for the periods referred to in Art. 121(4) and Rules 6(1), 16(1)(a), 31(2), 36(2), 40(3), 51(2) to (5), 52(2) and (3), 55, 56, 56a(1) and (3) to (7), 58, 59, 62a, 63, 64, 112(2) and 164(1) and (2).

Art. 122(1)

3. Re-establishment of rights

An applicant for or proprietor of a European patent who, despite taking all due care required by the circumstances, was unable to observe a time limit imposed in proceedings before the EPO may apply to have their rights re-established.

3.1 Admissibility of the request

Art. 122(1)

3.1.1 Time limits covered

Failure to observe the time limit must have the direct consequence of causing the refusal of the European patent application or of a request, the deemed withdrawal of the European patent application, the revocation of the European patent or the loss of any other right or means of redress. This means, for example, that in opposition proceedings there can be no re-establishment of rights in respect of the time limits for the patent proprietor's submission of observations on the written statements of the other parties to the proceedings or on communications from the opposition division. Likewise, there can be no re-establishment of rights where the time limit for paying the renewal fees under Rule 51(1) is missed, as valid payment is still possible under Rule 51(2).

Re-establishment of rights is ruled out in respect of all periods for which further processing is available and in respect of the period for requesting re-establishment of rights. This means that re-establishment of rights comes into play where further processing is excluded in respect of a specific period or where the time limit for requesting further processing has expired. In the latter case, re-establishment of rights is to be requested in respect of the time limit for requesting further processing (see E-VIII, 2), and not in respect of the originally missed time limit.

Art. 122(4)
Rule 136(3)

A "time limit" is taken to mean a specific period of time within which an act to be performed in proceedings before the EPO must be completed (see E-VIII, 1.1). Re-establishment of rights is therefore not admissible e.g. in respect of failure to attend on the date of oral proceedings.

Rule 131(1)

Examples of time limits in respect of which re-establishment of rights may be requested are the ones for:

- paying a renewal fee plus additional fee Rule 51(2)
- requesting further processing in respect of the time limit for replying to a communication from the examining division under Art. 94(3) Rule 135(1)
- filing the translation of any amended claims in opposition proceedings Rule 82(2)
- filing the request for a decision by the opposition division on the awarding of costs Rule 88(3)
- filing notice of appeal and/or grounds of appeal Art. 108
- filing a petition for review by the Enlarged Board of Appeal. Art. 112a(4)

3.1.2 Entitlement to file the request

The wording of Art. 122(1) implies that re-establishment of rights is available only to applicants and proprietors. Therefore, opponents are normally not entitled to request re-establishment of rights, e.g. in respect of the time limit for filing an appeal (see T 210/89). However, an opponent who has already filed an appeal can request re-establishment of rights in respect of the time limit for submitting the grounds for appeal (see G 1/86).

Where re-establishment of rights is requested by the patent proprietor in respect of a time limit to be met in the opposition procedure, the opponents are parties to the re-establishment proceedings (see T 552/02 and T 1561/05).

Where an application or patent is transferred, only the registered applicant can request re-establishment of rights (E-XIII, 3).

Rule 22(3)

3.1.3 Form of the request and applicable time limit

As a rule, the request for re-establishment of rights must be filed in writing within two months of the removal of the cause of non-compliance with the

Rule 136(1), (2)

time limit, but at the latest within one year of expiry of the unobserved time limit. The omitted act must be completed within this period.

Where the "cause of non-compliance with the time limit" involved some error in the carrying out of the party's intention to comply with the time limit, the cause of non-compliance is removed on the date on which the person responsible for the application is made aware of the fact that a time limit has not been observed or on which they ought to have noticed the error if all due care had been taken. The removal of the cause of non-compliance is a matter of fact which has to be determined in the circumstances of each individual case. In the absence of circumstances to the contrary, where a communication under Rule 112(1) has been duly sent, it may be assumed that the cause was removed by receipt of this communication (see J 27/90).

As an exception to the standard time limit described above, a request for re-establishment in respect of the priority period (Art. 87(1)) or the period for filing a petition for review by the Enlarged Board of Appeal (Art. 112a(4)) must be filed within two months of expiry of the relevant period.

A request for re-establishment is not deemed to be filed until after the fee for the re-establishment of rights has been paid.

The principles regarding unitary and independent procedural acts described in E-VIII, 2 apply *mutatis mutandis* to establishing the number of requests for re-establishment of rights, and in particular to establishing the payable fees. Where one unitary procedural act is omitted by not performing one or more actions forming that act, only one fee for re-establishment is due. Where several independent procedural acts are omitted and each omission results in the application being deemed withdrawn, a fee for re-establishment is due for each omitted act.

These principles also apply to cases where re-establishment of rights must be requested in respect of the time limit or limits for requesting further processing (see Rule 136(3)). In such cases, the number of missed time limits, each resulting in the application being deemed withdrawn and requiring a request for further processing, determines the number of requests for re-establishment and the corresponding number of fees for re-establishment.

Example 1

An international application comprises more than 35 pages and was published in a language other than an official language of the EPO. The acts required for entry into the European phase on expiry of the 31-month period under Rule 159(1) were omitted. Due to their different legal nature, the individual acts required under Rule 159(1) do not form a unitary procedural act but are legally independent and subject to independent time limits. The table below illustrates further processing and re-establishment of rights in this example (for information on the remedies available for missing the time limits under Rule 159(1), see the individual sections under E-IX, 2).

Box I of the table shows the number of independent time limits missed. Box II shows the fee for further processing payable for each missed time limit. Box III shows the fee for re-establishment payable for each missed time limit.

In the example, for a request for further processing to be allowed, completion of the omitted acts (i.e. all acts that were to be performed within the 31-month period) and payment of five fees for further processing (two of which comprise two fees) are required within the two-month period under Rule 135(1). If that period is missed, the applicant may request re-establishment of rights in respect of the period. The request requires completion of the omitted acts and payment of the corresponding number of fees for re-establishment of rights within the period under Rule 136(1). The omitted acts are those that were to be performed within the 31-month period and payment of the corresponding five fees for further processing. Payment of five fees for re-establishment of rights corresponds to the number of five independent fees for further processing.

Omitted acts	Time limits missed (box I)	Number of fees for further processing (box II)	Number of fees for re-establishment (box III)
Filing of the translation	1	1	1
Payment of the filing fee	1 (unitary)	1 (comprising 50% of the filing fee and 50% of the additional fee)	1
Payment of the additional fee for an application comprising more than 35 pages			
Payment of the designation fee	1	1	1
Payment of the search fee	1	1	1
Filing of the request for examination	1 (unitary)	1 (comprising a flat fee and 50% of the examination fee)	1
Payment of the examination fee			
Resulting number of fees to be paid	5 non-observed time limits	5 fees for further processing, 2 of them comprising 2 fees	5 fees for re-establishment

Example 2

The applicant missed the time limit for requesting further processing in respect of the time limit for replying to a communication from the examining

division under Art. 94(3) and the time limit for paying the renewal fee with the additional fee. As these two time limits expire independently of one another and both have been missed by the applicant, in each case resulting in the application being deemed withdrawn, a request for re-establishment has to be filed in respect of both of them (J 26/95). In such cases, a fee for re-establishment has to be paid for each request. In the case of independent time limits, in particular where they expire on different dates, the reasons for missing them and the date of removal of the cause of non-compliance may be different.

Example 3

After a decision to refuse by the examining division, the applicant missed both the time limit for filing the notice of appeal and the time limit for filing the statement of grounds of appeal. Both time limits were missed for the same reason. Although two time limits were missed, only one re-establishment fee has to be paid as both time limits were triggered by the same event, i.e. the notification of the decision, and both were missed for the same reason. In such a case, re-establishment in respect of both periods has to be examined together and, as the result would inevitably be the same in both cases, one re-establishment fee is considered to be sufficient.

If the time limits for filing the notice and the grounds were missed for different reasons, there would be no causal connection and two fees for re-establishment would have to be paid.

3.1.4 Substantiation of the request

The request must state the grounds on which it is based, and must set out the facts relied on. It must therefore give the precise cause of non-compliance with the time limit concerned (i.e. the fact or obstacle preventing the required action within the time limit), specify at what time and under which circumstances the cause arose and was removed, and present the main facts relevant to determining whether all due care required by the circumstances had been taken to comply with the time limit (see J 15/10). General statements that do not include the specific facts or events that caused the time limit to be missed do not satisfy the requirement of a duly substantiated request under Rule 136(2).

Once the time limit for filing the request for re-establishment has expired, the requester may clarify or supplement the alleged facts and, where appropriate, submit further evidence, but they cannot alter the factual basis for the original request (see J 5/94). Any new facts introduced at this stage are inadmissible and therefore disregarded by the deciding body.

3.2 Merits of the request

Applicants can have their rights re-established only if they show that they were unable to observe a time limit imposed in proceedings before the EPO despite taking all due care required by the circumstances. The obligation to exercise due care must be considered in the light of the situation before the missed time limit expired. "All due care" means all reasonable care, i.e. the standard of care that the notional reasonably competent proprietor,

Art. 122(1)

applicant or representative would apply in all the relevant circumstances (see [T 30/90](#)).

Where the cause of non-compliance with a time limit involves some error in the carrying out of the party's intention to comply with it, all due care is considered to have been taken if the non-compliance results either from exceptional circumstances or from an isolated mistake within a normally satisfactory monitoring system.

Whether there are exceptional circumstances justifying the re-establishment of rights depends on the specific facts of the individual case. Examples include organisational upheavals and sudden serious illnesses. In such cases, the requesters must show not only that those circumstances existed, but also that they took all due care, e.g. by carefully preparing the reorganisation or by having an effective staff substitution system.

Where a party alleges an isolated mistake within a normally satisfactory monitoring system, they must show that the monitoring system normally works well. Such a system must include an independent, effective cross-check mechanism. However, this requirement does not apply to relatively small entities/patent departments (see [T 166/87](#) and [J 11/03](#)).

The duty to exercise all due care applies first and foremost to the applicant and then, by virtue of delegation, to the representative duly entrusted by the applicant to act on their behalf in prosecuting the application (see [J 3/93](#)). The obligations of the applicant and those of their representative are clearly distinct and depend on the relationship between them (see [T 112/89](#) and [J 19/04](#)). In this regard, the scope of the mandate and any express instructions given to the representative are taken into account.

Applicants are entitled to rely on their representative. However, if they have been informed that instructions are required in order to meet a time limit, they have a duty to take all due care in the circumstances to meet the time limit (see [T 381/93](#)). The fact that the professional representative has acted correctly does not exempt applicants from suffering the consequences of their own mistakes or negligence.

Professional representatives have responsibility in proceedings before the EPO and must be presumed to be supervising their own work continuously (see [T 1095/06](#)). When professional representatives have been instructed by their client to perform a particular procedural action but do not receive the necessary additional instructions or required means in due time, they must in principle take all necessary measures to try to obtain these instructions from their client and ascertain their true wishes (see [T 112/89](#) and [J 19/04](#)).

Professional representatives can delegate routine tasks, such as typing, posting letters, noting time limits or checking due dates, to assistants. In those cases, the same strict standard of care is not expected of the assistant as is demanded of the representative. However, the

representative must show that the assistants have been carefully selected, duly instructed and periodically supervised (see J 5/80 and T 439/06).

If the applicants entrust another party with taking care of their application matters, e.g. a non-European representative or a fee payment agency, it has to be established that such a party has taken the due care required of an applicant for or proprietor of a European patent (see J 3/88). In particular, a non-European representative must also show that a reliable system for the monitoring of time limits was in place when the time limit was missed (see J 4/07).

3.3 Decision on re-establishment of rights

The department competent to decide on the omitted act is also competent to decide on the request for re-establishment of rights. The grounds for the decision need only be stated if the request is not granted, except in opposition proceedings, as opponents are parties to the re-establishment proceedings (see [E-VIII, 3.1.2](#)).

[Rule 136\(4\)](#)

The department which took the contested decision will have to consider re-establishment of rights in respect of a missed time limit for appeal when the conditions for granting interlocutory revision are fulfilled (see [E-XI, 7](#)). However, it can only decide to allow re-establishment if it can do so within the three-month time limit of [Art. 109\(2\)](#) and the conditions for re-establishment (see [E-VIII, 3.1.1](#) to [E-VIII, 3.1.4](#)) are fulfilled. In all other cases, the appeal, together with the request for the re-establishment of rights, must be submitted to the competent board of appeal.

If the request is granted, the legal consequences of missing the time limit will be deemed not to have ensued. Any renewal fees which may have fallen due between the expiry of the missed time limit and the notification of the decision to grant the request for re-establishment will be due on that latter date. Valid payment will still be possible within four months of that date. If a renewal fee was already due when the loss of rights occurred but could still be paid under [Rule 51\(2\)](#), it may still be paid within six months of the date of notification of the decision re-establishing the rights, provided that the additional fee is also paid within that period.

[Art. 122\(3\)](#)

[Rule 51\(4\)](#)

If other time limits the non-observance of which would also lead to a loss of rights were already running when the loss of rights occurred, on granting the request for re-establishment the EPO will send the applicant a communication triggering those time limits anew.

4. Accelerated prosecution of European patent applications

Applicants requiring faster examination can ask to have their applications processed under the programme for accelerated prosecution of European patent applications (PACE) (see the notice from the EPO dated 30 October 2025, [OJ EPO 2025, A69](#)). For information on other ways to expedite the European grant procedure see [OJ EPO 2015, A94](#)).

Requests to participate in the PACE programme (PACE requests) must be filed online using the dedicated request form (EPO Form 1005). The EPO will issue an acknowledgement of receipt promptly. Requests filed informally, i.e. without using the dedicated form, and/or on paper will not be processed by the EPO.

A PACE request may be filed only once during examination, and for one application at a time. If the applicant wants accelerated examination too, a PACE request may be filed once the application has entered the examination phase.

The EPO does not publish requests for accelerated examination and, by decision of the President dated 12 July 2007 ([Special edition No. 3, OJ EPO 2007, J.3](#)), they are excluded from file inspection.

An application will be taken out of the PACE programme if:

- the PACE request has been withdrawn
- the applicant has requested an extension of time limits
- the application has been refused
- the application has been withdrawn
- the application is deemed to be withdrawn.

This applies regardless of the legal remedies available under the EPC. In such cases it will not be possible to restore the application to the PACE programme, i.e. a second request for that application during examination will not be processed.

Accelerated prosecution will also be suspended if renewal fees are not paid by the due date stipulated in Rule 51(1).

Accelerated prosecution under the PACE programme can be provided only where practically feasible and subject to the workload of the examining divisions. In certain technical fields there may be constraints due to the numbers of incoming PACE requests. Applicants requesting accelerated prosecution for all or most of their applications will, as a rule, be required by the EPO to limit the number of their PACE requests by making a selection.

4.1 Accelerated examination

In principle, accelerated examination can be requested at any time after the examining division has assumed responsibility for the application (Rule 10(2), (3)).

For PCT applications entering the European phase where the EPO also acted as (S)ISA, accelerated examination can, in principle, be requested at any time (see A-XII, 7.4), for example:

- on entry into the European phase before the EPO, or
- together with any response to the WO-ISA, IPER or SISR required under Rule 161(1).

When accelerated examination is requested, the EPO makes every effort to issue its next action within three months of receipt by the examining division of the application, the applicant's response under Rule 70a or the end of the period under Rule 161(1), or the request for accelerated examination (whichever is later).

In particular for PCT applications entering the European phase where the EPO acted as (S)ISA, accelerated examination can only start after expiry of the six-month period under Rule 161(1), even if acceleration has been requested under the PACE programme. In order for examination to start immediately, on entry into the European phase the applicant must explicitly

waive the right to the communication pursuant to Rule 161(1) and Rule 162(2) and fulfil all applicable requirements (see the notice from the EPO dated 30 November 2015, OJ EPO 2015, A94).

The EPO strives to produce subsequent examination communications within three months of receipt of the applicant's reply, provided that the application is still being processed under the PACE programme (see E-VIII, 4).

4.2 Patent Prosecution Highway (PPH)

The Patent Prosecution Highway (PPH) enables an applicant whose claims have been found to be allowable to have a corresponding application filed with a PPH partner office processed in an accelerated manner while at the same time allowing the offices involved to use available work results. A request before the EPO must be filed before substantive examination has begun.

A PPH request can be based on:

- (i) the latest PCT work product (WO-ISA or IPRP/IPER) established by one of the PPH partner offices as ISA or IPEA (PPH based on PCT work products) or
- (ii) any national work product (communication indicating allowable claims) established during the processing of a national application or of a PCT application that has entered the national phase before one of the PPH partner offices (PPH based on national work products).

Currently, the EPO's PPH partner offices are:

OJ EPO 2016, A44

JPO (Japan)	<u>OJ EPO 2022, A115</u>
MOIP (South Korea)	<u>OJ EPO 2022, A115</u>
CNIPA (China)	<u>OJ EPO 2022, A115</u>
USPTO (USA)	<u>OJ EPO 2022, A115</u>
ILPO (Israel)	<u>OJ EPO 2020, A125</u>
CIPO (Canada)	<u>OJ EPO 2020, A137</u>
IMPI (Mexico)	<u>OJ EPO 2020, A21</u>
IPOS (Singapore)	<u>OJ EPO 2020, A138</u>
IPA (Australia)	<u>OJ EPO 2022, A58</u>
SIC (Colombia)	<u>OJ EPO 2022, A88</u>
MyIPO (Malaysia)	<u>OJ EPO 2020, A82</u>
IPOPHL (Philippines)	<u>OJ EPO 2020, A83</u>
INPI (Brazil)	<u>OJ EPO 2024, A99</u>
INDECOPI (Peru)	<u>OJ EPO 2022, A116</u>
INAPI (Chile)	<u>OJ EPO 2024, A56</u>
IPONZ (New Zealand)	<u>OJ EPO 2024, A98</u>
MOIC (Bahrain)	<u>OJ EPO 2025, A19</u>

The PPH programmes with Rospatent (Russian Federation) and EAPO (Eurasia) have been suspended.

OJ EPO 2022, A44
and A45

5. Accelerated processing of oppositions

Where an action for infringement or revocation of a European patent is pending before the Unified Patent Court, the national court or the

competent authority of a contracting state, a party to the opposition proceedings may request accelerated processing. The request may be filed at any time. It must be filed in written reasoned form. In addition, the EPO will also accelerate the processing of the opposition if it is informed by the Unified Patent Court, the national court or the competent authority of a contracting state that infringement or revocation actions are pending (OJ EPO 2023, A99).

The specific acceleration measures adopted depend on when the EPO is notified of parallel court proceedings:

- (i) If the EPO is notified during the opposition period: after the period expires, the proprietor will be invited to comment on the opposition within three months; the summons will be issued within two months of receipt of the proprietor's reply, with the parties being summoned at minimum notice (Rule 115(1)).
- (ii) If the EPO is notified after expiry of the opposition period but before the proprietor's reply to the opposition: the summons to oral proceedings will be issued within two months of receipt of the proprietor's reply. The parties will be summoned at minimum notice (Rule 115(1)).
- (iii) After the proprietor has replied but before the summons has been issued: the summons to oral proceedings will be issued within two months of receipt of the information on parallel proceedings. The parties will be summoned at minimum notice (Rule 115(1)).
- (iv) After the summons has been sent: oral proceedings are rescheduled for the earliest possible date (provided that the time saving is significant).
- (v) After the decision has been pronounced: the decision and the minutes will be issued within one month.

For reasons of legal certainty, the accelerated processing of opposition proceedings is maintained even if the EPO is informed about the termination of parallel court proceedings. However, if the information about the termination of parallel court proceedings reaches the EPO before it invites the proprietor under Rule 79(1) to submit observations, the opposition proceedings will not be accelerated. In such a case, even though the EPO has already informed the parties about the intention to accelerate the opposition proceedings, the acceleration has effectively not started and there is no longer any reason for accelerated proceedings. The parties will then be informed that the opposition proceedings are not being accelerated.

6. Accelerated processing before the boards of appeal

Parties with a legitimate interest may ask the boards of appeal to deal with their appeals rapidly. This option is also available to the courts and competent authorities of the contracting states (see Art. 10 Rules of Procedure of the Boards of Appeal, OJ EPO 2019, A63, as amended by

OJ EPO 2021, A19). Information on the possibility of accelerating processing before the boards of appeal can be found on the EPO website.

7. Enquiries

In specific cases, parties to proceedings before the EPO may have an interest in enquiring about the progress of the file and obtaining information on when the next EPO action is to be expected. A specific procedure for enquiries is available to all parties to proceedings before the EPO's departments of first instance, and applies to enquiries filed on or after 1 February 2026 (see the notice from the EPO dated 16 December 2025, OJ EPO 2025, A70).

Under this procedure, an enquiry is processed and replied to only if it is filed online using EPO Form 1012. It may be submitted for only one application or patent at a time. The EPO will promptly issue an acknowledgement of receipt. Both the enquiries and the replies from the EPO form integral parts of the file and so are open to file inspection.

The time needed to handle enquiries depends on certain factors. For example, a failure to pay the renewal fee by the due date under Rule 51(1) may delay the EPO's handling of an enquiry.

In general, the EPO will reply to enquiries by indicating the period within which its next action can be expected, taking into account the workload in the technical area concerned and the internal deadline for completing the pending action.

An enquiry in respect of an application that is being processed under the PACE programme or for which a previous enquiry has been made and where an examining communication has not been performed within the committed period will automatically cause the EPO to issue the next action within one month of receipt of the enquiry.

Unlike the PACE programme, the filing of enquiries does not imply a general acceleration of the prosecution of European patent applications. Prosecution of the examination of the application can be accelerated by separately requesting processing under the PACE programme (see E-VIII, 4).

8. Renunciation of rights

8.1 Withdrawal of application or designation

Applicants may withdraw their application at any time as long as the application is pending, provided that no third parties have proven to the EPO that they have initiated proceedings concerning entitlement to the application pursuant to Rule 14. On whether an application is pending, see A-IV, 1.1.1.

Rule 15

The same applies to the withdrawal of a designation (see also A-III, 11.2.4). If all designations are withdrawn, the application is deemed to be withdrawn.

Art. 79(3)
Rule 39(2) and (3)

Art. 87(4)

The advantage of withdrawing an application in due time before the end of the eighteen-month period preceding publication is that its contents do not become known to the public (see A-VI, 1.2). If, furthermore, no rights have been left outstanding and the application has not served as a basis for claiming a right of priority, a subsequent application for the same invention can be considered the first application for the purposes of determining priority (see F-VI, 1.4.1). If the examination fee has been paid, it will be refunded in full or in part (see A-VI, 2.5).

Where a patent application has been refused, the proceedings remain pending until the period for filing an appeal has ended. If no appeal is filed, they cease to be pending on the day after the period ends. An application which is refused either in written or oral proceedings can therefore still be withdrawn in this period.

8.2 Withdrawal of priority claim

The priority claim may also be withdrawn (see F-VI, 3.5). If this is done before the technical preparations for publishing the application are completed, the publication will be deferred until eighteen months after the date of filing of the European application or, where multiple priorities are claimed, the earliest priority date remaining (see A-VI, 1.1 and A-III, 6.3).

8.3 Statement of withdrawal

Any statement of withdrawal must be unqualified and unambiguous. However, it may be conditional on e.g. avoidance of publication or refund of the examination fee. An unqualified and unambiguous withdrawal takes effect on the day it is received by the EPO.

If a statement of withdrawal is made orally during oral proceedings, then either a (handwritten) signed confirmation is to be submitted during the proceedings or the division has to confirm the withdrawal in the minutes and read out the related passage for confirmation in the oral proceedings. The withdrawal has effect from the date of the oral proceedings.

8.4 Surrender of patentRule 84(1)

Proprietors cannot surrender their patent in opposition proceedings by filing a declaration of surrender with the EPO. A surrender must be declared before the competent authorities in the designated states in question (see D-VII, 5.1). Nevertheless, if a proprietor unambiguously declares the surrender (or abandonment or renunciation) of the patent before the EPO, this is deemed equivalent to a request that the patent be revoked (see also D-VIII, 1.2.5).

Chapter IX – Decisions

1. Basic principles of decisions

1.1 General remarks

Decisions taken by the Receiving Section, the examining divisions, the opposition divisions and the Legal Division are open to appeal. Unless otherwise specified, the principles described in this chapter apply to all such decisions. They also apply to decisions taken by formalities officers to whom this work is entrusted (see the decisions of the President of the EPO dated 12 December 2013, [OJ EPO 2014, A6](#), and 23 November 2015, [OJ EPO 2015, A104](#)). [Art. 106\(1\)](#)
[Art. 113\(1\)](#)

According to [Art. 113\(1\)](#), decisions of the EPO may only be based on grounds or evidence on which the parties concerned have had an opportunity to present their comments.

This provision is intended to ensure that no party is taken by surprise by grounds for a decision against their request on which they did not have an opportunity to present their comments.

1.2 Consideration of time limits

A decision may not be given until any time limit set has expired, unless all the parties affected by the time limit expressly agree that it no longer needs to be observed or they have submitted their final opinions before it expires. However, a decision to grant a patent may be given once the applicant is deemed to have approved the text submitted to them under [Rule 71\(5\)](#) and has fulfilled all other formal requirements, even if the time limit set in the [Rule 71\(3\)](#) communication has not yet expired.

Moreover, as a rule, decisions will not be taken until an internal EPO time limit (e.g. 20 days) following on from the official time limit (but from which the parties cannot derive any rights) has expired. This is designed to ensure that documents received at the end of the period officially allowed have actually been put on file by the time the decision is taken and can therefore be taken into account in the decision.

On submissions and applications received after expiry of a time limit, see [E-VIII, 1.8](#).

1.3 Form and content

Decisions are to be produced in writing. This also applies to decisions delivered at the end of oral proceedings (see [E-III, 9](#)).

No exhaustive rules can be laid down about the form and content of decisions, which will depend on the requirements of each particular case.

The written decision will contain:

- the names of the parties to the proceedings (applicant, proprietor, opponents) and, if applicable, their representatives

- the order (operative part) and, if necessary,
- the facts and submissions
- the reasoning
- information about the possibility of appeal (Rule 111(2)) and
- the signature(s) and the name(s) of the employee(s) responsible.

Rule 113(1)

Even if the decision does not contain any information about the possibility of appeal, it is still open to appeal if it is incorrect, e.g. if the grant was not based on the documents that the applicant had approved.

If the decision is produced by the employee responsible on a computer, the EPO seal may replace their signature. If it is produced automatically by a computer, their name may also be dispensed with (Rule 113(2)).

1.3.1 Order

The order (or "operative part") of the decision must clearly state the party request at issue and the extent to which it is allowed (T 756/14). For example:

"The European patent application ... is hereby refused pursuant to Art. 97(2) EPC."

"The opposition to the European patent ... is hereby rejected."

"The request for re-establishment of rights is hereby rejected".

1.3.2 Facts and submissions

Facts and submissions have to be included if they are significant for the decision.

Under facts, there is a brief description of the case and a summary of the main reasons for the decision and of the parties' most important replies. However, these points are to be covered in detail in the subsequent reasoning.

1.3.3 Reasoning

The statement of grounds must first set out and substantiate the reasons for the decision, citing the individual EPC articles and rules involved.

On decisions taken by the examining or opposition division, see E-IX 2.6.

The decision-making department will draft its decision on the basis of on one or more grounds. It is essential that the parties have been given an opportunity to comment on all the grounds on which the decision is based.

When there are several grounds for a decision, it is imperative to link them in a logical way and, in particular, ensure that no ground contradicts an

earlier one. Furthermore, the chain of grounds must be structured so that it starts with the main ground.

All significant arguments advanced by a party to the proceedings are carefully examined and comprehensively discussed in the decision.

In individual cases, reasoning may also have to be given for decisions which simply grant a party's request. If, for example, several reasons are invoked in support of a request for re-establishment and only one of them justifies re-establishment, it may be appropriate to issue a reasoned decision on re-establishment in order to clarify the EPO action issued.

2. Decisions taken by the examining or opposition divisions

In substantive examination, applicants must have an opportunity to present their comments on all the grounds invoked against their application.

The search under Art. 54(3) must be completed before the examining division can refuse an application (see also C-IV, 7.1).

If the patent is to be revoked in opposition proceedings, it must be ensured that the proprietor of the patent in particular is given sufficient opportunity to defend themselves. Similarly, if the oppositions are to be rejected or if, despite the opponents' requests, the patent is to be maintained in amended form, the opponents in particular must be given the same opportunity. A decision may be based on grounds indicated in a document from one of the parties, provided the document has been sent to the other parties and so they have had an opportunity to comment.

If more than two months have elapsed between dispatch of the document "only for information" and the issue of the decision, this generally means that parties have had sufficient opportunity to comment and their right to be heard has therefore been respected (T. 263/93).

If the patent is to be maintained in amended form, there must be a text of the claims and description which has been approved by the patent proprietor (D-VI, 2), and the opponent or opponents must have had an opportunity to comment on it.

2.1 Right to be heard

The right to be heard is a right not just to present comments but also to have those comments duly considered. Amendments and arguments submitted by a party need to be considered, and the party must be given an opportunity to comment on the grounds and evidence brought forward by the examining division (see T. 1123/04 and T. 852/07). A document may not be cited for the first time in a decision (see T. 635/04) unless it has been introduced during oral proceedings. It is permissible to include fresh arguments in a decision that is still based on grounds and evidence communicated beforehand (see T. 268/00 and T. 1557/07).

If a case is remitted from the boards of appeal for further prosecution, the examining division must check whether requests from examination proceedings prior to the appeal are still outstanding and must give the party

an opportunity to comment (see T 1494/05). If the facts and grounds essential to a decision have been submitted by one party and if the party whose case is to be rejected has been afforded sufficient time to comment, the right to be heard set out in Art. 113(1) will have been respected. If the decision in opposition proceedings is to be based on grounds which were raised in the examination proceedings but not in the notice of opposition, the parties' observations or the communications of the opposition division, the opposition division must introduce them into the opposition proceedings (i.e. raised them for discussion) before giving its decision so as to afford the parties an opportunity to comment. If the opposition is based on lack of inventive step, the patent proprietor must expect that the prior art newly invoked in the opposition proceedings will be considered in conjunction with the prior art described in the introductory part of an independent claim. However, if new facts and grounds are introduced during the proceedings or if the facts and grounds on which the envisaged decision is to be based were not stated unambiguously and clearly enough in a party's written submissions for the other party to be able to comment, that other party must be given an opportunity to submit an opinion and to submit evidence before the decision is given.

A patent proprietor's right to be heard is not infringed if, in response to a communication from the opposition division setting out the main arguments against maintaining the patent as granted, they make only minor amendments to the claims and the result is that the grounds for revoking the patent remain essentially unchanged, provided the proprietor's comments have been duly considered.

In such a case, where the obstacles to maintenance have already been put to the proprietor and continue to apply, the patent may be revoked immediately, without any need to communicate again the full arguments on which the decision is based.

2.2 Authoritative text of documents

Art. 113(2)

The EPO must decide on the European patent application or the European patent only in the text submitted to it, or agreed, by the applicant or proprietor and last used as a basis for the proceedings. This means, for example, an amended version proposed by the examining or opposition division (see C-V, 1.1, D-VI, 4.2 and 7.2.1) may only be adopted as a basis for the decision if it has been approved by the applicant or proprietor.

In the case of one or more auxiliary requests directed to alternative texts for grant or maintenance of a patent, each one qualifies as a text submitted or agreed by the applicant or proprietor within the meaning of Art. 113(2) (see T 234/86), and these requests must therefore be dealt with in the order indicated or agreed to by the applicant or proprietor, up to and including the highest-ranking allowable request, if any.

When considering such requests, it is essential that they are dealt with in the correct order. If, for instance, the only allowable request is an auxiliary request, but it is accompanied by a higher-ranking auxiliary request for oral proceedings (e.g. a request that oral proceedings be held if the main request cannot be granted), a communication under Rule 71(3) cannot be

issued on the basis of the allowable request, but instead oral proceedings will have to be scheduled in accordance with the higher-ranking request, or a further communication under Rule 71(1) will have to be issued (see E-IX, 2.9). If the order of the requests is not clear from the applicant's submissions, the applicant must be contacted to clarify the situation before proceeding.

2.3 Requirements as to form

Decisions taken by the examining or opposition divisions must be in line with the principles set out in E-IX, 1. Where a decision is produced on a computer, the copy put on file contains the name and the actual signature of the employee (or employees) responsible.

Rule 111(1)

If, exceptionally, one or more division members cannot sign the decision, e.g. owing to extended illness, only a division member who was present at the oral proceedings (preferably the chair) may sign it on their behalf (see T 243/87). A brief written explanation as to why one member is signing on behalf of another must be provided (T 2348/19). A written decision signed by someone who did not take part in the oral proceedings at which the decision was pronounced is not legally valid (see T 390/86).

The presentation of the facts and the submissions, the reasoning and the information on the means of redress are generally omitted when a decision merely meets the requests of all the parties concerned; this applies in particular to the decision to grant, which is based on documents that the applicant has approved (Rule 71(5)). The same applies when the patent is maintained in an amended form, because this is preceded by a final interlocutory decision under Art. 106(2) concerning the documents on which the maintenance of the patent is to be based (see D-VI, 7.2.2).

The decision must be drafted only in the language of proceedings, in order to meet the requirements of Rule 111(2). Arguments of parties in another official language must be summarised in the language of proceedings. Deviations from this rule are possible in exceptional cases only, for instance where necessary to address questions of fact, evidence or law, e.g. in relation to witness statements.

2.4 Facts and submissions

For general aspects relating to facts and submissions, see E-IX, 1.3.2. Facts and submissions which are irrelevant to the decision, e.g. requests for amendment which are not maintained, are to be omitted. The facts and submissions must be consistent with what is recorded in the minutes of oral proceedings (also see E-III, 10.3).

The facts and submissions must clearly indicate the subject-matter of the application and the documents on which the decision is based. In examination, this requirement is met by including a detailed reference to the application documents dealt with in the decision, including, in particular, any amendments to the claims or to the description and any maintained auxiliary requests. In addition, the examining division may cite the text of any important claims or passages of the description in the decision. In opposition, the text of the independent claims and other especially

important claims or passages of the description on which the decision is based must be cited verbatim in the language of the proceedings (Rule 3(2)) either by copying the text into the decision or annexing a copy of the claims. As regards the dependent claims, it may be sufficient to refer to the file.

2.5 Decision on the file as it stands

Applicants may request a decision "on the file as it stands" or "according to the state of the file", e.g. when all arguments have been presented sufficiently in the proceedings and the applicant is interested in a speedy appealable decision. C.V.15 and subsections, describes the procedure to be followed in the case of such a request.

2.6 Reasoning for decisions

If the division finds that a patent cannot be granted, it will substantiate this in a decision citing the individual EPC articles and rules involved. For important general aspects relating to the reasoning for decisions, see the example below and E-IX.1.3.3.

Example

Often an application lacking an inventive step also lacks clarity. The decision must clearly set out whether the application is refused because the subject-matter of the claims is unclear and would also lack inventive step once clarified or whether it is refused because the subject-matter of the claims lacks inventive step and would have to be clarified once the inventive step objection is overcome.

Art. 113(1)
Rule 111(2)

The reasoning for each of the grounds on which the decision is based must contain, in logical sequence, those arguments which justify the order. It must be complete and independently comprehensible, i.e. generally without references. If, however, a question has already been raised in detail in a particular communication on file, the reasoning for the decision may be summarised accordingly and the communication can be referred to for the details.

The conclusions drawn from the facts and evidence, e.g. publications, must be made clear. In particular, the reasons must be consistent with the facts as set out in the decision and in the minutes (also see E-IX.2.4). The parts of a publication which are important for the decision must be cited in such a way that conclusions drawn from them can be checked without difficulty. Therefore, reference is made to each particular passage in the publication. It is not sufficient, for example, merely to assert that the cited publications show that the subject of a claim is known or obvious, or, conversely, do not cast doubt on its patentability.

The arguments put forward by the examiner during the proceedings form the "skeleton" for the decision and already provide a complete and unbroken chain of reasoning leading to refusal. The decision may be based only on reasons already communicated to the applicant (Art. 113(1)). The applicant's arguments must be dealt with either point by point at the appropriate juncture in the chain of reasoning or all together at the end. The

latter approach is often preferable as it makes clear that the final result is based solely on reasons already communicated to the applicant in compliance with Art. 113(1). In the part refuting the applicant's arguments, the decision must make clear why none of those arguments persuaded the examining division to depart from the final result.

It is particularly important to address important facts and arguments which may speak against the decision made, as it may otherwise appear that they have been overlooked. Documents which cover the same facts or arguments may be dealt with in summary form, in order to avoid unnecessarily long reasoning.

It is especially crucial to give complete and detailed reasoning when dealing with contentious points which are important for the decision; on the other hand, there is no need to include unnecessary details or additional reasons as further proof of what has already been proven.

The decision is a standalone document and must include a statement that the application is refused to show, where there are several grounds, that all of them form the basis for the refusal.

The decision must not contain any matter on which the parties have not had an opportunity to comment.

2.7 Content

The decision normally deals with all independent claims of the valid request or requests that were discussed during the proceedings. A single ground is enough to refuse an application, so it is not always necessary to deal with all the dependent claims. If, however, a particular dependent claim has been discussed, the decision includes the relevant arguments.

Any additional requests still outstanding must be dealt with in the refusal decision. If, for example, new oral proceedings were requested in circumstances where Art. 116(1), second sentence, applies, the decision must give the reasons for rejecting that request.

Wording that implies doubt or uncertainty, such as "seems" or "apparently", must be avoided in decisions.

2.8 Analysing the parties' arguments

All significant arguments advanced by a losing party to the proceedings are carefully examined and comprehensively refuted in the decision. The decision must substantiate the division's view that none of the submitted arguments overcome the objections it has raised.

However, facts not in dispute need be mentioned only briefly. Arguments by the parties which are clearly irrelevant to the issues involved do not need to be discussed.

2.9 Main and auxiliary requests

If, in **examination proceedings**, a main and auxiliary requests have been filed (see E-IX.2.2) and none of them is allowable, the reasons for the

decision to refuse the application under Art. 97(2) must not be limited to the main request, but must also include the reasons for the non-allowability of each auxiliary request. If one of the requests is allowable, the communication under Rule 71(3) is to be issued on the basis of the (first) allowable request and must be accompanied by a brief indication of the main reasons why the higher-ranking requests are not allowable or not admissible (see C-V, 1.1). If, in response to the communication under Rule 71(3), the applicant maintains higher-ranking requests which are not allowable or not admissible, a decision to refuse the application under Art. 97(2) will normally be issued (see C-V, 4.7 and 4.6.2). The reasons must set out the grounds for the non-allowability or non-admissibility of each request which ranks higher than the allowable request. In respect of the allowable request, the decision to refuse must mention that applicants have failed to give their approval to it.

Similarly, if in **opposition proceedings**, the proprietor has submitted, in addition to the main request, one or more auxiliary requests, none of which is allowable, the patent must be revoked and the decision must set out the reasons for not allowing each request submitted and maintained by the proprietor. Where one of the proprietor's requests directed to the maintenance of the patent in amended form is allowable, an interlocutory decision is to be issued on the basis of the (first) allowable request. The decision has to set out the reasons why this request meets the requirements of the EPC and, additionally, the reasons why the higher-ranking requests do not.

A decision rejecting multiple requests may not be taken until the applicant or proprietor has been informed of the reasons for not allowing each of these requests, so that they are not deprived of the opportunity to present comments (Art. 113(1) – right to be heard). Similarly, the opponent or opponents must be given an opportunity to comment on an auxiliary request before it is held allowable by an interlocutory decision (see D-VI, 7.2).

Practical considerations will determine at which point in the decision the auxiliary request is dealt with.

2.10 Late-filed submissions

Art. 114(2)
Rule 116

If an examining or opposition division has exercised its discretion under Art. 114(2) or Rule 116 to refuse late-filed facts, evidence or requests, its decision must give the reasons for its refusal. A mere reference to its discretionary power under Art. 114(2) or Rule 116 is not sufficient (see T 755/96). For details on how to exercise this discretion, see E-VI, 2 and H-II, 2.7.

2.11 Refusal to admit amendments under Rule 137(3)

Rule 137(3)

When, in exercising its discretion under Rule 137(3), the examining division refuses to admit amended claims, it must give reasons for doing so. For details on how to exercise this discretion, see H-II, 2.3 and H-II, 2.7.

If no other requests are on file, then there is no text agreed by the applicant and the application is to be refused under Art. 113(2).

3. Decisions which do not terminate proceedings – interlocutory decisions

A decision that does not terminate the proceedings as regards one of the parties is called an interlocutory decision. An interlocutory decision can only be appealed together with the final decision unless it allows separate appeal. *Art. 106(2)*

The competent department will use its discretion as to the need for an interlocutory decision (see, however, D-VI, 7.2.2 on interlocutory decisions to maintain a patent in amended form in opposition proceedings). To avoid fragmentation of the proceedings, interlocutory decisions will be the exception rather than the rule and will be given only if the duration or cost of the proceedings as a whole is reduced as a result. The interests of the parties should also be taken into consideration as appropriate.

An interlocutory decision will normally be contemplated only for the purpose of allowing separate appeal, as this is the only way a decision can be obtained on a preliminary point before the final decision terminating the proceedings is reached. (The proceedings must be suspended until the decision has become final.) It is especially important to allow separate appeal where the continuation of the proceedings depends on a preliminary ruling on a fundamental point of law, e.g. where different boards of appeal have given different rulings or conflicting decisions have been given by different examining or opposition divisions and there is no decision of a board of appeal on the matter.

Interlocutory decisions must state the reasons on which they are based (see E-IX, 1.3.3).

If it is decided not to allow separate appeal, the reasons for this ruling may be given in the final decision instead.

A ruling to allow a separate appeal must be part of the order of the decision (E-IX, 1.3.1) (T 756/14).

4. Binding nature of decisions on appeals

If a department has to give a decision in a case which has already been remitted to it by the board of appeal for further prosecution, it is bound by the *ratio decidendi* of the board of appeal in so far as the facts, e.g. the subject-matter of the patent and the relevant prior art, are the same. *Art. 111(2)*

An opposition division is not bound by a decision of a board of appeal on appeal against a decision from an examining division (see T 167/93). The exclusive wording of the last sentence of Art. 111(2), which says only that examining divisions are bound by the decision on appeal against a decision of the Receiving Section, makes this clear. Opposition proceedings are entirely separate from the examination proceedings, and the opposition division is free to re-examine the facts, evidence and arguments, particularly since another party (the opponent) is now involved. However, it must take due account of the assessment of these facts, evidence and arguments in the reasons for the decision of the board of appeal.

5. Information on means of redressRule 111(2)

Decisions of the EPO which are open to appeal must be accompanied by a written communication of the possibility of appeal. The communication must also draw the parties' attention to the provisions of Art. 106 to 108 and Rules 97 and 98, the text of which must be attached. The parties may not invoke the omission of the communication.

6. NotificationArt. 119

Decisions must be notified as a matter of course (see E-II, 2).

7. Expiry of the term of the European patentArt. 63Art. 89

According to Art. 63(1), the term of the European patent is 20 years from the date of filing of the application. The contracting states can extend that the term in specific circumstances (Art. 63(2)).

The expiry of the 20-year term does not mean that the European patent application is no longer pending. An applicant may still have a legitimate interest in the grant of the patent in view of provisional protection provided for in Art. 67(1). This means that examination of the application must continue unless the applicant withdraws the application or allows it to lapse by not responding to a communication issued by the examining division.

Rule 75Rule 84Rule 98

An opposition or an appeal can be filed even if the European patent has been surrendered or has lapsed in all contracting states (see D-I, 2 and E-XI, 2 respectively). On the effect of the expiry of the 20-year term on pending opposition proceedings, see D-VII, 5.1.

Similarly, a request for limitation or revocation can be filed after the term of the European patent has expired.

Chapter X – Impartiality of divisions

Members of the competent divisions may not take part in the decision on a case:

- (i) in which they may have any personal interest (partiality for subjective reasons) or
- (ii) in respect of which the party may have good reasons to suspect partiality (partiality for objective reasons).

For a partiality objection to be admissible, it must be raised immediately after the party has become aware of the reason for it. It must also be accompanied by a reasoned statement of grounds setting out the supporting facts and arguments and, where appropriate, any evidence. Unsubstantiated and merely general statements, e.g. based on the nationality of the member concerned, are not admissible.

A partiality objection must be submitted to the competent division, which will forward it to the line manager responsible for the division member concerned, along with the member's statement on the facts and circumstances alleged by the party. The line manager will decide on the objection and issue a reasoned decision in writing.

If the partiality objection has been raised in written proceedings and has been found allowable, the division member or members concerned are replaced. If the objection has been found either inadmissible or not allowable, the proceedings will continue. In either case, the line manager's decision will be communicated to the parties as an annex to a communication from the division or to the division's decision, and will be referred to in the facts and submissions part of the division's decision.

If the partiality objection is raised in oral proceedings, they are interrupted to enable the line manager responsible to assess it. They are resumed on the same day, and the parties are informed of the outcome of the assessment. If the line manager considers the challenge allowable, the oral proceedings are adjourned and then continued by a division in which the member concerned has been replaced. If the line manager finds the objection either inadmissible or not allowable, the division will inform the parties accordingly and the oral proceedings will continue. In either case, the line manager's decision will be communicated to the parties, normally as an annex to the division's decision, and will be referred to in the facts and submissions part of that decision.

Chapter XI – Appeals

1. Suspensive effect

This chapter deals in detail only with those questions which are relevant for interlocutory revision. At this stage of the proceedings, the department of first instance is still competent. More information on the appeal proceedings and the rules of procedure of the boards of appeal can be found on the EPO website.

Art. 23(3)

Art. 109

Decisions of the Receiving Section, examining divisions, opposition divisions and the Legal Division are open to appeal.

Art. 106(1)

An appeal has suspensive effect. This means that the decision cannot yet become final and its effects are suspended. As the decision cannot then be enforced, the following do not take place: entry in the Register of European Patents, mention in the European Patent Bulletin and, where appropriate, publication of a new specification of the European patent. For more information on the binding nature of decisions of the boards of appeal, see E-IX.4.

2. Appeals after surrender or lapse of the patent

An appeal may be filed against the decision of the opposition division even if the European patent has been surrendered or has lapsed for all the designated states.

Rule 98

3. Appeals against the apportionment of costs

The apportionment of costs of opposition proceedings cannot be appealed on its own. Parties to the proceedings who feel that they have been adversely affected by the apportionment of costs may therefore file an appeal against the decision on costs only if they also file an appeal against the decision on the opposition on other admissible grounds.

Rule 97(1)

4. Appeals against the decision of the opposition division on the fixing of costs

In accordance with Rule 97(2), the decision of the opposition division fixing the amount of costs of opposition proceedings may be appealed if the amount is more than the fee for appeal.

Rule 97(2)

Art. 13 RFees

5. Persons entitled to appeal and to be parties to appeal proceedings

Any party to proceedings adversely affected by a decision may appeal. Any other parties to the proceedings are parties to the appeal proceedings as of right.

Art. 107

6. Time limit and form of appeal

Notice of appeal must be filed with the EPO within two months of the date of notification of the contested decision. It must contain the name and the address of the appellant as provided in Rule 41(2)(c), an indication of the contested decision and a request defining the subject of the appeal.

Art. 108

Rule 99(1)

The notice is not deemed to have been filed until the fee for appeal fixed in the Rules relating to Fees under the EPC has been paid. For appeals filed

Rule 7a(2)

on or after 1 April 2018 by natural persons and entities referred to in former Rule 6(4) and (5), i.e. small and medium-sized enterprises, non-profit organisations, universities and public research organisations, and from 1 April 2024 in Rule 7a(2), i.e. also for microenterprises, a reduced fee for appeal is payable, provided that a declaration of entitlement is filed at the latest by the time of payment of the reduced fee (see the notice from the EPO dated 18 December 2017, OJ EPO 2018, A5).

Rule 99(2)

Within four months of the date of notification of the decision, a written statement setting out the grounds of appeal must be filed. In the statement of grounds of appeal, the appellant must indicate the reasons for setting aside the contested decision or the extent to which it is to be amended and the facts and evidence on which the appeal is based.

7. Interlocutory revision

7.1 General remarks

Art. 109(1)

If the department whose decision is contested considers the appeal to be admissible and well founded, it must rectify its decision. This does not apply where the appellant is opposed by another party to the proceedings.

This means that a duty or possibility of rectification may arise in connection with a decision by the Receiving Section, the Legal Division, an examining division or, exceptionally, an opposition division if all oppositions were withdrawn and the proprietor has filed an appeal.

Art. 109(2)

After receipt of the statement of grounds, only three months are available to the department of first instance for rectifying its decision. It must therefore consider the appeal with the highest priority and start examining admissibility immediately. If it finds that the appeal is admissible in the form in which it has been filed, it will start examining allowability immediately.

The department concerned will rectify its decision if convinced in the light of the grounds of appeal that the appeal is admissible and well founded, for example because:

- (i) the department failed to take due account of some of the material available to it at the time the decision was made
- (ii) owing to an error on the EPO's part, the department did not receive material that had been filed at the EPO in due time before the decision was issued or
- (iii) although the department's decision does not appear to be incorrect, the applicant presents new information or evidence or files amendments to the application which overcome the objections in the decision (see T 139/87).

On the advantages of a decision covering more than one objection, see E-IX, 2.6.

In either case, whether the appealed decision is rectified or the appeal is remitted to the board, a decision issued by the examining or opposition division may be signed only by the examiners belonging to the division at the time of signature. If an examiner is absent for a long period or has left the department, a new member must be appointed to the division.

7.2 Remittal to the board of appeal

If the appeal is not allowed within three months of receipt of the statement of grounds, it must be remitted to the competent board of appeal without delay, and without comment as to its merit. This means that the department of first instance does not address any substantive comments to the board. Internal notes made by division members about the merits of the appeal are kept in the non-public part of the file and are not sent to the board of appeal.

Art. 109(2)

The examining division cannot decide whether the appeal is well-founded until it has received the statement of grounds of appeal. Such statements can be filed at any time within four months of notification of the decision (*Art. 108*). The examining division will therefore wait until all the grounds are received before deciding whether to allow interlocutory revision or to remit the appeal to the board, in order to ensure that the full content of the statement of grounds has been received.

7.3 Reimbursement of appeal fees

In the event of interlocutory revision, the department whose decision was contested will order reimbursement of the appeal fee if this is equitable because of a substantial procedural violation. This is particularly the case when essential facts or evidence were not taken into consideration in arriving at a decision, e.g. where a document filed at the EPO in good time by the party concerned was not put on file before the decision was reached or where the decision is based on facts or evidence on which the parties concerned had no opportunity to comment. The appeal fee is to be reimbursed, even if this was not explicitly requested by the appellant (see *G 3/03*).

Rule 103(1)(a)

Art. 109

The appeal fee will not be reimbursed if the basis for rectifying the decision by interlocutory revision is not a substantial procedural violation but, for example, amendments submitted by the party concerned when filing the appeal.

If the department whose decision is contested considers the requirements in *Art. 109* for interlocutory revision to be fulfilled, but not the requirements in *Rule 103(1)(a)* for reimbursement of the appeal fee, it must rectify its decision and remit the request for reimbursement to the board of appeal for a decision (see *J 32/95*).

The request for reimbursement of the appeal fee will be remitted to the board of appeal only if it was filed together with the appeal (see *G 3/03* and *T 21/02*).

7.4 Examples

7.4.1 No amended claims filed with the appeal

If the applicant has filed an appeal but not any amended claims, the division checks whether the decision was substantively correct. Interlocutory revision is allowed only if it was not. Reimbursement of the appeal fee is to be ordered if there was a substantial procedural violation (see [E-XI, 7.3](#)). If interlocutory revision is granted but new objections then arise, the division communicates these objections to the applicant as often as necessary to reach a final decision. This could include holding oral proceedings (again) and/or a second refusal.

Example

The applicant points out in the letter of appeal that the examining division overlooked a request for oral proceedings.

The examining division looks at the file and notes that this was indeed the case: interlocutory revision must be granted, even if it results in a further refusal after oral proceedings have been held. The appeal fee must be reimbursed.

7.4.2 Amended main/single request filed with the appeal

If amendments clearly overcome the grounds for refusal, interlocutory revision is granted even if further new objections arise. This is because the applicant has the right to examination at two instances (see [T 219/93](#)).

Important criteria are (see [T 47/90](#)):

1. the text is no longer the same
2. substantial amendments have been made.

"Substantial" amendments overcome grounds for refusal based on the documents already cited in the decision (e.g. example (d) below).

The examiner has discretion to decide whether, in each particular case, the amendments to the claims are such that examination has to be continued on a new basis, e.g. where a completely new line of argument on inventive step would be necessary.

In arriving at this decision, the examiner takes into account all the grounds mentioned in the original decision, including the main or supporting arguments already raised in previous objections to patentability to which the applicant has had an opportunity to respond and to which reference is made in the grounds of refusal (e.g. objections mentioned in previous communications, during personal consultation or at oral proceedings). This is in the interest of procedural efficiency and to the benefit of the applicant (no second appeal fee necessary; see [T 2445/11](#)).

If amendments made to the independent claims clearly do not meet the requirements of [Art. 123\(2\)](#), interlocutory revision is not granted, and the

division remits the appeal to the boards of appeal. If there are doubts as to whether the amendments meet the requirements of Art. 123(2) or the amendments clearly meet the requirements of Art. 123(2), the division checks whether the amended claims overcome the ground or grounds for refusal as described above.

Examples

- (a) The applicant has included a wording that has already been suggested by the examiner, the new claims are ready for grant but the description needs to be adapted: interlocutory revision must be granted since the grounds for the refusal have been overcome.
- (b) **Refusal for lack of novelty only.** New claims are clearly novel but not inventive. The question of inventive step was not raised in the decision or in the proceedings up to then: interlocutory revision must be granted.
- (c) **Refusal for lack of novelty.** New claim 1 filed which includes a feature from dependent claim 3. This claim has already been discussed in the decision and was considered not to be inventive: no interlocutory revision.
- (d) **Refusal for lack of novelty over D1.** New claim 1 filed which includes a feature from the description. This feature has not previously been discussed *per se* but is clearly disclosed in D1: no interlocutory revision since the ground for refusal – lack of novelty over D1 – has not been overcome.
- (e) **Refusal for lack of inventive step over D1 and D2.** New claims filed which include a feature from the description. This feature has not previously been discussed but is clearly disclosed in D1, and therefore there is no change in the line of argument: no interlocutory revision since the ground for refusal – lack of inventive step over D1 and D2 – has not been overcome.
- (f) **Refusal for lack of inventive step over D1 and D2.** New claim filed which includes five new features from the description. These features have not previously been discussed. The examiner notes that although these features are disclosed in D2, the line of argument relating to inventive step would have to be revised: interlocutory revision is granted because (i) the applicant has made substantial amendments to overcome the objections raised in the decision and (ii) the line of argument has to be revised.
- (g) **Refusal for novelty over D1.** New claims filed which clearly relate to unsearched subject-matter and which do not combine with the original searched claims to form a single general inventive concept: no interlocutory revision because the new claims are inadmissible.

7.4.3 Main and auxiliary requests filed with the appeal

Interlocutory revision can never be granted on the basis of an auxiliary request, even if the auxiliary request would overcome the grounds for the decision (T 919/95).

Example

The main request is the same as the one refused (i.e. not amended). However, the auxiliary request is in line with a suggestion made by the examining division and so would be allowable. There can be no interlocutory revision since the applicant has the right to have the main request examined by the boards of appeal.

7.4.4 Response to communication under Rule 58 filed with the appeal

If, in response to the Receiving Section's refusal of the application under Art. 90(5), the related deficiencies are fully rectified so as to overcome the grounds for refusal, interlocutory revision is granted by the Receiving Section.

Example

On the date of filing, the drawings did not comply with the requirements set by the President under Rule 49(2). The application was subsequently refused (Art. 90(5)) because the applicant had filed the same poor-quality drawings in reply to the communication under Rule 58. When filing an appeal complying with the requirements of Art. 108, the applicant also files drawings of sufficient quality and so corrects the deficiency on which the refusal was based. Since the ground for the refusal has been overcome and the reasoning in the decision under appeal no longer applies, the Receiving Section grants interlocutory revision and does not refer the case to the boards of appeal.

8. Rules of Procedure of the Boards of Appeal

Details of the procedure before the boards of appeal, including the acceleration of appeal proceedings, can be found in the Rules of Procedure of the Boards of Appeal (see OJ EPO 2019, A63, as amended by OJ EPO 2021, A19). The Enlarged Board of Appeal has also adopted Rules of Procedure (see OJ EPO 2015, A35).

9. Remittal to the examining or opposition division after appeal

If a decision by an examining or opposition division is appealed, the board of appeal may remit the case to the division under Art. 111(1). In such cases, the exact wording of the orders must be complied with. There are various possible scenarios:

- (a) The case is remitted for grant or maintenance in amended or limited form on the basis of a complete text which has been finally decided by the board.
- (b) The case is remitted for the description to be brought into line with claims whose wording has been finally decided by the board.

(c) The case is remitted for further prosecution.

In scenario (a), grant or maintenance is handled by the formalities officer. The division provides input by verifying the classification and title and adding any references to supplementary technical information (STIN) or newly cited documents (CDOC). The examining division also carries out a top-up search for national prior rights and provides information about whether any are found to be *prima facie* relevant, if this has not already been done in the proceedings. This information may assist the applicant in deciding whether to request Unitary Patent protection or choose the traditional validation route (C-IV, 7.2).

If the applicant requests further amendments under Rule 71(6), the application will be deemed withdrawn under Rule 71(7) as the procedure under Rule 71(6) cannot be applied in view of Art. 111(2).

Where the case is remitted with the order to grant, or maintain, the patent on the basis of documents with handwritten amendments, the formalities officer, acting on behalf of the competent division, invites the applicant, or proprietor, to file a formally compliant version of the amended text under Art. 94(3) or Rule 82(2), as the case may be (see E-III, 8.7.2 and E-III, 8.7.3 respectively).

In scenario (b) above, the board has taken a final decision on the wording of the claims which ends the matter. The division can no longer amend the claims or allow the applicant or proprietor to do so, even if new facts (e.g. new relevant citations) come to light (see T 113/92, Headnote No. 2, and T 1063/92, Headnote, second paragraph). Corrections under Rule 139 may still be allowable, however.

As far as possible, applicants and proprietors should respect the need for procedural economy when bringing the description into line with the claims' wording as decided by the board of appeal, and so completely retyped texts will normally not be accepted (see T 113/92, Headnote No. 1).

In scenario (c) above, the division whose decision was appealed is bound by the board's *ratio decidendi* in so far as the facts are the same (Art. 111(2)). However, new relevant documents or facts which come to light must be taken into account. In particular:

- the parties must be given the opportunity to submit further requests, and
- the division must check whether requests from examination or opposition proceedings prior to the appeal (e.g. for oral proceedings) are still outstanding – see T 892/92, Headnote.

Chapter XII – Request from a national court for a technical opinion concerning a European patent

1. General

At the request of the competent national court hearing an infringement or revocation action and for an appropriate fee, the EPO is obliged to give a technical opinion on the European patent which is the subject of the action. The examining divisions are responsible for issuing such opinions. *Art. 25*

Only requests from a national court in a contracting state will be accepted by the EPO. However, it is not up to the EPO to check whether or not the requesting court is "competent" to deal with the action. Nevertheless, the examining division does check whether a European patent is the "subject of the action".

The examining division responsible for the technical opinion gives the parties an opportunity to submit arguments in writing if the court so permits. However, the parties have no right to be heard before the EPO. Nevertheless, where the examining division considers it necessary, it may invite the parties, via the court and if the court so permits, either to be heard before the examining division or to submit supplementary observations on specific points identified by it. If the parties are heard, the hearing is not considered to be oral proceedings within the meaning of *Art. 116*.

The technical opinion is not a decision of the EPO. The parties to the national proceedings therefore have no right of appeal before the EPO against an unfavourable opinion.

2. Scope of the technical opinion

The examining division is obliged to give a "technical opinion" on request. This means that the division is bound to give an opinion only in so far as the questions put are of a technical character. However, the examining division must not be too restrictive about this and will attempt to assist the national court as much as is reasonably possible, while remembering that the actual decision on infringement or revocation is exclusively a matter for the national court.

Generally speaking, the examining division attempts to give a technical opinion on any technical question which is similar to those normally dealt with in European substantive examination work, even when it also has a legal dimension. On the other hand, the examining division will decline to make any specific statement on whether a patent is valid or on whether it is infringed. It also does not give any opinion on the extent of protection (*Art. 69* and the accompanying Protocol).

A request from a national court is expected to be clearly and precisely worded, so that the examining division will be in no doubt about the questions on which the court wishes to have an opinion. Since the court is responsible for deciding the issues of law involved in the questions and since most questions are a mixture of legal and technical aspects, the court

is expected to separate the legal aspects as clearly as possible from the technical aspects it wants the EPO to give an opinion on.

3. Composition and duties of the examining division

3.1 Composition

The composition of the examining division to which the request is referred must be as defined in Art. 18(2). This means that the division must include three technical examiners; normally, a legally qualified examiner will also be included. The main responsibility for dealing with the request up to the time of drawing up the opinion is entrusted to one technical examiner (referred to below as the "primary examiner").

In order to guarantee that the opinion given is not influenced by earlier proceedings before the EPO on the application/patent in question, examiners who have taken part in these proceedings as members of an examining or opposition division will be excluded from the examining division set up under Art. 25. Where this is not practicable, the national court and the parties are informed of the proposed members of the examining division under Art. 25 and of which of them have taken part in European examination or opposition proceedings on the case. The court will be asked to state whether, in the circumstances, it still requests a technical opinion.

3.2 Duties

The primary examiner will act on behalf of the examining division and will normally be responsible for issuing communications to the court. The primary examiner also drafts the written opinion and circulates the draft to the other members of the examining division for consideration. If changes to the draft are proposed and views on these changes differ, the chair arranges a meeting to resolve the matter. The final opinion is signed by all members of the division.

4. Language to be used

In principle, the language to be used is the language of the proceedings relating to the European patent, but another official language of the EPO may be used at the court's request. At least the request for an opinion itself, any submissions from the parties and any amendments to the patent must be in that language or translated into that language. The opinion is also produced in that language. However, where appropriate, the examining division will take the provisions of Art. 70(2) to (4) into account.

The provisions of Rule 3(3) apply to documents to be used as evidence (see A-VII, 3).

The court or the parties are responsible for providing any translations required to satisfy the above conditions.

5. Procedure

The procedure will normally involve the stages described below.

5.1 Formalities check

The formalities officer will check whether the fee has been paid and whether there are any obvious deficiencies as to the language requirements. If there are any deficiencies in these respects, the formalities officer will write to the national court to inform it that substantive work on the opinion will not begin until the deficiencies have been remedied. However, no time limit can be imposed on the court.

Art. 2(1).
item 20. RFees

If the file indicates that the court permits the parties to submit written arguments to the EPO and such arguments are not already on the file, the formalities officer will write, via the court, to the parties to give them a time limit (e.g. two months) for submitting their arguments.

5.2 Preliminary examination

Once the formal requirements have been met, and any arguments of the parties are on file, the case will be referred to the directorate responsible for the technical field of the patent for the setting up of the examining division. If an examining division consisting entirely of new members can be formed or, where this is not possible, the court nevertheless maintains its request for a technical opinion (see E-XII, 3.1), the primary examiner will perform a preliminary examination to determine whether:

- (i) the questions put by the national court are ones that the examining division is competent to answer, at least in part, and
- (ii) the papers filed are sufficiently complete and the necessary translations have also been filed.

If there are any deficiencies in these respects, the primary examiner will write to the national court accordingly.

5.3 Withdrawal of the request

If the request for a technical opinion is withdrawn before the examining division starts any substantive work on the opinion, 75% of the fee will be refunded.

Art. 10. RFees

5.4 Establishment and issue of the technical opinion

Once any deficiencies referred to in E-XII, 5.1 or E-XII, 5.2, above have been remedied, the examining division draws up the technical opinion as soon as possible.

The opinion is sent to the national court. Any papers received from the court which belong to the national proceedings are sent back with the opinion.

5.5 File inspection

The file relating to a request for a technical opinion is not a file within the meaning of Art. 128 and is not available for file inspection.

5.6 Appearance before the national court

If, after the opinion is issued, the national court asks the examining division to appear before it, the court is informed that the EPO is willing to send one

member of the division on condition that costs are paid and on the understanding that this member will be required only to answer questions on the technical opinion given and will not be required to give an opinion on additional matters unless the examining division is notified in writing of these additional matters at least one month before the appearance before the court.

Chapter XIII – Registration of changes of name, transfers, licences and other rights

1. General

Under Rules 22 to 24 and 85 in conjunction with Rule 143(1)(w), rights relating to an application or, where applicable, a European patent and any transfers of such rights are registered in the European Patent Register.

Transfers and changes of name are recorded as particulars of the applicant or proprietor in accordance with Rule 143(1)(f).

2. Department responsible

The Legal Division of the EPO has sole responsibility for these registrations (see the decision of the President of the EPO dated 21 November 2013, OJ EPO 2013, 600). *Art. 20*

However, the Legal Division may entrust specific duties which do not require legal expertise to formalities officers (see the decision of the President of the EPO dated 21 November 2013, OJ EPO 2013, 601).

3. Transfer of the European patent application

A European patent application may be transferred for one or more of the designated contracting states. *Art. 71*

Art. 72 is an autonomous provision which governs only the formal requirements for a transfer. The EPO registers a transfer of rights in respect of a pending European patent application (see A-IV, 1.1.1 and J 10/93) in the European Patent Register on request, if the conditions in Rule 22 are fulfilled. The registration of the transfer may be subject to the payment of an administrative fee under the conditions laid down by the President of the EPO pursuant to Rule 22(2). There is no administrative fee where the request is filed via MyEPO (see the decision of the President of the EPO dated 25 January 2024, OJ EPO 2024, A5). Otherwise, an administrative fee is payable and the request is not deemed to have been filed until it has been paid (see A-X, 2). The amount of the fee can be found in the latest schedule of fees and expenses of the EPO (see *epo.org*). *Art. 72 Rule 22(1) and (2)*

Where a fee is payable and the request relates to multiple applications, a separate fee has to be paid for each one. The only way to pay fees for multiple applications simultaneously is by using the batch payment functionality in Central Fee Payment (see OJ EPO 2022, A81). Where batch payment was attempted by other means, e.g. by editing the payable amount on an electronically filed EPO Form 1038, the transfer will be registered for the first application only and the overpayment will be refunded. The fee for each of the applications for which the batch payment failed will need to be paid again, which will lead to different dates of legal effect.

Rule 22 also requires the production of documents proving the transfer. Any kind of written evidence suitable for this is admissible. This includes formal documentary proof such as the instrument of transfer itself (the

original or a copy) or other official documents or extracts from them that directly verify the transfer (J.12/00). Art. 72 requires that assignment documents be signed by the parties to the contract. Assignment documents may bear handwritten, facsimile, text-string or digital signatures under the conditions specified by the EPO (see the decision of the President of the EPO dated 9 February 2024, OJ EPO 2024, A17, and the notice from the EPO dated 9 February 2024, OJ EPO 2024, A22). A facsimile signature is a reproduction of a person's signature. A text-string signature is a string of characters, preceded and followed by a forward slash (/), selected by the person to prove their identity and their intent to sign. Documents with a facsimile signature or a text-string signature may be filed either on paper or electronically using the EPO's electronic filing services. In addition, the EPO will accept digital signatures, for example those using public key infrastructure (PKI) technology, including advanced and qualified electronic signatures within the meaning of the EU's eIDAS Regulation. Documents with a digital signature must be filed electronically (see A-II, 1.1.1).

Documents can be signed on behalf of a legal person only by persons who are entitled to do so by law, by the legal person's articles of association or equivalent or by a special mandate. Entitlement to sign is governed by national law. In all cases, there must be an indication of the person signing's entitlement to sign, e.g. their position within the legal entity where the entitlement results directly from that position. It is up to the contracting parties to ensure that the signatories are duly authorised to sign the document under the applicable national law. However, the EPO reserves the right to request documentary proof of the person signing's entitlement to sign if necessary in view of the circumstances of a particular case. If the evidence then presented is found to be unsatisfactory, the EPO informs the party requesting the transfer accordingly and invites them to remedy the stated deficiency within a given time limit.

As a general rule, an authorisation to represent a party in proceedings before the EPO within the meaning of Rule 152, be it an individual or a general authorisation, is not as such considered to empower the representative to enter into an assignment agreement.

If the request complies with the requirements of Rule 22, the transfer is registered with the date on which the EPO received the request, the required evidence or, where applicable, the fee, whichever is the latest. If there is a minor deficiency, i.e. if all requirements were fulfilled but not completely (e.g. the request was signed but the name and/or position of the person signing were missing), the transfer will be registered – after rectification of the deficiency – with effect from the date of receipt of the original request for registration.

On the above date, the transfer becomes effective for the EPO, i.e. from that date the newly registered applicant is entitled to exercise the right to the European patent application in proceedings before the EPO (Art. 60(3)). If the transfer was for certain designated states only, Art. 118 applies.

Rule 22(3)

Once a transfer has been duly entered in the European Patent Register, the registration cannot be undone, even if it turns out that one or more requirements were actually not fulfilled for reasons not apparent at the time when the transfer was registered by the EPO, e.g. where doubts arise later about whether the person signing on behalf of one of the parties was entitled to enter a transfer agreement (see decisions J 16/14 to J 22/14). The previous situation cannot be restored until the actual legal circumstances have been established. In the meantime, proceedings may have to be stayed under Rule 14 or 78 until it is clear who the legitimate applicant/proprietor is.

Art. 20

4. Transfer of the European patent

Rule 22 applies *mutatis mutandis* to the registration of a transfer of the European patent during the opposition period or during opposition proceedings. After expiry of the opposition period or termination of the opposition proceedings, transfers are to be registered in the relevant national registers by the national authorities concerned and, if applicable, in the Unitary Patent Register. Where a fee is due and the request relates to both a European patent and to a European patent with unitary effect, only one fee is due (see UP Guidelines, 6.2).

Rule 85

5. Changes of name

Mere changes of name, i.e. changes that do not involve a change in the applicant's legal identity, can be entered in the European Patent Register on request, supported by documentary evidence, as long as the application (cf. A-IV.1.1.1) or the proceedings before the EPO are pending. The registration is free of charge.

6. Licences and other rights

6.1 Registration

A European patent application may give rise to rights *in rem*, may be licensed and may be the subject of legal means of execution. Only contractual licences can be registered (Art. 73). Licences and other rights may be geographically limited to certain parts of the territories of the designated contracting states.

Art. 71

Art. 73

Rule 23(1)

Rule 24(a) and (b)

In the case of co-applicants, each of them must consent to the registration of licences.

Rule 22(1) and (2) applies *mutatis mutandis* to the registration of the grant, establishment or transfer of such rights (see E-XIII.3). Licences and other rights cannot be registered in the European Patent Register after the decision to grant has become effective (Art. 97(3)).

A licence will be recorded in the European Patent Register as an exclusive licence if the applicant and the licensee so request. A licence will be

recorded as a sub-licence where it is granted by a licensee whose licence is recorded in the European Patent Register.

6.2 Cancellation of the registration

Rule 22(2)

Rule 23(2)

A registration of licences or other rights is cancelled on request, supported by documents showing that the right has lapsed or by the written consent of the proprietor of the right to the cancellation. Rule 22(2) applies *mutatis mutandis*, i.e. the cancellation may be subject to the payment of an administrative fee. Cancellation is only possible until publication of the mention of the grant.

Part F

The European Patent Application

Contents

Chapter I – Introduction **I-1**

Chapter II – Content of a European patent application (other than claims) **II-1**

1.	General	II-1
2.	Abstract	II-1
2.1	Purpose of the abstract	II-1
2.2	Definitive content	II-1
2.3	Content of the abstract	II-1
2.4	Figure accompanying the abstract	II-2
2.5	Checklist	II-2
2.6	Transmittal of the abstract to the applicant	II-2
2.7	Abstract in examination	II-2
3.	Request for grant – the title	II-3
4.	Description (formal requirements)	II-3
4.1	General remarks	II-3
4.2	Technical field	II-4
4.3	Background art	II-4
4.3.1	Format of background art citations	II-6
4.3.1.1	Examples of quotation for non-patent literature	II-6
4.3.1.2	Examples of quotation for patent literature	II-7
4.4	Irrelevant or unnecessary matter	II-7
4.5	Technical problem and its solution	II-7
4.6	Rule 42(1)(c) vs Art. 52(1)	II-8
4.7	Reference in the description to drawings	II-8
4.8	Reference signs	II-8
4.9	Industrial application	II-8
4.10	Manner and order of presentation	II-9

4.11	Terminology	<u>II-9</u>
4.12	Computer programs	<u>II-9</u>
4.13	Physical values, units	<u>II-9</u>
4.14	Registered trade marks	<u>II-10</u>
5.	Drawings	<u>II-10</u>
5.1	Form and content	<u>II-10</u>
5.2	Printing quality	<u>II-11</u>
5.3	Photographs	<u>II-11</u>
6.	Sequence listings	<u>II-11</u>
6.1	Reference to sequences disclosed in a database	<u>II-11</u>
6.2	Sequences that need to be itemised in the sequence listing	<u>II-12</u>
6.2.1	Requirements relating to sequence length and enumeration of residues	<u>II-12</u>
6.2.2	Sequences comprising residues that are not specifically defined (n or X)	<u>II-13</u>
6.2.3	Variants	<u>II-14</u>
6.2.4	The "mol_type" qualifier	<u>II-15</u>
7.	Prohibited matter	<u>II-15</u>
7.1	Categories	<u>II-15</u>
7.2	Matter contrary to " <i>ordre public</i> " or morality	<u>II-15</u>
7.3	Disparaging statements	<u>II-16</u>
7.4	Irrelevant or unnecessary matter	<u>II-16</u>
7.5	Omission of matter from publication	<u>II-16</u>
Annex 1 Checklist for considering the abstract (see F-II, 2.5)		<u>II-17</u>
Annex 2 Units recognised in international practice as determined by the President under Rule 49(2) (see F-II, 4.13)*		<u>II-18</u>
1.	SI units and their decimal multiples and submultiples	<u>II-18</u>
2.	Units which are defined on the basis of SI units but are not decimal multiples or submultiples thereof	<u>II-21</u>

3.	Units used with the SI, and whose values in SI are obtained experimentally	<u>II-21</u>
4.	Units and names of units permitted in specialised fields only	<u>II-22</u>
5.	Compound units	<u>II-22</u>

Chapter III – Sufficiency of disclosure III-1

1.	Sufficiency of disclosure	<u>III-1</u>
2.	Art. 83 vs Art. 123(2)	<u>III-2</u>
3.	Insufficient disclosure	<u>III-2</u>
4.	Burden of proof in relation to the possibility of performing and repeating the invention	<u>III-3</u>
5.	Cases of partially insufficient disclosure	<u>III-3</u>
5.1	Only variants of the invention are incapable of being performed	<u>III-3</u>
5.2	Absence of well-known details	<u>III-3</u>
5.3	Difficulties in performing the invention	<u>III-4</u>
6.	Inventions relating to biological material	<u>III-4</u>
6.1	Biological material	<u>III-4</u>
6.2	Public availability of biological material	<u>III-4</u>
6.3	Deposit of biological material	<u>III-5</u>
6.4	Priority claim	<u>III-7</u>
6.5	Euro-PCT cases	<u>III-7</u>
7.	Proper names, trade marks and trade names	<u>III-8</u>
8.	Reference documents	<u>III-8</u>
9.	"Reach-through" claims	<u>III-9</u>
10.	Further medical use claims	<u>III-10</u>
11.	Sufficiency of disclosure and Rules 56 and 56a	<u>III-11</u>
12.	Sufficiency of disclosure and clarity	<u>III-11</u>
13.	Sufficiency of disclosure and inventive step	<u>III-12</u>

Chapter IV – Claims (Art. 84 and formal requirements)	<u>IV-1</u>
1. General	<u>IV-1</u>
2. Form and content of claims	<u>IV-1</u>
2.1 Technical features	<u>IV-1</u>
2.2 Two-part form	<u>IV-1</u>
2.3 Two-part form unsuitable	<u>IV-2</u>
2.3.1 No two-part form	<u>IV-3</u>
2.3.2 Two-part form "wherever appropriate"	<u>IV-3</u>
2.4 Formulae and tables	<u>IV-3</u>
3. Kinds of claim	<u>IV-3</u>
3.1 Categories	<u>IV-3</u>
3.2 Number of independent claims	<u>IV-4</u>
3.3 Objection under Rule 43(2) or 137(5)	<u>IV-6</u>
3.4 Independent and dependent claims	<u>IV-7</u>
3.5 Arrangement of claims	<u>IV-8</u>
3.6 Subject-matter of a dependent claim	<u>IV-8</u>
3.7 Alternatives in a claim	<u>IV-8</u>
3.8 Independent claims containing a reference to another claim or to features from a claim of another category	<u>IV-8</u>
3.9 Claims directed to computer-implemented inventions	<u>IV-10</u>
3.9.1 Cases where all method steps can be fully implemented by generic data processing means	<u>IV-10</u>
3.9.2 Cases where method steps define additional devices and/or specific data processing means	<u>IV-12</u>
3.9.3 Cases where the invention is realised in a distributed computing environment	<u>IV-15</u>
4. Clarity and interpretation of claims	<u>IV-16</u>
4.1 Clarity	<u>IV-16</u>
4.2 Interpretation	<u>IV-17</u>
4.3 Inconsistencies	<u>IV-17</u>
4.4 General statements, "spirit of the invention", claim-like clauses	<u>IV-21</u>

4.5	Essential features	IV-22
4.5.1	Objections arising from missing essential features	IV-22
4.5.2	Definition of essential features	IV-22
4.5.3	Generalisation of essential features	IV-23
4.5.4	Implicit features	IV-23
4.5.5	Examples	IV-23
4.6	Relative terms	IV-23
4.7	Terms such as "about", "approximately" or "substantially"	IV-23
4.7.1	Interpretation of terms such as "about", "approximately" or "substantially"	IV-23
4.7.2	Clarity objections	IV-24
4.8	Trade marks	IV-25
4.9	Optional features	IV-25
4.10	Result to be achieved	IV-25
4.11	Parameters	IV-26
4.11.1	Unusual parameters	IV-27
4.12	Product-by-process claim	IV-28
4.12.1	Product claim with process features	IV-29
4.13	Interpretation of expressions stating a purpose	IV-29
4.13.1	Interpretation of expressions such as "Apparatus for ...", "Product for ..."	IV-29
4.13.2	Interpretation of means-plus-function features ("means for ...")	IV-30
4.13.3	Interpretation of expressions such as "Method for ..."	IV-31
4.14	Definition by reference to (use with) another entity	IV-32
4.14.1	Clarity objections	IV-32
4.14.2	Dimensions and/or shape defined by reference to another entity	IV-32
4.15	The expression "in"	IV-33
4.16	Use claims	IV-34
4.17	References to the description or drawings	IV-35
4.18	Reference signs	IV-35
4.19	Negative limitations (e.g. disclaimers)	IV-36
4.20	"Comprising" vs "consisting of"	IV-36
4.21	Functional definition of a pathological condition	IV-37
4.22	Broad claims	IV-37

4.23	Order of claims	IV-37
4.24	Interpretation of terms such as identity and similarity in relation to amino or nucleic acid sequences	IV-38
5.	Conciseness, number of claims	IV-38
6.	Support in description	IV-39
6.1	General remarks	IV-39
6.2	Extent of generalisation	IV-39
6.3	Objection of lack of support	IV-39
6.4	Lack of support vs insufficient disclosure	IV-40
6.5	Definition in terms of function	IV-41
6.6	Support for dependent claims	IV-42
	Annex Examples of essential features	IV-43
	Chapter V – Unity of invention	V-1
1.	Introduction	V-1
2.	Requirement of unity of invention	V-1
2.1	Insufficient grounds for lack of unity	V-2
2.2	Division's approach	V-3
3.	Assessment of unity	V-3
3.1	Non-unity and prior art	V-7
3.1.1	Non-unity and prior art under Art. 54(3)	V-7
3.1.2	Non-unity and prior art under Art. 54(2)	V-7
3.2	Grouping of inventions	V-7
3.2.1	Plurality of independent claims in the same category	V-7
3.2.2	Plurality of independent claims in different categories	V-8
3.2.3	Dependent claims	V-8
3.2.4	Common dependent claims	V-9
3.2.5	Markush grouping (alternatives in a single claim)	V-10
3.2.6	Claims for a known substance for a number of distinct medical uses	V-11
3.2.7	Intermediate and final products	V-11
3.3	Reasoning for a lack-of-unity objection	V-12
3.3.1	Minimum requirements for reasoning of lack of unity	V-13

3.4	Determination of the invention first mentioned in the claims	V-14
4.	Procedure in the case of lack of unity during search	V-14
4.1	Provisional opinion accompanying the partial search results	V-15
4.2	Consequences for the applicant	V-15
5.	Procedure in the case of lack of unity during substantive examination	V-16
5.1	General principles	V-16
5.2	Objections to unsearched inventions	V-16
5.3	Review of non-unity findings	V-16
6.	Amended claims	V-16
7.	Euro-PCT applications	V-17
7.1	International applications without supplementary search	V-17
7.2	International applications with supplementary search	V-18
7.3	International preliminary examination report (IPER)	V-18
7.4	Restricted IPER	V-18

Chapter VI – Priority

1.	The right to priority	VI-1
1.1	Date of filing as effective date	VI-1
1.2	Priority date as effective date	VI-1
1.3	Validly claiming priority	VI-1
1.4	First application	VI-2
1.4.1	Subsequent application considered as first application	VI-2
1.5	Multiple priorities and partial priorities	VI-3
2.	Determining priority dates	VI-5
2.1	Examining the validity of a right to priority	VI-5
2.2	The same invention	VI-6

2.3	Priority claim not valid	<u>VI-7</u>
2.4	Some examples of determining priority dates	<u>VI-7</u>
2.4.1	Intermediate publication of the contents of the priority application	<u>VI-7</u>
2.4.2	Intermediate publication of another European application	<u>VI-7</u>
2.4.3	Multiple priorities claimed for different inventions in the application with an intermediate publication of one of the inventions	<u>VI-8</u>
2.4.4	Where it is necessary to check whether the application from which priority is actually claimed is the "first application" within the meaning of Art. 87(1)	<u>VI-8</u>
3.	Claiming priority	<u>VI-9</u>
3.1	General remarks	<u>VI-9</u>
3.2	Declaration of priority	<u>VI-9</u>
3.3	Certified copy of the previous application (priority document)	<u>VI-9</u>
3.4	Translation of the previous application	<u>VI-9</u>
3.5	Withdrawal of priority claim	<u>VI-10</u>
3.6	Re-establishment of rights in respect of the priority period	<u>VI-11</u>

Chapter I – Introduction

Apart from the requirements of patentability (novelty, inventive step, industrial application and exclusions from patentability), a European patent application must also satisfy a number of other requirements. These include substantive requirements such as sufficiency of disclosure (Art. 83), clarity of the claims (Art. 84) and unity of invention (Art. 82) as well as requirements of a more formal nature such as the numbering of the claims (Rule 43(5)) and the form of the drawings (as determined by the President under Rule 49(2)). These requirements are dealt with here in Part F.

Part F also deals with the requirements relating to the right to priority. This is because, despite the fact that this issue is usually assessed only when it has a potential bearing on a question of patentability (see G-IV, 3), it is nonetheless assessed independently of any issues of patentability.

Chapter II – Content of a European patent application (other than claims)

1. General

The requirements for a European patent application are set out in Art. 78. Art. 78

The application must contain:

- (i) a request for the grant of a European patent Art. 78(1)(a)
- (ii) a description of the invention Art. 78(1)(b)
- (iii) one or more claims Art. 78(1)(c)
- (iv) any drawings referred to in the description or the claims and Art. 78(1)(d)
- (v) an abstract. Art. 78(1)(e)

This chapter deals with all these requirements, in so far as they are the concern of the search or examining division, with the exception of item (iii), which is the subject of chapter F-IV. Item (v) is dealt with first.

2. Abstract

2.1 Purpose of the abstract

The application must contain an abstract. The purpose of the abstract is to give brief technical information about the disclosure as contained in the description, claims and any drawings. As such, it cannot be used for the purpose of interpreting the scope of the protection sought. The abstract needs to be drafted so that it constitutes an efficient instrument for searching in the particular technical field and for assessing if it is worth considering the whole content of the application. Rule 57(d)
Rule 47(5)

2.2 Definitive content

The abstract is initially supplied by the applicant. The search division has the task of determining its definitive content, which will normally be published with the application. In doing this, it considers the abstract in relation to the application as filed (see B-X, 7(i)). If the search report is published later than the application, the abstract published with the application will be the one resulting from the examination referred to in B-X, 7(i), third sentence. Rule 66
Rule 68

In determining the definitive content, the search division takes into consideration the purpose of the abstract (see F-II, 2.1). Art. 85
Rule 47(5)

2.3 Content of the abstract

The abstract must:

- (i) indicate the title of the invention Rule 47(1)
- (ii) indicate the technical field to which the invention pertains Rule 47(2)

- Rule 47(2) (iii) contain a concise summary of the disclosure as contained in the description, the claims and any drawings, which must be so drafted as to allow a clear understanding of the technical problem, the gist of the solution of that problem through the invention and the principal use or uses of the invention and, where applicable, the chemical formula which, among those contained in the application, best characterises the invention
- Rule 47(2) (iv) **not** contain statements on the alleged merits or value of the invention or its speculative application
- Rule 47(3) (v) preferably not contain more than one hundred and fifty words and
- Rule 47(4) (vi) if the application contains drawings, be accompanied by an indication of the figure or, exceptionally, figures of the drawings which should accompany the abstract. Each essential feature mentioned in the abstract and illustrated by a drawing needs to be followed by a reference sign in parenthesis.

2.4 Figure accompanying the abstract

Rule 47(4) The search division considers not only the text of the abstract but also the selection of the figures for publication with it. It alters the text where necessary to meet the requirements set out in F-II, 2.3. The search division will select a different figure, or figures, of the drawings if it considers that they better characterise the invention.

The search division may prevent the publication of any drawings with the abstract where none of those present in the application is useful for understanding the abstract. It may decide to do so even if the applicant has requested that a particular drawing or drawings be published with the abstract according to Rule 47(4).

In determining the content of the abstract, the search division concentrates on conciseness and clarity, and refrains from introducing alterations merely to embellish the language (see B-X, 7).

2.5 Checklist

In considering the abstract, the search division checks it against the General Guidelines for the Preparation of Abstracts of Patent Documents, using the checklist contained in WIPO Standard ST.12, the relevant parts of which are annexed to this chapter (F-II, Annex 1).

2.6 Transmittal of the abstract to the applicant

Rule 66 The content of the abstract is transmitted to the applicant together with the search report (see B-X, 7(i)).

2.7 Abstract in examination

Art. 98 The general considerations relating to the abstract are set out in F-II, 2.1 to 2.6. The abstract relates to the application as filed and published, and its final form for publication is determined by the search division. It does not have to be brought into conformity with the content of the published patent, even if this differs in substance from that of the application, since the patent

specification does not contain an abstract. The examining division therefore does not seek any amendment of the abstract.

The abstract has no legal effect on the application containing it; for instance, it cannot be used to interpret the scope of protection or to justify the addition to the description of new subject-matter. *Art. 85*

3. Request for grant – the title

The items making up this request are dealt with in A-III, 4. They do not normally concern the search division or the examining division, with the exception of the title.

The title should clearly and concisely state the technical designation of the invention and should exclude all fancy names (see A-III, 7.1). While any obvious failures to meet these requirements are likely to be noted during the formalities examination (and possibly during the search, see B-X, 7(ii)), the search division or the examining division reviews the title in the light of its reading of the description and claims and any amendments to them to make sure that the title is concise and gives a clear and adequate indication of the subject of the invention. Thus, if amendments changing the categories of claims are made, the examining division checks whether a corresponding amendment is needed in the title. *Rule 41(2)(b)*

4. Description (formal requirements)

4.1 General remarks

The application must disclose the invention in a manner sufficiently clear and complete for it to be carried out by a person skilled in the art. *Art. 83*
Rule 42

The "person skilled in the art" – or "skilled person" – for this purpose is considered to be the skilled practitioner in the relevant field aware not only of the teaching of the application itself and the references therein, but also of what was common general knowledge in the art at the date of filing (date of priority) of the application. They are assumed to have at their disposal the means and the capacity for routine work and experimentation, which are normal for the technical field in question. "Common general knowledge" can generally be considered as the information contained in basic handbooks, monographs and textbooks on the subject in question (see T.171/84). As an exception, it can also be the information contained in patent specifications or scientific publications if the invention lies in a field of research so new that the relevant technical knowledge is not yet available from textbooks (see T.51/87). Sufficiency of disclosure must be assessed on the basis of the application as a whole, including the description, claims and drawings, if any. The provisions relating to the content of the description are set out in Rule 42. The purpose of the provisions of Art. 83 and Rule 42 is:

- (i) to ensure that the application contains sufficient technical information to enable a skilled person to put the invention as claimed into practice and

- (ii) to enable the skilled person to understand the contribution to the art which the invention as claimed has made.

Formal elements in the description drafted in accordance with the Common Application Format (CAF) adopted by the IP5 offices (EPO, JPO, MOIP, SIPO, USPTO) are accepted without further amendment. This concerns in particular:

- national legends and designations (e.g. statements regarding benefit claims to prior applications or federally sponsored research at the beginning of the description, after the title);
- statements of industrial applicability;
- citation lists of prior art or any information disclosure statement (except in cases where cited references cannot be retrieved or are obviously wrong).

Applicants are not required to remove such elements, not even at grant.

However, the practice of deleting statements that certain documents are "incorporated by reference" (F-III, 8) is unaffected by the CAF agreement.

4.2 Technical field

Rule 42(1)(a)

The invention should be placed in its setting by specifying the technical field to which it relates, for example by reproducing the first ("prior art") portion of the independent claims in full or in substance or by simply referring to it.

If claims are amended, the "field of the invention" and "summary of the invention" may also need to be amended to correspond to the claims. If appropriate, it is possible to use statements like "the invention is set out in the appended set of claims" instead of repeating the claims *verbatim*.

4.3 Background art

Rule 42(1)(b)

Art. 123(2)

The description should also mention any background art that the applicant is aware of and that can be regarded as useful for understanding the invention and its relationship to the prior art; identification of documents reflecting such art, especially patent specifications, should preferably be included. This applies, in particular, to the background art corresponding to the first ("prior art") portion of the independent claim or claims (see F-IV, 2.2).

In principle, when filing an application, the applicant should cite in the description the closest prior art known to them. It may happen that the prior art cited by the applicant is not the closest existing for the claimed invention. Therefore, the documents cited in the application as filed do not necessarily describe the known innovations closest to the claimed invention, but may in fact constitute more distantly related prior art.

It may be necessary to insert references to documents identified during examination into the statement of prior art to put the invention into proper perspective (see T.11/82). For instance, while the originally filed description

of prior art may give the impression that the inventor has developed the invention from a certain point, the cited documents may show that certain stages in or aspects of this alleged development were already known. In such a case, the examining division requires a reference to these documents and a brief summary of the relevant contents. The subsequent inclusion of such a summary in the description does not contravene Art. 123(2). The latter merely lays down that if the application is amended, for example by limiting it in the light of additional information on the background art, its subject-matter must not extend beyond the content of the application as filed. But the subject-matter of the European patent application within the meaning of Art. 123(2) is to be understood – starting from the prior art – as comprising those features which, in the context of the disclosure required by Art. 83, relate to the invention (see also H-IV, 2.1). In addition, relevant prior-art documents not cited in the original application may be subsequently acknowledged in the description, even if these were known to the applicant at the time of filing (T 2321/08 and H-IV, 2.2.7).

References to the prior art introduced after filing must be purely factual. Any alleged advantages of the invention must be adjusted, if necessary, in the light of the prior art.

New statements of advantage are permissible if they do not introduce into the description matter which extends beyond the content of the application as filed (see H-V, 2.2).

The applicant may cite documents in the application which relate to standard technical knowledge (background art neither addressing the same technical problem nor necessary to complete the disclosure of the claimed invention). Such citations typically relate to well-known tests for measuring certain parameters mentioned in the description or to the definitions of terms of established meaning that are used in the application. Usually they are not relevant for assessing the patentability of the claimed invention unless, for example, they contain relevant information which the applicant does not mention in the description.

Acknowledgment of prior art relevant only to the dependent claims is generally not required. If the applicant indicates that subject-matter initially cited as prior art is only "in-house state of the art", it may not be used in the assessment of novelty and inventive step (see T 654/92, Reasons 4, and T 1001/98, Reasons 3). However, it may be allowed to remain in the description if the fact that it is only "in-house state of the art" is made clear.

If the relevant prior art consists of another European patent application falling within the terms of Art. 54(3), this relevant prior document belongs to the state of the art for all contracting states. This is the case even if the two applications do not share any commonly designated state, or the designation of commonly designated states has been dropped (see G-IV, 6). The fact that this document falls under Art. 54(3) must be explicitly acknowledged. This will inform the public that the document is not relevant to the question of inventive step (see G-VII, 2). According to Rule 165, the above also applies to international applications designating EP, for which the filing fee pursuant to Rule 159(1)(c) has been validly paid

Art. 54(3)

and, where applicable, the translation into one of the official languages has been filed (Art. 153(3) and (4)) (see G-IV, 5.2).

Art. 54(4) EPC 1973

For transitional provisions concerning the applicability of Art. 54(4) EPC 1973, see H-III, 4.2.

4.3.1 Format of background art citations

In citing documents or inserting references, applicants and examining divisions alike must use codes that allow the references to be retrieved without difficulty. This can be best achieved through consistent use of the WIPO standards format:

- (i) for non-patent literature, WIPO Standard ST.14 (Recommendation for the Inclusion of References Cited in Patent Documents)
- (ii) for patent literature (applications, granted patents and utility models): for the two-letter country code, WIPO Standard ST.3 (Recommended Standard on Two-Letter Codes for the Representation of States, Other Entities and Intergovernmental Organizations); for symbols indicating the type of document, WIPO Standard ST.16 (Recommended Standard Code for the Identification of Different Kinds of Patent Documents).

WIPO standards:

ST.14 (wipo.int/export/sites/www/standards/en/pdf/03-14-01.pdf)

ST.3 (wipo.int/export/sites/www/standards/en/pdf/03-03-01.pdf)

ST.16 (wipo.int/export/sites/www/standards/en/pdf/03-16-01.pdf)

These can be found on the WIPO website.

However, in the case of deviation from these standards there is no need to correct the codes used as long as straightforward retrieval of the citation(s) is possible.

4.3.1.1 Examples of quotation for non-patent literature

- (i) For a monograph:

WALTON Hermann, Microwave Quantum Theory. London: Sweet and Maxwell, 1973, Vol. 2, pages 138 to 192.

- (ii) For an article in a periodical:

DROP, J.G. Integrated Circuit Personalization at the Module Level. IBM tech. dis. bull. October 1974, Vol. 17, No. 5, pages 1344 and 1345.

- (iii) For a separately published abstract:

Chem. abstr., Vol. 75, No. 20, 15 November 1971 (Columbus, Ohio, USA), page 16, column 1, abstract No. 120718k, SHETULOV, D.I.

"Surface Effects During Metal Fatigue," Fiz.-Him. Meh. Mater. 1971, 7(29), 7-11 (Russ.).

Patent Abstracts of Japan, Vol. 15, No. 105 (M-1092), 13 March 1991, JP 30 02404 A (FUDO).

4.3.1.2 Examples of quotation for patent literature

(i) JP 50-14535 B (NCR CORP.) 28 May 1975 (28.05.75), column 4, lines 3 to 27.

(ii) DE 3744403 A1 (A. JOSEK) 29.08.1991, page 1, abstract.

4.4 Irrelevant or unnecessary matter

Since the skilled person is presumed to have the general technical background knowledge appropriate to the art, the examining division does not require the applicant to insert anything in the nature of a treatise or research report or explanatory matter obtainable from textbooks or otherwise well known. Likewise, the examining division does not require a detailed description of the content of cited prior documents. It is sufficient to indicate the reason for the inclusion of the reference unless, in a particular case, a more detailed description is necessary for a full understanding of the application's invention (see also F-III, 8 and F-IV, 2.3.1).

Rule 48(1)(c)

A list of several reference documents relating to the same feature or aspect of the prior art is not required; only the most appropriate need be specified. On the other hand, the examining division does not insist upon the excision of any such unnecessary matter, except when it is very extensive (see F-II, 7.4).

4.5 Technical problem and its solution

The invention as claimed should be disclosed in such a way that the technical problem, or problems, it deals with can be appreciated and the solution can be understood. To meet this requirement, only such details should be included as are necessary for elucidating the invention.

Rule 42(1)(c)

Rule 48(1)(b)

As an example, to elucidate the nature of the solution according to the independent claims, either the characterising portion of the independent claims could be repeated or referred to, or the substance of the features of the solution according to the relevant claims could be reproduced (see F-II, 4.2).

In cases where the subject-matter of a dependent claim can be understood either by the wording of the claim itself or by the description of a way of performing the invention, no additional explanation of this subject-matter will be necessary. A mention in the description that a particular embodiment of the invention is set out in the dependent claim will then be sufficient.

When there is doubt, however, as to whether certain details are necessary, the examining division does not insist on their excision. It is not necessary, moreover, to explicitly present the invention in problem-solution form. Any advantageous effects which the applicant considers the invention to have in relation to the prior art should be stated, but this should not be done in such

a way as to disparage any particular prior product or process. Furthermore, neither the prior art nor the applicant's invention should be referred to in a manner likely to mislead. This might be done, for example, by an ambiguous presentation which gives the impression that the prior art had solved less of the problem than was actually the case. Fair comment as referred to in F-II, 7.3 is, however, permitted. Regarding amendment to or addition of a statement of problem, see H-V, 2.4.

4.6 Rule 42(1)(c) vs Art. 52(1)

Rule 42(1)(c)

If it is decided that an independent claim defines a patentable invention within the meaning of Art. 52(1), it must be possible to derive a technical problem from the application. If so, the requirement of Rule 42(1)(c) is fulfilled (see T 26/81).

4.7 Reference in the description to drawings

Rule 42(1)(d)

If drawings are included, they should first be briefly described in a manner such as: "Figure 1 is a plan view of the transformer housing; Figure 2 is a side elevation of the housing; Figure 3 is an end elevation looking in the direction of the arrow X of Figure 2; Figure 4 is a cross-section taken through AA of Figure 1." When it is necessary to refer in the description to elements of the drawings, the name of the element should be referred to as well as its number, i.e. the reference should not be in the form "3 is connected to 5 via 4" but "resistor 3 is connected to capacitor 5 via switch 4".

4.8 Reference signs

OJ EPO 2025, A49

The description and drawings need to be consistent with one another, especially regarding reference numbers and other signs, and each number or sign must be explained. However, where as a result of amendments to the description whole passages are deleted, it may be tedious to delete all superfluous references from the drawings; in such a case, the examining division is not too rigorous in pursuing a consistency objection under Art. 1(2)(i) of the decision of the President of the EPO dated 7 July 2025 (OJ EPO 2025, A49). The reverse situation should never occur, i.e. all reference numbers or signs used in the description or claims must also appear on the drawings.

4.9 Industrial application

Rule 42(1)(f)

Art. 52(1)

Art. 57

The description should indicate explicitly the way in which the invention is capable of exploitation in industry if this is not obvious from the description or from the nature of the invention. The expression "capable of exploitation in industry" means the same as "susceptible of industrial application", and indeed identical expressions are used in the French and German texts of the EPC. In view of the broad meaning given to the latter expression by Art. 57 (see G-III, 1), it is to be expected that, in most cases, the way in which the invention can be exploited in industry will be self-evident so that no more explicit description on this point will be required; but there may be a few instances, e.g. in relation to methods of testing, where the manner of industrial exploitation is not apparent and must therefore be explicitly indicated.

Also, in relation to certain biotechnological inventions, i.e. sequences and partial sequences of genes, the industrial application is not self-evident. The industrial application of such sequences must be disclosed in the patent application (see G-III, 4).

Rule 29(3)

4.10 Manner and order of presentation

The manner and order of presentation of the description should be that specified in Rule 42(1), i.e. as set out above unless, because of the nature of the invention, a different manner or a different order would afford a better understanding. Since the responsibility for clearly and completely describing the invention lies with the applicant, the examining division does not object to the presentation unless satisfied that such an objection would be a proper exercise of its discretion.

Rule 42(2)

Some departure from the requirements of Rule 42(1) is acceptable if the description is clear and orderly and all the requisite information is present. For example, the requirements of Rule 42(1)(c) may be waived where the invention is based on a fortuitous discovery, the practical application of which is recognised as being useful, or where the invention breaks entirely new ground. Also, certain technically simple inventions may be fully comprehensible with the minimum of description and only slight reference to prior art.

4.11 Terminology

Although the description needs to be clear, straightforward and avoid unnecessary technical jargon, the use of recognised terms of art is acceptable, and will often be desirable. Little-known or specially formulated technical terms may be allowed if they are adequately defined and there is no generally recognised equivalent. This discretion may be extended to foreign terms when there is no equivalent in the language of the proceedings. Terms already having an established meaning are not allowed to be used to mean something different if this is likely to cause confusion. There may, however, be circumstances where a term may legitimately be borrowed from a similar art. Terminology and signs must be consistent throughout the application.

4.12 Computer programs

In the particular case of inventions in the computer field, program listings in programming languages cannot be relied on as the sole disclosure of the invention. The description, as in other technical fields, should be written substantially in normal language, possibly accompanied by flow diagrams or other aids to understanding so that the invention may be understood by a skilled person who is deemed not to be a specialist in any specific programming language but does have general programming skills. Short excerpts from programs written in commonly used programming languages can be accepted if they serve to illustrate an embodiment of the invention.

4.13 Physical values, units

When the properties of a material are referred to, the relevant units need to be specified if quantitative considerations are involved. If this is done by reference to a published standard (e.g. a standard of sieve sizes) and that

standard is referred to by a set of initials or similar abbreviation, it needs to be adequately identified in the description.

Physical values must be expressed in the units recognised in international practice, which is generally in the metric system, using SI units and the other units referred to in Chapter I of the Annex to EEC Directive 80/181/EEC of 20 December 1979, as amended by EEC Directives 85/1/EEC of 18 December 1984, 89/617/EEC of 27 November 1989, 1999/103/EC of 24 January 2000, 2009/3/EC of 11 March 2009 and Commission Directive (EU) 2019/1258 of 23 July 2019 (see F-II, Annex 2). Any values not meeting this requirement must also be expressed in the units recognised in international practice. Values expressed in the system of imperial units (e.g. inches/pounds) or in units having local character (e.g. pint) do not, in general, meet the criterion "recognised in international practice".

Normally, each single occurrence of a physical value not complying with this criterion must be adapted such that it is replaced by a corresponding value expressed in units conforming to international standards, with the original value being maintained in brackets. Alternatively, it is also possible to add the corresponding value conforming to international standards in brackets and to maintain the original value.

As determined by the President under Rule 49(2), for mathematical formulae, the symbols in general use must be employed. For chemical formulae, the symbols, atomic weights and molecular formulae in general use must be employed.

In general, only technical terms, signs and symbols generally accepted in the field in question should be used.

4.14 Registered trade marks

It is the applicant's responsibility to ensure that registered trade marks are acknowledged as such in the description. For the assessment of the clarity of claims referring to a trade mark (Art. 84), see F-IV, 4.8. On the effect of references to trade marks on sufficiency of disclosure (Art. 83), see F-III, 7.

5. Drawings

5.1 Form and content

Most of the requirements relating to the form and content of drawings are formal (see A-IX), but the examining division may sometimes need to consider the requirements as determined by the President under Rule 49(2). Of these, the only question likely to cause difficulty is whether the textual matter included on the drawings is absolutely indispensable. In the case of circuit diagrams, block schematics and flow sheets, identifying catchwords for functional integers of complex systems (e.g. "magnetic core store", "speed integrator") may be regarded as indispensable from a practical point of view if they are necessary to enable a diagram to be interpreted rapidly and clearly.

5.2 Printing quality

The examining division has also to check whether the drawings in the printing copy ("Druckexemplar") are suitable for printing. If necessary, a copy of the original drawings must be prepared as the printing copy. If, however, the quality of the original drawings is also insufficient, then the examining division must require the applicant to present drawings of sufficient quality for printing. It needs to, however, beware of any extension of subject-matter (Art. 123(2)).

5.3 Photographs

For the presentation of photographs, see A-IX.1.2. In the case of photographs of insufficient original quality for printing, the examining division does not request the filing of better photographs, as the risk of infringing Art. 123(2) is obvious. In that case, the insufficient quality is accepted for reproduction.

6. Sequence listings

For the presentation of sequence listings in general, see A-IV.5.

6.1 Reference to sequences disclosed in a database

The application may refer to a biological sequence belonging to the state of the art by merely providing its accession number and version or release number in a publicly available database, without presenting the sequence itself either in a sequence listing complying with the applicable WIPO standard or in any other format.

In this case, since the sequence is already publicly available, the applicant does not need to supply a sequence listing. This applies even if these sequences are referred to in one or more claims or if they are essential features of the invention or necessary for the prior-art search (see J 8/11). If the European patent application discloses nucleotide or amino acid sequences that are fragments or variants of a prior-art sequence, a sequence listing complying with the applicable WIPO standard has to be filed for these fragments or variants (see the notice from the EPO dated 9 December 2021, OJ EPO 2021, A97, p. 7). If the database and/or the sequences in question is/are not completely and unambiguously identified, the sequences are not sufficiently disclosed according to Art. 83 and cannot be added to the application to complete the disclosure without contravening Art. 123(2) (see F-III.2).

If such insufficiently disclosed sequences are not essential features of the claimed invention, normally no objection is raised. On the other hand, where these sequences are essential features of at least a part of the claimed subject-matter, this results in problems relating to the sufficiency of the original disclosure according to Art. 83 because the nature of the sequences cannot be unambiguously derived from the incomplete or ambiguous reference to the database.

Examples where a biological sequence is considered an essential feature of the invention would be a diagnostic method using a particular nucleic acid sequence or a product made by a biochemical process using an enzyme with a particular amino acid sequence. An example of ambiguous

identification would be the citation of an accession number of a certain protein in the database of the European Molecular Biology Laboratory (EMBL) with no indication of the version number or database release number meant when there are several such numbers referring to different sequences of the protein.

6.2 Sequences that need to be itemised in the sequence listing

6.2.1 Requirements relating to sequence length and enumeration of residues

As defined in paragraph 7 of WIPO Standard ST.26, a sequence must be included in the sequence listing if:

1. it is disclosed anywhere in the application by enumeration of its residues, i.e. by listing, in order, each residue of the sequence as defined in paragraph 3(c) of WIPO Standard ST.26 (e.g. aagtgttcctagtg) and
2. it contains 10 or more specifically defined nucleotides or four or more specifically defined amino acids.

According to WIPO Standard ST.26, "specifically defined" residues are any nucleotide other than those represented by the symbol "n" and any amino acid other than those represented by the symbol "X", listed in Annex I (see paragraph 3(k) of WIPO Standard ST.26).

Degenerate symbols representing a subgroup of residues are considered as specifically defined. For example, the degenerate nucleotide symbol "s" (used to represent "c" or "g" as defined in Annex I, Table 1 of WIPO Standard ST.26) is specifically defined.

Sequences containing fewer than ten specifically defined nucleotides or fewer than four specifically defined amino acids must not be included in the sequence listing (WIPO Standard ST.26, paragraph 8).

If a sequence is only disclosed in prose, i.e. a text describing the sequence, but the sequence is not enumerated, then the sequence does not have to be included, but may be included if the applicant wishes so.

For instance, if the application refers to a partial sequence as follows: "nucleotides 90-179 of SEQ ID NO. 1", the partial sequence is described in prose only and, therefore, does not have to be entered as a separate SEQ ID in the sequence listing.

However, if the partial sequence was described by enumerating only the residues between positions 90 and 179, then paragraph 7 of WIPO Standard ST.26 would apply and the partial sequence would have to be included in the sequence listing.

6.2.2 Sequences comprising residues that are not specifically defined (n or X)

If an enumerated sequence comprises regions of specifically defined residues separated by one or more gaps of n or X, i.e. residues that are not specifically defined, the representation of this sequence in the sequence listing depends on whether the exact number of n or X residues is known (see WIPO Standard ST.26, paragraph 36) or unknown (see WIPO Standard ST.26, paragraph 37).

For example, considering that the following sequence is enumerated in the application:

a10nxt12

if the number of "n" residues is known, e.g. x=2, the sequence should be represented as a single SEQ ID (if it also meets the minimal length requirement as defined in paragraph 7 of WIPO Standard ST.26 and in F-II, 6.2.1) as follows:

aaaaaaaaaannntttttttttt

If the number of "n" residues is unknown, each region of specifically defined residues that meets the minimal length requirement in paragraph 7 of WIPO Standard ST.26 must be included in the sequence listing as a separate SEQ ID.

For example, for the sequence: a10nxt12

the sequence listing must have two entries

SEQ ID No. 1: aaaaaaaaaa

SEQ ID No. 2: tttttttttt

The sequences should be annotated to indicate that they are part of the same molecule and separated by an undefined number of "n" residues (see example 37-2 of Annex VI of WIPO Standard ST.26).

If a range is disclosed, e.g. x= 5-10 nucleotides, the sequence should be represented as a single SEQ ID comprising 5 n or 10 n (see example 36-3 of Annex VI of WIPO Standard ST.26).

In the above example, the sequence must either comprise 5 n or 10 n. In both cases, the SEQ ID must be annotated with a "note" qualifier. In cases where the sequence comprises 5 n, the note should indicate that up to 5 n can be added. In cases where the sequence comprises 10 n, the note should indicate that up to 5 n can be deleted. The appropriate feature key must be associated with the "note" qualifier describing the variant. See paragraph 96 of WIPO Standard ST.26 and F-II, 6.2.3 for information on selecting the correct feature key.

Alternatively, if a range is disclosed, e.g. x= 5-10 nucleotides, all possible variants may be represented independently, i.e. as separate SEQ IDs.

6.2.3 Variants

If the application describes variants of a sequence, e.g. "nucleotides 90-179 of SEQ ID No. 1 are deleted or substituted by another sequence", then paragraph 95 of WIPO Standard ST.26 applies. This paragraph defines that these variants should be described by annotation of the primary sequence. This is a recommendation, i.e. it is not compulsory as long as the specific variant sequence is not enumerated as such in the application.

If the applicant chooses to enter this information in the sequence listing, the following rules as defined in paragraph 95 of WIPO Standard ST.26 should be followed:

- (a) the variant may be represented by annotation of the primary sequence, where it contains variation(s) at a single location or multiple distinct locations and the occurrences of those variations are independent
- (b) the variant should be represented as a separate sequence and assigned its own sequence identification number, where it contains variations at multiple distinct locations and the occurrences of those variations are interdependent and
- (c) must be represented as a separate sequence and assigned its own sequence identification number, where it contains an inserted or substituted sequence that contains in excess of 1 000 residues.

The following table indicates which feature key and qualifier should be used to annotate the variants according to the type of sequence and the type of variation (see paragraph 96 of WIPO Standard ST.26).

Type of sequence	Feature key	Qualifier	Use
Nucleic acid	Variation	replace or note	Naturally occurring mutations and polymorphisms, e.g. alleles, RFLPs.
Nucleic acid	misc_difference	replace or note	Variability introduced artificially, e.g. by genetic manipulation or by chemical synthesis.
Amino acid	VAR_SEQ	note	Variant produced by alternative splicing, alternative promoter usage, alternative initiation and ribosomal frameshifting.
Amino acid	VARIANT	note	Any type of variant for which VAR_SEQ is not applicable.

6.2.4 The "mol_type" qualifier

The "source" feature key is mandatory for every sequence, in addition to the qualifiers "organism" and "mol_type" (paragraph 75 of WIPO Standard ST.26).

The value of the "mol_type" qualifier has to be selected from a list of predetermined terms as defined in Annex I of WIPO Standard ST.26 (section 6, qualifier mol_type 6.39; section 8, qualifier mol_type 8.1) and shown in the following table:

DNA	RNA	AA
genomic DNA other DNA unassigned DNA	genomic RNA mRNA tRNA rRNA transcribed RNA viral cRNA other RNA unassigned RNA	protein

The value "genomic DNA" does not imply that the molecule is nuclear (e.g. organelle and plasmid DNA must be described using "genomic DNA").

Ribosomal RNA genes must be described using "genomic DNA".

The value "rRNA" must only be used if the ribosomal RNA molecule itself has been sequenced.

The values "other RNA" and "other DNA" must be applied to synthetic molecules, i.e. molecules that have been artificially created.

The values "unassigned DNA" and "unassigned RNA", on the other hand, must be used for molecules that have been isolated from an organism but their nature is not known or not disclosed and they cannot be assigned to any more precise qualifier value (e.g. it is not known whether the sequence is a tRNA or an mRNA or another type of natural RNA).

7. Prohibited matter

7.1 Categories

The three categories of specifically prohibited matter are defined in Rule 48 sub-paragraphs (a) to (c) of Rule 48(1) (see also G-II, 4).

7.2 Matter contrary to "ordre public" or morality

The first category of prohibited matter (Rule 48(1)(a)) must be omitted from the application as published. Examples of the kind of matter coming within this category are: incitement to riot or to acts of disorder; incitement to criminal acts; racial, religious or similar discriminatory propaganda; and grossly obscene matter. Rule 48(1)(a)

With regard to patentability issues with such matter, see G-II, 4.1 and subsections.

7.3 Disparaging statements

Rule 48(1)(b)

It is necessary to discriminate in the second category between libellous or similarly disparaging statements, which are not allowed, and fair comment, e.g. in relation to obvious or generally recognised disadvantages or disadvantages stated to have been found and substantiated by the applicant, which, if relevant, is permitted.

7.4 Irrelevant or unnecessary matter

Rule 48(1)(c)

The third category is irrelevant or unnecessary matter: such matter is specifically prohibited under Rule 48(1)(c) only if it is "obviously irrelevant or unnecessary", for instance, if it has no bearing on the subject-matter of the invention or its background of relevant prior art (see also F-II, 4.4). The matter to be removed may already be obviously irrelevant or unnecessary in the original description. It may, however, be matter which has become obviously irrelevant or unnecessary only in the course of the examination proceedings, e.g. owing to a limitation of the claims to one of originally several alternatives. When matter is removed from the description, it must not be incorporated into the patent specification by reference to the corresponding matter in the published application or in any other document (see also F-III, 8).

7.5 Omission of matter from publication

Rule 48(2) and (3)

Generally, the Receiving Section will deal with matter falling under category 1(a) and may have dealt with matter obviously falling within category 1(b). Any such matter not omitted from the application as published must be removed, together with any other prohibited matter, during the application's examination. The applicant is informed of the category under which matter is required to be removed.

Annex 1**Checklist for considering the abstract (see F-II.2.5)**

In the following checklist, the abstractor should, after studying the disclosure to be abstracted, place a check mark in the column next to the applicable item listed in the first column. They should bear in mind the corresponding requirements listed in the third column when preparing the abstract. Finally, after comparing the finished abstract with the requirements marked, they can place a corresponding check mark in the fourth column if satisfied that the requirements have been met.

If the invention is a(n)	Check mark	The abstract should deal with:	If so, check mark
Article		its identity, use; construction, organisation, method of manufacture	
Chemical compound		its identity (structure if appropriate); method of preparation, properties, uses	
Mixture		its nature, properties, use; essential ingredients (identity, function); proportion of ingredients, if significant; preparation	
Machine, apparatus, system		its nature, use; construction, organisation; operation	
Process or operation		its nature and characterising features; material and conditions employed; product, if significant; nature of and relationship between the steps, if more than one	
If the disclosure involves alternatives		the abstract should deal with the preferred alternative and identify the others if this can be done succinctly; if this cannot be done, it should mention that they exist and whether they differ substantially from the preferred alternative	

Total number of words less than 250: in range 50-150:

Ref: Standards – ST.12/A, April 1994

Original: Handbook on Industrial Property Information and Documentation, Publication N° 208(E), 1998, WIPO, Geneva (CH).

Annex 2**Units recognised in international practice as determined by the President under Rule 49(2) (see F-II, 4.13)*****1. SI units and their decimal multiples and submultiples****1.1 SI base units**

Quantity	Unit	
	Name	Symbol
Length	metre	m
Mass	kilogram	kg
Time	second	s
Electric current	ampere	A
Thermodynamic temperature	kelvin	K
Amount of substance	mole	mol
Luminous intensity	candela	cd

Definitions of SI base units:

– Unit of time

The second, symbol s, is the SI unit of time. It is defined by taking the fixed numerical value of the caesium frequency $\Delta\nu_{\text{Cs}}$, the unperturbed ground-state hyperfine transition frequency of the caesium 133 atom, to be 9 192 631 770 when expressed in the unit Hz, which is equal to s^{-1} .

– Unit of length

The metre, symbol m, is the SI unit of length. It is defined by taking the fixed numerical value of the speed of light in vacuum c to be 299 792 458 when expressed in the unit m/s, where the second is defined in terms of $\Delta\nu_{\text{Cs}}$.

– Unit of mass

The kilogram, symbol kg, is the SI unit of mass. It is defined by taking the fixed numerical value of the Planck constant h to be $6.626\,070\,15 \times 10^{-34}$ when expressed in the unit J s, which is equal to $\text{kg m}^2 \text{s}^{-1}$, where the metre and the second are defined in terms of c and $\Delta\nu_{\text{Cs}}$.

– Unit of electric current

The ampere, symbol A, is the SI unit of electric current. It is defined by taking the fixed numerical value of the elementary charge e to be $1.602\,176\,634 \times 10^{-19}$ when expressed in the unit C, which is equal to A s, where the second is defined in terms of $\Delta\nu_{\text{Cs}}$.

– Unit of thermodynamic temperature

The kelvin, symbol K, is the SI unit of thermodynamic temperature. It is defined by taking the fixed numerical value of the Boltzmann constant k to be $1.380\,649 \times 10^{-23}$ when expressed in the unit J K^{-1} , which is equal to

* Mainly based on Chapter I of the Annex to EEC Directive 80/181/EEC of 20.12.1979, as amended by EEC Directives 85/1/EEC of 18.12.1984, 89/617/EEC of 27.11.1989, 1999/103/EC of 24.01.2000, 2009/3/EC of 11.03.2009 and Commission Directive (EU) 2019/1258 of 23.07.2019.

$\text{kg m}^2 \text{s}^{-2} \text{K}^{-1}$, where the kilogram, metre and second are defined in terms of h , c and $\Delta\nu_{\text{Cs}}$.

– Unit of amount of substance

The mole, symbol mol, is the SI unit of amount of substance. One mole contains exactly $6.022\,140\,76 \times 10^{23}$ elementary entities. This number is the fixed numerical value of the Avogadro constant, N_A , when expressed in the unit mol^{-1} and is called the Avogadro number.

The amount of substance, symbol n , of a system is a measure of the number of specified elementary entities. An elementary entity may be an atom, a molecule, an ion, an electron, any other particle or specified group of particles.

– Unit of luminous intensity

The candela, symbol cd, is the SI unit of luminous intensity in a given direction. It is defined by taking the fixed numerical value of the luminous efficacy of monochromatic radiation of frequency $540 \times 10^{12} \text{ Hz}$, K_{cd} , to be 683 when expressed in the unit lm W^{-1} , which is equal to cd sr W^{-1} , or $\text{cd sr kg}^{-1} \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^3$, where the kilogram, metre and second are defined in terms of h , c and $\Delta\nu_{\text{Cs}}$.

1.1.1 Special name and symbol of the SI derived unit of temperature for expressing Celsius temperature

Quantity	Unit	
	Name	Symbol
Celsius temperature	degree Celsius	$^{\circ}\text{C}$

Celsius temperature t is defined as the difference $t = T - T_0$ between the two thermodynamic temperatures T and T_0 where $T_0 = 273.15 \text{ K}$. An interval of or difference in temperature may be expressed either in kelvins or in degrees Celsius. The unit of "degree Celsius" is equal to the unit "kelvin".

1.2 SI derived units

1.2.1 General rule for SI derived units

Units derived coherently from SI base units are given as algebraic expressions in the form of products of powers of the SI base units with a numerical factor equal to 1.

1.2.2 SI derived units with special names and symbols

Quantity	Unit		Expression	
	Name	Symbol	In other SI units	In terms of SI base units
Plane angle	radian	rad		$\text{m} \cdot \text{m}^{-1}$
Solid angle	steradian	sr		$\text{m}^2 \cdot \text{m}^{-2}$
Frequency	hertz	Hz		s^{-1}
Force	newton	N		$\text{m} \cdot \text{kg} \cdot \text{s}^{-2}$
Pressure, stress	pascal	Pa	$\text{N} \cdot \text{m}^{-2}$	$\text{m}^{-1} \cdot \text{kg} \cdot \text{s}^{-2}$
Energy, work; quantity of heat	joule	J	$\text{N} \cdot \text{m}$	$\text{m}^2 \cdot \text{kg} \cdot \text{s}^{-2}$
Power ⁽¹⁾ , radiant flux	watt	W	$\text{J} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$	$\text{m}^2 \cdot \text{kg} \cdot \text{s}^{-3}$

Quantity	Unit		Expression	
	Name	Symbol	In other SI units	In terms of SI base units
Quantity of electricity, electric charge	coulomb	C		$\text{s} \cdot \text{A}$
Electric potential, potential difference, electromotive force	volt	V	$\text{W} \cdot \text{A}^{-1}$	$\text{m}^2 \cdot \text{kg} \cdot \text{s}^{-3} \cdot \text{A}^{-1}$
Electric resistance	ohm	Ω	$\text{V} \cdot \text{A}^{-1}$	$\text{m}^2 \cdot \text{kg} \cdot \text{s}^{-3} \cdot \text{A}^{-2}$
Conductance	siemens	S	$\text{A} \cdot \text{V}^{-1}$	$\text{m}^{-2} \cdot \text{kg}^{-1} \cdot \text{s}^3 \cdot \text{A}^2$
Capacitance	farad	F	$\text{C} \cdot \text{V}^{-1}$	$\text{m}^{-2} \cdot \text{kg}^{-1} \cdot \text{s}^4 \cdot \text{A}^2$
Magnetic flux	weber	Wb	$\text{V} \cdot \text{s}$	$\text{m}^2 \cdot \text{kg} \cdot \text{s}^{-2} \cdot \text{A}^{-1}$
Magnetic flux density	tesla	T	$\text{Wb} \cdot \text{m}^{-2}$	$\text{kg} \cdot \text{s}^{-2} \cdot \text{A}^{-1}$
Inductance	henry	H	$\text{Wb} \cdot \text{A}^{-1}$	$\text{m}^2 \cdot \text{kg} \cdot \text{s}^{-2} \cdot \text{A}^{-2}$
Luminous flux	lumen	lm	$\text{cd} \cdot \text{sr}$	cd
Illuminance	lux	lx	$\text{lm} \cdot \text{m}^{-2}$	$\text{m}^{-2} \cdot \text{cd}$
Activity (of a radionuclide)	becquerel	Bq		s^{-1}
Absorbed dose, specific energy imparted, kerma, absorbed dose index	gray	Gy	$\text{J} \cdot \text{kg}^{-1}$	$\text{m}^2 \cdot \text{s}^{-2}$
Dose equivalent	sievert	Sv	$\text{J} \cdot \text{kg}^{-1}$	$\text{m}^2 \cdot \text{s}^{-2}$
Catalytic activity	katal	kat		$\text{mol} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$

- (1) Special names for the unit of power: the name volt-ampere (symbol "VA") is used to express the apparent power of alternating electric current, and var (symbol "var") is used to express reactive electric power.

Units derived from SI base units may be expressed in terms of the units listed in this annex.

In particular, derived SI units may be expressed by the special names and symbols given in the above table. For example, the SI unit of dynamic viscosity may be expressed as $\text{m}^{-1} \cdot \text{kg} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$ or $\text{N} \cdot \text{s} \cdot \text{m}^{-2}$ or $\text{Pa} \cdot \text{s}$.

1.3 Prefixes and their symbols used to designate certain decimal multiples and submultiples

Factor	Prefix	Symbol	Factor	Prefix	Symbol
10^{24}	yotta	Y	10^{-1}	deci	d
10^{21}	zetta	Z	10^{-2}	centi	c
10^{18}	exa	E	10^{-3}	milli	m
10^{15}	peta	P	10^{-6}	micro	μ
10^{12}	tera	T	10^{-9}	nano	n
10^9	giga	G	10^{-12}	pico	p
10^6	mega	M	10^{-15}	femto	f
10^3	kilo	k	10^{-18}	atto	a
10^2	hecto	h	10^{-21}	zepto	z
10^1	deca	da	10^{-24}	yocto	y

The names and symbols of the decimal multiples and submultiples of the unit of mass are formed by attaching prefixes to the word "gram" and their symbols to the symbol "g".

Where a derived unit is expressed as a fraction, its decimal multiples and submultiples may be designated by attaching a prefix to units in the numerator or the denominator, or in both these parts.

Compound prefixes, that is to say prefixes formed by the juxtaposition of several of the above prefixes, may not be used.

1.4 Special authorised names and symbols of decimal multiples and submultiples of SI units

Quantity	Unit		
	Name	Symbol	Value
Volume	litre	l or L ⁽¹⁾	1 l = 1 dm ³ = 10 ⁻³ m ³
Mass	tonne	t	1 t = 1 Mg = 10 ³ kg
Pressure, stress	bar	bar	1 bar = 10 ⁵ Pa
Length	Ångström	Å	1 Å = 10 ⁻¹⁰ m

(1) The two symbols "l" and "L" may be used for the litre unit.

The prefixes and their symbols listed in F-II, Annex 2, 1.3 may be used in conjunction with the units and symbols contained in this table.

2. Units which are defined on the basis of SI units but are not decimal multiples or submultiples thereof

Quantity	Unit		
	Name	Symbol	Value
Plane angle	revolution ^(a)		1 revolution = 2 π rad
	grade or gon	gon	1 gon = π / 200 rad
	degree	°	1° = π / 180 rad
	minute of angle	'	1' = π / 10 800 rad
	second of angle	"	1" = π / 648 000 rad
Time	Minute	min	1 min = 60 s
	Hour	h	1 h = 3 600 s
	Day	d	1 d = 86 400 s

(a) No international symbol exists

The prefixes listed in F-II, Annex 2, 1.3 may only be used in conjunction with the names "grade" or "gon" and the symbols only with the symbol "gon".

3. Units used with the SI, and whose values in SI are obtained experimentally

The unified atomic mass unit is 1/12 of the mass of an atom of the nuclide ¹²C.

The electronvolt is the kinetic energy acquired by an electron passing through a potential difference of 1 volt in a vacuum.

Quantity	Unit		
	Name	Symbol	Value
Mass	unified atomic mass unit	u	1 u $\approx$ 1,6605655 x 10 ⁻²⁷ kg
Energy	Electronvolt	eV	1eV $\approx$ 1,6021892 x 10 ⁻¹⁹ J

The value of these units, expressed in SI units, is not known exactly.

The prefixes and their symbols listed in F-II, Annex 2, 1.3 may be used in conjunction with these two units and with their symbols.

4. Units and names of units permitted in specialised fields only

Quantity	Unit		Value
	Name	Symbol	
Vergency of optical systems	dioptre		1 dioptre = 1 m^{-1}
Mass of precious stones	metric carat		1 metric carat = $2 \times 10^{-4} \text{ kg}$
Area of farmland and building land	are	a	1 a = 10^2 m^2
Mass per unit length of textile yarns and threads	tex	tex	1 tex = $10^{-6} \text{ kg.m}^{-1}$
Blood pressure and pressure of other body fluids	millimetre of mercury	mm Hg	1 mm Hg = 133.322 Pa
Pressure in the fields of plasma physics and semiconductors	millimetre of mercury	mm Hg	1 mm Hg = 133.322387 Pa
Effective cross-sectional area	Torr	Torr	1 Torr = 133.322368 Pa
	Barn	b	1b = 10^{-28} m^2

The prefixes and their symbols listed in F-II, Annex 2, 1.3 may be used in conjunction with the above units and symbols, with the exception of the millimetre of mercury and its symbol. The multiple of 10^2 a is, however, called a "hectare".

5. Compound units

Combinations of the units listed in this annex form compound units.

Chapter III – Sufficiency of disclosure

1. Sufficiency of disclosure

A detailed description of at least one way of carrying out the invention must be given. Since the application is addressed to the skilled person, it is neither necessary nor desirable to give details of well-known ancillary features. However, the description must disclose any feature essential for carrying out the invention in sufficient detail to make it apparent to the skilled person how to put the invention into practice. A single example may suffice. But where the claims cover a broad field, the application is not usually regarded as satisfying the requirements of [Art. 83](#) unless the description gives a number of examples or describes alternative embodiments or variations extending over the area protected by the claims. It is nevertheless important to bear in mind the facts and evidence of each particular case. There are some instances where even a very broad field is sufficiently exemplified by a limited number of examples or even one example (see also [F-IV, 6.3](#)). In these cases, the application must contain, in addition to the examples, sufficient information to allow the skilled person, using common general knowledge, to perform the invention over the whole area claimed without undue burden and without needing inventive skill (see [T 727/95](#)). In this context, the "whole area claimed" is to be understood as substantially any embodiment falling within the scope of a claim, even though a limited amount of trial and error may be permissible, e.g. in an unexplored field or when there are many technical difficulties (see [T 226/85](#) and [T 409/91](#)).

[Rule 42\(1\)\(e\)](#)

[Art. 83](#)

However, when assessing sufficiency of disclosure, the intrinsic limitations that a sensible reading imposes on the subject-matter of the independent claims must be taken into consideration; in other words the skilled person wishing to implement the claimed invention will exclude any embodiment that is meaningless and not consistent with the teaching of the application (see [T 521/12](#)).

With regard to [Art. 83](#), an objection for lack of sufficient disclosure presupposes that there are serious doubts, substantiated by verifiable facts (see [T 409/91](#) and [T 694/92](#)). If the examining division is able, under the particular circumstances, to establish, with supporting evidence, that the application lacks sufficient disclosure, the onus of establishing that the invention may be performed and repeated over substantially the whole of the claimed range lies with the applicant (see [F-III, 4](#)).

For the requirements of [Art. 83](#) and [Rule 42\(1\)\(c\)](#) and [\(e\)](#) to be fully satisfied, the invention must be described in terms not only of its structure but also of its function unless the functions of the various parts are immediately apparent. Indeed, in some technical fields (e.g. computers), a clear description of function may be much more appropriate than an over-detailed description of structure.

[Art. 83](#)

[Rule 42\(1\)\(c\) and \(e\)](#)

Where an application is found to be sufficiently disclosed under [Art. 83](#) only in respect of a part of the claimed subject-matter, a partial European or supplementary European search report may be issued under [Rule 63](#) (see [B-VIII, 3.1](#) and [3.2](#)). In such cases, in the absence of appropriate

[Rule 63](#)

amendment, an objection under Rule 63(3) will also be raised (see H-II, 5 and H-IV, 4.1.1).

2. **Art. 83 vs Art. 123(2)**

Art. 83

Art. 123(2)

It is the responsibility of the applicant to ensure that on filing the application a sufficient disclosure is provided, i.e. one that meets the requirements of Art. 83 in respect of the invention as claimed in all of the claims. If the claims define the invention, or a feature of it, in terms of parameters, the application as filed must include a clear description of the methods used to determine the parameter values unless a skilled person would know what method to use or unless all methods would yield the same result (see F-IV, 4.11). If the disclosure is seriously insufficient, that deficiency cannot subsequently be remedied by adding further examples or features without offending Art. 123(2), which requires that amendments may not result in the introduction of subject-matter extending beyond the content of the application as filed (see H-IV, 2.1; see also H-V, 2.2). Therefore, in such circumstances, the application must normally be refused. If, however, the deficiency concerns only some embodiments of the invention and not others, it could be remedied by restricting the claims to correspond to the sufficiently described embodiments only and deleting the description of the remaining embodiments.

3. **Insufficient disclosure**

Art. 83

Occasionally, applications are filed in which there is a fundamental insufficiency in the invention to the extent that it cannot be carried out by a skilled person; this constitutes an essentially irreparable failure to satisfy the requirements of Art. 83.

Two instances deserve special mention. The first is where the successful performance of the invention is dependent on chance. That is to say, the skilled person, in following the instructions for carrying out the invention, finds either that the alleged results of the invention are unrepeatable or that success in obtaining these results is achieved in a totally unreliable way. Sufficiency of disclosure cannot be acknowledged if the skilled person has to carry out a research programme based on trial and error to reproduce the results of the invention, with limited chances of success (T 38/11, Reasons 2.6). An example where this may occur is a microbiological process involving mutations. Such a case must be distinguished from one where repeated success is assured even though accompanied by a proportion of failures, as can arise e.g. in the manufacture of small magnetic cores or electronic components. In this case, if the satisfactory parts can be readily sorted by a non-destructive testing procedure, no objection is raised under Art. 83. Another example can be found in the field of artificial intelligence if the mathematical methods and training datasets are disclosed in insufficient detail for the skilled person to be able to reproduce the invention without undue burden using common general knowledge over the whole scope of the claim, e.g. if the application does not make it credible that a purpose or technical effect stated in the claim can be achieved (see also G-II, 3.3.1 and F-III, 12).

The second instance is where successful performance of the invention is inherently impossible because it would be contrary to well-established

physical laws – this applies e.g. to a perpetual motion machine. If the claims for such a machine are directed to its function, and not merely to its structure, an objection is raised not only under Art. 83 but also under Art. 52(1) in that the invention is not "susceptible of industrial application" (see G-III, 1).

4. Burden of proof in relation to the possibility of performing and repeating the invention

Although the burden of proof in relation to sufficiency of disclosure lies, as a rule, with the party raising the objection, this principle does not apply to cases where the application as filed does not provide a single example or other technical information from which it is plausible that the claimed invention can be carried out (see e.g. T 1329/11).

Furthermore, if there are serious doubts as to the possibility of performing the invention and repeating it as described, the burden of proof in relation to this possibility, or at least a demonstration that success is credible, rests with the applicant or the proprietor of the patent. In opposition, this may be the case where, for example, experiments carried out by the opponent suggest that the subject-matter of the patent does not achieve the desired technical result. As regards the possibility of performing and repeating the invention, see also F-III, 3.

5. Cases of partially insufficient disclosure

5.1 Only variants of the invention are incapable of being performed

The fact that only variants of the invention, e.g. one of a number of its embodiments, are not capable of being performed does not in itself lead to the conclusion that the subject-matter of the invention as a whole is incapable of being performed, i.e. is incapable of resolving the problem involved and therefore of achieving the desired technical result.

Those parts of the description relating to the variants of the invention which are incapable of being performed and the relevant claims must, however, be deleted or marked as background information that is not part of the invention (see F-IV, 4.3(iii)) at the request of the division if the deficiency is not remedied. The specification must then be so worded that the remaining claims are supported by the description and do not relate to embodiments which have proved incapable of being performed.

In some particular cases (e.g. claims relating to a combination of ranges or Markush claims), the scope of the claim might encompass a large number of alternatives, some of which correspond to non-working embodiments. In such cases, the presence of non-working embodiments in the claim is not harmful if the specification contains sufficient information on the relevant criteria to identify the working embodiments within the claimed alternatives (G 1/03). See also G-VII, 5.2.

5.2 Absence of well-known details

For the purposes of sufficient disclosure, the specification does not need to describe all the details of the operations to be carried out by the skilled person on the basis of the instructions given if these details are well-known

and clear from the definition of the class of the claims or on the basis of common general knowledge (see also F-III, 1 and F-IV, 4.5).

5.3 Difficulties in performing the invention

An invention is not immediately regarded as incapable of being performed on account of a reasonable degree of difficulty experienced in its performance ("teething troubles", for example).

Example 1: The difficulties which could arise, for example, from the fact that an artificial hip joint could be fitted to the human body only by a surgeon of great experience and above-average ability would not prevent manufacturers of orthopaedic devices from deriving complete information from the description with the result that they could reproduce the invention with a view to making an artificial hip joint.

Example 2: A switchable semiconductor which, according to the invention, is used for switching electrical circuits on and off without using contacts, thereby making for smoother operation, suffers from teething troubles in that a residual current continues to flow in the circuit when switched off. However, this residual current adversely affects the use of the electrical switch in certain fields only and can otherwise be reduced to negligible proportions by routine further development of the semiconductor.

6. Inventions relating to biological material

6.1 Biological material

Rule 26(3)
Rule 31(1)

Applications relating to biological material are subject to the special provisions set out in Rule 31. In accordance with Rule 26(3), the term "biological material" means any material containing genetic information and capable of reproducing itself or being reproduced in a biological system. If an invention involves the use of or concerns biological material which is not available to the public and which cannot be described in the European patent application in such a manner as to enable the invention to be carried out by a skilled person, the disclosure is not considered to have satisfied the requirements of Art. 83 unless the requirements of Rules 31(1), (2), first and second sentences, and Rule 33(1), first sentence, have been met.

Rule 26(1)

For inventions based on biological material of plant or animal origin or using such material, it is recommended that the application, where appropriate, include information on the **geographical origin** of such material, if known. However, this is without prejudice to the examination of European patent applications and European patents (EU Dir 98/44/EC, rec. 27).⁵

6.2 Public availability of biological material

The division must form an opinion as to whether the biological material is available to the public. There are several possibilities. The biological material may be known to be readily available to those skilled in the art, e.g. baker's yeast or *Bacillus natto*, which is commercially available, it may be a standard preserved strain or other biological material which the

⁵ See Article 3 of the WIPO Treaty on Intellectual Property, Genetic Resources and Associated Traditional Knowledge (not yet applicable to EP/PCT applications).

division knows to have been preserved in a recognised depositary institution and available to the public without restriction (see the notice from the EPO dated 7 July 2010, OJ EPO 2010, 498). Alternatively, the applicant may have given in the description sufficient information as to the identifying characteristics of the biological material and the unrestricted prior availability to the public in a depositary institution recognised for the purposes of Rule 33(6) to satisfy the division (see the notice from the EPO dated 7 July 2010, OJ EPO 2010, 498). In any of these cases, no further action is called for. If, however, the applicant has given no or insufficient information on public availability and the biological material is a particular strain not falling within the known categories such as those already mentioned, then the division must assume that the biological material is not available to the public. It must also examine whether the biological material could be described in the European patent application in such a manner as to enable the invention to be carried out by a skilled person (see, in particular, F-III, 3 and G-II, 5.5).

6.3 Deposit of biological material

If the biological material is not publicly available and if it cannot be described in the application in a way that enables the invention to be carried out by a skilled person, the division must check:

- (i) whether the application as filed gives such relevant information as is available to the applicant on the characteristics of the biological material. The relevant information under this provision concerns the classification of the biological material and significant differences from known biological material. For this purpose, the applicant must, to the extent available, indicate morphological and biochemical characteristics and the proposed taxonomic description.

Rule 31(1) and (2)

The information on the relevant biological material generally known to the skilled person on the date of filing is presumed to be available to the applicant, who must therefore provide it. If necessary, it has to be provided through experiments in accordance with the relevant standard literature.

For characterising bacteria, for example, the relevant standard work would be R.E. Buchanan, N.E. Gibbons: *Bergey's Manual of Determinative Bacteriology*.

Information also needs to be given on every further specific morphological or physiological characteristic relevant for recognising and propagating the biological material, e.g. suitable media (composition of ingredients), in particular where they are modified.

Abbreviations for biological material or media are often less well known than the applicant assumes and are therefore to be avoided or written in full at least once.

If biological material is deposited that cannot replicate itself but must be replicated in a biological system (e.g. viruses, bacteriophages, plasmids, vectors or free DNA or RNA), the above-mentioned

information is also required for that biological system. If, for example, other biological material that cannot be sufficiently described or is not publicly available is required, e.g. host cells or helper viruses, it must also be deposited and characterised accordingly. In addition, the process for producing the biological material within this biological system must be indicated.

In many cases, the above required information will already have been given to the depositary institution (see Rule 6.1(a)(iii) and 6.1(b) of the Regulation under the Budapest Treaty) and need only be incorporated into the application.

- (ii) whether the name of the depositary institution and the deposit's accession number were supplied at the date of filing. If the name of the depositary institution and the deposit's accession number were submitted later, the division must check whether they were filed within the relevant period under Rule 31(2). If so, it must also check whether any reference was supplied on the date of filing enabling the deposit to be linked to the subsequently filed accession number. Normally, the identification reference given by the depositor to the deposit is used in the application documents. The relevant document for filing the data later under Rule 31(1)(c) could be a letter containing the name of the depositary institution, the accession number and the above-mentioned identification reference or, alternatively, the deposit receipt containing all this information (see also G 2/93 and A-IV, 4.2).
- (iii) whether the deposit was made by a person other than the applicant and, if so, whether the depositor's name and address are stated in the application or were supplied within the relevant period under Rule 31(2). In such a case, the division must also check whether the document fulfilling the requirements mentioned in Rule 31(1)(d) was submitted to the EPO within the same time limit (see A-IV, 4.1 for details of when this document referred to in Rule 31(1)(d) is required).

The division, in addition to the checks referred to under (i) to (iii) above, asks for the deposit receipt issued by the depositary institution (see Rule 7.1 of the Regulation under the Budapest Treaty) or equivalent proof of the deposit of biological material if such proof has not already been filed (see (ii) above and A-IV, 4.2). This is to provide evidence for the indications made by the applicant pursuant to Rule 31(1)(c).

If this deposit receipt has been filed within the relevant time period under Rule 31(2), this document alone is regarded as submission of the information according to Rule 31(1)(c).

Rule 33(6)

In addition, the depositary institution named must be on the list of recognised institutions that is regularly updated and published in the Official Journal of the EPO.

Where a deposit was originally made outside the Budapest Treaty, it must be converted to one under it no later than the date of filing of the European patent application in order to fulfil the requirement of Rule 31(1)(a).

If any of these requirements is not satisfied, the biological material in question cannot be considered as having been disclosed according to Art. 83 by way of reference to the deposit.

Moreover, there are two situations in which the applicant can file information concerning the deposit required under Rule 31(1)(c) and, where applicable, also under Rule 31(1)(d) in a document filed after the accorded date of filing and within the relevant time limit for filing that document but after the expiry of one of the time limits under Rule 31(2)(a) to (c). As in the preceding paragraph, the consequence of the information being filed after the relevant time limit under Rule 31(2) is that the biological material is deemed not to have been disclosed according to Art. 83 by way of reference to the deposit. In these situations, the information concerning the deposit is contained in either:

Rule 31
Rule 40(1)(c)
Rule 56(2) and
(3)
Rule 56a(3) and (4)

- (a) a previously filed application to which reference is made under Rule 40(1)(c), the copy of that application being filed within either the two-month period under Rule 40(3) or that under Rule 55 or
- (b) missing parts of the description filed later within the two-month period under Rule 56(2) when the requirements of Rule 56(3) are satisfied, or correct application documents or parts filed later within the two-month period under Rule 56a(3) when the requirements of Rule 56a(4) are satisfied so that the application is not redated.

6.4 Priority claim

An application may claim the priority of a previous application with regard to unavailable biological material mentioned in F-III.6.1. In this case, the invention is considered disclosed in the previous application for the purpose of the priority claim under Art. 87(1) only if the deposit of the biological material was made no later than the date of filing of the previous application and in accordance with the requirements of the country in which it was filed. Also, the reference to the deposit in the previous application must be made in a manner enabling it to be identified. Where the deposit of the biological material referred to in the European patent application is not the same as the deposit referred to in the priority, it is up to the applicant, if the EPO considers it necessary, to provide evidence that the biological material is identical (see also the notice from the EPO dated 7 July 2010, OJ EPO 2010, 498).

6.5 Euro-PCT cases

International applications relating to the unavailable biological material above and designating or electing the EPO must comply with Rule 13bis PCT in conjunction with Rule 31 EPC. That means that for sufficient disclosure of the material, the deposit with a recognised depositary institution must be made no later than the international filing date, relevant information must be given in the application and the necessary indications

must be furnished as required during the international phase (see also the notice from the EPO dated 7 July 2010, OJ EPO 2010, 498).

7. Proper names, trade marks and trade names

The use of proper names, trade marks or trade names or similar words to refer to materials or articles is undesirable in so far as such words merely denote origin or where they may relate to a range of different products. If such a word is used, then, where necessary to satisfy the requirements of Art. 83, the product must be sufficiently identified, without reliance upon the word, to enable the invention to be carried out by the skilled person at the date of filing. However, where such words have become internationally accepted as standard descriptive terms and have acquired a precise meaning (e.g. "Bowden" cable, "Belleville" washer, "Panhard" rod, "caterpillar" belt), they may be allowed without further identification of the product to which they relate. For the assessment of the clarity of claims referring to a trade mark (Art. 84), see F-IV, 4.8.

8. Reference documents

References in European patent applications to other documents may relate either to the background art or to part of the disclosure of the invention.

Where the reference document relates to the background art, it may be in the application as originally filed or introduced at a later date (see F-II, 4.3 and 4.4 and H-IV, 2.2.7).

Where the reference document relates directly to the disclosure of the invention (e.g. details of one of the components of a claimed apparatus), then the examining division first considers whether knowing what is in the reference document is in fact essential for carrying out the invention as meant by Art. 83.

If not essential, the usual expression "which is hereby incorporated by reference" or similar needs to be deleted from the description.

Art. 65

If matter in the document referred to is essential to satisfy the requirements of Art. 83, the examining division requires the deletion of the above-mentioned expression and that, instead, the matter be expressly incorporated into the description because the patent specification must, regarding the essential features of the invention, be self-contained, i.e. capable of being understood without reference to any other document. Furthermore, documents are not part of the text to be translated according to Art. 65 (T.276/99).

Such incorporation of essential matter or essential features is, however, subject to the restrictions set out in H-IV, 2.2.1. It may be that the search division has requested the applicant to furnish the document referred to in order to be able to carry out a meaningful search (see B-IV, 1.3).

If, for the disclosure of the invention, a document is referred to in an application as originally filed, the relevant content of the reference document is to be considered as forming part of the content of the application for the purpose of citing the application under Art. 54(3) against

later applications. For reference documents not available to the public before the date of filing of the application, this applies only if the conditions set out in H-IV, 2.2.1 are fulfilled.

Because of this effect under Art. 54(3), it is very important that, where a reference is directed only to a particular part of the document referred to, that part needs to be clearly identified in the reference.

9. "Reach-through" claims

In certain technical areas (e.g. biotechnology, pharmacy) cases occur where:

- (i) one of the following and its use in a screening method have been defined as the only contribution to the art
 - a polypeptide
 - a protein
 - a receptor
 - an enzyme, etc. or
- (ii) a new mechanism of action of such molecule has been defined.

It may happen that such applications contain "reach-through" claims, i.e. claims directed to a chemical compound (or the use of that compound) defined only in functional terms with regard to the technical effect it exerts on one of the above molecules.

Typical examples of such claims would be:

- "An agonist/antagonist to polypeptide X [optionally as identified by the screening method of claim A]."
- "An agonist/antagonist to polypeptide X [optionally as identified by the screening method of claim A], for use in therapy."
- "An agonist/antagonist to polypeptide X [optionally as identified by the screening method of claim A], for use in the treatment of disease Y.",

where the description indicates that polypeptide X is involved in disease Y.

According to Art. 83 and Rule 42(1)(c), the claim must contain sufficient technical disclosure of the solution to the problem. A functional definition of a chemical compound ("reach-through" claim) covers all compounds possessing the activity or effect specified in the claim. It would be an undue burden to isolate and characterise all potential compounds (e.g. agonists/antagonists) without any effective pointer to their identity (see F-III, 1) or to test every known compound and every conceivable future compound for this activity to see if it falls within the scope of the

claim. In effect, the applicant is attempting to patent what has not yet been invented, and the fact that the applicant can test for the effect used to define the compounds does not necessarily confer sufficiency on the claim; in fact it constitutes an invitation for the skilled person to perform a research programme (see T.435/91, Reasons 2.2.1, followed by T.1063/06, Headnote II).

In general, claims directed to merely functionally defined chemical compounds that are to be found by means of a new kind of research tool (e.g. using a new screening method based on a newly discovered molecule or a new mechanism of action) are directed to future inventions, which patent protection under the EPC is not designed for. In the case of such "reach-through" claims, it is both reasonable and imperative to limit the subject-matter of the claims to the actual contribution to the art (see T.1063/06, Headnote I).

10. Further medical use claims

In a further medical use claim, the claimed therapeutic effect is a functional technical feature of the claim, i.e. the claims are commonly limited to a known substance or composition for use in a new therapeutic application (G-VI, 6.1).

In order to meet the requirements of Art. 83, the proof of a claimed therapeutic effect has to be provided in the application as filed, in particular if, in the absence of experimental data in the application as filed, it would not be credible to the skilled person that the therapeutic effect is achieved. An insufficiency in this respect cannot be remedied by post-published evidence (G.2/21).

It is therefore necessary that, at the date of filing, the application render it credible that the known substance or composition is suitable for the claimed therapeutic application and that the therapeutic effect arises as a result of the therapeutic measures defined in the claims. Mere verbal statements are not sufficient to render the therapeutic effect credible. The application as filed must provide either suitable evidence in which the therapeutic effect is demonstrated or scientific reasoning based on known effects for the claimed substance or composition. While it is not necessary for every conceivable treatment falling within the scope of the claims to be therapeutically effective, an undue amount of research should not be needed for the skilled person to arrive at therapeutically effective treatments.

A claim directed to a further medical use wherein the active pharmaceutical agent is defined only in terms of functional features meets the requirements of Art. 83 if all of the following conditions are met:

- (a) specific compounds achieving the claimed function are part of common general knowledge or are known from the prior art or are disclosed in the application as filed in such a way that it is credible that the compounds achieve the claimed function;

- (b) the claimed function can be verified by tests or procedures which are adequately specified in the description or known to the skilled person and which do not require undue experimentation; and
- (c) the application as filed shows that the claimed function is causal for the solution of the problem underlying the invention, such that it is credible that any compound achieving the claimed function is suitable for the claimed therapeutic application.

11. Sufficiency of disclosure and Rules 56 and 56a

Missing parts under Rule 56 and correct application documents or parts filed under Rule 56a may be withdrawn within one month of a notification on redating to maintain the original date of filing. These parts are then deemed to be no longer part of the application (see also A-II, 5.4.2 and 5.5, A-II, 6.5, C-III, 1, H-IV, 2.2.2 and 2.2.3).

Under Rule 56a(4), documents or parts filed erroneously cannot be withdrawn and may be removed only by amending the application in compliance with Art. 123(2).

In this case, the division must carefully evaluate whether the invention is still sufficiently disclosed without relying on the technical information contained in the withdrawn missing parts. If the division concludes that the requirements of Art. 83 are not satisfied, a corresponding objection is raised. Ultimately, the application may be refused for lack of sufficient disclosure (see F-III, 3 to 5).

12. Sufficiency of disclosure and clarity

An ambiguity in the claims may lead to an insufficiency objection. However, ambiguity also relates to the scope of the claims, i.e. Art. 84 (see F-IV, 4). Normally, therefore, an ambiguity in a claim will lead to an objection under Art. 83 only if the whole scope of the claim is affected such that it is impossible to carry out at all the invention defined. Otherwise an objection under Art. 84 is appropriate (see T 608/07, T 1811/13).

In particular (see T 593/09), where a claim contains an ill-defined ("unclear", "ambiguous") parameter (see also F-IV, 4.11) and where, as a consequence, a skilled person would not know whether they were working within or outside of the scope of the claim, this, by itself, is not a reason to deny sufficiency of disclosure as required by Art. 83. Nor is such a lack of clear definition necessarily a matter for objection under Art. 84 only. What is decisive for establishing insufficiency within the meaning of Art. 83 is whether the parameter, in the specific case, is so ill-defined that a skilled person is not able, on the basis of the disclosure as a whole and using common general knowledge, to identify (without undue burden) the technical measures necessary to solve the problem underlying the application at issue, e.g. see T 61/14.

There is a delicate balance between Arts. 83 and 84, which has to be assessed on the merits of each individual case. Care, therefore, has to be taken in opposition that an insufficiency objection is not merely a hidden objection under Art. 84, especially in the case of ambiguities in the claims

(T 608/07). On the other hand, even though lack of support/clarity is not a ground for opposition (see also F-IV, 6.4), a problem related to it may in fact be of concern under Art. 83.

13. Sufficiency of disclosure and inventive step

If the claimed invention lacks reproducibility, this may become relevant under the requirements of sufficiency of disclosure or inventive step. The technical effect achieved by the invention solves the problem underlying the application. If an invention lacks reproducibility because its desired technical effect as expressed in the claim is not achieved, this results in a lack of sufficient disclosure, which has to be objected to under Art. 83. Otherwise, i.e. if the effect is not expressed in the claim but is part of the problem to be solved, there is a problem of inventive step (see G 1/03, Reasons 2.5.2, T 1079/08, T 1319/10, T 5/06 and T 380/05).

See F-III, 3 for cases where successful performance of the invention is inherently impossible because it would be contrary to the well-established laws of physics.

Chapter IV – Claims (Art. 84 and formal requirements)

1. General

The application must contain "one or more claims".

Art. 78(1)(c)

These must:

Art. 84

- (i) "define the matter for which protection is sought"
- (ii) "be clear and concise" and
- (iii) "be supported by the description".

Since the extent of the protection conferred by a European patent or application is determined by the claims (interpreted with the help of the description and drawings), clarity of the claims is of the utmost importance (see also F-IV, 4).

Art. 69(1)

2. Form and content of claims

2.1 Technical features

The claims must be drafted in terms of the "technical features of the invention". This means that claims must not contain any statements relating, for example, to commercial advantages or other matters not related to "carrying out" the invention. Statements of purpose, however, are allowed if they assist in defining the invention.

Rule 43(1)

It is not necessary for every feature to be expressed in terms of a structural limitation. Functional features may be included if a skilled person would have no difficulty in providing some means of performing this function without exercising inventive skill (see F-IV, 6.5). For the specific case of a functional definition of a pathological condition, see F-IV, 4.21.

Claims to the use of the invention, i.e. the technical application of it, are allowable.

2.2 Two-part form

Rule 43(1)(a) and (b) defines the two-part form which a claim must have "wherever appropriate".

Rule 43(1)

The first part – or "preamble" – needs to contain a statement indicating "the designation of the subject-matter of the invention", i.e. the general technical class of apparatus, process, etc. to which the invention relates, followed by a statement of "those technical features which are necessary for the definition of the claimed subject-matter but which, in combination, are part of the prior art". This requirement to state prior-art features in the first part of the claim is applicable only to independent claims and not to dependent ones (see F-IV, 3.4). It is clear from the wording of Rule 43 that it is necessary only to refer to those prior-art features which are relevant to the invention. For example, if the invention relates to a photographic camera

but the inventive step relates entirely to the shutter, it would be sufficient for the first part of the claim to read: "A photographic camera including a focal plane shutter"; there is no need to also refer to the other known features of a camera such as the lens and view-finder.

The second part – or "characterising portion" – needs to state the features which the invention adds to the prior art, i.e. the technical features for which, in combination with the features stated in the first part, protection is sought.

If a single document in the state of the art according to Art. 54(2), e.g. cited in the search report, reveals that one or more features in the second part of the claim were already known in combination with all the features in the first part of the claim and in that combination have the same effect as they have in the full combination according to the invention, the division will require that such feature or features be transferred to the first part.

Where, however, a claim relates to a novel combination and where the division of the features of the claim between the preamble and the characterising part could be made in more than one way without inaccuracy, the applicant must not be pressed, unless there are very substantial reasons, to adopt a different division of the features from that which they have chosen if their version is not incorrect. If the applicant insists on including more features in the preamble than can be derived from the closest available prior art, this is accepted.

If no other prior art is available, this first part of the claim could be used to raise an objection on the ground of lack of inventive step (see G-VII, 5.1, last paragraph).

2.3 Two-part form unsuitable

Subject to what is stated in F-IV.2.3.2, final sentence, applicants are required to follow the above two-part formulation in their independent claim or claims, where, for example, it is clear that their invention resides in a distinct improvement in an old combination of parts or steps. However, as is indicated by Rule 43, this form need be used only in appropriate cases. The nature of the invention may be such that this form of claim is unsuitable, e.g. because it would give a distorted or misleading picture of the invention or the prior art. Examples of the kind of invention which may require a different presentation are:

- (i) the combination of known integers of equal status, the inventive step lying solely in the combination
- (ii) the modification of, as distinct from addition to, a known chemical process, e.g. by omitting one substance or substituting one substance for another and
- (iii) a complex system of functionally interrelated parts, the inventive step concerning changes in several of these or in their interrelationships.

In examples (i) and (ii), the Rule 43 form of claim may be artificial and inappropriate, whilst in example (iii) it might lead to an inordinately lengthy and involved claim. Another example in which the Rule 43 form of claim may be inappropriate is where the invention is a new chemical compound or group of compounds. It is likely also that other cases will arise in which the applicant is able to provide convincing reasons for formulating the claim in a different form.

2.3.1 No two-part form

There is a special instance in which the Rule 43 form of claim is avoided. Art. 54(3) This is when the only relevant prior art is another European patent application falling within the terms of Art. 54(3). Such prior art must, however, be clearly acknowledged in the description (see F-II, 4.3, penultimate paragraph, and 4.4).

2.3.2 Two-part form "wherever appropriate"

When examining whether a claim is to be put in the form provided for in Rule 43(1), second sentence, it is important to assess whether this form is "appropriate". In this respect, the purpose of the two-part form is to allow the skilled person to see clearly which features necessary for the definition of the claimed subject-matter are, in combination, part of the prior art. If this is sufficiently clear from the indication of prior art made in the description to meet the requirement of Rule 42(1)(b), the two-part form is not insisted upon.

2.4 Formulae and tables

The claims, as well as the description, may contain chemical or mathematical formulae but not drawings (see the decision of the President of the EPO dated 7 July 2025, OJ EPO 2025, A49, Art. 2(8)). The claims may contain tables but "only if their subject-matter makes the use of tables desirable". In view of the use of the word "desirable" in this decision, the division does not object to the use of tables in claims where this form is convenient.

3. Kinds of claim

3.1 Categories

The EPC refers to different "categories" of claim ("product, process, apparatus or use"). For many inventions, claims in more than one category are needed for full protection. In fact, there are only two basic kinds of claim, viz. claims to a physical entity (product, apparatus) and claims to an activity (process, use). The first basic kind of claim ("product claim") includes a substance or compositions (e.g. chemical compound or a mixture of compounds) as well as any physical entity (e.g. object, article, apparatus, machine, or system of co-operating apparatus) which is produced by a person's technical skill. Examples are: "a steering mechanism incorporating an automatic feed-back circuit ..."; "a woven garment comprising ..."; "an insecticide consisting of X, Y, Z"; or "a communication system comprising a plurality of transmitting and receiving stations". The second basic kind of claim ("process claim") is applicable to all kinds of activities in which the use of some material product for effecting the process is implied; the activity may be exercised upon material Rule 43(2)

products, upon energy, upon other processes (as in control processes) or upon living things (see, however, G-II, 4.2 and 5.4).

Rule 43(2) in combination with Rule 44(1) should be construed as permitting the inclusion of any one of the following combinations of claims of different categories in the same application:

- (i) in addition to an independent claim for a given product, an independent claim for a process specially adapted for the manufacture of said product and an independent claim for a use of said product or
- (ii) in addition to an independent claim for a given process, an independent claim for an apparatus or means specifically designed for carrying out said process or
- (iii) in addition to an independent claim for a given product, an independent claim for a process specially adapted for the manufacture of said product and an independent claim for an apparatus or means specifically designed for carrying out said process.

Art. 82

However, while a single set of independent claims according to any one of the combinations (i), (ii) or (iii) above is always permissible, a plurality of such sets of independent claims in one European patent application can only be allowed if the specific circumstances defined in Rule 43(2)(a) to (c) apply and the requirements of Arts. 82 and 84 are met. The proliferation of independent claims arising out of a combined effect of this kind may therefore be allowed only by way of an exception.

Art. 64(2)

If the subject-matter of a European patent is a process, the protection conferred by the patent extends to the products directly obtained by such a process.

3.2 Number of independent claims

Rule 43(2)

According to Rule 43(2), as applicable to all European patent applications, the number of independent claims is limited to one independent claim in each category.

Exceptions to this rule can only be admitted in the specific circumstances defined in sub-paragraphs (a), (b) or (c) of this rule, provided the requirement of Art. 82 with regard to unity is met (see F-V).

The following are examples of typical situations falling within the scope of the exceptions from the principle of one independent claim per category:

- (i) Examples of a plurality of interrelated products (Rule 43(2)(a))
 - plug and socket
 - transmitter – receiver

- intermediate(s) and final chemical product
- gene – gene construct – host – protein – medicament.

For the purpose of Rule 43(2)(a), the term "interrelated" is interpreted to mean "different objects that complement each other or work together". In addition, Rule 43(2)(a) can be interpreted as covering apparatus claims since the term "products" is considered to include apparatuses. Likewise, it may include systems, subsystems and subunits of such systems as long as these entities are interrelated. Interrelated method claims may also fall under the exception of Rule 43(2)(a).

(ii) Examples of a plurality of different inventive uses of a product or apparatus (Rule 43(2)(b))

- claims directed to further medical uses when a first medical use is known (see G-II, 4.2)
- claims directed to the use of compound X for multiple purposes, e.g. for cosmetically fortifying hair and for promoting hair growth.

(iii) Examples of alternative solutions to a particular problem (Rule 43(2)(c))

- a group of chemical compounds
- two or more processes for the manufacture of such compounds.

(iv) Examples of allowable claim types

- claims directed to multiple methods involving a novel and inventive polypeptide P, e.g. an enzyme that controls a specific step in the synthesis of a compound:

a method for manufacturing the polypeptide P

a method for manufacturing the compound by using either the isolated polypeptide or host cells expressing said polypeptide

a method for selecting a host cell based on whether it expresses the polypeptide of the invention.

- a data-sending method for sending a data packet between a plurality of devices coupled to a bus

a data-receiving method for receiving a data packet between a plurality of devices coupled to a bus.

- methods of operating a data processing system comprising steps A, B, ... – a data processing apparatus/system comprising means for carrying out said method – a computer program [product] adapted to perform said method – a computer-readable storage medium/data carrier comprising said program.

Note, however, that when several independent claims are directed to equivalent embodiments that are not sufficiently different (e.g. computer program adapted to perform said method, optionally carried on an electric carrier signal – computer program comprising software code adapted to perform method steps A, B ...), the exceptions under Rule 43(2) usually do not apply.

For the purpose of Rule 43(2)(c), the term "alternative solutions" can be interpreted as "different or mutually exclusive possibilities". Moreover, if it is possible to cover alternative solutions by a single claim, the applicant should do so. For example, overlaps and similarities in the features of the independent claims of the same category are an indication that it would be appropriate to replace such claims with a single independent claim, e.g. by selecting a common wording for the essential features (see F-IV, 4.5).

3.3 Objection under Rule 43(2) or 137(5)

Where, after the search, the application under examination still contains an unjustified plurality of independent claims in the same category (see B-VIII, 4.1 and 4.2), an objection is raised under Rule 43(2). If no Rule 62a(1) invitation was sent at the search stage, the examining division can still raise an objection under Rule 43(2). If the application is a Euro-PCT application not subject to the preparation of a supplementary European search report (see B-II, 4.3.1), an objection under Rule 43(2) may also be raised in examination.

Rule 43(2)

When an objection under Rule 43(2) is raised, the applicant is invited to amend the claims as appropriate. If the search was restricted in accordance with Rule 62a and the examining division upholds the objection under Rule 43(2) despite possible counter-arguments provided by the applicant in response to the invitation under Rule 62a(1) (see B-VIII, 4.2.2) or to the search opinion under Rule 70a (see B-X, 8), the claims must be amended in such a way as to result in the removal of all subject-matter excluded from the search (Rule 62a(2)) and the description amended accordingly (see H-II, 5).

If, in reply to the reasoned objection (raised or confirmed in a communication from the examining division), the additional independent claims are maintained and no convincing arguments are presented that one of the situations referred to in sub-paragraphs Rule 43(2)(a) to (c) applies, the application may be refused under Art. 97(2). The refusal must include a complete reasoning addressing the applicant's arguments and explaining why none of the situations referred to in Rule 43(2)(a) to (c) applies (E-IX, 2.6).

If the application is amended to provide a set of claims complying with Rule 43(2) but containing one or more claims directed to subject-matter excluded from the search in accordance with Rule 62a(1), an objection under Rule 137(5) is raised (see also H-II, 5 and 4.1.1) and the applicant is invited to restrict the claims to the subject-matter searched (Rule 62a(2)). The application cannot be refused under Art. 97(2) in conjunction with Rule 137(5) before the applicant has been given the opportunity according to Art. 113(1) to comment on the objection under Rule 137(5) and in particular on the underlying issue of whether the claims in respect of which the invitation under Rule 62a(1) was sent did in fact comply with Rule 43(2).

The burden of proof in relation to an objection under Rule 43(2) rests initially with the applicant, i.e. it is up to them to argue convincingly why additional independent claims can be maintained. For example, the mere statement that the number of claims is the minimum necessary to provide the overall scope of protection sought by the applicant is not a convincing argument (see T 56/01, Reasons 5).

Where the application also lacks unity of invention, the division may raise an objection under either Rule 43(2) or Art. 82, or both. The applicant cannot contest which of these objections has priority.

3.4 Independent and dependent claims

All applications will contain one or more "independent" claims directed to the essential features of the invention. Any such claim may be followed by one or more claims concerning "particular embodiments" of that invention. It is evident that any claim relating to a particular embodiment must effectively also include the essential features of the invention and, hence, must include all the features of at least one independent claim. The term "particular embodiment" is construed broadly as meaning any more specific disclosure of the invention than that set out in the independent claim or claims.

Rule 43(3) and (4)

Any claim which includes all the features of any other claim is termed a "dependent claim". Such a claim must contain, if possible at the beginning, a reference to the other claim, all features of which it includes (see, however, F-IV, 3.8 for claims in different categories). Since a dependent claim does not in itself define all the characterising features of the subject-matter which it claims, expressions such as "characterised in that" or "characterised by" are not necessary in such a claim but are nevertheless permissible. A claim defining further particulars of an invention may include all the features of another dependent claim by referring back to that claim. Also, in some cases, a dependent claim may define a particular feature or features which may appropriately be added to more than one previous claim (independent or dependent). It follows that there are several possibilities: a dependent claim may refer back to one or more independent claims, one or more dependent claims or both independent and dependent claims.

Rule 43(4)

It sometimes occurs that an independent claim refers explicitly to alternative solutions and that these alternatives are also claimed separately in dependent claims. Such claims may seem redundant but may be

important for applicants in some national procedures if they wish to restrict their claims.

Art. 84

The division objects to such claims only if they detract from the clarity of the claims as a whole.

A dependent claim referring explicitly to independent claims in two categories as alternatives cannot be objected to on this ground alone. For example, if the invention relates to both a composition and a use of that composition, it is possible for a claim specifying further features of the composition to be made dependent on both the independent claim for the composition and the independent claim for its use.

Art. 84

Objections are, however, raised to this type of claim dependency if it leads to a lack of clarity.

3.5 Arrangement of claims

Rule 43(4)

All dependent claims referring back to a single previous claim and those referring back to several previous claims must be grouped together to the extent and in the most appropriate way possible. The arrangement must therefore be one which enables the association of related claims to be readily determined and their meaning in association to be readily construed. The division objects if the arrangement of claims is such as to create obscurity in the definition of the subject-matter to be protected. In general, however, when the corresponding independent claim is allowable, the division does not concern itself unduly with the subject-matter of dependent claims if it is satisfied that they are truly dependent and thus in no way extend the scope of protection of the invention defined in the corresponding independent claim (see also F-IV, 3.8).

3.6 Subject-matter of a dependent claim

If the two-part form is used for the independent claim(s), dependent claims may relate to further details of features not only of the characterising portion but also of the preamble.

3.7 Alternatives in a claim

Art. 84

Art. 82

A claim, whether independent or dependent, may refer to alternatives if the number and presentation of alternatives in a single claim does not make the claim obscure or difficult to construe and if the claim meets the requirements of unity (see also F-V, 3.2.1 and 3.2). In the case of a claim defining (chemical or non-chemical) alternatives, i.e. referred to as a "Markush grouping", unity of invention is considered to be present if the alternatives are of a similar nature and can fairly be substituted for one another (see F-V, 3.2.5).

3.8 Independent claims containing a reference to another claim or to features from a claim of another category

A claim containing a reference to another claim is not necessarily a dependent claim as defined in Rule 43(4). One example of this is a claim referring to a claim of a different category (e.g. "Apparatus for carrying out the process of claim 1 ..." or "Process for the manufacture of the product of claim 1 ..."). Similarly, in a situation like the plug-and-socket example of

F-IV. 3.2(i), a claim to the one part referring to the other co-operating part (e.g. "plug for co-operation with the socket of claim 1 ...") is not a dependent claim. In all these examples, the division carefully considers the extent to which the claim containing the reference necessarily involves the features of the claim referred to and the extent to which it does not. Indeed, objections on the grounds of lack of clarity and failure to state the technical features (Rule 43(1)) apply to a claim which simply says "Apparatus for carrying out the process of claim 1". Since the change of category already makes the claim independent, the applicant is required to set out clearly in the claim the essential features of the apparatus.

The same is true for a claim which says "Method for using an apparatus according to claim 1". The method claim, formulated as a use claim, lacks the steps that are carried out in order to use the apparatus (see F-IV. 4.16) and is therefore not clear.

For claims directed to computer-implemented inventions in which independent claims often comprise references to other independent claims, see F-IV. 3.9.

The subject-matter of a claim in one category may also to some extent be defined in terms of features from another category; therefore, an apparatus may be defined in terms of functions it is able to perform if the structure is made sufficiently clear; or a process may be defined in terms of essential structural features of the apparatus for carrying it out; or an element of an apparatus may be defined in terms of how it is made. However, in the wording of these claims and in the assessment of the claimed subject-matter, a clear distinction must be maintained between product claims (for a device, apparatus or system) and process claims (for a process, activity or use). For example, a claim for an apparatus cannot normally be limited only by the manner in which the apparatus is used; for this reason, a claim which simply reads "Apparatus Z, when used for carrying out process Y" is also objected to on the grounds of lack of clarity and failure to state the technical features (Rule 43(1)).

No separate examination for the novelty and inventive step of a process claim for producing a product is necessary if:

- all features of the product as defined in the product claim inevitably (see also G-VII. 14) result from the claimed process (see F-IV. 4.5 and T. 169/88) and
- the product claim is patentable.

This also applies in the case of a claim for the use of a product when the product is patentable and the use explicitly or implicitly implements all features of the product claim (see T. 1144/07). In all other instances, the patentability of the claim referred to does not necessarily imply the patentability of the independent claim containing the reference. If the process, product and/or use claims have different effective dates (see F-VI. 1 and 2), a separate examination may still be necessary in view of intermediate documents (see also G-VII. 14).

3.9 Claims directed to computer-implemented inventions

The expression "computer-implemented inventions" (CII) covers claims which involve computers, computer networks or other programmable apparatus, whereby at least one feature is realised by means of a program.

Claims directed to CII should define all the features which are essential for the technical effect of the process which the computer program is intended to carry out when it is run (see F-IV, 4.5.2, last sentence). An objection under Art. 84 may be raised if the claims contain program listings. Short excerpts from programs may be accepted in the description (see F-II, 4.12).

The following three sections distinguish between three different situations. The practice defined in F-IV, 3.9.1 is confined to inventions in which all the method steps can be carried out by generic data processing means. F-IV, 3.9.2, on the other hand, relates to inventions in which at least one method step defines the use of specific data processing means or other technical devices. Inventions that are realised in a distributed computing environment are discussed in F-IV, 3.9.3.

3.9.1 Cases where all method steps can be fully implemented by generic data processing means

A common type of CII relates to subject-matter where all the method steps can fully be carried out by computer program instructions running on means which, in the context of the invention, provide generic data processing functions. Such means can, for example, be embedded in a personal computer, smartphone, printer, etc. In such inventions, although different claim structures are possible, the set of claims usually starts with a method claim. Further claims in other categories with subject-matter corresponding to that of the method may be included to obtain complete protection of the invention. If the invention concerns software which can be loaded into memory, transmitted over a network or distributed on a data carrier, a claim to a computer program [product] may also be present in addition to a computer-implemented method. The category of a computer program [product] claim is distinguished from that of a corresponding computer-implemented method (T 424/03 and G 3/08). The following non-exhaustive list comprises examples of acceptable claim formulations (T 410/96, T 1173/97 and T 2140/08) in such a set of claims:

- (i) Method claim (claim 1)
 - A computer-implemented method comprising steps A, B, ...
 - A method carried out by a computer comprising steps A, B, ...
- (ii) Apparatus/device/system claim (claim 2)
 - A data processing apparatus/device/system comprising means for carrying out [the steps of] the method of claim 1.
 - A data processing apparatus/device/system comprising means for carrying out step A, means for carrying out step B, ...

- A data processing apparatus/device/system comprising a processor adapted to/configured to perform [the steps of] the method of claim 1.

(iii) Computer program [product] claim (claim 3)

- A computer program [product] comprising instructions which, when the program is executed by a computer, cause the computer to carry out [the steps of] the method of claim 1.
- A computer program [product] comprising instructions which, when the program is executed by a computer, cause the computer to carry out steps A, B, ...

(iv) Computer-readable [storage] medium/data carrier claim (claim 4)

- A computer-readable [storage] medium comprising instructions which, when executed by a computer, cause the computer to carry out [the steps of] the method of claim 1.
- A computer-readable [storage] medium comprising instructions which, when executed by a computer, cause the computer to carry out steps A, B, ...
- A computer-readable data carrier having stored thereon the computer program [product] of claim 3.
- A data carrier signal carrying the computer program [product] of claim 3.

In formulation (ii) above, apparatus features of the means-plus-function type ("means for ...") are interpreted as means adapted to carry out the respective steps/functions rather than merely means suitable for carrying them out (T 410/96). There is no particular preference of wording among "comprising means for", "adapted to", "configured to" or equivalents. In this way, novelty is conferred over an unprogrammed data processing apparatus or a data processing apparatus programmed to perform a different function.

An objection under Rule 43(2) is not raised if the claim set comprises one claim from each of the above formulations (i)-(iv). In these cases, an invitation under Rule 62a(1) is therefore not sent at the search stage since the requirements of Rule 43(2) are fulfilled.

However, an objection under Rule 43(2) is raised if there are multiple independent claims present from a given heading (i)-(iv) and they do not fall under the exceptions of Rule 43(2) (F-IV, 3.2) (e.g. two or more computer program [product] claims which cannot be considered as falling under one of the exceptions of Rule 43(2)).

When assessing the novelty and inventive step of a set of claims as defined above (formulations (i)-(iv)), the division usually starts with the method

claim. If the subject-matter of the method claim is considered novel and inventive, the subject-matter of the other claims in a set formulated in accordance with the headings above will normally be novel and inventive as well if they comprise the features corresponding to all those which assure the patentability of the method.

Claims related to CII which are formulated differently to those in the formulations (i)-(iv) defined above are assessed on a case-by-case basis in the light of the requirements of clarity, novelty and inventive step (see also F-IV.3.9.2).

For example, when the invention is realised in a distributed computing environment or involves interrelated products, it may be necessary to refer to the specific features of the different entities and to define how they interact to ensure the presence of all essential features rather than making a mere reference to another claim as in the above formulations (ii)-(iv). In such cases, further independent claims to interrelated products and their corresponding methods may also be allowable under Rule 43(2)(a) (F-IV.3.2 and 3.9.3).

Similarly, if user interaction is required, an objection under Art. 84 may be raised if it is not possible to determine from the claim which steps are carried out by the user.

Furthermore, a claim to a computer-implemented data structure in addition to formulations (i)-(iv) may be allowable under Rule 43(2) if it is defined by its own technical features, e.g. by a well-defined structure as in T.858/02, possibly with references to the corresponding method or system in which it is used. However, a computer-implemented data structure does not necessarily comprise features of the process by which it is generated. It is not necessarily restricted by a method in which it is used, either. Therefore, a claim to a computer-implemented data structure usually cannot be defined merely by reference to a method or as an outcome of a process. For further information on data structures, see G-II.3.6.3.

For the assessment of inventive step for claims comprising features related to exclusions under Art. 52(2), as is often the case with CII, see G-VII.5.4.

3.9.2 Cases where method steps define additional devices and/or specific data processing means

Where a method claim includes steps defined as being carried out by devices other than generic data processing means, a corresponding device and/or computer program claim may need more than a mere reference to the method claim as in formulations (i)-(iv) in F-IV.3.9.1 to fulfil the requirements of Art. 84 (see also F-IV.3.8). Furthermore, if not all the features of the method claim are reflected in claims in other categories referring to the method, said claims in other categories have to be construed and examined separately with respect to novelty and inventive step.

In particular, in applied fields such as medical devices, measuring, optics, electro-mechanics or industrial production processes, method claims

frequently involve steps of manipulating or interacting with technical physical entities by using computer control. These method steps may not always be fully performed by the computer, and the method claim may recite specific technical means for carrying out some of the steps. In such a case, defining a computer program claim as in F-IV, 3.9.1(iii) will normally lead to an objection under Art. 84 if the step carried out by the specific technical means cannot be carried out by a generic data processing means (see Example 1 below). An objection under Art. 84 may also be raised if the claims do not define which steps are carried out by the data processor or by the additional devices involved, as well as their interactions. The same applies if specific data processing means (e.g. a particular parallel computer architecture) are required as opposed to the generic data processing means described in F-IV, 3.9.1.

On the other hand, if the method claim defines the further processing, by generic computational means, of data received from specific technical means, such as sensors, it is not necessary that the computer or computer program claims referring to the method comprise those specific technical means. In this case, the specific technical means recited in the method are not required for carrying out the method steps, and formulations as in F-IV, 3.9.1 may be appropriate (see Example 2 below).

Finally, as is the case for any essential feature, if the specific technical means are essential for defining the invention, they have to be present in all the independent claims. Whether a feature is essential is decided according to the principles defined in F-IV, 4.5 and subsections, taking due account of implicit features (F-IV, 4.5.4).

Example 1

1. A method of determining oxygen saturation in blood in a pulse oximeter, comprising:
 - receiving in an electromagnetic detector first and second electromagnetic radiation signals from a blood-perfused tissue portion corresponding to two different wavelengths of light;
 - normalising said electromagnetic signals according to steps A, B and C to provide normalised electromagnetic signals;
 - determining oxygen saturation based on said normalised electromagnetic signals according to steps D and E.
2. A pulse oximeter having an electromagnetic detector and means adapted to execute the steps of the method of claim 1.
3. A computer program [product] comprising instructions to cause the device of claim 2 to execute the steps of the method of claim 1.
4. A computer-readable medium having stored thereon the computer program of claim 3.

Remarks: In this example, the method claim comprises a step which is defined as being executed by specific technical means (the electromagnetic detector in a pulse oximeter). A computer program claim making reference only to the method would lack clarity because such a program could not be executed, for example, on a general-purpose computer which does not have a pulse oximeter with an electromagnetic detector. Therefore, the computer program claim should be defined as being executed on the pulse oximeter with an electromagnetic detector (by referring to the device of claim 2) rather than only referring to the method claim 1.

Example 2

1. A computer-implemented method of determining oxygen saturation in blood, comprising:
 - receiving data representing first and second electromagnetic radiation signals acquired by an electromagnetic detector from a blood-perfused tissue portion corresponding to two different wavelengths of light;
 - normalising the data representing said electromagnetic signals according to steps A, B and C to provide normalised data;
 - determining oxygen saturation based on said normalised data according to steps D and E.
2. A data processing apparatus comprising means for carrying out the method of claim 1.
3. A computer program [product] comprising instructions which, when the program is executed by a computer, cause the computer to carry out the method of claim 1.
4. A computer-readable medium having stored thereon the computer program [product] of claim 3.

Remarks: In this example, the invention lies in the further processing of acquired data for determining the oxygen saturation in blood. The data can be received, for example, from a data file storing data previously acquired by the electromagnetic detector. Such a method can therefore be carried out by generic data processing means, for example, in the form of a desktop computer. It does not specify the electromagnetic detector as a required feature for receiving the input data. Hence, the device claim defined by reference to the method claim does not need to include the pulse oximeter or an electromagnetic detector. Furthermore, the computer program claim can be executed on a general-purpose computer and not on a specific device, in contrast to the case in Example 1. As a result, the formulations as in F-IV, 3.9.1 are appropriate for claims 2-4 of Example 2.

3.9.3 Cases where the invention is realised in a distributed computing environment

Another common type of CII is realised in a distributed computing environment. Examples are a networked client (e.g. a smartphone) and server system, accessing storage or processing resources of a computer cloud, devices in a peer-to-peer network performing file sharing, an augmented reality environment with head-mounted displays, autonomous vehicles interacting over an ad hoc network or maintaining a distributed ledger using a blockchain.

For such distributed CII, the claim set may comprise claims directed to each entity of the distributed system and/or to the overall system and the corresponding methods. Such a claim set may be allowable under Rule 43(2)(a) (F-IV, 3.2). Each independent claim must nevertheless fulfil the requirements for patentability, in particular the requirements of Arts. 54, 56 and 84. For example, if the invention lies in the implementation of a computer cloud using virtual machines enabling adaptation to workload changes by allocating resources in an automatic manner, a client device accessing the resources of the cloud may already be known in the art. The claim set must also fulfil the requirements of unity.

It may be necessary to refer to the specific features of the different entities and to define how they interact to ensure the presence of all essential features. When referring to the interaction between the different entities, particular care must be taken that the claim is clear. In some situations, it may be necessary to limit the claim to the combination of the entities (see F-IV, 4.14). If the distribution of the steps of a method across the involved entities is essential to the invention, it will be necessary to define which method step is carried out by which entity to fulfil the requirements of Art. 84. Otherwise, this may be left undefined in generic CII claims (see F-IV, 3.9.1).

The following examples illustrate some considerations relating to these requirements. Other formulations (F-IV, 3.9.1) than the ones given in the examples can also be part of the claim set but have been omitted for reasons of brevity.

Example

1. A transmitter device comprising means for encoding data by performing steps A and B and means to transmit the encoded data to a receiver device.
2. A receiver device comprising means for receiving encoded data from a transmitter device and means for decoding the data by performing steps C and D.
3. A system comprising a transmitter device according to claim 1 and a receiver device according to claim 2.
4. A computer program [product] comprising instructions which, when the program is executed by a first computer, cause the first computer

to encode data by performing steps A and B and to transmit the encoded data to a second computer.

5. A computer program [product] comprising instructions which, when the program is executed by a second computer, cause the second computer to receive encoded data from a first computer and decode the received data by performing steps C and D.

Remarks: The problem addressed by the invention is the transmission of data over a network. The transmitter device encodes the data using an algorithm comprising steps A and B, and the receiver device performs the complementary function of decoding the data using an algorithm comprising steps C and D. The requirements of Rule 43(2) are fulfilled since the devices of claims 1 and 2 are interrelated in that they interact to perform the invention and solve the stated problem. Novelty and inventive step have to be assessed for each independent claim individually. For example, if encoding according to steps A and B enables encoding to a known coding format in a more efficient way, and decoding according to steps C and D is conventional, it may be that only claims 1, 3 and 4 are new and inventive.

4. Clarity and interpretation of claims

4.1 Clarity

Art. 84

Art. 84 provides that the claims must define the matter for which protection is sought. It further provides that the claims must be clear and concise and supported by the description.

In view of the function of claims in defining the matter for which protection is sought, their clarity is of the utmost importance for reasons of legal certainty. The meaning of the terms of a claim must, as far as possible, be clear for the skilled person from the wording of the claim alone (see also F-IV, 4.2). There should be no doubt as to which subject-matter is covered by the claims. The skilled person should be able to establish the scope of the claim without undue burden. Otherwise, the claim lacks clarity.

The requirement that the claims must be clear applies to individual claims, i.e. to independent and dependent claims alike, and also to the claims as a whole. Given the differences in the scope of protection which may be attached to the various claim categories, the division must ensure that the wording of a claim leaves no doubt as to its category.

The correct response to any lack of clarity in a claim is amendment (G 1/24; see also F-IV, 4.2 and F-IV, 4.3).

Where the claims are found to lack clarity under Art. 84, a partial European or supplementary European search report may be issued under Rule 63 (see B-VIII, 3.1 and 3.2). In such cases, in the absence of appropriate amendment and/or convincing arguments from the applicant as to why the invitation under Rule 63(1) was not justified, an objection under Rule 63(3) will also be raised (see H-II, 5).

4.2 Interpretation

The claims are the starting point and the basis for assessing the patentability of an invention under Arts. 52 to 57. The description and any drawings are always referred to when interpreting the claims, and not just in the case of a lack of clarity or ambiguity (G 1/24).

However, when assessing patentability, the description and drawings cannot be relied on to read into the claim a restrictive feature not suggested by the wording of the claim.

If, on the other hand, the description provides a special broad definition of a term used in a claim, the claim must be interpreted in the light of that broad definition when assessing patentability, provided this interpretation is technically meaningful.

Otherwise, each claim must be read giving the words the meaning and scope which they normally have in the relevant art.

If, in particular cases, the description gives the words a special meaning by explicit definition or otherwise, the division will, so far as possible, require that the claim be amended in such a way that the meaning is clear from the wording of the claim alone. This is important because it is only the claims of the European patent, not the description, which will be published in all official EPO languages. The claim must also be read with an attempt to make technical sense out of it. Such a reading may involve a departure from the strict literal meaning of the wording of the claims.

4.3 Inconsistencies

Any inconsistency between the description and the claims must be avoided if it casts doubt on the subject-matter for which protection is sought, thereby rendering the claim either unclear or unsupported under Art. 84, second sentence, or objectionable under Art. 84, first sentence. Such inconsistency can take the following forms:

(i) Simple verbal inconsistency

For example, there is a statement in the description which suggests that the invention is limited to a particular feature but the claims are not thus limited; also, the description places no particular emphasis on this feature and there is no reason for believing that the feature is essential for the performance of the invention. In such a case, the inconsistency can be removed either by broadening the description or by limiting the claims. Similarly, if the claims are more limited than the description, the claims may be broadened or the description may be limited. See also paragraph (iii) below.

(ii) Inconsistency regarding apparently essential features

For example, it may appear, either from general technical knowledge or from what is stated or implied in the description, that a certain described technical feature not mentioned in an independent claim is essential to the performance of the invention or, in other words, is

necessary for the solution of the problem to which the invention relates. In such a case, the claim does not meet the requirements of Art. 84 because Art. 84, first sentence, when read in conjunction with Rule 43(1) and (3), has to be interpreted as meaning not only that an independent claim must be comprehensible from a technical point of view but also that it must clearly define the subject-matter of the invention, that is to say indicate all the essential features of it (see T 32/82). If, in response to this objection, the applicant shows convincingly, e.g. by means of additional documents or other evidence, that the feature is in fact not essential, they may be allowed to retain the unamended claim and, where necessary, amend the description instead. The opposite situation where an independent claim includes features which do not seem essential for the performance of the invention is not objectionable. This is a matter of the applicant's choice. The division therefore does not suggest that a claim be broadened by the omission of apparently inessential features.

- (iii) Part of the description and/or drawings is inconsistent with the subject-matter for which protection is sought

– Description inconsistent with independent claim(s)

According to Art. 84, second sentence, the claims must be supported by the description. This means that there must not be inconsistency between the claims and the description. Parts of the description that give the skilled person the impression that they disclose ways to carry out the invention but are not encompassed by the wording of the claims are inconsistent (or contradictory) with the claims. Such inconsistencies may be present in the application as originally filed or may result from amending the claims to such an extent that they are no longer consistent with the description or drawings.

For example, an inconsistency may exist due to the presence of an alternative feature which has a broader or different meaning than a feature of the independent claim or if the embodiment comprises a feature which is demonstrably incompatible with an independent claim.

Moreover, features required by the independent claims may not be described in the description as being optional using wording such as "preferably", "may" or "optionally". The description must be amended to remove such terms if they make a mandatory feature of an independent claim appear as being optional.

Examples

- The independent claim defines a feature as being made of "purely substance X" whereas the description defines it as being made of a blend of substances "X and Y".
- The independent claim defines the feature of an article comprising nicotine-free liquid material whereas the description states that the liquid material may contain nicotine.

However, it is not an inconsistency when an embodiment comprises further features which are not claimed as dependent claims if the combination of the features in the embodiment is encompassed by the subject-matter of an independent claim. Similarly, it is not an inconsistency when an embodiment fails to explicitly mention one or more features of an independent claim as long as they are present by reference to another embodiment or implicit.

Example: Where the claim comprises features A, B and C taken in combination, the passages dealing individually with how each of A, B and C are realised are normally understood as describing the refinements of the combination defined in the claim unless there are indications to the contrary. The passages which describe only the realisation of feature A, for example by introducing features A1-A3 and discussing their advantages, but which can be interpreted as meant for being combined with the other features of the claim would not need an amendment caused by the limitation of the claim from B to B2 unless one of A1-A3 is incompatible with B2. On the other hand, any passage explicitly referring to a sub-combination of the claimed features (e.g. only A or A+B) as being the invention is inconsistent with the claim.

Subject-matter in the description regarded as an exception to patentability under Art. 53 needs to be excised, reworded such that it does not fall under the exceptions to patentability or prominently marked as not being according to the claimed invention (see G-II, 4.2 for adaptation of the description for methods of treatment of the human and animal body, G-II, 5.3 for adaptation of the description for the use of human embryonic stem cells and G-II, 5.4 for adaptation of the description for plant and animals).

For borderline cases where there is doubt as to whether an embodiment is consistent with the claims, the benefit of the doubt is given to the applicant.

- Procedural aspects and examples

The applicant must remove any inconsistencies by amending the description either by deleting the inconsistent embodiments or marking them appropriately so that it is clear

that they do not fall within the subject-matter for which protection is sought. See F-IV, 4.3, (i), above for the case where an inconsistency can be removed by broadening the claims.

Example: Independent claim defines a vehicle with a broad feature of a "motor", together with other features. The description and the drawings comprise Embodiment 1, in which the vehicle has an electric motor, and Embodiment 2, in which the vehicle has a combustion engine. During prosecution, to fulfil the requirements of inventive step, the independent claim is amended to specify a vehicle employing an electric motor since the combination of claimed features using a combustion engine was anticipated by the prior art. Embodiment 2 is no longer consistent with the independent claim unless it can be inferred from this embodiment that the combustion engine is used in combination with the electric motor. This inconsistency must be rectified either by removing Embodiment 2 from the description and drawings or by marking Embodiment 2 as not being covered by the claimed subject-matter (e.g. "Embodiment 2 is not covered by the subject-matter of the claims" or similar wording).

An inconsistency between the description and the claims cannot be removed by introducing a **generic** statement at the beginning of the description, such as "embodiments not falling under the scope of the appended claims are to be considered merely as examples suitable for understanding the invention", without indicating which parts of the description are no longer covered. To remove the inconsistency, such a statement has to refer to **specific** embodiments (e.g. "Embodiments X and Y are not encompassed by the wording of the claims but are considered as useful for understanding the invention").

The terms "disclosure", "example", "aspect" or similar do not, on their own, necessarily imply that what follows is not encompassed by an independent claim. Unambiguous expressions have to be adopted to mark an inconsistent embodiment (e.g. by adding "not encompassed by the wording of the claims", "not according to the claimed invention" or "outside the subject-matter of the claims") instead of merely replacing the terms "embodiment" or "invention" by one of the aforementioned terms.

As long as the resulting text of the description does not present conflicting information to the reader, an inconsistent embodiment may also be remedied by ensuring that it is not referred to as being "according to the invention" throughout the description and by complementing the reference to it with an explicit statement to the effect that it is retained due to being useful for understanding the invention (e.g. "embodiment

useful for understanding the invention", "comparative example from background art").

When inviting the applicant to amend the description, the division provides examples of embodiments inconsistent with the independent claims and brief reasons why. If the inconsistency concerns describing a mandatory feature of an independent claim as optional, the division provides an example passage.

See also H-V.2 for the allowability of amendments to the description.

An inconsistency between the description/drawings and the claims may frequently occur when, after a limitation of the claims following an invitation under Rule 62a(1) or Rule 63(1), the subject-matter excluded from the search is still present in the description. Unless the initial objection was not justified, such subject-matter is objected to under Art. 84 (inconsistency between the claims and the description).

Furthermore, an inconsistency between the description/drawings and the claims will occur when, after a non-unity objection (Rule 64 or Rule 164), the claims have been limited to only one of the originally claimed inventions: the embodiments and/or examples of the non-claimed inventions must be either deleted or clearly indicated as not being covered by the claims.

4.4 General statements, "spirit of the invention", claim-like clauses

General statements in the description which imply that the extent of protection may be expanded in some vague and not precisely defined way are not allowed. In particular, any statement which refers to the extent of protection being expanded to cover the "spirit of the invention" or "all equivalents" of the claims must be deleted.

Statements that refer to the extent of protection covering the "scope of the claims" or the invention being "defined in the claims" are allowed. This does not preclude the removal of inconsistencies (F-IV, 4.3).

Where the claims are directed to a combination of features, any statement that seems to imply that protection is nevertheless sought not only for the combination as a whole but also for individual features or sub-combinations of them must be deleted.

Finally, claim-like clauses must also be deleted or amended to avoid claim-like language prior to grant since they otherwise may lead to a lack of clarity as to the subject-matter for which protection is sought.

"Claim-like" clauses are clauses present in the description which, despite not being identified as a claim, appear as such and usually comprise an independent clause followed by a number of clauses referring to previous clauses. These claim-like clauses are usually found at the end of the description and/or in the form of numbered paragraphs, particularly in

divisional or Euro-PCT applications where the original set of claims from the parent or PCT application is appended to the description.

4.5 Essential features

4.5.1 Objections arising from missing essential features

Art. 84
Rule 43(1) and
(3)

The claims, which define the matter for which protection is sought, must be clear, i.e. a claim must not only be comprehensible from a technical point of view, it must also define clearly all the essential features of the invention (see T 32/82). Furthermore, the requirement of Art. 84 that the claims be supported by the description applies to features which are explicitly presented in the description as being essential for carrying out the invention (see T 1055/92). A lack of essential features in the independent claim(s) is therefore to be dealt with under the clarity and support requirements.

4.5.2 Definition of essential features

Essential features of a claim are those necessary for achieving a technical effect underlying the solution of the technical problem with which the application is concerned (the problem usually being derived from the description). Independent claims must therefore contain all features explicitly described in the description as being necessary to carry out the invention. Any features which, even if mentioned throughout the application in the context of the invention, do not actually contribute to the solution of the problem are not essential features.

As a general rule, the technical effect or result produced by the feature will provide the key to answering the question of whether the feature contributes to solving the problem (see also G-VII, 5.2).

If a claim is to a process for producing the product of the invention, then the process as claimed must be one which, when carried out in a manner which would seem reasonable to a skilled person, necessarily has as its end result that particular product; otherwise there is an internal inconsistency and therefore lack of clarity in the claim.

In particular, where patentability depends on a technical effect, the claims must be drafted to include all the technical features of the invention which are essential for the technical effect (see T 32/82).

Claims towards plants or animals which are not exclusively produced by an essentially biological process comprising a functionally defined phenotypic trait and which are worded as product-by-process claims (i.e. obtainable by crossing a plant with a plant grown from deposited seed having accession number XXX and selecting for a progeny plant comprising the phenotypic trait) must fulfil the clarity requirement of Art. 84, as must any other type of claim. In particular, the claimed subject-matter must be defined so that the public is left in no doubt as to the subject-matter for which protection is sought. If the process through which the claimed plant or animal is defined does not impart identifiable and unambiguous technical features to the plant or animal, e.g. the genetic information present in the genome, the claim directed to a plant or animal lacks clarity.

4.5.3 Generalisation of essential features

In deciding how specific the essential features must be, the provisions of Art. 83 must be borne in mind: the application as a whole must describe the necessary characteristics of an invention in a degree of detail such that a skilled person can perform the invention (see F-III, 3). It is not necessary to include all details of the invention in the independent claim. Thus, a certain degree of generalisation of the claimed features may be permitted if the claimed generalised features as a whole allow the problem to be solved. In this case, a more specific definition of the features is not required. This principle applies equally to structural and functional features.

4.5.4 Implicit features

As detailed above, an independent claim must specify explicitly all of the essential features needed to define the invention. This applies except in so far as such features are implied by the generic terms used, e.g. a claim to a "bicycle" does not need to mention the presence of wheels.

In the case of a product claim, if the product is of a well-known kind and the invention lies in modifying it in certain respects, it is sufficient for the claim to clearly identify the product and specify what is modified and in what way. Similar considerations apply to process claims.

4.5.5 Examples

Examples illustrating essential features can be found in the annex to F-IV.

4.6 Relative terms

Relative or similar terms such as "thin", "wide" or "strong" constitute a potentially unclear element due to the fact that their meaning may change depending on the context.

The use of a relative or similar term in a claim is objected to under Art. 84 unless it has a well-recognised meaning in the particular art, e.g. "thin-film transistor" or "near-field communication", or its meaning is clear to the skilled person in the context of the whole disclosure of the application or patent.

Where the relative term has no well-recognised meaning and its meaning is not clear in the context of the whole disclosure, the division invites the applicant to replace it, if possible, by a more precise wording found elsewhere in the disclosure as originally filed.

When the use of a relative term is allowed in a claim, this term is interpreted by the division in the least restrictive possible way (referring to the description and drawings; see F-IV, 4.2) when determining the scope of the claim.

4.7 Terms such as "about", "approximately" or "substantially"

4.7.1 Interpretation of terms such as "about", "approximately" or "substantially"

Where terms such as "about" or "approximately" are applied to a particular value (e.g. "about 200°C" or "approximately 200°C") or to a range

(e.g. "about x to approximately y"), the value or range is interpreted as being as accurate as the method used to measure it. If no error margins are specified in the application, the same principles described in [G-VI, 7.1](#) apply, i.e. the expression "about 200°C" is interpreted as having the same round-off as "200°C". If error margins are specified in the application, they must be used in the claims in place of the expression containing "about" or similar terms.

When terms such as "substantially" or "approximately" qualify a structural unit of an apparatus (e.g. "a tray plate with a substantially circular circumference" or "a tray plate with an approximately curved base"), the expression containing the term "substantially" or "approximately" will be interpreted as a technical feature being produced within the technical tolerance of the method used to manufacture it (e.g. cutting a metal is much more accurate than cutting a plastic; or cutting with a CNC machine is more accurate than cutting by hand) unless the application suggests otherwise. In other words, in the absence of any indication to the contrary in the application, the expression "a tray plate with a substantially circular circumference" is interpreted as claiming the same technical feature as "a tray plate with a circular circumference"; in turn, both expressions are considered as claiming any tray whose base the skilled person in the manufacturing field would consider as being circular.

The same applies when the expression containing "substantially" or "approximately" implies that a certain effect or result can be obtained within a certain tolerance and the skilled person knows how to obtain that tolerance. For example, "a substantially vertical seat back" is interpreted as allowing for a certain +/- variation around 90° where the skilled person can recognise that a functionality for supporting the sitting person's back is present.

4.7.2 Clarity objections

If the application suggests that the use of terms such as "about", "approximately" or "substantially" extends either the interval claimed by a value and/or range outside the error margins of the measurement system or the structural unit beyond the manufacturing tolerances or any other tolerance that the skilled person would take into consideration in the technical field concerned, then the wording of the claims becomes vague and undefined. This leads to an objection under [Art. 84](#) because the presence of this wording raises doubts as to which subject-matter is covered by the claims and thus prevents the skilled person from establishing the scope of the claim.

For example, if the application suggests that an icosagon (20-sided polygon) is also a "substantially circular circumference" for a metal tray realised by a CNC waterjet cutting machine, this renders the scope of the claims unclear because:

- (i) the tolerance indicated by the application is outside the tolerance of the manufacturing method (a CNC waterjet cutting machine approximates a circular circumference by using a polygon with hundreds of sides); and

- (ii) if an icosagon is also a "substantially circular circumference", what about an enneadecagon (19-sided polygon) or an octadecagon (18-sided polygon)? When does a polygon stop being a "substantially circular circumference"? How can this be assessed objectively by the skilled person?

4.8 Trade marks

The use of trade marks and similar expressions in claims is not allowed as it does not guarantee that the product or feature referred to is not modified while maintaining its name during the term of the patent. They may be allowed exceptionally if their use is unavoidable and they are generally recognised as having a precise meaning.

With regard to the need to acknowledge trade marks as such in the description, see [F-II, 4.14](#). For the effect of references to trade marks on sufficiency of disclosure ([Art. 83](#)), see [F-III, 7](#).

4.9 Optional features

Optional features, i.e. features preceded by expressions such as "preferably", "for example", "such as" or "more particularly" are allowed if they do not introduce ambiguity. In such a case, they are to be regarded as entirely optional.

These expressions introduce ambiguity and render the scope of the claim unclear if they do not lead to a restriction of the subject-matter of the claim.

For example, the wording "a method to manufacture an artificial stone, such as a clay brick" does not fulfil the requirements of [Art. 84](#) because a clay brick will never be an artificial stone. Hence, it is unclear if either an artificial stone or a clay brick is manufactured by the method of the claim.

Similarly, the wording "the solution is heated up to between 65 and 85°C, particularly to 90°C" does not fulfil the requirements of [Art. 84](#) because the temperature after the term "particularly" contradicts the range before it.

4.10 Result to be achieved

The area defined by the claims must be as precise as the invention allows. As a general rule, claims which attempt to define the invention by a result to be achieved are not allowed, in particular if they only amount to claiming the underlying technical problem. However, they may be allowed if the invention either can only be defined in such terms or cannot otherwise be defined more precisely without unduly restricting the scope of the claims and if the result is one which can be directly and positively verified by tests or procedures adequately specified in the description or known to the skilled person and which do not require undue experimentation (see [T. 68/85](#)). For example, the invention may relate to an ashtray in which a smouldering cigarette end will be automatically extinguished by reason of the shape and relative dimensions of the ashtray. The latter may vary considerably in a manner difficult to define whilst still providing the desired effect. So long as the claim specifies the construction and shape of the ashtray as clearly as possible, it may define the relative dimensions by reference to the result to be achieved if the specification includes adequate

directions to enable the skilled person to determine the required dimensions by routine test procedures (see F-III, 1 to 3).

However, these cases have to be distinguished from those in which the product is defined by the result to be achieved or where the result amounts in essence to the problem underlying the application. It is established case law that an independent claim must indicate all the essential features of the object of the invention in order to comply with the requirements of Art. 84 (see G 2/88 and G 1/04). Art. 84 also reflects the general legal principle that the extent of monopoly conferred by a patent, as defined in the claims, must correspond to the technical contribution to the art. It must not extend to subject-matter which, after reading the description, would still not be at the disposal of the skilled person (T 409/91). The technical contribution of a patent resides in the combination of features which solve the problem underlying the application. Therefore, if the independent claim defines the product by a result to be achieved and the result amounts in essence to the problem underlying the application, that claim must state the essential features necessary to achieve the result claimed (T 809/12), see also F-IV, 4.5.

The above-mentioned requirements for allowing a definition of subject-matter in terms of a result to be achieved differ from those for allowing a definition of subject-matter in terms of functional features (see F-IV, 4.13 and F-IV, 6.5).

4.11 Parameters

Parameters are characteristic values which may be values of directly measurable properties (e.g. the melting point of a substance, the flexural strength of a steel, the resistance of an electrical conductor) or defined as more or less complicated mathematical combinations of several variables in the form of formulae.

The characteristics of a product may be specified by parameters related to the physical structure of the product if those parameters can be clearly and reliably determined by objective procedures which are usual in the art. Where the characteristics of the product are defined by a mathematical relation between parameters, each parameter needs to be clearly and reliably determined.

The same applies to process-related features defined by parameters.

The requirements of Art. 84 with regard to the characterisation of a product by parameters can be summarised as follows (see T 849/11):

- (i) the claims must be clear in themselves when read by the skilled person (not including knowledge derived from the description)
- (ii) the method for measuring a parameter (or at least a reference thereto) must appear completely in the claim itself and
- (iii) an applicant who chooses to define the scope of the claim by parameters needs to ensure that the skilled person can easily and

unambiguously verify whether they are working inside or outside the scope of the claim.

If the description of the method for measuring a parameter is so long that its inclusion makes the claim unclear through lack of conciseness or difficult to understand, the requirement under point (ii) can be met by including in the claim a reference to the description in accordance with Rule 43(6).

Furthermore the requirement under point (ii) can still be met if it can be convincingly shown that (see T 849/11):

- (a) the measurement method to be employed belongs to the skilled person's common general knowledge, e.g. because there is only one method or because a particular method is commonly used or
- (b) all the measurement methodologies known in the relevant technical field for determining this parameter yield the same result within the appropriate limit of measurement accuracy.

For further issues relating to lack of support and sufficiency of disclosure regarding parameters, see F-III, 11 and F-IV, 6.4.

4.11.1 Unusual parameters

Unusual parameters are parameters not commonly used in the field of the invention. Two main situations can present themselves:

- (i) The unusual parameter measures a property of the product/process for which another generally recognised parameter is used in the field of the invention.
- (ii) The unusual parameter measures a property of the product/process that was not measured before in the field of the invention.

In addition to the requirements contained in F-IV, 4.11:

- Cases in which an unusual parameter of type (i) is employed and no straightforward conversion from the unusual parameter to the parameter generally recognised in the art is possible, or a non-accessible apparatus for measuring the unusual parameter is used are *prima facie* objectionable on grounds of lack of clarity as no meaningful comparison with the prior art can be made. Such cases might also disguise lack of novelty (see G-VI, 5).
- Use of unusual parameters of type (ii) is allowable if it is evident from the application that the skilled person would face no difficulty in carrying out the presented tests and would thereby be able to establish the exact meaning of the parameter and to make a meaningful comparison with the prior art. In addition, the onus of proof that an unusual parameter is a genuine distinctive feature vis-à-vis the prior art lies with the applicant. No benefit of doubt can be accorded in this respect (see G-VI, 5).

Example of an allowable unusual parameter of type (ii)

The application explains that the abrasive action of sandpaper of very fine grade is improved if strips with abrasive grain are alternated with strips without abrasive grain. Claim 1 contains an unusual parameter of type (ii) that measures the relationship between the widths of the abrasive strips and the non-abrasive strips within a certain length of the sandpaper.

The skilled person has no problem in establishing the exact meaning of the parameter, measuring it and determining its genuine distinctive feature against the prior art.

4.12 Product-by-process claim

Art. 53(b)
Rule 28(2)
Art. 64(2)

A claim defining a product in terms of a process is to be construed as a claim to the product as such. The technical content of the invention lies not in the process *per se*, but rather in the technical properties imparted to the product by the process. Claims defining plants or animals produced by a method including a technical step which imparts a technical feature to a product constitute an exception in so far as the requirements of Art. 53(b) as interpreted by Rule 28(2) are concerned. The exclusion under Rule 28(2) regarding plants and animals exclusively obtained by means of an essentially biological process does not apply to patents granted before 1 July 2017, nor to pending patent applications with a date of filing and/or a priority date before 1 July 2017 (see G 3/19, OJ EPO 2020, A119).

If a technical feature of a claimed plant or animal, e.g. a single nucleotide exchange in the genome, can be the result of both a technical intervention (e.g. directed mutagenesis) and an essentially biological process (a natural allele), a disclaimer is necessary to delimit the claimed subject-matter to the technically produced product (see examples in G-II, 5.4.2.1 and G-II, 5.4). If, on the other hand, the feature in question can unambiguously be obtained by technical intervention only, e.g. a transgene, no disclaimer is necessary. For the general principles governing disclaimers see H-V, 4.1 and H-V, 4.2.

If the process through which the claimed plant or animal is defined does not impart identifiable and unambiguous technical features to the plant or animal, e.g. the genetic information present in the genome, the claim directed to a plant or animal lacks clarity.

Claims for products defined in terms of a process of manufacture are allowable only if the products as such fulfil the requirements for patentability, i.e. *inter alia* that they are new and inventive, and it is impossible to define the claimed product other than in terms of a process of manufacture. A product is not rendered novel merely by the fact that it is produced by means of a new process. The claim may for instance take the form "Product X obtainable by process Y". Irrespective of whether the term "obtainable", "obtained", "directly obtained" or an equivalent wording is used in the product-by-process claim, it is still directed to the product *per se* and confers absolute protection upon the product.

As regards novelty, when a product is defined by its method of manufacture, the question to be answered is whether the product under consideration is identical to known products. The burden of proof for an allegedly distinguishing "product-by-process" feature lies with the applicant, who has to provide evidence that the modification of the process parameters results in another product, for example by showing that distinct differences exist in the properties of the products. Nevertheless, the division needs to furnish reasoned argumentation to support the alleged lack of novelty of a product-by-process claim, especially if this objection is contested by the applicant (see G 1/98, T 828/08).

Similarly, examination of product or product-by-process claims in respect of their patentability under the EPC is unaffected by the extent of the protection conferred by the patent or the patent application (see G 2/12 and G 2/13, Reasons VIII(2)(6)(b)). Art. 69

4.12.1 Product claim with process features

Provided they are allowable, the process features in a product claim comprising both product and process features can establish the novelty of the claimed product only if they cause the claimed product to have different properties from the products known from the prior art. As in the case of product-by-process claims (see F-IV, 4.12), the burden of proof for an allegedly distinguishing "product-by-process" feature lies with the applicant.

4.13 Interpretation of expressions stating a purpose

4.13.1 Interpretation of expressions such as "Apparatus for ...", "Product for ..."

If a claim commences with such words as "Apparatus for carrying out the process ...", this must be construed as meaning merely apparatus suitable for carrying out the process. An apparatus which otherwise possesses all of the features specified in the claims but which is unsuitable for the stated purpose or requires modifications to enable it to be so used for said purpose is normally not considered as anticipating the claim.

Similar considerations apply to a claim for a product for a particular use. For example, if a claim refers to a "mould for molten steel", this implies certain limitations for the mould. Therefore, a plastic ice cube tray with a melting point much lower than that of steel does not come within the claim. Similarly, a claim to a substance or composition for a particular use is construed as meaning a substance or composition which is in fact suitable for the stated use; a known product which *prima facie* is the same as the substance or composition defined in the claim, but which is in a form which renders it unsuitable for the stated use, does not deprive the claim of novelty. However, if the known product is in a form in which it is in fact suitable for the stated use, though it has never been described for that use, it deprives the claim of novelty.

An exception to this general principle of interpretation is where the claim is to a known substance or composition for use in a surgical, therapeutic or diagnostic method (see G-II, 4.2 and G-VI, 6.1).

4.13.2 Interpretation of means-plus-function features ("means for ...")

Means-plus-function features ("means for ...") are a type of functional feature and hence do not contravene the requirements of Art. 84.

Any prior-art feature suitable for carrying out the function of a means-plus-function feature will anticipate the latter. For example, the feature "means for opening a door" is anticipated by both the door key and a crowbar.

An exception to this general principle of interpretation is where the function of the means-plus-function feature is carried out by a computer or similar apparatus. In this case, the means-plus-function features are interpreted as means adapted to carry out the relevant steps/functions rather than merely means suitable for carrying them out.

Example

- "1. An eyeglass lens grinding machine for processing a lens such that the lens is fitted in an eyeglass frame, said machine comprising:

at least a grinding wheel for bevelling the lens;

means for receiving frame configurational data on the eyeglass frame and layout data to be used in providing a layout of the lens relative to the eyeglass frame;

means for detecting an edge position of the lens on the basis of the received frame data and layout data;

means for determining a first bevel path by calculation based on the result of detection by said edge position detecting means;

means for determining a second bevel path obtained by tilting said first bevel path such that said second bevel path passes through a desired position on a lens edge; and

means for controlling the grinding wheel during the bevelling of the lens on the basis of said second bevel path."

- "1. An eyeglass lens grinding machine for processing a lens such that the lens is fitted in an eyeglass frame, said machine comprising

at least a grinding wheel for bevelling the lens;

a computer adapted to:

- receive frame configurational data on the eyeglass frame and layout data to be used in providing a layout of the lens relative to the eyeglass frame;
- detect an edge position of the lens on the basis of the received frame data and layout data;

- determine a first bevel path by calculation based on the result of detection by said edge position detecting means;
- determine a second bevel path that is obtained by tilting said first bevel path such that said second bevel path passes through a desired position on a lens edge; and
- control the grinding wheel during the bevelling of the lens on the basis of said second bevel path."

Each of these two claims is new over a prior art disclosing an eyeglass lens grinding machine comprising a grinding wheel and a computer for controlling the grinding wheel if the specific processing steps are not disclosed in the prior art. When "means for" refers to computer means, the processing steps being defined as "means for + function" (first claim) and "computer adapted to + function" (second claim) are to be interpreted as limiting. Therefore, a prior-art document disclosing an eyeglass lens grinding machine comprising at least a grinding wheel for bevelling the lens and a computer only anticipates these claims if the prior-art document also discloses that the computer is programmed to carry out the claimed steps.

For further information on claim formulations commonly used in computer-implemented inventions, see [F-IV.3.9](#).

4.13.3 Interpretation of expressions such as "Method for ..."

In the context of a method, two different types of stated purpose are possible, namely those that define the application or use of a method and those that define an effect arising from the steps of the method and are implicit therein (see [T.1931/14](#)).

Where the stated purpose defines the specific application of the method, this purpose requires additional steps which are not implied by or inherent in the other remaining steps defined in the claim and without which the claimed process would not achieve the stated purpose. Hence, a method claim that defines a working method which, for example, commences with such words as "Method for remelting galvanic layers", the part "for remelting ..." is not to be understood as meaning that the process is merely suitable for remelting galvanic layers but rather as a functional feature concerning the remelting of galvanic layers and, hence, defining one of the method steps of the claimed working method (see [T.1931/14](#) and [T.848/93](#)).

Similarly, in the case of a "method of manufacture", i.e. a claim directed to a method for manufacturing a product, the fact that the method results in the product is to be treated as an integral method step (see [T.268/13](#)).

On the other hand, where the purpose merely states a technical effect which inevitably arises when carrying out the other remaining steps of the claimed method and is thus inherent in those steps, this technical effect has no limiting effect on the subject-matter of the claim. For example, a method claim concerning the application of a particular surface active agent to a specified absorbent product and defining its purpose as "for reducing

malodor" in terms of an intended technical effect is anticipated by a prior-art document describing a method having such suitability "for reducing malodor" although not mentioning the specific use (see T.1931/14 and T.304/08).

4.14 Definition by reference to (use with) another entity

A claim in respect of a physical entity (product, apparatus) may seek to define the invention by reference to features relating to another entity that is not part of the claimed first entity but that is related to it through use. An example of such a claim is "a cylinder head for an engine" where the former is defined by features of its location in the latter.

Since the first entity (the cylinder head) can often be produced and marketed independently of the other entity (the engine), the applicant is normally entitled to independent protection of the first entity *per se*. Therefore, in first instance, such a claim is always interpreted as not including the other entity or its features: these limit the subject-matter of the claim only in so far as the first entity's features are suitable to be used with the second entity's features. In the above example, the cylinder head must be suitable to be mounted in the engine described in the claim, but the features of the engine do not limit the subject-matter of the claim *per se*.

Only if the claim is directed without any doubt to a combination of the first and second entities, the features of the other entity are limiting for the subject-matter of the claim. In the above example, the claim should be written as an "engine with a cylinder head" or an "engine comprising a cylinder head" for the features of the engine to be considered as limiting the subject-matter of the claim.

For the assessment of claims directed to computer-implemented inventions, where a claim to a computer program refers to a computer (a separate entity), see F-IV.3.9.

4.14.1 Clarity objections

Once it has been established if a claim is directed either to one entity or to a combination of entities, the wording of the claim must be adapted appropriately to reflect it; otherwise the claim is objected to under Art. 84.

For example, in the case of a claim directed to a single entity, the first entity is "connectable" to the second entity; in the case of a claim directed to a combination of entities the first entity is "connected" to the second entity.

4.14.2 Dimensions and/or shape defined by reference to another entity

It may be allowable to define the dimensions and/or shape of a first entity in an independent claim by general reference to the dimensions and/or corresponding shape of a second entity which is not part of the claimed first entity but is related to it through use. This particularly applies where the size of the second entity is in some way standardised (for example, in the case of a mounting bracket for a vehicle number-plate, where the bracket frame and fixing elements are defined in relation to the outer shape of the number-plate).

Furthermore, references to second entities which cannot be seen as subject to standardisation may also be sufficiently clear in cases where the skilled person would have little difficulty in inferring the resultant restriction of the scope of protection for the first entity (for example, in the case of a covering sheet for an agricultural round bale, where the length and breadth of the covering sheet and how it is folded are defined by reference to the bale's circumference, width and diameter, see T.455/92). It is neither necessary for such claims to contain the exact dimensions of the second entity, nor do they have to refer to a combination of the first and second entities. Specifying the length, width and/or height of the first entity without reference to the second would lead to an unwarranted restriction of the scope of protection.

4.15 The expression "in"

To avoid ambiguity, particular care is exercised when assessing claims which employ the word "in" to define a relationship between different physical entities (product, apparatus), between entities and activities (process, use) or between different activities. Examples of claims worded in this way include the following:

- (i) Cylinder head in a four-stroke engine
- (ii) In a telephone apparatus with an automatic dialler, dial tone detector and feature controller, the dial tone detector comprising ...
- (iii) In a process using an electrode feeding means of an arc-welding apparatus, a method for controlling the arc welding current and voltage comprising the following steps: ... and
- (iv) In a process/system/apparatus etc. ... the improvement consisting of ...

In examples (i) to (iii), the emphasis is on the fully functioning subunits (cylinder head, dial tone detector, method for controlling the arc welding current and voltage) rather than the complete unit within which the subunit is contained (four-stroke engine, telephone, process). This can make it unclear whether the protection sought is limited to the subunit *per se* or whether the unit as a whole is to be protected. For the sake of clarity, claims of this kind must be directed either to "a unit with (or comprising) a subunit" (e.g. "four-stroke engine with a cylinder head") or to the subunit *per se*, specifying its purpose (for example, "cylinder head for a four-stroke engine"). The latter course may be followed only at the applicant's express wish and only if there is a basis for it in the application as filed, in accordance with Art. 123(2).

With claims of the type indicated by example (iv), the use of the word "in" sometimes makes it unclear whether protection is sought for the improvement only or for all the features defined in the claim. Here, too, it is essential to ensure that the wording is clear.

However, claims such as "use of a substance ... as an anticorrosive ingredient in a paint or lacquer composition" are acceptable on the basis of second non-medical use (see G-VI, 6.2).

4.16 Use claims

For the purposes of examination, a "use" claim in a form such as "the use of substance X as an insecticide" is regarded as equivalent to a "process" claim of the form "a process of killing insects using substance X". Thus, a claim in the form indicated is not to be interpreted as directed to the substance X recognisable (e.g. by further additives) as intended for use as an insecticide. Similarly, a claim for "the use of a transistor in an amplifying circuit" is equivalent to a process claim for the process of amplifying using a circuit containing the transistor and is not to be interpreted as being directed to "an amplifying circuit in which the transistor is used", nor to "the process of using the transistor in building such a circuit". However, a claim directed to the use of a process for a particular purpose is equivalent to a claim directed to that very same process (see T 684/02).

Care is to be taken when a claim relates to a two-step process which combines a use step with a product production step. This may be the case, e.g. when a polypeptide and its use in a screening method have been defined as the only contribution to the art. An example of such a claim would then be:

"A method comprising:

- (a) contacting polypeptide X with a compound to be screened and
- (b) determining whether the compound affects the activity of said polypeptide, and subsequently transforming any active compound into a pharmaceutical composition."

Many variations of such a claim are conceivable but, in essence, they combine (a) a screening step (i.e. using a specified test material to select a compound having a given property) with (b) further production steps (i.e. further transforming the selected compound for instance into the desired composition).

According to G 2/88, there are two different types of process claim, (i) the use of an entity to achieve a technical effect and (ii) a process for the production of a product. G 2/88 makes clear that Art. 64(2) applies only to processes of type (ii). The above claim and its analogues thus represent a combination of two different and irreconcilable types of process claim. Step (a) of the claim relates to a process of type (i), step (b) to a process of type (ii). Step (b) builds on the "effect" achieved by step (a), rather than step (a) feeding into step (b) a specific starting material and resulting in a specific product. Thus, the claim is made up partly of a use claim and partly of a process for producing a product. This renders the claim unclear according to Art. 84.

4.17 References to the description or drawings

As indicated in Rule 43(6), the claims must not, in respect of the technical features of the invention, rely on references to the description or drawings "except where absolutely necessary". In particular, they must not normally rely on such references as "as described in part ... of the description" or "as illustrated in Figure 2 of the drawings".

Rule 43(6)

The emphatic wording of the excepting clause is important to note. The onus is on the applicant to show that it is "absolutely necessary" to rely on references to the description or drawings in appropriate cases (see T 150/82).

An example of an allowable exception is an invention involving a peculiar shape that is illustrated in the drawings but cannot be readily defined either in words or by a simple mathematical formula. Another special case is where the invention relates to chemical products, some of whose features can be defined only by means of graphs or diagrams.

4.18 Reference signs

If the application contains drawings and comprehension of the claims is improved by establishing the connection between the features mentioned in the claims and the corresponding reference signs in the drawings, then appropriate reference signs need to be placed in parentheses after the features mentioned in the claims. If there is a large number of different embodiments, only the reference signs of the most important embodiments need be incorporated in the independent claim(s). Where claims are drafted in the two-part form set out in Rule 43(1), the reference signs need to be inserted not only in the characterising part but also in the preamble of the claims.

Rule 43(7)

Reference signs are not, however, to be construed as limiting the extent of the matter protected by the claims; their sole function is to make claims easier to understand. A comment to that effect in the description is acceptable (see T 237/84).

Adding text to reference signs in parentheses in the claims can give rise to a lack of clarity (Art. 84). Expressions such as "securing means (screw 13, nail 14)" or "valve assembly (valve seat 23, valve element 27, valve seat 28)" are not reference signs within the meaning of Rule 43(7) but special features to which the last sentence of Rule 43(7) is not applicable. Consequently, it is unclear whether the features added to the reference signs are limiting. Accordingly, such bracketed features are generally not permissible. However, additional references to those figures where particular reference signs are to be found, such as "(13 – Figure 3; 14 – Figure 4)" are unobjectionable.

A lack of clarity can also arise with bracketed expressions that do not include reference signs, e.g. the expression "(concrete) moulded brick" is unclear because it cannot be determined if the feature moulded brick is limited – or not – by the word concrete. In contrast, bracketed expressions with a generally accepted meaning are allowable, e.g. "(meth)acrylate" which is known as an abbreviation for "acrylate and methacrylate". The use

of brackets in chemical or mathematical formulae is also unobjectionable, as is their use when correcting physical values not complying with the requirements as determined by the President under Rule 49(2).

4.19 Negative limitations (e.g. disclaimers)

A claim's subject-matter is normally defined in terms of positive features, indicating that certain technical elements are present. In exceptional cases, however, the subject-matter may be restricted using a negative limitation expressly stating that particular features are absent. This may be done, for example, if the absence of a feature can be deduced from the application as filed (see T 278/88).

Negative limitations such as disclaimers may be used only if adding positive features to the claim either would not define more clearly and concisely the subject-matter still protectable (see G 1/03 and T 4/80) or would unduly limit the scope of the claim (see T 1050/93). It has to be clear what is excluded by means of the disclaimer (see T 286/06). A claim containing one or more disclaimers must also fully comply with the clarity and conciseness requirements of Art. 84 (see G 1/03, Reasons 3). Moreover, in the interests of the patent's transparency, the excluded prior art needs to be indicated in the description in accordance with Rule 42(1)(b), and the relation between the prior art and the disclaimer needs to be shown.

For the allowability of disclaimers excluding embodiments that were disclosed in the original application as being part of the invention, see H-V, 4.2.2. With respect to the allowability of disclaimers not disclosed in the application as originally filed (referred to as "undisclosed disclaimers"), see H-V, 4.2.1.

4.20 "Comprising" vs "consisting of"

This section outlines how the terms "comprising" and "consisting of" are to be interpreted when construing a claim.

A claim directed to an apparatus/method/product "comprising" certain features is interpreted as meaning that it includes those features, but that it does not exclude the presence of other features as long as they do not render the claim unworkable.

On the other hand, if the wording "consist of" is used, then no further features are present in the apparatus/method/product apart from the ones following said wording. In particular, if a claim for a chemical compound refers to it as "consisting of components A, B and C" by their proportions expressed in percentages, the presence of any additional component is excluded and therefore the percentages must add up to 100% (see T 711/90).

In the case of chemical compounds or compositions, the use of "consisting essentially of" or "comprising substantially" means that specific further components can be present, namely those not materially affecting the essential characteristics of the compound or composition. For any other

apparatus/method/product, these terms have the same meaning as "comprising".

Regarding Art. 123(2), "comprising" does not provide *per se* an implicit basis for either "consisting of" or "consisting essentially of" (T 759/10).

4.21 Functional definition of a pathological condition

When a claim is directed to a further therapeutic application of a medicament and the condition to be treated is defined in functional terms, e.g. "any condition susceptible of being improved or prevented by selective occupation of a specific receptor", the claim can be regarded as clear only if instructions, in the form of experimental tests or testable criteria, are available from the patent documents or from the common general knowledge allowing the skilled person to recognise which conditions fall within the functional definition and accordingly within the scope of the claim (see T 241/95; see also G-II, 4.2).

4.22 Broad claims

The EPC does not explicitly mention overly broad claims. Broad claims are therefore not unclear *per se*. In particular, the clarity of a claim is not affected by the mere breadth of a term contained in it, if the meaning of the term is clear to the skilled person. However, objections to such claims may be raised for various reasons.

A broad claim lacks clarity if the skilled person cannot determine the demarcation of the scope of the claim without undue burden. Moreover, where there are discrepancies between the claims and the description, the claims may not be supported by the description (Art. 84) and also the invention may not be sufficiently disclosed over the whole of the broad field claimed (Art. 83) (see T 409/91, F-IV, 6.1 and F-IV, 6.4).

Art. 84 and Art. 83

A lack-of-novelty objection may be raised, for example, if the claim is formulated in such broad terms that it also covers known subject-matter from other technical fields. Broad claims may also cover embodiments for which a purported effect has not been achieved. On raising an objection of lack of inventive step in such cases, see G-VII, 5.2.

Art. 54 and Art. 56

For broad claims in opposition proceedings, see also D-V, 4 and 5.

4.23 Order of claims

There is no legal requirement that the first claim must be the broadest. However, Art. 84 requires that the claims must be clear not only individually but also as a whole. Therefore, where there is a large number of claims, they need to be arranged with the broadest claim first. If the broadest of a large number of claims is a long way down such that it could easily be overlooked, the applicant is required either to rearrange the claims in a more logical way or to direct attention to the broadest claim in the introductory part or in the summary of the description.

Furthermore, if the broadest claim is not the first one, the later broader claim must also be an independent claim. Consequently, where these

independent claims are of the same category, an objection may also be raised under Rule 43(2) (see F-IV, 3.2 and 3.3).

Rule 43(5)

Claims which are not consecutively numbered in Arabic numerals constitute a deficiency under Rule 43(5). Such a deficiency may occur, for example, if a numeral is missing, a numeral is used multiple times or a claim contains no numeral or a numeral comprising a decimal separator. Deficient claim numbering can also lead to a lack of clarity, for example if a dependent claim refers to a claim number used twice.

4.24 Interpretation of terms such as identity and similarity in relation to amino or nucleic acid sequences

Amino acid or nucleic acid sequences can be defined by a percentage of identity. The percentage of identity determines the number of identical residues over a defined length in a given alignment. If no algorithm or calculation method for determining the percentage of identity is defined, the broadest interpretation will be applied using any reasonable algorithm or calculation method known at the relevant date of filing.

Amino acid sequences can be defined by a degree of similarity (expressed as a percentage of similarity). The term similarity is broader than the term identity because it allows conservative substitutions of amino acid residues having similar physicochemical properties over a defined length of a given alignment. The percentage of similarity is determinable only if a similarity-scoring matrix is defined. If no similarity-scoring matrix is defined, a claim referring to a sequence displaying a percentage of similarity to a recited sequence is considered to cover any sequence fulfilling the similarity requirement as determined with any reasonable similarity-scoring matrix known at the relevant date of filing.

For nucleic acid sequences, homology percentage and identity percentage are usually considered to have the same meaning. For amino acid sequences, homology percentage is interpreted in the least restrictive technically meaningful way when determining the scope of the claim.

5. Conciseness, number of claims

Art. 84

Rule 43(5)

The requirement that the claims must be concise refers to the claims in their entirety as well as to the individual claims. The number of claims must be considered in relation to the nature of the invention the applicant seeks to protect. Undue repetition of wording, e.g. between one claim and another, is to be avoided by using the dependent form. Regarding independent claims in the same category, see F-IV, 3.2 and 3.3. The conciseness requirement also applies to dependent claims in respect of both their number and their content. For example, the repetition of subject-matter that has already been claimed is unnecessary and negatively affects the conciseness of the claims. Similarly, the number of dependent claims should be reasonable. What is or what is not a reasonable number of claims depends on the facts and circumstances of each particular case. The interests of the relevant public must also be borne in mind. The presentation of the claims must not make it unduly burdensome to determine the matter for which protection is sought (T 79/91 and T 246/91). An objection may also be raised where there is a multiplicity

of alternatives within a single claim if this renders it unduly burdensome to determine the matter for which protection is sought.

Where the claims are found to lack conciseness under Art. 84, a partial European or partial supplementary European search report may be issued under Rule 63 (see B-VIII, 3.1 and 3.2). In such cases, in the absence of appropriate amendment and/or convincing arguments from the applicant as to why the invitation under Rule 63(1) was not justified, an objection under Rule 63(3) will also be raised (see H-II, 5).

6. Support in description

6.1 General remarks

The claims must be supported by the description. This means that there must be a basis in the description for the subject-matter of every claim and the scope of the claims must not be broader than is justified by the extent of the description and drawings and also the contribution to the art (see T 409/91). Regarding the support of dependent claims by the description, see F-IV, 6.6. Art. 84

6.2 Extent of generalisation

Most claims are generalisations of one or more particular examples. The extent of generalisation permissible is a matter for the division to judge in each particular case in the light of the relevant prior art. Thus, an invention opening up a whole new field is entitled to more generality in the claims than one concerned with advances in a known technology. A fair statement of claim is one which is not so broad that it goes beyond the invention nor yet so narrow as to deprive the applicant of a just reward for the disclosure of their invention. The applicant is allowed to cover all obvious modifications of, equivalents to and uses of that which they have described. In particular, if it is reasonable to predict that all the variants covered by the claims have the properties or uses the applicant ascribes to them in the description, they are allowed to draw the claims accordingly. After the date of filing, however, the applicant is allowed to do so only if this does not contravene Art. 123(2).

6.3 Objection of lack of support

As a general rule, a claim is regarded as supported by the description unless there are well-founded reasons for believing that the skilled person would be unable, on the basis of the information given in the application as filed, to extend the particular teaching of the description to the whole of the field claimed by using routine methods of experimentation or analysis. Support must, however, be of a technical character; vague statements or assertions having no technical content provide no basis.

The division raises an objection of lack of support only if it has well-founded reasons. Once the division has set out a reasoned case that, for example, a broad claim is not supported over the whole of its breadth, the onus of demonstrating that the claim is fully supported lies with the applicant (see F-IV, 4). Where an objection is raised, the reasons are, if possible, to be supported specifically by a published document.

A claim in generic form, i.e. relating to a whole class of materials or machines, for example, may be acceptable even if of broad scope if there is fair support in the description and there is no reason to suppose that the invention cannot be worked through the whole of the field claimed. Where the information given appears insufficient to enable a skilled person to extend the teaching of the description to parts of the field claimed but not explicitly described by using routine methods of experimentation or analysis, the division raises a reasoned objection and invites the applicant to establish, by suitable response, that the invention can in fact be readily applied on the basis of the information given over the whole field claimed or, failing this, to restrict the claim accordingly.

The question of support is illustrated by the following examples:

- (i) a claim relates to a process for treating all kinds of "plant seedlings" by subjecting them to a controlled cold shock to produce specified results, whereas the description discloses the process applied to one kind of plant only. Since it is well-known that plants vary widely in their properties, there are well-founded reasons for believing that the process is not applicable to all plant seedlings. Unless the applicant can provide convincing evidence that the process is nevertheless generally applicable, they must restrict their claim to the particular kind of plant referred to in the description. A mere assertion that the process is applicable to all plant seedlings is not sufficient;
- (ii) a claim relates to a specified method of treating "synthetic resin mouldings" to obtain certain changes in physical characteristics. All the examples described relate to thermoplastic resins and the method is such as to appear inappropriate to thermosetting resins. Unless the applicant can provide evidence that the method is nevertheless applicable to thermosetting resins, they must restrict their claim to thermoplastic resins;
- (iii) a claim relates to improved fuel oil compositions which have a given desired property. The description provides support for one way of obtaining fuel oils having this property, which is by the presence of defined amounts of a certain additive. No other ways of obtaining fuel oils having the desired property are disclosed. The claim makes no mention of the additive. The claim is not supported over the whole of its breadth and an objection is raised.

Where the claims are found to lack support in the description under Art. 84, a partial European or supplementary European search report may be issued under Rule 63 (see B-VIII, 3.1 and 3.2). In such cases, in the absence of appropriate amendment and/or convincing arguments from the applicant in their response to the invitation under Rule 63(1) (see B-VIII, 3.2) or the search opinion under Rule 70a (see B-XI, 8), an objection under Rule 63(3) will also be raised (see H-II, 5).

6.4 Lack of support vs insufficient disclosure

Although an objection of lack of support is an objection under Art. 84, it can often, as in the above examples, also be considered as an objection of

Art. 83

Art. 84

insufficient disclosure of the invention under Art. 83 (see F-III, 1 to 3), the objection being that the disclosure is insufficient to enable the skilled person to carry out the "invention" over the whole of the broad field claimed (although sufficient in respect of a narrow "invention"). Both requirements are designed to reflect the principle that the terms of a claim must be commensurate with or justified by the invention's technical contribution to the art. Therefore, the extent to which an invention is sufficiently disclosed is also highly relevant to the issue of support. The reasons for failure to meet the requirements of Art. 83 may in effect be the same as those that lead to the infringement of Art. 84 as well, namely that the invention, over the whole range claimed, extends to technical subject-matter not made available to the skilled person by the application as filed (see T.409/91, Reasons 2 and 3.3 to 3.5).

For example, where a technical feature is described and highlighted in the description as being an essential feature of the invention, to comply with Art. 84 this feature must also be part of the independent claim(s) defining the invention (see F-IV, 4.5.1). By the same token, if the (essential) technical feature in question is absent from the claims and no information is given on how to perform the claimed invention successfully without using said feature, the description does not disclose the invention defined in the claim(s) in the manner prescribed by Art. 83.

An objection under both Art. 84 and Art. 83 may also be justified. An example would be a claim relating to a known class of chemical compounds defined by measurable parameters but the description does not disclose a technical teaching allowing the skilled person to manufacture those compounds complying with the parametric definition and this is not otherwise feasible by the application of common general knowledge or routine experimentation. Such a claim would be neither technically supported nor sufficiently disclosed, regardless of whether the parametric definition meets the clarity requirement of Art. 84.

Whether the objection is raised as lack of support or insufficiency is not important in examination proceedings; but it is important in opposition proceedings since only the latter ground is available there (see D-III, 5).

6.5 Definition in terms of function

Even where only one example of the feature has been given in the description, a claim may broadly define a feature in terms of its function, i.e. as a functional feature, if it is clear to the skilled person that other means could be used for the same function (see also F-IV, 2.1, F-IV, 4.10 and F-IV, 4.13). For example, "terminal position detecting means" in a claim might be supported by a single example comprising a limit switch, it being evident to the skilled person that e.g. a photoelectric cell or a strain gauge could be used instead. In general, however, if the entire contents of the application are such as to convey the impression that a function is to be carried out in a particular way, with no intimation that alternative means are envisaged, and a claim is formulated in such a way as to embrace other or all means of performing the function, then an objection should be raised. Furthermore, it may not be sufficient for the description to merely state in

vague terms that other means may be adopted if it is not reasonably clear what they might be or how they might be used.

6.6 Support for dependent claims

Where certain subject-matter is clearly disclosed in a claim of the application as filed but not mentioned anywhere in the description, it is permissible to amend the description so that it includes this subject-matter. Where the claim is dependent, it may suffice for the description to mention that the claim sets out a particular embodiment of the invention (see F-II, 4.5).

Annex

Examples of essential features

Example 1

Claim 1 relates to a method for storing gel-coated seeds having a gel coat comprising an aqueous gel having been made water-insoluble by a metal ion. The method is characterised by storing the gel-coated seeds in an aqueous solution containing said metal ion. In the description the object of the invention is defined as providing a method for storing gel-coated seeds easily without causing reduction in yield and handling properties. It was emphasised in the description that it is necessary to confine the metal ion concentration to a specific range in order to achieve the goals of the invention. A metal ion concentration outside the specific range was presented as negatively influencing yield and handling properties. The subject-matter of claim 1 – which does not indicate the specific range – therefore does not solve the problem stated in the description.

Example 2

The invention relates to an apparatus for concave shaping of a metal strip. In the closest prior art, the metal strip is passed transversely to its length through a shaping set of rollers at which the concave shape is applied to the strip. According to the description, the problem is that the rollers are unable to subject the lateral ends of the strip to a curve-creating force and so the lateral ends normally end up planar. The distinguishing feature of the independent claim specifies that a flexible belt or web-like member is provided to support the strip in its passage through the shaping set of rollers. This feature is sufficient to solve the problem. Further features, e.g. the details of the mechanism for advancing the strip into the shaping set of rollers or the provision of at least three rollers, are not necessary to solve the problem: such additional features would unduly restrict the claim (see T.1069/01).

Example 3

Claim 1 is directed to an apparatus for coding television signals comprising, amongst other features, a parameter-generating means which ensures that the error between the pixel data of the predicted and actual current fields is minimised. The description describes only one example for minimising the error, namely a method of least squares. What is important is that the skilled person would be able to realise how the error-minimising function can be implemented: it is not relevant in this context whether the method of least squares is the only method applicable. It is therefore not necessary to further restrict the claimed parameter-generating means in the sense that it uses a method of least squares (see T.41/91).

Example 4

The description states that a compound C is obtained by reacting a mixture of A and B for at least 10 minutes at 100°C. It is emphasised that A and B must be reacted for this minimum amount of time, as otherwise the reaction will be incomplete and C will not be formed. Claim 1 is directed to a process

for the production of compound C, characterised by reacting a mixture of A and B for 5 to 15 minutes at 100°C. The claim does not contain all the essential features of the invention, as the description clearly states that for the reaction to be complete, it is necessary to react A and B for at least 10 minutes.

Example 5

The description identifies the problem to be solved as providing aerosol compositions wherein the percentage of undesirable volatile organic compounds (VOCs) required as propellant is dramatically decreased, resulting in less VOC release to the atmosphere. Claim 1 specifies the minimum amount of at least 15 weight% of propellant (which is a VOC) in the aerosol, but is completely silent about any maximum amount thereof. The problem underlying the application of releasing less VOCs into the environment is solved only when the propellant does not exceed a particular maximum amount in the aerosol composition: this maximum value is therefore an essential feature of the invention. Claim 1 covers aerosols comprising any amount of propellant greater than or equal to 15 weight%, thereby covering the deficient high percentage of propellant present in conventional aerosols. The percentage of undesirable VOCs in the claimed aerosol compositions is therefore not "dramatically decreased", and so the stated aim of the present invention is not achieved (see T.586/97).

Example 6

As regards diagnostic methods, in G.1/04 it is indicated that if the deductive medical or veterinary decision phase is unambiguously derivable from the application or patent as a whole, it is to be included as an essential feature in the independent claim. In other words, if the inevitable outcome of the first three phases of such a method (see G-II.4.2.1.3) is a specific diagnosis for curative purposes allowing the deviation to be attributed to a particular clinical picture, the decision phase must be included in the independent claim in order to fulfil the requirements of Art. 84. However, this may cause a claim to be excluded from patentability under Art. 53(c) (see also G-II.4.2.1.3). The requirement that the final decision phase be included in the independent claim as an essential feature is to be applied only if it is clear from the application/patent as a whole that the inevitable result of the findings leads unambiguously to a particular diagnosis: this will have to be decided by the division on a case-by-case basis.

Chapter V – Unity of invention

1. Introduction

The basic principle behind the requirement of unity is that a patent is granted for each invention separately, i.e. in order to proceed to grant, a European patent application is required to contain claims relating to one invention only (G 2/92, Reasons 2).

This requirement of unity is further justified by the principle of equal treatment of applicants: any applicant is entitled to the same service for the fees paid, i.e. one search/examination for one search/examination fee.

Therefore, at the search stage, if an application as filed is considered by the search division to relate to more than one invention, a search fee may be paid for each such invention, and the search report will be drawn up only in respect of inventions for which search fees have been paid. At the examination stage, the applicant can select only one searched invention in each application to be examined for conformity with the patentability and other requirements of the EPC (see G 2/92, Reasons 2).

Rule 64

Art. 82 and Rule 44 govern the application of the requirement of unity to European patent applications. This requirement is not applicable in opposition proceedings (G 1/91).

This chapter deals with the substantive aspects of the assessment of unity of invention (F-V, 2 and 3), as well as some procedural aspects relating to lack of unity during search (F-V, 4) and lack of unity during substantive examination (F-V, 5). Aspects of unity of invention in the case of amended claims and Euro-PCT applications are dealt with in F-V, 6 and 7 respectively. Further aspects related to the procedural implementation of unity of invention in search and examination are to be found in chapters B-VII and C-III respectively.

Given the harmonisation of the definitions concerning unity of invention in Rule 13(1) and (2) PCT versus Art. 82 and Rule 44(1) respectively, the criteria for unity in both systems are the same. Hence, unity of invention is examined in search and substantive examination in both European and PCT procedures according to the same principles. This does not apply to the respective procedures themselves, which differ significantly.

Art. 150(2)

Consequently, decisions of the boards of appeal rendered according to the former PCT protest procedures continue to be of interest for the consideration of unity in European applications.

2. Requirement of unity of invention

A European patent application must relate to one invention only or a group of inventions which must be so linked as to form a single general inventive concept (see also B-VII, 1).

Art. 82

The requirement of unity of invention needs to be assessed only if a group of inventions is claimed. A group of inventions may be formed, for example, by a plurality of independent claims in the same or in different categories, a

plurality of alternative inventions defined within a single independent claim (see also [F-IV, 3.7](#)) or a plurality of dependent claims where the independent claim is either not novel or not inventive.

Rule 44(1)

If a group of inventions is claimed, the requirement that the inventions in this group be so linked as to form a single general concept ([Art. 82](#)) is fulfilled only if there is a technical relationship between the claimed inventions involving one or more of the same or corresponding special technical features.

The term "special" means that the features in question define the contribution that the invention considered as a whole makes over the "prior art at hand" in terms of novelty and inventive step. The "prior art at hand", i.e. the prior art relied upon in the non-unity assessment, may vary depending on the stage of proceedings (see [F-V, 3](#)).

The term "same" means that the special technical features are identical or define an identical chemical structure.

The term "corresponding" means that the special technical features achieve the same technical effect or solve the same technical problem. Correspondence may be found, for example, in alternative solutions or interrelated features, e.g. the interaction between a plug and a socket causing a releasable electrical connection, or in a causal relationship such as a step in a manufacturing process that causes a certain structural feature in a product. For example, an application might include two claims, one relating to a metal spring and another relating to a block of rubber. The metal spring and block of rubber may be considered to be corresponding technical features as they both achieve the same technical effect of resilience.

In contrast, features that are not shared, i.e. features that appear only in some but not in other claims, cannot be part of the single general inventive concept.

2.1 Insufficient grounds for lack of unity

Art. 84

When determining unity of invention, a finding of lack of clarity of the claims is not on its own a sufficient ground for a finding of lack of unity.

Normally, too, the sequence of the claims has no impact on the determination of unity of invention. However, it will have an impact on which invention is to be considered the first invention mentioned in the claims (see [F-V, 3.4](#)).

Moreover, the fact that the separate inventions claimed belong to different groups of the classification is not in itself a reason for a finding of lack of unity.

Rule 43(2)

If an application contains claims of different categories or several independent claims of the same category, this is not in itself a reason for an objection of lack of unity of invention (the relationship between [Rule 43\(2\)](#) and [Art. 82](#) is explained in more detail in [F-V, 3.2.1](#)).

Lack of unity does not occur because of one claim containing a number of individual features, where these features do not present a technical interrelationship (i.e. a combination) but merely a juxtaposition (see [G-VII, 7](#)).

By definition, no lack of unity can be present between an independent claim and its dependent claims, even if the features of the dependent claims are juxtaposed with the features of the independent claim (see [F-V, 3.2.3](#)).

2.2 Division's approach

Lack of unity is not a ground for revocation in later proceedings. Therefore, although an objection should certainly be raised in sufficiently clear cases and an amendment requested, the division should not base an objection on an interpretation that is overly rigid, narrow, literal or academic. This is particularly so during search when the possible lack of unity does not necessitate a further search. That is, the search division may raise a lack of unity objection at the search stage but will not invite the applicant to pay further search fees for other inventions that can be searched without effort together with the first invention, see [F-V, 4](#).

If a lack of unity is established, the claimed subject-matter is divided into separate inventions and/or inventions grouped together in view of their technical relationships (see [F-V, 3.2](#)), i.e. according to any common matter comprising same or corresponding potential special technical features. In this context, an invention must have technical character and be concerned with a technical problem within the meaning of [Art. 52\(1\)](#) (see [G-I, 1](#)) but it does not necessarily need to meet other requirements for patentability, such as novelty and inventive step (see [G-VI](#) and [G-VII](#)).

Lack of unity may be evident *a priori*, i.e. before carrying out a prior-art search, or may become apparent *a posteriori*, i.e. after taking into account the prior art revealed by the search in terms of novelty and inventive step.

3. Assessment of unity

The assessment of unity of invention serves to determine if the subject-matter of the claims has anything in common that represents a single general inventive concept ([Art. 82](#)). If any of the claims contain one or more alternatives, each of the alternatives is considered as if it were a separate claim for the purpose of assessing lack of unity.

A substantive assessment of unity of invention requires

- (i) determining, in the light of the application as a whole, the common matter, if any, between the claims of the different claimed inventions that the examiner provisionally identifies (see [F-V, 2.2, 3.2](#) and [3.4](#))
- (ii) comparing the common matter with the "prior art at hand" to examine whether the common matter makes a contribution over that prior art, namely whether it comprises "special" technical features within the meaning of [Rule 44\(1\)](#)

- (iii) if the common matter does not comprise special technical features, analysing any remaining technical features which are not part of the identified common matter to determine if there is a unifying technical relationship between some of the claims.

For example, there may be a lack of unity between dependent claims if the independent claim on which they depend does not comprise any features making a technical contribution over the prior art at hand. In such a case, the independent claim would not provide a unifying technical relationship between the dependent claims as required by Rule 44(1) as it would not contain any "special technical features".

- (i) Determining the common matter

Common matter represents a potential single general inventive concept among the claims. It may be present in features which are the same or corresponding (see F-V, 2), namely in features that are either identical to each other or that alone or in combination provide a common technical effect or a solution to a common technical problem.

The technical problem in the non-unity assessment may be different from that in a patentability assessment since the overall object is to find out what the claims have in common.

When analysing the technical problem in a non-unity assessment, the starting point is usually what is considered by the applicant in the description as having been achieved. In this regard, the applicant must disclose the invention in such terms that the technical problem and its solution can be understood, and state any advantageous effects of the invention with reference to the background art (Rule 42(1)(c)). This technical problem defines in the first instance the common matter of the claims.

However, for the purpose of considering unity of invention, the division is not restricted to the general concept of what the applicant subjectively claims to be the invention (G 1/89 and G 2/89).

The technical problem put forward by the applicant in the description may, on closer examination, reveal itself as unsuitable as a means of linking the subject-matter of the claims in such a way that they form a single general inventive concept. This may happen either where, in view of the information contained in the description and the common general knowledge of the skilled person, it is evident that different claims solve different problems (*a priori* assessment of lack of unity) or where the search reveals prior art disclosing or rendering obvious a solution to the unifying technical problem stated by the applicant in the description (*a posteriori* assessment of lack of unity). In the latter case, the technical problem stated by the applicant may no longer constitute the single general inventive concept required by Art. 82 since it cannot be regarded as inventive.

For example, a prior-art document under Art. 54(2) disclosing all the features of an independent claim also discloses, at least implicitly, the

technical problem stated by the applicant since, by definition, this problem must be solved by the features of said independent claim.

The division will then proceed to analyse if any other common matter is present among the claims, i.e. identify, in the light of the application as a whole, any technical features of the claims that are the same or corresponding. When determining whether technical features are corresponding, it is important that the technical problems solved, which are associated with the technical effects, are not formulated too narrowly or too generally. If the technical problems are too narrow when they could have been more general, they may have nothing in common, leading to the possibly wrong conclusion that technical features are not corresponding. If they are too general when they could have been narrower, the common aspects of the problem may be known, also leading to the possibly wrong conclusion that there is a lack of unity.

For example, a membrane and a diaphragm may achieve the technical effect of "providing resilience" and, hence, may be regarded as corresponding features.

Common matter may not only be found in features of claims in the same category but may also be embodied in features of claims of different categories. For example, in the case of a product, a process specially adapted for the manufacture of said product and the use of said product, the product may represent the common matter which is present in the use and in the process as the effect or result of the process.

Common matter may also be embodied in interrelated product features (e.g. a plug and a socket). Although corresponding features in interrelated products may be formulated quite differently, if in their interaction they contribute to the same technical effect or to the solution of the same technical problem, they become part of the common matter.

There may be cases where no common matter at all can be identified. In such cases, the application lacks unity because neither a technical relationship within the meaning of Rule 44(1) is present between the independent claims, nor does the application entail a single general inventive concept within the meaning of Art. 82.

(ii) Comparison of the common matter with the prior art at hand

If common matter, namely subject-matter involving the same or corresponding technical features, is identified in the claims, it must be compared with the prior art at hand. If the common matter defines a non-obvious contribution over that prior art, it will involve "special technical features", and the inventions concerned will be so linked as to form a single general inventive concept. Otherwise, if the common matter is known or obvious from the prior art at hand, then the application lacks unity. This assessment is to be done on the basis of an assessment of novelty and inventive step vis-à-vis the prior art at hand. The obviousness is to be assessed, whenever appropriate, using the problem-solution approach.

The common matter may involve features defining technical alternatives. If the common technical effect to be achieved by these technical alternatives is already known or may be recognised as generally desirable (a mere desideratum), or is obvious, these alternative features cannot be considered as defining a technical relationship within the meaning of Rule 44(1) because there is no inventive merit in formulating the problem.

The "prior art at hand", i.e. the prior art relied upon in the non-unity assessment, may vary depending on the stage of proceedings. For example, where the assessment is carried out before the search ("*a priori* assessment"), the only "prior art at hand" may be the background art provided by the applicant in the description and any common general knowledge. During the search, other prior art may be revealed and may form the basis for the "*a posteriori* assessment". Therefore, the "prior art at hand" may change during the course of the proceedings. For this reason the assessment of unity is iterative.

(iii) Analysis of the remaining technical features

If the comparison of the common matter under (ii) leads to a finding of a lack of unity, the next step is to confirm or specify the groups of different inventions present in the claims (see F-V, 3.2).

To determine these groups of inventions, the remaining technical features not forming part of the identified common matter need to be analysed. In most cases, each group will comprise several claims. This grouping is performed on the basis of the technical problems associated with the remaining technical features of each of the claims. Those claims comprising remaining technical features associated with the same technical problem are combined into a single group.

The technical problems associated with the claims must be carefully formulated. It may not be sufficient to analyse the remaining technical features of each claim in isolation; rather it may be necessary to analyse their effect when read in the context of the individual claim as a whole and in the light of the description. When formulating the technical problems of the various inventions in a unity assessment, a very narrow approach should be avoided since the objective is to see whether any commonality may be established between the inventions. It is therefore often necessary to redefine the very specific problems associated with each of the claims to arrive at a more general problem while bearing in mind the context in which the relevant features are disclosed. However, if claims are directed to alternatives associated with the same technical problem and the technical problem has been successfully solved in the prior art, these claims may be placed into different groups (for the reasoning in this case see F-V, 3.3.1(v)(6)). If the application allows a more specific problem associated with each of the alternatives defined in the different groups to be derived, the more specific problem should be used in place of the same technical problem defined earlier.

For the grouping, it is irrelevant whether the subject-matter of the claims or of their remaining technical features are novel or inventive over the prior art

at hand. However, this is relevant for assessing whether the applicant is to be invited to pay an additional search fee for a group (see [F-V, 4](#)).

If the problems associated with the different groups are either known from the prior art at hand or different from each other, then the finding of step (ii) that there exists a lack of unity is confirmed.

3.1 Non-unity and prior art

3.1.1 Non-unity and prior art under [Art. 54\(3\)](#)

Documents cited under [Art. 54\(3\)](#) should be disregarded in the evaluation of unity of invention since they cannot anticipate the inventive concept of the application under examination.

3.1.2 Non-unity and prior art under [Art. 54\(2\)](#)

Documents cited under [Art. 54\(2\)](#) as accidental anticipation should be disregarded in the evaluation of unity of invention since they cannot anticipate the inventive concept of the application under examination (see [H-V, 4.2.1](#), [G 1/03](#) and [G 1/16](#)).

3.2 Grouping of inventions

As a general rule, after the initial identification of subject-matter lacking unity, the claims and alternatives contained in claims are assigned to the identified groups of inventions. This step comprises assessing which of the remaining claims or alternatives in claims could potentially relate to the same technical problem. By doing so, groups of inventions are identified where each group relates to unitary subject-matter in view of the prior art at hand. If, in the course of grouping, the same special technical feature providing a contribution over the prior art is identified in two groups of inventions, both groups need to be combined into one single group. Conversely, if, within one initial single group of inventions, claims or alternatives in claims are identified that are not linked by a potentially special technical feature providing a contribution over the prior art at hand, they will normally be separated into different groups of inventions. See also [F-V, 3\(iii\)](#) for analysing features in their context rather than in isolation. The initial grouping of claims and alternatives in claims into different inventions may require re-evaluation during the course of assessment of unity of invention.

Typically, different groups of inventions are based on different independent claims of the same category, alternatives defined in one independent claim (see [F-V, 3.2.1](#)) or dependent claims defining alternative embodiments, provided that the independent claim is either not novel or not inventive. However, different groups of inventions may also be based on independent claims in different categories if lack of unity is present between these claims.

3.2.1 Plurality of independent claims in the same category

[Rule 43\(2\)](#)'s sub-paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) define the situations where, without prejudice to the requirements of [Art. 82](#), an application is allowed to comprise a plurality of independent claims in the same category (see [F-IV, 3.2](#) and [3.3](#)). The express reference to [Art. 82](#) in [Rule 43\(2\)](#) makes

[Rule 43\(2\)](#)

clear that the requirement for unity of invention must still be met. Where the application both lacks unity of invention and fails to comply with the requirements of Rule 43(2), it is at the discretion of the division to raise an objection under Rule 43(2) or Art. 82, or both.

A plurality of inventions in the same category may constitute a group of inventions so linked as to form a single general inventive concept. Examples of inventions in the same category are alternative forms of an invention or interrelated inventions provided that they share a single general inventive concept.

Rule 44(2)

An invention may be claimed either in a plurality of independent claims or in a single independent claim (see also F-IV, 3.7). In the latter case, the presence of the two alternatives may not be immediately apparent. In either case, the same criteria are applied in deciding whether there is unity of invention, and lack of unity of invention may therefore also exist within a single claim.

Several independent claims in the same category directed to interrelated subject-matter may meet the requirement of unity even if the claimed subject-matter appears quite different, provided the technical features making a contribution over the prior art at hand are the same or corresponding. Examples of such situations include a transmitter and the corresponding receiver or a plug and the corresponding socket (see also F-IV, 3.2).

Thus, special technical features relating to the single general inventive concept must be either implicitly or explicitly present in each of the independent claims.

3.2.2 Plurality of independent claims in different categories

A plurality of independent claims in different categories (see F-IV, 3.1) may constitute a group of inventions so linked as to form a single general inventive concept as defined in Rule 44(2).

However, the decisive factor is that a single general inventive concept links the claims in the various categories. The presence in each claim of expressions such as "specially adapted" or "specifically designed" does not necessarily imply that a single general inventive concept is present.

3.2.3 Dependent claims

A dependent claim and the higher-ranking claim on which it depends cannot be grouped into two different groups of inventions (see F-V, 2.1).

If, however, the higher-ranking claim appears not patentable, then the question of whether there is still an inventive link between all the claims dependent on it needs careful consideration.

In this context it is important to verify that a claim drafted as a dependent claim is in fact a true dependent claim comprising all the features of the corresponding independent claim, see F-IV, 3.7. For a definition of a dependent claim, see F-IV, 3.4 and 3.8.

3.2.4 Common dependent claims

While an independent claim is always part of the common matter among its dependent claims, the opposite is not true: a claim dependent on several independent claims is never part of the common matter between these independent claims.

Unity is assessed firstly between the independent claims. If a dependent claim comprises technical features common to several inventions, then it is part of all of these inventions at the same time.

Example 1

An application contains two independent claims and one dependent claim:

1. A device comprising feature A.
2. A device comprising feature B.
3. A device comprising features A and B.

In this example, independent claims 1 and 2 are not linked by a single general inventive concept; features A and B are neither the same nor corresponding special technical features. A lack of unity is present between claims 1 and 2, each of them being directed to a different invention. The content of dependent claim 3 has no bearing on this analysis.

If dependent claims comprise features of two or more groups of inventions, then they belong to each of these group of inventions. In example 1, the subject-matter of claim 3 contains features of each of the two inventions (claim 1, claim 2), thus belonging to both inventions at the same time. Therefore, the search for the first invention mentioned in the claims should, in this example, cover the subject-matter of claim 1 and claim 3.

The examiner also assesses if a further search fee should be paid for the second invention (see F-V, 2.2, F-V, 4, B-VII, B-III, 3.8).

Example 2

An application comprises the following claims:

1. A device comprising feature A.
2. A device according to claim 1, further comprising feature B.
3. A device according to any of the previous claims, further comprising feature C.

Claim 3 is thus directed to the following subject-matter:

3. A device that is either:
 - (a) a device comprising features A and C; or

(b) a device comprising features A, B and C.

In this example, feature A is not a special technical feature (i.e. the subject-matter of claim 1 is either not new or not inventive).

- If both features B and C are special technical features (new and inventive) and they are corresponding (i.e. they have a technical relationship with each other), then the claimed devices A+B and A+C are the same invention. Consequently, the device A+B+C is part of the same invention as well. There is unity of invention.
- If features B and C are different and are not corresponding (i.e. they have no technical relationship with each other), then there is a lack of unity. There are two inventions: the device having the features A+B (claim 1 partially and claim 2 entirely) and the device having the features A+C (claim 1 partially and claim 3(a) entirely). The subject-matter of claim 3(b) has all the features of the first invention (A+B) and all the features of the second invention (A+C). Therefore, it belongs entirely to both inventions at the same time. Thus, the search for the first invention mentioned in the claims should, in this example, cover not only claim 2 (A+B), but also the subject-matter of claim 3(b) (A+B+C).

The examiner also assesses if a further search fee should be paid for the second invention (see F-V, 2.2, F-V, 4, B-VII, B-III, 3.8).

3.2.5 Markush grouping (alternatives in a single claim)

Where a single claim defines several (chemical or non-chemical) alternatives, e.g. it contains a "Markush grouping", the requirement of Rule 44(1) for same or corresponding special technical features is considered met if the alternatives are of a similar nature (see F-IV, 3.7).

When the Markush grouping is for alternatives of chemical compounds, they should be regarded as being of a similar nature where:

- (i) all alternatives have a common property or activity and
- (ii) a common structure is present, i.e. a significant structural element is shared by all of the alternatives or all alternatives belong to a recognised class of chemical compounds in the art to which the invention pertains.

Thus, common matter is provided for a Markush grouping by the common property or activity of the alternatives (see (i) above) and the common structure defined by (ii) above.

A "significant structural element is shared by all of the alternatives" if the compounds share a common chemical structure that occupies a large portion of their structures or, if the compounds have in common only a small portion of their structures, the commonly shared structure constitutes a structurally distinctive portion, and this structure or portion leads to a technical contribution in view of the existing prior art at hand. The structural

element may be a single component or a combination of individual components linked together.

There is no need for a significant structural element to be novel in absolute terms (i.e. novel *per se*). Rather, the term "significant" means that in relation to the common property or activity, there must be a common part of the chemical structure that distinguishes the claimed compounds from any known compounds having the same property or activity.

In other words, the significant structural element defines the technical contribution which the claimed invention, considered as a whole, makes over the prior art at hand.

The alternatives belong to a "recognised class of chemical compounds" if there is an expectation from the knowledge in the art that members of the class will behave in the same way in the context of the claimed invention, i.e. that each member could be substituted one for the other, with the expectation that the same intended result would be achieved.

However, if it can be shown that at least one Markush alternative is not novel, unity of invention must be reconsidered. In particular, if the structure of at least one of the compounds covered by a Markush claim is known, together with the property or technical effect under consideration, this is an indication of lack of unity of the remaining compounds (alternatives).

This is because the Markush alternatives comprise no same (common structure) or corresponding (same property or technical effect) technical features that are "special".

Claims covering different alternative nucleic acids or proteins defined by different sequences are equally considered to represent a Markush grouping and are also analysed according to the above principles.

3.2.6 Claims for a known substance for a number of distinct medical uses

For the particular case of claims for a known substance for a number of distinct medical uses, see G-VI, 6.1.

3.2.7 Intermediate and final products

In the present context of intermediate and final products, the term "intermediate" means intermediate or starting products. Such products are made available with a view to obtaining end products through a physical or chemical change in which the intermediate product loses its identity.

The requirement for the same or corresponding special technical features (Rule 44(1)) is considered to be met in the context of intermediate and final products where:

- (i) the intermediate and final products have the same essential structural element, i.e. their basic chemical structures are the same or their chemical structures are technically closely interrelated, the

intermediate incorporating an essential structural element into the final product and

- (ii) the intermediate and final products are technically interrelated, i.e. the final product is manufactured directly from the intermediate or is separated from it by a small number of intermediates all containing the same essential structural element.

An essential structural element is a chemical structure that defines the technical contribution that the claimed inventions, considered as a whole, make over the prior art. Typically, the above-mentioned conditions are met in the case of a precursor compound yielding the final product directly upon reaction.

Unity of invention may also be present between intermediate and final products of which the structures are not known – for example, between an intermediate having a known structure and a final product with unknown structure or between an intermediate of unknown structure and a final product of unknown structure. In such cases, there should be sufficient evidence to be able to conclude that the intermediate and final products are technically closely interrelated as, for example, when the intermediate contains the same essential element as the final product or incorporates an essential element into the final product.

Different intermediate products used in different processes for the preparation of the final product may be claimed if they have the same essential structural element. The intermediate and final products should not be separated in the process leading from one to the other by an intermediate which is not new. Where different intermediates for different structural parts of the final product are claimed, unity should not be regarded as being present between the intermediates. If the intermediate and final products are families of compounds, each intermediate compound should correspond to a compound claimed in the family of the final products. However, some of the final products may have no corresponding compound in the family of the intermediate products, so the two families need not be absolutely congruent.

The mere fact that, besides the ability to be used to produce final products, the intermediates also exhibit other possible effects or activities should not prejudice unity of invention.

3.3 Reasoning for a lack-of-unity objection

An objection of lack of unity must consist of logically presented, technical reasoning containing the basic considerations behind the finding of lack of unity. If necessary, it must comprise considerations relating to the number and grouping of the claimed separate inventions.

3.3.1 Minimum requirements for reasoning of lack of unity

When raising a non-unity objection, the division must back it up with a minimum reasoning outlining at least the following elements:

- (i) the common matter, if any, between the groups of inventions. The common matter is based on the same or corresponding technical features. It is not confined to individual features but also includes synergistic effects being the result of a combination of features, see G-VII, 7.
- (ii) the reasons why this common matter cannot provide a single general inventive concept based on the same or corresponding special technical features. This includes prior art or general knowledge or the teaching of the application itself which anticipates or renders obvious the common matter (and the general problem if applicable). If prior art is relied upon, it must be identified, indicating any relevant passages and the reasons why they are considered relevant
- (iii) the reasons why there is no technical relationship between the remaining technical features of the different groups of claims, including:
 - (a) an identification of any remaining technical features of the different groups and the respective claims of each group, with an explicit statement that these technical features are different
 - (b) for each group, an identification, in the light of the description, of the objective technical problems solved by these remaining technical features
 - (c) why the problems solved are either known from the prior art or are different so that the different technical features cannot be considered "corresponding special technical features"
- (iv) in all cases, the minimum reasoning comprises a concluding statement that, because neither the same nor corresponding special technical features are present in the claims, there is no single general inventive concept and the requirements for unity of invention are not met
- (v) in special cases, point iii, parts (a) to (c), which prove that there is no technical relationship involving the same or corresponding special technical features, will be automatically covered if it is explained:
 - (1) why grouped alternatives of chemical compounds are not of a similar nature
 - (2) in the case of lack of unity between intermediate and final products, why the intermediate and final products do not have the same essential structural elements and are not technically closely interrelated

- (3) why a process is not specially adapted to the production of a product
- (4) why a product itself does not provide a single general inventive concept linking different uses as defined in the claims
- (5) why a use in itself does not provide a single general inventive concept linking the subject-matter of the claims
- (6) in the case of lack of unity between groups of inventions covering alternatives why the groups of inventions solve the same problem and why this problem has already been solved successfully in the prior art

3.4 Determination of the invention first mentioned in the claims

Rule 64(1)
Rule 164(1)

When lack of unity is established, the sequence of the claimed (groups of) inventions will normally start with the invention first mentioned in the claims ("first invention"); see also B-VII, 1.1 and 2.3. In other words, as a general rule, the division of subject-matter follows the order of appearance of the different inventions in the claims. The content of the dependent claims will be taken into account when determining the first invention. Trivial claims relating exclusively to features that seem unimportant in the light of the invention or that are generally known in the technical field of the invention are disregarded (see B-III, 3.8 for the search phase).

However, if the filed claims do not fulfil the requirements of Rule 43(4), i.e. if the dependency of the claims is not correct, the claims will be re-ordered accordingly before assessing the fulfilment of the requirements of unity.

4. Procedure in the case of lack of unity during search

Rule 64(1)
Rule 64(2)

The search division may neither refuse the application for lack of unity nor require limitation of the claims but must inform the applicant that the search report cannot be drawn up for inventions other than the one first mentioned unless further search fees are paid within two months. This applies even if the search reveals prior art that renders the entire subject-matter of the first invention not novel.

When lack of unity is raised *a posteriori*, the assessment of the search division is provisional (G 2/89) and is based on the prior art at hand when the assessment is done. In view of the fact that such novelty and inventive step considerations are being made without the applicant having had an opportunity to comment, the search division will exercise restraint in this assessment and, in borderline cases, will preferably refrain from considering an application as not complying with the requirement of unity of invention.

Before issuing an invitation to pay additional fees based on an *a posteriori* assessment (see B-VII, 1.2), the search division will assess the technical problem underlying a claimed group of inventions in the light of both the disclosure of the application as a whole and the relevant prior art at hand revealed by the search (see W 6/97, W 6/91).

The consideration of the requirement of unity of invention is always made with a view to giving the applicant fair treatment and the invitation to pay additional fees is made only in clear cases.

The applicant is never invited to pay an additional search fee for claimed inventions that are not novel or do not possess an inventive step over the prior art at hand. Nevertheless, the search division may still raise an objection of lack of unity for such alleged "sub-inventions" in view of potential amendments that could be reasonably expected in the light of the description and any drawings.

However, if the inventions concern non-obvious alternatives to the disclosure of the prior art at hand or technical details of different apparatuses/methods/products that require a complete new search for an enabling disclosure, the search division may invite the applicant to pay additional fees for all the inventions.

Example

The independent claim is directed to a new method to dope a molecule so as to enhance its ability to bind to a cellular membrane's receptor. A dependent claim claims that the molecule can be doped to bind to several different receptors of the membrane. The search reveals that the method of the independent claim, applied to one receptor listed in the dependent claim, has already been disclosed in the prior art. If the search division is of the opinion that the application of the by now known method to the alternative receptor is an invention in view of the prior art at hand, it invites the applicant to pay additional fees for all the remaining alternatives since a complete search needs to be carried out to try to retrieve an enabling disclosure for each of them.

4.1 Provisional opinion accompanying the partial search results

Since 1 April 2017, the EPO provides applicants with a provisional opinion on the patentability of the invention (or unitary group of inventions) first mentioned in the claims (see OJ EPO 2017, A20). This provisional opinion is sent together with the invitation to pay further/additional search fees and the partial search results. It also includes the reasons for the non-unity findings.

The provisional opinion is sent for information only. A reply addressing the points raised in the provisional opinion is not required and will not be taken into account when the extended European search report (EESR) is issued. Only the EESR requires a response under Rule 70a.

The provisional opinion accompanying the partial search results is available to the public via online file inspection.

4.2 Consequences for the applicant

There is no obligation for applicants to pay any additional fee.

However, subject-matter that has not been searched will not be examined by the examining division (G 2/92). Hence, it cannot be prosecuted in an independent claim.

If the lack of unity persists also in examination after the claims have been amended, the excision of the non-searched subject-matter from the application may be necessary (see C-III, 3.3 and F-IV, 4.3).

Non-searched subject-matter can always be prosecuted in a divisional application.

5. Procedure in the case of lack of unity during substantive examination

5.1 General principles

In the final analysis, it is up to the examining division to determine whether the application meets the requirement of unity of invention (see T 631/97; see also C-III, 3.2). For Euro-PCT applications having entered the European phase, see F-V, 7.

Whether or not the question of unity of invention has been raised by the search division, it must always be considered by the examining division. The conclusion reached may change, e.g. if further prior art becomes available at a later stage of the proceedings. If lack of unity of invention arises only during substantive examination, the examining division should raise an objection only in clear cases, particularly if substantive examination is at an advanced stage (see also H-II, 6.3).

Rule 36(1)

Whenever unity is found to be lacking, the applicant should be required to limit their claims in such a way as to overcome the objection (see C-III, 3.2 and 3.3), which means restricting them to a single searched invention (see H-II, 6.1). Excision or amendment of parts of the description may also be necessary (see C-III, 3.3). One or more divisional applications covering matter removed to meet this objection may be filed (see C-IX, 1), provided that the parent application is pending (A-IV, 1.1.1).

5.2 Objections to unsearched inventions

See H-II, 6.2 and 6.3.

5.3 Review of non-unity findings

The review of non-unity findings and the refund of additional search fees are dealt with in C-III, 3.4.

In so far as the examining division finds that unity of invention is given, if the applicant has paid the further search fee(s) and requested a full or partial refund, the examining division will order refund of the relevant further search fee(s).

6. Amended claims

Rule 137(5)

For cases where the applicant submits new claims directed to subject-matter which has not been searched, e.g. because it only appeared in the description, and it was not considered appropriate at the search

stage to extend the search to that subject-matter, see [H-IV, 4.1.2](#) and [B-III, 3.5](#).

7. Euro-PCT applications

7.1 International applications without supplementary search

As indicated in [B-II, 4.3.1](#), a supplementary European search is not carried out for certain international applications entering the European phase with an international search report. The following situations may then arise during substantive examination:

[Art. 153\(7\)](#)

- (i) If a lack-of-unity objection has been raised during the international search and the applicant has not taken the opportunity to have the other invention(s) searched by paying additional search fees for them, but has taken advantage of the possibility of amending the claims after receiving the international search report (see [A-XIV, 3](#)) so that they are limited to the invention searched, and has indicated that examination is to be carried out on these amended claims, the examining division proceeds on the basis of these claims.
- (ii) If a lack-of-unity objection has been raised during the international search and the applicant has **neither** taken the opportunity to have the other invention(s) searched by paying additional search fees for them, **nor** amended the claims so that they are limited to the invention searched, **and** the examining division agrees with the ISA's objection (taking into account any comments on the issue of unity submitted by the applicant in the response to the WO-ISA or IPER, see [A-XIV, 3](#)), the examining division will then proceed to issue an invitation under [Rule 164\(2\)](#) to pay search fees for any claimed invention in the application documents for which no additional search fee has been paid to the EPO where it has acted as the ISA.
- (iii) If additional search fees have been paid during the international phase, the applicant may determine that the application is to proceed on the basis of any of the searched inventions, the other(s) being deleted, if the examining division agrees with the ISA's objection. Where the applicant has not yet taken that decision, the examining division will, at the beginning of substantive examination, invite them to do so.
- (iv) If the claims to be examined relate to an invention which differs from any of the inventions originally claimed, the examining division will proceed to issue an invitation under [Rule 164\(2\)](#) to pay search fees for any claimed invention in the application documents not covered by the international search report or supplementary international search report, if any (see [C-III, 3.1](#)).
- (v) If the applicant has not paid additional search fees during the international phase and the examining division does not agree with the ISA's objection (for example, because the applicant has convincingly argued in response to the WO-ISA or IPER, see [A-XIV, 3](#), that the unity-of-invention requirement is satisfied), an

[Rule 164\(2\)](#)

additional search will be performed (see B-II, 4.2(iii)) and the examination will be carried out on all claims.

Rule 36(1)

In cases (i) to (iv), the applicant may file divisional applications for the inventions deleted to satisfy the non-unity objection (see C-IX, 1 and A-IV, 1), provided that the application being divided is still pending when a divisional application is filed (see A-IV, 1.1.1).

7.2 International applications with supplementary search

Art. 153(7)

Rule 164(1)

For international applications entering the European phase with an international search report established by an ISA other than the EPO, a supplementary European search is carried out by the search division in the cases listed in B-II, 4.3.2. If the search division notes a lack of unity during the supplementary European search, B-VII, 2.3 applies.

The procedure before the examining division in such cases is described in A-XIV, 5.1. In brief, the examining division will proceed with the examination of the invention (or group of inventions) covered by the supplementary European search report and chosen by the applicant in response to the ESOP.

7.3 International preliminary examination report (IPER)

For international applications entering the European phase with an international preliminary examination report, the examining division should carefully consider the position taken in that IPER before departing from it. This may be necessary where the claims have been changed, the applicant successfully refutes the objection (either of which may happen in response to the IPER, see A-XIV, 6.3) or the rules regarding unity of invention were misinterpreted; see also F-V, 7.1 and 7.2 above.

7.4 Restricted IPER

Art. 76

Rule 164(2)

If the EPO has established an IPER on the application and the applicant wishes to obtain protection for claims which were not covered by that IPER because they were not searched during the international phase due to a lack-of-unity objection, the applicant may, in response to the invitation to pay additional search fees under Rule 164(2), request that a search be carried out on those claims and select them for prosecution. Alternatively, the applicant can decide to file one or more divisional applications for the inventions not searched if the application being divided is still pending when a divisional application is filed (see A-IV, 1.1.1).

Chapter VI – Priority

1. The right to priority

In this respect see also A-III, 6.

1.1 Date of filing as effective date

According to Art. 80, a European application is accorded as its date of filing the date on which it satisfies the requirements of Rule 40, or, if filed under the PCT, the date on which it satisfies Art. 11 PCT. This date remains unchanged except in the special circumstances of late-filed drawings or parts of the description provided for in Rule 56 and late-filed correct application documents or parts filed under Rule 56a. Rule 40

The date of filing may be the application's only effective date. It is important for determining the expiry of certain time limits (e.g. the date by which the designation of the inventor must be filed under Rule 60), for defining the state of the art relevant to assess the novelty or obviousness of the application's subject-matter, and for determining, in accordance with Art. 60(2), which of two or more European applications from separate persons for the same invention is to be granted.

1.2 Priority date as effective date

However, in many cases, a European application will claim the right of priority of the date of filing of a previous application. In such cases, it is the priority date (i.e. the date of filing of the previous application) which becomes the effective date for the purposes mentioned in the preceding paragraph. Art. 89

1.3 Validly claiming priority

For a valid claim to priority, the following conditions must be satisfied: Art. 87(1), (2) and (5)

- (i) the previous application was filed in or for a state or WTO member recognised as giving rise to a priority right in accordance with the provisions of the EPC (see also A-III, 6.2)
- (ii) the applicant for the European patent was the applicant, or is the successor in title to the applicant, who made the previous application (see also A-III, 6.1 and, for transfer of partial priority, F-VI, 1.5)
- (iii) the European application is made during a period of twelve months from the date of filing of the previous application (subject to certain exceptions, see A-III, 6.6) and
- (iv) the European application is in respect of the same invention as that disclosed in the previous application, which must be the "first application" (see F-VI, 1.4 and 1.4.1).

The words "in or for" any member state of the Paris Convention or member of the WTO, referred to in A-III, 6.2, mean that priority may be claimed in respect of a previous national application, a previous European application, a previous application filed under another regional patent treaty or a previous PCT application. If the previous application was filed in or for an Art. 87(2) and (3)

EPC contracting state, this state may also be designated in the European application. The previous application may be for a patent, a utility model or a utility certificate. However, a priority right based on the deposit of an industrial design is not recognised (see J 15/80). So long as the contents of the application were sufficient to establish a date of filing, that date can be used to create a priority date, no matter the outcome of the application; for example, it may subsequently be abandoned or refused (see A-III, 6.2).

Art. 87(1)

The expression "the same invention" in Art. 87(1) means that the subject-matter of a claim in a European application may enjoy the priority of a previous application only if the skilled person can derive the subject-matter of the claim directly and unambiguously, using common general knowledge, from the previous application as a whole. This means that the specific combination of features present in the claim must at least implicitly be disclosed in the previous application (see F-VI, 2.2 and G 2/98).

1.4 First application

Art. 87(1)

The date of filing of the "first application", i.e. the application first disclosing any or all of the subject-matter of the European application, must be claimed as priority. If it is found that the application to which the priority claim is directed is in fact not the first application in this sense, but that some or all of the subject-matter was disclosed in a still earlier application filed by the same applicant or a predecessor in title, the priority claim is invalid in so far as the subject-matter was already disclosed in the still earlier application (see F-VI, 1.4.1).

Where the priority claim is invalid, the effective date of the European application is its date of filing. The previously disclosed subject-matter of the European application is not novel if the still earlier application referred to above was published prior to the effective date of the European application (Art. 54(2)) or if the still earlier application is also a European application which was published on or after the effective date of the European application in question (Art. 54(3)).

1.4.1 Subsequent application considered as first application

Art. 87(4)

A subsequent application for the same subject-matter and filed in or for the same state or member of the WTO is considered as the "first application" for priority purposes if, at the date this subsequent application was filed, the still earlier application had been withdrawn, abandoned or refused without being open to public inspection and without leaving any rights outstanding and had not served as a basis for claiming priority. The EPO will not consider this question unless there is evidence of the existence of a still earlier application as, for example, in the case of a United States continuation-in-part application. Where it is clear that a still earlier application for the same subject-matter exists and where the priority right is important because of intervening prior art (see F-VI, 2.1), the applicant is required to establish by evidence from an appropriate authority (normally a national patent office) that there were no rights outstanding in the still earlier application in respect of the subject-matter of the application being examined.

Examples of applications that cannot be recognised as a "first application" within the meaning of Art. 87(4) are:

- (i) US applications which are a "continuation" of a previous application ("con")
- (ii) US applications which are a "continuation in part" of a previous application ("cip"), in so far as the subject-matter in question was already disclosed in the original US application
- (iii) national applications claiming priority from a previous national application or national utility model.

In the case of US con or cip applications, the first sentence of the description reads as follows: "This application is a continuation in part (continuation) of Serial Number ... filed ...". The following information is found on the title page under the heading "CONTINUING DATA*****": "VERIFIED THIS APPLICATION IS A CIP (or CON) OF ..." A form headed "Declaration for Patent Application" must also be attached to the end of the application (in this case the priority document), listing earlier foreign or US applications under the heading "foreign priority benefits under Title 35, United States Code, 119" or "benefit under Title 35, U.S.C., 120 of any United States application(s)".

Applications may be filed by reference to a previously filed application (see A-II, 4.1.3.1). If no priority is claimed from this previously filed application, the filing by reference itself does not generate outstanding rights according to Art. 87(4).

Rule 40(1)(c)

For example, in the case of national applications GB1 and GB2 (filed on 1 February 2002 and 2 January 2008 respectively, without claiming priority) pertaining to the same subject-matter, a European application EP1 (filed on 2 January 2009) claims priority of GB2 but refers to GB1 for its content according to Rule 40(1)(c). If GB1 is withdrawn, abandoned or refused without being open to public inspection and without having served as a basis for claiming a right of priority, the mere reference to it under Rule 40(1)(c) does not amount to an outstanding right within the meaning of Art. 87(4). Consequently, in this case the priority claim to GB2 has to be considered valid for EP1.

1.5 Multiple priorities and partial priorities

"Multiple priorities may be claimed" – i.e. a European application may claim rights of priority based on more than one previous application (G 2/98).

Art. 88(2) and (3)

"Partial priority" refers to a situation in which only a part of the subject-matter encompassed by a generic "OR" claim is entitled to the priority date of a previous application (G 1/15).

The previous application may have been filed in or for the same or different states or members of the WTO, but in all cases the earliest application must have been filed not more than 12 months before the date of filing of the European application. Subject-matter of a European application will be

accorded the priority date of the earliest priority application which discloses it.

If, for instance, the European application describes and claims two embodiments (A and B) of an invention, A being disclosed in a French application and B in a German application, both filed within the preceding 12 months, the priority dates of both the French and German applications may be claimed for the appropriate parts of the European application; embodiment A will have the French priority date and embodiment B the German priority date as effective dates. If embodiments A and B are claimed as alternatives in one claim, these alternatives will likewise have the different priority dates as effective dates.

If, on the other hand, a European application is based on one previous application disclosing a feature C and a second previous application disclosing a feature D, neither disclosing the combination of C and D, a claim to that combination will be entitled only to the date of filing of the European application itself. In other words, it is not permitted to "mosaic" priority documents. An exception might arise where one priority document contains a reference to the other and explicitly states that features from the two documents can be combined in a particular manner.

According to G 1/15, entitlement to partial priority may not be refused for a claim encompassing alternative subject-matter by virtue of one or more generic expressions or otherwise (generic "OR" claim) provided that said alternative subject-matter was first disclosed, directly or at least implicitly, unambiguously and sufficiently in the priority document. No other substantive conditions or limitations apply in this respect.

In assessing whether subject-matter within a generic "OR" claim may enjoy partial priority, the first step is to determine the subject-matter disclosed in the priority document that is relevant, i.e. relevant in respect of prior art disclosed in the priority interval. This is to be done in accordance with the disclosure test laid down in the conclusion of G 2/98 and on the basis of explanations put forward by the applicant or patent proprietor to support the claim to priority to show what the skilled person would have been able to derive from the priority document. The next step is to examine whether this subject-matter is encompassed by the claim of the application or patent claiming said priority. If the answer is yes, the claim is *de facto* conceptually divided into two parts, the first corresponding to the invention disclosed directly and unambiguously in the priority document, the second being the remaining part of the subsequent generic "OR" claim not enjoying this priority but itself giving rise to a right to priority as laid down in Art. 88(3).

For example, if the priority document discloses the use of a specific composition whereas the application claims the use of a composition defined in more generic terms, two alternative groups of subject-matter are identified as being encompassed by the claim, even if the claim does not expressly spell them out:

- alternative (a), concerning the use of a specific composition (e.g. calcium salt of the active ingredient and tribasic phosphate salt in which the cation was multivalent) and
- alternative (b), concerning the use of a composition defined in more generic terms (e.g. acid form or acceptable salt thereof as the active, inorganic salt in which the cation was multivalent, wherein active ingredient and inorganic salt were other than calcium salt of the acid and tribasic phosphate salt in combination).

Alternative (a) is the subject-matter disclosed in the priority document, not defined as such in the claim but encompassed by it. Alternative (b) is the remaining subject-matter of the claim, which was not disclosed in the priority document. In such a situation, the subject-matter of alternative (a) enjoys priority whereas that of alternative (b) does not.

The rationale of decision G 1/15 also applies in the context of deciding whether an application from which priority is claimed is the first application within the meaning of Art. 87(1). Just as a priority application and a patent claiming priority from it may partially relate to the same invention, the priority application and an earlier application filed by the same applicant may also partially relate to the same invention. In that case, the priority application would be the first application in respect of only that part of the invention which is not the same as in the earlier application (T 282/12).

Partial priority may also be separately transferable (T 969/14). This, however, has consequences for the remaining priority right because the assignor is left with a limited right and may no longer keep claiming that partial priority (an applicant can only claim a right they own). The transfer agreement of the partial priority gives a respective partial priority right to the assignor and the assignee corresponding to two clearly distinct and precisely defined alternatives.

2. Determining priority dates

2.1 Examining the validity of a right to priority

As a rule, the division does not examine the validity of a priority right. However, the priority right assumes importance if the prior art under consideration (e.g. an intermediate document, see G-IV.3) was made available to the public within the meaning of Art. 54(2) on or after the priority date claimed and before the date of filing, or if the content of the European patent application is wholly or partially identical to that of another European application within the meaning of Art. 54(3) which claims a priority date within that period. In such cases (i.e. where the art in question would be relevant if of earlier date), the division must examine whether the priority date(s) claimed may be accorded to the appropriate parts of the

application it is examining and inform the applicant of the outcome and whether, in consequence, the particular prior art under consideration, e.g. the intermediate document, or the other European application forms part of the state of the art within the meaning of Art. 54. Also, in the case of possible conflict with another European application under Art. 54(3), it may be necessary, in addition, to allocate effective dates to the appropriate parts of that other application and to communicate this to the applicant (see also G-IV, 3). When the division needs to consider the question of priority date, it has to bear in mind all the matters mentioned in F-VI, 1.3 to 1.5 above. Moreover, in such cases, if the validity of the priority claim or claims could not be examined at the search stage, this issue needs to be reviewed in examination (B-XI, 4.1).

If, in the case of a Euro-PCT application where the EPO is acting as a designated or elected Office, the priority document is not on file, substantive examination may nevertheless be started. In such a case, the application may even be refused, where appropriate, for lack of novelty or inventive step, without the priority document being on file, provided that the relevant state of the art is neither an intermediate document nor an Art. 54(3) application with an effective date between the priority date claimed and the date of filing. However, no European patent may be granted until such time as the priority document is on file. In that case, the applicant is informed that the decision to grant will not be taken as long as the priority document is missing.

If there are intermediate documents or Art. 54(3) applications and the patentability of the subject-matter claimed depends on the validity of the priority right, substantive examination cannot be finalised as long as the priority document is missing. Where the applicant has complied with Rule 17.1(a), (b) or (b-bis) PCT, they may not be requested to file the priority document. The proceedings have to be stayed and the applicant informed that, since the patentability of the subject-matter claimed depends on the validity of the priority right, substantive examination cannot be finalised until the priority document is on file.

2.2 The same invention

As far as "the same invention" requirement is concerned (see F-VI, 1.3(iv)), the basic test to determine whether a claim is entitled to the date of a priority document is the same as the test for determining whether or not an amendment to an application satisfies the requirement of Art. 123(2) (see H-IV, 2). That is to say, for the priority date to be valid in this respect, the subject-matter of the claim must be directly and unambiguously derivable from the disclosure of the invention in the priority document, also considering any features implicit to a skilled person in what is expressly mentioned in the document (see G 2/98). As an example of an implicit disclosure, a claim to an apparatus including "releasable fastening means" would be entitled to the priority date of a disclosure of that apparatus in which different embodiments of releasable fastening elements such as a nut and bolt, a spring catch and a toggle-operated latch are shown.

Art. 88(4)

It is not necessary for the subject-matter for which priority is claimed to appear in any of the previous application's claims. It is sufficient if the

documents of the previous application, taken as a whole, "specifically disclose" such subject-matter. The description and any claims or drawings of the previous application are, therefore, to be considered as a whole in deciding this question; however, subject-matter only found in the part of the description referring to the prior art or in an explicit disclaimer is not to be taken into account.

The requirement that the disclosure must be specific means that it is not sufficient if the subject-matter in question is merely referred to in broad and general terms. A claim to a detailed embodiment of a certain feature would not be entitled to priority on the basis of a mere general reference to that feature in a priority document. Exact literal correspondence is not required, however. It is enough that, on a reasonable assessment, there is in substance a disclosure of the same subject-matter of the claim.

A disclaimer which is allowable under Art. 123(2) (see H-V, 4.2.1 and 4.2.2) has no effect on the identity of the invention within the meaning of Art. 87(1). It may therefore be introduced when drafting and filing a successive European patent application without affecting the right to priority from the first application not containing the disclaimer (see G 1/03, G 2/03 and G 2/10).

2.3 Priority claim not valid

If the tests set out in F-VI, 2.2 are not satisfied in relation to a particular previous application, then the effective date of the subject-matter of the claim in question will be either the date of filing of the earliest application which does provide the required disclosure and of which the priority is validly claimed (see G 3/93) or, in the absence of such, the date of filing of the European application itself (or the new date of filing if the application has been redated under Rule 56 or Rule 56a).

2.4 Some examples of determining priority dates

Note: the dates used are merely illustrative; they do not take account of the fact that the filing offices of the EPO are closed on weekends and certain public holidays.

2.4.1 Intermediate publication of the contents of the priority application

P is the application from which priority is claimed by EP, D is the disclosure of the subject-matter of P.

1.1.90	1.5.90	1.6.90
Filing	Publication	Filing
P	D	EP

D is state of the art under Art. 54(2) if the priority claim of P is not valid.

2.4.2 Intermediate publication of another European application

P1 is the application from which EP1 claims priority, P2 the one from which EP2 claims priority. EP1 and EP2 are filed by different applicants.

1.2.89	1.1.90	1.2.90	1.8.90	1.1.91
Filing	Filing	Filing	Publication	Filing
P1	P2	EP1	EP1	EP2
A + B	A + B	A + B	A + B	A + B

EP1 is state of the art under Art. 54(3) if the respective priority claims of P1 and P2 are valid. This does not change if EP1 is published after EP2's date of filing. The publication of EP1 is state of the art under Art. 54(2) if the priority claim of P2 is not valid.

2.4.3 Multiple priorities claimed for different inventions in the application with an intermediate publication of one of the inventions

EP claims priority of P1 and P2, D is the disclosure of A+B.

1.1.90	1.2.90	1.3.90	1.6.90
Filing	Publication	Filing	Filing
P1	D	P2	EP
A + B	A + B	A + B + C	claim 1: A + B claim 2: A + B + C

As the priority of P1 is valid in respect of the subject-matter of claim 1, publication D is not state of the art under Art. 54(2) for that claim. Claim 2 cannot benefit from the priority of P1, as it does not concern the same subject-matter. Thus, publication D is state of the art under Art. 54(2) for that claim (see G 3/93). It is immaterial whether claim 2 is in the form of a dependent or independent claim.

2.4.4 Where it is necessary to check whether the application from which priority is actually claimed is the "first application" within the meaning of Art. 87(1)

P1 is the earliest application of the same applicant containing the invention. EP claims the priority of the later US application P2, which is a "continuation-in-part" of P1. D is a public disclosure of A+B.

1.7.89	1.1.90	1.6.90	1.12.90
Filing	Filing	Publication	Filing
P1	P2 (cip)	D	EP
A + B	A + B A + B + C	A + B	claim 1: A + B claim 2: A + B + C

The priority of P2 cannot validly be claimed for claim 1, as P2 is not the "first application" for this subject-matter within the meaning of Art. 87(1); rather the "first application" is P1, which has "left rights outstanding" in that P2 is a "continuation-in-part" of P1. Therefore, Art. 87(4) does not apply and this does not change even if P1 is abandoned, withdrawn, refused or not published. D is prior art pursuant to Art. 54(2) for claim 1, but not for claim 2, as the latter claim has the earlier priority of P2.

3. Claiming priority

3.1 General remarks

An applicant who wishes to claim priority must file a declaration of priority giving particulars of the previous filing, as specified in [Rule 52\(1\)](#), together with a certified copy of the previous application and, if necessary for the assessment of patentability, a translation of it into one of the official EPO languages (see [A-III, 6.7](#) and [6.8](#)).

[Art. 88\(1\)](#)
[Rule 52\(1\)](#)
[Rule 53\(1\)](#) and
[Rule 53\(3\)](#)

3.2 Declaration of priority

A declaration of priority from an earlier filing should preferably be made when the European application is filed, although this can be done at any time within 16 months of the earliest priority date claimed (see [A-III, 6.5.1](#)). The declaration of priority must indicate the date of the priority application, the relevant state party to the Paris Convention or member of the WTO concerned and the file number.

[Rule 52\(1\)](#) and
[Rule 52\(2\)](#)

A declaration of priority may be corrected within 16 months of the earliest priority date. This time limit cannot expire earlier than four months after the date of filing (see [A-III, 6.5.2](#)).

[Rule 52\(3\)](#)

3.3 Certified copy of the previous application (priority document)

The certified copy of the previous application, i.e. the priority document, must be filed within 16 months of the priority date (see [A-III, 6.7](#); for Euro-PCT cases see, however, [A-XII, 5.4](#) and [A-XIII, 11.2](#)) unless such a copy is already on file because it has been supplied in the context of [Rule 40\(3\)](#) (see [A-II, 4.1.3.1](#)) or a request under [Rule 56](#) or [Rule 56a](#) (see [A-II, 5.4.3](#) and [6.4.2](#)).

[Rule 53\(1\)](#)

Moreover, in accordance with [Rule 53\(2\)](#) and the decision of the President of the EPO dated 9 August 2012, [OJ EPO 2012, 492](#), the EPO will include a copy of the previous application in the file of the European patent application without charging a fee in the cases indicated in [A-III, 6.7](#).

[Rule 53\(2\)](#)

3.4 Translation of the previous application

A translation of the previous application into one of the official EPO languages is required only if needed for determining the validity of the priority claim, where this is of relevance to the patentability of the underlying invention. The translation must be filed within the time limit set by the EPO. For more details on the procedure, see [A-III, 6.8](#) and subsections.

[Art. 88\(1\)](#)
[Rule 53\(3\)](#)

Alternatively, under [Rule 53\(3\)](#), a declaration that the European patent application is a complete translation of the previous application may be submitted within that same time limit. This declaration must be unambiguous, stating that the translation is "complete" or, for example, "identical" or "literal". Declarations in diluted or modified form (stating, for example, that the translation is "practically complete" or that the contents "are essentially the same") cannot be accepted. The same applies to cases where the declaration is obviously incorrect (e.g. if several priorities are claimed for a single European application or if the European application contains more or less text than is contained in the previous application as

filed). In all these cases, a complete translation must be filed. Where the European application contains claims on its date of filing and the priority application did not contain claims on its date of filing or contained fewer claims on its date of filing than the subsequent European application, the declaration cannot be accepted. A simple change in the arrangement of the various elements of the application (e.g. presenting the claims before the description or vice versa) does not affect the validity of such a declaration. See also A-III, 6.8.6.

The translation or declaration under Rule 53(3) must also be filed in cases where the EPO adds a copy of the previous application to the file (see the notice from the EPO, OJ EPO 2002, 192).

Rule 56 and Rule 56a

If the applicant has already provided the EPO with a translation of the priority document as part of a request under Rule 56 (see A-II, 5.4(vi)) to base missing parts of the description or drawings on the priority application itself or under Rule 56a to base correct application documents or parts on it (see A-II, 6.4.3), then there is no need for the applicant to file the translation a second time.

The request for translation cannot be made by telephone (regardless of whether this is mentioned in the minutes). Because of the time limit and its possible legal consequences, the request must always be made in writing. In examination proceedings, it may be issued alone or may accompany a communication under Art. 94(3). The translation of the priority document may become necessary only at later stages of the examination procedure when documents are retrieved by carrying out a "topping-up" search for conflicting applications under Art. 54(3) (see C-IV, 7.1 and A-III, 6.8.2). This may also happen during opposition proceedings where the applicant was not requested to file the translation before grant and the opponent raises patentability issues requiring examination of the validity of the priority.

If the required translation or declaration is not filed within the time limit, the right of priority is lost and the applicant or proprietor is informed accordingly (see A-III, 6.11). The intermediate document(s) then becomes prior art under Art. 54(2) or Art. 54(3), as applicable, and therefore relevant for assessing patentability (see A-III, 6.8.3). However, for reasons of legal certainty, the right of priority remains effective for determining the state of the art for the purposes of Art. 54(3) (see F-VI, 2.1 and 3.5) in respect of any other European patent application. In that respect, it is immaterial whether the translation or declaration has been filed, as changes taking effect after the date of publication do not affect the application of Art. 54(3).

If the required translation or declaration is filed within the time limit, ideally with accompanying observations, the extent of the validity of the priority and the related substantive issues will be examined.

3.5 Withdrawal of priority claim

Applicants may voluntarily withdraw a claimed priority at any time. If they do so before the technical preparations for publication have been completed, then the priority date is not effective and the publication is deferred until 18 months after the date of filing. If it is withdrawn after the technical

preparations for publication have been completed, then the application is still published 18 months after the priority date originally claimed (see A-VI, 1.1 and G-IV, 5.1.1).

3.6 Re-establishment of rights in respect of the priority period

Applicants may file a request for re-establishment of rights in respect of the priority period under Art. 122 (see A-III, 6.6). Any request for re-establishment of rights in respect of the period specified in Art. 87(1) must be filed within two months of expiry of that period, according to Rule 136(1), second sentence. Where a request for re-establishment in respect of the priority period has been allowed, the examining division carefully reviews the relevance of prior-art documents cited previously in the search report or communications.

Art. 122

Rule 136(1)

Part G

Patentability

Contents

Chapter I – Patentability I-1

1.	Patentability requirements	<u>I-1</u>
2.	Technical progress, advantageous effect	<u>I-1</u>

Chapter II – Inventions II-1

1.	General remarks	<u>II-1</u>
2.	Examination practice	<u>II-1</u>
3.	List of exclusions	<u>II-1</u>
3.1	Discoveries	<u>II-2</u>
3.2	Scientific theories	<u>II-2</u>
3.3	Mathematical methods	<u>II-2</u>
3.3.1	Artificial intelligence and machine learning	<u>II-5</u>
3.3.2	Simulation, design or modelling	<u>II-6</u>
3.4	Aesthetic creations	<u>II-8</u>
3.5	Schemes, rules and methods for performing mental acts, playing games or doing business	<u>II-9</u>
3.5.1	Schemes, rules and methods for performing mental acts	<u>II-9</u>
3.5.2	Schemes, rules and methods for playing games	<u>II-11</u>
3.5.3	Schemes, rules and methods for doing business	<u>II-13</u>
3.6	Programs for computers	<u>II-15</u>
3.6.1	Examples of further technical effects	<u>II-17</u>
3.6.2	Information modelling, activity of programming and programming languages	<u>II-17</u>
3.6.3	Data retrieval, formats and structures	<u>II-19</u>
3.6.4	Database management systems and information retrieval	<u>II-20</u>
3.7	Presentations of information	<u>II-22</u>
3.7.1	User interfaces	<u>II-26</u>
4.	Exceptions to patentability	<u>II-27</u>
4.1	Matter contrary to " <i>ordre public</i> " or morality	<u>II-27</u>
4.1.1	Prohibited matter	<u>II-28</u>
4.1.2	Offensive and non-offensive use	<u>II-28</u>
4.1.3	Economic effects	<u>II-28</u>

4.2	Surgery, therapy and diagnostic methods	<u>II-28</u>
4.2.1	Limitations of exception under Art. 53(c)	<u>II-29</u>
4.2.1.1	Surgery	<u>II-31</u>
4.2.1.2	Therapy	<u>II-32</u>
4.2.1.3	Diagnostic methods	<u>II-33</u>
4.2.2	Methods for screening potential medicaments and clinical trials	<u>II-34</u>
5.	Exclusions and exceptions for biotechnological inventions	<u>II-35</u>
5.1	General remarks and definitions	<u>II-35</u>
5.2	Patentable biotechnological inventions	<u>II-35</u>
5.3	List of exceptions (Rule 28)	<u>II-37</u>
5.4	Plant and animal varieties or essentially biological processes for the production of plants or animals	<u>II-40</u>
5.4.1	Plant varieties	<u>II-42</u>
5.4.2	Essentially biological processes for the production of plants or animals	<u>II-43</u>
5.4.2.1	Examples	<u>II-45</u>
5.5	Microbiological processes	<u>II-46</u>
5.5.1	General remarks	<u>II-46</u>
5.5.2	Repeatability of results of microbiological processes	<u>II-47</u>
6.	Antibodies	<u>II-47</u>
6.1	General remarks	<u>II-47</u>
6.1.1	Definition by structure of the antibody	<u>II-48</u>
6.1.2	Definition by reference to the target antigen	<u>II-48</u>
6.1.3	Definition by target antigen and further functional features	<u>II-48</u>
6.1.4	Definition by functional and structural features	<u>II-49</u>
6.1.5	Definition by production process	<u>II-49</u>
6.1.6	Definition by hybridoma	<u>II-49</u>
6.2	Inventive step of antibodies	<u>II-49</u>
Chapter III – Industrial application		<u>III-51</u>
1.	General remarks	<u>III-51</u>
2.	Method of testing	<u>III-51</u>
3.	Industrial application vs. exclusion under Art. 52(2)	<u>III-51</u>
4.	Sequences and partial sequences of genes	<u>III-51</u>

Chapter IV – State of the art **IV-1**

1.	General remarks and definition	IV-1
2.	Enabling disclosure	IV-2
3.	Date of filing or priority date as effective date	IV-3
4.	Documents in a non-official language	IV-4
4.1	Machine translations	IV-4
5.	Conflict with other European applications	IV-5
5.1	State of the art pursuant to Art. 54(3)	IV-5
5.1.1	Requirements	IV-5
5.1.2	Accorded date of filing and content of the application still subject to review	IV-6
5.2	Euro-PCT applications	IV-6
5.3	Commonly designated states	IV-7
5.4	Double patenting	IV-7
6.	Conflict with national rights of earlier date	IV-7
7.	State of the art made available to the public "by means of a written or oral description, by use, or in any other way"	IV-8
7.1	Types of use and instances of state of the art made available in any other way	IV-8
7.2	Matters to be determined by the division as regards prior use	IV-8
7.2.1	General principles	IV-9
7.2.2	Agreement on secrecy	IV-10
7.2.3	Use on non-public property	IV-10
7.2.4	Example of publicly available use	IV-11
7.2.5	Example of a process not made publicly available	IV-11
7.3	State of the art made available by means of oral description	IV-11
7.3.1	Cases of oral description	IV-11
7.3.2	Non-prejudicial oral description	IV-11
7.3.3	Matters to be determined by the division in cases of oral description	IV-11
7.3.4	Evidence of oral disclosure	IV-12
7.4	State of the art made available to the public in writing and/or by any other means	IV-12

7.5	Internet disclosures	IV-12
7.5.1	Establishing the publication date	IV-13
7.5.2	Evidence of internet disclosures	IV-13
7.5.3	Burden of proof	IV-13
7.5.3.1	Technical journals	IV-14
7.5.3.2	Other "print equivalent" publications	IV-14
7.5.3.3	Non-traditional publications	IV-15
7.5.4	Disclosures which have no date or an unreliable date	IV-16
7.5.5	Problematic cases	IV-17
7.5.6	Technical details and general remarks	IV-17
7.6	Standards and standard preparatory documents	IV-18
8.	Cross-references between prior-art documents	IV-19
9.	Errors in prior-art documents	IV-19
Chapter V – Non-prejudicial disclosures		V-1
1.	General	V-1
2.	Time limit	V-1
3.	Evident abuse	V-1
4.	International exhibition	V-1
Chapter VI – Novelty		VI-1
1.	Novelty and state of the art	VI-1
2.	Implicit features or well-known equivalents	VI-1
3.	Relevant date of a prior-art document	VI-1
4.	Generic disclosure and specific examples	VI-1
5.	Implicit disclosure and parameters	VI-2
6.	Examination of novelty	VI-2
6.1	First or further medical use of known products	VI-3
6.1.1	Products that may be claimed for a further medical use	VI-5
6.1.2	Therapeutic uses pursuant to Art. 54(5)	VI-5
6.1.2.1	Preclinical data and clinical trials in the prior art	VI-8
6.1.2.2	Patient group	VI-9
6.1.2.3	Mechanistic definitions leading to a new clinical situation	VI-10

	A mere pharmaceutical effect does not necessarily imply a therapeutic application. For instance, the selective occupation of a specific receptor by a given substance cannot be considered in itself to be a therapeutic application; indeed, the discovery that a substance selectively binds a receptor, even if representing an important piece of scientific knowledge, still needs to find an application in the form of a defined, real treatment of a pathological condition in order to make a technical contribution to the art and to be considered as an invention eligible for patent protection. See also F-IV, 4.21 for the functional definition of a pathological condition.	
6.1.4	Surgical uses under Art. 54(5)	VI-11
6.1.5	Dependent claims under Art. 54(5)	VI-12
6.2	Second non-medical use	VI-12
7.	Selection inventions	VI-13
7.1	Error margins in numerical values	VI-15
8.	Novelty of "reach-through" claims	VI-15

Chapter VII – Inventive step **VII-1**

1.	General	VII-1
2.	State of the art; date of filing	VII-1
3.	Person skilled in the art	VII-1
3.1	Common general knowledge of the skilled person	VII-1
4.	Obviousness	VII-2
5.	Problem-solution approach	VII-2
5.1	Determination of the closest prior art	VII-3
5.2	Formulation of the objective technical problem	VII-4
5.3	Could-would approach	VII-5
5.4	Claims comprising technical and non-technical features	VII-6
5.4.1	Formulation of the objective technical problem for claims comprising technical and non-technical features	VII-8
5.4.2	Examples of applying the COMVIK approach	VII-9
5.4.2.1	Example 1	VII-9
5.4.2.2	Example 2	VII-11
5.4.2.3	Example 3	VII-13

5.4.2.4	Example 4	<u>VII-15</u>
5.4.2.5	Example 5	<u>VII-18</u>
6.	Combining pieces of prior art	<u>VII-20</u>
7.	Combination vs. juxtaposition or aggregation	<u>VII-21</u>
8.	"Ex post facto" analysis	<u>VII-21</u>
9.	Origin of an invention	<u>VII-22</u>
10.	Secondary indicators	<u>VII-22</u>
10.1	Predictable disadvantage; non-functional modification; arbitrary choice	<u>VII-22</u>
10.2	Unexpected technical effect; bonus effect	<u>VII-23</u>
10.3	Long-felt need; commercial success	<u>VII-23</u>
11.	Arguments and evidence submitted by the applicant	<u>VII-23</u>
12.	Selection inventions	<u>VII-24</u>
13.	Inventive step assessment in the field of biotechnology	<u>VII-24</u>
14.	Dependent claims; claims in different categories	<u>VII-25</u>
15.	Examples	<u>VII-25</u>
Annex Examples relating to the requirement of inventive step – indicators		<u>VII-26</u>
1.	Application of known measures?	<u>VII-26</u>
2.	Obvious combination of features?	<u>VII-27</u>
3.	Obvious selection?	<u>VII-28</u>
4.	Overcoming a technical prejudice?	<u>VII-30</u>
1.	Novelty and state of the art	
2.	Implicit features or well-known equivalents	
3.	Relevant date of a prior-art document	
4.	Generic disclosure and specific examples	

5. Implicit disclosure and parameters**6. Examination of novelty**

- 6.1 First or further medical use of known products
 - 6.1.1 Products that may be claimed for a further medical use
 - 6.1.2 Therapeutic uses pursuant to Art. 54(5)
 - 6.1.2.1 Preclinical data and clinical trials in the prior art
 - 6.1.2.2 Patient group
 - 6.1.2.3 Mechanistic definitions leading to a new clinical situation
 - 6.1.3 Diagnostic uses under Art. 54(5)
 - 6.1.4 Surgical uses under Art. 54(5)
 - 6.1.5 Dependent claims under Art. 54(5)

- 6.2 Second non-medical use

7. Selection inventions

- 7.1 Error margins in numerical values

8. Novelty of "reach-through" claims**Chapter VII – Inventive step****1. General****2. State of the art; date of filing****3. Person skilled in the art**

- 3.1 Common general knowledge of the skilled person

4. Obviousness**5. Problem-solution approach**

- 5.1 Determination of the closest prior art
- 5.2 Formulation of the objective technical problem
- 5.3 Could-would approach
- 5.4 Claims comprising technical and non-technical features
 - 5.4.1 Formulation of the objective technical problem for claims comprising technical and non-technical features
 - 5.4.2 Examples of applying the COMVIK approach
 - 5.4.2.1 Example 1
 - 5.4.2.2 Example 2
 - 5.4.2.3 Example 3

5.4.2.4 Example 4

5.4.2.5 Example 5

6. Combining pieces of prior art

7. Combination vs. juxtaposition or aggregation

8. "Ex post facto" analysis

9. Origin of an invention

10. Secondary indicators

10.1 Predictable disadvantage; non-functional
modification; arbitrary choice

10.2 Unexpected technical effect; bonus effect

10.3 Long-felt need; commercial success

**11. Arguments and evidence submitted by the
applicant**

12. Selection inventions

**13. Inventive step assessment in the field of
biotechnology**

14. Dependent claims; claims in different categories

15. Examples

**Annex Examples relating to the requirement of inventive
step – indicators**

1. Application of known measures?

2. Obvious combination of features?

3. Obvious selection?

4. Overcoming a technical prejudice?

Chapter I – Patentability

1. Patentability requirements

There are four basic requirements for patentability:

Art. 52(1)

- (i) there must be an "invention", belonging to any field of technology (see G-II)
- (ii) the invention must be "susceptible of industrial application" (see G-III)
- (iii) the invention must be "new" (see G-IV to VI) and
- (iv) the invention must involve an "inventive step" (see G-VII).

Technical character is an implicit requirement for there to be an "invention" within the meaning of Art. 52(1) (requirement (i) above; see G-II, 1 and 2 for more details).

In addition:

- the invention must be such that a person skilled in the art – after proper instruction by the application – can carry it out (see F-III, 3 for instances where this requirement is not met) and *Art. 83*
- the invention must relate to a technical field (Rule 42(1)(a) – see F-II, 4.2), must be concerned with a technical problem (Rule 42(1)(c) – see F-II, 4.5) and must have technical features in terms of which the matter for which protection is sought can be defined in the claim (Rule 43(1) – see F-IV, 2.1). *Rule 42(1)(a) and Rule 42(1)(c) Rule 43(1)*

2. Technical progress, advantageous effect

The EPC does not provide either explicitly or implicitly that, to be patentable, an invention must entail some technical progress or even any useful effect. Nevertheless, if there is any advantageous effect over the state of the art, it should be stated in the description (Rule 42(1)(c)), as such an effect is often important in determining "inventive step" (see G-VII, 5).

Chapter II – Inventions

1. General remarks

The EPC does not define what is meant by "invention", but Art. 52(2) contains a non-exhaustive list of "non-inventions", i.e. subject-matter which is not to be regarded as an invention within the meaning of Art. 52(1). The items on this list are all abstract (e.g. discoveries or scientific theories) and/or non-technical (e.g. aesthetic creations or presentations of information). By contrast, an "invention" within the meaning of Art. 52(1) must have technical character (see G-I, 1). It can be in any field of technology. *Art. 52(2) and (3)*

2. Examination practice

The question of whether there is an invention within the meaning of Art. 52(1) is separate and distinct from the questions of whether it is susceptible of industrial application, is new and involves an inventive step.

The exclusions from patentability under Art. 52(2) play a role in assessing both patent eligibility and inventive step because patent protection is reserved for inventions involving a "technical teaching", i.e. an instruction addressed to a skilled person on how to solve a particular technical problem using particular technical means. This twofold assessment is referred to as the "two-hurdle approach" (G 1/19).

The first hurdle, also known as the "patent eligibility hurdle", requires that the claimed subject-matter as a whole not fall under the "non-inventions" listed in Art. 52(2) and (3). Art. 52(3) limits the exclusion from patentability of the subject-matter and activities listed in Art. 52(2) to ones that are claimed "as such". This limitation is a bar to a broad interpretation of the non-inventions. It implies that one technical feature is sufficient for eligibility: if the claimed subject-matter is directed to or uses technical means, it is an invention within the meaning of Art. 52(1). This is assessed without reference to the prior art.

The second hurdle is where inventive step is assessed. In addition to technical features, claims may also comprise "non-technical features", meaning features which, on their own, would be considered "non-inventions" under Art. 52(2). Inventive step of claims comprising such a mix of technical and non-technical features is assessed using the COMVIK approach (G-VII, 5.4). This approach is a special application of the problem-solution approach that involves establishing which features of the invention contribute to its technical character (i.e. contribute to the technical solution of a technical problem by providing a technical effect). A feature may support inventive step if and to the extent that it contributes to the technical character of the invention. Whether a feature contributes to the technical character of the invention has to be assessed in the context of the invention as a whole.

3. List of exclusions

The items listed in Art. 52(2) will now be dealt with in turn, and more examples will be given in order to make it clearer how to distinguish

between what is patentable, i.e. not excluded from patentability under Art. 52(2) and (3), and what is not.

3.1 Discoveries

Art. 52(2)(a)

If a new property of a known material or article is found, that is mere discovery and unpatentable because discovery as such has no technical effect and is therefore not an invention within the meaning of Art. 52(1). If, however, that property is put to practical use, then this is an invention which may be patentable. For example, the discovery that a particular known material is able to withstand mechanical shock would not be patentable, but a railway sleeper made from that material could well be patentable. Finding a previously unrecognised substance occurring in nature is also mere discovery and therefore unpatentable. However, if a substance found in nature can be shown to produce a technical effect, it may be patentable. An example is a substance occurring in nature which is found to have an antibiotic effect. In addition, if a microorganism is discovered to exist in nature and to produce an antibiotic, the microorganism itself may also be patentable as one aspect of the invention. Similarly, a gene which is discovered to exist in nature may be patentable if a technical effect is revealed, e.g. its use in making a certain polypeptide or in gene therapy.

For more detail on biotechnological inventions see G-II, 5, 5.3 to 5.5, and G-III, 4.

3.2 Scientific theories

Art. 52(2)(a)

These are a more generalised form of discoveries, and the same principle as set out in G-II, 3.1 applies. For example, the physical theory of semiconductivity would not be patentable. However, new semiconductor devices and processes for manufacturing them may be patentable.

3.3 Mathematical methods

Art. 52(2)(a)

Mathematical methods play an important role in solving technical problems in all fields of technology. However, they are excluded from patentability under Art. 52(2)(a) when claimed as such (Art. 52(3)).

The exclusion applies if a claim is directed to a purely abstract mathematical method and does not require any technical means. For instance, a method for performing a Fast Fourier Transform on **abstract data** which does not specify the use of any technical means is a mathematical method as such. A purely **abstract** mathematical object or concept, e.g. a particular type of geometric object or of graph with nodes and edges, is not a method, but it is not an invention within the meaning of Art. 52(1) either, because it lacks technical character.

If a claim is directed either to a method involving the use of technical means (e.g. a computer) or to a device, its subject-matter has technical character as a whole and is thus not excluded from patentability under Art. 52(2) and (3).

Merely specifying the technical nature of the data or parameters of the mathematical method may not be sufficient on its own to define an invention within the meaning of Art. 52(1). Even if the resulting method

would not be considered a purely abstract mathematical method as such within the meaning of Art. 52(2)(a) and (3), it may still fall under the excluded category of methods for performing mental acts as such if no use of technical means is implied (Art. 52(2)(c) and (3); see G-II, 3.5.1).

Once it is established that the claimed subject-matter as a whole is not excluded from patentability under Art. 52(2) and (3) and is thus an invention within the meaning of Art. 52(1), it is examined for compliance with the other requirements for patentability, in particular novelty and inventive step (G-I, 1).

For the assessment of inventive step, all features which contribute to the technical character of the invention must be taken into account (G-VII, 5.4). When the claimed invention is based on a mathematical method, it is assessed whether the mathematical method contributes to the technical character of the invention.

A mathematical method may contribute to an invention's technical character, i.e. contribute to producing a **technical effect** that serves a technical purpose, by being applied in a field of technology and/or by being adapted to a specific technical implementation (T 2330/13). The criteria for assessing these two situations are explained below.

Technical applications

To assess the contribution made by a mathematical method to the technical character of an invention, it must be determined whether, in the context of the invention, the method produces a technical effect serving a technical purpose.

Examples of technical contributions of a mathematical method are:

- controlling a specific technical system or process, e.g. an X-ray apparatus or a steel-cooling process
- determining from measurements the number of passes a compaction machine must make to achieve a desired material density
- enhancing or analysing digital audio, image or video, e.g. denoising, detecting persons in a digital image, estimating the quality of a transmitted digital audio signal
- separating sources in speech signals; speech recognition, e.g. mapping a speech input to a text output
- encoding data for reliable and/or efficient transmission or storage (and corresponding decoding), e.g. error-correction coding of data for transmission over a noisy channel, compression of audio, image, video or sensor data
- encrypting/decrypting or signing electronic communications; generating keys in an RSA cryptographic system

- optimising load distribution in a computer network
- determining the energy expenditure of a subject by processing data obtained from physiological sensors; deriving the body temperature of a subject from data obtained from an ear-temperature detector
- providing a genotype estimate based on an analysis of DNA samples, as well as providing a confidence interval for this estimate so as to quantify its reliability
- providing a medical diagnosis by an automated system processing physiological measurements.

A **generic** purpose such as "controlling a technical system" is not sufficient to confer technical character on the mathematical method. The technical purpose must be a **specific** one.

The mere fact that a mathematical method can serve a technical purpose is not sufficient either. The claim must be functionally **limited** to the technical purpose, either explicitly or implicitly. This can be achieved by establishing a sufficient link between the technical purpose and the mathematical method steps, for example by specifying how the input and the output of the sequence of mathematical steps relate to the technical purpose so that the mathematical method is causally linked to a technical effect.

Defining the nature of the data input to a mathematical method does not necessarily mean that the method contributes to the technical character of the invention (T.2035/11, T.1029/06, T.1161/04).

If steps of a mathematical method are used to derive or predict the physical state of an existing real object from measurements of physical properties, as in the case of indirect measurements, those steps make a technical contribution regardless of what use is made of the results of the derivation or prediction.

Technical implementations

A mathematical method may also contribute to the technical character of the invention independently of any technical application when the claim is directed to a **specific technical implementation** of the mathematical method and the mathematical method is specifically **adapted** for that implementation in that its design is motivated by technical considerations relating to the **internal functioning** of the computer system or network (T.1358/09, G.1/19). This may be the case if the mathematical method is designed to exploit particular technical properties of the technical system on which it is implemented in order to bring about a technical effect such as efficient use of computer storage capacity or network bandwidth. For instance, the adaptation of a polynomial reduction algorithm to exploit word-size shifts matched to the word size of the computer hardware is based on such technical considerations and can contribute to producing the technical effect of an efficient hardware implementation of that algorithm. Another example is assigning the execution of data-intensive training steps

of a machine-learning algorithm to a graphical processing unit (GPU) and preparatory steps to a standard central processing unit (CPU) so as to take advantage of the parallel architecture of the computing platform. The claim should be directed to the implementation of the steps on the GPU and CPU for this mathematical method to contribute to the technical character.

Computational efficiency

If the mathematical method does not serve a technical purpose and the claimed technical implementation does not go beyond a generic technical implementation, the mathematical method does not contribute to the invention's technical character. In such cases, it is not sufficient that the mathematical method is algorithmically more efficient than prior-art mathematical methods to establish a technical effect (see also [G-II, 3.6](#)).

However, if it is established that the mathematical method produces a technical effect due to having been applied in a field of technology and/or adapted to a specific technical implementation, the computational efficiency of the steps causing that established technical effect is to be taken into account when assessing inventive step. See [G-II, 3.6.4](#) for examples where an improvement in computational efficiency qualifies as a technical effect.

3.3.1 Artificial intelligence and machine learning

Artificial intelligence and machine learning are based on computational models and algorithms such as artificial neural networks, genetic algorithms, support vector machines, k-means, kernel regression and discriminant analysis. Such computational models and algorithms are per se of an abstract mathematical nature, irrespective of whether they can be "trained" using training data. However, their use does not by itself render inventions related to artificial intelligence or machine learning non-patentable, and the guidance provided in [G-II, 3.3](#) generally applies. This means that, if a claim of an invention related to artificial intelligence or machine learning is directed either to a method involving the use of technical means (e.g. a computer) or to a device, its subject-matter has technical character as a whole and is thus not excluded from patentability under [Art. 52\(2\)](#) or [\(3\)](#). In such cases, the computational models and algorithms themselves contribute to the technical character of the invention if they contribute to a technical solution to a technical problem, for example by being applied in a field of technology and/or by being adapted to a specific technical implementation.

Terms such as "support vector machine", "reasoning engine" or "neural network" may, depending on the context, merely refer to abstract models or algorithms and so do not, on their own, necessarily imply the use of a technical means. This has to be taken into account when examining whether the claimed subject-matter has technical character as a whole ([Art. 52\(1\)](#), [\(2\)](#) and [\(3\)](#)).

Artificial intelligence and machine learning can be applied in various fields of technology. For example, using a neural network in a heart monitoring apparatus to identify irregular heartbeats makes a technical contribution. The classification of digital images, videos, audio or speech signals based

on low-level features (e.g. edges or pixel attributes for images) is another typical technical application of classification algorithms. More examples of technical purposes for which artificial intelligence and machine learning could be used are listed in G-II, 3.3.

However, classifying text documents solely according to their textual content is not considered to be per se a technical purpose but a linguistic one (T.1358/09). Similarly, classifying abstract data records or even "telecommunication network data records" without any indication that a technical use is made of the resulting classification is per se not a technical purpose, even if the classification algorithm can be considered to have valuable mathematical properties such as robustness (T.1784/06).

Where a classification method serves a technical purpose, the steps of generating the training set and training the classifier may also contribute to the invention's technical character if they help to achieve that technical purpose.

The technical effect that a machine learning algorithm achieves may be readily apparent or established by explanations, mathematical proof, experimental data or the like. Mere assertions are not enough, but comprehensive proof is not required either. If the technical effect depends on particular characteristics of the training dataset used, the characteristics required to reproduce the technical effect must be disclosed unless the skilled person can determine them without undue burden using common general knowledge. However, in general, there is no need to disclose the specific training dataset itself (see also F-III, 3 and G-VII, 5.2).

3.3.2 Simulation, design or modelling

Claims directed to methods of simulation, design or modelling typically comprise features which fall under the category of mathematical methods or of methods for performing mental acts. Hence, the claimed subject-matter as a whole may fall under the exclusions from patentability in Art. 52(2)(a) and (c) and (3) (see G-II, 3.3 and 3.5.1).

However, the methods considered in this section are at least partially computer-implemented and so the claimed subject-matter as a whole is not excluded from patentability.

Computer-implemented methods of simulating, designing or modelling should be examined according to the same criteria as any other computer-implemented invention (G-VII, 5.4, G 1/19).

For establishing a technical effect, it is not decisive whether the simulated system or process is technical or whether the simulation reflects technical principles underlying the simulated system and how accurately it does so.

Simulations interacting with the external physical reality

Computer-implemented simulations that comprise features representing an interaction with an external physical reality at the level of their input or output may provide a technical effect related to this interaction. A computer-

implemented simulation that uses measurements as input may form part of an indirect measurement method that calculates or predicts the physical state of an existing real object and thus make a technical contribution, regardless of how the results are used.

Purely numerical simulations

A computer-implemented simulation without an input or output having a direct link with physical reality may still solve a technical problem. In such a "purely numerical" simulation, the underlying models and algorithms may contribute to the technical character of the invention by their adaptation to a **specific technical implementation** or by an **intended technical use** of the **data resulting from the simulation**.

Models and algorithms that do not make a contribution to the technical character of the invention form constraints that may be included in the formulation of the objective technical problem when following the COMVIK approach outlined in G-VII, 5.4.

Specific technical implementation of a numerical simulation

The technical contribution that may be made by models or algorithms because of their adaptation to the internal functioning of the computer system or network on which they are implemented is assessed in the same way as adaptations of mathematical methods to specific technical implementations (see G-II, 3.3).

Intended technical use of the calculated numerical output data of a numerical simulation

Calculated numerical data reflecting the physical state or behaviour of a system or process existing only as a model in a computer usually cannot contribute to the technical character of the invention, even if it adequately reflects the behaviour of the real system or process.

Calculated numerical data may have a "**potential technical effect**", namely the technical effect that will be produced when the data is used according to an intended technical use. Such a potential technical effect may **only** be considered in the assessment of inventive step if the intended technical use is either explicitly or implicitly specified in the claim.

If the data resulting from a numerical simulation is **specifically adapted** for an intended technical use, e.g. it is control data for a technical device, its potential technical effect can be considered "**implied**" by the claim. The specific adaptation implies that the claim does not encompass other non-technical uses because the intended technical use is then inherent to the claimed subject-matter over substantially the whole scope of the claim (see also G-II, 3.6.3). On the other hand, if the claim also encompasses non-technical uses of the simulation results (such as gaining scientific knowledge about a technical or natural system), the potential technical effect is not achieved over substantially the whole scope of the claim and therefore cannot be relied on in the assessment of inventive step.

Accuracy

Whether a simulation contributes to the technical character of the claimed subject-matter does not depend on the quality of the underlying model or the degree to which the simulation represents reality.

However, the accuracy of a simulation is a factor that may influence an already established technical effect going beyond the mere implementation of the simulation on a computer. It may be that an alleged improvement is not achieved if the simulation is not accurate enough for its intended technical purpose. This may be taken into account when formulating the objective technical problem (Art. 56) or assessing sufficiency of disclosure (Art. 83) (see F-III, 13). Conversely, a technical effect may still be achieved by a method where certain simulation parameters are inaccurate but sufficient for the method's intended technical use.

Design processes

The above principles equally apply where a computer-implemented simulation is claimed as part of a design process.

If a computer-implemented method results merely in an abstract model of a product, system or process, e.g. a set of equations, this per se is not considered to be a technical effect, even if the modelled product, system or process is technical (T 49/99, T 42/09). For example, a logical data model for a family of product configurations has no inherent technical character, and a method merely specifying how to arrive at such a logical data model would not make a technical contribution beyond its computer-implementation. Likewise, a method merely specifying how to describe a multi-processor system in a graphical modelling environment does not make a technical contribution beyond its computer-implementation. See G-II, 3.6.2 on information modelling as an intellectual activity.

3.4 Aesthetic creations

Art. 52(2)(b)

Subject-matter relating to aesthetic creations will usually have both technical aspects, e.g. a "substrate" such as a canvas or a cloth, and aesthetic aspects, the appreciation of which is essentially subjective, e.g. the form of the image on the canvas or the pattern on the cloth. If an aesthetic creation has technical aspects, it is not an aesthetic creation "as such" and it is not excluded from patentability.

A feature which does not in itself involve any technical aspect could have technical character if it brings about a technical effect. For example, the pattern of a tyre tread may actually be a further technical feature of the tyre if, for example, it provides improved channelling of water. By contrast, this would not be the case for a particular colour of the tyre's sidewall that serves only an aesthetic purpose.

The aesthetic effect itself is not patentable, neither in a product nor in a process claim.

For example, features relating solely to the aesthetic or artistic effect of a book's information content, or to its layout or letter font, would not be considered technical features. Nor would features such as the aesthetic effect of a painting's subject, the arrangement of its colours or its artistic (e.g. Impressionist) style be technical. Nevertheless, where an aesthetic effect is obtained by a technical structure or other technical means, the aesthetic effect itself will not be of technical character, but the means of obtaining it may be. For example, a fabric may be provided with an attractive appearance by means of a layered structure not previously used for this purpose, in which case a fabric incorporating that structure might be patentable.

Similarly, a book defined by a technical feature of the binding or pasting of the back is not excluded from patentability under Art. 52(2) and (3), even though it has an aesthetic effect too. A painting defined by the kind of cloth, or by the dyes or binders used, is likewise not excluded.

Even if it is used to produce an aesthetic creation (such as a cut diamond), a technical process remains a technical process and is not excluded from patentability. A printing technique for a book that results in a particular layout with an aesthetic effect is not excluded, and nor is the book as a product of that process. A substance or composition defined by technical features serving to produce a special effect with regard to scent or flavour, e.g. to preserve it for longer or to accentuate it, is likewise not excluded.

3.5 Schemes, rules and methods for performing mental acts, playing games or doing business

3.5.1 Schemes, rules and methods for performing mental acts

The exclusion from patentability of schemes, rules and methods for performing mental acts under Art. 52(2)(c) concerns instructions to the human mind on how to conduct cognitive, conceptual or intellectual processes, e.g. how to learn a language. The exclusion applies only when such schemes, rules and methods are claimed as such (Art. 52(3)).

Art. 52(2)(c)

If a method claim encompasses a purely mental accomplishment of all method steps, it falls under the category of methods for performing mental acts as such (Art. 52(2)(c) and (3)). This applies regardless of whether the claim also encompasses technical embodiments and whether the method is based on technical considerations (T 914/02, T 471/05, G 3/08).

An example is a claim defining a method for designing an arrangement for loading nuclear reactor fuel bundles into a reactor core in order to maximise the amount of energy that is generated before the reactor fuel needs to be refreshed. The method involves determining optimal values for specific technical parameters of the arrangement by starting with initial values, performing simulations based on these values and iteratively changing the values based on simulation results until a stopping criterion is met. Such a method is based on technical considerations related to the technical field of nuclear reactors. However, if the claim does not exclude the possibility of carrying out all method steps mentally, the claimed subject-matter is excluded from patentability. This objection also applies when the simulation

involves real-world values obtained by a technical measurement unless the claim includes either a step of carrying out the technical measurement or a step of receiving the measured real-world values using technical means.

In general, the complexity of a method cannot disqualify it as a method for performing mental acts as such. If technical means (e.g. a computer) are necessary to carry out the method, they are included in the claim as an essential feature (Art. 84, F-IV, 4.5). See also G-II, 3.3 for aspects related to algorithmic efficiency.

A claimed method is not a method for performing mental acts as such if it requires the use of technical means (e.g. a computer or a measuring device) to carry out at least one of its steps or if it provides a physical entity as the resulting product (e.g. if it is a method of manufacturing a product comprising steps of designing the product and a step of manufacturing the product so designed).

Once it is established that the claimed method as a whole is not excluded from patentability under Art. 52(2) and (3), it is examined for compliance with the other requirements for patentability, in particular novelty and inventive step (G-I, 1).

Where a claim defining a method for performing mental acts as such is limited by specifying that the method is carried out by a computer, not only the use of a computer but also the steps carried out by the computer themselves may make a technical contribution if they then contribute to a technical effect. That technical considerations are involved, such as those related to the technical field of nuclear reactors in the example above, is not in itself sufficient to establish that there is a technical effect (G 1/19).

A method comprising steps which involve the use of technical means may also specify steps which are to be carried out mentally by the user of the method. These mental steps contribute to the technical character of the method only if, in the context of the invention, they contribute to producing a technical effect serving a technical purpose.

For example, a method may specify steps resulting in the selection of a product from among a family of products on the basis of various criteria and a step of manufacturing the selected product. If the selection steps are carried out mentally, they contribute to the method's technical character only to the extent that a technical effect can be derived from the features characterising the sub-family of selected products over the generic family of suitable products (T 619/02). If the selection steps rely on purely aesthetic criteria, they result in a non-technical selection and so do not contribute to the method's technical character. As another example, in a method of affixing a driver to a Coriolis mass flowmeter, steps specifying how to select the position of the driver so as to maximise the performance of the flowmeter make a technical contribution to the extent that they define that particular position (T 1063/05).

For additional information about methods of simulation, design and modelling, see G-II, 3.3.2. On methods of information modelling and the activity of programming a computer, see G-II, 3.6.2.

3.5.2 Schemes, rules and methods for playing games

Under Art. 52(2)(c) and (3), schemes, rules and methods for playing games are excluded from patentability if claimed as such. The exclusion applies to rules for traditional games such as card or board games, as well as to game rules for contemporary forms of gameplay such as gambling machines or video games. Art. 52(2)(c)

Game rules define a conceptual framework of conventions and conditions that govern player conduct and how a game evolves in response to the players' decisions and actions. They comprise the setup of the game, options that arise as gameplay unfolds and goals defining progress in the game. They are normally perceived (or even agreed to) by the players as rules serving the explicit purpose of playing the game. Game rules are therefore of an abstract, purely mental nature and are meaningful only in the gaming context (T 336/07). For example, a condition requiring a match between two randomly drawn numbers for a win is a game rule.

Contemporary games, and in particular video games, are often characterised by complex interactive and narrative elements of a virtual game world. Such game elements govern how the game proceeds of its own accord (e.g. evolving characters and storylines), as well as how it proceeds in interaction with the players (e.g. tapping along in rhythm with the game soundtrack to make their character dance). These elements are conceptual in nature, and so they qualify, in a wider sense, as rules for playing games within the meaning of Art. 52(2)(c) (T 12/08). This holds true even if they are unspoken or not revealed until during play.

If the claimed subject-matter specifies technical means for implementing game rules, it has a technical character. For example, when implementing the aforementioned condition of matching random numbers, the use of a computer calculating a pseudo-random sequence or of mechanical means such as cubic dice or uniformly sectorised reels is sufficient to overcome an objection under Art. 52(2)(c) and (3).

Inventive step of a claim comprising a mix of game rules and technical features is examined in accordance with the problem-solution approach for mixed-type inventions set out in G-VII, 5.4. As a matter of principle, inventive step cannot be established by the game rules themselves, irrespective of how original they may be, or by their mere automation. Rather, it must be based on further technical effects of a technical implementation of the game, i.e. technical effects that go beyond those already inherent to the rules. For example, a networked implementation of a game of chance like bingo, in which numbers physically drawn by an operator undergo a random mapping prior to transmission to remote players, makes a technical contribution since the scrambling of results has the technical effect of securing a data transmission, analogous to encryption, while having no bearing on the actual playing of the game. In contrast, a reduction of memory, network or computational resources

achieved by limiting the complexity of a game does not overcome a technical constraint by a technical solution. Rather than solving the technical problem of improving the efficiency of implementation, such a limitation would at best circumvent it (G-VII, 5.4.1). Similarly, the commercial success of a game product resulting from simplified rules is an incidental effect without a direct technical cause.

Inventive step of an implementation is to be assessed from the point of view of the skilled person, typically an engineer or a game programmer who is tasked with implementing game rules set by a game designer. Mere claim drafting exercises, such as paraphrasing non-technical game elements ("win computation means" for monitoring the number of game tokens) or making them more abstract ("objects" instead of "game tokens") using terms that are technical only on the surface, have no bearing on inventive step.

Game rules often are designed to entertain and hold the players' interest by way of psychological effects such as amusement, suspense or surprise. Such effects do not qualify as technical effects. Similarly, giving rise to a balanced, fair or otherwise rewarding gameplay is a psychological effect, not a technical one. As a result, rules and associated computations determining a game score or a player's skill rating, even if computationally complex, are usually considered non-technical.

Highly interactive gameplay such as in video games involves technical means for sensing user input, updating the game state and outputting visual, audio or haptic information. Features defining such presentations of information and user interfaces are assessed as described in G-II, 3.7 and 3.7.1. Cognitive content that informs the player about the current game status at a non-technical level, e.g. about a game score, the arrangement and suits of playing cards, the status and attributes of a game character, is regarded as non-technical information. The same goes for instructions presented on game boards or cards, e.g. "go back to square one". An example of a technical context in which the way information is presented can make a technical contribution is the interactive control of real-time manoeuvres in a game world, the display of which is subject to conflicting technical requirements (T 928/03).

Aside from rules, the state of a game world may also evolve in accordance with numerical data and equations that model physical principles or pseudo-physical behaviour, especially in video games. The systematic calculation of updates to such game states amounts to a computer-implemented simulation based on these models (G 1/19). For the purpose of assessing inventive step in this context, the models are to be understood as defining a given constraint for a corresponding implementation on a computer (G-VII, 5.4). Unlike effects that are intrinsic to the virtual game world or are otherwise inherent to the model already, the effect produced by a specific implementation of a simulation, if adapted to the internal functioning of a computer system, is technical. For instance, merely predicting the virtual trajectory of a billiard ball shot by the player, even if highly accurate, fails to solve a technical problem beyond its implementation. In contrast, adjusting the step sizes used in the distributed

simulation of bullets fired in a multi-player online game based on current network latencies produces a technical effect.

Features which specify how to provide user input normally make a technical contribution (G-II, 3.7.1). However, a mapping of parameters obtained from known input mechanisms to parameters of a computer game qualifies as a game rule in a wider sense if it reflects a choice made by the game designer for the purpose of defining the game or making it more interesting or challenging (e.g. a condition specifying that a slide gesture on a touchscreen determines both the power and the spin of a virtual golf shot).

3.5.3 Schemes, rules and methods for doing business

Subject-matter or activities which are of a financial, commercial, administrative or organisational nature fall within the scope of schemes, rules and methods for doing business, which are as such excluded from patentability under Art. 52(2)(c) and (3). In the rest of this section, the term "business method" will be used for all such subject-matter and activities.

Art. 52(2)(c)

Financial activities typically include banking, billing or accounting. Marketing, advertising, licensing, managing rights and contractual agreements are all of a commercial or administrative nature, as are activities involving legal considerations. Personnel management, designing a workflow for a business process or communicating postings to a target user community based on location information are examples of organisational rules. Other activities typical of doing business concern operational research, planning, forecasting and optimisations in business environments, including logistics and scheduling of tasks. These activities involve collecting information, setting goals, and using mathematical and statistical methods to evaluate the information for the purpose of facilitating managerial decision-making.

If the claimed subject-matter specifies technical means, such as computers, computer networks or other programmable apparatus, for executing at least some steps of a business method, it is not limited to excluded subject-matter as such and so not excluded from patentability under Art. 52(2)(c) and (3).

However, the mere possibility of using technical means is not sufficient to avoid exclusion, even if the description discloses a technical embodiment (T 388/04, T 306/04, T 619/02). Terms like "system" or "means" are to be looked at carefully, because "system" could refer, for example, to a financial organisation and "means" to organisational units unless it can be inferred from the context that they refer exclusively to technical entities (T 154/04).

Once it is established that the claimed subject-matter as a whole is not excluded from patentability under Art. 52(2) and (3), it is examined for novelty and inventive step (G-I, 1). To examine inventive step, it needs to be established which features contribute to the technical character of the invention (G-VII, 5.4).

Where the claim specifies a technical implementation of a business method, the features which contribute to the technical character of the claim are in most cases limited to those specifying the particular technical implementation.

Features which are the result of technical implementation choices and not part of the business method contribute to the technical character and so have to be duly taken into account. For example: the claim defines a computerised networked system which allows customers to obtain audio-visual content about selected products using computers installed at each sales outlet of a company, all connected to a central server with a central database storing the audio-visual content as electronic files. The distribution of the electronic files from the central server to the sales outlets could be technically implemented either by enabling download of individual files directly from the central database to the computer at a customer's request or, alternatively, by transferring several selected electronic files to each sales outlet, storing these files in a local database of the sales outlet and retrieving the file required from the local database when audio-visual content is requested by a customer at the sales outlet. Choosing one implementation from among these two options is a matter for a technically skilled person, such as a software engineer, unlike, for example, specifying that the set of audio-visual contents offered is different for each sales outlet, which would typically be a matter for a business expert. Features of the claim specifying any of these two possible technical implementations contribute to the technical character of the invention, whereas features specifying the business method do not.

In the case of claims directed to a technical implementation of a business method, modifying the underlying business method to circumvent a technical problem, rather than addressing this problem in an inherently technical way, is not considered to make a technical contribution over the prior art. In the context of an automation of a business method, effects which are inherent in the business method do not qualify as technical effects (G-VII, 5.4.1).

For instance, an automated accounting method that avoids redundant bookkeeping may be considered to require fewer computer resources in terms of computer workload and storage requirements. However, these advantages, in so far as they result from a reduction in the number of operations to be performed and the amount of data to be considered that is attributable to the business specification of the accounting method, are inherent to the accounting method itself and so do not qualify as technical effects.

Another example is an electronic auction performed by successively lowering the price until the price is fixed by the remote participant who first transmits a message. Since messages may be received out of order due to possible transmission delays, each message contains timestamp information. Changing the auction rules to obviate the need for timestamp information amounts to circumventing the technical problem of transmission delays rather than solving it with technical means (T.258/03). As a further example, in a method for carrying out electronic financial transactions with

credit cards at a point of sale, the administrative decision to dispense with the need to obtain the buyer's name or address to authorise the transaction may save time and reduce data traffic. However, this measure, on its own, is not a technical solution to the technical problem of the bandwidth bottleneck of communication lines and the limited capacity of server computers, but an administrative measure which does not contribute to the technical character of the claimed subject-matter.

The mere fact that the input to a business method is real-world data is not sufficient for the business method to contribute to the technical character of the claimed subject-matter, even if the data relates to physical parameters (e.g. geographic distances between sales outlets) (T 154/04, T 1147/05, T 1029/06). See also G-II, 3.3.

In a computer-implemented method for facilitating managerial decision-making, automatically selecting from a set of business plans the most cost-effective one which also allows for meeting certain technical constraints (e.g. to achieve a targeted reduction in environmental impact) is not considered to make a technical contribution beyond the computer-implementation.

The mere possibility of serving a technical purpose is not enough for a method to contribute to the technical character of the invention. For example, a claim to a "method of resource allocation in an industrial process" encompasses pure business processes and services in finance, administration or management, without limiting the method to any specific technical process because of the broad meaning of the term "industry".

The result of a business method may be useful, practical or saleable but that does not qualify as a technical effect.

Business method features, e.g. administrative features, can be found in different contexts. For example, a medical support system may be configured to deliver information to the clinician on the basis of data obtained from patient sensors, and only if such data is not available, on the basis of data provided by the patient. The prioritisation of the sensor data over the data provided by the patient is an administrative rule. Establishing it is a task for an administrator, e.g. the head of the clinic, rather than for an engineer. As an administrative rule with no technical effect, it does not contribute to the technical character of the claimed subject-matter and may be used in the formulation of the objective technical problem as a constraint that has to be met when assessing inventive step (G-VII, 5.4). For more examples of applying the problem-solution approach to assess inventive step for subject-matter comprising business-method features, see G-VII, 5.4.2.1 to 5.4.2.3.

3.6 Programs for computers

Computer programs are excluded from patentability under Art. 52(2)(c) and (3) if claimed as such. However, following the generally applicable criteria for Art. 52(2) and (3) (G-II, 2), the exclusion does not apply to computer programs with **technical character**. *Art. 52(2)(c)*

In order to have technical character, and so not be excluded from patentability, a computer program must produce a **"further technical effect"** when run on a computer. A "further technical effect" is a technical effect going beyond the "normal" physical interactions between the program (software) and the computer (hardware) on which it is run. The normal physical effects of running a program, e.g. the circulation of electrical currents in the computer, are not in themselves sufficient to confer technical character on a computer program (T.1173/97 and G.3/08).

Examples of further technical effects which confer technical character on a computer program are the control of a technical process or of the internal functioning of the computer itself or its interfaces (see G-II, 3.6.1).

Whether there is a further technical effect is assessed without reference to the prior art. It follows that the mere fact that a computer program serving a non-technical purpose requires less computing time than a prior-art program serving the same non-technical purpose does not on its own establish that there is a further technical effect (T.1370/11). Likewise, comparing a computer program with how a human being would perform the same task is not a suitable basis for assessing whether the computer program has technical character (T.1358/09).

If a further technical effect of the computer program has already been established, the computational efficiency of an algorithm affecting the established technical effect contributes to the technical character of the invention and thus to inventive step (e.g. where the design of the algorithm is motivated by technical considerations of the internal functioning of the computer; see also G-II, 3.3).

A computer program does not have technical character simply because it has been designed in such a way that it can be automatically performed by a computer. "Further technical considerations", typically related to the technical considerations of the computer's internal functioning, that go beyond merely finding a computer algorithm to perform a task are needed. They have to be reflected in claimed features that cause a further technical effect (G.3/08).

If a claim is directed to a computer program which does not have technical character, the examiner objects to it under Art. 52(2)(c) and (3). If it passes the test for technical character, the examiner moves on to assess its novelty and inventive step (see G-VI and G-VII, in particular G-VII, 5.4).

Computer-implemented inventions

"Computer-implemented invention" is an expression intended to cover claims which involve computers, computer networks or other programmable apparatus wherein at least one feature is realised by means of a computer program. Claims directed to computer-implemented inventions may take the forms described in F-IV, 3.9 and its subsections.

A computer program and a corresponding computer-implemented method are distinct from each other. The former refers to a sequence of

computer-executable instructions specifying a method while the latter refers to a method actually performed on a computer.

Claims directed to a computer-implemented method, a computer-readable storage medium or a device cannot be objected to under Art. 52(2) and (3) as any method involving the use of technical means (e.g. a computer) and any technical means itself (e.g. a computer or a computer-readable storage medium) have technical character and are therefore inventions within the meaning of Art. 52(1) (T 258/03, T 424/03, G 3/08).

3.6.1 Examples of further technical effects

If a method has technical character over and above the mere fact that it is computer-implemented, a corresponding computer program specifying that method produces a further technical effect when run on a computer. For example, a computer program which specifies a method of controlling an anti-lock braking system in a car, determining emissions by an X-ray device, compressing video, restoring a distorted digital image or encrypting electronic communications brings about a further technical effect when it is run on a computer (see G-II, 3.3).

A computer program can also be considered to produce a further technical effect where it is designed on the basis of specific technical considerations relating to the internal functioning of the computer on which it is to be executed, e.g. by being adapted to the computer's specific architecture. For instance, computer programs implementing security measures for protecting boot integrity or countermeasures against power analysis attacks have technical character because they rely on a technical understanding of the computer's internal functioning.

Similarly, computer programs controlling a computer's internal functioning or operation, such as the processor load balancing or memory allocation, normally produce a further technical effect (see, however, G-VII, 5.4.2.3 for an example of a case where the controlling is based on a non-technical scheme).

Programs for processing code at low level, such as builders or compilers, may well have technical character. For example, when building runtime objects from development objects, regenerating only those runtime objects resulting from modified development objects contributes to producing the further technical effect of limiting the resources needed for a particular build.

3.6.2 Information modelling, activity of programming and programming languages

Information modelling is an intellectual activity devoid of technical character and typically carried out by a systems analyst in a first stage of software development to provide a formal description of a real-world system or process. It follows that specifications of a modelling language, the structure of an information modelling process (e.g. use of a template) or the maintenance of models likewise have no technical character (T 354/07). Similarly, properties inherent to information models, such as re-usability,

platform-independence or convenience for documentation, are not regarded as technical effects (T 1171/06).

If an information model is purposively used in the context of an invention to solve a specific technical problem by providing a technical effect, it can contribute to the technical character of the invention (see also G-II, 3.3.2 and 3.5.1).

Features specifying how the model is actually stored (e.g. using relational database technology) can also make a technical contribution.

Conceptual methods describing the process of software development (meta-methods) normally have no technical character. For example, in a computer-implemented method for generating program code for a control task, a feature specifying that a platform-independent model is converted to a platform-dependent model, from which program code adapted to the target platform is derived, makes no technical contribution in so far as the performance of the control task itself is not affected.

The **activity of programming**, in the sense of writing code, is an intellectual, non-technical activity unless it is used in the context of an actual application or environment to contribute in a causal manner to producing a technical effect (G 3/08, T 1539/09).

For example, reading a data type parameter from a file as input to a computer program, rather than defining the data type in the program itself, is merely a programming option when writing code, which per se has no technical character. The same applies to naming conventions for object names for facilitating the intelligibility and the management of program code.

Defining and providing a **programming language** or a programming paradigm such as object-oriented programming does not per se solve a technical problem, even if its particular syntax and semantics enable the programmer to develop a program more easily. Easing the intellectual effort of the programmer is not per se a technical effect.

When assessing an invention relating to a **programming environment**, the features pertaining to the programming language do not normally contribute to its technical character. For example, in a visual programming environment, the provision of specific graphical building blocks is part of the programming language and makes no technical contribution if the only effect is to ease the programmer's intellectual effort. The provision of particular programming constructs may enable a programmer to write shorter programs, but that does not qualify as a technical effect, since any resulting reduction in program length ultimately depends on how the programming constructs are used by a human programmer. In contrast, automatically processing machine code by dividing it into an instruction chain and an operand chain and replacing repeating instruction sets by macro-instructions so as to generate optimised code of reduced memory size makes a technical contribution as the effect does not depend on how a human programmer makes use of the macro-instructions.

Features of a programming environment that relate to its graphical user interface, e.g. visualisations and data input mechanisms, are to be assessed as described in G-II, 3.7 and 3.7.1.

3.6.3 Data retrieval, formats and structures

A computer-implemented data structure or data format embodied on a medium or as an electromagnetic carrier wave has technical character as a whole and so is an invention within the meaning of Art. 52(1).

A data structure or format contributes to the technical character of the invention if it has an intended technical use and it causes a technical effect when used according to this intended technical use. Such a potential technical effect related to an implied technical use is to be taken into account in assessing inventive step (G 1/19). This may happen in the case of functional data, i.e. where the data structure or format has a technical function in a technical system, such as controlling the operation of the device processing the data. Functional data inherently comprises, or maps to, the corresponding technical features of the device (T 1194/97). Cognitive data, on the other hand, does not contribute to producing a technical effect as its content and meaning are only relevant to human users (see, however, G-II, 3.7 on the presentation of information to a user in a continued and/or guided human-machine interaction process).

For example, a record carrier for use in a picture retrieval system stores coded pictures together with a data structure defined in terms of line numbers and addresses which instruct the system how to decode and access the picture from the record carrier. This data structure is defined in terms which inherently comprise the technical features of the picture retrieval system, namely the record carrier and a reading device for retrieving pictures therefrom in which the record carrier is operative. It thus contributes to the record carrier's technical character, whereas the cognitive content of the stored pictures (e.g. photograph of a person or landscape) does not.

Similarly, an index structure used for searching a record in a database produces a technical effect since it controls the way the computer performs the search operation (T 1351/04).

Another example is an electronic message with a header and a content section. The information in the header comprises instructions which are automatically recognised and processed by the receiving message system. This processing in turn determines how the content elements are to be assembled and presented to the final recipient. The provision of such instructions in the header contributes to the electronic message's technical character, whereas the information in the content section is cognitive data and does not (T 858/02).

A data structure or a data format may have features which cannot be characterised as cognitive data (i.e. not for conveying information to a user) but which nevertheless do not make a technical contribution. For example, the structure of a computer program may merely aim at facilitating the task of the programmer, which is not a technical effect serving a technical

purpose. Furthermore, data models and other information models at an abstract logical level have per se no technical character (see [G-II, 3.6.2](#)).

Digital data is used to control devices in additive manufacturing (AM), which is the general term for technologies manufacturing physical objects by successively adding material on the basis of a digital representation of the object's geometry. If the data defines the instructions for operating the AM device, it makes a technical contribution, as illustrated by the following example.

Example

A computer-readable medium storing data which defines both a digital representation of the product of claim 1 and operating instructions adapted to control an AM device to fabricate the product using the digital representation of the product when said data is relayed to the AM device.

Remarks

A computer-readable medium is a technical object, so there is no objection under [Art. 52\(2\)](#) and [\(3\)](#).

Since the data comprises both a digital description of the (physical) product of claim 1 and associated operating instructions adapted to control an AM device, it is *intended* to be used to control an AM device to fabricate the product. This technical use of the data is implied across substantially the whole scope of the claim. Construing the claim to encompass a non-technical use of merely visualising the data would be artificial. The technical effect of fabricating the physical product defined in claim 1 that is achieved when the data is used as intended is thus a potential technical effect that has to be taken into account when assessing inventive step. The digital representation of the product makes a technical contribution to the extent that it defines technical features of the fabricated physical product.

However, if the claim did not imply this technical use of the data, the data's potential technical effect of fabricating the physical product could not be taken into account when assessing inventive step, as it would not be implied across substantially the whole scope of the claim. This would be the case, for instance, if the data defined only a digital description or 3D model of the product that is not adapted to additive manufacturing of the product and could be used merely to visualise the product in a CAD software tool. Abstract descriptions or models are not considered technical even if the described entities are technical (see [G-II, 3.3.2](#)). In such cases, the stored non-technical data would not make a technical contribution.

3.6.4 Database management systems and information retrieval

Database management systems are technical systems implemented on computers to perform the technical tasks of storing and retrieving data using various data structures for efficient data management. A method performed in a database management system is thus a method which uses technical means and is therefore not excluded from patentability under [Art. 52\(2\)](#) and [\(3\)](#).

Features specifying the internal functioning of a database management system are normally based on technical considerations. They therefore contribute to the invention's technical character and are taken into account when assessing inventive step. For instance, technical considerations are involved in improving system throughput and query response times by automatically managing data using various data stores with different technical properties such as different levels of consistency or performance (T.1924/17, T.697/17).

Database management systems execute structured queries, which formally and precisely describe the data to be retrieved. Optimising the execution of such structured queries with respect to the computer resources needed (such as CPU, main memory or hard disk) contributes to the invention's technical character since it involves technical considerations relating to efficient exploitation of the computer system.

However, not all features implemented in a database management system necessarily make a technical contribution by virtue of this fact alone. For example, a feature of a database management system for accounting costs related to the system's use by different users does not make a technical contribution.

Data structures, such as an index, a hash table or a query tree, used in database management systems to facilitate access to data or execute structured queries, contribute to the technical character of the invention. Such data structures are functional since they purposively control the operation of the database management system to perform those technical tasks. Conversely, data structures defined solely by the cognitive information they store are not considered to contribute to the invention's technical character beyond the mere storage of data (see also G-II, 3.6.3).

A distinction is made between executing structured queries by a database management system and information retrieval. The latter includes searching for information in a document, searching for documents themselves, and also searching for metadata that describe data, such as texts, images or sounds. The query may be formulated by the user in need of information, typically informally using natural language without a precise format: the user may enter search terms as a query in internet search engines to find relevant documents or submit an exemplary document to find similar documents. If the method of estimating relevance or similarity relies solely on non-technical considerations, such as the cognitive content of the items to be retrieved, purely linguistic rules or other subjective criteria (e.g. items found relevant by friends in social networks), it does not make a technical contribution.

Translating linguistic considerations into a mathematical model with the aim of enabling a computer to do the linguistic analysis automatically can be seen as involving, at least implicitly, technical considerations. However, this is not enough to guarantee that the mathematical model has technical character, and other technical considerations, such as those relating to the computer system's internal functioning, are needed.

For example, a mathematical model for calculating the probability that a given term is similar in meaning to another term by analysing how often the two terms both appear in a collection of documents does not make a technical contribution per se, because it is based on considerations of a purely linguistic nature (i.e. the assumption that related terms are more likely than unrelated ones to appear in the same documents). The search results produced using this method of similarity calculation would differ from prior art using another mathematical model only in that information with different cognitive content would be retrieved. That is a non-technical distinction and does not qualify as a technical effect. In this context of retrieval based on the similar meaning of terms, the concept of "better search" is subjective (T.598/14). In contrast, optimising the execution time of structured queries in a database management system as described above is a technical effect.

See also G-II, 3.3.1 on artificial intelligence and machine-learning algorithms.

3.7 Presentations of information

Art. 52(2)(d)

The term "presentations of information" in Art. 52(2)(d) is to be understood as referring to the conveying of information to a user. It concerns both the cognitive content of the information presented and the way it is presented (T.1143/06, T.1741/08). It is not limited to visual information, but also covers information presented in other forms, e.g. audio or haptic information. However, it does not include the technical means used to generate the presentation of information.

Conveying information to a user also has to be distinguished from technical representations of information directed to a technical system which will process, store or transmit that information. Features of data encoding schemes, data structures and electronic communication protocols which represent functional data as opposed to cognitive data are not regarded as presentations of information within the meaning of Art. 52(2)(d) (T.1194/97).

When assessing whether it is excluded from patentability under Art. 52(2) and (3), the claimed subject-matter has to be considered as a whole (G-II, 2). In particular, a claim directed to or specifying the use of any technical means for presenting information (e.g. a computer display) has, as a whole, technical character and so is not excluded from patentability. As another example, a claim directed to a kit comprising a product (e.g. a bleaching composition) and other features that have no technical effect on the product, such as instructions for using the product or reference information for evaluating the results obtained, is not excluded, since the claim has a technical feature: a product comprising a composition of matter.

Once it is established that the claimed subject-matter as a whole is not excluded from patentability under Art. 52(2) and (3), it is examined for compliance with the other patentability requirements, in particular novelty and inventive step (G-I, 1).

In the assessment of inventive step, features related to the presentation of information are analysed to determine whether, in the context of the

invention, they contribute to producing a technical effect serving a technical purpose. If not, they make no technical contribution and cannot support a finding of inventive step (G-VII, 5.4). To determine whether a technical effect is produced, the examiner assesses the context of the invention, the task the user carries out and the actual purpose served by the particular presentation of information.

A feature defining a presentation of information produces a technical effect if it credibly assists the user in performing a technical task by means of a continued and/or guided process of human-machine interaction (T 336/14 and T 1802/13). Such a technical effect is considered credibly achieved if the assistance the user receives when performing the technical task is objectively, reliably and causally linked to the feature. This would not be the case if the alleged effect depends on the user's subjective interests or preferences. For example, some users find it easier to understand data when it is displayed as numerical values, whereas others prefer a colour-coded display. Choosing between these two ways of displaying the data is therefore not considered to have a technical effect (T 1567/05). Similarly, whether or not it is easier to understand audio information conveyed as a musical scale instead of in spoken words depends solely on the user's cognitive abilities. As another example, allowing the user to set parameters determining what information is presented or to choose the way it is presented does not make a technical contribution if it merely accommodates the user's subjective preferences.

Determining the extent to which a particular presentation of information may be considered to credibly support the user in performing a technical task can be difficult. It can be simplified during the assessment of inventive step by comparing the invention with the prior art and so limiting the analysis to the distinguishing features (G-VII, 5.4, paragraph 5). This comparison may reveal that the potential support for the performance of the technical task is already achieved in the prior art, which means that the distinguishing features make no technical contribution (e.g. relate only to non-technical subjective user preferences).

A feature relating to the presentation of information commonly defines:

- (i) the cognitive content of the information presented, i.e. "what" is presented, or
- (ii) the way in which the information is presented, i.e. "how" it is presented.

These two categories will be used to allow for a more detailed discussion of technical effects in the rest of this section. However, they are not meant to be exhaustive, and there are also cases in which a feature falls into both. For example, a step of "displaying the surname of a customer in capital letters" in a claimed method defines both the cognitive content of the presented information (surname of a customer) and the way it is presented (in capital letters). Such a feature may be considered to consist in fact of two features: the displayed text is the surname of a customer (falling into the first category) and the displayed text is shown in capital letters (falling

into the second category). The manner of presentation itself might additionally convey cognitive information. For example, there may be a convention that capitals indicate which part of a name is the surname.

(1) What (which information) is presented?

If the cognitive content of the information presented to the user relates to an internal state prevailing in a technical system and enables the user to properly operate this technical system, it has a technical effect. An internal state prevailing in a technical system is an operating mode, a technical condition or an event which is related to the internal functioning of the system, may dynamically change and is automatically detected. Its presentation typically prompts the user to interact with the system, for example to avoid technical malfunctions (T 528/07).

Static or predetermined information about technical properties or potential states of a machine, specifications of a device or operating instructions do not qualify as an internal state prevailing in the device. If the presentation of static or predetermined information merely has the effect of helping the user with the non-technical tasks preceding the technical task, it does not make a technical contribution. For example, the effect that the user does not have to know or memorise a sequence of buttons to be operated prior to configuring a device is not a technical effect.

Non-technical information such as the state of a casino game, a business process or an abstract simulation model is exclusively aimed at the user for subjective evaluation or non-technical decision-making. It is not directly linked to a technical task and therefore does not qualify as an internal state prevailing in a technical system.

(2) How is the information presented?

A feature in this category typically specifies the form or arrangement in which information is conveyed to the user (e.g. on a screen) or the timing of its conveyance. An example is a diagram designed solely for conveying information. Specific technical features related to, for example, the way audio signals or images are generated are not regarded as a way in which information is presented.

Features defining a visualisation of information in a particular diagram or layout are normally not considered to make a technical contribution, even if the diagram or layout arguably conveys information in a way which a viewer may intuitively regard as particularly appealing, lucid or logical.

For instance, dealing with limited available screen space is part of designing presentations of information for human viewing and therefore not an indication of technicality per se. The general idea of giving an overview of several images in a limited display area by displaying a single image and sequentially replacing it with other images is not based on technical considerations, but is a matter of layout design. Similarly, arranging objects within available screen space by eliminating "white space" between window

panes follows the same layout principles as would apply to the layout of a magazine cover and does not involve technical considerations.

On the other hand, if the way the information is presented credibly assists the user in performing a technical task by means of a continued and/or guided process of human-machine interaction, it produces a technical effect (T.1143/06, T.1741/08, T.1802/13). For example, displaying several images side by side in low resolution and allowing selection and display of an image at higher resolution conveys information to the user in the form of a technical tool that enables the user to perform the technical task of interactively searching and retrieving stored images more efficiently. Storing digital images at different resolutions gives rise to the technical effect of allowing the simultaneous overview display of several images (T.643/00). As another example, in a video soccer game, the particular manner of conveying to the user where the nearest teammate is located by dynamically displaying a guide mark on the edge of the screen when the teammate is off-screen produces the technical effect of facilitating a continued human-machine interaction by resolving conflicting technical requirements: displaying an enlarged portion of an image and maintaining an overview of a zone of interest which is larger than the display area (T.928/03). As a further example, in the context of a visual aid for a surgeon, if, in the course of surgery, the current orientation of a medical ball joint implant is displayed in a way which credibly helps the surgeon to correct the position of the implant more precisely, this is considered to provide a technical effect.

Effects relying on human physiology

When a way of presenting information produces an effect in the user's mind that does not depend on psychological or other subjective factors but on physical parameters which are based on human physiology and can be precisely defined, that effect may qualify as a technical effect. The way of presenting the information then makes a technical contribution to the extent that it contributes to this technical effect. For example, displaying a notification on one of several computer screens near the user's current visual focus of attention has the technical effect that it is more or less guaranteed to be seen immediately (compared e.g. with an arbitrary placement on one of the screens). In contrast, the decision to show only urgent notifications (rather than e.g. all notifications) is based only on psychological factors and thus makes no technical contribution. Minimising information overload and distraction is not considered to qualify per se as a technical effect (T.862/10). As another example, displaying a stream of images in which the parameters for delay and change in the content between successive images are computed on the basis of physical properties of human visual perception in order to achieve a smooth transition is considered to make a technical contribution (T.509/07).

If information (e.g. a visual or audio stimulus) is presented to a person in order to produce in that person a physiological reaction (e.g. involuntary eye gaze) which can be measured for the purpose of assessing a medical condition (e.g. eyesight, hearing impairment or brain damage), that

presentation of information may be considered to produce a technical effect.

Effects relying on mental activities of the user

Where the claimed subject-matter comprises a feature of presenting information to a user, be it of category (i) or (ii), an evaluation by the user is involved. Although such an evaluation per se is a mental act (Art. 52(2)(c)), the mere fact that mental activities are involved does not necessarily make subject-matter non-technical. For example, in a situation such as the one at issue in T.643/00 (see above), the user makes an evaluation based on an overview of low-resolution images in order to locate and objectively recognise a desired image. This mental evaluation may be considered to be an intermediate step steering the image search and retrieval process and so forms an integral part of a solution to a technical problem. This solution does not rely on facilitating the human tasks of understanding, learning, reading or memorising or on influencing the user's decision as to which image is to be searched. It provides a mechanism for inputting a selection which would not be possible if the images were not displayed in that specific arrangement.

On the other hand, if the choice or layout of information presented is aimed exclusively at the human mind, in particular to help the user to take a non-technical decision (e.g. which product to buy based on a diagram showing properties of products), no technical contribution is made.

3.7.1 User interfaces

User interfaces, in particular graphical user interfaces (GUIs), comprise features of presenting information and receiving input in response as part of human-computer interaction. Features defining user input are more likely to have a technical character than those solely concerning data output and display, because input requires compatibility with the predetermined protocol of a machine, whereas output may be largely dictated by a user's subjective preferences. Features concerning the graphic design of a menu (e.g. its look and feel) which are determined by aesthetic considerations, subjective user preferences or administrative rules do not contribute to the technical character of a menu-based user interface. Evaluating features related to output of data is covered in G-II.3.6.3. This section focuses on evaluating features relating to how a user can provide input.

Features which specify a mechanism enabling user input, such as entering text, making a selection or submitting a command, are normally considered to make a technical contribution. For example, providing in a GUI an alternative graphical shortcut that allows the user to directly set different processing conditions, such as initiating a printing process and setting the number of copies to be printed by dragging and reciprocated movement of a document icon onto a printer icon, makes a technical contribution. On the other hand, supporting user input by providing information that merely facilitates the user's mental decision-making process during this task (e.g. by helping the user to decide what to input) is not considered to make a technical contribution (T.1741/08).

Assisting a user in entering text in a computer system by providing a predictive input mechanism is a technical function. However, generating word variants to be displayed for the predictive input mechanism is, in itself, a non-technical problem. The linguistic model used to solve this non-technical problem does not, on its own, make a technical contribution. If technical considerations are involved in implementing the linguistic model on a computer, such as those relating to the internal functioning of a computer, then there may be a technical effect.

Where the actual achievement of effects such as simplifying the user's actions or providing more user-friendly input functions depends exclusively on subjective user abilities or preferences, the effects cannot form the basis of an objective technical problem to be solved. For example, a reduction in the number of interactions required to perform the same input is not credibly achieved if it materialises only for some usage patterns that occur depending on the user's level of expertise or subjective preferences.

Ways of providing input, such as gestures or keystrokes, that merely reflect subjective user preferences, conventions or game rules and cannot objectively be regarded as having any physical ergonomic advantage do not make a technical contribution. However, performance-oriented improvements to the detection of input, such as allowing faster or more accurate gesture recognition or reducing the device's processing load when performing recognition, do make a technical contribution.

4. Exceptions to patentability

4.1 Matter contrary to "*ordre public*" or morality

Any invention the commercial exploitation of which would be contrary to "*ordre public*" or morality is specifically excluded from patentability. The purpose of this is to deny protection for inventions likely to induce riot or public disorder or to lead to criminal or other generally offensive behaviour (see also F-II, 7.2). Antipersonnel mines are an obvious example. Examples of biotechnological inventions falling under Rule 28 are listed in G-II, 5.3. G 1/03 explains that practical examples under Art. 53(a) arise from the fact that not everything can be done to human beings that can be done to other living beings. For example, avoiding offspring that, for economic reasons, are unwanted because of certain properties (sex, colour, health) may be quite legitimate in the case of domestic animals, but it would be contrary to "*ordre public*" or morality when applied to human beings. Art. 53(a)

This provision is likely to be invoked only in rare and extreme cases. A fair test to apply is whether it is probable that the public in general would regard the invention as so abhorrent that granting patent rights would be inconceivable. If that is clearly the case, an objection is raised under Art. 53(a); otherwise not. The mere possibility that an invention could be abused is not sufficient to deny patent protection pursuant to Art. 53(a) EPC if the invention can also be exploited in a way which does not and would not infringe "*ordre public*" and morality (see T 866/01). If difficult legal questions arise in this context, then refer to C-VIII, 7.

Where the claims are found to relate in part to such excluded subject-matter, this may lead to the issuing of a partial European or supplementary European search report under Rule 63 (see B-VIII, 1, 3.1 and 3.2). In such cases, if the applicant does not make an appropriate amendment and/or provide convincing arguments in response to the invitation under Rule 63(1) (see B-VIII, 3.2) or to the search opinion under Rule 70a (see B-XI, 8), an objection under Rule 63(3) will also be raised (see H-II, 5).

4.1.1 Prohibited matter

Art. 53(a)

Exploitation is not to be deemed contrary to "*ordre public*" or morality merely because it is prohibited by law or regulation in some or all of the contracting states. One reason for this is that a product could still be manufactured under a European patent for export to states in which its use is not prohibited.

4.1.2 Offensive and non-offensive use

Special care must be taken when dealing with applications in which the invention has both an offensive and a non-offensive use, e.g. a process for breaking open locked safes, where use by a burglar is offensive and use by a locksmith in an emergency non-offensive. In such cases, no objection is raised under Art. 53(a). Similarly, if a claimed invention defines a copying machine with features resulting in an improved precision of reproduction and an embodiment of this apparatus could comprise further features (not claimed but apparent to the skilled person) whose only purpose would be to allow also for the reproduction of security strips in banknotes strikingly similar to those in genuine banknotes, the claimed apparatus would cover an embodiment for producing counterfeit money which could be considered to fall under Art. 53(a). There is, however, no reason to consider the copying machine as claimed to be excluded from patentability, since its improved properties could be used for many acceptable purposes (see G 1/98, Reasons 3.3.3). However, if the application contains an explicit reference to a use which is contrary to "*ordre public*" or morality, this reference must be deleted under Rule 48(1)(a).

4.1.3 Economic effects

It is not the EPO's task to consider the economic effects of granting patents in specific areas of technology and to restrict the field of patentable subject-matter accordingly (see G 1/98 Reasons 3.9, and T 1213/05). The standard to apply for an exception under Art. 53(a) is whether the commercial exploitation of the invention is contrary to "*ordre public*" or morality.

4.2 Surgery, therapy and diagnostic methods

Art. 53(c)

European patents are not to be granted for "methods for treatment of the human or animal body by surgery or therapy and diagnostic methods practised on the human or animal body; this provision shall not apply to products, in particular substances or compositions, for use in any of these methods." This means that patents may be obtained for surgical, therapeutic or diagnostic instruments or apparatuses for use in such methods. The manufacture of prostheses or artificial limbs could be patentable. For instance, a method of manufacturing insoles designed to

correct posture or a method of manufacturing an artificial limb is patentable because taking the imprint of the footplate or a moulding of the stump on which an artificial limb is fitted is clearly not of a surgical nature. Besides, both the insoles and the artificial limb are manufactured outside the body. However, a method of manufacturing an endoprosthesis which, although taking place outside the body, requires a surgical step for taking measurements would be excluded from patentability under Art. 53(c) (see T 1005/98).

The exception under Art. 53(c) does not extend to products, particularly substances or compositions, for use in these methods of treatment or diagnosis.

Where a substance or composition is already known, (notional) novelty can result from a new medical use in accordance with Art. 54(4) and (5).

Under Art. 54(4), a known substance or composition may still be patented for use in a method referred to in Art. 53(c) if it has not previously been disclosed for use in such a method ("**first medical use**"). A claim to a known substance or composition for the first use in surgical, therapeutic and/or diagnostic methods must be in a form such as: "Substance or composition X", followed by the indication of the use, e.g. "... for use as a medicament" or "... for use in therapy/in vivo diagnostics/surgery" (see G-VI, 6.1). Art. 54(4)

Furthermore, if the known substance or composition was previously disclosed for use in surgery, therapy or diagnostic methods practised on the human or animal body, a patent may still be obtained in accordance with Art. 54(5) for any second or further use of the substance in these methods that is novel and inventive ("**further medical use**"). A claim to a further medical use of a known substance must be in the form: "Substance or composition X", followed by the indication of the **specific** therapeutic/in vivo diagnostic/surgical use, e.g. "... for use in treating disease Y" (see G-VI, 6.1). Art. 54(5)

Subject-matter in the description which is regarded as falling under one of the exceptions to patentability needs to be excised, reworded in such a way that it no longer falls under the exception or prominently marked as not being according to the claimed invention (see F-IV, 4.3). In that last case, one way of amending the description in accordance with Art. 53(c) is to add a statement such as: "The references to the methods of treatment by therapy or surgery or in vivo diagnosis methods in examples X, Y and Z of this description are to be interpreted as references to compounds, pharmaceutical compositions and medicaments of the present invention for use in those methods".

4.2.1 Limitations of exception under Art. 53(c)

Exceptions under Art. 53(c) are limited to methods for treatment of the human or animal body by surgery or therapy and diagnostic methods practised on the human or animal body. It follows that other methods of treating living human beings or animals (e.g. treatment of a sheep in order to promote growth, to improve the quality of mutton or to increase the yield Art. 53(c)

of wool) or other methods of measuring or recording characteristics of the human or animal body are patentable as long as they are of a technical and not essentially biological character (see G-II, 5.4.2). For example, an application containing claims directed to the purely cosmetic treatment of a human by administration of a chemical product is considered to be patentable (see T 144/83), whereas a cosmetic treatment involving surgery or therapy would not be patentable (see below).

To be excluded from patentability, a treatment or diagnostic method must actually be carried out on the living human or animal body (G 1/04). A treatment of or diagnostic method practised on a dead human or animal body would therefore not be excluded from patentability under Art. 53(c). Treatment of body tissues or fluids after they have been removed from the human or animal body, or diagnostic methods applied on them, are not excluded from patentability as long as they are not then returned to the same body. So the treatment of blood for storage in a blood bank or diagnostic testing of blood samples is not excluded, whereas a treatment of blood by dialysis where the blood is returned to the same body would be excluded.

As regards methods which are carried out on or in relation to the living human or animal body, it must be borne in mind that Art. 53(c) is intended only to free non-commercial and non-industrial medical and veterinary activities from restraint. It must be interpreted in a way that ensures the exceptions do not go beyond their proper limits (see G 5/83, G 1/04, and G 1/07).

Whether or not a method is excluded from patentability under Art. 53(c) cannot depend on the person carrying it out (see G 1/04 and G 1/07, Reasons 3.4.1).

However, unlike the subject-matter referred to in Art. 52(2) and (3), which is only excluded from patentability if claimed as such, a method claim is not allowable under Art. 53(c) if it includes at least one feature defining a physical activity or action that constitutes a method step for treatment of the human or animal body by surgery or therapy. In that case, whether or not the claim includes or consists of features directed to a technical operation performed on a technical object is legally irrelevant to the application of Art. 53(c) (see G 1/07, Reasons 3.2.5).

Claims to medical devices, computer programs and storage media which comprise subject-matter corresponding to that of a method for treatment of the human or animal body by surgery or therapy or to that of a diagnostic method practised on the human or animal body are not to be objected to under Art. 53(c), because only method claims can fall under the exception of Art. 53(c).

However, as an exception, product claims defined by a construction which is only arrived at in the human or animal body following a surgical method step are not allowable under Art. 53(c) (T 775/97).

4.2.1.1 Surgery

The term "treatment by surgery" is not to be interpreted as meaning only surgical methods with a therapeutic purpose (see G. 1/07, Reasons 3.3.10). Accordingly, the term "surgery" defines the nature of the treatment rather than its purpose. So, for example, a method of treatment by surgery for cosmetic purposes or for embryo transfer is excluded from patentability in the same way as surgical treatment for therapeutic purposes. The term "treatments by surgery" also covers interventions performed on the structure of an organism by conservative ("closed, non-invasive") procedures such as repositioning or by operative (invasive) procedures using instruments.

Whether a claimed method is to be considered surgical treatment falling under the exception of Art. 53(c) should be assessed on a case-by-case basis, taking the individual merits of each case into account. The reason for the exception is to allow medical and veterinary practitioners to use their skills and knowledge of the best available treatments to achieve the utmost benefit for their patients uninhibited by any worry that some treatment might be covered by a patent (see G. 1/07, Reasons 3.3.6).

Any definition of the term "treatment by surgery" must therefore cover the kind of interventions which constitute the core of the medical profession's activities, i.e. the kind of interventions for which its members are specifically trained and for which they assume a particular responsibility (G. 1/07, Reasons 3.4.2.3).

The exclusion applies to substantial physical interventions on the body which require professional medical expertise to be carried out and which entail a substantial health risk even when carried out with the required professional care and expertise. The health risk must be associated with the mode of administration and not solely with the agent as such (G. 1/07, Reasons 3.4.2.3). Examples of excluded treatments by surgery are the injection of a contrast agent into the heart, catheterisation and endoscopy.

Invasive techniques of a routine character which are performed on uncritical body parts and generally carried out in a non-medical, commercial environment are not excluded from patentability. They include e.g. tattooing, piercing, hair removal by optical radiation and micro-abrasion of the skin.

Similar considerations apply to routine interventions in the medical field. Thus, uncritical methods involving only a minor intervention and no substantial health risks, when carried out with the required care and skill, do not fall under the scope of Art. 53(c). This narrower understanding of the exclusion still protects the medical profession from the concerns mentioned above. An example is a method for retraction of the sulcus of a tooth using a paste and a cap to prepare an impression of the tooth to manufacture a dental crown: the possible damage is limited to the superficial epithelium, the only risks are the superficial bleeding and inflammation, which rapidly heal, and the specific training needed to perform the method is minimal.

However, the medical expertise required and the health risk involved are not the only criteria which may be used to determine that a claimed method actually is "treatment by surgery" within the meaning of Art. 53(c). Other criteria, such as the degree of invasiveness or the complexity of the operation performed, could also lead to a finding that a physical intervention on the human or animal body is such treatment (see G 1/07, Reasons 3.4.2.4).

The exclusion under Art. 53(c) applies to multi-step methods which comprise or encompass at least one surgical step as defined above. The non-patentable subject-matter must be removed from the scope of the claim either by means of a disclaimer or by omitting the surgical step from the wording of the claim (G 1/07, Reasons 4.2.2). For the general principles governing disclaimers, see H-V, 4. The overall patentability of the amended claim will depend, however, on its compliance with the other EPC requirements, which is assessed on a case-by-case basis.

If a surgical method claim is open to objection under Art. 53(c), this also applies to a corresponding claim directed to a computer-assisted surgical method. In other words, surgical methods for which European patents cannot be granted according to Art. 53(c) do not avoid exclusion simply because they are computer-assisted.

Finally, when interpreting the scope of the exclusion under Art. 53(c), no distinction is to be made between human beings and animals.

4.2.1.2 Therapy

Therapy involves the curing of a disease or malfunction of the body and covers prophylactic treatment, e.g. immunisation against a certain disease (see T 19/86) or the removal of plaque (see T 290/86). Its purpose is to bring the body back from a pathological state to its normal, healthy state or to prevent a pathological state. Where a method is directed to the treatment of a human or animal body that is in a normal, healthy state and, even if subject to some discomfort, not likely to develop a pathological state due to the discomfort, providing relief from the discomfort is not necessarily a therapy. For example, cooling an animal subject to hot weather conditions does not cure or lessen the symptoms of any disorder or malfunction of the animal's body, nor does it reduce the possibility of contracting any disorder or malfunction, since no such disorder or malfunction would normally occur if the animal were not cooled (T 385/09).

A method for therapeutic purposes concerning the functioning of an apparatus associated with a living human or animal body is not excluded from patentability if no functional relationship exists between the steps related to the apparatus and the therapeutic effect of the apparatus on the body (see T 245/87).

As clinical trials have a therapeutic aspect for the human subjects undergoing them, an objection under Art. 53(c) is raised if a claim includes a step relating to a method of treatment of the human body by therapy (see G-II, 4.2.2).

The exclusion under Art. 53(c) applies to multi-step methods which comprise or encompass at least one therapeutic step. The non-patentable subject-matter must be removed from the scope of the claim either by means of a disclaimer or by omitting the step of treatment by therapy from the wording of the claim (G 1/07). For the general principles governing disclaimers, see H-V, 4. The overall patentability of the amended claim will depend, however, on its compliance with the other EPC requirements, which are assessed on a case-by-case basis.

If a method claim directed to therapy is open to objection under Art. 53(c), this also applies to a corresponding claim directed to a computer-implemented therapeutic method (T 1680/08). In such cases, the same observations apply as are set out in G-II, 4.2.1.1, for computer-implemented surgical methods.

4.2.1.3 Diagnostic methods

Diagnostic methods likewise do not cover all methods related to diagnosis.

To determine whether a claim is directed to a diagnostic method within the meaning of Art. 53(c) and so excluded from patentability, it must first be established whether it includes all of the necessary phases (G 1/04).

The claim must include method steps relating to **all** of the following phases:

- (i) the **examination phase**, involving the collection of data
- (ii) the **comparison** of the data with standard values
- (iii) the **finding of any significant deviation**, i.e. a symptom, during the comparison
- (iv) the attribution of the deviation to a particular clinical picture, i.e. the deductive medical or veterinary **decision phase** (diagnosis for curative purposes in the strict sense).

If features pertaining to any of these phases are missing and are essential for the definition of the invention, they must be included in the independent claim (see Example 6 in the annex to F-IV). Due account must be taken of steps which may be considered to be implicit: for example, steps relating to the comparison of data with standard values (phase (ii)) may imply the finding of a significant deviation (phase (iii)) – see T 1197/02. The deductive medical or veterinary decision phase (iv), i.e. the "diagnosis for curative purposes *stricto sensu*", involves determining the nature of a medical or veterinary medicinal condition with a view to identifying or uncovering a pathology; the identification of the underlying disease is not required (see T 125/02).

In addition, a method is only regarded as a diagnostic method within the meaning of Art. 53(c), and so excluded from patentability, if all method steps of a technical nature belonging to the preceding steps which are constitutive for making the diagnosis, i.e. phases (i)-(iii), satisfy the criterion "practised on the human or animal body". However, the steps of phases (ii)

and (iii) which consist in comparing the data collected in the examination phase with standard values and in finding a significant deviation resulting from the comparison are not subject to this criterion, because these activities are predominantly of a non-technical nature and are normally not practised on the human or animal body. This means that, in most cases, only phase (i), i.e. the examination phase involving the collection of data, can actually be of a technical nature within the meaning of G.1/04 and so concerned by the criterion "practised on the human or animal body" (see T.1197/02, T.143/04, T.1016/10).

Only the steps strictly describing phases (i)-(iv) have to be taken into account in determining the diagnostic character of the claimed method. Additional, preparatory or intermediate steps which may be introduced into the claimed method are irrelevant for this question (see T.1197/02, T.143/04, T.1016/10). For example, a claim may comprise preparatory steps of adjusting or preparing the apparatus used to collect data. However, these additional features are not part of any of phases (i)-(iii), which are constitutive for making the diagnosis. Likewise, data processing using an automated apparatus is not actually part of the examination phase, which involves collecting data, but it results from a subsequent step, intermediate between data collection and the comparison of the collected data with standard values. The issue of whether or not such additional steps are of a technical nature and practised on the human or animal body is therefore irrelevant for assessing whether a claimed method is a diagnostic method falling under the exception clause of Art. 53(c).

For a method step of a technical nature to meet the criterion "practised on the human or animal body", there must be an interaction with the human or animal body. The type or intensity of the interaction is not decisive: the criterion is fulfilled if the performance of the method step in question necessitates the presence of the body. Direct physical contact with the body is not required.

A medical or veterinary practitioner does not have to be involved in the procedure, be it by being present or by bearing the overall responsibility.

If all of the above criteria are satisfied, then the claim defines a diagnostic method practised on the human or animal body, and an objection will be raised under Art. 53(c).

Accordingly, methods for merely obtaining information (data, physical quantities) from the living human or animal body (e.g. X-ray investigations, MRI studies, and blood pressure measurements) are not excluded from patentability under Art. 53(c).

4.2.2 Methods for screening potential medicaments and clinical trials

Art. 53(a)

In general, a medical claim directed to tests carried out on "animals" must exclude from its scope the use of human beings as "test animals" (e.g. by means of a disclaimer). However, in some infrequent cases, a claim may be interpreted, in the light of the description, as exclusively relating to a clinical trial of an experimental medicament carried out on human beings. It

is assumed that unless there is evidence to the contrary, such trials are performed under strictly controlled conditions and with the informed consent of the patient concerned. In such cases, no objection under Art. 53(a) is raised (see, however, G-II, 4.2.1.2).

5. Exclusions and exceptions for biotechnological inventions

5.1 General remarks and definitions

"Biotechnological inventions" are inventions which concern a product consisting of or containing biological material or a process by means of which biological material is produced, processed or used. "Biological material" means any material containing genetic information and capable of reproducing itself or being reproduced in a biological system.

Rule 26(2) and (3)

5.2 Patentable biotechnological inventions

In principle, biotechnological inventions are patentable under the EPC. For European patent applications and patents concerning biotechnological inventions, the relevant provisions of the EPC are to be applied and interpreted in accordance with the provisions of Rules 26 to 29. European Union Directive 98/44/EC of 6 July 1998 on the legal protection of biotechnological inventions (OJ EPO 1999, 101) is to be used as a supplementary means of interpretation. In particular, the recitals (abbreviated to "rec." below) in the preamble to the Directive are also to be taken into account. Judgments of the Court of Justice of the European Union on the interpretation of the Directive are not binding on the EPO but they may still be considered persuasive (T 2221/10 and T 1441/13).

Rule 27
Rule 26(1)

Biotechnological inventions are also patentable if they concern an item on the following non-exhaustive list:

- (i) Biological material which is **isolated** from its natural environment or produced by means of a technical process even if it previously occurred in nature

Rule 27(a)

Biological material may therefore be considered patentable even if it already occurs in nature (see also G-II, 3.1).

Although the human body, at the various stages of its formation and development, and the simple discovery of one of its elements, including the sequence or partial sequence of a gene, cannot be patentable inventions (see G-II, 5.3), an element that is isolated from the human body or otherwise produced by means of a technical process and is susceptible of industrial application, including the sequence or partial sequence of a gene, may be a patentable invention, even if its structure is identical to that of a natural element. Such an element is not excluded from patentability on principle, since it is, for example, the result of technical processes used to identify, purify and classify it and to produce it outside the human body, techniques which human beings alone are capable of putting into practice and which nature is incapable of accomplishing itself (EU Dir. 98/44/EC, rec. 21).

Rule 29(1) and (2)

Rule 29(3)

A patent application or a patent for gene sequences or partial sequences must be examined on the basis of the same patentability criteria as apply in all other areas of technology (EU Dir. 98/44/EC, rec. 22). The industrial application of a sequence or partial sequence must be disclosed in the patent application as filed (see G-III, 4).

Rule 27(b)Rule 28(2)

- (ii) Plants or animals if the technical feasibility of the invention is not confined to a particular plant or animal variety and if the plants or animals are not exclusively obtained by means of an essentially biological process

Inventions which concern plants or animals are patentable if their application is not technically confined to a single plant or animal variety (EU Dir. 98/44/EC, rec. 29). However, the plants or animals in question must not be exclusively obtained by means of an essentially biological process (see G-II, 5.4).

The exclusion of plants and animals exclusively obtained by means of an essentially biological process applies to patent applications with a date of filing and/or a priority date after 1 July 2017. It does not apply to patents granted before 1 July 2017 or to pending patent applications with a date of filing and/or a priority date before that date (see G 3/19, OJ EPO 2020, A119).

If a technical feature of a claimed plant or animal, e.g. a single nucleotide exchange in the genome, can be the result of both a technical intervention (e.g. directed mutagenesis) and an essentially biological process (a natural allele), a disclaimer is needed to limit the claimed subject-matter to the technically produced product (see examples in G-II, 5.4.2.1 and G-II, 5.4). This applies only to patent applications with a date of filing and/or a priority date after 1 July 2017. It is not required for patents granted before 1 July 2017 or for pending patent applications with a date of filing and/or a priority date before that date (see G 3/19, OJ EPO 2020, A119). If, on the other hand, the feature in question can be obtained by technical intervention only, e.g. a transgene, no disclaimer is needed. For the general principles governing disclaimers, see H-V, 4.

Where the claimed subject-matter covers but does not identify plant varieties, the claim is not considered to be directed to a variety or varieties (see G 1/98, Reasons 3.8). If no specific plant variety is identified in a product claim, the subject-matter of the claimed invention is neither limited nor directed to a variety or varieties within the meaning of Art. 53(b) (G 1/98, Reasons 3.1 and 3.10) and is therefore not excluded from patentability. More detailed instructions on the exclusions of plant varieties can be found in G-II, 5.4.1.

Rule 27(c)

- (iii) A microbiological or other technical process, or a product obtained by means of such a process other than a plant or animal variety

Rule 26(6)

"Microbiological process" means any process involving, performed on or resulting in microbiological material.

5.3 List of exceptions (Rule 28)

For the area of biotechnological inventions, Rule 28 lays down the list of exceptions to patentability under Art. 53(a) and (b) set out below. The list falling under Art. 53(a) is illustrative and non-exhaustive and is to be seen as giving concrete form to the concept of "*ordre public*" and "morality" in this technical field. A possible immoral use is only to be taken into account if it is specifically considered or at least suggested in the application and so can be regarded as an avowed use (G-II, 4.1 and T 866/01).

According to Rule 28(2), plants and animals exclusively obtained by means of an essentially biological process are excluded from patentability. This exclusion of plants and animals exclusively obtained by means of an essentially biological process applies to patent applications with a date of filing and/or a priority date after 1 July 2017. It does not apply to patents granted before 1 July 2017 or to pending patent applications with a date of filing and/or a priority date before that date (see G 3/19, OJ EPO 2020, A119).

Under Art. 53(a), in conjunction with Rule 28(1), European patents are not to be granted for biotechnological inventions which concern: *Rule 28(1)*

- (i) Processes for cloning human beings *Rule 28(1)(a)*

For the purpose of this exception, a process for the cloning of human beings can be defined as any process, including techniques of embryo splitting, designed to create a human being with the same nuclear genetic information as another living or deceased human being (EU Dir. 98/44/EC, rec. 41).

- (ii) Processes for modifying the germ line genetic identity of human beings *Rule 28(1)(b)*

- (iii) Uses of human embryos for industrial or commercial purposes *Rule 28(1)(c)*

A claim directed to a product which at the date of filing of the application could be obtained **exclusively** by a method which necessarily involved the destruction of human embryos from which the product is derived is excluded from patentability under Rule 28(1)(c), even if the method is not part of the claim (see G 2/06). The point in time at which such destruction takes place is irrelevant (T 2221/10).

When examining subject-matter relating to human embryonic stem cells under Art. 53(a) and Rule 28(1)(c), the following has to be taken into account:

- (a) the **entire teaching** of the application, not only the claim category and wording, and
- (b) the **relevant disclosure in the description** in order to establish whether or not products such as stem cell cultures are obtained exclusively by a use of a human embryo that

involves its destruction. For this purpose, the disclosure of the description has to be considered in view of the state of the art at the date of filing.

An application concerning human pluripotent stem cells, including human embryonic stem cells, uses of such cells or products derived from them cannot be regarded as excluded from patentability under Art. 53(a) and Rule 28(1)(c) (T 0385/14) if (i) it has an effective date (i.e. a valid priority date or, if no priority is claimed or the priority is not valid, a date of filing) on or after 5 June 2003 and (ii) its technical teaching can be put into practice using human embryonic stem cells derived from parthenogenetically activated human oocytes. In such cases, any disclosure, embodiment, example or similar encompassing the use of human embryonic stem cells excluded from patentability under Art. 53(a) must be excised from the description or prominently marked as not being according to the claimed invention (e.g. by using the term "*reference* human embryonic stem cell") (see F-IV, 4.3).

Foetal and post-natal human cells are not excluded from patentability in principle.

Culture media, supports and apparatuses "suitable for" use with human embryonic cells, or even "specifically designed" for this purpose, are not per se excluded from patentability. Their production normally does not require the use of human embryos as base material.

The exclusion of the use of human embryos for industrial or commercial purposes does not affect inventions for therapeutic or diagnostic purposes which are applied to the human embryo and are useful to it (EU Dir. 98/44/EC, rec. 42).

Rule 28(1)(d)

- (iv) Processes for modifying the genetic identity of animals which are likely to cause them suffering without any substantial medical benefit to humans or animals, and also animals resulting from such processes

A claim directed to genetically modified animals or to processes for genetically modifying animals needs to meet the requirements of Rule 28(1)(d) and Art. 53(a) (see T 315/03 and T 19/90).

To fulfil the requirements of Rule 28(1)(d), the following needs to be established:

- (a) that the subject-matter in question concerns a process for modifying the genetic identity of animals or animals resulting from that process
- (b) the likelihood of animal suffering
- (c) the likelihood of substantial medical benefit and

- (d) the necessary correspondence between suffering and substantial medical benefit in terms of the animals claimed.

The likelihood of animal suffering and substantial medical benefit has to be established by applying the principle of the free evaluation of evidence (E-IV, 4.1).

For the purposes of Art. 53(a), the suffering of animals and possible risks to the environment are carefully weighed up against the invention's usefulness to humankind, to the extent that these two opposing aspects are supported by evidence (see T.19/90 and T.315/03).

The substantial medical benefit referred to above includes any benefit in terms of research, prevention, diagnosis or therapy (EU Dir. 98/44/EC, rec. 45).

The above must be applied to the whole scope of the claim.

For applications relating to non-genetically modified animals, in all cases where animal suffering or possible risks to the environment are involved, the invention's usefulness to humankind must be considered when carrying out the assessment under Art. 53(a) (T.1553/15).

The list of exceptions set out in Rule 28(1) is not exhaustive. Rather, Rule 28(1) provides essential guidance for interpreting the scope of Art. 53(a) concerning "ordre public" and morality. Rule 28(1), together with the articles and recitals of EU Dir. 98/44/EC as a supplementary means of interpretation under Rule 26(1), should be seen as a basis for assessment within a composite legal framework.

In this framework, neither source is regarded as providing an exhaustive and exclusive catalogue of exclusions.

The assessment of patentability under Art. 53(a) requires a careful analysis of the object and purpose of the exclusions set out in Rule 28(1) and EU Dir. 98/44/EC. Such assessment must be based on the evaluation of evidence, such as scientific publications, reflecting the state of the art on the effective date.

For example, based on the rationale underlying EU Dir. 98/44/EC rec. 38, Art. 53(a) in conjunction with Rule 28(1) exclude from patentability inventions relating to any human-animal chimeras where integration of human cells into the chimera's brain or germ line is a realistic possibility and not just a hypothetical one (T.1553/22).

In addition, the human body, at the various stages of its formation and development, and the simple discovery of one of its elements, including the sequence or partial sequence of a gene, cannot constitute patentable inventions (see, however, G-II, 5.2). Such stages in the formation or

Rule 29(1)

development of the human body include germ cells (EU Dir. 98/44/EC, rec. 16).

A parthenote is neither a human body at a stage of its formation and development nor one of its elements (i.e. human germ cell) and so, in principle, a parthenote or cells derived from one are not excluded from patentability under Rule 29(1).

5.4 Plant and animal varieties or essentially biological processes for the production of plants or animals

Art. 53(b)

The list of exceptions to patentability under Art. 53(b) also includes "plant or animal varieties or essentially biological processes for the production of plants or animals".

Rule 28(2)

Rule 28(2) excludes products (plants/animals and plant/animal parts) exclusively obtained by non-technical, i.e. essentially biological, processes. This exclusion of plants and animals exclusively obtained by means of an essentially biological process applies to patent applications with a date of filing and/or a priority date after 1 July 2017. It does not apply to patents granted before 1 July 2017 or to pending patent applications with a date of filing and/or a priority date before that date (see G 3/19, OJ EPO 2020, A119).

The exclusion covers plants and animals exclusively obtained by means of an essentially biological process that does not involve any direct technical intervention in the genome of the plants or animals, as the relevant parental plants or animals are merely crossed and the desired offspring is selected for. This is the case even if technical means are provided that enable or assist with the performance of the essentially biological steps. In contrast, plants or animals produced by a technical process which modifies the genetic characteristics of the plant or animal are patentable.

The term **exclusively** is used here to mean that a plant or animal originating from a technical process or characterised by a technical intervention in the genome is not covered by the exclusion from patentability even if a non-technical method (crossing and selection) is additionally applied in its production.

Determining whether a plant or animal is obtained by exclusively biological means entails examining whether there is a change in a heritable characteristic of the claimed organism which results from a technical process going beyond mere crossing and selection, i.e. one that does not merely enable or assist with the performance of the essentially biological process steps.

Transgenic plants and technically induced mutants are therefore patentable, while the products of conventional breeding are not.

Both targeted mutation, e.g. with CRISPR/Cas, and random mutagenesis such as UV-induced mutation are such technical processes. If the offspring of transgenic organisms or mutants also have the transgene or mutation,

they are not produced exclusively by an essentially biological method and are thus patentable.

For living matter to be patentable, it must also be possible to reproduce it in a way that has exactly the same technical features. For example, reproducibility can be ensured:

- (1) by a deposit of the living matter (seeds, microbiological strains). The deposited material must be publicly available and such that the invention can actually be reproduced starting from it. If, for example, a novel and inventive trait is due to a single transgene, a skilled person can reproduce the invention from a living sample. If, instead, the claimed trait is dependent on a large number of structurally undefined loci in the genome, these will segregate in subsequent generations and it will be an undue burden to reproduce the invention from the deposited sample (T 1957/14).
- (2) by disclosing in the application as filed the gene sequence responsible for the claimed trait together with instructions on how to reproducibly introduce by technical means such an altered sequence in a target organism (e.g. by CRISPR-Cas).

If a technical feature of a claimed plant or animal, e.g. a single nucleotide exchange in the genome, can be the result of either a technical intervention (e.g. directed mutagenesis) or an essentially biological process (a natural allele), a disclaimer is necessary to limit the claimed subject-matter to the technically produced product in order to comply with the requirements of Art. 53(b) and Rule 28(2). Otherwise the subject-matter is directed to excluded subject-matter and is to be refused on the basis of Art. 53(b) in conjunction with Rule 28(2). A disclaimer is required in all cases and, in particular, even if the description only mentions a technical method of production and is silent on the use of an essentially biological process. If, on the other hand, the feature in question can unambiguously be obtained by technical intervention only, e.g. a transgene, no disclaimer is needed.

This should apply also if such a disclaimer relates to subject-matter that was not disclosed in the application as filed. In such a case the disclaimer fulfils the requirements laid down in G 1/03, G 2/03 and G 1/16 because it is introduced to exclude subject-matter not eligible for patent protection (for the general principles governing disclaimers, see also H-V. 4).

Such a disclaimer is needed only for patent applications with a date of filing and/or a priority date after 1 July 2017. A disclaimer is not required for patents granted before 1 July 2017 or for pending patent applications with a date of filing and/or a priority date before that date (see G 3/19, OJ EPO 2020, A119).

The technical character of a claimed plant or animal product may lie in a non-heritable physical feature imparted directly to the claimed organism, e.g. a seed coated with a beneficial chemical.

The technical method of producing the plant or animal may be included in the claims, in the form of product-by-process claims (see [F-IV, 4.12](#)).

Plant products that are not propagation material, such as flour, sugars or fatty acids, have to be considered on the basis of their chemical properties only. As long as the general patentability requirements are fulfilled, it will therefore be irrelevant whether the subject-matter (e.g. a sugar molecule) is isolated from a product (e.g. a living plant) of an essentially biological process or is produced in a laboratory.

Examples are provided in [G-II, 5.4.2.1](#) below.

This exclusion of plants and animals exclusively obtained by means of an essentially biological process does not apply to patents granted before 1 July 2017 or to pending patent applications with a date of filing and/or a priority date before that date (see [G 3/19](#), [OJ EPO 2020, A119](#)).

For these applications and granted patents, the exclusion from patentability of essentially biological processes for the production of plants does not adversely affect the allowability of a product claim directed to plants or plant material such as seeds or other plant propagation material. This applies even if the only method available at the date of filing for generating the claimed plants or plant material is an essentially biological process for the production of plants, and even if the claimed product is defined in terms of such a process (product-by-process claim, see [F-IV, 4.12](#)). In this context it is irrelevant that the protection conferred by the product claim encompasses the generation of the claimed product by means of an essentially biological process for the production of plants (see [G 2/12](#) and [G 2/13](#)). The same principle applies *mutatis mutandis* to animals produced by means of essentially biological processes (see also [F-IV, 4.12](#)).

For patent applications with a date of filing and/or a priority date on or after 1 July 2017, if the technical characteristics of a claimed plant or animal are due to a technical step, the description must not contain any references to essentially biological methods (such as screening wild populations or conventional breeding) as an alternative method of obtaining the claimed plant or animal. Such references must be deleted because they are not commensurate with the scope of the claim. In addition to the disclaimer in the claims, the description has to be adapted to bring it into line with the claims (see [F-IV, 4.3](#)) but there is no need for an additional disclaimer in the description. In contrast, any mention of essentially biological processes to multiply or transfer a feature obtained by technical means, e.g. mutagenesis, can remain in the description, even though these processes cannot be claimed.

5.4.1 Plant varieties

The term "plant variety" is defined in [Rule 26\(4\)](#). A patent cannot be granted if the claimed subject-matter is directed to a specific plant variety or specific plant varieties. The method for the plant's production, be it by recombinant gene technology or by a classical plant breeding process, is irrelevant for considering this issue (see [T 1854/07](#)). This means that plant varieties containing genes introduced into an ancestral plant by

[Rule 26\(4\)](#)

[Rule 27\(b\)](#)

[Rule 28\(2\)](#)

recombinant gene technology are excluded from patentability (G 1/98). However, the invention is patentable if it concerns plants or animals which are not exclusively obtained by means of an essentially biological process (see G-II, 5.4, above and G 3/19), and if the technical feasibility of the invention is not confined to a particular plant or animal variety (see G-II, 5.2).

A claimed plant grouping is not excluded from patentability under Art. 53(b) if it does not meet the definition of a plant variety set out in Rule 26(4).

Art. 64(2) is not to be taken into consideration when examining a claim to a process for the production of a plant variety (see G 1/98). This means that a process claim for the production of a plant variety (or plant varieties) which is not exclusively essentially biological is not excluded from patentability merely because the resulting product constitutes or may constitute a plant variety.

Controlled hybrids with inbred parents are excluded from patentability under Art. 53(b), as they define either a seed or a plant which necessarily belongs to a particular plant grouping within the meaning of plant variety as defined in Rule 26(4).

A claim cannot escape the exclusion of plant varieties under Art. 53(b) by comprising a large number or even hundreds of varieties. Only if the claimed subject-matter comprises at least one embodiment which does not constitute a variety is the claim allowable under Art. 53(b) (see T 1208/12). For instance, a claim directed to a hybrid of a specific deposited Brassica variety with any high-yielding Brassica variety results in a non-patentable Brassica hybrid variety.

5.4.2 Essentially biological processes for the production of plants or animals

A process for the production of plants or animals which is based on the sexual crossing of whole genomes and on the subsequent selection of plants or animals is considered to be essentially biological and so excluded from patentability. This applies even if the process comprises human intervention, including the provision of technical means, that enables or assists with the performance of the process steps or if other technical steps relating to the preparation of the plant or animal or its further treatment are mentioned in the claim before or after the crossing and selection steps (see G 1/08 and G 2/07). *Rule 26(5).*

To take some examples, a method of crossing, interbreeding or selectively breeding, say, horses that involves merely selecting for breeding and bringing together those animals (or their gametes) with certain characteristics would be essentially biological and therefore excluded from patentability. Selfing of a transgenic plant is also excluded from patentability because, like crossing, it is the mixing of entire genomes. These methods remain essentially biological and thus excluded from patentability even if they contain an additional feature of a technical nature, for example the use of genetic molecular markers to select either parent or progeny. Patent protection is available for any such additional technical

steps per se which are performed either before or after the process of crossing and selection. However, such steps are ignored when determining whether or not the process as a whole is excluded from patentability under Art. 53(b) EPC (see G 1/08, G 2/07).

However, if a process of sexual crossing and selection includes an additional step of a technical nature that by itself introduces a trait into the genome of the produced plant or modifies a trait in its genome, so that the introduction or modification of that trait is not the result of the mixing of the genes of the plants chosen for sexual crossing, then the process is not excluded from patentability under Art. 53(b) but qualifies as a potentially patentable technical teaching (see G 1/08, G 2/07).

Genetic engineering techniques applied to plants which differ profoundly from conventional breeding techniques in that they work primarily through the purposeful insertion and/or modification of one or more genes in a plant are patentable (see T 356/93). However, in such cases the claims must not, explicitly or implicitly, include the sexual crossing and selection process.

Processes for selecting plants or animals using genetic molecular markers without crossing the plants or animals are not excluded from patentability. Technical means, such as genetic molecular markers, used in such processes are not excluded either.

A process for producing triploid seedless melon fruit which involves the pollination of sterile female flowers of a triploid plant, unable to carry out successful meiosis, with pollen of the diploid polliniser plant and which therefore does not concern sexually crossing two whole genomes of plants (implying meiosis and fertilisation) and the subsequent selection of plants is not an essentially biological process and so is not excluded from patentability (T 1729/06).

A process of treating a plant or animal to improve its properties or yield or to promote or suppress its growth, e.g. a method of pruning a tree, would not be an essentially biological process for the production of plants or animals since it is not based on the sexual crossing of whole genomes and subsequent selection of plants or animals. The same applies to a method of treating a plant characterised by the application of a growth-stimulating substance or radiation. The treatment of soil by technical means to suppress or promote the growth of plants is also not excluded from patentability (see also G-II, 4.2.1).

Claims to breeding methods which do not explicitly refer to either a crossing or selection step, even though such a step is an essential feature, lack clarity and support (Art. 84).

The abbreviation NBT stands for "new breeding techniques". This is not a technical term, but a general one which is used for a variety of methods, some clearly technical but others either comprising or consisting of essentially biological processes. It is therefore not a suitable basis for establishing whether claimed subject-matter is allowable under Art. 53(b) and it has no relevance in terms of patentability.

5.4.2.1 Examples

The following subject-matter relates to essentially biological processes excluded from patentability:

- Method for the production of plants having trait X comprising crossing plants A and B and selecting progeny having marker X.
- Use of a (transgenic) plant for generating further plants by crossing and selection.
- Use of a (transgenic) animal for breeding.
- Introgression of a (transgenic) gene X into a plant, i.e. introducing it into the genome by crossing and selection.
- Methods for plant breeding by crossing of whole genomes and selection of plants comprising the step of embryo rescue.

The following subject-matter relates to products exclusively obtained by means of an essentially biological process which are excluded from patentability where the application in question has a date of filing or priority date after 1 July 2017 (see G 3/19):

- A plant produced by introgression of gene A, i.e. by introducing it into the genome by crossing and selection.
- A plant produced exclusively by crossing and selection, wherein molecular markers are used to assist the selection process.
- A plant part obtained exclusively by means of an essentially biological process which is propagation material, e.g. a seed or plant embryo.
- A cultivated pepper plant expressing a mutant AHAS enzyme

The following subject-matter is not excluded from patentability under Art. 53(b):

- Method of producing a (transgenic) plant having trait X comprising introducing by transformation a vector comprising the sequence of SEQ ID NO: 1.
- Method for selecting animals having phenotype Y by screening for the presence of a marker having the sequence shown in SEQ ID NO: 1.
- Use of the nucleic acid of SEQ ID NO: 1 to select a plant having trait X.
- A mutant of a plant carrying a heritable exchange in a nucleotide sequence effected by technical means, e.g. UV mutagenesis or

CRISPR/Cas with the proviso that the plant is not exclusively obtained by means of an essentially biological process (EBP).

- A transgenic plant carrying transgene X.
- Progeny of a mutant (wherein the mutant is not exclusively produced by EBP) or a transgenic plant which carries the mutation/the transgene.
- A seed of a wild-type plant covered with a chemical which inhibits fungal growth.
- Flour or oil produced from plant X (even if it is apparent from the description that the plant was exclusively obtained by means of an essentially biological method).

5.5 Microbiological processes

5.5.1 General remarks

Art. 53(b)
Rule 26(6)

As expressly stated in Art. 53(b), second clause, the exception referred to in the first clause does not apply to microbiological processes or their products.

"Microbiological process" means any process involving or performed on or resulting in microbiological material. The term "microbiological process" is to be interpreted as covering not only processes performed on microbiological material or resulting in such material, e.g. by genetic engineering, but also processes which as claimed include both microbiological and non-microbiological steps.

Rule 27(c)

The product of a microbiological process may also be patentable per se (product claim). Propagation of the microorganism itself is to be construed as a microbiological process for the purposes of Art. 53(b). Consequently, the microorganism can be protected per se as it is a product obtained by a microbiological process (see G-II, 3.1). The term "microorganism" includes bacteria and other generally unicellular organisms with dimensions beneath the limits of vision which can be propagated and manipulated in a laboratory (see T 356/93), including plasmids and viruses and unicellular fungi (including yeasts), algae, protozoa and, moreover, human, animal and plant cells. Isolated plant or animal cells or in vitro plant or animal cell cultures are treated as microorganisms, since cells are comparable to unicellular organisms (G 1/98, Reasons 5.2).

On the other hand, product claims for plant or animal varieties cannot be allowed even if the variety is produced by means of a microbiological process (Rule 27(c)). The exception to patentability in Art. 53(b), first clause, applies to plant varieties irrespective of how they are produced.

However, plant cells or tissues are usually totipotent and able to regenerate the full plant. Therefore, even if plant cells or cell cultures may be regarded as the product of a microbiological process, plant material which is able to propagate the full plant is excluded from patentability if the plant from which

the material originates has been exclusively produced by an essentially biological process (G 3/19) (for the meaning of the term "exclusively" in relation, for example, to offspring of transgenic organisms or mutants, see G-II, 5.4). This exclusion does not apply to patents granted before 1 July 2017 or to pending patent applications with a date of filing and/or a priority date before then (see G 3/19, XXIX).

5.5.2 Repeatability of results of microbiological processes

In the case of microbiological processes, special attention must be given to the requirement of repeatability referred to in F-III, 3. If biological material has been deposited in accordance with Rule 31, repeatability is ensured by the possibility of taking samples (Rule 33(1)), and so there is no need to specify any other process for producing the material.

Rule 33(1)

6. Antibodies

6.1 General remarks

Antibodies exist in a number of different formats. The most frequently used format is an immunoglobulin G (IgG), which is a large, Y-shaped protein composed of two identical light chains and two identical heavy chains, both containing variable and constant domains. Antibodies bind specifically to antigen targets via the antigen-binding region, which contains complementarity-determining regions (CDRs). In the case of an IgG, the antigen-binding region consists of a heavy and a light chain variable domain, each variable domain having three CDRs.

Other immunoglobulin structures are also known, such as heavy-chain-only antibodies that consist of only two identical heavy chains (with variable and constant domains) and have an antigen-binding region consisting of a single variable domain with only three CDRs.

Thanks to knowledge of the structure-function relationships of antibody parts, it has been possible to create antibody derivatives for a multitude of applications. These include antibody fragments, bispecific or multispecific antibodies and antibody fusion products.

In general, antibodies can be defined by (but are not limited to):

- (a) their own structure (amino acid sequences)
- (b) nucleic acid sequences encoding the antibody
- (c) reference to the target antigen
- (d) target antigen and further functional features
- (e) functional and structural features
- (f) the production process
- (g) the hybridoma producing the antibody.

6.1.1 Definition by structure of the antibody

In order to fulfil the requirements of Art. 84, the structural definition of an antibody must contain at least the sequence of each of the CDRs required for binding to the antigen, which, in the case of an IgG, is CDRs 1-3 of each of the variable domains.

If an IgG is defined by fewer than its six CDRs, the claim must be objected to under Art. 84 because it lacks essential technical features, unless it is experimentally shown that one or more of the six CDRs do not interact with the antigen.

If CDRs are not defined by their specific sequence, but by reference to a larger heavy or light chain sequence, the numbering scheme, e.g. Kabat, Chothia or IMGT, must also be indicated.

6.1.2 Definition by reference to the target antigen

An antibody can be functionally defined by the antigen it binds to, as long as the antigen is clearly defined in the claims. If the antigen is defined by a protein sequence, its definition must not use any sequence variability or open wording (e.g. "an antigen comprising ..."). Otherwise the claimed subject-matter will be considered to lack novelty over any known antibody because existing antibodies will bind to the undefined region of the target antigen.

Examples of accepted antigen-defined antibody claim wording are:

- antibody binding to X
- anti-X antibody
- antibody reacting with X
- antibody specific for antigen X or
- antibody binding to antigen X consisting of the sequence defined by SEQ. ID. NO: y.

An antibody can also be defined by its ability to bind to a well-defined antigen in combination with a negative feature, for example: "Antibody binding to antigen X and not binding to antigen Y".

6.1.3 Definition by target antigen and further functional features

In addition to being functionally defined by their target antigen, antibodies can be further characterised by functional features defining their other properties, for example binding affinity, neutralising properties, induction of apoptosis, internalisation, inhibition or activation of receptors.

An antibody may also be claimed by reference to its epitope, i.e. the structurally defined part of the antigen that it specifically binds to. Claims are sometimes directed to antibodies defined by their ability to compete with a reference antibody which is disclosed for the first time in the application. However, this property will normally not be sufficient to identify

antibodies in the state of the art. In such cases, a complete search cannot be carried out (B-VIII, 3) and an invitation under Rule 63(1) to indicate subject-matter for search is sent (B-VIII, 3.1).

In all these cases, if there is no indication to the contrary, it is to be assumed that a prior-art antibody binding the same target antigen will have the claimed functional properties. A novelty objection may therefore be raised and the burden of proof lies with the applicant (cf. G-VI, 5).

The application must enable the skilled person to produce further antibodies having the claimed functional property without undue burden (see F-III, 1 and 4). In addition, the functional definition must allow the skilled person to easily and unambiguously verify whether they are working inside or outside the scope of the claim. The claim should therefore normally include the relevant characteristics of the method used to determine and define the functional property (see F-IV, 4.11).

6.1.4 Definition by functional and structural features

Antibodies can also be defined by both functional properties and structural features. It is possible to claim an antibody characterised by the sequences of both variable domains or CDRs with less than 100% sequence identity when combined with a clear functional feature.

6.1.5 Definition by production process

Antibodies can be defined by the process of their production, i.e. either by the immunisation protocol of a non-human animal with a well-characterised antigen or by the specific cell line used to produce them (for more details, see F-IV, 4.12).

However, if such a product by process definition is based on the immunisation by an antigen comprising a sequence less than 100% identical to a defined sequence, it does not fulfil the requirements of Art. 84, because the use of variants renders the scope of the antibodies obtained by the immunisation process unclear.

6.1.6 Definition by hybridoma

Antibodies may also be defined by a deposited hybridoma cell producing the antibodies. The general requirements for deposited biological materials apply (see F-III, 6.3).

6.2 Inventive step of antibodies

The subject-matter of a claim defining a novel antibody binding to a known antigen involves an inventive step if the application shows a surprising technical effect or there was no reasonable expectation of success in obtaining antibodies having the required properties (see G-VII, 13). Examples of surprising technical effects include an unexpected improvement over prior art antibodies in one or more properties, such as therapeutic activity, stability or immunogenicity, or an unexpected property not exhibited by prior art antibodies. In addition, subject-matter relating to antibodies can be inventive if the application overcomes technical difficulties in generating or manufacturing those antibodies. A novel type of functional antibody format may also be considered inventive.

However, inventive step cannot be established solely on the basis that an antibody is structurally different from the prior art antibodies. Arriving at alternative antibodies exclusively by applying techniques known in the art is considered to be obvious to the skilled person. The fact that an antibody's structure, i.e. its amino acid sequence, is not predictable is not a reason for considering the antibody to be nonobvious (see T.605/14, section 24; T.187/04, section 11).

Chapter III – Industrial application

1. General remarks

"An invention shall be considered as susceptible of industrial application if it can be made or used in any kind of industry, including agriculture". *Art. 57*
"Industry" is understood in its broad sense as including any physical activity of "technical character" (see *G-I, 1*), i.e. an activity which belongs to the useful or practical arts as distinct from the aesthetic arts. It does not necessarily imply using a machine or manufacturing an article and could cover e.g. a process for dispersing fog or for converting energy from one form to another. *Art. 57* thus excludes from patentability very few "inventions" which are not already excluded by the list in *Art. 52(2)* (see *F-II, 1*). One other class of "invention" which would be excluded, however, would be articles or processes alleged to operate in a manner clearly contrary to well-established physical laws, e.g. a perpetual motion machine. An objection under *Art. 57* could be raised only in so far as the claim specifies the invention's intended function or purpose, but if, say, a perpetual motion machine is claimed merely as an article constructed in a particular specified way, then an objection is made under *Art. 83* instead (see *F-III, 3*).

2. Method of testing

Methods of testing generally are regarded as inventions susceptible of industrial application and therefore patentable if the test is applicable to the improvement or control of a product, apparatus or process which is itself susceptible of industrial application. In particular, using test animals for test purposes in industry, for instance to test industrial products (e.g. to establish that there are no pyrogenetic or allergic effects) or phenomena (e.g. to determine water or air pollution), would be patentable.

3. Industrial application vs. exclusion under *Art. 52(2)*

Meeting the requirement "susceptible of industrial application" does not override the restriction imposed by *Art. 52(2)*. For example, an administrative method of stock control is not patentable, having regard to *Art. 52(2)(c)*, even though it could be applied to the factory storeroom for spare parts. On the other hand, although an invention must be "susceptible of industrial application" and the description must, where this is not obvious, state how it can be industrially applied (see *F-II, 4.9*), the claims do not necessarily need to be restricted to the industrial application or applications.

4. Sequences and partial sequences of genes

As a general rule, the description of a European patent application must state how the invention is capable of exploitation in industry unless this is self-evident. The invention claimed must have such a sound and concrete technical basis that the skilled person can recognise that its contribution to the art could lead to practical exploitation in industry (see *T 898/05*). This general requirement takes a specific form in cases of a sequence or partial sequence of a gene in that its industrial application must be disclosed in the patent application. A mere nucleic acid sequence without indication of a function is not a patentable invention (EU Dir. 98/44/EC, rec. 23). Where a sequence or partial sequence of a gene is used to produce a protein or a

Rule 42(1)(f)
Rule 29(3)

part of a protein, it is necessary to specify which protein or part of a protein is produced and what function it performs. Where a nucleotide sequence is not used to produce a protein or part of a protein, the function to be indicated could be, for example, that it exhibits a certain transcription promoter activity.

Chapter IV – State of the art

1. General remarks and definition

An invention is "considered to be new if it does not form part of the state of the art". The "state of the art" is defined as "everything made available to the public by means of a written or oral description, by use, or in any other way, before the date of filing of the European patent application". It is important to note the broad scope of this definition. There are no restrictions whatsoever as to the geographical location where the information in question was made available to the public or as to how or in what language it was made available. Nor is any age limit stipulated for the documents or other sources of the information. There are nevertheless some specific exceptions (see G-V). However, since the "state of the art" available to the examiner will mainly consist of the documents listed in the search report, G-IV, 3 to 6, deals with the question of public availability only in relation to written description (either alone or in combination with an earlier oral description or use).

Art. 54(1) and (2)

The principles to be applied in determining whether other kinds of prior art (which could be introduced into the proceedings e.g. by a third party under Art. 115) have been made available to the public are set out in G-IV, 7.1 to 7.4.

For the examination of the novelty of claimed subject-matter, see G-VI.

Art. 52(1)

A written description, i.e. a document, is regarded as made available to the public if, at the relevant date, it was possible for members of the public to gain knowledge of its content and there was no duty of confidentiality restricting the use or dissemination of this knowledge. For instance, German utility models ("Gebrauchsmuster") are already publicly available as of their date of entry in the Register of utility models ("Eintragungstag"), which comes before the date of their announcement in the Patent Bulletin ("Bekanntmachung im Patentblatt"). The search report also cites documents where doubts about whether they were publicly available (on "in-house state of the art", see F-II, 4.3) and doubts about their precise publication date (see B-VI, 5.6 and G-IV, 7.5) have not or have only partially been removed (see B-VI, 5.6 and G-IV, 7.5).

If the applicant contests the cited document's public availability or its assumed publication date, the examiner needs to consider whether to investigate the matter further. If the applicant shows sound reasons for doubting whether the document forms part of the "state of the art" relevant for the application and any further investigation does not produce evidence sufficient to remove that doubt, the examiner does not pursue the matter. The only other problem likely to arise for the examiner is where:

- (i) a document reproduces an oral description (e.g. a public lecture) or gives an account of a prior use (e.g. display at a public exhibition) and

- (ii) only the oral description or lecture was publicly available before the "date of filing" of the European application, while the document itself was published on or after this date.

In such cases, the examiner initially assumes that the document gives a true account of the earlier lecture, display or other event and therefore regards the earlier event as forming part of the "state of the art". If, however, the applicant gives sound reasons for contesting the truth of the account given in the document, the examiner does not pursue the matter.

2. Enabling disclosure

Subject-matter described by documentary evidence, i.e. in written, oral or pictorial form, can be regarded as having been made available to the public, and therefore as forming part of the state of the art within the meaning of Art. 54(1), only if the information given is sufficient to enable the skilled person, at the relevant date (see G-VI, 3) and taking into account the common general knowledge in the field at that time, to put the disclosed technical teaching into practice (see T 26/85, T 206/83 and T 491/99).

A product put on the market before the date of filing of a European patent application cannot be excluded from the state of the art within the meaning of Art. 54(2) for the sole reason that its composition or internal structure could not be analysed and reproduced by the skilled person before that date (G 1/23, order 1). The requirement of reproducibility (enablement, see G 1/23, summary V) is inherently fulfilled, as it is satisfied by the skilled person's ability to obtain and possess the marketed product (G 1/23, reason 73). A product put on the market is thus part of the state of the art and all analysable properties of that product are also part of the state of the art (G 1/23, Reasons 74 and 91). In this context, the term "product put on the market" includes man-made products as well as naturally occurring materials (G 1/23, Reasons 30). Such products are usually relied upon as prior use, see G-IV, 7.2. Technical information about such a product (e.g. a technical brochure, non-patent or patent literature) which was made available to the public before the filing date forms part of the state of the art within the meaning of Art. 54(2), irrespective of whether the skilled person could analyse and reproduce the product and its composition or internal structure before that date (G 1/23, order 2). Where a prior-art document discloses subject-matter which is relevant to the novelty and/or inventive step of the claimed invention, the disclosure of that document must be such that the skilled person can reproduce that subject-matter using common general knowledge (see G-VII, 3.1). Subject-matter is not necessarily common general knowledge simply because it has been disclosed in the state of the art: in particular, if the information can only be obtained after a comprehensive search, it cannot be considered common general knowledge and cannot be used to complete the disclosure (see T 206/83).

For example, a document discloses a chemical compound (identified by name or by structural formula), indicating that the compound may be produced by a process defined in the document itself. It does not, however, indicate how to obtain the starting materials and/or reagents used in the process. If, moreover, the skilled person cannot obtain these starting materials or reagents on the basis of common general knowledge

(e.g. from textbooks, by purchasing them or taking from nature, see G 1/23), the document is insufficiently disclosed with respect to that compound. As a result, it is not considered to form part of the state of the art under Art. 54(2) (at least in so far as it relates to that compound) and so does not prejudice the patentability of the claimed invention.

If, on the other hand, the skilled person knows how to obtain the starting materials and reagents (e.g. they are commercially available, or are well-known and appear in reference textbooks, or can be taken from nature, see G 1/23), the document is sufficiently disclosed with respect to the compound and is therefore state of the art under Art. 54(2). The examiner can then validly rely on it to raise objections to the claimed invention.

For the enabling disclosure of preclinical data and clinical trials, see G-VI, 6.1.2.1.

3. Date of filing or priority date as effective date

For the purposes of Art. 54(2) and (3), the date of priority counts as the date of filing for both the European application being examined and conflicting European applications under Art. 54(3), on condition that the priority in question is valid (Art. 89). Different claims, or alternatives claimed in one claim, can have different effective dates, i.e. the date of filing or (one of) the claimed priority date(s). The question of novelty must be considered against each claim (or part of a claim). The state of the art in relation to one claim or one part of a claim may include matter, e.g. an intermediate document (see B-X, 9.2.4), which cannot be cited against another claim or another alternative subject-matter encompassed by the same claim because it has an earlier effective date.

Art. 89

The priority right of the application being examined or the patent being opposed may also be lost as a result of failure to provide a translation of the priority document when requested in accordance with Rule 53(3) (see A-III, 6.8 and subsections).

Of course, if all the matter in the state of the art was made available to the public before the date of the earliest priority document, the examiner need not (and must not) be concerned with allocating effective dates.

If the applicant files missing parts of the description, or drawings (see A-II, 5.1), late under Rule 56, the date of their filing is the date accorded to the application under Rule 56(2) (see A-II, 5.3) unless they are completely contained in the priority document and the requirements laid down in Rule 56(3) are satisfied (see A-II, 5.4), in which case the original date of filing is maintained. So the date of the application as a whole is either the date of filing of the missing elements or the original date of filing. In the case of erroneously filed documents, the same applies if the applicant files a correct description, claims or drawings, or parts of them, under Rule 56a (see A-II, 6).

Rule 56
Rule 56a

Rule 58

Claims filed in response to a communication under Rule 58 do not result in a change in the date of filing of the application (see A-III, 15), as they are treated as amendments to the application as filed (see H-IV, 2.2.4).

4. Documents in a non-official language

If the applicant

- (i) disputes the relevance of a document in a non-official language cited in the search report (for procedure at the search stage, see B-X, 9.1.2 and 9.1.3) and
- (ii) gives specific reasons,

the examiner needs to consider whether, in the light of these reasons and of the other prior art available, pursuing the matter is justified. If so, the examiner must obtain a translation of the document (or just the relevant part of it if that can be easily identified). If, after the translation, the document remains relevant, the examiner sends a copy of the translation to the applicant with the next official communication.

A translation of a document in a non-official language must be provided even if the applicant is proficient in that language. The translation enables the boards of appeal to examine whether the examining division's decision was justified (T 655/13).

4.1 Machine translations

In order to overcome the language barrier posed by a document in an unfamiliar non-official language, it might be appropriate for the examiner to rely on a machine translation of the document (see T 991/01), which is sent to the applicant (see B-X, 9.1.3). If only part of the translated document is relevant, the particular passage relied on must be identified (see B-XI, 3.2). A translation has to serve the purpose of rendering the meaning of the text in a familiar language (see B-X, 9.1.3). Mere grammatical or syntactical errors which have no impact on whether the content can be understood do not disqualify it as a translation (see T 287/98).

A general statement that machine translations as such cannot be trusted is not sufficient to invalidate the translation's probatory value. If a party objects to the use of a specific machine translation, that party bears the burden of adducing evidence (e.g. a better translation of the whole document or of its relevant parts) that shows to what extent its quality is defective and should therefore not be relied on.

If the party provides substantiated reasoning for questioning the objections raised on the basis of the translated text, the examiner must take these reasons into account in the same way as when the publication date is questioned (see G-IV, 7.5.3).

5. Conflict with other European applications

5.1 State of the art pursuant to Art. 54(3)

The state of the art also comprises the content of other European applications filed or validly claiming a priority date earlier than – but published under Art. 93 on or after – the date of filing or valid priority date of the application being examined. The priority date counts as the date of filing for both the European application being examined and conflicting European applications under Art. 54(3), on condition that the priority is valid (Art. 89). Such earlier applications are part of the state of the art only when considering novelty and not when considering inventive step. The "content" of a European application means the whole disclosure, i.e. the description, drawings and claims, including:

Art. 54(3)

Art. 56

Art. 85

Art. 89

- (i) any matter explicitly disclaimed (with the exception of disclaimers for unworkable embodiments)
- (ii) any matter for which an allowable reference (see F-III, 8, penultimate paragraph) to other documents is made
- (iii) prior art in so far as it is explicitly described.

However, the "content" does not include any priority document (the purpose of such document being merely to determine to what extent the priority date is valid for the disclosure of the European application (see F-VI, 1.2)) or, in view of Art. 85, the abstract (see F-II, 2).

It is important to note that it is the content of the earlier application as filed which is to be considered when applying Art. 54(3). Where an application is filed in a non-official language, as permitted by Art. 14(2) (see A-VII, 1.1), it can happen that some content is erroneously omitted from the translation into the language of the proceedings and not published under Art. 93 in that language. Even then, it is the content of the original text which is relevant for the purposes of Art. 54(3).

5.1.1 Requirements

Whether a published European application can be considered a conflicting application under Art. 54(3) is determined firstly by its date of filing, which must be before the date of filing or valid priority date of the application under examination, and its publication date, which must be on or after that date of filing or priority date. If the published European application validly claims priority, the priority date replaces the date of filing (Art. 89) for that subject-matter in the application which corresponds to the priority application. If a priority claim was abandoned or otherwise lost with effect from a date before publication, it is the date of filing, and not the priority date, that is relevant, irrespective of whether or not the priority claim might have conferred a valid priority right.

In addition, the conflicting application must have been still pending on its publication date (see J 5/81). If the application was withdrawn or otherwise lost before the publication date but nevertheless published because the preparations for publication had been completed, the publication has no

effect under Art. 54(3), but only under Art. 54(2). Art. 54(3) must be interpreted as referring to the publication of a "valid" application, i.e. a European patent application in existence on its publication date.

Changes taking effect after the date of publication (e.g. withdrawal of a designation or withdrawal of the priority claim or loss of the priority right for other reasons) do not affect the application of Art. 54(3) (see H-III, 4.2 for transitional provisions concerning Art. 54(4) EPC 1973 and A-III, 11.1 and 11.3 for transitional arrangements concerning non-payment of designation fees for applications filed before 1 April 2009).

5.1.2 Accorded date of filing and content of the application still subject to review

The prior art considered by the examiner may comprise documents (European or international patent applications) whose accorded date of filing and content on the date of filing are still being reviewed by the EPO, e.g. when:

- (i) a European patent application contains parts of the description and/or drawings filed under Rule 56 or (parts of) claims, description and/or drawings filed under Rule 56a, or
- (ii) an international patent application contains elements or parts of the description, drawings or claims filed under Rule 20.5, 20.5bis or 20.6 PCT.

The examiner checks whether a final decision on the accorded date of filing and the application's content on the date of filing has already been taken before considering the documents to be state of the art under Art. 54(3). The content determined in accordance with Rules 56 or 56a EPC or Rules 20.5, 20.5bis or 20.6 PCT is considered to be the content of the application as filed within the meaning of Art. 54(3) EPC. Note that under Rule 56a(4) EPC and Rule 20.5bis(d) PCT, the erroneously filed application documents or parts remain in the application (see A-II, 6.4 and PCT-EPO Guidelines A-II, 6.2).

If the date of filing and/or the content of the disclosure have/has not yet finally been determined, the examiner provisionally deals with the documents (if relevant for assessing the patentability of the claimed subject-matter) as if all application documents and parts of them had been filed on the date of filing initially accorded to the application and revisits the issue later.

5.2 Euro-PCT applications

The above principles also apply to PCT applications designating EP, but with an important difference. Art. 153(5), in conjunction with Rule 165, makes it clear that a PCT application is included in the state of the art for the purposes of Art. 54(3) if the PCT applicant has paid the required filing fee under Rule 159(1)(c) and has supplied the PCT application to the EPO in English, French or German (this means that a translation is required where the PCT application was published in Japanese, Chinese, Spanish, Russian, Korean, Portuguese or Arabic).

Art. 153
Rule 165

Therefore, not all the conditions for entry into the European phase have to be fulfilled for a Euro-PCT application to be considered a conflicting European application under Art. 54(3) EPC.

5.3 Commonly designated states

See H-III, 4.2 for the transitional applicability of Art. 54(4) EPC 1973 to applications which were pending on 13 December 2007 and patents which had already been granted on that date.

5.4 Double patenting

As acknowledged by the Enlarged Board, the prohibition on double patenting is applicable under Art. 125 (G 4/19). It is a principle of procedural law generally recognised in the majority of contracting states that two patents cannot be granted to the same applicant with claims directed to the same subject-matter.

In line with that, a European patent application can be refused under Art. 97(2) if it claims the same subject-matter as a European patent that has been granted to the same applicant and does not form part of the state of the art pursuant to Art. 54(2) and (3). This would especially be the case in the following typical situations: two applications filed on the same day, parent and divisional applications, or an application and its priority application.

An applicant can be allowed to proceed with an application that has the same description as a patent already granted to them as long as it does not claim the same subject-matter (see also T 2461/10). However, when, for example, the subject-matter of claim 1 in an application is the same as that of a dependent claim in a granted patent held by the same applicant, an objection of double patenting will be raised (see T 1128/19). Where two or more European applications from the same applicant designate the same state or states and their claims have the same filing or priority date and relate to the same invention, the applicant must amend one or more of the applications so that the subject-matter of their claims is no longer the same, withdraw overlapping designations or choose which one of those applications is to proceed to grant. Otherwise, once one of the applications has been granted, the others will be refused under Art. 97(2) in conjunction with Art. 125 (G 4/19). If the claims of those applications only partially overlap, no objection should be raised (see T 877/06). If two applications with the same effective date are received from two different applicants, each must be allowed to proceed as though the other did not exist.

6. Conflict with national rights of earlier date

Where there is a national right of an earlier date in a contracting state designated in the application, applicants have several amendment options. First, they can withdraw the designation of that contracting state from the application. Second, they can file claims for that state which are different from the claims for the other designated states (see H-II, 3.3 and H-III, 4.4). Third, they can limit the existing set of claims in a way that makes the earlier national right irrelevant.

Rule 138

In opposition or limitation proceedings, the proprietor may file claims differing from the claims for the other contracting states or limit the existing set of claims in a way that makes the earlier national right irrelevant (see [H-III, 4.4](#) and [D-X, 10.1](#)).

In opposition proceedings, the proprietor may also request revocation of the patent for the contracting state where there is an earlier national right (see [D-I, 3](#); [D-VIII, 1.2.5](#); [E-VIII, 8.4](#)). However, this is not possible in limitation or revocation proceedings (see [D-X, 3](#)).

Amending the application to take account of prior national rights is not to be required or suggested (see also [H-III, 4.4](#)). However, if the claims have been amended, amending the description and drawings is to be required if necessary to avoid confusion.

7. State of the art made available to the public "by means of a written or oral description, by use, or in any other way"

7.1 Types of use and instances of state of the art made available in any other way

Use can take the form of producing, offering, marketing or otherwise exploiting a product, of offering or marketing a process or its application or of applying the process. Marketing can take the form, for example, of a sale or exchange.

The state of the art can also be made available to the public in other ways, for example by demonstrating an object or process in specialist training courses or on online media platforms.

Availability to the public in any other way also includes all possibilities which technological progress may subsequently offer of making the aspect of the state of the art concerned available.

Instances of public prior use or availability in any other way will typically be invoked in opposition proceedings. While possible, they will rarely be an issue in examination proceedings.

7.2 Matters to be determined by the division as regards prior use

When dealing with an allegation that an object or process has been used in such a way that it is comprised in the state of the art (prior use), the division will have to determine the following details:

- (i) the date on which the alleged use occurred, i.e. whether there was any instance of use before the relevant date (prior use);
- (ii) what was used, in order to determine the degree of similarity between the object used and the subject-matter of the European patent; and
- (iii) all the circumstances relating to the use, e.g. where and in what form, in order to determine whether and to what extent it was made available to the public. These factors are important because the

details of, for example, a demonstration of a manufacturing process in a factory or the delivery and sale of a product may well provide information as regards whether it is possible that the subject-matter became available to the public.

Based on the submissions and the evidence already available, e.g. documents confirming sale, or affidavits related to the prior use, the division will first establish the relevance of the alleged prior use. If, based on this assessment, it considers that the prior use is sufficiently substantiated and relevant, and if the prior use is not contested, it may take a decision using the submissions and the evidence already available. If the prior use or certain circumstances relating to it are contested, the division will need to take further evidence (e.g. by hearing witnesses or performing an inspection) for those facts which are relevant but cannot yet be considered proven on the basis of the evidence already submitted. Depending on the circumstances of the individual case, this further evidence may have to be submitted by the party or parties. Evidence is always taken with the participation of the party or parties, normally at oral proceedings. For details on means of evidence, see E-IV.1.2.

7.2.1 General principles

Subject-matter is regarded as having been made available to the public by use or in any other way if, on the relevant date, it was possible for members of the public to gain knowledge of it and there was no duty of confidentiality restricting the use or dissemination of this knowledge (see also G-IV.1 on written descriptions). This may, for example, be the case if an object is unconditionally sold to a member of the public, since the buyer thereby acquires unlimited possession of any knowledge which may be obtained from the object. Even where in such cases the object's specific features cannot be ascertained from an external examination, but only by further analysis, those features are nevertheless to be regarded as having been made available to the public. Identical reproducibility or enabling disclosure of a product put on the market is not required for it to be accepted as part of the state of the art (see G.1/23). Nor does it matter whether particular reasons can be identified for analysing the object's composition or internal structure. These specific features only relate to the intrinsic features. Extrinsic characteristics, which are only revealed when the product is exposed to interaction with specifically chosen outside conditions, e.g. reactants or the like, in order to provide a particular effect or result or to discover potential results or capabilities, therefore point beyond the product per se by virtue of being dependent on deliberate choices being made. Typical examples are the first or further application of a known substance or composition as a pharmaceutical product (see Art. 54(4) and (5)) and the use of a known compound for a particular purpose, based on a new technical effect (see G.2/88). Thus, such extrinsic characteristics cannot be considered as already having been made available to the public (see G.1/92, reasons 3).

If, on the other hand, an object could be seen in a place (e.g. a factory) to which members of the public not bound to secrecy, including people with sufficient technical knowledge to ascertain the object's specific features, had access, all knowledge which an expert was able to gain from a purely

external examination is to be regarded as having been made available to the public. In such cases, however, any concealed features which could be ascertained only by dismantling or destroying the object cannot be regarded as having been made available to the public.

7.2.2 Agreement on secrecy

The basic principle to be applied is that subject-matter has not been made available to the public by use or in any other way if there is an express or tacit agreement on secrecy which has not been broken.

In order to establish whether there is a tacit agreement, the division must consider the particular circumstances of the case and especially whether one or more parties involved in the prior use had an objectively recognisable interest in maintaining secrecy. If only some of the parties had such an interest, it must be established whether the other parties implicitly accepted to act accordingly. For example, this is the case when the other parties could be expected to maintain secrecy in accordance with the usual business practice in the relevant industry. Important aspects to be considered when considering whether there is a tacit agreement include the commercial relationship between the parties and the exact object of the prior use. The following may indicate a tacit secrecy agreement: a parent company – subsidiary relationship, a relationship of good faith and trust, a joint venture, the delivery of test specimens. The following may indicate that there was no such an agreement: an ordinary commercial transaction, the sale of parts for serial production.

The division must determine whether any (explicit or tacit) secrecy agreement existed or not, based on the principle of free evaluation of evidence (E-IV, 4.1; E-IV, 4.3). An opponent alleging that subject-matter was made available without any express or tacit agreement on secrecy must substantiate and, if contested, convincingly prove the circumstances supporting public availability (e.g. ordinary sale to a customer, parts supplied for serial production). The proprietor can challenge this by demonstrating inconsistencies and gaps in the chain of proof or by substantiating facts supporting secrecy (e.g. joint development, samples for test purposes). If these elements lead to reasonable doubts as to public availability, public prior use has not been established.

Art. 55(1)(a)

On the special case of a non-prejudicial disclosure arising from an evident abuse in relation to the applicant, see G-IV, 7.3.2 and G-V.

7.2.3 Use on non-public property

As a general rule, use on non-public property, for example in factories and barracks, is not considered as use made available to the public, because company employees and soldiers are usually bound to secrecy, save in cases where the objects or processes used are exhibited, explained or shown to the public in these places, or where specialists not bound to secrecy are able to recognise their essential features from the outside. "Non-public property" clearly does not cover the premises of a third party to whom the object in question was unconditionally sold or the place where the public could see the object in question or ascertain its features (see the examples in G-IV, 7.2.1 above).

7.2.4 Example of publicly available use

A press for producing light building (hard fibre) boards was installed in a factory shed. Although the door bore the notice "Unauthorised persons not admitted", customers (in particular dealers in building materials and clients who were interested in purchasing light building boards) were given the opportunity of seeing the press but without any form of demonstration or explanation. No obligation to maintain secrecy was imposed as, according to witnesses, the company did not consider the visitors to be a possible source of competition. They were not genuine specialists, i.e. they did not manufacture such boards or presses, but were not entirely laypersons either. In view of the simple construction of the press, the essential features of the invention concerned were bound to be evident to anyone observing it. It was therefore possible that these customers, and in particular the dealers in building materials, would recognise these essential features and, as they were not bound to secrecy, they would be free to tell others about them.

7.2.5 Example of a process not made publicly available

The patent is directed to a process for the manufacture of a product. As proof that this process had been made available to the public by use, it was asserted that a similar already known product had been produced by the process claimed. However, it could not be clearly ascertained, even after an exhaustive examination, by which process it had been produced.

7.3 State of the art made available by means of oral description

7.3.1 Cases of oral description

The state of the art is made available to the public by oral description when facts are unconditionally brought to the knowledge of members of the public, for example during a conversation or lecture or via television, a podcast or sound reproduction equipment.

Art. 54(2)

7.3.2 Non-prejudicial oral description

The state of the art will not be affected by oral descriptions made by and to people who were bound to, and preserved, secrecy, or by an oral disclosure which was made no earlier than six months before the filing of the European patent application and which derives directly or indirectly from an evident abuse in relation to the applicant or that party's legal predecessor. On determining whether evident abuse has occurred, see G-V. 3.

Art. 55(1)(a)

7.3.3 Matters to be determined by the division in cases of oral description

Once again, the following details will have to be determined:

- (i) when the oral description took place
- (ii) what was orally described and
- (iii) whether the oral description was made available to the public; this will also depend on the type of oral description (conversation, lecture)

and on the place where it was given (public meeting, factory hall; see also G-IV, 7.2(iii)).

7.3.4 Evidence of oral disclosure

Unlike a written document, the contents of which are fixed and can be read again and again, an oral presentation is ephemeral. Establishing the content of an oral disclosure requires strong evidence. Whether the evidence provided is sufficient to prove the content of the oral disclosure has to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis and depends on the quality of the evidence in each case. However, evidence from the lecturer alone is usually not a sufficient basis for determining the content of the oral disclosure.

7.4 State of the art made available to the public in writing and/or by any other means

For this state of the art, details equivalent to those listed in G-IV, 7.3.3 have to be determined if they are not clear from the written or other disclosure itself or if they are contested by a party.

If information is made available by means of a written description and use or by means of a written and an oral description, but only the use or the oral description is made available before the relevant date, then in accordance with G-IV, 1, the subsequently published written description may be deemed to give a true account of that oral description or use unless the patent proprietor can give a good reason why this is not the case. The opponent must then adduce proof countering the reasons given by the patent proprietor. Caution must be exercised when considering the type of evidence presented to substantiate the content of an oral description. For example, a report of a lecture written by the person who gave it may not be an accurate account of what was in fact conveyed to the public. Similarly, a script from which the lecturer purportedly read may not actually have been completely and comprehensibly read (see T 1212/97).

In opposition, if the publication date of a document originating from the opponent is in dispute, the opponent must prove that date beyond reasonable doubt. However, if the document is a brochure for advertising, it must be taken into account that such brochures are not normally kept secret for long after printing (T 2451/13, T 804/05, T 743/89).

7.5 Internet disclosures

As a rule, disclosures on the internet form part of the state of the art within the meaning of Art. 54(2). Information disclosed on the internet or in online databases is considered to be publicly available as of the date it was publicly posted. Websites often contain highly relevant technical information. Certain information may even be available only on such websites, for example online manuals and tutorials for software products (such as video games) or other products with a short life cycle. This means that, to ensure a valid patent, it is often crucial to cite publications only obtainable from websites.

7.5.1 Establishing the publication date

A publication date is established in two separate stages. It must be assessed first whether a given date is correct and then whether the content in question was indeed made available to the public on that date.

The nature of the internet can make it difficult to establish the actual date on which information was made available to the public: for instance, not all web pages mention when they were published. Also, websites are easily updated but usually do not provide any archive of previously displayed material or display records enabling the public – including examiners – to establish precisely what was published and when.

Neither restricting access to a limited circle of people (e.g. by password protection) nor requiring payment for access (analogous to purchasing a book or subscribing to a journal) prevent a web page from forming part of the state of the art. It is sufficient if the web page is in principle available without any duty to treat it as confidential.

Finally, it is theoretically possible to manipulate the date and content of an internet disclosure (as it is with traditional documents). However, in view of the sheer size and redundancy of the content available on the internet, it is considered very unlikely that an internet disclosure discovered by an examiner has been manipulated. Its date can therefore be accepted as correct unless there is specific evidence to the contrary.

7.5.2 Evidence of internet disclosures

When an internet document is cited against an application or patent, the same facts are to be established as for any other piece of evidence, including standard paper publications (see G-IV, 1). This evaluation is made in accordance with the principle of "free evaluation of evidence" (see T 482/89 and T 750/94, E-IV, 4.1; E-IV, 4.3). That means that each piece of evidence is weighted according to its probative value, which is evaluated in view of the particular circumstances of each case.

The publication dates of internet disclosures submitted by a party to opposition proceedings are assessed on the basis of the same principles as are applied in examination proceedings, i.e. they are assessed in view of the specific circumstances of the case. In particular, the timing of the submission and the interests of the party submitting the disclosure are to be taken into account.

Internet disclosures often contain an explicit publication date. This date is generally considered reliable and accepted at face value. The applicant bears the burden of proving otherwise. Circumstantial evidence may be required to establish or confirm the publication date (see G-IV, 7.5.4). If the examiner concludes that it has been established that a particular document was available to the public on a particular date, this date is taken as the publication date for the purposes of examination.

7.5.3 Burden of proof

It is a general principle that, when raising objections, the burden of proof lies initially with the examiner. This means that objections must be

reasoned and substantiated and must show that the objection is well-founded. It is then up to the applicant to prove otherwise, i.e. the burden of proof shifts to the applicant.

If an applicant provides reasons for questioning the alleged publication date of an internet disclosure, the examiner will have to take these reasons into account. If the examiner is no longer convinced that the disclosure forms part of the state of the art, it will no longer be used as prior art against the application unless the examiner is able to present further evidence in support of the disputed publication date.

The later the examiner starts to look for such evidence, the more difficult it may become. The examiner has to judge whether it is worth spending a short amount of time at the search stage on finding further evidence in support of the publication date.

If an applicant disputes the publication date of an internet disclosure with no reasoning or merely with generic statements about the reliability of internet disclosures, this argument will be given minimal weight and is therefore unlikely to sway the examiner's opinion.

While the dates and content of internet disclosures can be taken at face value, there are of course differing degrees of reliability. The more reliable a disclosure, the harder it will be for the applicant to prove that it is incorrect. The following sections look at the reliability of various popular types of internet disclosure.

7.5.3.1 Technical journals

Of particular importance for examiners are online technical journals from scientific publishers (e.g. IEEE, Springer, Derwent). Their reliability is the same as that of traditional paper journals, i.e. very high.

It should be noted that the internet publication of a particular issue of a journal may be earlier than the date of publication of its paper version. What is more, some journals pre-publish on the internet manuscripts which have been submitted to them but have not yet been published in a paper issue, and in some cases before they have even been approved for paper publication (e.g. the "Geophysics" journal). If the journal then does not approve the manuscript for publication, this pre-publication of the manuscript may be the only disclosure of its content. Examiners must also remember that the pre-published manuscript may differ from the final, published version.

Where the given publication date of an online journal publication is too vague (e.g. only the month and year is known), and the most pessimistic possibility (the last day of the month) is too late, the examiner may request the exact publication date. The request can be made directly using an online contact form offered by the publisher or via the EPO library.

7.5.3.2 Other "print equivalent" publications

Many sources other than scientific publishers are generally deemed to provide reliable publication dates. These include for example publishers of

newspapers or periodicals or television or radio stations. Academic institutions (such as academic societies or universities), international organisations (such as the European Space Agency ESA), public organisations (such as ministries or public research agencies) or standardisation bodies also typically fall into this category.

Some universities host what are known as "eprint archives" to which authors submit reports on research results in electronic form before they are submitted or accepted for publication by a conference or journal. In fact, some of these reports are never published anywhere else. The most well-known archive of this kind is *arXiv.org* (*arxiv.org*, hosted by the Cornell University Library), but there are several others, e.g. the Cryptology eprint archive (*eprint.iacr.org*, hosted by the International Association for Cryptology Research). Some of these archives crawl the internet to automatically retrieve publications which are publicly available from researchers' web pages, such as CiteseerX (*citeseerx.ist.psu.edu*, hosted by Pennsylvania State University).

Companies, organisations or individuals use the internet to publish documents previously published on paper, including manuals for software products such as video games, handbooks for products such as mobile phones, product catalogues or price lists and white papers on products or product families. Since most of these documents are obviously aimed at the public – e.g. actual or potential customers – and so meant for publication, the date given can be taken as a date of publication.

7.5.3.3 Non-traditional publications

The internet is also used to exchange and publish information in ways which did not exist before, for example via Usenet discussion groups, blogs, email archives of mailing lists or wiki pages. Documents obtained from such sources also constitute prior art, but establishing their publication date may be more involved, and their reliability may vary.

The content of a transmitted email cannot be considered to be public simply because it could have been intercepted (T.2/09).

Computer-generated timestamps (usually seen, for example, on blogs, Usenet or the version history available from wiki pages) can be considered reliable publication dates. While such dates could have been generated by an imprecise computer clock, this should be weighed up against the fact that many internet services rely on accurate timing and will often stop functioning if time and date are incorrect. If there is no evidence to the contrary, the frequently used "last modified" date can be treated as the publication date.

7.5.4 Disclosures which have no date or an unreliable date

Where an internet disclosure is relevant for examination but does not explicitly indicate the publication date in the text of the disclosure, or if an applicant has shown that a given date is unreliable, the examiner may try to obtain further evidence to establish or confirm the publication date. Specifically, the examiner may consider using the following:

- (a) Information relating to a web page available from an internet archiving service. The most well-known service is the Internet Archive accessible via the "Wayback Machine" (*archive.org*). The fact that the Internet Archive is incomplete does not detract from the credibility of the data it does archive. Legal disclaimers relating to the accuracy of any supplied information are routinely used on websites (even respected sources of information such as Espacenet or IEEE), but they are not to be taken to reflect negatively on the websites' actual accuracy.
- (b) Timestamp information relating to the history of modifications applied to a file or web page (for example, as available for wiki pages such as Wikipedia and in version control systems used for distributed software development).
- (c) Computer-generated timestamp information as available from file directories or other repositories, or as automatically appended to content (e.g. forum messages and blogs).
- (d) Information about the publication date embedded in the internet disclosure itself. Date information is sometimes hidden in the programming used to create the website and not visible on the web page as it appears in the browser. Examiners may, for example, consider using computer forensic tools to retrieve such dates. In order to allow a fair evaluation of the accuracy of the date by both the applicant and the examiner, these dates can be used only if the examiner knows how they were obtained and can communicate this to the applicant.
- (e) Information about replication of the disclosure on several sites (mirror sites) or in several versions.

It may also be possible to make enquiries with the owner or the author of the website when trying to establish the publication date to a sufficient degree of certainty. The probative value of statements obtained this way will have to be assessed separately. As indicated in T 1961/13, if it cannot be shown that a particular date reported by a search engine corresponds to the publication date of a website, it cannot be used as evidence of a publication date.

If no date can be obtained (other than the date of retrieval by the examiner, which will be too late for the application in question), the disclosure cannot be used as prior art during examination. If a publication, although undated, is highly relevant to the invention and can therefore be considered to be of interest to the applicant or third parties, it may be cited in the search report

as an "L" document. The search report and the written opinion must explain why it was cited. Citing the disclosure will also make it citable against future applications, using the date of retrieval as the date of publication.

7.5.5 Problematic cases

Web pages are sometimes divided into frames with content drawn from different sources. Each of these frames may have its own publication date, which may have to be checked. In an archiving system, for instance, it may happen that one frame contains the archived information with an old publication date whereas other frames contain commercials generated at the time of retrieval. The examiner must ensure that the right publication date is used, i.e. that the cited publication date relates to the intended content.

When a document retrieved from the Internet Archive contains links, there is no guarantee that the links point to documents archived on the same date. It may even happen that a link does not point to an archived page at all but to the current version of the web page. This may in particular be the case for linked images, which are often not archived. It may also happen that archived links do not work at all.

Some internet addresses (URLs) are not persistent, i.e. they are designed to work only during a single session. Long URLs with seemingly random numbers and letters are indicative of these. Such a URL does not prevent the disclosure from being used as prior art, but it does mean that the URL will not work for other people (e.g. for the applicant on receiving the search report). For non-persistent URLs, or if considered prudent for other reasons, the examiner must indicate how the specific URL was reached from the home page of the website concerned (i.e. which links were followed, or which search terms were used).

7.5.6 Technical details and general remarks

When printing a web page, it is important to ensure that the complete URL and the relevant publication date are clearly legible.

It has to be borne in mind that publication dates can be given in different formats, in particular the European format dd/mm/yyyy, the US format mm/dd/yyyy or the ISO format yyyy/mm/dd. Unless the format is explicitly indicated, it will be impossible to distinguish between the European format and the US format for days 1-12 of each month.

If a publication date is close to the relevant priority date, the time zone of publication may be crucial in interpreting the publication date.

The examiner must always indicate the date on which the web page was retrieved. When citing internet disclosures, the examiner must explain the prior-art status of the document, for example by stating:

- (i) how and where the publication date was obtained (e.g. that the eight digits in the URL show the date of archiving in the format `yyyymmdd`) and

- (ii) any other relevant information (e.g. where two or more related documents are cited, how they are related, for instance by mentioning that following link "xyz" on the first document leads to the second document).

When citing a multimedia disclosure found on the internet, such as a video or podcast, the division will request capture and storage of electronic evidence suitable to prove its content and availability to the public. Parties to the proceedings have access to the online multimedia citations captured by the EPO throughout the proceedings via MyEPO for European patent applications and patents in their own portfolio. If the multimedia disclosure is no longer available online, parties to the proceedings who do not use MyEPO can request access to the capture by submitting a written request via the means of electronic filing. Alternatively, parties who do not use MyEPO or third parties may request access via the EPO contact form (see also B-X, 11.6 and the notice from the EPO dated 30 June 2025, OJ EPO 2025, A41).

7.6 Standards and standard preparatory documents

Standards define sets of characteristics or qualities for products, processes, services or materials (e.g. the properties of an interface) and are usually developed by standards development organisations (SDOs) by consensus amongst the relevant economic stakeholders.

In principle, final standards themselves form part of the state of the art under Art. 54(2), but there are important exceptions. One relates to private standards consortia (e.g. in the field of CD-ROM, DVD and Blu-ray discs), which do not publish the final standards but make them available to the interested circles, subject to acceptance of a non-disclosure agreement (categorically forbidding them to disclose the documents' content).

Before an SDO reaches agreement on the establishment or further development of a standard, various types of preparatory documents are submitted and discussed. These preparatory documents are treated like any other written or oral disclosures, i.e. to qualify as prior art, they must have been made available to the public prior to the filing or priority date without any bar of confidentiality. This means that, if a standard preparatory document is cited against an application during search or examination, the same facts must be established as for any other piece of evidence (see G-IV, 1 and T 738/04).

The existence of an explicit confidentiality obligation must be determined case by case on the basis of the documents allegedly showing this obligation (see T 273/02 and T 738/04). These may be general guidelines, directives or principles of the SDO concerned, licensing terms or a memorandum of understanding resulting from interaction between the SDOs and their members. In cases of a general confidentiality clause, i.e. one that is not indicated on or in the relevant preparatory document itself, it must be established that the general confidentiality obligation actually extended to the document in question until the relevant point in time. However, that does not mean that the document itself must be explicitly marked as confidential (see T 273/02).

If the preparatory documents are available in the EPO's in-house databases or at freely accessible sources (e.g. on the internet), the examiner is allowed to cite them in the search report and to refer to them during the proceedings. The public availability of the documents, if at all necessary, may be further investigated during examination and opposition in accordance with the principles set out above.

While documents in the EPO's in-house databases are regarded as being available to the public, no general indication can be given for documents obtained from other sources.

Norms and standards are comparable with trade marks in that their content can vary over time. They must therefore be identified properly by their version number and publication date (see also F-III, 7, F-IV, 4.8 and H-IV, 2.2.9).

8. Cross-references between prior-art documents

If a document (the "primary" document) refers explicitly to another document (the "secondary" document) as providing more detailed information on certain features, the teaching of the secondary document is to be regarded as incorporated into the primary document if the secondary document was available to the public on the publication date of the primary document (see T 153/85) (for the state of the art under Art. 54(3), see G-IV, 5.1 and F-III, 8, penultimate paragraph). The relevant date for novelty purposes, however, is always the date of the primary document (see G-IV, 3).

9. Errors in prior-art documents

Prior-art documents may contain errors.

When a potential error is detected, three situations may arise depending on whether the skilled person, using general knowledge:

- (i) can directly and unambiguously derive from the prior-art document that it contains an error and what the only possible correction should be
- (ii) can directly and unambiguously derive from the prior-art document that it contains an error, but can identify more than one possible correction
- (iii) cannot directly and unambiguously derive from the prior-art document that it contains an error.

When assessing the relevance of a document for patentability:

in case (i), the disclosure is considered to contain the correction

in case (ii), the disclosure of the passage containing the error is disregarded

in case (iii), the literal disclosure is taken into account as is.

For possible errors concerning compound records in online databases, see B-VI, 6.5. For non-enabling disclosures, see G-IV, 2.

Chapter V – Non-prejudicial disclosures

1. General

There are only two specific cases in which a prior disclosure of the invention is not taken into consideration as part of the state of the art, namely where the disclosure was due to, or in consequence of: *Art. 55(1)*

- (i) an evident abuse in relation to the applicant or their legal predecessor, e.g. the invention derived from the applicant or their legal predecessor and was disclosed against their wishes; or *Art. 55(1)(a)*
- (ii) the display of the invention by the applicant or their legal predecessor at an officially recognised international exhibition within the meaning of *Art. 55(1)(b)*.

2. Time limit

In both cases *G-V, 1(i)* and *(ii)*, it is essential that the disclosure took place no more than six months before the application was filed. For calculating the six-month period the relevant date is the actual date of filing of the European patent application, not the priority date (*G 3/98* and *G 2/99*).

3. Evident abuse

In case *G-V, 1(i)*, the disclosure might be made in a published document or in any other way. In particular, it might be made in a European application with an earlier priority date. For example, a person B who has been told of A's invention in confidence might apply for a patent for this invention. If so, the disclosure resulting from the publication of B's application will not prejudice A's rights if A has already filed an application or files one within six months of that publication. In view of *Art. 61*, B may anyway not be entitled to proceed with the application (see *A-IV, 2*).

For "evident abuse" to be established, the person disclosing the invention must have had either actual intent to cause harm or actual or constructive knowledge that harm would or could ensue from this disclosure (see *T 585/92*).

4. International exhibition

In case *G-V, 1(ii)*, the application must be filed within six months of the invention's disclosure at the exhibition to ensure that the display does not prejudice the application. Furthermore, the applicant must state, when filing the application, that the invention has been so displayed, and must also file a supporting certificate within four months, giving the particulars required by *Rule 25* (see *A-IV, 3*). The exhibitions recognised are published on the EPO website (epo.org). *Art. 55(2)*
Rule 25

Chapter VI – Novelty

1. Novelty and state of the art

An invention is considered to be new if it does not form part of the state of the art. For a definition of "state of the art", see G-IV, 1. It is important to note that, when considering novelty (as distinct from inventive step; see G-VII, 6), it is not permissible to combine separate items of prior art. It is also not permissible to combine separate items belonging to different embodiments described in one and the same document unless such a combination has specifically been suggested (see T 305/87). On the specific case of selection inventions, see G-VI, 7.

For determining novelty, it has to be decided which subject-matter has been made available to the public by a prior-art disclosure and so forms part of the state of the art. In this context, it is not only examples but the whole content of the prior-art document that has to be taken into consideration.

In addition, any matter explicitly disclaimed (with the exception of disclaimers which exclude unworkable embodiments) and prior art acknowledged in a document, in so far as explicitly described in it, are to be regarded as incorporated in the document.

It is also permissible to use a dictionary or similar reference document to interpret a special term used in a document.

An unclear term cannot be used to distinguish the invention from the prior art and is only allowable under Art. 84 under certain circumstances (see F-IV, 4.6).

2. Implicit features or well-known equivalents

A document takes away the novelty of any claimed subject-matter derivable directly and unambiguously from it, including any features a skilled person would consider implicit in what is expressly mentioned in it. For example, a disclosure of the use of rubber in circumstances where its elastic properties are clearly used even though this is not explicitly stated takes away the novelty of the use of an elastic material. The limitation to subject-matter "derivable directly and unambiguously" from the document is important. Thus, when considering novelty, it is not correct to interpret the teaching of a document as embracing well-known equivalents which are not disclosed in the documents; this is a matter of obviousness.

3. Relevant date of a prior-art document

In determining novelty, a prior-art document is to be read as it would have been read by a skilled person on its "relevant" date", which means its publication date if it is a previously published document and its date of filing (or priority date, where applicable) if it is a European patent application referred to in Art. 54(3) (see G-IV, 5.1).

4. Generic disclosure and specific examples

In considering novelty, it is to be borne in mind that a generic disclosure usually does not take away the novelty of any specific example falling

within the terms of that disclosure, but that a specific disclosure does take away the novelty of a generic claim including that disclosure. For example, a disclosure of copper takes away the novelty of metal as a generic concept, but not the novelty of any metal other than copper, while a disclosure of rivets takes away the novelty of fastening means as a generic concept, but not the novelty of any fastening other than rivets. See also [G-VI, 7](#) on selection inventions.

5. Implicit disclosure and parameters

In the case of a prior-art document, the lack of novelty may be apparent from what is explicitly stated in the document itself. Alternatively, it may be implicit in the sense that, in carrying out the teaching of the prior-art document, the skilled person would inevitably arrive at a result falling within the terms of the claim. An objection of lack of novelty of this kind is raised by the examiner only where there can be no reasonable doubt as to the practical effect of the prior teaching (for a second non-medical use, however, see [G-VI, 6](#)).

Situations of this kind may also arise when the claims define the invention, or one of its features, by parameters (see [F-IV, 4.11](#)). The relevant prior art may mention a different parameter, or no parameter at all. If the known and the claimed products are identical in all other respects (which is to be expected if, for example, the starting products and the manufacturing processes are identical), then this initially gives rise to an objection of lack of novelty. The burden of proving an alleged distinguishing feature lies with the applicant. No benefit of the doubt can be given if the applicant does not provide evidence in support of the allegations (see [T.1764/06](#)). If, on the other hand, the applicant is able to show, e.g. by appropriate comparison tests, that there are differences between the parameters, it is questionable whether the application discloses all the features essential to manufacture products having the parameters specified in the claims ([Art. 83](#)).

6. Examination of novelty

When determining whether the claimed subject-matter is novel, the examiner must take account of the guidance given in [F-IV, 4.5](#) to [4.21](#). Especially for claims directed to a physical entity, non-distinctive characteristics of a particular intended use are to be disregarded (see [F-IV, 4.13.1](#)). For example, a claim to a substance X for use as a catalyst would not be considered to be novel over the same substance known as a dye unless the use referred to implies a particular form of the substance (e.g. the presence of certain additives) which distinguishes it from the known form of the substance. This means that characteristics which are not explicitly stated but are implied by the particular use are to be taken into account (see the example of a "mould for molten steel" in [F-IV, 4.13.1](#)). For claims to a first medical use, see [G-II, 4.2](#).

A claim defining a compound as having a certain purity lacks novelty over a prior-art disclosure describing the same compound only if the prior art discloses the claimed purity at least implicitly, e.g. by way of a method for preparing the compound that inevitably results in the purity as claimed. However, such a claim does not lack novelty if the disclosure of the prior art

needs to be supplemented, e.g. by suitable (further) purification methods allowing the skilled person to arrive at the claimed purity.

6.1 First or further medical use of known products

Where a substance or composition is already known, it may still be patentable under Art. 54(4) if the known substance or composition was not previously disclosed for use in a method referred to in Art. 53(c).

Where a substance or composition is already known to have been used in a "first medical use", it may still be patentable under Art. 54(5) for any second or further use in a method referred to in Art. 53(c), provided that use is novel and inventive.

Art. 54(4) and (5) thus provide for an exception from the general principle that product claims can only be obtained for novel products. However, this does not mean that product claims for the first and further medical uses need not fulfil all other requirements for patentability, especially that of inventive step (see T 128/82).

A claim in the form "Use of substance or composition X for the treatment of disease Y..." will be regarded as relating to a method for treatment explicitly excluded from patentability under Art. 53(c) and will therefore not be accepted. A claim in the form "Substance X for use as a medicament" is acceptable, even if X is a known substance, but its use in medicine is not known. Likewise, it is acceptable to have a claim in the form "Substance X for use in the treatment of disease Y" if the claim involves an inventive step over any prior art disclosing the use of X as a medicament.

If an application discloses for the first time a number of distinct surgical, therapeutic or diagnostic uses for a known substance or composition, independent claims each directed to the substance or composition for one of the various uses are normally allowed; i.e. as a general rule, an *a priori* objection of lack of unity of invention is not raised (see F-V, 7). Art. 82

Where the subject-matter of a claim is rendered novel only by a new therapeutic use of a medicament, the claim may no longer have the format of a "Swiss-type" claim as instituted by decision G 5/83 ("Use of a substance or composition X for the manufacture of a medicament for therapeutic application Z") if the application has a filing or earliest priority date of 29 January 2011 or later (see the notice from the EPO dated 20 September 2010, OJ EPO 2010, 514).

The table below summarises the effect of the different claim formulations on patentability.

Examples

#	Claim	Patentable?	Article
A	Use of product X for the treatment of asthma	No	<u>53(c)</u>
B	1. Product X for use as a medicament [X known as e.g. herbicide] 2. Product according to claim 1 for use in the treatment of asthma	Yes (even if X is a known product, but its use in medicine is not known) Yes	<u>54(4)</u>
C	Product X for use in the treatment of cancer*	Yes (even if case B is prior art, provided that such a claim is inventive over B and any other prior art)	<u>54(5)</u>
D	Product X for use in the treatment of leukaemia*	Yes (even if cases B and C are prior art, provided that D is inventive over B and C and any other prior art because leukaemia is a specific type of cancer)	<u>54(5)</u>

* Note: The corresponding Swiss-type claims for cases C and D (required under EPC 1973) would be: "The use of product X for the manufacture of a medicament for the treatment of cancer/leukaemia".

In cases where an applicant simultaneously discloses more than one "subsequent" therapeutic use, claims of the above type directed to these different uses are allowable in a single application, but only if they form a single general inventive concept (Art. 82).

A claim in the format of a Swiss-type claim is a purpose-related process claim, whereas a claim drafted in accordance with Art. 54(5) is a purpose-related product claim. Such claims therefore belong to different categories, which means that:

- (i) If a parent application has been granted with a Swiss-type claim, granting a patent on the basis of the purpose-related product claim in its divisional application would not lead to double patenting (T 13/14; see also G-IV, 5.4).

- (ii) Since a claim to a particular physical activity (e.g. method, process, use) confers less protection than a claim to the physical entity per se (G 2/88, Reasons 5.1), a Swiss-type claim confers less protection than a claim formulated in accordance with Art. 54(5). Changing from a Swiss-type claim to a claim drafted in accordance with Art. 54(5) therefore contravenes Art. 123(3) (T 1673/11; see also H-IV, 3.4).

6.1.1 Products that may be claimed for a further medical use

The scope of protection for use-related product claims under Art. 54(5) is limited to the substance or composition in the context of its medical use which confers novelty and non-obviousness, if any, on the claimed product.

This principle applies only to substances and compositions and cannot be extended to other products. A claim directed to a device for an intended medical use (e.g. pacemaker or implantable chemical sensor for use in ...) must be construed as claiming a device which is suitable for that medical use (F-IV, 4.13).

A product qualifies as a "substance or composition" within the meaning of Art. 54(5) if it is the active agent or ingredient in the specific medical use and if the therapeutic effect can be ascribed to its chemical properties (see G 5/83 and T 1758/15). For example, consider a filler material which is injected between a first tissue targeted for radiation treatment and a second sensitive tissue to be protected from radiation. If the shielding effect of the filler material is achieved by a mere mechanical displacement of the sensitive tissue relative to the target tissue, due to the volume it occupies between the two tissues, the filler material qualifies as a device rather than a substance or composition. On the other hand, if the filler material produced a radiation-reducing effect on the sensitive tissue which could be attributed to its chemical properties, it would be considered a "substance or composition" within the meaning of Art. 54(5).

6.1.2 Therapeutic uses pursuant to Art. 54(5)

The treatment of a disease with a substance or composition which is already known to be used for treating that disease, where the only difference from the known treatment is in the dosage regime, is a specific further medical use within the meaning of Art. 54(5) (see G 2/08). Thus, therapeutic uses of a substance/composition may be based not only on the treatment of a different disease but also on the treatment of the same disease by a different therapeutic method differing for example in the dosage, administration regime, group of subjects (see G-VI, 6.1.2.2) or route of administration (G 2/08).

A claim directed to the further therapeutic use of a substance/composition must indicate the illness/disease to be treated, the nature of the therapeutic compound used for that purpose and, if relevant for establishing novelty and inventive step, the subject to be treated. If the further therapeutic use relates to a different therapy of the same disease using the same substance/composition, the claim must also define all technical features of the therapy giving rise to the desired technical effect (G 2/08).

An independent claim directed to a further therapeutic use of a substance/composition which is based on the use of said product in the treatment of a different disease must be formulated as follows:

Substance X or Composition comprising X	for use	in a method for the treatment of Y, or in the therapy of Y, or in a method of treating Y, or in a method of therapy of Y, or as a medicament defined by its function, (e.g. as an anti-inflammatory medicament)

The presence of the term "for use" is mandatory, to closely adhere to the wording of Art. 54(5).

If the independent claim is directed to a composition, the definition of the composition may be inserted before or after the term "for use". For example: "Composition comprising X for use in the therapy of Y" or "Composition for use in the therapy of Y comprising X".

If the further therapeutic use is based on the use of the same product in a different treatment of the same disease, the independent claim must be formulated as follows:

Substance X for use or Composition comprising X for use	in a method for the treatment of Y, or in the therapy of Y, or in a method of treating Y, or in a method of therapy of Y, or as a medicament defined by its function (e.g. as an anti-inflammatory medicament)	characterised in that/ wherein	other features (e.g. the substance/ composition is administered topically, three times daily ...)

Purpose-related product claims which do not define exclusively (see claim 4 in the table below) a medical use excluded from patentability under Art. 53(c) are construed as claims directed to a product per se which is suitable for the claimed use.

The table below shows some examples of claims which do not define a further medical use within the meaning of Art. 53(c).

		... because ...
1. Substance X or Composition comprising X in/for	a method for the treatment of Y, or the therapy of Y, or a method of treating Y, or a method of therapy of Y, or the (topical) treatment of Y, or the (topical) therapy of Y	without the term "for use" it is not evident whether the claim is directed to the product suitable for the specified use or whether the claim is limited by the medical use
2. (Anti-inflammatory) medicament, or Pharmaceutical comprising substance X, or Composition comprising X	for topical treatment	the claim does not indicate either a therapeutic role or a therapeutic application of the claimed product. Moreover, without the term "for use" it is not evident whether the claim is directed to the product suitable for the specified use or whether the claim is limited by the medical use
3. Substance X or Composition comprising X	as an anti-inflammatory agent	without the term "for use" it is not evident whether the claim is directed to the product suitable for the specified use or whether the claim is limited by the medical use
4. Substance X or Composition comprising X	for use as an antifungal /antibacterial agent	the claim does not define a specific medical use of the claimed product. It encompasses non-medical uses, because antifungal/antibacterial agents are also used in e.g. agriculture for treating plants

If the prior art discloses either the product per se in a form which could be considered suitable for the claimed use or its first medical application, claims 1 to 4 would lack novelty. The novelty objection could be overcome by reformulating the claim as described above (first table).

The examining division can propose these amendments in the Rule 71(3) communication without having to consult the applicant beforehand (see C-V, 1.1.1, point (f)).

The following are examples of claims which would not be considered novel.

Example 1

Composition comprising X for use by topical treatment/application

It is assumed that a composition comprising X is already known in the prior art.

Reasons for objection: Since the claim fails to identify the specific therapeutic indication for X, the feature "for topical treatment/application" remains *de facto* purely illustrative and does not limit the scope of the claim to that specific application.

Furthermore, the term "topical treatment/application" does not necessarily relate to use in a method referred to in Art. 53(c) since it could refer to a cosmetic treatment. Consequently, the subject-matter of the claimed composition would be anticipated if the composition comprising X is already known in the prior art.

Example 2

Composition comprising X for use in therapy by topical administration

It is assumed that a composition comprising X is already known in the prior art for a medical use.

Reasons for objection: The mode of administration may be a critical factor in a medical treatment and has been considered to be a limiting feature, but only in relation to a further (specific) medical indication (T. 51/93). "Topical administration" specifies only the mode of delivery, but does not relate to any therapeutic effect obtained thereby. Consequently, since the claim fails to identify the specific therapeutic indication, the feature "by topical administration" is merely illustrative and not a restrictive technical feature capable of establishing novelty. The subject-matter of the claimed composition would thus be anticipated if the composition comprising X is already known in the prior art for any medical use.

Example 3

Product X for use in a method of contraception

Reasons for objection: Such a claim would not be considered novel over the disclosure of product X per se because pregnancy is not a disease. This claim can usually be reformulated as a method of contraception using product X. Reformulation may not be possible in so far as the contraception method involves the personal and private sphere, i.e. does not fulfil the requirement of industrial application (T. 74/93).

6.1.2.1 Preclinical data and clinical trials in the prior art

A document is prejudicial to the novelty of a claim directed to a specific further medical use if it

- (i) clearly identifies the essential conceptual features of the therapeutic treatment, i.e. the substance/composition used for treating the medical indication and any essential features of the treatment; and
- (ii) plausibly establishes the underlying therapeutic effect. Plausibility may be established by way of data or scientific reasoning. It is not however necessary that the mechanism underlying the therapeutic effect be explained.

Hence if a prior art document discloses clinical trials such as phase I, II or III studies (or states that these investigations are ongoing) but fails to disclose any positive results of these studies, then such a document may not be novelty destroying because requirement (ii) may not be fulfilled. Since clinical trials fail more often than they succeed, the mere announcement of a clinical trial is in itself not enough to make the claimed invention available to the public.

6.1.2.2 Patient group

The treatment of a known clinical indication in a different patient group for example characterised by age, gender, weight, physiological parameters or a biomarker may represent a new specific use under Art. 54(5) EPC.

The selection of the patient group may be defined

- in passive terms where the group characteristic is defined (e.g. “being at least X years of age”, “expressing gene X” “having mutation Y in gene X”) or
- in active terms where the step of determination/selection is explicitly defined as an essential feature of the claim (e.g. “comprising a determination of mutation Y in gene X and selecting a patient having said mutation”).

Passive definition of the patient sub-group

Example:

Compound A for use in the treatment of disease B in a subject positive for biomarker C.

Novelty is established if the claimed patient sub-group is clearly identifiable by its physiological or pathological status. The patient sub-group must either be:

- (i) a different and distinct patient sub-group not overlapping with any previously treated group or
- (ii) a more specific sub-group of the previously treated patient group or an overlapping group which has not been identified in the prior art in the context of the claimed medical indication.

Active definition of the patient sub-group

The patient sub-group can also be defined actively in the claim. Such a claim typically comprises a determination/selection step allowing the identification of the sub-group to be treated. The treatment regimen is thus construed as comprising said determination step.

Example:

Compound A for use in the treatment of disease B in a subject positive for biomarker C comprising the determination of said biomarker in the patient by step D.

If in such a case the method of determining the biomarker including step D has not previously been disclosed in the context of the claimed therapy, the claim is normally considered novel.

6.1.2.3 Mechanistic definitions leading to a new clinical situation

Where appropriate, medical use claims may include, in the definition of the therapeutic indication, mechanistic features relating to a mode of action underlying the therapy. However, when the mechanism is the only difference between the claimed invention and the prior art, the mechanism should not merely be an explanation of a mechanism that underlay a previous therapeutic use.

Example:

Compound X for use in inhibiting angiogenesis in the treatment of cancer

A mere pharmaceutical effect does not necessarily imply a therapeutic application. For instance, the selective occupation of a specific receptor by a given substance cannot be considered in itself to be a therapeutic application; indeed, the discovery that a substance selectively binds a receptor, even if representing an important piece of scientific knowledge, still needs to find an application in the form of a defined, real treatment of a pathological condition in order to make a technical contribution to the art and to be considered as an invention eligible for patent protection. See also F-IV, 4.21 for the functional definition of a pathological condition.

6.1.3 Diagnostic uses under Art. 54(5)

A suitable formulation of a diagnostic claim in accordance with Art. 54(5) may read:

Substance X or Composition comprising X	for use in a method of diagnosis	"in vivo"	of disease Y

The wording "in vivo" limits the scope of the claim to diagnostic methods which are excluded from patentability under Art. 53(c).

If the independent claim is directed to a composition, the definition of the composition may be inserted before or after the term "for use".

Purpose-related product claims which do not define a diagnostic use excluded from patentability under Art. 53(c) are construed as claims directed to a product per se which is suitable for the claimed use.

The following table shows some examples of claims which do not define a diagnostic use within the meaning of Art. 53(c).

1. Substance X or Composition comprising X	for use in the diagnosis of disease Y, or for use in the "in vitro"/"ex vivo" diagnosis of disease Y
2. Substance X or Composition comprising X	for use as a contrast agent for imaging blood flow

Claims 1 and 2 would lack novelty over prior art disclosing either the product per se in a form which could be considered suitable for the claimed use or its first medical application.

Claim 1 could be reformulated as "Use of [...] in the "in vitro/ex vivo" diagnosis of disease Y". If the application as filed discloses, either explicitly or implicitly, that the claimed diagnostic methods are to be carried out "in vivo", the wording of claim 1 could also be limited to encompass only "in vivo" methods, as described above.

Claim 2 could be reformulated as "Use of [...] as contrast agent for imaging blood flow".

Claims 1 and 2 could also be reformulated as method claims, e.g. "A method for in vitro/ex vivo diagnosing disease Y using substance X [...]" or "A method for diagnosing disease Y in a sample by using substance X [...]" or "A method of imaging blood flow using substance X [...]".

The examining division may propose these amendments in the Rule 71(3) communication without having to consult the applicant beforehand (see C-V, 1.1, point (f)).

6.1.4 Surgical uses under Art. 54(5)

A claim defining a second surgical use may read "Substance X/ Composition comprising X for use in a method of intracardiac catheterisation as a protector of blood vessel walls".

If the independent claim is directed to a composition, the definition of the composition may be inserted before or after the term "for use".

Purpose-related product claims which do not define a surgical use excluded from patentability under Art. 53(c) are construed as claims directed to a product per se which is suitable for the claimed use.

The following table shows an example of a claim which does not define a surgical use within the meaning of Art. 53(c):

1. Substance X or Composition comprising X	for use in a method for hair removal by laser radiation

The claim would lack novelty over prior art disclosing either the product per se in a form which could be considered suitable for the claimed use or its first medical application.

The claim could be reformulated as "Use of [...] for hair removal by laser radiation" or as "Method for removing hair by laser radiation by using substance X [...]".

The examining division may propose this amendment in the Rule 71(3) communication without having to consult the applicant beforehand (see C-V, 1.1, point (f)).

6.1.5 Dependent claims under Art. 54(5)

The wording of the dependent claims must clearly reflect their dependency on the independent claim (T 2106/10). A suitable formulation may read:

Substance (X) or Composition (comprising X) (according to claim #)	for use in the therapy of disease Y according to claim # or for use according to claim #	wherein	other features (e.g. it is provided as water-soluble granulates)

In the following example, the dependent claim is not correctly formulated in accordance with Art. 54(5).

Claim 1: Composition comprising X for use in the treatment of Y.

Claim 2: Composition according to claim 1, comprising 5 mg X.

The category of claim 2 is unclear and the dependency is doubtful. The claim appears to depend on a claim directed to a product per se.

The claim would also lack novelty over prior art disclosing a composition comprising 5 mg X, or a first medical application of that composition.

The claim must be reworded in line with the above by inserting "for use" between "Composition" and "according". The examining division can propose this amendment in the Rule 71(3) communication without having to consult the applicant beforehand (see C-V, 1.1, point (f)).

6.2 Second non-medical use

A claim to the use of a known compound for a particular purpose (second non-medical use) which is based on a technical effect is interpreted as including that technical effect as a functional technical feature. Accordingly, such a claim is not open to objection under Art. 54(1) as long as the

technical feature has not previously been made available to the public (G 2/88 and G 6/88). The novelty of the use of the known compound for the known production of a known product cannot be deduced from a new property of the produced product. In such a case, the use of a compound for the production of a product has to be interpreted as a process for production of the product with the compound. It can be regarded as novel only if the process of production as such is novel (see T 1855/06). On claims to a second or further medical use, see G-II, 4.2.

However, a feature of a step in a chemical process which merely serves to explain the technical effect obtained is not a functional technical feature which could render a claim novel over prior art which discloses the same process with the same step providing the same effect, even if that prior art does not comprise a corresponding indication of technical effect. Such a feature would instead be considered to be a discovery (T 151/13).

7. Selection inventions

Selection inventions involve selecting individual elements, subsets, or subranges from a more generic disclosure in the prior art (see also G-VI, 5).

Assessment of the novelty of selection inventions is dependent on the number of selections identified compared with the prior art, leading to one of the following two scenarios:

(i) One selection identified

In the case of one single selection, the following scenarios may arise:

- (a) The selection is a selection of individual elements or of subsets of a larger set.

A selection of one or more elements from a single list of specifically disclosed elements does not confer novelty.

- (b) The selection is a selection of a subrange selected from a broader numerical range disclosed in the prior art. Whether the selection of a subrange can be considered novel depends on the specific circumstances:

A claimed selection of a subrange is not considered novel if any specific value disclosed in the prior art falls within the claimed range, irrespective of whether the value stems from a specific example or is disclosed as the endpoint of a range.

- A subrange selected from a broader numerical range of the prior art is considered novel if it cannot be established that, on application of the “gold standard”, the skilled person, using common general knowledge, can directly and unambiguously derive the selected subrange from the prior art (G 2/10, T 1688/20). (ii) Multiple selections identified

If multiple selections are identified, the situation becomes more complex to assess. Depending on the type of the selections, this generally leads to one of the following three scenarios:

- (a) The identified selections involve the selection of individual elements or in selection of subsets of multiple larger sets. This amounts to a selection from two or more lists of a certain length. A list is a description of equal, i.e. non-convergent, alternatives.

A list is usually considered to have a “certain length” if it has a length of at least two or three elements. Whether a list has the required length has to be decided on a case-by-case basis. If a selection from two or more lists of a certain length has to be made to arrive at a specific combination of features, then the resulting combination of features, not specifically disclosed in the prior art, confers novelty (the “two-list principle”). On the other hand, novelty is not conferred if there is a pointer in the prior art to the specific combination. Similarly, merely reducing the length of lists does not generally confer novelty if their length is not reduced below the required length.

For example, a claim may define the use of sodium chloride (NaCl) as catalyst in a chemical reaction. If D1 describes the use of an alkaline metal halide as catalyst, the alkaline metal being selected from Li, Na, K and Rb and the halide being selected from F, Cl, Br and I, a selection from two lists needs to be made to arrive at the specific combination of the claim. In the absence of any further information in D1, the claim is new over D1.

The same principle is also applicable to chemical compounds described by a Markush formula. This includes individual chemical compounds from a known generic formula where the compound selected results from the selection of specific substituents from two or more lists of substituents given in the known generic formula. The same applies to specific mixtures resulting from the selection of individual components from lists of components making up the prior-art mixture. Similar considerations also apply to starting materials for the manufacture of a final product.

- (b) The identified selections involve the selection of multiple subranges from broader numerical ranges. In this context, a subrange is a range that either lies completely inside the

prior-art range or overlaps with an endpoint of the prior-art range, thereby creating a range of overlap with the prior-art range. These two scenarios are illustrated below, with the area of overlap marked as "xxxx".

1.	I-----I	2.	claim
3.	I-----IxxxxxI-----I	4.	prior art
5.	I-----I	6.	claim
7.	I-----IxxxI	8.	prior art

The two-list principle mentioned above applies in the same way here. In contrast to the situation involving a single selection described in (i)(b) above, it is not sufficient that, for each claimed range taken individually, the prior art discloses a specific value or a range endpoint falling within that range to anticipate the subject-matter of the claim. In other words, the selection of multiple subranges will, in the absence of any pointers to the combination of the specific subranges, be novel over the broader ranges.

If the selections of the multiple subranges concern elements that interact with each other, as is generally the case for the constituents of alloys and compositions, the different selections must not be considered in isolation but in combination (T 261/15, Reasons 2.3.1).

- (c) The identified selections involve a combination of selections from lists and subranges. In this case, both principles described above under (ii)(a) and (ii)(b) need to be applied. This situation frequently arises in the field of chemistry when a compound is described by a Markush formula. For example, one difference over the prior art may be the selection of a specific substituent from a list of substituents and another difference may be in the selection of a numerical subrange from a broader numerical range of repeating units disclosed in the prior art.

7.1 Error margins in numerical values

The skilled person knows that numerical values relating to measurements suffer from measurement errors limiting their accuracy. For this reason, the general convention in the scientific and technical literature is applied: the last decimal place of a numerical value indicates its degree of accuracy. Where no other error margins are given, the maximum margin is ascertained by applying the rounding-off convention to the last decimal place (see T 175/97), e.g. for a measurement of 3.5 cm, the error margin is 3.45-3.54. The skilled person takes the same approach when interpreting ranges of values in patent specifications.

8. Novelty of "reach-through" claims

"Reach-through" claims are claims aimed at obtaining protection for a chemical product (and also its uses, compositions, etc.) by defining that

product functionally in terms of its action (e.g. agonist, antagonist) on a biological target such as an enzyme or receptor (see F-III, 9). In many such cases, the applicant functionally defines chemical compounds in this way by reference to a newly identified biological target. However, compounds which bind to and exercise this action on that biological target are not necessarily novel compounds simply because the biological target which they act on is new. Indeed, in many cases, the applicants themselves provide test results in their applications which show that known compounds exert this action on the new biological target. They thereby demonstrate that compounds falling within the functional definition of the "reach-through" claim are known in the state of the art and so establish that a reach-through claim relating to compounds defined in this way lacks novelty.

Chapter VII – Inventive step

1. General

An invention is considered to involve an inventive step if, having regard to the state of the art, it is not obvious to a person skilled in the art. Novelty (see G-VI) and inventive step are two separate criteria. The question whether there is any inventive step arises only if the invention is novel. Art. 56

2. State of the art; date of filing

The "state of the art" for the purposes of considering inventive step is as defined in Art. 54(2) (see G-IV, 1). It is to be understood as concerning such kind of information as is relevant to a certain field of technology. It does not include later-published European applications referred to in Art. 54(3). As mentioned in G-IV, 3, the date of priority counts as the date of filing for the European application being examined on condition that the priority is valid (Art. 89). The state of the art may be the relevant common general knowledge, which need not necessarily be in writing and needs substantiation only if challenged (see T 939/92).

3. Person skilled in the art

The "person skilled in the art", or "skilled person", is presumed to be a skilled practitioner in the relevant field of technology who has average knowledge and ability (average skilled person). This skilled person is aware of what was common general knowledge in the art at the relevant date (see T 4/98, T 143/94 and T 426/88). The skilled person is also presumed to have had access to everything in the "state of the art", in particular the documents cited in the search report, and to have had the means and capacity for routine work and experimentation which are normal for the field of technology in question. If the problem prompts the skilled person to seek its solution in another technical field, the specialist in that field is the person qualified to solve the problem. The skilled person is involved in constant development in the relevant technical field (see T 774/89 and T 817/95). The skilled person may be expected to look for suggestions in neighbouring and general technical fields (see T 176/84 and T 195/84) or even in remote technical fields, if prompted to do so (see T 560/89). Assessment of whether the solution involves an inventive step must then be based on the knowledge and ability of a specialist in the field concerned (see T 32/81). There may be instances where it is more appropriate to think in terms of a group of people, e.g. a research or production team, rather than a single person (see T 164/92 and T 986/96). It is to be borne in mind that the skilled person has the same level of skill for assessing inventive step and sufficient disclosure (see T 60/89, T 694/92 and T 373/94).

3.1 Common general knowledge of the skilled person

Common general knowledge can come from various sources and does not necessarily depend on the publication of a specific document on a specific date. An assertion that something is common general knowledge need only be backed by documentary evidence (e.g. a textbook) if this is contested (see G-IV, 1).

A single publication (e.g. a patent document, but also the content of a technical journal) cannot normally be considered common general

knowledge (see T 475/88). In special cases, articles in technical journals can be representative of common general knowledge (see T 595/90), in particular where they provide a broad review or survey of a topic (see T 309/88). For the skilled person addressing the problem of bringing together certain starting materials, the conclusions of research on these materials carried out by only a very few manufacturers form part of the relevant general technical knowledge, even if the studies in question have only been published in technical journals (see T 676/94). Another exception is that the common general knowledge can also be the information contained in patent specifications or scientific publications if the invention is in a field of research which is so new that the relevant technical knowledge is not yet available from textbooks (see T 51/87).

Basic textbooks and monographs can be considered to represent common general knowledge (see T 171/84). If they refer the reader to other articles dealing with specific problems, these articles too may be counted as part of this knowledge (see T 206/83). Information does not usually become common general knowledge because it has been published in a particular textbook, reference work, etc.; on the contrary, it appears in books of this kind because it is normally already common general knowledge (see T 766/91). This means that the information in such a publication will generally have already become part of common general knowledge some time before the date of publication (T 1249/22).

4. Obviousness

The question to consider in relation to any claim defining the invention is therefore whether, before the filing or priority date valid for that claim and having regard to the art known at the time, it would have been obvious to the skilled person to arrive at something falling within the terms of the claim. If so, the claim is not allowable for lack of inventive step. The term "obvious" means that which does not go beyond the normal progress of technology but merely follows plainly or logically from the prior art, i.e. something which does not involve the exercise of any skill or ability beyond that to be expected of the skilled person. In considering inventive step, as distinct from novelty (see G-VI, 3), it is fair to construe any published document in the light of knowledge up to and including the day before the filing or priority date valid for the claimed invention and to consider all the knowledge generally available to the skilled person up to and including that day.

5. Problem-solution approach

In order to assess inventive step objectively and predictably, what is known as the "**problem-solution approach**" is applied.

The problem-solution approach has three main stages:

- (i) determining the "closest prior art"
- (ii) establishing the "objective technical problem" to be solved and

- (iii) considering whether or not the claimed invention, starting from the closest prior art and the objective technical problem, would have been obvious to the skilled person.

5.1 Determination of the closest prior art

The closest prior art discloses, in one single reference, the combination of features which constitutes the most promising starting point for a development leading to the invention. In selecting the closest prior art, the first consideration is that it must be directed to a similar purpose or effect as the invention or at least belong to the same or a closely related technical field as the claimed invention. In practice, the closest prior art generally corresponds to a similar use and requires the minimum of structural and functional modifications to arrive at the claimed invention (see T 606/89).

There are sometimes several equally valid starting points for assessing inventive step, e.g. if the skilled person has a choice of several workable solutions, i.e. solutions starting from different documents, which might lead to the invention. If a patent is to be granted, it may be necessary to apply the problem-solution approach to each of these starting points in turn, i.e. for all these workable solutions.

However, applying the problem-solution approach from different starting points, e.g. from different prior-art documents, is only required if it has been convincingly shown that these documents are equally valid springboards. In particular in opposition proceedings, the structure of the problem-solution approach is not that of a forum where the opponent can freely develop as many inventive-step attacks as desired in the hope that one of them has a chance of succeeding (T 320/15, Reasons 1.1.2).

In the event of refusal or revocation, it is sufficient to show on the basis of one relevant piece of prior art that the claimed subject-matter lacks an inventive step: there is no need to discuss which document is "closest" to the invention; the only relevant question is whether the document used is a feasible starting point for assessing inventive step (see T 967/97, T 558/00, T 21/08, T 308/09 and T 1289/09). This is true even if the problem identified by problem-solution reasoning is different from the one identified by the applicant/proprietor.

As a consequence, the applicant or proprietor cannot refute the argument that the claimed subject-matter lacks inventive step by submitting that a more promising springboard is available: a piece of prior art on the basis of which the claimed invention is considered non-obvious cannot be "closer" than a document on the basis of which the claimed invention appears obvious, because it is evident in this situation that the former is not the most promising springboard from which to arrive at the invention (T 1742/12, Reasons 6.5; T 824/05, Reasons 6.2).

The closest prior art must be assessed from the skilled person's point of view on the day before the filing or priority date valid for the claimed invention. The examiner must not interpret the closest prior art artificially on the basis of prior knowledge of the application (see also G-VII, 8).

In identifying the closest prior art, account is taken of what the applicant acknowledges in the description and claims to be known. The examiner regards any such acknowledgement of known art as correct unless the applicant states that a mistake was made (see [C-IV, 7.3\(vii\)](#)).

5.2 Formulation of the objective technical problem

The second stage is to objectively establish the **technical problem** to be solved by studying the application (or the patent), the closest prior art and the differences (also called "the **distinguishing features**" of the claimed invention) in terms of features (either structural or functional) between the claimed invention and the closest prior art, identifying the technical effect resulting from the distinguishing features and then formulating the technical problem.

Features which cannot be seen to make any contribution, either independently or in combination with other features, to the technical character of an invention cannot support a finding of an inventive step (see [T 641/00](#)). Such a situation can occur for instance if a feature only contributes to the solution of a non-technical problem, e.g. a problem in a field excluded from patentability. For the treatment of claims comprising technical and non-technical features, see [G-VII, 5.4](#). The criteria for determining whether a feature, even if non-technical in isolation, contributes to producing a technical effect in the context of the invention are explained in [G-II, 3](#) and its subsections for different types of subject-matter listed under [Art. 52\(2\)](#).

In the context of the problem-solution approach, the technical problem means the aim and task of modifying or adapting the closest prior art to achieve the technical effects that the invention offers over the closest prior art. The technical problem thus defined is often referred to as the "**objective technical problem**".

The objective technical problem identified in this way may not be what the applicant presented as "the problem" in the application. That problem may need to be reformulated, since the objective technical problem is based on objectively established facts, in particular those apparent from the prior art revealed over the course of the proceedings, which may be different from the prior art of which the applicant was actually aware at the time the application was filed. In particular, the prior art cited in the search report may put the invention in an entirely different perspective from that apparent from reading the application only. Alternatively, it may also be possible to rely on technical effects submitted subsequently during the proceedings by the applicant (see [G-VII, 11](#)). In certain situations, reformulation might make the objective technical problem less ambitious than originally envisaged in the application. An example would be where the originally stated problem is the provision of a product, process or method demonstrating some improvement, but there is no evidence that the claimed subject-matter is thereby improved over the closest prior art identified in the search and instead there is only evidence with respect to more distantly related prior art (or possibly none at all). In this case, the problem has to be reformulated as the provision of an alternative product, process or method. The obviousness of the claimed solution to that

reformulated problem must then be assessed in the light of the cited prior art (see T 87/08).

The extent to which the technical problem can be reformulated has to be assessed on the merits of each particular case. As a rule, any effect provided by the invention can be taken as a basis for reformulating the technical problem, provided the skilled person, having the common general knowledge at the effective date of filing in mind, and based on the application as originally filed, would consider the effect in question to be encompassed by the technical teaching and embodied by the same originally disclosed invention (see G-VII, 11 and G 2/21, Headnote II). This means that the effect need not be literally disclosed in the application as originally filed (T 116/18, Reasons 11.10). Furthermore, the two criteria "encompassed by the technical teaching" and "embodied by the same originally disclosed invention" need to be met cumulatively (T 1989/19, Reasons 3.3.8).

The objective technical problem must be formulated in such a way that it does not contain pointers to the technical solution, because including part of a technical solution offered by an invention in the statement of the problem must, when the state of the art is assessed in terms of that problem, necessarily result in an *ex post facto* view of inventive activity (see T 229/85). However, where a claim refers to an aim to be achieved in a non-technical field, this aim may legitimately appear in the formulation of the problem as part of the framework of the technical problem to be solved, in particular as a constraint that has to be met (see G-VII, 5.4 and G-VII, 5.4.1).

The expression "technical problem" is interpreted broadly; it does not necessarily imply that the technical solution is an improvement to the prior art. This means that the problem could be simply to seek an alternative to a known device or process which provides the same or similar effects or is more cost-effective. A technical problem may be regarded as solved only if it is credible that substantially all claimed embodiments exhibit the technical effects on which the invention is based. The criteria for deciding whether lack of reproducibility of the claimed invention is to be dealt with under Art. 56 or 83 are explained in F-III, 13.

Sometimes, the objective technical problem must be regarded as an aggregation of several "**partial problems**", e.g. where no technical effect is achieved by all the distinguishing features taken in combination, but rather several partial problems are independently solved by different sets of distinguishing features (see G-VII, 6 and T 389/86).

5.3 Could-would approach

At the third stage, the question to be answered is whether there is any teaching in the prior art as a whole that **would** (not simply could, but would) have prompted the skilled person, when faced with the objective technical problem, to modify or adapt the closest prior art in the light of that teaching in such a way as to arrive at something falling within the terms of the claims and thus achieve what the invention achieves (see G-VII, 4).

In other words, the point is not whether the skilled person could have arrived at the invention by adapting or modifying the closest prior art but whether the skilled person **would have done** so because the prior art provided motivation to do so in the expectation of some improvement or advantage (see [T 2/83](#)). Even an implicit prompting or implicitly recognisable incentive is sufficient to show that the skilled person would have combined the elements from the prior art (see [T 257/98](#) and [T 35/04](#)). It must be shown that the skilled person would have done so before the filing or priority date valid for the claim under examination.

Even if various steps need to be taken to solve the technical problem entirely, the invention will still be regarded as obvious if the technical problem leads the skilled person step by step to its solution and each individual step is obvious in the light of what has already been accomplished and what still remains to be solved (see [T 623/97](#) and [T 558/00](#)).

5.4 Claims comprising technical and non-technical features

It is legitimate to have a mix of technical and non-technical features in a claim, as is often the case with computer-implemented inventions. The non-technical features may even form a major part of the claimed subject-matter. However, in the light of [Art. 52\(1\)](#), [\(2\)](#) and [\(3\)](#), a non-obvious technical solution to a technical problem is required for there to be an inventive step under [Art. 56](#) ([T 641/00](#), [T 1784/06](#)).

When assessing the inventive step of such a mixed-type invention, all features which contribute to the invention's technical character are taken into account. That includes features which are non-technical when taken in isolation but which, in the context of the invention, do contribute to producing a technical effect serving a technical purpose and so contribute to the invention's technical character. However, features which do not contribute to the invention's technical character cannot support an inventive step ("COMVIK approach", [T 641/00](#), [G 1/19](#)). An example of such a feature is one that contributes only to solving a non-technical problem, e.g. a problem in a field excluded from patentability (see [G-II, 3](#) and subsections).

The problem-solution approach is applied to mixed-type inventions in such a way as to ensure that inventive step cannot be established on the basis of features not contributing to the invention's technical character but that all those features which do contribute to it are properly identified and taken into account in the assessment. To this end, where the claim refers to an aim to be achieved in a non-technical field, this aim may legitimately appear in the formulation of the objective technical problem as part of the framework of the technical problem to be solved, in particular as a constraint that has to be met ([T 641/00](#); see step (iii)(c) below and [G-VII, 5.4.1](#)).

The steps below outline how the problem-solution approach is applied to mixed-type inventions following the COMVIK approach:

- (i) The features which contribute to the technical character of the invention are determined on the basis of the technical effects achieved in the context of the invention (see G-II, 3.1 to 3.7).
- (ii) A suitable starting point in the prior art is selected as the closest prior art with a focus on the features contributing to the technical character of the invention identified in step (i) (see G-VII, 5.1).
- (iii) The differences from the closest prior art are identified. The technical effect or effects of these differences, in the context of the claim as a whole, are determined in order to identify from these differences the features which make a technical contribution and those which do not.
 - (a) If there are no differences (not even a non-technical difference), an objection under Art. 54 is raised.
 - (b) If the differences do not make any technical contribution, an objection under Art. 56 is raised on the ground that the subject-matter of a claim cannot be inventive if there is no technical contribution to the prior art.
 - (c) If the differences include features making a technical contribution, the following applies:
 - The objective technical problem is formulated on the basis of the technical effects achieved by these features. In addition, if the differences include features making no technical contribution, these features, or any non-technical effect achieved by the invention, may be used in the formulation of the objective technical problem as part of what is "given" to the skilled person, in particular as a constraint that has to be met (see G-VII, 5.4.1).
 - If the claimed technical solution to the objective technical problem is obvious to the skilled person, an objection under Art. 56 is raised.

The features contributing to the technical character of the invention should be determined for all claim features in step (i) (T 172/03, T 154/04). However, in practice, due to the complexity of this task, the examiner can normally do so in step (i) on a first-glance basis only; a more detailed analysis is then carried out at the beginning of step (iii). In step (iii), the technical effects achieved by the differences over the selected closest prior art are determined. The extent to which the differences contribute to the technical character of the invention is analysed in relation to these technical effects. This analysis, limited to the differences, can be performed in more detail and on a more definite basis than the one performed at step (i). It may therefore reveal that some features considered at first glance in

step (i) not to contribute to the technical character of the invention do, on closer inspection, make such a contribution. The reverse situation is also possible. In such cases, the selection of the closest prior art in step (ii) might need to be revised.

When performing the analysis in steps (i) and (iii) above, examiners must take care to avoid missing any features that might contribute to the technical character of the claimed subject-matter, in particular if they reproduce their understanding of the subject-matter in their own words during the analysis (T 756/06).

The examples in G-VII, 5.4.2.1 to 5.4.2.4 illustrate the application of the COMVIK approach.

5.4.1 Formulation of the objective technical problem for claims comprising technical and non-technical features

The objective technical problem must be a technical problem which the skilled person in the particular technical field might have been asked to solve at the relevant date. It must not be formulated in such a way as to refer to matters of which the skilled person would only have become aware by knowledge of the solution claimed (G-VII, 5.2). In other words, the objective technical problem must be formulated in such a way that it does not contain pointers to the technical solution. However, this principle only applies to those features of the subject-matter claimed which contribute to the technical character of the invention and so are part of the technical solution. The mere fact that a feature appears in the claim does not automatically exclude it from appearing in the formulation of the problem. In particular, where the claim refers to an aim to be achieved in a non-technical field, this aim may legitimately appear in the formulation of the problem as part of the framework of the technical problem that is to be solved, in particular as a constraint that has to be met (T 641/00).

In other words, the formulation of the objective technical problem may refer to features which do not make a technical contribution, or to any non-technical effect achieved by the invention, as a given framework within which the technical problem is posed, e.g. in the form of a requirements specification provided to the skilled person in a technical field. The aim of formulating the technical problem according to these principles is to ensure that inventive step can be established only on the basis of features which contribute to the technical character of the invention. The technical effects used for formulating the objective technical problem have to be derivable from the application as filed when considered in the light of the closest prior art. They must be achieved over the whole scope of the claim. A claim must therefore be limited in such a way that substantially all embodiments encompassed by the claim show these effects (G 1/19, G-VII, 5.2).

On technical effects which are not directly achieved by the claimed invention but are only "potential technical effects", see G-II, 3.3.2.

On technical effects arising from specific technical implementations where the design of algorithms is motivated by technical considerations of the internal functioning of the computer, see G-II, 3.3.

Where claims are directed to a technical implementation of a non-technical method or scheme, in particular a business method or game rules, a modification of the underlying non-technical method or scheme aimed at circumventing a technical problem, rather than addressing it in an inherently technical way, is not considered to make a technical contribution over the prior art (T 258/03, T 414/12). Rather, such a solution is a modification of the constraints given to the technically skilled person tasked with implementing the non-technical method or scheme.

In such cases, consideration must be given to any further technical advantages or effects associated with the specific features of the technical implementation over and above the effects and advantages inherent in the underlying non-technical method or scheme. The latter are at best to be regarded as incidental to that implementation (T 1543/06). They do not qualify as technical effects for the purpose of defining the objective technical problem.

Example

In a game played online over a distributed computer system, the effect of a reduction in network traffic obtained by reducing the maximum number of players cannot form the basis for formulating the objective technical problem. Rather, it is a direct consequence of changing the rules of the game which is inherent in the non-technical scheme. The problem of reducing network traffic is not addressed by a technical solution but circumvented by the non-technical gaming solution offered. The feature defining the maximum number of players is therefore a given constraint which forms part of the non-technical scheme that the skilled person, e.g. a software engineer, would be tasked with implementing. Whether the claimed specific technical implementation would have been obvious to the skilled person would still have to be assessed.

5.4.2 Examples of applying the COMVIK approach

The following examples illustrate how the COMVIK approach is applied following the steps described in G-VII, 5.4 in various scenarios. The scenarios are adapted from case law. The claims have been greatly simplified for illustrative purposes.

5.4.2.1 Example 1

Claim 1:

Method of facilitating shopping on a mobile device wherein:

- (a) *the user selects two or more products to be purchased;*
- (b) *the mobile device transmits the selected products data and the device location to a server;*
- (c) *the server accesses a database of vendors to identify vendors offering at least one of the selected products;*

- (d) *the server determines, on the basis of the device location and the identified vendors, an optimal shopping tour for purchasing the selected products by accessing a cache memory in which optimal shopping tours determined for previous requests are stored; and*
- (e) *the server transmits the optimal shopping tour to the mobile device for displaying.*

Application of the steps of the problem-solution approach outlined in G-VII, 5.4:

Step (i): The features contributing to the technical character are identified at first glance as a distributed system comprising a mobile device connected to a server computer which has a cache memory and is connected to a database.

Step (ii): Document D1, which discloses a method for facilitating shopping on a mobile device wherein the user selects a single product and the server determines from a database the vendor selling the selected product nearest to the user and transmits this information to the mobile device, is selected as the closest prior art.

Step (iii): The differences between the subject-matter of claim 1 and D1 are:

- (1) The user can select two or more products to purchase (instead of a single product only).
- (2) An "optimal shopping tour" for purchasing the two or more products is provided to the user.
- (3) The optimal shopping tour is determined by the server by accessing a cache memory in which optimal shopping tours determined for previous requests are stored.

Differences (1) and (2) represent modifications of the underlying business concept, since they define producing an ordered list of shops to visit which sell these products. No technical purpose is served, and no technical effects can be identified from these differences. Hence, these features make no technical contribution over D1. On the other hand, difference (3) makes a technical contribution as it relates to the technical implementation of differences (1) and (2) and has the technical effect of enabling rapid determination of the optimal shopping tour by accessing previous requests which are stored in a cache memory.

Step (iii)(c): The objective technical problem is to be formulated from the perspective of the skilled person as an expert in the technical field concerned (G-VII, 3). This person is deemed not to have any expertise in business-related matters. In this case, the skilled person can be defined as an expert in information technology who gains knowledge of the business-related features (1) and (2) as part of the formulation of the technical problem to be solved, as would be the case in a realistic situation

in the form of a requirement specification. The objective technical problem is thus formulated as how to modify the method of D1 to implement in a technically efficient manner the non-technical business concept defined by the differences (1) and (2), which is given as a constraint to be met.

Obviousness: As regards requirement (1), it would have been a matter of routine for the skilled person to adapt the mobile device used in D1 so as to enable the user to select two or more products instead of a single one. It would also have been obvious to assign the task of determining the optimal shopping tour (arising from requirement (2)) to the server, by analogy with the server likewise determining the nearest vendor in D1. Since the objective technical problem further requires a technically efficient implementation, the skilled person would have looked for efficient technical implementations of the determination of a tour. A second document D2 discloses a travel planning system for determining travel trips, listing a set of places to visit, and addresses this technical problem: for this purpose, the system of D2 accesses a cache memory storing results of previous queries. The skilled person would thus have considered the teaching of D2 and adapted the server in D1 to access and use a cache memory as suggested in D2 so as to provide a technically efficient implementation of the determination of the optimal shopping tour, i.e. difference (3). Hence, no inventive step is involved within the meaning of Art. 52(1) and 56.

Remarks: The example shows a typical application of the approach developed in T 641/00 (COMVIK) to assess the second hurdle (inventive step) of the “two-hurdle approach” as defined in G 1/19 (simulation method). The analysis of technical effects is performed in detail at step (iii) to see if the differences from the closest prior art comprise features making a technical contribution. This analysis refines the initial finding of step (i) by identifying the feature of accessing the cache memory for results of previous requests in the step of determining the tour as a technical feature. Note that in this case step (i) would not need to be indicated explicitly in the reasoning. In step (iii)(c), the non-technical modifications of the business concept are given to the skilled person as a constraint to be met. Whether or not the new business concept is innovative is irrelevant here for the assessment of inventive step, which has to be based on the features of its technical implementation.

5.4.2.2 Example 2

Claim 1:

A computer-implemented method for brokering offers and demands in the field of transporting freight, comprising the following steps:

- (a) receiving transportation offers/demands from users, including location and time data;*
- (b) receiving current location information of the users from GPS terminals with which the users are equipped;*

- (c) *after receiving a new offer/demand request, verifying if there are previous offers/demands not yet satisfied that can respond to the new request;*
- (d) *if so, selecting the one for which the current locations of both users are closest; and*
- (e) *otherwise storing the new request.*

Application of the steps of the problem-solution approach outlined in G-VII. 5.4:

Step (i): The claimed method is based on the following business method:

A method for brokering offers and demands in the field of freight transportation, comprising:

- receiving transportation offers/demands from users, including location and time data;
- receiving information regarding the current location of the users;
- after receiving a new offer/demand request, verifying if there are previous offers/demands not yet satisfied that can respond to the new request;
- if so, selecting the one for which the current locations of both users are closest; and
- otherwise storing the new request.

Such a business method is per se non-technical and excluded under Art. 52(2)(c) and (3). Brokering offers and demands is a typical business activity. Using the geographical location of users is the kind of criterion which a transportation broker could specify as part of a business method based on non-technical, business considerations only. This business method does not serve any technical purpose in the context of the invention and so does not contribute to its technical character.

Therefore, only the features related to the technical implementation of this business method can be identified as the features contributing to the technical character of the invention:

- The business method steps are carried out by a computer.
- The current location information is received from GPS terminals.

Step (ii): As a suitable starting point, document D1, which discloses a method of order management in which a server computer receives location information from GPS terminals, is selected as the closest prior art.

Step (iii): The difference between the subject-matter of claim 1 and D1 is thus the computer implementation of the steps of the business method defined above.

The technical effect of this difference is merely the automation of the business method underlying claim 1. The conclusion reached in step (i) still holds, since the only distinguishing feature making a technical contribution is the technical implementation of this business method.

Step (iii)(c): The objective technical problem is formulated as how to adapt the method of D1 so as to implement the business method of brokering offers and demands according to the user's current location. The skilled person is considered to be a software project team and is given the knowledge of the business method in the form of a requirement specification.

Obviousness: Adapting the method of D1 to execute the business method steps is straightforward and requires routine programming only. Therefore, no inventive step is involved within the meaning of Art. 52(1) and Art. 56.

Remarks: In this example, it was clear from the initial analysis at step (i) that the claimed method was based on a method for brokering offers and demands, which as such is a business method. The features defining the business method were easily separable from the technical features of its computer implementation. This example therefore illustrates a line of argument in which it was possible in step (i) to determine all the features which contribute to the technical character of the invention and all those which do not. This line of argument pertains more to the field of computer-implemented business methods and might be less suitable in other fields.

5.4.2.3 Example 3

This example illustrates the two-level technicality analysis described in G-VII, 5.4.

Claim 1:

A system for the transmission of a broadcast media channel to a remote client over a data connection, said system including:

- (a) means for storing an identifier of the remote client and an indication of an available data rate of the data connection to the remote client, said available data rate being lower than the maximum data rate for the data connection to the remote client;*
- (b) means for determining a rate at which data is to be transmitted based on the indication of the available data rate of the data connection; and*
- (c) means for transmitting data at the determined rate to said remote client.*

Application of the steps of the problem-solution approach outlined in G-VII, 5.4:

Step (i): At first glance, all features appear to contribute to the technical character of the invention.

Step (ii): Document D1, which discloses a system for broadcasting video over an xDSL connection to the set-top boxes of subscribers, is selected as the closest prior art. The system comprises a database storing identifiers of subscribers' computers and, in association with them, an indication of the maximum data rate for the data connection to each subscriber's computer. The system further comprises means for transmitting the video to a subscriber's computer at the maximum data rate stored for said computer.

Step (iii): The differences between the subject-matter of claim 1 and D1 are:

- (1) Storing an indication of an available data rate of the data connection to the remote client, said available data rate being lower than the maximum data rate for the data connection to the remote client.
- (2) Using said available data rate to determine the rate at which the data is transmitted to the remote client (instead of transmitting the data at the maximum data rate stored for said remote client as in D1).

The purpose served by using an "available data rate" which is lower than a maximum data rate for the data connection to the remote client is not apparent from the claim. The relevant disclosure in the description is therefore taken into account. In the description, it is explained that a pricing model is provided which allows a customer to choose from several service levels, each service level corresponding to an available data-rate option having a different price. With a view to paying less, a user may select an available data rate lower than the maximum data rate possible with the connection. Hence, using an available data rate which is lower than the maximum data rate for the connection to the remote client addresses the aim of allowing a customer to choose a data-rate service level according to that pricing model. This is not a technical aim, but an aim of a financial, administrative or commercial nature, and so it falls under the exclusion of schemes, rules and methods for doing business in Art. 52(2)(c). It may thus be included in the formulation of the objective technical problem as a constraint to be met.

The features of *storing* the available data rate and of *using it to determine the rate at which the data is transmitted* have the technical effect of implementing this non-technical aim.

Step (iii)(c): The objective technical problem is therefore formulated as how to implement in the system of D1 a pricing model which allows the customer to choose a data-rate service level.

Obviousness: Given the task of implementing this choice of data-rate service level in accordance with the pricing model, it would be obvious to

the skilled person that the data rate purchased by a subscriber (i.e. the "available data rate" of claim 1), which can only be lower or equal to the maximum data rate of the data connection to the subscriber's computer (i.e. the "remote client" of claim 1), would have to be stored for each subscriber and used by the system to determine the rate at which data is to be transmitted to a subscriber. Therefore, no inventive step is involved within the meaning of Art. 52(1) and Art. 56.

Remarks: This example illustrates a claim which involves a complex mix of technical and non-technical features. In step (i), all features appeared at first glance to contribute to the technical character of the invention. After comparison with D1, it was possible to carry out a detailed analysis of the technical character of the contribution made by the invention over D1 at step (iii). This detailed analysis revealed that the distinguishing features addressed a non-technical aim, which could thus be incorporated into the formulation of the objective technical problem (T. 641/00).

5.4.2.4 Example 4

Claim 1:

A computer-implemented method of determining areas in which there is an increased risk of condensation for a surface in a building comprising the steps of:

- (a) controlling an infrared (IR) camera to capture an image of the temperature distribution of the surface;*
- (b) receiving mean values for the air temperature and the relative air humidity measured inside the building over the last 24 hours;*
- (c) calculating, based on said mean air temperature and mean relative air humidity, a condensation temperature at which there is a risk of condensation on the surface;*
- (d) comparing the temperature at each point on the image to said calculated condensation temperature;*
- (e) identifying the image points having a temperature lower than the calculated condensation temperature as areas at increased risk of condensation on the surface; and*
- (f) modifying the image by colouring the image points identified in step (e) in a particular colour to indicate the areas at increased risk of condensation to a user.*

Application of the steps of the problem-solution approach outlined in G-VII. 5.4:

Step (i): The control of an IR camera in step (a) clearly makes a technical contribution. The question is whether steps (b) to (f) also contribute to the technical character of the claimed subject-matter.

Considered in isolation, steps (b) to (e) relate to algorithmic/mathematical steps and step (f) defines a presentation of information. However, the claim is not directed to a mental act, a mathematical method or presentation of information as such (which would be excluded from patentability under Art. 52(2)(a), (c), (d) and (3)), because the claimed subject-matter involves technical means such as a computer.

It therefore has to be assessed whether the algorithmic and mathematical steps and the step related to presentation of information do, in the context of the invention, contribute to producing a technical effect and thereby contribute to the technical character of the invention.

Since the above-mentioned algorithmic and mathematical steps (b) to (e) are used to predict the physical state (condensation) of an existing real object (surface) from measurements of physical properties (IR image, measured air temperature and relative air humidity over time), they contribute to a technical effect serving a technical purpose. This applies regardless of what use is made of the output information about the risk of condensation on the surface (see G-II.3.3, in particular subsection "Technical applications"). So steps (b) to (e) also contribute to the technical character of the invention.

A decision on whether step (f) makes a technical contribution is deferred to step (iii) below.

Step (ii): Document D1 discloses a method for monitoring a surface to determine the risk of condensation forming on it. The risk of condensation is determined based on the difference of the temperature reading obtained via an IR pyrometer for a single point on the surface and the condensation temperature calculated based on the actual ambient air temperature and the relative air humidity. The numerical value of the difference is then shown to a user as an indication of the likelihood of condensation at that point. This document is taken as the closest prior art.

Step (iii): The differences between the subject-matter of claim 1 and D1 are:

- (1) an *IR camera* is used (instead of the IR pyrometer of D1, which only captures the temperature at a single point of the surface);
- (2) *mean* values for air temperature and relative air humidity measured inside the building *over the last 24 hours* are received;
- (3) the condensation temperature is calculated *on the basis of the mean air temperature and mean relative air humidity* and compared to the temperature at each point on the IR image of the surface;
- (4) image points having a temperature lower than the calculated condensation temperature are identified as *areas* at increased risk of condensation on the surface;
- (5) *colours* are used to indicate areas at increased risk of condensation.

As mentioned above, distinguishing features (1)-(4) contribute to the technical character of the claimed subject-matter and must be taken into consideration when formulating the technical problem. These features produce the technical effect of a more precise and reliable prediction of the risk of condensation as a result of considering all surface areas (as opposed to a single point) and accounting for temperature variations during a day.

Distinguishing feature (5) defines a particular way of presenting information to a user (Art. 52(2)(d)) which does not produce a technical effect since any effect of choosing to display data using colours rather than numerical values depends on subjective preferences of the user: some users may prefer the former and others the latter (see G-II, 3.7). This feature therefore does not make a technical contribution. It cannot support inventive step and is not discussed further in the analysis since it has no bearing on the other distinguishing features.

Step (iii)(c): The objective technical problem is therefore formulated as how to determine the risk of condensation on a surface in a more precise and reliable manner.

Obviousness: The use of an IR camera for obtaining temperature readings on a surface can be considered a normal technical development in the field of thermography that does not require any inventive activity: IR cameras were well known at the effective date of the application. For the skilled person, using an IR camera to determine temperature distribution on the surface is a straightforward alternative to measuring the temperature at several points on the monitored surface using an IR pyrometer.

However, D1 does not suggest considering a temperature distribution on a surface (as opposed to at a single point) or calculating mean values for air temperature and taking relative air humidity measured inside the building over the last 24 hours into consideration. Neither does it suggest taking into account different conditions which may realistically occur inside the building over time for predicting the risk of condensation.

Assuming that no other prior art suggests the technical solution of the objective technical problem defined by distinguishing features (1)-(4), the subject-matter of claim 1 involves an inventive step.

Remarks: This example illustrates the situation addressed in G-VII, 5.4, second paragraph: features which, when taken in isolation, are non-technical but do, in the context of the claimed invention, contribute to producing a technical effect serving a technical purpose (features (b) to (e), which are algorithmic/mathematical steps). Since these features contribute to the technical character of the invention, they may support an inventive step.

5.4.2.5 Example 5

Claim 1:

A method for coating a workpiece using a thermal spray coating process, the method comprising:

- (a) applying, using a spray jet, a material to the workpiece by thermal spray coating;*
- (b) monitoring the thermal spray coating process in real time by detecting properties of particles in the spray jet and supplying the properties as actual values;*
- (c) comparing the actual values with target values;*

and, in the event that the actual values deviate from the target values,

- (d) adjusting process parameters for the thermal spray coating process automatically by a controller on the basis of a neural network, said controller being a neuro-fuzzy controller which combines a neural-network and fuzzy logic rules and thereby maps statistical relationships between input variables and output variables of the neuro-fuzzy controller.*

Background: The invention relates to the control of an industrial process, namely thermal spray coating of a workpiece. The material used for the coating is injected with the help of a carrier gas into the high-temperature jet, where it is accelerated and/or molten. The properties of the resulting coatings are subject to great fluctuations, even with seemingly constant parameters of the coating operation. The spray jet is monitored visually with a CCD camera. The image picked up by the camera is sent to an image processing system, from which the properties of particles in the spray jet (e.g. velocity, temperature, size, etc) can be derived. A neuro-fuzzy controller is a mathematical algorithm which combines a neural network with fuzzy-logic rules.

Application of the steps of the problem-solution approach outlined in COMVIK:

Step (i): The method is directed at thermal spray coating, i.e. a specific technical process, comprising various concrete technical features, e.g. particles, workpiece, a spray coating device (implicit).

Step (ii): Document D1 discloses a method for the control of a thermal spray coating process by applying material to a workpiece using a spray jet, detecting deviations in the properties of the particles in said spray jet and adjusting process parameters automatically on the basis of the outcome of a neural network analysis. This document represents the closest prior art.

Step (iii): The difference between the method of claim 1 and D1 concerns the use of a neuro-fuzzy controller combining a neural network and fuzzy logic rules as specified in the second part of step (d).

Computational models and algorithms related to artificial intelligence are, on their own, of an abstract mathematical nature (G-II, 3.3.1). The feature of combining results of a neural network analysis and fuzzy logic defines a mathematical method when taken on its own. However, together with the feature of adjusting the process parameters, it contributes to the control of the coating process. Hence, the output of the mathematical method is directly used in the control of a specific technical process.

Control of a specific technical process is a technical application (see G-II, 3.3, subsection "Technical applications"). In conclusion, the distinguishing feature contributes to producing a technical effect serving a technical purpose and thereby contributes to the technical character of the invention. It is therefore taken into account in the assessment of inventive step.

Step (iii)(c): The objective technical problem must be derived from technical effects that are based on objectively established facts and that are directly and causally related to the technical features of the claim.

In this case, the mere fact that the parameters are calculated using a combination of results of a neural network analysis and fuzzy logic – without any details on specific adaptation to the thermal spray coating process – cannot credibly ensure any technical effect beyond a different adjustment of the process parameters. In particular, no evidence can be found to support any increase in the quality of coating properties or of the thermal spraying method that would result from the combination of features of claim 1. In the absence of such evidence, the objective technical problem is to provide an alternative solution to the problem of adjusting the process parameters which control the thermal spray coating process already solved in D1.

Obviousness: Starting from the teaching of D1 and tasked with the above objective technical problem, the skilled person in the field of control engineering (G-VII, 3) would look for an alternative solution to determine the control parameters of the process.

A second prior-art document D2 discloses a combination of a neural network and fuzzy logic rules providing a neuro-fuzzy controller in the technical field of control engineering. From this prior art, it has become apparent that at the date of filing of the application, neuro-fuzzy controllers were well known and applied in the field of control engineering. The present solution is therefore considered to be an obvious alternative, rendering the subject-matter of claim 1 not inventive.

Remarks: This example illustrates the case of a mathematical feature which is non-technical when taken in isolation but contributes to producing a technical effect serving a technical purpose in the context of the claim. The feature of using a combination of neural network results and fuzzy logic for

adjusting process parameters for controlling thermal spraying contributes to the technical character of the invention and may therefore support inventive step.

The availability of the general teaching of using neuro-fuzzy controllers in the field of control engineering resulted in the objection that the controller of claim 1 was an obvious alternative. This particular objection could have been avoided if the claim had recited further features of the fuzzy control method linked to some technical properties of the spray coating process. For example, if the desirable coating properties resulted from specific input and output variables of the neuro-fuzzy controller, how the controller is trained or how the output is used in the regulation of the process parameters, these features would have had to be recited in the claim. The description and figures as filed could have provided evidence that the desirable coating properties are indeed achieved. As currently claimed, the neuro-fuzzy controller is not adapted for the specific application of thermal spray coating. There is no evidence of any particular technical effect which is credibly achieved over the whole claimed scope other than that of providing different process parameters as input to the controller.

6. Combining pieces of prior art

In the context of the problem-solution approach, it is permissible to combine the disclosure of one or more documents, parts of documents or other pieces of prior art (e.g. a public prior use or unwritten general technical knowledge) with the closest prior art. However, the fact that more than one disclosure must be combined with the closest prior art in order to arrive at a combination of features may indicate that there is an inventive step, e.g. if the claimed invention is not a mere aggregation of features (see G-VII, 7).

The situation is different where the invention is a solution to several independent "partial problems" (see G-VII, 7 and 5.2). Indeed, in such a case it is necessary to separately assess, for each partial problem, whether the combination of features solving the partial problem is obviously derivable from the prior art. This means that a different document can be combined with the closest prior art for each partial problem (see T 389/86). For the subject-matter of the claim to be inventive, it suffices, however, that one of these combinations of features involves an inventive step.

In determining whether it would be obvious to combine two or more distinct disclosures, the examiner must consider especially:

- (i) whether the content of the disclosures (e.g. documents) is such as to make it likely or unlikely that the skilled person, when faced with the problem solved by the invention, would combine them – for example, if two disclosures considered as a whole could not in practice be readily combined because of inherent incompatibility in disclosed features essential to the invention, combining these disclosures is not normally regarded as obvious
- (ii) whether the disclosures (e.g. documents) come from similar, neighbouring or remote technical fields (see G-VII, 3)

- (iii) that combining two or more parts of the same disclosure would be obvious if there is a reasonable basis for the skilled person to associate these parts with one another. It would normally be obvious to combine a well-known textbook or standard dictionary with a prior-art document; this is only a special case of the general proposition that it is obvious to combine the teaching of one or more documents with the **common general knowledge** in the art. Generally speaking, it would also be obvious to combine two documents where one of them contains a clear and unmistakable reference to the other (on references which are considered an integral part of the disclosure, see G-IV, 5.1 and G-VI, 1). In determining whether it is permissible to combine a document with an item of prior art made public in some other way, e.g. by use, similar considerations apply.

7. Combination vs. juxtaposition or aggregation

The invention claimed must normally be considered as a whole. When a claim consists of a "combination of features", it is wrong to argue that, viewed in isolation, the individual features of this combination are known or obvious and that "therefore" the whole subject-matter claimed is obvious. However, where the claim is merely an "aggregation or juxtaposition of features" and not a true combination, it is enough to show that the individual features are obvious to prove that the aggregation of features does not involve an inventive step (see G-VII, 5.2, last paragraph). A set of technical features is regarded as a combination of features if the functional interaction between the features achieves a combined technical effect which is different from, e.g. greater than, the sum of the technical effects of the individual features. In other words, the interactions of the individual features must produce a synergistic effect. If no such synergistic effect exists, there is no more than a mere aggregation of features (see T 389/86 and T 204/06).

For example, the technical effect of an individual transistor is essentially that of an electronic switch. However, transistors interconnected to form a microprocessor synergically interact to achieve technical effects, such as data processing, which go beyond the sum of their respective individual technical effects (see also G-VII, Annex, 2).

According to T 9/81, a preparation in the form of a "kit-of-parts" in which the individual active compounds, representing known therapeutic agents, are physically separated is patentable if the use of those compounds simultaneously, separately or sequentially produces a new and unexpected joint therapeutic effect which the compounds cannot achieve independently of each other.

8. "Ex post facto" analysis

An invention which at first sight appears obvious might in fact involve an inventive step. Once a new idea has been formulated, it can often be shown theoretically how it might be arrived at, starting from something known, by a series of apparently easy steps. The examiner must be wary of any *ex post facto* analysis of this kind. When combining documents cited in the search report, it always has to be borne in mind that the documents

produced in the search were necessarily obtained with foreknowledge of the alleged invention's subject-matter. The examiner must always attempt to visualise the overall state of the art confronting the skilled person before the applicant's contribution and make a "real-life" assessment of this and other relevant factors. The examiner has to take into account everything known about the background to the invention and give fair weight to relevant arguments or evidence submitted by the applicant. If, for example, an invention is shown to be of considerable technical value, and particularly if it provides a technical advantage which is new and surprising and which is not merely achieved as a bonus effect in a "one-way street" situation (see G-VII, 10.2), and this technical advantage can convincingly be related to one or more of the features included in the claim defining the invention, the examiner should be hesitant about raising an objection that such a claim lacks inventive step.

9. Origin of an invention

While the claim must always be directed to technical features (and not, for example, merely to an idea), it is important for the examiner to bear in mind when assessing whether an inventive step is involved that an invention may, for example, be based on the following:

- (i) devising a solution to a known problem

Example: the problem of permanently marking farm animals such as cows without causing them pain or damaging their hide has existed since farming began. The solution ("freeze-branding") consists in applying the discovery that the hide can be permanently depigmented by freezing.

- (ii) arriving at an insight into the cause of an observed phenomenon (the practical use of this phenomenon then being obvious)

Example: the agreeable flavour of butter is found to be caused by minute quantities of a particular compound. As soon as this insight has been arrived at, the technical application comprising adding this compound to margarine is immediately obvious.

Many inventions are of course based on a combination of the above possibilities. For example, the arrival at an insight and the technical application of that insight may both involve using inventive faculty.

10. Secondary indicators

10.1 Predictable disadvantage; non-functional modification; arbitrary choice

If an invention is the result of a foreseeable disadvantageous modification of the closest prior art which the skilled person could clearly predict and correctly assess, and if this predictable disadvantage is not accompanied by an unexpected technical advantage, then the claimed invention does not involve an inventive step (see T 119/82 and T 155/85). In other words, a foreseeable worsening of the prior art does not on its own involve an inventive step but it may involve one if it is accompanied by an unexpected

technical advantage. Similar considerations apply where an invention is merely the result of an arbitrary non-functional modification of a prior-art device or of a merely arbitrary choice from a host of possible solutions (see T 72/95 and T 939/92).

10.2 Unexpected technical effect; bonus effect

An unexpected technical effect can be regarded as an indication of inventive step. However, it must result from the subject-matter as claimed, and not merely from some additional features mentioned only in the description. The unexpected effect must be based on the characterising features of the invention in combination with the known features of the claim. It cannot be based only on features which are, in combination, already comprised in the prior art.

However, if, having regard to the state of the art, it would already have been obvious for a skilled person to arrive at something falling within the terms of a claim, for example because a lack of alternatives created a "one-way street" situation, the unexpected effect is merely a bonus effect which does not make the claimed subject-matter inventive (see T 231/97 and T 192/82). If the skilled person would have to choose from a range of possibilities, there is no one-way street situation and the unexpected effect may very well lead to the recognition of an inventive step.

The unexpected property or effect must be described in precise terms. A vague statement such as "The new compounds have shown unexpectedly good pharmaceutical properties" cannot support inventive step.

However, the product or process does not have to be "better" than known products or processes. It is sufficient that the property or effect would not have been expected.

10.3 Long-felt need; commercial success

Where the invention solves a technical problem which workers in the art have been attempting to solve for a long time, or otherwise fulfils a long-felt need, this can be regarded as an indication of inventive step.

Commercial success alone cannot be regarded as indicative of inventive step, but evidence of immediate commercial success together with evidence of a long-felt want is relevant if the examiner is satisfied that the success is attributable to the invention's technical features and not a result of other factors (e.g. selling techniques or advertising).

11. Arguments and evidence submitted by the applicant

The arguments and evidence considered by the examiner when assessing inventive step can be either taken from the originally-filed patent application or submitted by the applicant during the subsequent proceedings (see G-VII, 5.2 and H-V, 2.2 and 2.4).

When an effect is cited in support of inventive step, it must be checked that the effect in question is encompassed by the technical teaching and embodied by the same originally disclosed invention (see G-VII, 5.2).

Any evidence submitted to prove a purported technical effect that can be taken into account for the assessment of inventive step is to be considered in accordance with the principle of free evaluation of evidence. It cannot be disregarded solely on the ground that it is post-published (G 2/21).

Example of an effect relied on at a later stage:

The invention as filed relates to a pharmaceutical composition having a specific activity. At first sight, having regard to the relevant prior art, it would appear to lack inventive step. The applicant later submits new evidence showing that the claimed composition exhibits an unexpected advantage in terms of low toxicity. It is then permissible to reformulate the technical problem by including the aspect of toxicity, since pharmaceutical activity and toxicity are related in the sense that the skilled person would always contemplate them together.

Reformulating the technical problem may or may not lead to an amendment of the statement of the technical problem in the description or to its insertion into the description. Any such amendment is only allowable if it satisfies the conditions listed in H-V, 2.4. In the above example of a pharmaceutical composition, neither the reformulated problem nor the information on toxicity could be introduced into the description without infringing Art. 123(2).

12. Selection inventions

The subject-matter of selection inventions differs from the closest prior art in that it represents selected subsets or sub-ranges. On the assessment of novelty, see G-VI, 7. If this selection is linked to a particular technical effect, and if there are no hints leading the skilled person to the selection, then an inventive step is accepted (this technical effect occurring within the selected range may also be the same effect as is achieved with the broader known range, but to an unexpected degree).

The technical effect must apply to the entire range as claimed. If it occurs in only part of the claimed range, the claimed subject-matter does not solve the specific problem to which the effect relates, but only the more general problem of obtaining, for example, "a further product X" or "a further process Y" (see T 939/92).

Similarly, if there is no evident or plausible effect associated with the selection, a less ambitious problem of providing an alternative needs to be formulated (see T 2108/21, Reasons 3.3.10).

For inventive step in relation to selection inventions, it has to be considered whether the skilled person would have made the selection or would have chosen the overlapping range in the expectation of some improvement or advantage. If the answer is no, then the claimed matter involves an inventive step.

13. Inventive step assessment in the field of biotechnology

In the field of biotechnology, a solution is considered obvious not only when the results are clearly predictable, but also when there is a reasonable

expectation of success. For a solution to be obvious, it is sufficient to establish that the skilled person would have followed the teaching of the prior art with a reasonable expectation of success. Likewise, a mere "try and see" attitude in light of the closest prior art does not necessarily make the solution inventive.

However, a "reasonable expectation of success" is not to be confused with a "hope of success". If researchers are aware when starting their research that, in order to reach a technical solution, they will need not only technical skill but also the ability to make the right non-trivial decisions along the way, this cannot be regarded as a "reasonable expectation of success".

On the assessment of inventive step of antibodies, see G-II, 6.2.

14. Dependent claims; claims in different categories

If the subject-matter of an independent claim is new and non-obvious, there is no need to investigate the novelty and non-obviousness of the subject-matter of any claims dependent on it unless the subject-matter of a dependent claim has a later effective date than the independent claim and intermediate documents are to be considered (see F-VI, 2.4.3).

Similarly, if the subject-matter of a product claim is new and non-obvious there is no need to investigate the novelty and non-obviousness of the subject-matter of any claims for a process which inevitably results in the manufacture of that product or of any claims for a use of that product. In particular, analogy processes, i.e. processes which themselves would otherwise not involve an inventive step, are nevertheless patentable in so far as they provide a novel and inventive product (see T.1119/82). However, where the product, process and use claims have different effective dates, a separate examination as to novelty and inventive step may still be necessary in view of intermediate documents.

15. Examples

The annex to this chapter gives examples of circumstances where an invention may be regarded as obvious or where it may involve an inventive step. It is important to stress that these examples are for illustrative purposes only and that the applicable principle in each case is: "was it obvious to a person skilled in the art?" (see G-VII, 5). Examiners must not try to make a particular case fit into one of these examples if it is not clearly applicable. The list is also not exhaustive.

Annex**Examples relating to the requirement of inventive step – indicators****1. Application of known measures?**

1.1 Inventions which involve the application of **known measures** in an obvious way and for which inventive step is therefore to be ruled out.

- (i) The teaching of a prior-art document is incomplete and at least one of the possible ways of "**filling the gap**" which would naturally or readily occur to the skilled person results in the invention.

Example: The invention relates to a building structure made from aluminium. A prior-art document discloses the same structure and says that it is of light-weight material but does not mention the use of aluminium.

- (ii) The invention differs from the known art only in the use of **well-known equivalents** (mechanical, electrical or chemical).

Example: The invention relates to a pump which differs from a known pump solely in that its motive power is provided by a hydraulic motor instead of an electric motor.

- (iii) The invention consists merely in a new use of a well-known material employing the **known properties** of that material.

Example: Washing composition containing as detergent a known compound having the known property of lowering the surface tension of water, this property being known to be an essential one for detergents.

- (iv) The invention consists in the substitution in a known device of a recently developed material whose properties make it plainly suitable for that use ("**analogous substitution**").

Example: An electric cable comprises a polyethylene sheath bonded to a metallic shield by an adhesive. The invention lies in the use of a particular newly developed adhesive known to be suitable for polymer-metal bonding.

- (v) The invention consists merely in the use of a known technique in a closely analogous situation ("**analogous use**").

Example: The invention consists in the application of a pulse control technique to the electric motor driving the auxiliary mechanisms of an industrial truck, such as a fork-lift truck, the use of this technique to control the electric propulsion motor of the truck being already known.

1.2 Inventions which involve the application of **known measures** in a **non-obvious** way and for which inventive step is therefore to be recognised.

- (i) A known working method or means when used for a **different purpose** has a new, **surprising effect**.

Example: It is known that high-frequency power can be used in **inductive** butt welding. It should therefore be obvious that high-frequency power could also be used in **conductive** butt welding with similar effect. However, if high-frequency power were used for the continuous conductive butt welding of coiled strip but without removing scale (as is normally necessary during conductive welding in order to avoid arcing between the welding contact and the strip), there is the unexpected additional effect that scale removal is found to be unnecessary because at high frequency the current is supplied in a predominantly capacitive manner via the scale which forms a dielectric. In that case, an inventive step would exist.

- (ii) A new use of a known device or material involves **overcoming technical difficulties** not resolvable by routine techniques.

Example: The invention relates to a device for supporting and controlling the rise and fall of gas holders, enabling the previously employed external guiding framework to be dispensed with. A similar device was known for supporting floating docks or pontoons but practical difficulties not encountered in the known applications needed to be overcome in applying the device to a gas holder.

2. Obvious combination of features?

2.1 Obvious and consequently **non-inventive combination** of features.

The invention consists merely in the **juxtaposition** or association of known devices or processes functioning in their normal way and not producing any non-obvious working interrelationship.

Example: A machine for producing sausages that consists of a known mincing machine and a known filling machine disposed side by side.

2.2 Not obvious and consequently **inventive combination** of features.

The combined features mutually support each other in their effects to such an extent that a new technical result is achieved. It is irrelevant whether each individual feature is fully or partly known by itself. However, if the combination of features is a bonus effect, e.g. the result of a "one-way street" situation, the combination might lack an inventive step.

Example: A mixture of medicines consists of a painkiller (analgesic) and a tranquilliser (sedative). It was found that adding the tranquilliser, which intrinsically appeared to have no painkilling effect, intensified the analgesic

effect of the painkiller in a way which could not have been predicted from the known properties of the active substances.

3. Obvious selection?

3.1 Obvious and consequently **non-inventive selection** from among a number of known possibilities.

- (i) The invention consists merely in choosing from a number of **equally likely alternatives**.

Example: The invention relates to a known chemical process in which it is known to supply heat electrically to the reaction mixture. There are a number of well-known alternative ways of so supplying the heat, and the invention resides merely in choosing one of those alternatives.

- (ii) The invention consists in choosing particular dimensions, temperature ranges or other parameters from a limited range of possibilities, and it is clear that these parameters could be arrived at by routine trial and error or by applying **normal design procedures**.

Example: The invention relates to a process for carrying out a known reaction and is characterised by a specified rate of flow of an inert gas. The prescribed rates are merely those which the skilled person would necessarily arrive at.

- (iii) The invention can be arrived at merely by a **simple extrapolation** in a straightforward way from the known art.

Example: The invention is characterised by the use of a specified minimum content of a substance X in a preparation Y in order to improve its thermal stability, and this characterising feature can be derived by mere extrapolation on a straight-line graph obtainable from the known art and relating thermal stability to the content of substance X.

- (iv) The invention consists merely in **selecting** particular chemical compounds or compositions (including alloys) **from a broad field**.

Example: The prior art includes the disclosure of a chemical compound characterised by a specified structure including a substituent group designated "R". This substituent "R" is defined so as to embrace entire ranges of broadly-defined radical groups such as all alkyl or aryl radicals either unsubstituted or substituted by halogen and/or hydroxy, although for practical reasons only a very small number of specific examples are given. The invention consists in the selection of a particular radical or particular group of radicals from among those referred to as the substituent "R" (the selected radical or group of radicals not being specifically disclosed in the prior-art document since the question would then be one of lack of novelty rather than obviousness). The resulting compounds:

- (a) are neither described as having nor shown to possess any advantageous properties not possessed by the prior-art examples; or
 - (b) are described as possessing advantageous properties compared with the compounds specifically referred to in the prior art, but these properties are ones which the skilled person would expect such compounds to possess, so that they are likely to be led to make this selection.
- (v) The invention follows inevitably from developments in the prior art, in such a way that there was no choice between several possibilities ("**one-way street**" situation).

Example: It is known from the prior art that when you reach a particular compound in a series of known chemical compounds, expressed in terms of the number of carbon atoms, there is a consistently increasing insecticidal effect as you move up the series. With regard to insecticidal effect, the next member of the series after the member previously known then lies in a "one-way street". This member of the series remains obvious even if, in addition to exhibiting the expected enhanced insecticidal effect, it proves also to have the unexpected effect of being selective, i.e. of killing some insects but not others.

3.2 Not obvious and consequently **inventive selection** from among a number of known possibilities.

- (i) The invention involves **special selection** in a process of particular operating conditions (e.g. temperature and pressure) within a known range, such selection producing **unexpected effects** in the operation of the process or the properties of the resulting product.

Example: In a process where substance A and substance B are transformed at high temperature into substance C, it was known that there is generally a constantly increasing yield of substance C as the temperature increases in the range between 50 and 130°C. It has now been found that in the temperature range from 63 to 65°C,

which previously had not been explored, the yield of substance C was considerably higher than expected.

- (ii) The invention consists in selecting **particular** chemical compounds or compositions (including alloys) from a broad field, and these compounds or compositions have **unexpected advantages**.

Example: As in the example of a substituted chemical compound given in G-VII, Annex, 3.1(iv) above, the invention again consists in the selection of the substituent radical "R" from the total field of possibilities defined in the prior disclosure. This time, however, not only does the selection cover a particular area of the possible field and result in compounds that can be shown to possess advantageous properties (see G-VII, 10 and H-V, 2.2) but there are also no indications which would lead the skilled person to this particular selection rather than any other in order to achieve the advantageous properties.

4. Overcoming a technical prejudice?

As a general rule, there is an inventive step if the prior art leads the skilled person away from the procedure proposed by the invention. This applies in particular when the skilled person would not even consider carrying out experiments to determine whether there were alternatives to the known way of overcoming a real or imagined technical obstacle.

Example: After being sterilised, drinks containing carbon dioxide are bottled while hot in sterilised bottles. It is generally thought that, immediately after withdrawal of the bottle from the filling device, the bottled drink must be automatically shielded from the outside air to prevent it from spurting out. A process involving the same steps but in which no precautions are taken to shield the drink from the outside air (because none are in fact necessary) would therefore be inventive.

Part H

Amendments and Corrections

Contents

Chapter I – The right to amend I-1

Chapter II – Admissibility of amendments – general rules II-1

1.	Introduction	II-1
2.	Admissibility in the examination procedure	II-1
2.1	Before receipt of the search report – Rule 137(1)	II-1
2.2	After receipt of the search report – Rule 137(2)	II-1
2.3	After receipt of the first communication – Rule 137(3)	II-2
2.3.1	Examples of the exercise of discretion under Rule 137(3)	II-4
2.3.1.1	Rule 137(3) in conjunction with Art. 83	II-4
2.3.1.2	Rule 137(3) in conjunction with Art. 123(2)	II-4
2.3.1.3	Rule 137(3) in conjunction with Art. 84 – missing essential feature	II-4
2.3.1.4	Rule 137(3) in conjunction with auxiliary requests	II-4
2.3.2	Rule 137(3) vs non-unity	II-5
2.3.3	Rule 137(3) during oral proceedings	II-5
2.4	At an advanced stage of the proceedings	II-5
2.5	Amendments filed in reply to a Rule 71(3) communication	II-5
2.5.1	Criteria for admitting such amendments	II-6
2.5.2	Further course of proceedings	II-6
2.5.3	Exceptional case where amendments must be admitted	II-6
2.5.4	Rule 137(4) applies to amendments filed at this stage	II-7
2.6	Further requests for amendment after approval	II-7
2.7	Late-filed requests after summons to oral proceedings in examination	II-8
2.7.1	Concept of "clear allowability"	II-9
3.	Admissibility in opposition procedure	II-9
3.1	Amendments related to the grounds for opposition	II-9
3.2	Amendments not related to the grounds for opposition	II-10
3.3	Amendments occasioned by national rights	II-11
3.4	Insistence on inadmissible amendments	II-11

3.5	Late-filed requests in opposition proceedings	II-11
4.	Amendments in limitation procedure	II-11
5.	Amendments required by a limitation of the search under Rule 62a and/or Rule 63	II-11
6.	Amendments in the case of non-unity	II-12
6.1	Restriction to a single, searched invention	II-12
6.2	Restriction to an unsearched invention	II-12
6.3	No restriction to a single invention searched	II-13
6.4	Further procedural aspects concerning Euro-PCT applications	II-14
6.4.1	Where the EPO does not perform a supplementary European search	II-14
6.4.2	Where the EPO performs a supplementary European search	II-14

Chapter III – Admissibility of amendments – other procedural matters

III-1

1.	Introduction	III-1
2.	Procedure for amendments to documents	III-1
2.1	Indication of amendments and their basis under Rule 137(4)	III-1
2.1.1	Rule 137(4) communication and response thereto	III-2
2.1.2	Amendments withdrawn or superseded in the Rule 137(4) period	III-3
2.1.3	Rule 137(4) and oral proceedings	III-4
2.1.4	Transitional provisions relating to Rule 137(4)	III-4
2.2	Amendment by submitting missing documents or by filing replacement pages	III-4
2.3	Amendments made by the EPO at the request of a party	III-5
2.4	Withdrawal of amendments/abandonment of subject matter	III-5
3.	Auxiliary requests	III-5
3.1	General principles	III-6
3.1.1	Sequence of requests	III-6
3.1.2	Obligation to give reasons	III-7
3.1.3	Neither main nor auxiliary requests allowable	III-7

3.2	In the search phase	III-7
3.3	In examination proceedings	III-7
3.3.1	Indication of the amendments made in the requests and of their basis	III-7
3.3.2	Admissibility of auxiliary requests	III-7
3.3.2.1	Criteria for admissibility of auxiliary requests	III-7
3.3.2.2	Timeliness and structure of auxiliary requests	III-8
3.3.3	Preparing the decision	III-8
3.3.4	Complete text for auxiliary request not yet available	III-9
3.3.5	Complete text for auxiliary request available	III-9
3.3.6	Applicant does not approve the text proposed for grant	III-9
3.4	In opposition proceedings	III-10
3.4.1	Written procedure	III-10
3.4.2	Oral proceedings	III-10
3.5	In limitation proceedings	III-11
3.5.1	General principles	III-11
3.5.2	Written procedure	III-11
3.5.3	Oral proceedings	III-12
4.	Different texts in respect of different contracting states	III-12
4.1	Dealing with different texts in examination	III-12
4.2	Different text in respect of the state of the art according to Art. 54(3) EPC and Art. 54(4) EPC 1973	III-13
4.3	Different text where a transfer of right takes place pursuant to Art. 61 or Rule 78 in respect of certain designated states	III-13
4.3.1	Different text where a transfer of right takes place pursuant to Art. 61 in examination proceedings	III-13
4.3.2	Different texts where a transfer of the patent in respect of certain designated states takes place in opposition proceedings	III-14
4.3.3	Opposition cases with different texts where a transfer of rights by virtue of a final decision pursuant to Art. 61 takes place in examination proceedings	III-14
4.4	Different texts where national rights of earlier date exist	III-14
4.5	Opposition proceedings where the claims as granted are different for different contracting states	III-15
5.	Calculation of claims fees	III-15

Chapter IV – Allowability of amendments **IV-1**

1.	Introduction	IV-1
2.	Allowability of amendments under Art. 123(2)	IV-1
2.1	Basic principle	IV-1
2.2	Content of the application as "originally" filed – general rules	IV-1
2.2.1	Features described in a document cross-referenced in the description	IV-2
2.2.2	Missing parts of the description or missing drawings filed under Rule 56 after the date of filing	IV-3
2.2.3	Erroneously filed application documents or parts under Rule 56a	IV-3
2.2.4	Claims filed after the date of filing	IV-4
2.2.5	Sequence listings filed after the date of filing	IV-4
2.2.6	Priority documents	IV-5
2.2.7	Citation of prior art in the description after the filing date	IV-5
2.2.8	Clarifications	IV-5
2.2.9	Trade marks	IV-5
2.3	Content of the application as "originally" filed – special applications	IV-5
2.3.1	Applications filed by reference to an earlier application	IV-5
2.3.2	Divisional applications	IV-5
2.3.3	Applications resulting from a decision under Art. 61	IV-6
2.3.4	International applications	IV-6
3.	Allowability of amendments under Art. 123(3)	IV-6
3.1	Basic principles	IV-6
3.2	Protection conferred by the patent as granted	IV-7
3.3	Version of the granted patent to be considered	IV-7
3.4	Assessment of impermissible extension of the protection conferred	IV-7
3.5	Conflicts between Art. 123(2) and Art. 123(3)	IV-8
3.6	Conflicts between Art. 123(3) and other requirements of the EPC	IV-8
4.	Amendments relating to unsearched matter	IV-9
4.1	Rule 137(5)	IV-9
4.1.1	Rule 62a and/or Rule 63 cases	IV-9
4.1.2	Subject-matter taken from the description	IV-9

4.2	Euro-PCT applications	IV-10

Chapter V – Allowability of amendments – examples

V-1

1.	Introduction	V-1
2.	Amendments in the description	V-1
2.1	Clarification of a technical effect	V-1
2.2	Introduction of further examples and new effects	V-1
2.3	Supplementary technical information	V-1
2.4	Revision of stated technical problem	V-2
2.5	Reference document	V-2
2.6	Alteration, excision or addition of text in the description	V-2
2.7	Bringing the description into line with amended claims	V-2
3.	Amendments in claims	V-2
3.1	Replacement or removal of features from a claim	V-3
3.2	Inclusion of additional features	V-3
3.2.1	Intermediate generalisations	V-4
3.3	Deletion of part of the claimed subject-matter	V-6
3.4	Further cases of broadening of claims	V-7
3.5	Amendments relating to ranges	V-8
4.	Disclaimers	V-8
4.1	Disclaimer disclosed in the application as originally filed	V-8
4.2	Disclaimers not disclosed in the application as originally filed	V-8
4.2.1	The subject-matter to be excluded is not disclosed in the application as originally filed (so-called undisclosed disclaimers)	V-8
4.2.2	The subject-matter to be excluded is disclosed in the application as originally filed	V-10
5.	Amendments to drawings	V-10

6.	Amendments derived from drawings	<u>V-11</u>
7.	Changes in claim category in opposition	<u>V-12</u>
7.1	Product claim to use claim	<u>V-12</u>
7.2	Product claim to method claim	<u>V-12</u>
7.3	Method claim to product claim	<u>V-12</u>
7.4	Method claim to use claim	<u>V-13</u>
8.	Changes in the title	<u>V-13</u>
 Chapter VI – Correction of errors		 <u>VI-1</u>
1.	Introduction	<u>VI-1</u>
2.	Corrections of errors in documents filed with the EPO	<u>VI-1</u>
2.1	Admissibility	<u>VI-1</u>
2.1.1	Admissibility in opposition and limitation proceedings	<u>VI-2</u>
2.1.1.1	Errors in the description, claims and drawings	<u>VI-2</u>
2.2	Allowability	<u>VI-3</u>
2.2.1	Correction of description, claims and drawings	<u>VI-3</u>
2.2.2	Missing parts of description, missing drawings or correction of erroneously filed application documents filed as corrections under Rule 139	<u>VI-4</u>
3.	Correction of errors in decisions	<u>VI-5</u>
3.1	Admissibility	<u>VI-5</u>
3.2	Allowability of the correction of bibliographic data	<u>VI-6</u>
3.3	Correction of the decision to grant while opposition proceedings are pending – procedural aspects	<u>VI-6</u>
3.3.1	Correction of errors in bibliographic data	<u>VI-7</u>
3.3.1.1	The requested correction has no effect on the outcome of the opposition proceedings	<u>VI-7</u>
3.3.1.2	The outcome of the opposition proceedings depends entirely on the decision on the requested correction	<u>VI-7</u>
3.3.2	Correction of editing/formatting errors	<u>VI-8</u>
3.3.2.1	Request for correction filed at a late stage	<u>VI-8</u>
3.4	Correction of errors under Rule 140 after an incorrect cover sheet with an incorrect operative part of the decision is sent	<u>VI-8</u>
4.	Correction of formatting/editing errors	<u>VI-9</u>

5.	Correction of the translations of the claims	<u>VI-10</u>
6.	Errors in publication	<u>VI-10</u>

Chapter I – The right to amend

A European patent application or European patent may be amended in examination, opposition and limitation proceedings. With regard to amendments filed in such proceedings, there are a number of important aspects to consider. Firstly, amendments must be admissible, i.e. they must meet the requirements for being admitted into the proceedings (see [H-II](#), [H-III](#)).

Secondly, amendments must be allowable, which means, in particular, that they must not:

- (i) add to the application or patent subject-matter which was not disclosed in the application as originally filed ([Art. 123\(2\)](#))
- (ii) introduce other deficiencies (such as lack of clarity in the claims – [Art. 84](#))
- (iii) extend the protection conferred by a granted patent ([Art. 123\(3\)](#)).

Chapters [H-II](#) and [H-III](#) deal with the admissibility of amendments, while Chapters [H-IV](#) and [H-V](#) deal with their allowability. Chapter [H-VI](#) is dedicated to the correction of errors.

Chapter II – Admissibility of amendments – general rules

1. Introduction

How the admissibility of amendments is assessed will depend on the type of procedure (examination, opposition or limitation) and on the stage of the proceedings, as detailed in the following sections.

2. Admissibility in the examination procedure

2.1 Before receipt of the search report – Rule 137(1)

In the case of a European patent application filed directly at the EPO (not via the PCT), it is not possible for the applicant to amend the application before receiving the European search report (Rule 137(1)).

Rule 137(1)

In the case of a Euro-PCT application requiring a supplementary European search according to Art. 153(7), the applicant may amend the originally filed claims, description and/or drawings before the application is subject to the supplementary search either by maintaining amendments filed in the international phase under Art. 19 PCT and/or Art. 34(2)(b) PCT or by filing amendments on and/or after entry into the European phase under Rule 159(1)(b) and/or Rule 161(2) respectively (see also A-XII, 5.3 and B-III, 3.3.2).

For replies to an invitation under Rule 62a or 63, see H-II, 5.

2.2 After receipt of the search report – Rule 137(2)

After receiving the European search report and the search opinion, applicants must respond to the search opinion (see B-XI, 8) and may amend the description, claims and drawings of their own volition, provided that the amendment and their reply are filed within the time limit for responding to the search opinion (see C-II, 1, C-II, 3.1 and C-III, 2.1). Likewise, for applications for which no supplementary European search report is prepared (see B-II, 4.3) when entering the European phase from the PCT, the applicant is required to respond to the WO-ISA, IPER or SISR where the ISA and, if applicable, the IPEA or SISA was the EPO (see A-XIV, 3.1). This response to the WO-ISA, IPER or SISR may include amendments made by the applicant of their own volition to the description, claims and drawings. After expiry of the relevant time limit for the reply (or, if the applicant waives the remainder of the reply period, after the reply), the applicant may amend the application only with the consent of the examining division.

Rule 137(2)

For applications:

Rule 71(1)

- (i) for which no search opinion is prepared (see B-XI, 1.1 and B-XI, 7),
- (ii) for which a search opinion was prepared, but where the search report was drawn up before 1 April 2010 (in which case Rule 70a does not apply and the applicant is not required to respond to the search opinion), or

- (iii) which enter the European phase from the PCT, where the EPO was the ISA, IPEA or SISA and prepared a written opinion, but for which a communication under Rule 161 was already issued before 1 April 2010,

it is after receipt of the first communication from the examining division in examination proceedings that applicants may "of their own volition, amend once the description, claims and drawings", provided that the amendment and the reply are filed within the time limit for replying to that communication.

2.3 After receipt of the first communication – Rule 137(3)

Subsequent to the applicable event mentioned in H-II, 2.2, the prosecution of further amendments proposed by the applicant is within the discretion of the examining division. Giving the examining division this discretion is intended to ensure that the examination procedure is brought to a conclusion in as few actions as possible (see C-IV, 3). In exercising its discretion the examining division must consider all relevant factors; in particular, it must balance the applicant's interest in obtaining a patent which is legally valid and the EPO's interest in bringing the examination procedure to a close in an effective way (in accordance with the principles set out in G 7/93).

Furthermore, the exercise of discretion to refuse amendments under Rule 137(3) must be reasoned (see T 755/96). The examining division also cannot refuse to admit amendments in advance (T 1105/96; T 246/08).

As an exception to Rule 137(3), paragraph (b) of Rule 164(2) provides for a right to amend the application in response to the results of any search under Rule 164(2). This means that applicants may make amendments of their own volition once in response to the communication under Art. 94(3) to which the search results under Rule 164(2) are annexed (see also H-II, 6.4.1).

If an amendment is admitted, subsequent proceedings are based on the description, claims and drawings as amended. Admitting an amendment does not necessarily imply that the application as amended is allowable, i.e. free from any objection under the EPC.

In exercising its discretion under Rule 137(3), the examining division will take into account the circumstances of each individual case and the stage of the proceedings which the application has reached to date.

One of the assessments the examining division may carry out in this respect is a *prima facie* assessment of the allowability of the amendments filed.

Where the examining division decides to make use of its discretionary power not to admit amended claims, the reasons why the amended set of claims is *prima facie* not allowable must be given.

Extensive reasoning is incompatible with a *prima facie* assessment. If an amendment needs to be discussed in the same degree of detail as if it had been admitted, it should therefore be admitted.

A further important element is whether the applicant has already had sufficient opportunity to make amendments. In particular, amendments reintroducing deficiencies previously pointed out by the examining division and removed by the applicant are not admitted (see T 1326/11 and T 1064/04).

The applicant has to bear in mind that it is easier to secure an amendment at an earlier rather than at a later stage: the later amendments are filed, the more important the aspect of procedural economy becomes in balancing the interest of the applicant in obtaining a patent and the EPO's interest in bringing the examination procedure to a close (see T 951/97 and G 7/93).

On the other hand, amendments limiting a claim which is already considered allowable are normally admitted. The same applies to amendments improving the clarity of the description or claims in a clearly desirable manner (see T 1929/13).

If amendments clearly remedy a deficiency in response to the preceding communication, they are always admitted, provided they do not give rise to some new deficiency. Art. 94(3)

A further factor is the amount of alteration to the application documents involved. Extensive reworking of the description or claims may be a proper response to highly relevant further prior art of which the applicant has only just become aware (e.g. either through further citation by the examining division or through knowledge obtained from another source). Regarding less extensive amendments, the examining division will adopt a reasonable approach, trying to balance fairness to the applicant against the need to avoid unnecessary delay and excessive and unjustified additional work for the EPO.

Additional reasons for not admitting amendments according to Rule 137(3) include the non-admittance of:

- auxiliary requests in certain circumstances (see H-III, 3.3.2.1), and
- a request filed in, or in preparation for, oral proceedings, where Rule 137(4) is not complied with in respect of the request in question (see H-III, 2.1.3),

for reasons of procedural economy (taking into account the applicant's right to comment according to Art. 113(1)).

Further limitations may apply after a remittal by a board of appeal under Rule 62a, 63, 137(5) Art. 111(2).

2.3.1 Examples of the exercise of discretion under Rule 137(3)

Three examples of the use of Rule 137(3) are presented below. The guiding principles in these examples are:

- (i) a communication/written opinion has been sent highlighting an objection against the application
- (ii) the allowability analysis of the requested amendments is very limited and can usually be carried out in a straightforward manner.

2.3.1.1 Rule 137(3) in conjunction with Art. 83

The examining division has raised an objection under Art. 83 that the entire application, i.e. claims, description and drawings, does not disclose to a person skilled in the art how to carry out the invention without using inventive skill.

The examining division will not admit any (further) amendment under Rule 137(3) unless the applicant is able to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the examining division that the application contains enough information to enable the person skilled in the art to carry out the invention; for example the applicant could demonstrate that an embodiment in the description is sufficiently disclosed for the person skilled in the art to put it into practice.

If the applicant cannot demonstrate the above, then the objection under Art. 83 EPC can only be overcome by adding information to the application as filed, which usually infringes Art. 123(2) EPC.

2.3.1.2 Rule 137(3) in conjunction with Art. 123(2)

The examining division has raised an objection under Art. 123(2) indicating that a certain feature introduced into the claims extends the subject-matter of the application as filed.

Unless the applicant is able to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the examining division that the application as filed disclosed this feature directly and unambiguously, the examining division will normally not admit under Rule 137(3) any further set of claims containing the feature in question.

2.3.1.3 Rule 137(3) in conjunction with Art. 84 – missing essential feature

The examining division has raised an objection under Art. 84 that the claims are missing an essential feature (see F-IV, 4.5).

Unless the applicant is able to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the examining division that the indicated feature is not essential for carrying out the invention, the examining division will normally not admit under Rule 137(3) any further set of claims not containing the feature in question.

2.3.1.4 Rule 137(3) in conjunction with auxiliary requests

See H-III, 3.3.2.1.

2.3.2 Rule 137(3) vs non-unity

If a non-unity objection was raised during the search and the applicant paid at least one additional search fee, the applicant will be invited to choose which invention they want to have examined (see C-III, 3.2). Art. 82

If, after examination of one invention has started, the applicant tries to switch to a second searched invention, the amended claims will not be admitted in the proceedings under Rule 137(3), since only one invention in each application can be examined (see H-II, 6.1, third paragraph).

The same principle likewise applies if the applicant files several auxiliary requests containing different searched inventions.

2.3.3 Rule 137(3) during oral proceedings

As specified in H-II, 2.3, second paragraph, the examining division cannot refuse to admit amendments before they are submitted.

However, the examining division may warn the applicant, in particular during oral proceedings, that unless a specific objection is overcome by amendment, it intends to use its discretion under Rule 137(3) to not admit new requests. The objection to be overcome must be clearly explained.

If after such a warning the newly filed request does not clearly overcome the objection in question and is not convergent with the previous requests, it will not be admitted into the proceedings under Rule 137(3).

2.4 At an advanced stage of the proceedings

When the applicant files an extensively revised request to replace the text of the application on the basis of which a patent could be granted, they must provide good reasons for proposing the changes only at this stage in the proceedings. This applies particularly in cases where the examining division has indicated that a version of the claims proposed by the applicant is grantable and that the applicant has only to bring the description into line with that version. Normally only those amendments which do not appreciably delay the preparations for grant of the patent will be admitted under Rule 137(3). To this end, the examining division carries out a *prima facie* analysis of the amendments to determine the amount of time their examination might require. It is this amount of time that determines whether the amendments are extensive. If the examining division comes to the conclusion that a request is *prima facie* not allowable, for example, because it introduces new deficiencies, they refuse the request under Rule 137(3). Rule 137(3)

2.5 Amendments filed in reply to a Rule 71(3) communication

If, in reply to the communication under Rule 71(3) and within the period specified in Rule 71(6), the applicant files a request for amendments and/or a correction of errors, the procedure is as defined in C-V, 4. This applies regardless of whether the request is an explicit request for amendment or is drafted as an approval which is conditional on the filed amendments and/or corrections. Rule 71(6)

2.5.1 Criteria for admitting such amendments

Decision G 7/93 dealt with the criteria to be applied when examining the admissibility of late-filed amendments in examination. The particular case to which that decision relates arose when the rules were differently formulated, and in a situation where the applicant had already consented to the version proposed by the examining division. However, what was said by the Enlarged Board in that case can be considered generally applicable to new requests put forward at a late stage of the proceedings, i.e. when the applicant has already had at least one opportunity to amend the application and the examining division has already completed substantive examination of the application (see T 1064/04).

Rule 71(3)
Rule 137(3)

In particular, applying the principles of G 7/93 to amendments filed in response to the communication under Rule 71(3) (see C-V.1 to C-V.3) means that this communication does not constitute an opportunity for the applicant to call into question the outcome of the earlier procedure. In deciding whether to admit such amendments, a balance must be struck between the applicant's interest in obtaining a patent which is valid in all of the designated states and the EPO's interest in bringing the examination procedure to a close by the issue of a decision to grant the patent. At this stage of the proceedings, the substantive examination has already been completed and the applicant has had the opportunity to amend the application. Therefore normally only those amendments which do not appreciably delay the preparations for grant of the patent will be admitted under Rule 137(3).

It is, however, appropriate to admit separate sets of claims for one or more designated states for which prior national rights exist (see H-III.4.4).

The rejection of amendments proposed by the examining division in a Rule 71(3) communication which have been introduced without prior consultation and agreement of the applicant (C-V.1.1) does not amount to a request for amendment to which discretion under Rule 137(3) applies.

2.5.2 Further course of proceedings

Rule 71(6)

If the examining division gives its consent under Rule 137(3) to these amendments and/or the correction and considers them allowable without issuing a further communication under Art. 94(3), it issues a second communication under Rule 71(3) based on the amended/corrected text (see C-V.4.6), after which it then proceeds to the grant of the patent pursuant to Art. 97(1).

Rule 71a(2)

Where amendments or corrections are not admitted, or where they are admitted but not considered allowable, examination will be resumed (see C-V.4.7).

2.5.3 Exceptional case where amendments must be admitted

Rule 137(3)

If the application was one of the exceptional cases (i), (ii) or (iii) mentioned in H-II.2.2 and no communication under Art. 94(3) has preceded the communication under Rule 71(3), the applicant may amend the description, claims and drawings of their own volition (see C-III.2; see also C-II.3.1) within the time limit for replying to the communication under Rule 71(3). If

the examining division finds that these amendments are allowable, a second communication according to Rule 71(3) is issued based on the text as amended (see C-V, 4.6).

However, if the examining division is of the opinion that the amendments are not allowable (a finding of inadmissibility with regard to these amendments not being possible), the examination procedure is normally resumed in accordance with C-V, 4.7.

2.5.4 Rule 137(4) applies to amendments filed at this stage

Amendments filed in reply to the communication under Rule 71(3) must satisfy the requirements of Rule 137(4) by identifying the amendments and indicating the basis for them in the application as filed (see H-III, 2.1 and in particular the transitional provisions in H-III, 2.1.4). If these requirements are not met:

- (i) if the application is of one of the types mentioned in H-III, 2.1.4, the examining division may send a Rule 137(4) communication before proceeding further, as provided for in H-III, 2.1.1;
- (ii) otherwise, if the basis for any amendments is not apparent, the examining division objects to these amendments under Art. 123(2).

In case (i), if the applicant replies to the communication under Rule 137(4) in time, the examining division will then decide if it consents to the amendments and will proceed accordingly as indicated in C-V, 4.

The examining division has discretion to decide whether to send a communication under Rule 137(4) at this late stage. Alternatively, it can first consult the applicant and, if the amendments and their basis are sufficiently explained in the course of that consultation, a Rule 137(4) communication will no longer be necessary.

2.6 Further requests for amendment after approval

Once the applicant has approved the text communicated to them pursuant to Rule 71(3), by paying the fees and filing the translation of the claims, further requests for amendment will only exceptionally be admitted under the discretionary power of the examining division given by Rule 137(3). A clear example of an admissible request is where the applicant files separate sets of claims for designated states for which prior national rights exist (see H-III, 4.4). Similarly, it is appropriate to admit minor amendments which do not require re-opening of the substantive examination and which do not appreciably delay the issue of the decision to grant (see G 7/93).

Rule 71(5)
Rule 137(3)

If amendments are filed and do not comply with the requirements of Rule 137(4), the examining division may send a communication under Rule 137(4) (see H-III, 2.1.1).

When exercising its discretion under Rule 137(3) an examining division must consider and balance the applicant's interest in obtaining a patent which is legally valid in all of the designated states and the EPO's interest in bringing the examination procedure to a close by the issue of a decision

to grant the patent. The criteria for exercising its discretion under Rule 137(3) at this late stage are whether the request can be decided on in a reasonable period of time, and whether the amendments are allowable. If either of these criteria is not satisfied, the request for amendments is refused by the division in the exercise of its discretion according to Rule 137(3).

Refusal of amendments must be reasoned, and both Art. 113(1) and Art. 116(1) must be observed (see C-V, 4.7.1). It must be shown that the conditions defined in G 7/93 are not met. This means that arguments must be given as to why the amendments are not minor in nature but in fact necessitate resuming substantive examination while considerably delaying the issue of a decision to grant the patent.

Rule 140

However, once the decision to grant is handed over for notification by the EPO to the parties, the examining division is bound by it (see G 12/91) and can only amend it to the limited extent provided for in Rule 140 (see H-VI, 3.1). In the examination procedure, this corresponds to the date on which the centrally generated Form 2006, "Decision to grant a European patent pursuant to Art. 97(1), EPC", is notified to the parties. This date is shown at the bottom right-hand corner of Form 2006. The examining division is no longer competent to decide on a request for amendments or corrections under Rule 139 if the filing of the request and the completion of the proceedings occur on the same date (T 798/95).

2.7 Late-filed requests after summons to oral proceedings in examination

If requests are filed after the final date set in accordance with Rule 116(1), they are usually treated as late-filed unless a summons to oral proceedings was issued as the first action of the examining division. Another exception is a request filed in response to a change of the subject of the proceedings, e.g. when a further relevant document is cited for the first time during the oral proceedings. In such a case, the request has to be admitted under Rule 116(2) (T 951/97).

The examining division will first consider the requests before deciding on their admissibility. The mere fact that they are filed late is not *per se* a reason for not admitting them. This issue will normally be dealt with during oral proceedings.

In exercising its discretion under Rule 137(3) (see G 7/93), the examining division needs to take into account whether the applicant has good reasons for filing the request late. In the absence of such reasons, and if the applicant has already had sufficient opportunity to address the reasoned objections, when balancing the relevant interests the examining division may give more weight to bringing the examination procedure to a close.

In such cases, late-filed requests will be subject to the "clear allowability" criterion (see H-II, 2.7.1) in addition to the criteria indicated in H-II, 2.3.

2.7.1 Concept of "clear allowability"

The examining division will apply the criterion of "clear allowability" in exercising its discretion under Rule 137(3) for treating requests filed after the final date set in accordance with Rule 116(1) without proper justification (T 153/85).

These late-filed claims will only be admitted into the proceedings if they are clearly allowable. This means that it must be immediately apparent to the examining division that the amendments successfully overcome the objections without giving rise to new ones (*prima facie* assessment).

For example, late-filed requests will not be admitted if they do not clearly meet the requirements under Art. 123(2) or Art. 84. Likewise, late-filed requests may be rejected if the newly defined subject-matter does not constitute a convergent development of the subject-matter which has been the subject of examination (for a definition of convergence, see H-III, 3.3.2.2).

For ascertaining whether or not the claims are clearly allowable, the examining division must take into account the reasons given by the applicant which explain why the amendments have been made and how they are intended to overcome the objections raised.

If, after discussions, the examining division comes to the conclusion that the late-filed requests are not clearly allowable, it rejects them under Rule 116(2) and Rule 137(3) on the grounds that they do not contain subject-matter which is clearly allowable, i.e. because the subject-matter does not clearly meet the requirements of the EPC (for cases where the applicant does not attend the oral proceedings, see H-III, 3.3.3 and E-III, 8.3.3). In the decision, reasoning is also to be given as to why the specific requirement(s) for allowability is (are) not met.

The "clear allowability" criterion is generally also applied to patent proprietors' late-filed requests in opposition proceedings (see E-VI, 2.1, and E-VI, 2.2; see also T 98/96 with regard to opposition appeal proceedings).

3. Admissibility in opposition procedure

3.1 Amendments related to the grounds for opposition

In contrast to the discretionary power of the opposition division under Art. 114(2) or Rule 116 (see E-IX, 2.10), Rule 80 establishes the non-discretionary, substantive requirement that any amendments made in opposition proceedings must be occasioned by the grounds for opposition specified in Art. 100. Not admitting late-filed amendments on the basis of arguments of procedural efficiency or non-convergence should not therefore rely on Rule 80. That is to say, amendments are admissible only if they represent a genuine attempt to overcome a ground for opposition. However, the ground for opposition does not actually have to have been invoked by the opponent. For example, in opposition proceedings admissibly opened on grounds of non-patentability, the patent proprietor can also submit amendments to remove added subject-matter. The replacement of one independent claim as granted by multiple, e.g. two,

Rule 80

independent claims each directed to a respective specific embodiment covered by the independent claim as granted is admissible if such a replacement is occasioned by a ground for opposition specified in Art. 100 (see T 223/97). Amendment of the claims in opposition proceedings may require amendment of the description (see D-V, 5).

3.2 Amendments not related to the grounds for opposition

If the proprietor proposes amendments to the patent in reply to the grounds for opposition and the opposition division intends to maintain the patent in amended form pursuant to those grounds, other amendments not related to the grounds for opposition (e.g. clarifications), or corrections (H-VI, 3.1), may be allowed provided that the patent thus amended still fulfils the requirements of the EPC and that the amendments are considered necessary and appropriate. In particular, if one part of a claim has been amended, it may be necessary or appropriate to amend other parts of the claim as well.

Moreover, where a "clarification" can be considered as a limitation of the claim, it would be admissible under Rule 80 and could form the basis for maintaining the patent in amended form, provided the other requirements of the EPC are also met by the amended text (with the exception of unity of invention – G 1/91). If the division is of the opinion that such a limiting clarification is not necessary, it needs to consider that the practice of interpreting a claim in a contracting state may be quite different from that of the EPO, and hence the proprietor may see a need for such a limiting clarification.

Such amendments, however, are not proposed by the opposition division and they can only be taken into consideration up to the pronouncement of the decision (in oral proceedings) or until the date the decision is handed over for notification by the EPO to the parties (in written proceedings) (see G 12/91).

Opposition proceedings cannot be used merely to tidy up and improve the disclosure in the patent specification (see T 127/85). Simply adding new claims to the claims as granted is inadmissible because such amendments cannot be said to meet a ground for opposition.

If an otherwise allowable request for maintenance of the opposed patent either as granted or in amended form has been submitted, the following amendments are not allowed:

- (a) filing of further claims (see T 829/93);
- (b) comprehensive redrafting of the dependent claims;
- (c) comprehensive redrafting of the description (see D-V, 5 for allowable amendments to the description).

In the absence of any amendments submitted by the patent proprietor with a view to meeting the grounds for opposition, there is no possibility to make any other amendments (see for example T 223/97). Publication errors and

exceptionally formatting/editing errors may however be corrected (see H-VI, 4).

3.3 Amendments occasioned by national rights

Apart from the above (H-II, 3.1 and H-II, 3.2), amendments occasioned by national rights of earlier date are admissible pursuant to Rule 138 (see also G-IV, 6, H-III, 4.4 and H-III, 4.5).

3.4 Insistence on inadmissible amendments

If the patent proprietors request amendments going beyond those permissible under Rule 80 (see H-II, 3.1 and H-II, 3.2), they are invited to withdraw them. If they then maintain their request, it is not admitted.

If, in addition to requests containing unnecessary amendments, there is an auxiliary request which meets the requirements of the Convention and in particular does not comprise amendments not complying with Rule 80, the decision must include the grounds for not admitting the higher-ranking requests.

It may occur that there is only one request which would be allowable, but for amendments which clearly do not comply with Rule 80. If the amendments cannot be admitted, the opposition division explains to the proprietor that revocation of the patent is to be expected solely for reasons of the request's non-compliance with Rule 80.

3.5 Late-filed requests in opposition proceedings

With respect to how late-filed requests are dealt with in opposition proceedings, reference is made to E-VI, 2.1 (general examples) and E-VI, 2.2 (examples concerning oral proceedings).

4. Amendments in limitation procedure

For admissibility of amendments in the limitation procedure, reference is made to D-X, 4 and D-X, 10.

5. Amendments required by a limitation of the search under Rule 62a and/or Rule 63

Where the search was limited to certain subject-matter by application of Rule 63 (see B-VIII, 3.1 and 3.2), the claims must be amended in such a way as to remove the unsearched subject-matter and the description adapted accordingly. *Rule 63(3)*

Where the search was limited to certain claims by application of Rule 62a (see B-VIII, 4.1 and 4.2), the claims must be amended in such a way as to remove the unsearched independent claims and the description adapted accordingly. To this end, the claims may be amended, for example, by deleting an unsearched independent claim or, where this complies with Art. 123(2) and Art. 84, by making an unsearched independent claim dependent on another independent claim of the same category which *has* been searched. *Rule 62a(2)*

In both of these cases, a specific amendment is necessary unless the examining division finds that the limitation of the search under Rule 62a

and/or Rule 63 or the declaration of no search under Rule 63 was not justified, e.g. in view of arguments provided by the applicant.

Such amendments may, however, be made only in examination proceedings or, preferably, in reply to the search opinion (see F-IV, 3.3). Since the applicant may not amend the claims before receipt of the search report (Rule 137(1)), any claims filed in reply to an invitation under Rule 62a or Rule 63 will be taken only as an indication of what the applicant wants the EPO to search and dealt with accordingly (see B-VIII, 3.2 and B-VIII, 4.2). The applicant will then have to confirm maintenance of these amendments formally on entry into the examination phase (see A-V, 2.2).

Rule 137(5)

If, following the first communication of the examining division, the claims are not amended (i.e. by deletion of claims and/or parts of the claims as originally filed) and still cover non-searched subject-matter, and the applicant fails to submit convincing arguments as to why the invitation under Rule 62a(1) and/or Rule 63(1) was not justified, the application is to be refused under Art. 97(2) based on a failure to comply with the requirements of the EPC underlying the invitation under Rule 62a(1) and/or Rule 63(1) (see F-IV, 3.3). The decision to refuse the application must indicate why the subject-matter claimed includes non-searched subject-matter and state the reasons for the invitation under Rule 62a(1) and/or Rule 63(1), taking account of the applicant's comments.

Art. 113(1)

Any request for oral proceedings must be granted before refusing an application.

6. Amendments in the case of non-unity

6.1 Restriction to a single, searched invention

In reply to an objection of lack of unity, the applicant must restrict the claims to a single invention which has been searched unless the applicant can convince the examining division that the objection was not justified.

If the claims have been restricted to a single searched invention, the examination can be continued as for a unitary application but limited to that invention (see C-III, 3). If the objection is withdrawn in view of the arguments put forward by the applicant, an additional search may be necessary (see C-IV, 7.3) in order for the examination of the claimed invention to be continued.

However, if in response to a negative opinion concerning that invention the applicant later amends the claims to switch to a different searched invention, the division will exercise its discretion under Rule 137(3) and refuse to admit the amendments since only one invention in each application can be examined for conformity with the requirements of the EPC (see G 2/92 and T 158/12).

6.2 Restriction to an unsearched invention

If not all of the claimed inventions have been searched, in accordance with G 2/92 the applicant must restrict the claims to one of the searched inventions. Thus, if in reply to the search opinion the applicant then restricts

the claims to one of the originally claimed inventions which has not been searched, the examining division will write a first communication repeating the lack-of-unity objection raised in the search opinion. Any arguments of the applicant must be duly considered and dealt with in the communication.

If the application is restricted to an unsearched but originally claimed invention, it can be refused under Rule 64 in line with G 2/92 (subject to the applicant's rights under Art. 113(1) and Art. 116(1)).

Rule 137(5) cannot be invoked. It does not apply when the applicant has not paid the search fee in respect of a non-unitary invention relating to the originally filed claims.

If the application is a Euro-PCT application (see also H-II, 6.4) the examining division, depending on the case:

- either objects under Rule 164(2)(c) to the restriction of the claims to an invention searched neither (on grounds of lack of unity) by the EPO as (Supplementary) International Searching Authority nor as part of a search under Rule 164(2)(a),
- or objects under Rule 164(1) in line with G 2/92 in the context of a supplementary search in the European phase (see B-II, 4.3.2, B-VII, 2.3 and A-XIV, 6.2).

In both cases, if the applicant declines to limit the claims to a searched invention, the application is refused under Rule 164 in accordance with G 2/92 (subject to the applicant's rights under Art. 113(1) and Art. 116(1)).

The objection under Rule 164(2)(c) mentioned above is drafted in the communication sent under Rule 164(2)(b) issuing the results of any additional search. If the applicant does not reply to the invitation to pay additional search fees under Rule 164(2)(a), they do not receive a communication under Rule 164(2)(b). In this case, the examining division issues a communication under Art. 94(3) and Rule 71(1) and (2) inviting the applicant to limit the application under Rule 164(2)(c) before the application can be refused.

Concerning the application of G 2/92, it is to be kept in mind that the prohibition on pursuing an application for subject-matter for which no search fees have been paid applies to inventions; it does not apply to features which were originally claimed with a different invention and had not been searched, but which were originally disclosed in combination with the searched invention or group of inventions (see T 998/14).

6.3 No restriction to a single invention searched

If in response to the search opinion the applicant does not restrict the application to a single invention searched, the objection of lack of unity raised at the search stage will be reviewed and if the examining division considers that it remains valid, a first communication repeating the lack-of-unity objection raised in the search opinion will be issued.

In Rule 164(2) cases, a lack of unity objection is addressed in the communication under Rule 164(2)(b) (see also H-II, 6.4.1).

If the applicant does not restrict the application at all, or does restrict it, but still maintains two or more inventions, the application can be refused under Art. 82 (subject to the applicant's rights under Art. 113(1) and 116(1)).

If the claims still cover an unsearched invention, an objection under Rule 64 would also apply, in line with decision G 2/92 as discussed in H-II, 6.2.

If the claims have not been simply restricted, but have instead, or additionally, been amended, such amendments can often result in the previously raised lack-of-unity objection no longer being valid, or in the arguments on which the objection was based no longer being complete. Such amendments would thus result in the objection having to be either withdrawn or at least newly argued.

Sometimes lack of unity of invention arises only during substantive examination, for example following an amendment of one or more claims so as to overcome an objection of lack of inventive step. In such situations the examining division may raise an objection, but only in very clear cases.

6.4 Further procedural aspects concerning Euro-PCT applications

6.4.1 Where the EPO does not perform a supplementary European search

Where the EPO does not perform a supplementary European search, the application must be limited to an invention searched either in the international phase by the EPO or in the European phase in a search under Rule 164(2)(a). The above principles (H-II, 6.1 to H-II, 6.3) then apply *mutatis mutandis* (see also A-XIV, 6.2).

In Rule 164(2) cases, a further communication according to Art. 94(3) and Rules 71(1) and (2) repeating a lack of unity objection is not necessary, as a communication according to Art. 94(3) and Rule 71(1) and Rule 71(2) addressing (also) unity of invention has already been issued under Rule 164(2)(b) (see also H-II, 2.3 and 6.2).

6.4.2 Where the EPO performs a supplementary European search

Where the EPO performs a supplementary European search on an application which is considered to lack unity, the applicant will be invited to pay additional fees, and the supplementary search report will be established for those inventions for which a search fee has been paid. The application must then be limited to one of the inventions searched in the supplementary search. The above principles (H-II, 6.1 to 6.3) then apply *mutatis mutandis* (see also A-XIV, 6.2).

Chapter III – Admissibility of amendments – other procedural matters

1. Introduction

This chapter deals with procedural matters and formal requirements relating to the admissibility of amendments. An important requirement dealt with is the applicant's obligation to identify amendments and indicate the basis for them in the application as filed (Rule 137(4); for transitional provisions, see H-III, 2.1.4). The chapter also deals with the format of and procedure for making amendments, as well as issues relating to auxiliary requests and how to deal with different texts for different contracting states.

2. Procedure for amendments to documents

2.1 Indication of amendments and their basis under Rule 137(4)

When filing amendments, the applicant must identify them and indicate the basis for them in order to enable the division to assess compliance of the amendments with the provisions of Art. 123(2). To this end, the division may request that amendments have to be indicated either with respect to the immediate previous amendments in the sequence or with respect to the application as filed. The requirement to indicate amendments is to be understood as an opportunity for the applicant to provide convincing arguments to the division as to why the amendment(s) is/are directly and unambiguously derivable from the application as filed. These arguments are particularly important for the outcome of the division's assessment of Art. 123(2) where literal support for the amendment(s) is not present in the application as filed.

Rule 137(4)

The requirement that the basis for amendments be indicated is met if, on consulting those parts of the application indicated, it is not necessary to look further in order to assess the amendment's compliance with Art. 123(2). Non-specific indications such as "see the description as filed" or "see the claims as filed" or "see the examples as filed" are generally not considered sufficient. This requirement also applies in cases where the applicant requests the examining division to amend the application (see H-III, 2.3).

Whether the requirements of Rule 137(4) are met is assessed independently of whether the amendments in question comply with Art. 123(2). For example, the applicant may indicate that a particular amendment is based on a technical feature disclosed only in a schematic drawing. If the feature supposedly forming the basis for the amendment is indeed disclosed in the drawing indicated by the applicant, the requirements of Rule 137(4) are met, irrespective of whether the amendment based on that technical feature is allowable according to Art. 123(2).

Where the application was not filed in an official language of the EPO, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, for the purpose of assessing compliance with Art. 123(2) the EPO assumes that any translation of the application as filed is accurate. Consequently, in order to comply with

Rule 7

Rule 137(4), the basis of an amendment must be indicated in the translation of the application as filed.

2.1.1 Rule 137(4) communication and response thereto

Rule 137(4)

If the amendments and/or their basis cannot be properly identified such that compliance with Art. 123(2) cannot be assessed, the examining division notes a failure to meet either requirement of Rule 137(4). It consequently issues a communication requesting the correction of this deficiency within a period of one month. The amendments in respect of which such a communication may be sent include, *inter alia*:

- (i) claims filed after the date of filing under Rule 58 (see A-III, 15)
- (ii) amendments filed before entry into the European phase from the PCT under Art. 19 PCT and/or Art. 34 PCT, if maintained on entry (see A-XII, 5.2)
- (iii) amendments filed on entry into the European phase from the PCT under Art. 28 PCT or Art. 41 PCT (see A-XII, 5.2)
- (iv) amendments filed after entry into the European phase from the PCT under Rule 161(1) or Rule 161(2) (see A-XII, 5.3)
- (v) amendments filed in response to the search opinion (see B-XI, 8)
- (vi) amendments filed during the examination procedure (see, however, H-III, 2.1.3), including those filed after the communication according to Rule 71(3).

Such a communication can only be sent in respect of amendments which are part of a current request. It cannot relate to amendments which have since been withdrawn or superseded. A communication under Rule 137(4) can only be issued by the examining division, i.e. once it is responsible for the application (see C-II, 1). Thus, a communication under Rule 137(4) cannot be issued by a search division drawing up a supplementary European search report (see B-XI, 2).

Art. 94(4)

If the applicant fails to comply with either requirement of Rule 137(4) within the above-mentioned period of one month, the application is deemed to be withdrawn, because the applicant is considered not to have replied to the communication from the examining division. The applicant may request further processing for failure to observe this time limit (see E-VIII, 2).

If the amendments are filed in response to a communication according to Rule 71(3) and the requirements of Rule 137(4) are not satisfied in respect of them, the examining division may send a Rule 137(4) communication. Thereafter, if the applicant replies in time, the examining division will then decide whether to admit the amendments (see H-II, 2.5.4).

Regarding the application of Rule 137(4) to auxiliary requests, see H-III, 3.3.1.

2.1.2 Amendments withdrawn or superseded in the Rule 137(4) period

If the applicant replies in time to the Rule 137(4) communication by withdrawing the amendments in respect of which the communication was sent but without identifying those amendments or indicating their basis in the application as filed, then no loss of rights will occur according to Rule 137(4). However, where the withdrawal results in the re-introduction of subject-matter that has already been objected to, the amendment introducing this subject-matter may be deemed to be inadmissible according to Rule 137(3) (see H-II, 2.3).

No further Rule 137(4) communication will be sent in respect of further amendments filed in a timely response to the Rule 137(4) communication. By the expiry of the one-month period, the applicant must have identified and indicated the basis of:

- (i) amendments in respect of which the Rule 137(4) communication was sent and which are not superseded by further amendments filed during the one-month period under Rule 137(4), and
- (ii) amendments filed during that one-month period.

The applicant does not need to comply with Rule 137(4) in respect of amendments which are superseded by further amendments filed in the one-month period. For example:

3 June 2020	Application filed: 10 claims
25 March 2021	Extended European search report drawn up
21 August 2023	Amended claims 1-10 filed in examination proceedings, no basis indicated
6 November 2023	Examining division sends a <u>Rule 137(4)</u> communication in respect of amended claims 1-10 filed on 21 August 2023
16 November 2023	Amended claims 6-10 filed
6 December 2023	One-month period under <u>Rule 137(4)</u> expires

In the above example, the applicant must, by expiry of the one-month period according to Rule 137(4) on 6 December 2023, indicate the basis for amended claims 1-5 as filed on 21 August 2023 and for amended claims 6-10 as filed on 16 November 2023, and failure to do so results in the application being deemed to be withdrawn according to Art. 94(4). It is not necessary for the applicant to indicate the basis for the superseded amendments to claims 6-10 filed on 21 August 2023. Note in particular that, where the basis for the amendments to claims 6-10 filed on 16 November 2023 is not indicated by 6 December 2023, then no further Rule 137(4) communication is sent in respect of these amendments and the application is deemed to be withdrawn on expiry of the one-month period on 6 December 2023.

2.1.3 Rule 137(4) and oral proceedings

A Rule 137(4) communication will not be sent where the amendments in question are filed during oral proceedings. Nonetheless, it is a requirement of Rule 137(4) that amendments and their basis be identified. If the applicant fails to fulfil this requirement in respect of amendments filed during oral proceedings, the amendments may, for reasons of procedural economy and taking into account the applicant's right to be heard in accordance with Art. 113(1), be rejected as inadmissible by the examining division, exercising its discretion under Rule 137(3).

Amendments filed in preparation for oral proceedings in response to the invitation according to Rule 116(2) will be dealt with in those oral proceedings as indicated above. However, if the oral proceedings are cancelled or applicants do not attend and the procedure is continued in writing after the oral proceedings are held in their absence, a Rule 137(4) communication may be sent by the examining division in respect of those amendments.

2.1.4 Transitional provisions relating to Rule 137(4)

The procedure described in H-III.2.1.1 to H-III.2.1.3 applies to the following applications (see Art. 2(2) of the decision of the Administrative Council of 25 March 2009, OJ EPO 2009, 299):

- (i) European applications for which the search report is drawn up on or after 1 April 2010,
- (ii) Euro-PCT applications for which the supplementary European search report is drawn up on or after 1 April 2010, and
- (iii) Euro-PCT applications for which the international search report is drawn up by the EPO acting as International Searching Authority on or after 1 April 2010 (Art. 153(6); see also A-XIV.2.1.2).

2.2 Amendment by submitting missing documents or by filing replacement pages

The content of a European patent application or patent may be amended within the limits laid down in Art. 123(2) and (3). (For the conditions governing amendments, see also A-V.2, H-II, H-IV, H-V and D-V.6.) This will normally be done by submitting missing documents or by filing replacement pages. Where replacement pages are filed, the applicant or patent proprietor is advised, in the interests of procedural efficiency, to identify clearly all amendments made, and indicate on which passages of the original application these amendments are based. Where whole paragraphs have been added or deleted, it is not necessary to renumber the paragraphs throughout the entire application or patent.

If handwritten amendments are filed during oral proceedings in opposition, the proprietor is invited in a Rule 82(2) communication to submit replacement paragraphs and/or claims only, and not replacement pages (see E-III.8.7.3, and OJ EPO 2016, A22, points 8 to 14).

Amendments should preferably be identified using functions available in a text editor to clearly indicate deletions and insertions in the amended text. Pages with such indications should be submitted in addition to clean copies. Alternatively, handwritten form is appropriate to fulfil the requirements of [Rule 137\(4\)](#), provided that clean copies are free from handwritten amendments.

The basis for amendments should preferably be indicated by including in the letter of reply a list of the amendments made and the precise basis for amendments in the application as filed (see [H-III, 2.1](#)). Where the basis is not explicit, e.g. where a different wording is used or features are taken only from drawings or generalised from a specific embodiment, it is advisable to give a short explanation of why [Art. 123\(2\)](#) is fulfilled.

2.3 Amendments made by the EPO at the request of a party

Where necessary, deficient documents may also be amended at the request of a party by the competent department of the EPO. This could be the procedure for minor amendments, e.g. where it is necessary to insert details which were omitted in the request for grant, and the number of amendments involved is reasonable, or where whole pages or paragraphs are to be deleted. The party concerned is advised to submit a list summarising the amendments to be undertaken by the EPO. It is, however, at the discretion of the examining division to decide whether the number of changes requested is in fact unreasonable and would take a considerable amount of time to deal with. If so, the examining division will require that the party makes the amendments and submits amended pages. This procedure could also be followed for minor amendments to drawings, e.g. for amending a reference number or deleting one or more whole figures (as regards the removal of references following an amendment to the description, see [F-II, 4.8](#)). In the case of complicated amendments to drawings, where it is not immediately clear how the changes are to be made, the party concerned, who as a rule is the applicant or proprietor, must submit replacement pages.

2.4 Withdrawal of amendments/abandonment of subject matter

Any subsequent request to withdraw an amendment is itself a request for further amendment; thus, if this subsequent request occurs after reply to the first communication from the examining division, the corresponding amendment will be admitted only if the examining division consents.

In deleting subject-matter from an application, the applicant should avoid any statement which could be interpreted as abandonment of that subject-matter. Otherwise the subject-matter cannot be reinstated (see [J 15/85](#), confirmed in [G 1/05](#) and [G 1/06](#)).

3. Auxiliary requests

In examination, opposition and limitation proceedings, parties may submit a main request followed by one or more auxiliary requests (see also [D-IV, 5.3](#)).

Example 1:

"We request grant of a patent as per the documents originally filed or, alternatively, as per the amended documents now enclosed."

Example 2:

"We request that the opposition be rejected or, alternatively, that the patent be maintained in amended form as per the enclosed documents."

Such further (auxiliary) requests are made in case the examining or opposition division cannot allow the main (first) request.

If in examination proceedings applicants file text labelled as an auxiliary request, but also indicate that they are not yet willing to restrict themselves to that request, the text is not to be considered as a true auxiliary request within the meaning of this chapter, such that it is not possible to proceed directly to the issue of a communication under Rule 71(3) based on this text (see C-V, 1.1). In such circumstances it is appropriate to contact applicants by telephone to establish whether they are prepared to proceed to grant on the basis of that text. The applicant's agreement or non-agreement that a Rule 71(3) communication can be based on such an auxiliary request must be mentioned in the minutes of the telephone conversation or, in the case of agreement, in the Rule 71(3) communication (see C-VII, 2.5).

3.1 General principles

If the main request is allowable, the division will ignore any auxiliary requests.

If the main request is not allowable, the division will consider the auxiliary requests, in the sequence chosen by the requester.

If an auxiliary request is allowable, the division will ignore all subsequent requests.

3.1.1 Sequence of requests

When a group of auxiliary requests is filed, these requests must be filed in a clear order and must not be worded such that they leave it for the examining division to identify and speculate on the intended text of the claims (R 14/10). Furthermore, all auxiliary requests must relate to one invention: the examining division will exercise its discretion under Rule 137(3) and will refuse to admit auxiliary requests which involve switching from the searched invention chosen for examination to another invention (see C-III, 3.5 and H-II, 6).

Under Art. 113(2), the EPO decides upon European patent applications or patents only in the text submitted to it, or agreed, by applicants or proprietors. These parties must therefore clearly indicate the text they are proposing or, if they are submitting more than one text, the sequence in which they want the EPO to consider them. Otherwise the division does not know which version to base its decision on and would ultimately have to

refuse the application, revoke the patent or reject the request for limitation for lack of any clear request.

3.1.2 Obligation to give reasons

In examination, opposition and limitation proceedings, whenever a request by any of the parties is refused, reasons must always be given.

3.1.3 Neither main nor auxiliary requests allowable

If the examining or opposition division cannot allow the main request or any of the auxiliary requests, it must issue a decision to that effect, taking Art. 113(1) and 116 into account. The decision must include the reasons for rejecting/refusing the main request and each of the auxiliary requests, except where the requests in question have been withdrawn.

3.2 In the search phase

In the search phase, under Rule 137(1) amendments to the claims are not admissible before the applicant receives the European search report, and therefore no auxiliary requests can be submitted. If auxiliary requests are submitted before the establishment of a supplementary European search report (see H-II, 2.1), only the main request will be taken into account in the search (see, however, B-VIII, 3.2.2 and B-VIII, 4.2.2).

3.3 In examination proceedings

3.3.1 Indication of the amendments made in the requests and of their basis

Where requests (main and/or auxiliary) are filed in examination proceedings and the applicant does not identify the amendments and/or does not indicate the basis for them in the application as filed, a communication according to Rule 137(4) may also be sent in respect of one or more of the newly filed main and/or auxiliary requests.

For requests filed in preparation for oral proceedings, late filed requests or requests filed during oral proceedings, see H-III, 2.1.3.

3.3.2 Admissibility of auxiliary requests

3.3.2.1 Criteria for admissibility of auxiliary requests

As a matter of principle, the examining division must, when exercising its discretion under Rule 137(3) not to admit one or more auxiliary requests, balance the interests of the applicant and procedural efficiency (see also H-II, 2.3, H-II, 2.5.1, H-II, 2.6 and H-II, 2.7).

Thus, an auxiliary request which contains minor deficiencies but otherwise complies with the requirements of the EPC is normally admitted into the procedure.

When deciding on the admissibility of auxiliary requests the principles set out in H-II are considered for each of the requests, since each request is in fact a set of amended claims.

Auxiliary requests reintroducing subject-matter which has already been considered unallowable and has been removed by the applicant will not be admitted (see also [H-II, 2.3](#)). The same may apply to auxiliary requests introducing new deficiencies.

3.3.2.2 Timeliness and structure of auxiliary requests

If auxiliary requests are filed after the final date set in accordance with [Rule 116\(2\)](#), they are usually treated as late-filed unless a summons to oral proceedings was issued as the first action.

For late-filed requests, in addition to the criteria set out in [H-III, 3.3.2.1](#), the subject-matter of the new claims must not diverge considerably from the claims already filed. The requests normally need to represent a convergent development, i.e. the subject-matter of the auxiliary requests constitutes a sequential limitation in the direction of an intended invention and does not make use of different characteristics in order to branch out in different directions ([T 1273/04](#)). In particular, the applicant cannot shift to the examining division the responsibility for defining the subject-matter of the application by filing a large number of unstructured requests or requests involving different variants: this leads to the requests not being admitted.

3.3.3 Preparing the decision

If the examining division is able to allow an auxiliary request (but not the main request or any higher-ranking auxiliary requests), it will inform the applicant accordingly in a communication under [Rule 71\(2\)](#) or in an annex to the communication according to [Rule 71\(3\)](#), giving a brief indication of the essential reasons for refusing the main and higher-ranking auxiliary requests (see [C-V, 1.1](#)).

Where an auxiliary request appears to comprise subject-matter that offers a good starting point for an allowable request, but it is considered expedient to issue a communication under [Art. 94\(3\)](#), a brief indication is given of the essential reasons for the non-allowability or non-admissibility of the subject-matter of the higher-ranking requests, and a suggestion is provided as to the most promising request (see [C-III, 4.1.2](#)).

Care needs to be taken where oral proceedings have been specifically requested in cases where the examining division has not allowed the main request: the applicant must be summoned to oral proceedings even if the examining division considers one of the auxiliary requests to be patentable. In such cases it may be appropriate to ask applicants in a telephone call whether, in view of the examining division's intention to issue a communication under [Rule 71\(3\)](#) for the allowable auxiliary request, they would be prepared either to withdraw the request for oral proceedings for the main request or to replace the main request with the allowable auxiliary request.

During oral proceedings, the division addresses the main request and decides on the admissibility of the auxiliary requests, if any, filed in reply to the summons to oral proceedings (see [H-II, 2.3](#) and [H-III, 2.1.3](#)). Moreover, it may be appropriate to ask applicants whether, in view of an allowable

request, they would be prepared to withdraw the unallowable higher-ranking request(s). However, the applicant is not obliged to do so.

The summons to oral proceedings must indicate the essential reasons that led the examining division not to allow or not to admit the auxiliary requests already filed so that the applicant is not taken by surprise by the refusal of the application in case the applicant decides not to attend the oral proceedings (C-V, 1.1 and C-V, 4.9). This applies regardless of whether oral proceedings are held in the absence of the applicant or are cancelled.

In deciding on the admissibility of the auxiliary requests, the examining division will apply the criteria set out in:

- (i) H-III, 3.3.2.1 if auxiliary requests are submitted by the date set according to Rule 116(1);
- (ii) H-III, 3.3.2.1 and H-III, 3.3.2.2 if auxiliary requests are submitted after the date set according to Rule 116(1).

The examining division may then exercise its discretion under Rule 137(3) not to admit one or more of the requests (see H-II, 2.3, H-II, 2.7, H-II, 2.7.1 and H-III, 3.3.1), and it may do so in the absence of the applicant/representative. A decision to refuse the application in these circumstances must not take the applicant by surprise (E-III, 8.3.3.1 and E-III, 8.3.3.3).

3.3.4 Complete text for auxiliary request not yet available

If a complete text corresponding to the allowable auxiliary request does not yet exist, the applicant must be asked to make the necessary amendments.

In oral proceedings, the division does always try to have the description brought into line with the version of the claims it considers allowable. If necessary, the oral proceedings are interrupted for this purpose.

3.3.5 Complete text for auxiliary request available

If a complete text of the application according to the allowable auxiliary request already exists, a communication under Rule 71(3) is issued. In an annex to this communication the division must give a brief indication of the reasons on which the refusal of the higher-ranking requests is based (see also C-V, 1.1). Where appropriate, this may be done by reference to earlier communications. If applicants approve this proposed text, then in accordance with Rule 71(3) they indicate this by filing the translations of the claims and paying the fees for grant and publishing without filing any request for amendment or correction of the proposed text (if such a request is filed, the procedure is as indicated in C-V, 4). If they do so, the application proceeds to grant on the basis of the text of the auxiliary request as proposed in the communication under Rule 71(3) (see C-V, 2).

3.3.6 Applicant does not approve the text proposed for grant

If the applicant does not approve the text according to the auxiliary request as proposed in the communication under Rule 71(3), the procedure is as set out in C-V, 4 (see in particular C-V, 4.7 and C-V, 4.6.2).

3.4 In opposition proceedings

In opposition proceedings, if an auxiliary request by the proprietor for maintenance of the patent in amended form is allowable, the division cannot revoke the patent (see T 234/86).

3.4.1 Written procedure

If the opposition division, after examining the parties' submissions, considers it can maintain the patent only in amended form as per an auxiliary request from the proprietor, it must first ensure that the parties have been allowed to comment under Art. 113(1) on the grounds and evidence behind the non-allowance of the higher-ranking request(s) and on the grounds and evidence behind the allowance of the lower-ranking request (where oral proceedings have been requested, see also H-III 3.5.2).

If, despite the existence of an allowable request, the proprietor continues to maintain one or more unallowable higher-ranking requests, an interlocutory decision is issued. This decision must include the finding that the patent and the invention to which it relates, as amended in accordance with the allowable auxiliary request, meet the requirements of the EPC. It must also set out the reasons, based on grounds and evidence already communicated to the parties, for refusing the higher-ranking requests and for allowing the lower-ranking request.

3.4.2 Oral proceedings

If the opposition division is able to allow an auxiliary request but not the main or higher-ranking auxiliary requests, the chair informs the parties (possibly after interrupting the proceedings) which request is allowable and that the higher-ranking request(s) is/are not allowable (and on which grounds they are not allowable), ensuring beforehand that the parties have already had the opportunity to comment on all grounds and evidence underlying this finding. The chair will then normally ask proprietors if they are prepared to convert the allowable auxiliary request into a main request (by abandoning all higher-ranking unallowable requests). The division cannot, however, insist on the proprietor making such a declaration.

If, despite the existence of an allowable auxiliary request, the proprietor continues to maintain higher-ranking unallowable requests, the division issues an interlocutory decision to the effect that:

- (a) the main request and possibly one or more auxiliary requests is/are not allowable
- (b) in respect of the allowable auxiliary request, the amended patent and the invention to which it relates satisfy the requirements of the EPC.

If, on the other hand, the proprietor withdraws the higher-ranking requests such that the allowable auxiliary request becomes the main request, the division will issue an interlocutory decision to the effect that this request satisfies the EPC.

The division tries as far as possible to ensure that, if it allows an auxiliary request at oral proceedings, the complete final text is available at the end of the proceedings.

3.5 In limitation proceedings

Art. 105b

3.5.1 General principles

The filing of auxiliary requests (e.g. claim versions) together with a main request is possible in limitation proceedings, just as in examination proceedings. However, there are restrictions with regard to the possibility of filing amendments in limitation proceedings (see D-X, 4.3 and D-X, 4.5).

The procedure to be applied, subject to any request for oral proceedings, is slightly different to that applicable in pre-grant proceedings under Rule 71(3), especially in view of the requirements of Art. 113(1) and (2). In particular, in a case where an auxiliary request is allowable and the main request is not, if this were communicated under Rule 95(3), this would no longer leave the requester the option of having the main request rejected with an appealable decision. Thus, the following applies:

- (a) if the main request is allowable, the invitation under Rule 95(3) to file the translations and pay the fees will be issued on that basis;
- (b) if an auxiliary request is allowable, but not the main request (and possibly other higher-ranking requests), proprietors will be informed of the reasons in a communication under Rule 95(2) and invited to abandon the non-allowable request(s); if they do not do so, the request will be rejected as in (c) below;
- (c) if none of the requests is allowable, initially a communication under Rule 95(2) setting out the reasons and indicating a possible remedy is sent to the requester; if no remedy is undertaken, a decision rejecting the request is issued, and the annex prepared by the examining division will need to set out the reasons why none of the requests are allowable.

In cases (b) and (c), the decision may be appealed by the requester.

3.5.2 Written procedure

If the examining division, after examining the request for limitation, considers that the patent can be limited only on the basis of an auxiliary request, it informs the requester accordingly in a communication under Rule 95(2), giving reasons why the main request and any higher-ranking auxiliary requests are not allowable and informing the requester which auxiliary request is considered allowable. Where appropriate, the division also informs the requester what amendments must be made to the patent specification documents to bring them into line (Art. 105b(1) and Rule 95(2)).

If in response to the communication under Rule 95(2) the requester withdraws the unallowable request(s) and (where applicable) makes any amendments still outstanding, the examining division will issue a

communication under Rule 95(3) inviting them to pay the prescribed fee and to file the translation of the limited claims of the allowable request (see D-X, 5).

If the requesters insist on maintaining an unallowable request, and fail to comply with the examining division's request that they file documents corresponding to the allowable auxiliary request, the request for limitation must be rejected (Art. 105b(2) and Rule 95(4)). The decision must give the reasons for not allowing the higher-ranking request(s) and must point out, as regards the allowable auxiliary request, that the requester failed to comply with the division's request to submit a text enabling the patent to be limited on the basis of the allowable request.

3.5.3 Oral proceedings

If the examining division is able to allow an auxiliary request but not the main or higher-ranking requests, the chair informs the requesters (possibly after interrupting the proceedings) which request is allowable and why the higher-ranking request(s) is/are not. The requesters will then normally be asked if they are prepared to convert the allowable auxiliary request into a main request. The division cannot however insist on the requester making such a declaration.

If, despite the existence of an allowable text, the requester continues to maintain an unallowable higher-ranking request, the request for limitation shall be rejected (Rule 95(4)). The division will issue a decision giving the reasons for not allowing the higher-preference requests and pointing out that, as regards the allowable auxiliary request, the requester failed to comply with its request to submit a text enabling the patent to be limited on the basis of the allowable request.

4. Different texts in respect of different contracting states

In the cases discussed in H-III, 4.2 to H-III, 4.4, an application or a patent may contain a different set of claims (and descriptions) for different contracting states (also see G-IV, 6). For examination and opposition proceedings, see H-III, 4.1 to H-III, 4.4; for limitation proceedings, see D-X, 10.

It is not possible to have different text in respect of extension or validation states, as the relevant provisions allowing an exception to the principle of unity of the European patent application/patent relate only to EPC contracting states. However, where there are different text versions for the contracting states, the applicant may determine which one applies to the respective extension/validation state.

4.1 Dealing with different texts in examination

If the examining or opposition division considers that the description and drawings are so inconsistent with any set of claims as to create confusion, it will require the applicant or proprietor to amend the description and drawings to remedy this. If the applicant or proprietor voluntarily proposes such an amendment the examining or opposition division will admit it only if it considers this necessary. In particular, different descriptions and drawings will be required only if it is not possible to set out clearly in a

common description which subject-matter is to be protected in the different contracting states. For adaptation of the description in the case of national rights of earlier date, see H-III, 4.4.

Hence this type of application or patent will, after amendment, either consist of two or more distinct sets of claims each supported by the same description and drawings, or two or more sets of claims each supported by different descriptions and drawings.

For the application of Rules 80 and 138 in opposition proceedings, see H-III, 4.2, H-III, 4.4 and H-III, 4.5.

4.2 Different text in respect of the state of the art according to Art. 54(3) EPC and Art. 54(4) EPC 1973

If the EPO notes that in respect of one or more of the designated contracting states the content of an earlier European patent application forms part of the state of the art pursuant to Art. 54(3), two situations can arise:

- (i) the application under examination was pending at the date of entry into force of the EPC 2000 (13 December 2007), or the patent under examination had already been granted at that date. Art. 54(4) EPC 1973 is still transitionally applicable (see Art. 1 of the decision of the Administrative Council of 28 June 2001, OJ EPO 2003, Special edition No. 1, 202), with Rule 23a EPC 1973 and the first part of Rule 87 EPC 1973 as implementing regulations thereto. Here, if conflicting prior art gives rise to different texts of the claims for different contracting states and if the relevant designation fee(s) for the earlier European patent application has/have been paid, different sets of claims for the contracting states concerned may be filed, if required to establish novelty over that prior art. In opposition proceedings, Rule 80 also applies to amendments occasioned by the state of the art according to Art. 54(4) EPC 1973.
- (ii) the application or patent under examination is not one of those covered under (i). As Art. 54(4) EPC 1973 has been deleted, the conflicting prior art belongs to the state of the art for all contracting states, irrespective of the effected designations (see also F-II, 4.3). Likewise, it is irrelevant if the designation fee(s) for the earlier European patent application has/have been paid, since there is no provision in the EPC 2000 corresponding to Rule 23a EPC 1973. Consequently, the possibility of having different texts for different contracting states on the basis of Art. 54(3) no longer exists.

4.3 Different text where a transfer of right takes place pursuant to Art. 61 or Rule 78 in respect of certain designated states

4.3.1 Different text where a transfer of right takes place pursuant to Art. 61 in examination proceedings

If by a final decision pursuant to Art. 61 it is adjudged that a third party is entitled to the grant of a European patent, the original European patent application must contain, "where appropriate", for the designated

Art. 61(1)(b)

Rule 17

Rule 18(1) and (2)

contracting states in which the decision was taken or recognised or must be recognised on the basis of the Protocol on Recognition, claims, a description and drawings which are different from those for the other designated contracting states (see also [H-III, 4.1](#) and [C-IX, 2](#)).

4.3.2 Different texts where a transfer of the patent in respect of certain designated states takes place in opposition proceedings

[Rule 78\(2\)](#)

Where a third party has, in accordance with [Art. 99\(4\)](#), replaced the previous proprietor for one or some of the designated contracting states (see [D-I, 6](#), third paragraph), the patent as maintained in opposition proceedings may for those states contain claims, a description and drawings which are different from those for the other designated contracting states (see also [D-VII, 3.2](#)). However, [Rule 80](#) applies to amendments by each of the proprietors.

4.3.3 Opposition cases with different texts where a transfer of rights by virtue of a final decision pursuant to [Art. 61](#) takes place in examination proceedings

The substance of [H-III, 4.3.2](#) applies *mutatis mutandis* (see also [D-I, 6](#), third paragraph and [D-VII, 3.2](#)).

4.4 Different texts where national rights of earlier date exist

[Art. 139\(2\)](#)

National rights of earlier date are not comprised in the state of the art ([Art. 54](#)) for the purposes of the EPO examination for patentability. However, under [Art. 139\(2\)](#), national rights of earlier date can be invoked, after the grant of the European patent, in national proceedings as a ground for revocation. These rights represent exceptions to the uniformity of European substantive patent law. Where national rights exist, therefore, the applicant or proprietor has a legitimate interest in submitting different claims to ensure that the patent granted will not be partly revoked in some contracting states (see [Rule 80](#) and [Rule 138](#)). The filing of different claims is, however, neither required nor suggested.

If an applicant or proprietor produces evidence in examination/opposition proceedings of the existence of pertinent national rights of earlier date in a particular (designated) contracting state, it is appropriate to admit separate claims for the contracting state in question. The evidence must be in the form of a specification or, where applicable, a copy of the utility model or utility certificate or of the application for it (see [Art. 140](#)); this is necessary to prevent unjustified deviation from the unity of the European patent.

In opposition proceedings, a national right of earlier date is neither a ground for opposition nor a ground for revocation. Hence, it is not admissible for an opponent to introduce a national right of earlier date into opposition proceedings to support a novelty attack.

The effect of the national right of earlier date is determined by the relevant national provisions. The examining or opposition division does not decide whether the applicant or proprietor has limited the scope of the application/patent to the extent required to overcome the effect of the national right (see [G-IV, 6](#)). That is the responsibility of the applicant or proprietor.

The examining or opposition division must check that the separate claims do not contravene Art. 123(2) and Art. 123(3), and that they meet the other requirements of the EPC. The same applies to a separate description (see H-III, 4.1).

Moreover, in general, there is no justification for a separate description. However, at a suitable point in the preamble to the description, preferably in a separate paragraph following the information pursuant to Rule 42(1)(a), a reference to this situation must be made, for example along the following lines:

"With reference to ... (e.g. earlier application No. ... in ...), the applicant has voluntarily limited the scope of the application /patent for... (contracting state) by submitting separate claims for this (these) state(s)."

4.5 Opposition proceedings where the claims as granted are different for different contracting states

Where a patent has been granted with different sets of claims for the reasons set out in H-III, 4.2 to H-III, 4.4, the proprietor might wish to bring the claims into line either by applying a limitation already introduced for one or more contracting states to the other contracting states or by filing a new single set of claims for all contracting states.

In such a case, the amendments to each different set of claims as granted must separately fulfil the requirements of Rule 80 and Art. 123(3) (and Rule 138, if applicable).

5. Calculation of claims fees

The claims fees are calculated in accordance with A-X, 11.2, C-V, 1.4, C-V, 4.2 and C-V, 4.8.1.

Chapter IV – Allowability of amendments

1. Introduction

Chapters H-II and H-III deal with the admissibility of amendments, i.e. whether the competent department of the EPO will admit amended application documents or an amended patent specification into the procedure. After an amendment has been admitted into the procedure, the competent department must then decide whether the amendment is allowable, i.e. whether it satisfies the requirements of the EPC. It is important to note that an admissible amendment is not automatically allowable.

2. Allowability of amendments under Art. 123(2)

2.1 Basic principle

The question of allowability of amendments is legally a question of whether the application as so amended is allowable. An amended application must of course satisfy all the requirements of the EPC including, in particular, inventive step and the other matters listed in B-XI, 3.6 (see also C-III, 2).

If, however, the applicant seeks to amend the description (other than references to the prior art, see H-IV, 2.2.7), the drawings or the claims in such a way that subject-matter which extends beyond the content of the application as filed is thereby introduced, the application as so amended cannot be allowed.

The underlying idea of Art. 123(2) is that applicants are not allowed to improve their position by adding subject-matter not disclosed in the application as filed, which would give them an unwarranted advantage and could be damaging to the legal security of third parties relying on the content of the original application (see G 1/93).

An amendment is regarded as introducing subject-matter which extends beyond the content of the application as filed, and therefore unallowable, if the overall change in the content of the application (whether by way of addition, alteration or excision) results in the skilled person being presented with information which is not directly and unambiguously derivable from that previously presented by the application, even when account is taken of matter which is implicit to a person skilled in the art (see G 2/10).

2.2 Content of the application as "originally" filed – general rules

Under Art. 123(2), it is impermissible to add to a European application subject-matter which the skilled person cannot derive directly and unambiguously, using common general knowledge and also taking into account any features implicit to a person skilled in the art in what is expressly mentioned in the document, from the disclosure of the application as filed. Literal support is, however, not required by the wording of Art. 123(2) (see T 667/08).

The term "implicit disclosure" means no more than the clear and unambiguous consequence of what is explicitly mentioned in the application as filed. Thus, the common general knowledge must be taken

into account in deciding what is clearly and unambiguously implied by the explicit disclosure of a document. However, the question of what may be rendered obvious by that disclosure in the light of common general knowledge is not relevant to the assessment of what is implicitly disclosed by that document (T 823/96, T 1125/07).

When assessing the conformity of the amended claims with the requirements of Art. 123(2), the focus is placed on what is really disclosed to the skilled person by the documents as filed as directed to a technical audience. In particular, the examining division needs to avoid disproportionally focusing on the structure of the claims as filed to the detriment of the subject-matter that the skilled person would directly and unambiguously derive from the application as a whole.

Furthermore, the assessment of the requirements of Art. 123(2) is made from the standpoint of the skilled person on a technical and reasonable basis, avoiding artificial and semantic constructions (T 99/13).

2.2.1 Features described in a document cross-referenced in the description

Features which are not disclosed in the description of the invention as originally filed but which are only described in a cross-referenced document which is identified in such description are *prima facie* not within "the content of the application as filed" for the purpose of Art. 123(2). It is only under particular conditions that such features can be introduced by way of amendment into the claims of an application.

Such an amendment would not contravene Art. 123(2) if the description of the invention as originally filed leaves no doubt to a skilled reader (see T 689/90) that:

- (i) protection is or may be sought for such features;
- (ii) such features contribute to solving the technical problem underlying the invention;
- (iii) such features at least implicitly clearly belong to the description of the invention contained in the application as filed (Art. 78(1)(b)) and thus to the content of the application as filed (Art. 123(2)); and
- (iv) such features are precisely defined and identifiable within the disclosure of the reference document.

Moreover, documents not available to the public on the date of filing of the application can only be considered if (see T 737/90):

- (a) a copy of the document was available to the EPO, or to the receiving Office if the application is a Euro-PCT application which was not filed at the EPO as the receiving Office, on or before the date of filing of the application; and

- (b) the document was made available to the public no later than on the date of publication of the application under Art. 93 (e.g. by being present in the application dossier and therefore made public under Art. 128(4)).

2.2.2 Missing parts of the description or missing drawings filed under Rule 56 after the date of filing

Rule 56 allows the applicant to file missing drawings or parts of the description subsequently, and to rely on the priority document in order to avoid redating of the application to the date of filing of the missing parts. Under Rule 56(3), redating is only avoided where the missing parts were "completely contained" in the priority document (see C-III, 1 and A-II, 5). Rule 56(3) applies only at the filing stage of the application. At later stages of the procedure it is not permissible to rely on the priority documents to correct or amend the application as filed (in keeping with G 3/89 and G 11/91). For Euro-PCT applications a similar provision exists under Rule 20.6 PCT, whereby a review by the EPO as elected or designated Office is possible under Rule 82ter PCT.

Rule 56

Missing parts of the description and/or missing drawings allowed under Rule 56(3) are always considered to be part of the application documents "as originally filed".

2.2.3 Erroneously filed application documents or parts under Rule 56a

Rule 56a allows the applicant to file correct application documents or parts if wrong application documents or parts have been filed erroneously. Under Rule 56a(4) the applicant can rely on the priority document to avoid redating the application to the date of filing of the correct application documents or parts.

Rule 56a

If applicants realise on the filing date (or earlier if the filing date cannot yet be accorded) that they erroneously filed incorrect application documents, they can file correct application documents under Rule 56a(2) on or before the filing date, without changing the filing date (A-II, 6.6).

If correct application documents or parts are filed later than the date of filing, under Rule 56a(4), redating is avoided if the correct documents or parts were "completely contained" in the priority document (see C-III, 1 and A-II, 6).

Rule 56a(4) applies only at the filing stage of the application. It is not permissible to rely on the priority documents to correct or amend the application as filed at later stages of the procedure (in keeping with G 3/89 and G 11/91). For Euro-PCT applications a similar provision exists under Rule 20.5bis(d) PCT and Rule 20.6 PCT, whereby a review by the EPO as elected or designated Office is possible under Rule 82ter PCT.

Correct application documents or parts allowed under Rule 56a(2) and Rule 56a(4) are always considered to be part of the application documents "as originally filed" (see A-II, 6.3 and A-II, 6.4). If erroneously filed

application documents or parts remain in the application under Rule 56a(4), they are part of the application as filed (Art. 123(2)).

2.2.4 Claims filed after the date of filing

Rule 58

Claims filed after the date of filing under Rule 58 are never considered to be part of the application documents "as originally filed" and must therefore comply with the requirements of Art. 123(2) (see A-III, 15). For this reason, the examining division has to check that the claims satisfy the requirements of Art. 123(2), according to the same practice and standards as established in examination for amendments filed in other phases of the procedure (see H-V).

2.2.5 Sequence listings filed after the date of filing

A standardised sequence listing filed after the date of filing does not form part of the description (Rule 30(2)). Such a standardised sequence listing is not published either as an annex to the application or together with the specification (see the notice from the EPO dated 9 December 2021, OJ EPO 2021, A97, point 15).

Pages and electronic files disclosing sequences or constituting a non-standardised sequence listing which were filed at the date of filing are an integral part of the application as originally filed and are treated like any other parts of the description.

A subsequently filed standardised sequence listing may contain only the sequence information – in a standardised form – already contained in the original application, and in particular the number of sequences and their numbering needs to be the same as in the original description (see the notice from the EPO dated 9 December 2021, OJ EPO 2021, A97). To this end the applicant must file a statement confirming that the subsequently filed standardised sequence listing does not include matter which goes beyond the content of the application as originally filed (Art. 1(4) of the decision of the President dated 14 November 2025, OJ EPO 2025, A64). In line with this, a subsequently filed standardised sequence listing cannot be used to determine the originally disclosed content of the application, but only for search purposes (see the notice from the EPO dated 9 December 2021, OJ EPO 2021, A97).

A subsequently filed standardised sequence listing is not to be examined for compliance with the requirements of Art. 123(2), as it is not part of the description.

Without prejudice to Rule 30, a sequence listing forming part of the description may be corrected or amended in accordance with Rule 139 and/or Art. 123(2). In this case a complete new sequence listing containing the corrections or amendments is to be filed in ST.25 TXT format (for applications filed before 1 July 2022) or in ST.26 XML format (for applications filed on or after 1 July 2022); see the notice from the EPO dated 9 December 2021, OJ EPO 2021, A97, points 10 and 38.

2.2.6 Priority documents

Under Art. 123(2) it is impermissible to add to a European application matter present only in the priority document for that application (see T 260/85) unless this is done under the provisions of Rule 56(3) (H-IV, 2.2.2) or Rule 56a(4) (H-IV, 2.2.3). For correction of errors, see H-VI, 4.

2.2.7 Citation of prior art in the description after the filing date

There is normally no objection to an applicant introducing, by amendment, further information regarding prior art which is relevant; indeed this may be required by the examining division (see F-II, 4.3 and F-III, 8). *Art. 123(2)*

2.2.8 Clarifications

The removal of a lack of clarity will normally not be objected to, provided that the change does not extend beyond the disclosure of the application as originally filed (Art. 123(2)).

2.2.9 Trade marks

If an amendment is made in order to clarify the meaning of a trade mark or to replace a registered trade mark with a corresponding technical term, the examining division needs to be particularly careful to ascertain that the amendment does not conflict with Art. 123(2). The composition of a trade-marked product may have changed over time.

2.3 Content of the application as "originally" filed – special applications

2.3.1 Applications filed by reference to an earlier application

According to Rule 40(1)(c), the applicant may file a European application by reference to a previously filed application (A-II, 4.1.3.1). Since claims are no longer required in order for a date of filing to be accorded, the applicant has three options:

- (i) when filing the European application, indicate that the reference to the previously filed application includes the claims
- (ii) at the time of filing, file a new set of claims together with an indication that the description and any drawings are filed by reference to a previously filed application
- (iii) when filing the European application, indicate the reference to a previously filed application and file the claims after the date of filing (Rule 58).

In cases (i) and (ii) the claims will form part of the application as originally filed, whereas in case (iii) the claims filed after the date of filing will not and will thus have to fulfil the requirements of Art. 123(2) (see H-IV, 2.2.4).

2.3.2 Divisional applications

Under Art. 76(1), the subject-matter of a divisional application may not extend beyond the content of the parent application as originally filed. Furthermore, amendments made to the divisional application subsequent to

its filing may not extend beyond the content of the divisional application as originally filed (Art. 123(2); for more details see C-IX, 1.4).

2.3.3 Applications resulting from a decision under Art. 61

If, as a result of a final decision, it is adjudged that a person other than the applicant is entitled to the grant of a patent, that person may file a new European patent application under Art. 61(1)(b). In this case, the provisions of Art. 76(1) apply *mutatis mutandis* to the new application filed under Art. 61(1)(b).

This means that the new application must not contain any subject-matter extending beyond the content of the earlier (unentitled) application as originally filed. Furthermore, Art. 123(2) means that this new application may not be amended in such a way as to extend its subject-matter beyond its content as originally filed, even where the subject-matter in question is contained in the earlier application (for more details see C-IX, 2.1).

2.3.4 International applications

For the purposes of Art. 123(2), the documents as originally filed are those originally filed in the PCT phase (normally published as a WO publication), a copy of which can always be obtained from the International Bureau. Therefore amendments made during the PCT phase (including amended, substitute or rectified sheets, even if attached to the WO publication) or upon entry into the regional phase before the EPO must, if maintained in the European phase, fulfil the requirements of Art. 123(2), and all such amendments must be carefully considered.

3. Allowability of amendments under Art. 123(3)

3.1 Basic principles

Art. 69(2)

The European patent as granted or as amended in opposition, limitation or revocation proceedings determines retroactively the protection conferred by the European patent application.

Opposition proceedings will frequently give rise to amendments to the claims, following from grounds for opposition raised under Art. 100. Reasoned requests filed independently by proprietors of the patent for an amendment to the claims, e.g. for limitation of the patent in view of an aspect of the state of the art which has come to their knowledge, may also result in amendments to the claims after examination by the opposition division.

Art. 123(3)

In such cases the claims of the European patent may not be amended in such a way as to extend the protection conferred by the patent.

Art. 123(3) is directly aimed at protecting the interests of third parties by prohibiting any broadening of the claims of a granted patent, even if there is a basis for such broadening in the application as filed (see G 1/93, Reasons 9).

3.2 Protection conferred by the patent as granted

The extent of protection conferred by a European patent is determined by the claims. Nevertheless, the description and drawings are to be used to interpret the claims. Art. 69(1)

The Protocol on the Interpretation of Art. 69, which is, pursuant to Art. 164(1), an integral part of the EPC, specifies how Art. 69 is to be interpreted.

Since, pursuant to Art. 69(1), amendments to the description and drawings will also influence the interpretation of the claims, and may therefore extend the protection conferred, any such amendments extending protection in this way are not allowable (see G 1/93).

3.3 Version of the granted patent to be considered

In order to verify the criteria of Art. 123(3) the examining or opposition division needs to compare the text of the amended claims with the claims of the patent as granted or as amended in opposition or earlier limitation proceedings, whichever claims are the most recent in force.

3.4 Assessment of impermissible extension of the protection conferred

In view of the above considerations, all amendments made to claims and any connected amendments to the description and drawings in the course of opposition proceedings, such as a change in the technical features of the invention, must be examined to determine whether such amendments could result in the extension of the subject-matter beyond the content of the application as originally filed (Art. 123(2)) or in the extension of the protection conferred (Art. 123(3)).

If, in view of Art. 84, the application documents have been adapted to amended claims before grant, thereby deleting part of the subject-matter originally disclosed in order to avoid inconsistencies in the patent specification, as a rule, subject-matter deleted for this reason cannot be reinserted either into the patent specification or into the claims as granted without infringing Art. 123(3). An analogous finding applies to subject-matter retained in the patent specification during such adaptation for reasons of comprehensibility, but indicated as not relating to the claimed invention.

The requirements of Art. 123(2) and Art. 123(3) have to be dealt with separately:

- (a) Examination for compliance with Art. 123(2) is conducted in the same way as in examination proceedings.
- (b) Examination for compliance with Art. 123(3), on the other hand, is based on the claims as granted, or as amended in opposition or earlier limitation proceedings, where necessary using the description and drawings to interpret the claims (Art. 69 and the Protocol on the Interpretation of Art. 69).

A composition which is specified in a claim as comprising a component in an amount which is defined by a numerical range of values is subject to an implicit proviso excluding the presence of that component in an amount outside of that range. An amendment restricting the breadth of that component, for instance by narrowing down a generic class or a list of chemical compounds defining that component, has the consequence of limiting the scope of this implicit proviso. However, a composition which is defined as comprising the components indicated in the claim is open to the presence of any further components unless otherwise specified. Therefore in a claim directed to such an openly defined composition, the restriction of the breadth of a component present therein may have the effect of broadening the scope of protection of that claim, with the consequence that in opposition/appeal proceedings such amended claim may extend the protection conferred by the granted patent (Art. 123(3)) (see T 2017/07 and T 287/11). Restricting the breadth of the component means that certain materials are no longer explicitly limited by the claim and therefore can be present in amounts which were excluded from the granted claim.

3.5 Conflicts between Art. 123(2) and Art. 123(3)

A possible conflict between the requirements of Art. 123(2) and (3) may occur where, in the procedure before grant, a feature was added to the application which is considered unallowable under Art. 123(2) in opposition proceedings. In that case, Art. 123(2) would require deletion of such a feature whereas Art. 123(3) would not allow deletion, as this would extend the protection conferred by the patent as granted. In such a case the patent will have to be revoked under Art. 100(c). However, where this feature can be **replaced** by a feature for which there is a basis in the application as filed **and** which does not extend the protection conferred by the patent as granted, maintenance in this amended form can be allowed. If the added feature, **without providing a technical contribution to the subject-matter of the claimed invention**, merely limits the protection conferred by the patent as granted by excluding protection for part of the subject-matter of the claimed invention as covered by the application as filed, this feature may be maintained (see G 1/93). The technical significance of a feature in a claim is governed by its contribution to the technical definition of the claimed subject-matter, and that contribution is to be assessed by the skilled person in the light of the original disclosure (see T 518/99).

3.6 Conflicts between Art. 123(3) and other requirements of the EPC

Other requirements of the EPC may also interact with Art. 123(3) after grant. For instance, if a patent as granted only contains claims that in fact define a "method for treatment of the human or animal body by therapy or surgery practised on the human or animal body" or contain such a method step, and such a patent is opposed under Art. 53(c), then Art. 53(c) and 123(3) may operate in combination so that the patent must inevitably be revoked, in that:

- the patent cannot be maintained as granted because its claims define subject-matter which is excluded from patentability under Art. 53(c); and

Art. 123(3)

- the patent cannot be maintained in amended form because amendment of the claims as granted by deletion of such "method features" would be contrary to Art. 123(3) (see T 82/93).

4. Amendments relating to unsearched matter

4.1 Rule 137(5)

Rule 137(5) relates to a matter of substantive law rather than to procedural law. It sets out two further conditions for the allowability of amended claims, namely they may not relate to (i) unsearched subject-matter which does not combine with the originally claimed invention or group of inventions to form a single general inventive concept and (ii) subject-matter not searched in accordance with Rule 62a and Rule 63 (see, however, H-II, 5).

Thus Rule 137(5), as opposed to Rule 137(3), does not provide a legal basis for the exercise of discretion by the division not to admit amended claims. The examination of the compliance of amended claims with Rule 137(5) therefore requires an *in-depth* assessment, not just a *prima facie* analysis.

4.1.1 Rule 62a and/or Rule 63 cases

Amended claims may not relate to subject-matter not searched in accordance with Rule 62a or Rule 63 (see, however, H-II, 5). Consequently, the presence of this subject-matter in the description cannot be used as a basis for its reintroduction into the claims (see also B-VIII, 3.2.2 and B-VIII, 4.2.2).

*Rule 137(5),
second sentence*

However, the examining division does not raise an objection under Rule 137(5), second sentence, if the applicant only further limits a searched claim by introducing subject-matter taken from the description unless this subject-matter was explicitly declared as not searched under Rule 62a and/or Rule 63.

When assessing the allowability of an amendment under Rule 137(5), second sentence, the examining division also evaluates if the limitation of the search under Rule 62a and/or Rule 63 or the declaration of no search was justified (see B-VIII, 3.2.2, B-VIII, 4.2.2, H-II, 5). If the invitation was not appropriate or the limitation not justified, an additional search may be necessary (see C-IV, 7.3).

4.1.2 Subject-matter taken from the description

Within the framework of Art. 123(2) and Art. 82, Rule 137(5), first sentence, should be construed as permitting any limitation of searched subject-matter which is unitary with the originally claimed subject-matter, irrespective of whether the technical feature(s) used for the limitation has/have been searched.

*Rule 137(5),
first sentence*

Where the EPO has acted as ISA or SISA and the application has just entered the regional phase before the EPO, the amendments filed in response to a communication under Rule 161 are exempt from the requirements of Rule 137(5). If the claims to be examined relate to an

invention which differs from any of the inventions originally claimed, an invitation under Rule 164(2) has to be sent out instead (see H-IV, 4.2).

The subject-matter of the claims searched by the EPO may encompass more than one invention. This may be the case when at search stage a lack of unity objection was raised and the applicant paid a further search fee. If the applicant limits the examination to one of the searched inventions and later, following amendments, switches to another searched invention, Rule 137(5) is not applicable. Instead, the procedure outlined in H-II, 6.1 needs to be followed.

If amended claims are directed to subject-matter which has not been searched because it only appeared in the description (and the search division did not find it appropriate to extend the search to this subject-matter; see B-III, 3.5) and which does not combine with the originally claimed and searched invention or group of inventions to form a single general inventive concept (see F-V, 3), such amendments are not allowable.

In other words, in order to assess whether or not amended claims fulfil the requirements of Rule 137(5), first sentence, the examining division needs to establish first whether or not the subject-matter to which they relate has or should have been searched (see B-III, 3) and second whether or not an objection of lack of unity would have been raised if the amended claims had been present in the set of claims on file at the time of the search.

As a consequence, an objection under Rule 137(5), first sentence, will normally arise if the applicant attempts to replace a technical feature contained in a claim with a technical feature taken from the description and having an effect unrelated to the effect(s) of the features of the originally claimed invention(s).

If an objection under Rule 137(5), first sentence, is raised, the examining division provides a reasoning why the subject-matter has not been searched (see B-III, 3) and why the subject-matter does not combine with the originally claimed invention or group of inventions to form a single general inventive concept (see F-V, 3). Applicants are informed that they may continue to pursue such subject-matter only in the form of a divisional application under Art. 76.

The situation described above is different from amendments corresponding to an invention originally claimed but not searched under Rule 64, or Rule 164(1) or Rule 164(2), which are dealt with in H-II, 6.2.

Rule 137(3)

Applicants should bear in mind that the examination procedure should be brought to a conclusion in as few actions as possible. Therefore, the examining division may exercise its right not to admit further amendments under Rule 137(3) (see H-II, 2.3).

4.2 Euro-PCT applications

For Euro-PCT applications where the EPO acted as ISA or SISA, the examining division has to issue an invitation under Rule 164(2) for any now

claimed but unsearched invention contained in the originally filed application documents (description, claims and drawings, if any) which are to serve as the basis for examination upon expiry of the six-month time limit set in the communication under Rule 161 or Rule 162 (see C-III, 3.1). For the purpose of Rule 137(5), in the subsequent examination procedure, the originally claimed invention of a Euro-PCT application is the invention searched by the EPO in the international phase or the invention searched under Rule 164(2).

Chapter V – Allowability of amendments – examples

1. Introduction

Chapter H-V provides additional guidance and examples relating to a number of typical situations where compliance with Art. 123(2) and/or Art. 123(3) is an issue. However, it must be borne in mind that the allowability of a specific amendment is ultimately to be decided on a case-by-case basis.

2. Amendments in the description

2.1 Clarification of a technical effect

Where a technical feature was clearly disclosed in the original application but its effect was not mentioned or not mentioned fully, yet it can be deduced without difficulty by a person skilled in the art from the application as filed, subsequent clarification of that effect in the description does not contravene Art. 123(2).

2.2 Introduction of further examples and new effects

Amendment by the introduction of further examples always needs to be looked at very carefully in the light of the general considerations outlined in H-IV.2. The same applies to the introduction of statements of new (i.e. previously not mentioned) effects of the invention such as new technical advantages. For example, if the invention as originally presented related to a process for cleaning woollen clothing consisting of treating the clothing with a particular fluid, the applicant is not allowed to introduce later into the description a statement that the process also has the advantage of protecting the clothing against moth damage.

Art. 123(2)

Under certain circumstances, however, later filed examples or new effects, even if not allowed into the application, may nevertheless be taken into account by the examining division as evidence in support of the patentability of the claimed invention. For instance, an additional example may be accepted as evidence that the invention can be readily applied, on the basis of the information given in the originally filed application, over the whole field claimed (see F-IV.6.3). Similarly, a technical effect may be considered in support of inventive step, provided this effect is encompassed by the technical teaching and embodied by the same originally disclosed invention (see G-VII.5.2, G-VII.11 and G 2/21, Headnote II).

Art. 123(2)

2.3 Supplementary technical information

Any supplementary technical information submitted after the filing date of the application will be added to the part of the file which is open to public inspection unless excluded from public inspection pursuant to Rule 144(d). From the date on which the information is added to the open part of the file, it forms part of the state of the art within the meaning of Art. 54(2). In order to notify the public of the existence of such information submitted after the application was filed and not included in the specification, an appropriate mention will be printed on the cover page of the patent specification.

2.4 Revision of stated technical problem

Care must also be taken to ensure that any amendment to, or subsequent insertion of, a statement of the technical problem solved by the invention meets Art. 123(2). For example it may happen that following restriction of the claims to meet an objection of lack of inventive step, it is desired to revise the stated problem to emphasise an effect attainable by the thus restricted invention but not by the prior art.

It must be remembered that such revision is only permissible if the effect emphasised is one deducible by a person skilled in the art without difficulty from the application as filed (see H-V, 2.1 and 2.2 above).

If the suggested amendment would contravene Art. 123(2), it will be necessary to amend the description in some other way, e.g. by defining the problem in more general terms or by omitting any express statement of the problem altogether.

2.5 Reference document

Features from a cross-referenced document can, under particular conditions be introduced by way of amendment into the claims of an application (see H-IV, 2.2.1).

2.6 Alteration, excision or addition of text in the description

Alteration or excision of the text, as well as the addition of further text, may introduce fresh subject-matter. For instance, suppose an invention related to a multi-layer laminated panel, and the description included several examples of different layered arrangements, one of these having an outer layer of polyethylene; amendment of this example either to alter the outer layer to polypropylene or to omit this layer altogether would not normally be allowable. In each case, the panel disclosed by the amendment example would be quite different from that originally disclosed and, hence, the amendment would introduce fresh subject-matter and therefore be unallowable.

2.7 Bringing the description into line with amended claims

The description must be brought into line with amended claims by amending it as needed to meet the requirements set out in F-II, 4.2, F-IV, 4.3(iii) and F-IV, 4.4.

If the applicant does not amend the description as required despite being asked to do so, the examining division's next action may be to issue a summons to oral proceedings; for the time limit, E-III, 6(iii) applies.

3. Amendments in claims

Replacement or removal of features from a claim, as well as the addition of further features, may introduce fresh subject-matter not only in the claim itself, but also in the claims when considered as a whole. In fact, such amendments could result in a combination of features not disclosed in the application as filed when the amended claim is considered together with its dependent claims and/or the claims on which it depends.

3.1 Replacement or removal of features from a claim

The requirements of Art. 123(2) are only met if the replacement or removal of a feature lies within the limits of what a skilled person would derive directly and unambiguously, using common general knowledge and seen objectively and relative to the date of filing (or the date of priority according to Art. 89), from the whole of the application documents (G 3/89, G 11/91 and G 2/10). Art. 123(2)

If the amendment by replacing or removing a feature from a claim fails to pass the following test by at least one criterion, it necessarily contravenes the requirements of Art. 123(2):

- (i) the replaced or removed feature was not explained as essential in the originally filed disclosure;
- (ii) the skilled person would directly and unambiguously recognise that the feature is not, as such, indispensable for the function of the invention in the light of the technical problem the invention serves to solve (in this context special care needs to be taken in cases where the technical problem is reformulated during the proceedings, see H-V, 2.4 and G-VII, 11); and
- (iii) the skilled person would recognise that the replacement or removal requires no modification of one or more features to compensate for the change (it does not in itself alter the invention).

However, even if the above criteria are met, the division must still ensure that the amendment by replacing or removing a feature from a claim satisfies the requirements of Art. 123(2) as they also have been set out in G 3/89 and G 11/91, referred to in G 2/10 as "the gold standard".

If several features are deleted from an independent claim, so that for example it is restricted to only part of the originally claimed subject-matter, the subject-matter of the amended claim must be directly and unambiguously derivable from the application as filed as being an invention *per se*, i.e. it must solve a technical problem and be able to work in the absence of any of the particular features being deleted.

The removal of a limiting feature from an independent granted claim is likely to result in broadening the scope of protection afforded and could therefore contravene Art. 123(3). Likewise, if a feature in a granted claim is replaced, compliance with Art. 123(3) has to be carefully checked. Art. 123(3)

3.2 Inclusion of additional features

A claim may be limited by the inclusion of additional features, provided the resulting combination was directly and unambiguously disclosed in the application as originally filed in an explicit or implicit manner (see H-IV, 2.1) and does not relate to an invention which was not searched (see H-IV, 4 and H-II, 6.2). If the resulting combination is novel over the application as originally filed (see the test for novelty given in G-VI, 2), the amended claim does not fulfil the requirements of Art. 123(2). Art. 123(2)

The fact that the resulting combination can be seen as:

- "not inconsistent" with the description (T 495/06) or
- "reasonably plausible" (T 824/06) or
- "obvious" in view of the application (T 329/99)

is not sufficient for an amendment to be allowable under Art. 123(2), since its direct and unambiguous disclosure is required.

A claim may be limited by inclusion of additional features, for example:

- (a) from dependent claims, which were dependent on the claim to be limited;
- (b) from the description (see also H-V, 3.2.1);
- (c) from drawings (see H-V, 6);
- (d) arising from the conversion of an independent claim to a dependent claim;

provided the above requirements are fulfilled.

3.2.1 Intermediate generalisations

Art. 123(2)

Extracting a specific feature in isolation from an originally disclosed combination of features and using it to delimit claimed subject-matter may be allowed only if there is no structural and functional relationship between the features.

When evaluating whether the limitation of a claim by a feature extracted from a combination of features fulfils the requirements of Art. 123(2), the content of the application as filed must not be considered to be a reservoir from which individual features pertaining to separate embodiments can be combined in order to artificially create a particular combination.

When a feature is taken from a particular embodiment and added to the claim, it has to be established that:

- the feature is not related or inextricably linked to the other features of that embodiment and
- the overall disclosure justifies the generalising isolation of the feature and its introduction into the claim.

These conditions are to be understood as an aid to assessing, in the particular case of an intermediate generalisation, if the amendment fulfils the requirements of Art. 123(2). In any case it has to be ensured that the skilled person is not presented with information which is not directly and unambiguously derivable from the originally filed application, even when

account is taken of matter which is implicit to a person skilled in the art using the common general knowledge.

Example 1

The amended claim relates to a heddle for the harness of a loom. The original claim was limited by introducing features that were disclosed only in connection with a specific embodiment in which the eyelet of the heddle had the shape of a spindle. This shape was not included in the amended claim. In the general part of the description it was also mentioned that the eyelet could also have other shapes such as an elliptic shape. Therefore the board concluded that the amendment was allowable under Art. 123(2) (T. 300/06).

Example 2

Claim 1 relates to a water dispersible and flushable absorbent article. Amended claim 1 specifies that each of the first and second fibrous assemblies is a wet laid tissue. The application as filed referred, in connection with the first fibrous assembly, to a wet laid tissue in combination with other features (tissue is apertured; tissue is provided with fibrils or sufficient inherent porosity).

Since the first fibrous assembly is disclosed in the application as filed as being a wet laid tissue only in combination with other features which are not present in claim 1, the amendments made constitute a generalisation of the originally disclosed technical information and thereby introduce subject-matter extending beyond the content of the application as filed (T. 1164/04).

Example 3

Original claim 1 relates to a coating composition comprising at least one rosin compound, at least one polymer and an antifoulant.

After amendment a new claim was introduced relating to a method for preparing a coating composition comprising the mixing of at least one rosin compound, at least one polymer and an antifoulant. The only basis for the method is the examples. The board observed that for some solutions the amount of added rosin was extremely low whereas for others it was extremely high. The subject-matter of the amended claim was considered to be an unallowable generalisation of the examples, since nothing in the description indicated to the person skilled in the art that the observed variations were not essential to make a coating composition (T. 200/04).

Example 4

Original claim 1 relates to a multi-processing system comprising a shared memory, a directory and a serialisation point. The serialisation point is defined in functional terms. Claim 1 was amended by adding features that were addressed in the description as part of the cache coherence strategy. The board held that the incorporated features, albeit disclosed as such, had been isolated in an arbitrary manner from the overall disclosure of the cache coherent memory access architecture. At least one feature had been

omitted although its function was presented as being essential to achieving cache coherence. Therefore amended claim 1 was not directly and unambiguously derivable from the original application (T.166/04).

3.3 Deletion of part of the claimed subject-matter

Art. 123(2)

It is permissible to delete parts of the claimed subject-matter if the corresponding embodiments were originally described, e.g. as alternatives in the claim or as embodiments explicitly set out in the description.

Example:

Original application:	"A polymer blend XY ... containing, as a filler, graphite, talc, asbestos or silica"
Prior art:	"A polymer blend XY ... containing asbestos"
Limited claim:	"A polymer blend XY ... containing, as a filler, graphite, talc or silica"

The deletion of alternatives from more than one list is only allowable if this does not result in the creation of new technical information that is not directly and unambiguously derivable from the application as originally filed.

In particular, limitations that do not result in the singling out of a particular combination of specific features but maintain the remaining subject-matter as a generic group which differs from the original group only by its smaller size will normally fulfil the requirements of Art. 123(2) EPC.

Deletion of part of the claimed subject-matter resulting in a combination of specific features may be allowable if the application as filed provides a pointer towards that particular combination, e.g. by reference to particular embodiments.

These principles also apply to the combination of features resulting from dependent claims.

Example

Original claim 1	"A composition for therapeutic use comprising a therapeutic agent and a glass-forming carbohydrate."
Original claim 22	"A composition according to claim 1 wherein the therapeutic agent is selected from the group enzymes, biopharmaceuticals, growth hormones, growth factors, insulin, monoclonal antibodies, interferons, interleukins and cytokines."
Original disclosure	In the description, inhalation is listed as one of several ways of administration. In the description, insulin is listed as one of several therapeutic agents.
Limited claim 1	"A composition for therapeutic use suitable for administration by inhalation comprising a therapeutic agent and a glass-forming carbohydrate".
Dependent claim 10	"A composition according to claim 1 wherein the therapeutic agent is insulin"

The limitation to inhalation in claim 1 results from a choice from one list and has a basis in the application as originally filed.

The combination of the subject-matter of dependent claim 10 with the subject-matter of claim 1 results from a selection from multiple lists which is not disclosed directly and unambiguously in the application as originally filed.

The number of amendments held to have been combined to arrive at the amended claimed subject-matter is not decisive in order to assess whether the claimed subject-matter extends beyond the content of the application as filed. What is required is an analysis of whether the claimed subject-matter is explicitly or implicitly, but directly and unambiguously, disclosed in the application as filed.

Wherever possible, the claim should be limited by a positive indication of what subject-matter remains instead of stating what is being deleted from the subject-matter (as a disclaimer would do).

Example:

- "... a polyether of molecular weight from 600 to 10 000" restricted to "... above 1 500 to 10 000" (T. 433/86).

3.4 Further cases of broadening of claims

The deletion of a statement regarding use or intended purpose in an independent product claim fulfils the requirements of Art. 123(2) only if the application as filed offers a basis for the assumption that the product can

Art. 123(2)

also be used in some other way (and if the statement of purpose does not amount to a functional limitation).

The broadening of a claim by exchanging a particular feature for a more general feature cannot be based on an indication that it would be obvious for a skilled person (see also H-V, 3.2.1).

Art. 123(3)

Moreover, the deletion of a particular feature or its replacement by a more general feature usually leads to a broadening of the claim. Therefore, the requirements of Art. 123(3) are not fulfilled.

Art. 123(2)

3.5 Amendments relating to ranges

In the case of a disclosure of both a general and a preferred range, a combination of the preferred disclosed narrower range and one of the part-ranges lying within the disclosed overall range on either side of the narrower range can usually be derived from the original disclosure of the application.

4. Disclaimers

4.1 Disclaimer disclosed in the application as originally filed

In this case, the original application already indicates that specific subject-matter is not part of the invention.

Art. 123(2)

Negative features help to define the claimed invention in the same way as positive ones, and must be examined on the same basis. In other words, they may confer novelty and, like positive features, are assessed as to their relevance to inventive step. They must also fulfil the requirements of Art. 84 (clarity, conciseness and support), and their inclusion in the claims must not infringe Art. 123(2).

Examples:

- "... said delivery means does not comprise a capacitor element";
- "... with the proviso that blends having a melt index of lower than 0.05 are excluded".

Negative features, like positive ones, may be structural or functional, and may relate to either a physical entity or an activity.

4.2 Disclaimers not disclosed in the application as originally filed

4.2.1 The subject-matter to be excluded is not disclosed in the application as originally filed (so-called undisclosed disclaimers)

Limiting the scope of a claim by using a "disclaimer" to exclude a technical feature not disclosed in the application as filed may be allowable under Art. 123(2) in the following cases (see G 1/03 and G 1/16 and F-IV, 4.20):

- (i) restoring novelty over a **disclosure under Art. 54(3)**;

- (ii) restoring novelty over an **accidental anticipation** under Art. 54(2). "An anticipation is accidental if it is so unrelated to and remote from the claimed invention that the person skilled in the art would never have taken it into consideration when making the invention". The status of "accidental" is to be ascertained without looking at the available further state of the art. A related document does not become an accidental anticipation merely because there are other disclosures even more closely related. The fact that a document is not considered to be the closest prior art is insufficient for achieving the status of "accidental". An accidental disclosure has nothing to do with the teaching of the claimed invention, since it is not relevant for examining inventive step. For example, this is the case when the same compounds serve as starting materials in entirely different reactions yielding different end products (see T 298/01). A prior art, the teaching of which leads away from the invention, however, does not constitute an accidental anticipation; the fact that the novelty destroying disclosure is a comparative example is also insufficient for achieving the status of "accidental" (see T 14/01 and T 1146/01);
- (iii) removing subject-matter which, under Art. 52 to Art. 57, is excluded from patentability for **non-technical reasons**. For example, the insertion of "non-human" in order to satisfy the requirements of Art. 53(a) is allowable.

These criteria notwithstanding the introduction of the undisclosed disclaimer may not provide a technical contribution to the subject-matter disclosed in the application as filed. The undisclosed disclaimer (which inevitably quantitatively reduces the original technical teaching) may not qualitatively change the original technical teaching in the sense that the applicant's or patent proprietor's position with regard to other requirements for patentability is improved. In particular, it may not be or become relevant for the assessment of inventive step or for the question of sufficiency of disclosure. Hence, the evaluation of inventive step has to be carried out disregarding the undisclosed disclaimer (see G 1/16).

The disclaimer may not remove more than necessary either to restore novelty (cases (i) and (ii) above) or to disclaim subject-matter excluded from patentability for non-technical reasons (case (iii) above).

An undisclosed disclaimer is, in particular, **not** allowable if:

- (i) it is made in order to exclude **non-working embodiments** or remedy **insufficient disclosure**;
- (ii) it makes a technical contribution.
- (iii) the limitation is relevant for assessing inventive step;
- (iv) the disclaimer, which would otherwise be allowable on the basis of a conflicting application alone (Art. 54(3)), renders the invention novel or inventive over a separate prior art document under Art. 54(2), which is a **not accidental** anticipation of the claimed invention;

- (v) the disclaimer based on a conflicting application also serves another purpose, e.g. it removes a deficiency under Art. 83.

Art. 84 applies equally to the claim *per se* and to the disclaimer itself (see T 2130/11).

In the interest of the patent's transparency, the excluded prior art must be indicated in the description in accordance with Rule 42(1)(b) and the relation between the prior art and the disclaimer must be shown.

4.2.2 The subject-matter to be excluded is disclosed in the application as originally filed

The test to be applied is whether the subject-matter remaining in the claim after the introduction of the disclaimer is, be it explicitly or implicitly, directly and unambiguously disclosed in the application as filed to the skilled person using its common general knowledge at the date of filing (or the date of priority according to Art. 89), see G 2/10, Headnote 1a.

This test is the same as that applied when the allowability of a limitation of a claim by a positively defined feature is to be determined (see H-V, 3.2).

When it comes to determining whether, after the introduction of the disclaimer, the claim infringes Art. 123(2) or whether it is in conformity with it, this cannot be decided solely by establishing that the disclaimed subject-matter is disclosed in the application as filed.

Whether the skilled person is presented with new information depends on how they would understand the amended claim, i.e. the subject-matter remaining in the amended claim and on whether, using common general knowledge, they would regard that subject-matter as at least implicitly disclosed in the application as filed.

What is required is an assessment of the overall technical circumstances of the individual case under consideration, taking into account the nature and extent of the disclosure in the application as filed, the nature and extent of the disclaimed subject-matter and its relationship with the subject-matter remaining in the claim after the amendment.

In this respect it has to be established whether the disclaiming of subject-matter leads for example to the singling out of compounds or sub-classes of compounds or other so-called intermediate generalisations not specifically mentioned or implicitly disclosed in the application as filed (see G 2/10).

Whether the invention works for the claimed subject-matter and what problem is credibly solved by it are questions which are not relevant for assessing whether this subject-matter extends beyond the content of the application as filed (see T 2130/11).

5. Amendments to drawings

It sometimes occurs that the drawings used for publication of the application are not those originally filed but are subsequently filed drawings,

because the latter are more suitable for reproduction (for drawings filed under Rule 56, see A-II, 5 and subsections and for drawings filed under Rule 56a, see A-II, 6 and subsections). In this case, the formalities officer in the Receiving Section will check that the subsequently filed drawings are identical to the originals.

However, the ultimate responsibility for ensuring that the subsequently filed drawings do not contain new technical information, which would conflict with Art. 123(2), rests with the examining division.

If the examining division considers that these drawings conflict with Art. 123(2), it requires the applicant to submit other drawings which correspond exactly in substance to the drawings originally filed.

It is not normally possible under Art. 123(2) to add completely new drawings to an application, since in most cases a new drawing cannot be unambiguously derivable from the mere text of the description. For the same reasons, amendments to drawings are carefully checked for compliance with Art. 123(2).

Amended drawings filed electronically may contain colour or greyscale content (A-IX, 7.1 and 10). However, the conditions and requirements for filing amendments, including Article 123(2) EPC in particular, apply (OJ EPO 2025, A57).

6. Amendments derived from drawings

Care needs to be taken when amendments are based on details which may only be derived from the schematic drawings of the original application.

In particular, a figure which serves only to give a schematic explanation of the principle of the subject-matter of the invention and not to represent it in every detail does not allow the conclusion that the disclosed teaching purposively excluded a feature not represented.

The manner in which a particular feature is depicted in the drawings may be accidental. The skilled person must be able to clearly and unmistakably recognise from the drawings, in the context of the whole description, that the added feature is the deliberate result of the technical considerations directed to the solution of the technical problem involved.

For example, in an application relating to a vehicle where neither the claims nor the description contains any information about the location of the engine, the drawings may depict a vehicle in which approximately two thirds of the height of the engine is located below a plane tangent to the top of the wheels. An amendment which uses the generalised terms "the **major portion of the height** of the engine" to define that said major portion is located below the given level would infringe Art. 123(2) unless the skilled person would be able to recognise from the drawings, in the context of the whole description, that such a spatial arrangement of the engine with respect to the wheels is in fact a deliberate measure directed to the solution of the technical problem.

Rule 80

Art. 123(2) and (3)

7. Changes in claim category in opposition

An amendment can be in the form of a change in the category of a claim, possibly combined with a change in the technical features of the invention. Firstly it must be clear that this amendment is necessitated by grounds for opposition (see H-II, 3.1). If that is not the case, a change of category is refused.

Even if this condition is fulfilled, the opposition division exercises great caution in allowing a change of claim category, since the protection as conferred by the claims may thus be extended (Art. 123(3)). Examples are given in the following sections. Note that these examples could also give rise to issues under Art. 123(2).

7.1 Product claim to use claim

If a patent is so amended that a claim to a product (a physical entity) is replaced by a claim to the use of this product, the degree of protection is not extended, provided that the use claim in reality defines the use of a particular physical entity to achieve an effect and does not define such a use to produce a product (see G 2/88).

7.2 Product claim to method claim

If a patent is so amended that a claim to a product is replaced by a claim to a method for producing the product, this change of category is allowable, provided that the method now claimed only results in the product previously claimed. As it is a fundamental principle of European patent law that the protection conferred by a product claim covers all methods for production of the product, the limitation to one of these methods cannot extend the protection conferred originally (see T 5/90 and T 54/90).

7.3 Method claim to product claim

In general, a change in claim category from a method in which an apparatus is used to the apparatus itself is not allowable (see T 86/90).

However, it may exceptionally be allowable to replace a claim directed to a method of operating a device by a claim directed to the device itself if the original claim contains the claimed features of the device exhaustively, whether in structural or functional terms (see T 378/86 and T 426/89).

This exception, however, does not apply if the device as now claimed is for its features no longer dependent on the circumstances of its operation whereas it depended on them under the terms of the prior method claim (see T 82/93).

Moreover, changing the category from a purpose-limited process claim in the format of a Swiss-type claim in accordance with G 5/83 to a purpose-limited product claim in accordance with Art. 54(5) contravenes Art. 123(3), because a purpose-limited process claim confers less protection than a purpose-limited product claim (T 1673/11).

7.4 Method claim to use claim

The change from a process for the preparation of a product to the use of the product for a purpose other than previously claimed is not allowable (see [T 98/85](#) and [T 194/85](#)).

On the other hand, the change in a claim from a method in which a certain product is used to a claim to the use of that product in performing that same method is allowable (see [T 332/94](#)).

8. Changes in the title

The sole purpose of the title is to inform the public about the technical information disclosed in the application. The title has no bearing on the content of the application as filed or on the protection conferred by the patent, once granted. Furthermore, the title is not part of the documents to be approved by an applicant before a patent can be granted.

Thus the ultimate responsibility for the title (in the three official EPO languages) rests with the division, and it is within the division's discretion to accept or not any request from the applicant for a change in the title (see also [A-III, 7](#)).

Chapter VI – Correction of errors

1. Introduction

Documents filed with the EPO may contain errors, e.g. in the bibliographic data, the description, the claims or the drawings (see [H-VI.2](#)). Errors may also occur in the decision to grant or other decisions of the EPO (see [H-VI.3](#)), in formatting/editing (see [H-VI.4](#)), as well as in printing the specification (see [H-VI.6](#)).

These errors can be corrected as set out below.

2. Corrections of errors in documents filed with the EPO

Corrections under [Rule 139](#) concern linguistic errors, errors of transcription and other mistakes in documents filed with the EPO, especially in application documents (see [H-VI.2.2.1](#)).

[Rule 139](#)

However, see also [A-VII.7](#) for the correction of errors in a translation of a patent application, [A-III.5.5](#) for the correction of the designation of inventor and [A-III.6.5.2](#) for the correction/addition of a priority claim.

Requests for correction under [Rule 139](#) are dealt with by the department responsible for the proceedings:

- (i) In examination and opposition proceedings, the correction of errors under [Rule 139](#) is the responsibility of the formalities officer, with the exception of errors in the description, claims and drawings (see the decision of the President of the EPO dated 12 December 2013, [OJ EPO 2014, A6](#), Art. 1, point 22, and Art. 2, point 21).
- (ii) Where the Receiving Section is responsible ([Rule 10\(1\)](#)), it decides on requests for correction unless the request requires technical examination. In the latter case, the examining division will decide on the request once it has assumed responsibility (see [J 4/85](#)).

2.1 Admissibility

The correction of linguistic errors, errors of transcription and other mistakes in any document filed with the EPO may in principle be requested as long as proceedings are pending before the EPO ([J 42/92](#)). However, during examination proceedings, such requests for correction can be considered only if the decision-making process has not yet been concluded, in other words at the latest on the day before the date on which the decision to grant is handed over for notification by the EPO to the applicant (see [G 12/91](#); date "to EPO postal service" printed at the bottom of Form 2006A). See also [H-II.2.6](#), last paragraph.

[Rule 139](#)

Moreover, other time limitations apply to requests under [Rule 139](#):

- (i) In the case of correction of bibliographic data (e.g. priority, designation) or of procedural declarations (e.g. withdrawal), time limitations may derive from the protection of the interests of the public. For instance, in the absence of any special circumstances, a request for correction of a priority claim by the addition of a first

priority needs to be made sufficiently early for a warning to be included in the publication of the application (J.6/91). Otherwise, correction is possible only where it is apparent on the face of the published application that a mistake has been made (see also A-V.3). An erroneous withdrawal of an application may only be corrected if, at the time when the request for correction is made, the public has not yet been officially notified of the withdrawal (J.25/03).

- (ii) Limitations on requesting the correction of an error in a document filed with the EPO also exist where a decision has already been taken or a procedural phase terminated on the basis of the document containing the error. A request under Rule 139 cannot reinstate an applicant into an earlier procedural phase or reverse the effects of a decision already taken (J.3/01, see also H-VI.3.1). Such a request is therefore inadmissible in these cases.

2.1.1 Admissibility in opposition and limitation proceedings

Errors in documents filed during opposition and limitation proceedings may be corrected under Rule 139 (G.1/12) as long as the corresponding proceedings are pending before the EPO.

In opposition and limitation, requests to correct an error under Rule 139 may not, however, be used to correct the content of the decision to grant, thereby circumventing the restrictions under Rule 140.

2.1.1.1 Errors in the description, claims and drawings

The submission by the proprietor of an amended specification containing the correction of an obvious error will be admitted:

Rule 80

- in opposition proceedings if the correction is part of an amendment going beyond the mere removal of an error, namely an amendment occasioned by a ground for opposition (see H-II.3);

Therefore, if the proprietor files an amended specification fulfilling the requirements of Rule 80, they can additionally request the correction of an obvious error under Rule 139 (see T.657/11). This request for correction will be dealt with by the opposition division (see H-VI.2), as described in H-VI.2.2 to H-VI.2.2.1.

Rule 95(2)

- in limitation proceedings if the correction is part of an amendment going beyond the mere removal of an error, namely an amendment constituting a limitation vis-à-vis the claims as granted or amended, and complies with Art. 84 and Art. 123 (see D-X.4.3).

In other words, if an amended set of claims fulfilling the requirements of Rule 95(2) is filed in limitation proceedings, obvious errors can be corrected under Rule 139.

2.2 Allowability

For a correction of linguistic errors, errors of transcription and mistakes in any document filed with the EPO to be allowable, the following requirements must be met (G 1/12):

Rule 139

Art. 123(2)

- (i) The correction must introduce what was originally intended. The possibility of correction cannot be used to enable a person to give effect to a change of mind or development of plans. It is the party's actual rather than ostensible intention which must be considered.
- (ii) Where the original intention is not immediately apparent, the requester bears the burden of proof, which must be a heavy one.
- (iii) The error to be remedied may be an incorrect statement or an omission.
- (iv) The request for correction must be filed without undue delay.

However, correction of errors in the description, claims and drawings is a special form of amendment and is bound by Art. 123(2) (G 2/95; see also H-VI, 2.2.1). These errors can be corrected as set out below.

If a request for correction under Rule 139 is allowed during opposition, the correction will be published as part of the publication of the patent as amended.

2.2.1 Correction of description, claims and drawings

Where the mistake is in the description, claims or drawings, both the error and the correction must be such that it is immediately evident:

- (i) that an error has occurred; and
- (ii) what the correction should be.

Regarding (i), the incorrect information must be objectively recognisable for a skilled person, using common general knowledge, from the originally filed application documents (description, claims and drawings) taken by themselves.

Regarding (ii), the correction needs to be within the limits of what a skilled person would derive directly and unambiguously, using common general knowledge, and seen objectively and relative to the date of filing, from the originally filed application documents.

In other words, the requirements of Art. 123(2) apply *mutatis mutandis*.

Evidence of what was common general knowledge on the date of filing may be furnished in any suitable form.

The priority documents cannot be used for the purposes mentioned under (i) and (ii) above (see G 3/89 and G 11/91).

Correction under Rule 139, second sentence, is of a strictly declaratory nature and establishes what a skilled person, using common general knowledge, would derive on the date of filing from the parts of a European patent application, seen as a whole, relating to the disclosure (see G 3/89 and G 11/91 mentioned above). Therefore, the complete replacement of the application documents (i.e. description, claims and drawings) by other documents is not possible (see G 2/95).

Some examples of allowable corrections:

- (I) The replacement of "respectfully" by "respectively" in a claim (T 34/03).
- (II) The addition of the plural "s" to the word "particle" as the corresponding verb "have" was in the plural form, and the application as originally filed described a particle size distribution. Since particle size distributions can be defined only for a plurality of particles, the correction was held allowable (T 108/04).

On the other hand, the applicant/proprietor cannot rely on:

- (a) A mere count of the number of instances of the relevant words in the application as originally filed for obtaining the replacement of one word by another word, for instance the substitution of "included" for "excluded", if it is not clear that an error has occurred and not possible to ascertain that nothing other than "included" was intended by the drafter (T 337/88).
- (b) Usual practice or industry standards for measuring concentrations of compounds in the relevant technical field, if the application as originally filed merely refers to "%", without clarification as to whether by weight or volume, and the description contains no clear guidance as to whether "%" refers to concentration by % by weight or % by volume or something different (T 48/02).
- (c) Common general knowledge in the absence of further evidence, such as an encyclopaedia or basic textbook, to argue for instance that the skilled person would have immediately recognised that an ASTM standard with a six-digit number did not exist before the priority date of a patent (T 881/02).

2.2.2 Missing parts of description, missing drawings or correction of erroneously filed application documents filed as corrections under Rule 139

The applicant may also request that missing parts of the description and/or missing drawings be included in the application documents by way of a correction according to Rule 139. In virtually all cases this will not be possible (see J 1/82). Similarly, it is not generally possible to completely replace erroneously filed application documents (description, claims or drawings) or parts by way of a correction under Rule 139 because that would require making it evident that nothing else was intended than what is offered as the corrected application documents.

In **extremely rare cases** the other application documents might allow the skilled person to reconstruct the missing parts of the description and/or missing drawings such that they may be filed by way of a correction according to Rule 139.

In contrast to missing parts of the description and/or missing drawings filed under Rule 56(3) and correct application documents subsequently filed under Rule 56a(4), corrections under Rule 139 can never be substantiated by merely referring to the priority document (see H-VI, 2.2.1).

3. Correction of errors in decisions

Correction of errors in decisions under Rule 140 must be clearly distinguished from correction of errors in documents filed by the applicant (or proprietor) pursuant to Rule 139. For the latter, see A-V, 3 and H-VI, 2 and subsections. Correction of errors made by the applicant (or proprietor) in application (or patent) documents cannot be arrived at in a roundabout manner through correction of the decision to grant (or to maintain in amended form).

Correction of a decision is allowable only if the text of the decision is manifestly other than intended by the department concerned. An error in the text of the patent that forms the basis for the decision cannot be imputed to the division by suggesting that the division did not intend to make a decision that in fact included the very text approved by the applicant (or patent proprietor) as a means of bringing the error within the ambit of Rule 140. Thus only linguistic errors, errors of transcription and obvious mistakes in decisions can be corrected. The correction of an error in a decision under Rule 140 has a retrospective effect (see T 212/88). Therefore, when the decision to be corrected is the refusal of the application or the revocation of the patent, the time limit for filing a notice of opposition or an appeal is not changed by the publication or the notification of the corrected decision.

The competence to correct errors under Rule 140 lies with the body which took the decision (see e.g. G 8/95, J 12/85, J 16/99).

Hence, even during opposition (or appeal) proceedings, the examining division is competent to correct errors in bibliographic data contained in the decision to grant (see H-VI, 3.3). Examining or opposition divisions are competent to correct errors in the text of the patent that was the subject of their respective decisions, including editing/formatting errors (see H-VI, 4).

3.1 Admissibility

Rule 140 is not available to correct errors in documents filed by a patent applicant or proprietor (G 1/10). The correction of such documents is admissible only under Rule 139 and only as long as proceedings are pending (see H-VI, 2.1). Once the decision to grant is handed over for notification by the EPO to the parties (G 12/91), only errors in bibliographic data, printing errors in the publication of the patent specification and formatting/editing errors may be corrected (see H-VI, 3.2 and H-VI, 3.3).

Since the final responsibility for the text of the patent lies with the applicant or proprietor, it is their duty to properly check all the documents making up the communication under Rule 71(3) (i.e. Form 2004 and the Druckexemplar). The same applies to documents as proposed for maintenance in amended form (see Rules 71(5), 82(1) and 95(2), Art. 113(2) and G 1/10).

However, requests for correction under Rule 139 of documents on which the patent is granted may under certain conditions be submitted in opposition and limitation proceedings (see H-VI, 2.1.1).

Corrections of decisions are to be made at the reasoned request of one of the parties or by the EPO of its own motion. If the request for correction is refused, this decision must be reasoned (see T 850/95). These reasons must previously have been communicated to the requester (Art. 113(1)).

3.2 Allowability of the correction of bibliographic data

The sole reason for allowing the correction of linguistic errors, errors of transcription and obvious mistakes is to ensure that the decision says what the division actually intended at the time of issue. If the bibliographic data referred to in the examining division's decision to grant or limit a patent or in the opposition division's communication under Rule 82(2) that a decision to maintain a patent in amended form has become final is not and obviously cannot be the bibliographic data corresponding to the real intention of the division, the bibliographic data erroneously indicated can be corrected under Rule 140. In this respect, it is irrelevant whether the error was originally introduced by the applicants in their submissions or by the division itself.

In particular, misspellings or similar errors in the name of the patent proprietor may be corrected under Rule 140 wherever it does not result in the designation of a person different than the one originally named on filing (or their successor in title) and to whom the examining division intended to grant the patent.

In accordance with the decision of the President of the EPO dated 23 November 2015 (OJ EPO 2015, A104), requests for the correction of errors in bibliographic data are dealt with by formalities officers.

3.3 Correction of the decision to grant while opposition proceedings are pending – procedural aspects

Even during opposition proceedings, the examining division is competent to correct errors in its decision to grant, in particular errors in the decision's reasoning and bibliographic data, or formatting/editing errors in the text of the B1 publication (see H-VI, 3.2 and H-VI, 4).

Thus the opposition division refers to the examining division any request under Rule 140 to correct such errors filed by the patent proprietor while opposition proceedings are pending.

However, if the request for correction under Rule 140 is clearly inadmissible, i.e. the requested correction does not concern errors in

bibliographic data contained in the decision to grant or formatting/editing errors in the text of the B1 publication, the opposition division continues the proceedings until the decision under Art. 101 is taken without waiting for closure of the proceedings before the examining division concerning the correction (in line with the reasoning of G 1/10). The procedural decision to continue the proceedings is appealable together with the opposition decision.

If the request for correction is admissible, the examining division processes it without delay in order to minimise or avoid delays to the opposition proceedings. The opposition division may wait for closure of the proceedings before the examining division.

Where a request concerns more than one type of correction, the opposition division will handle it as a set of separate requests, each concerning only one type of correction.

3.3.1 Correction of errors in bibliographic data

The correction of errors in the bibliographic data is entrusted to formalities officers. The formalities officer will deal with the request on behalf of the examining division.

3.3.1.1 The requested correction has no effect on the outcome of the opposition proceedings

Where bibliographic data is not relevant to the substantive examination of a patent, the opposition division will continue the proceedings up to and including dispatch of the written (interlocutory) decision.

Where the (interlocutory) decision is to:

- reject the opposition or revoke the patent, the proceedings before the opposition division can be closed, even if the proceedings before the examining division are still open
- maintain the patent in amended form under Art. 101(3)(a) and Art. 106(2), the communication pursuant to Rule 82 will be dispatched only once the proceedings before the examining division have been closed.

3.3.1.2 The outcome of the opposition proceedings depends entirely on the decision on the requested correction

Where the outcome of the proceedings depends entirely on the decision on the correction, the opposition division will adjourn the proceedings until the proceedings before the examining division are closed and after any subsequent republishing of the patent (B8 publication).

Examples where the correction could have an effect on the outcome of the opposition proceedings:

- A correction of the name of the applicant could influence the right to claim priority.

- A correction of the priority claim could affect the assessment of novelty and inventive step.

3.3.2 Correction of editing/formatting errors

The request for correction of editing/formatting errors is admissible and allowable (see H-VI.3.3). For the criteria for assessing whether the error indicated by the proprietor is an editing/formatting error and for examples, see H-VI.4.

In this case, the examining division:

- decides on the request and orders republication of the corrected patent specification within two weeks from remittal of the request by the opposition division, and
- informs the proprietor and the opposition division that the request is allowable and that the specification will be republished.

The proceedings continue on the basis of the corrected text.

3.3.2.1 Request for correction filed at a late stage

Where the request for correction of editing/formatting errors is submitted at the oral proceedings or so shortly before that republication is not possible in the meantime, the opposition division will inform the parties without delay that the request is being remitted to the examining division.

Furthermore, if the outcome of the proceedings depends entirely on the requested correction, the opposition division will – after giving the parties the opportunity to comment – adjourn the proceedings until the proceedings before the examining division are closed.

The same applies if the opposition division comes to the conclusion that – regardless of whether or not the requested correction is allowable – the patent can be maintained in amended form and that it intends to issue an interlocutory decision under Art. 101(3)(a) and Art. 106(2).

Where the opposition division comes to the conclusion that – regardless of whether or not the requested correction is allowable – the opposition is to be rejected or the patent revoked, it will continue the proceedings up to and including dispatch of the written decision. If no appeal is filed, or if this decision is confirmed upon appeal, the proceedings before the opposition division can be closed, even if the proceedings before the examining division have not come to a close.

3.4 Correction of errors under Rule 140 after an incorrect cover sheet with an incorrect operative part of the decision is sent

A decision contains an obvious mistake within the meaning of Rule 140 if the wording of the decision deviates from the intention of the division concerned.

Therefore if an opposition division issues an (interlocutory) decision whose operative part contradicts the grounds for the decision, this decision can as

a rule be rectified by the opposition division at any time under Rule 140, even after it becomes legally binding.

Requests for correction under Rule 140 can be filed by any party to the proceedings.

The correction of an obvious mistake in a decision pursuant to Rule 140 alters neither the date of the decision nor the time limit for appeal, which runs from notification of the initial (incorrect) decision. Where the time limit for appeal against the decision of the opposition division has already expired, and the correction is not allowable, a separate appealable decision is issued. The time limit for appeal against this decision runs from its notification.

4. Correction of formatting/editing errors

Formatting/editing errors which were already contained in the text approved by the applicant may be corrected by the EPO of its own motion or at the request of the patent proprietor. Formatting/editing errors are alterations in the patent documents which occur during the preparation of the Druckexemplar and which are indicated neither by standard marks nor in Form 2004.

Example 1

In the Druckexemplar, page 10 contains two changes:

- the first change is indicated with standard marks;
- the second change is in a different paragraph on page 10 to the first change, and consists in the absence of the two top lines, but the deletion is not indicated by any standard mark (i.e. the two lines have just disappeared).

After publication of the grant, the applicant spots the errors and requests:

- (a) the correction of a spelling error in the first change introduced by the examining division;
- (b) the re-insertion of the top two lines that have disappeared.

Request (a) cannot be accepted, as the error is in the marked change. However, request (b) regarding the second change is a formatting/editing error. Thus, the request to reinstate the two top lines can be granted.

Example 2

EPO Form 2004 indicates inter alia page 10 as amended by the examining division; other pages of the description have been amended.

In the Druckexemplar, page 10 as originally filed is present; no amendments are present.

In this case, the amendment is indicated in EPO Form 2004 so that the error does not qualify as a formatting/editing error. Thus, no correction can be made after issuance of the decision to grant.

If any correction in the text of the specification as published is allowed, a corrected version of it will be published. However, such a correction has no influence on the start of the opposition period.

In the case of a discrepancy between the Druckexemplar and Form 2004, the patent proprietor can seek remedy by filing an appeal against the decision to grant. This would apply to example 2 above.

The situation is different to that of errors already present in the application documents or in any of the amended application documents submitted by the applicant. An error introduced by the applicant does not qualify as a formatting/editing error. A request for correction will not be accepted and the situation cannot be remedied by an appeal.

5. Correction of the translations of the claims

According to Art. 70(1), the text of a patent in the language of the proceedings is the authentic text. It therefore follows that the translations of the claims of the patent specification required by Art. 14(6) are for information only. Hence no examination of the translations takes place (C-V, 1.3); in particular, the translations do not form part of the decision to grant the patent. Therefore they cannot be corrected under Rule 140, either. However, if when a corrected version of a translation of the claims is received, the stage of preparations for the B publication still allows the exchange of documents, the EPO will publish the corrected version instead of the original version of the translation.

Where corrected translations of claims are not submitted to the EPO in time to be taken into account for the B publication, the only possibilities for the patent proprietor to amend them are when the patent is maintained in amended form (Rule 82(2)) or, as indicated in Art. 70(4), before a national authority.

6. Errors in publication

Errors in publication occur where the content of the printed specification differs from the documents (Druckexemplar) transmitted to the applicant with the communication under Rule 71(3) (Form 2004), if these documents form the basis of the decision to grant.

Errors in publication have to be distinguished from changes introduced in the text to be granted after the applicant's approval but before the decision to grant (G. 1/10). In such cases, the patent proprietor has to file an appeal to seek remedy.

The above errors in publication can be corrected at any time (see also C-V, 10). The same applies *mutatis mutandis* to errors in the process for publication of the application and of the amended patent specification following a decision to maintain the patent as amended.

The competence to correct errors in publication lies with the body before which proceedings are or were last pending.

Therefore a request for correction of errors in the publication of the B1 specifications filed during opposition proceedings is dealt with by the opposition division.

Formalities officers are responsible for the correction of publication errors (see the decision of the President of the EPO dated 23 November 2015, OJ EPO 2015, A104).

Index for Computer-Implemented Inventions

A computer-implemented invention (CII) is one which involves the use of a computer, computer network or other programmable apparatus, where one or more features are realised wholly or partly by means of a computer program.

The following collection of hyperlinks is provided in order to facilitate access to the sections of the Guidelines for Examination in the EPO which give instructions particularly useful for the search and examination of CII.

It is noted that this collection is not a separate publication about CII. Instead, following a hyperlink will lead to the section of the most recent and applicable version of the Guidelines which has the stated number and title.

The collection of sections essentially comprises the teaching about assessing patentability requirements, in particular in case of claims comprising a mix of technical and non-technical features, which are common in CII. Sections providing teaching about how to evaluate features related to the list of [Article 52\(2\)](#) are included as well as sections describing the search practice and requirements of [Article 83](#) and [84](#).

The collection of sections should not be regarded as an exhaustive list. The whole of the Guidelines apply for any European patent application or patent.

As with the rest of the Guidelines, the updating of sections relating particularly to CII is an ongoing process to take account of developments in European patent law and practice. The list below also serves to point out which sections have recently been updated as indicated by the dates which follow the section title.

Patentable inventions

[G-I, 1](#) Patentability requirements

[G-II, 1](#) General remarks (updated in GL 2022)

[G-II, 2](#) Examination practice (updated in GL 2022)

Features related to the list of [Art. 52\(2\)](#) and technical contribution

[G-II, 3.3](#) Mathematical methods (updated in GL 2025)

– [G-II, 3.3.1](#) Artificial intelligence and machine learning (updated in GL 2025)

– [G-II, 3.3.2](#) Simulation, design or modelling (updated in GL 2022)

[G-II, 3.4](#) Aesthetic creations

[G-II, 3.5](#) Schemes, rules and methods for performing mental acts, playing games or doing business

- G-II, 3.5.1 Schemes, rules and methods for performing mental acts (updated in GL 2022)
- G-II, 3.5.2 Schemes, rules and methods for playing games (updated in GL 2022)
- G-II, 3.5.3 Schemes, rules and methods for doing business (introduced in GL 2018)

G-II, 3.6 Programs for computers (updated in GL 2018)

- G-II, 3.6.1 Examples of further technical effects (introduced in GL 2018)
- G-II, 3.6.2 Information modelling, activity of programming and programming languages (introduced in GL 2018)
- G-II, 3.6.3 Data retrieval, formats and structures (updated in GL 2022)
- G-II, 3.6.4 Database management systems and information retrieval (introduced in GL 2021)

G-II, 3.7 Presentations of information (updated in GL 2018)

- G-II, 3.7.1 User interfaces (updated in GL 2021)

Novelty and inventive step

G-VII, 5.4 Claims comprising technical and non-technical features (updated in GL 2022)

- G-VII, 5.4.1 Formulation of the objective technical problem (updated in GL 2022)
- G-VII, 5.4.2 Examples of applying the COMVIK approach (updated in GL 2022)
 - G-VII, 5.4.2.1 Example 1
 - G-VII, 5.4.2.2 Example 2
 - G-VII, 5.4.2.3 Example 3
 - G-VII, 5.4.2.4 Example 4 (updated in GL 2022)
 - G-VII, 5.4.2.5 Example 5 (introduced in GL 2022)

Search practice

B-VIII, 2.2 Subject-matter excluded from patentability under Art. 52(2) and (3) (introduced in GL 2015)

- B-VIII, 2.2.1 Computer-implemented business methods (updated in GL 2015)

Requirements of Art. 84 EPC

F-IV, 3.9 Claims directed to computer-implemented inventions (introduced in GL 2016, with its sub-sections)

- F-IV, 3.9.1 Cases where all method steps can be fully implemented by generic data processing means
- F-IV, 3.9.2 Cases where method steps define additional devices and /or specific data processing means (updated in GL 2021)
- F-IV, 3.9.3 Cases where the invention is realised in a distributed computing environment (introduced in GL 2018)

Requirements of Art. 83 EPC

F-III, 1 Sufficiency of disclosure (see par. 4)

Formal requirements for the description part

F-II, 4.12 Computer programs

Guidelines for Examination

Alphabetical keyword index

The Alphabetical keyword index is added for the convenience of the reader; it does not form part of the Guidelines.

A

Abandoned claims [B-III, 3.4](#)

Abandonment of subject-matter [C-IX, 1.3](#)

Abbreviations [General Part, 2.2](#)

Absence of well-known details [F-III, 5.2](#)

Abstract [A-III, 10](#), [A-III, 10.1](#), [A-III, 16.2](#), [F-II, 1](#), [F-II, 2](#), [F-II, 2.2](#), [F-II, 2.7](#), [G-IV, 5.1](#)
 Abstract in examination [F-II, 2.7](#)
 Checklist [F-II, 2.5](#)
 Checklist for considering the abstract [F-II, An. 1](#)
 Conflict between abstract and source document [B-VI, 6.3](#)
 Conflict with other European applications [G-IV, 5.1](#)
 Content of a European patent application (other than claims) [F-II, 2](#)
 Content of the abstract [A-III, 10.2](#), [F-II, 2.3](#)
 Definitive content [A-III, 10.2](#), [F-II, 2.2](#)
 Examination of formal requirements [A-III, 10](#)
 Figure accompanying the abstract [A-III, 10.3](#), [F-II, 2.4](#)
 Purpose of the abstract [F-II, 2.1](#)
 Summaries, extracts or abstracts [B-X, 11.5](#)
 Title, abstract and figure to be published with the abstract (as indicated on supplemental sheet A) [B-X, 7](#)
 Transmittal of the abstract to the applicant [F-II, 2.6](#)

Accelerated

Accelerated processing before the boards of appeal [E-VIII, 6](#)
 Accelerated processing of oppositions [E-VIII, 5](#)
 Accelerated prosecution of European patent applications [E-VIII, 4](#)
 Accelerated examination [E-VIII, 4.1](#)
 Patent Prosecution Highway (PPH) [E-VIII, 4.2](#)

Access to EPO documentation for the national patent offices [B-IX, 5](#)

Accorded date of filing and content of the application still subject to review [G-IV, 5.1.2](#)

Accounts

Debit orders for deposit accounts held with the EPO [A-II, 1.5](#)
 Deposit accounts with the EPO [A-X, 4.2](#)
 Safety provision for late replenishment of deposit accounts [A-X, 6.2.2](#)

Activity of the opposition division [D-IV, 2](#)

Adaptation of the description [C-V, 4.5](#)

Additional

Additional European searches [B-II, 4.2](#)
 Additional fee
 Additional fee (if application documents comprise more than 35 pages) [A-III, 13.2](#)
 Additional fee for a European patent application [A-III, 13.2](#)
 Additional fee for divisional applications of second or subsequent generations [A-IV, 1.4.1.1](#)
 Additional fee for divisional applications [A-III, 13.3](#)
 Additional fee for divisional applications of second or subsequent generations [A-IV, 1.4.1.1](#)
 Additional fee for pages [A-II, 5.6](#), [A-II, 6.8](#)
 Correction of erroneously filed application documents or parts [A-II, 6.8](#)
 Late filing of missing drawings or missing parts of the description [A-II, 5.6](#)
 Additional search [D-VI, 5](#)
 Invitation to pay additional search fees combined with invitation to restrict the scope of the search [C-III, 3.2.3](#)
 Limitation to searched invention, no additional search fees paid [C-III, 3.2.1](#)
 Refund of additional search fees [C-III, 3.4](#)
 Additional search fees paid [C-III, 3.2.2](#)
 Limitation to searched invention, no additional search fees paid [C-III, 3.2.1](#)
 Additional searches during examination [C-IV, 7.3](#)

Adherence to the text of the European patent submitted or approved by the patent proprietor [D-VI, 2](#)

Basis for the examination [D-VI, 2.1](#)
 Revocation of the patent [D-VI, 2.2](#)

Adjournment of oral proceedings due to lack of time [E-III, 8.11.2](#)

Administrative fees [A-XI, 1](#), [A-XI, 2.2](#), [E-XIII, 3](#)

Administrative structure [D-II, 1](#)

Admissibility [H-VI, 2.1](#), [H-VI, 3.1](#)

Admissibility in opposition and limitation proceedings [H-VI, 2.1.1](#)
 Errors in the description, claims and drawings [H-VI, 2.1.1.1](#)
 Admissibility in opposition procedure [H-II, 3](#)

Amendments not related to the grounds for opposition [H-II, 3.2](#)
 Amendments occasioned by national rights [H-II, 3.3](#)
 Amendments related to the grounds for opposition [H-II, 3.1](#)
 Insistence on inadmissible amendments [H-II, 3.4](#)
 Late-filed requests in opposition proceedings [H-II, 3.5](#)
 Admissibility in the examination procedure [H-II, 2](#)
 Admissibility in the examination procedure, after receipt of the search report - [Rule 137\(2\)](#) [H-II, 2.2](#)
 Admissibility in the examination procedure, at an advanced stage of the proceedings [H-II, 2.4](#)
 Admissibility in the examination procedure, before receipt of the search report - [Rule 137\(1\)](#) [H-II, 2.1](#)
 Admissibility in the examination procedure, further requests for amendment after approval [H-II, 2.6](#)
 Amendments filed in reply to a [Rule 71\(3\)](#) communication [H-II, 2.5](#)
 Late-filed requests after summons to oral proceedings in examination [H-II, 2.7](#)
 Admissibility in the examination procedure, after receipt of the first communication - [Rule 137\(3\)](#) [H-II, 2.3](#)
 Examples of the exercise of discretion under [Rule 137\(3\)](#) [H-II, 2.3.1](#)
 Admissibility of amendments [C-V, 4.4](#), [H-II, H-III](#)
 Admissibility of amendments made by the applicant [C-IV, 6](#)
 Amendments and Corrections [H-II](#)
 Amendments in limitation procedure [H-II, 4](#)
 Amendments in the case of non-unity [H-II, 6](#)
 Amendments required by a limitation of the search under [Rule 62a](#) and/or [Rule 63](#) [H-II, 5](#)
 Auxiliary requests [H-III, 3](#)
 Calculation of claims fees [H-III, 5](#)
 Different texts in respect of different contracting states [H-III, 4](#)
 Procedure for amendments to documents [H-III, 2](#)
 Request for amendments or corrections in reply to the [Rule 71\(3\)](#) communication [C-V, 4.4](#)
 Admissibility of auxiliary requests [H-III, 3.3.2](#)
 Criteria for admissibility of auxiliary requests [H-III, 3.3.2.1](#)
 Timeliness and structure of auxiliary requests [H-III, 3.3.2.2](#)
 Admissibility of the request [E-VIII, 3.1](#)
 Entitlement to file the request [E-VIII, 3.1.2](#)
 Form of the request and applicable time limit [E-VIII, 3.1.3](#)
 Substantiation of the request [E-VIII, 3.1.4](#)
 Time limits covered [E-VIII, 3.1.1](#)
 Correction of errors in decisions [H-VI, 3.1](#)
 Corrections of errors in documents filed with the EPO [H-VI, 2.1](#)
 Decision concerning the admissibility of an opposition, the patent proprietor being a party [D-IV, 5.5](#)
 Examination of the admissibility of an intervention and preparations in the event of an intervention [D-IV, 5.6](#)

Admissible languages on filing [A-VII, 1](#)

[Art. 61](#) applications [A-VII, 1.3](#)
 European divisional applications [A-VII, 1.3](#)
 Filing by reference [A-VII, 1.2](#)

Invitation to file the translation [A-VII, 1.4](#)

Admissible non-EPO languages [A-VII, 3.2](#)

Admission of the public to proceedings [E-III, 8.1](#)

Aesthetic creations [G-II, 3.4](#)

Agreement

Agreement on secrecy [G-IV, 7.2.2](#)
 Agreement reached on a text - second [Rule 71\(3\)](#) communication [C-V, 4.7.2](#)
 Amendments not admitted and/or not allowable, examination resumed, no agreement reached on a text [C-V, 4.7.3](#)

Agriculture, industrial application [G-III, 1](#)

Aim of the search [B-II, 2](#)

Allocation

Allocation of duties and appointment of members of the opposition division [D-II, 3](#)
 Allocation of individual duties [D-II, 7](#)
 Allocation of tasks to members [D-II, 5](#)
 Allocation of the application [C-II, 2](#)

Allowability [H-VI, 2.2](#)

Allowability of amendments [H-IV, H-V](#)
 Amendments and Corrections [H-IV, H-V](#)
 Amendments derived from drawings [H-V, 6](#)
 Amendments in claims [H-V, 3](#)
 Amendments in the description [H-V, 2](#)
 Amendments relating to unsearched matter [H-IV, 4](#)
 Amendments to drawings [H-V, 5](#)
 Changes in claim category in opposition [H-V, 7](#)
 Changes in the title [H-V, 8](#)
 Disclaimers [H-V, 4](#)
 Allowability of amendments under [Art. 123\(2\)](#) [H-IV, 2](#)
 Content of the application as "originally" filed [H-IV, 2.2](#), [H-IV, 2.3](#)
 Special applications [H-IV, 2.3](#)
 Allowability of amendments under [Art. 123\(3\)](#) [H-IV, 3](#)
 Assessment of impermissible extension of the protection conferred [H-IV, 3.4](#)
 Basic principles [H-IV, 3.1](#)
 Conflicts between [Art. 123\(2\)](#) and [Art. 123\(3\)](#) [H-IV, 3.5](#)
 Conflicts between [Art. 123\(3\)](#) and other requirements of the EPC [H-IV, 3.6](#)
 Protection conferred by the patent as granted [H-IV, 3.2](#)
 Version of the granted patent to be considered [H-IV, 3.3](#)
 Allowability of the correction of bibliographic data [H-VI, 3.2](#)
 Concept of "clear allowability" [H-II, 2.7.1](#)
 Correction of description, claims and drawings [H-VI, 2.2.1](#)
 Missing parts of description, missing drawings or correction of erroneously filed application documents filed as corrections under [Rule 139](#) [H-VI, 2.2.2](#)

Alteration, excision or addition of text in the description [H-V.2.6](#)**Alternatives in a claim** [F-IV.3.7](#)**Amended**Amended claims [F-V.6](#)Bringing the description into line with amended claims [H-V.2.7](#)Examples, no amended claims filed with the appeal [E-XI.7.4.1](#)Amended claims, missing parts (Rule 56) or erroneously filed application documents or parts (Rule 56a) [B-III.3.3](#)General considerations [B-III.3.3.1](#)Specific rules applicable to Euro-PCT applications [B-III.3.3.2](#)Amended main/single request filed with the appeal [E-XI.7.4.2](#)**Amendments**Admissibility of amendments made by the applicant [C-IV.6](#)Allowability of amendments under Art. 123(2) [H-IV.2](#)Allowability of amendments under Art. 123(3) [H-IV.3](#)Amendment by submitting missing documents or by filing replacement pages [H-III.2.2](#)Amendment of application [A-V. A-V.2](#)Communications concerning formal deficiencies [A-V.1](#)Correction of errors in documents filed with the EPO [A-V.3](#)Examination of amendments as to formalities [A-V.2.2](#)Filing of amendments [A-V.2.1](#)Amendments and corrections [Part H, H-II.2.6](#)Admissibility of amendments [H-II, H-III](#)Allowability of amendments [H-IV, H-V](#)Correction of errors [H-VI](#)Other procedural matters [H-III](#)Right to amend [H-I](#)Amendments derived from drawings [H-V.6](#)Amendments filed in preparation for or during oral proceedings [E-VI.2.2.2](#)

Amendments filed in reply to a Rule 71(3)

communication [H-II.2.5](#)Amendments filed in reply to a Rule 71(3) communication, further course of proceedings [H-II.2.5.2](#)Criteria for admitting such amendments [H-II.2.5.1](#)Exceptional case where amendments must be admitted [H-II.2.5.3](#)Rule 137(4) applies to amendments filed at this stage [H-II.2.5.4](#)Amendments in claims [H-V.3](#)Amendments in claims, further cases of broadening of claims [H-V.3.4](#)Amendments relating to ranges [H-V.3.5](#)Deletion of part of the claimed subject-matter [H-V.3.3](#)Inclusion of additional features [H-V.3.2](#)Replacement or removal of features from a claim [H-V.3.1](#)Amendments in limitation procedure [H-II.4](#)Amendments in the case of non-unity [H-II.6](#)Amendments in the case of non-unity, no restriction to a single invention searched [H-II.6.3](#)Restriction to a single, searched invention [H-II.6.1](#)Restriction to an unsearched invention [H-II.6.2](#)Amendments in the case of non-unity, further procedural aspects concerning Euro-PCT applications [H-II.6.4](#)Where the EPO does not perform a supplementary European search [H-II.6.4.1](#)Where the EPO performs a supplementary European search [H-II.6.4.2](#)Amendments in the description [H-V.2](#)Alteration, excision or addition of text in the description [H-V.2.6](#)Bringing the description into line with amended claims [H-V.2.7](#)Clarification of a technical effect [H-V.2.1](#)Introduction of further examples and new effects [H-V.2.2](#)Reference document [H-V.2.5](#)Revision of stated technical problem [H-V.2.4](#)Supplementary technical information [H-V.2.3](#)Amendments made by applicants of their own volition [C-III.2](#)Amendments made in response to the search opinion [C-III.2.1](#)Amendments made in response to the WO-ISA, IPER or supplementary international search report [C-III.2.2](#)Amendments made by the EPO at the request of a party [H-III.2.3](#)Amendments not admitted and/or not allowable, examination resumed [C-V.4.7](#)Agreement reached on a text - second Rule 71(3) communication [C-V.4.7.2](#)Amendments not admitted and/or not allowable, examination resumed, no agreement reached on a text [C-V.4.7.3](#)Communications/oral proceedings/refusal after resumption [C-V.4.7.1](#)Refusal [C-V.4.7.3](#)Amendments not related to the grounds for opposition [H-II.3.2](#)Amendments occasioned by national rights [H-II.3.3](#)Amendments or corrections should be reasoned [C-V.4.3](#)Amendments related to the grounds for opposition [H-II.3.1](#)Amendments relating to unsearched matter [H-IV.4](#)Euro-PCT applications [H-IV.4.2](#)Rule 137(5) [H-IV.4.1](#)Amendments required by a limitation of the search under Rule 62a and/or Rule 63 [H-II.5](#)Amendments to drawings [A-IX.10, H-V.5](#)Allowability of amendments [H-V.5](#)Drawings [A-IX.10](#)Amendments withdrawn or superseded in the Rule 137(4) period [H-III.2.1.2](#)Amendments/corrections admitted and allowable - second Rule 71(3) communication sent [C-V.4.6](#)Examining division proposes amendments in second Rule 71(3) communication [C-V.4.6.3](#)

Second Rule 71(3) communication based on higher-ranking request initially rejected in first Rule 71(3) communication C-V, 4.6.2

Second Rule 71(3) communication reversing the amendments proposed by the examining division in first Rule 71(3) communication C-V, 4.6.1

Amendments/corrections filed in second Rule 71(3) period C-V, 4.10

Anticipation of amendments to claims B-III, 3.5

Comments and amendments in response to the search opinion B-XI, 3.3

Distinction between allowable and unallowable amendments D-V, 6.2

Examination of amendments C-IV, 5

Facts, evidence or amendments introduced at a late stage E-III, 8.6

Handwritten amendments in oral proceedings E-III, 8.7

Indication of amendments and their basis under

Rule 137(4) H-III, 2.1

Indication of the amendments made in the requests and of their basis H-III, 3.3.1

Insistence on inadmissible amendments H-II, 3.4

Invitation to file comments and amendments C-III, 4.2

Procedure for amendments to documents H-III, 2

Refusal to admit amendments under Rule 137(3) E-IX, 2.11

Request for amendments or corrections in reply to the Rule 71(3) communication C-V, 4

Request for amendments or corrections in reply to the Rule 71(3) communication, no payment of fees or filing of translations necessary C-V, 4.1

Standard marks for indicating amendments or corrections by the divisions C-V, An

Standard marks for indicating amendments or

corrections by the divisions, further communication with the applicant C-VIII, 5

Standard marks for indicating amendments or corrections by the divisions, further ways to accelerate examination C-VI, 3

Use of Rule 137(4) for amendments filed during oral proceedings in examination E-III, 8.8

Withdrawal of amendments/abandonment of subject matter H-III, 2.4

Amino acid sequences (Applications relating to nucleotide and ~) A-IV, 5

Amount

Amount of fee payable A-X, 6.2.4

Amount of the fee A-X, 5.1.2

Analysing the parties' arguments E-IX, 2.8

Analysis of the application B-IV, 1.1

Analysis of the application and content of the search opinion B-XI, 3

Comments and amendments in response to the search opinion B-XI, 3.3

Contribution to the known art B-XI, 3.5

EPC requirements B-XI, 3.6

Making suggestions B-XI, 3.8

Positive opinion B-XI, 3.9

Reasoning B-XI, 3.2

Scope of first analysis for generally deficient applications B-XI, 3.4

Search division's approach B-XI, 3.7

Search division's dossier B-XI, 3.1

Ancillary proceedings D-II, 4.3

Animal varieties

Excluded from patentability G-II, 5.4, G-II, 5.5.1

Plant and animal varieties or essentially biological processes for the production of plants or animals G-II, 5.4

Animals

Essentially biological processes for the production of plants or animals G-II, 5.4.2

Plant and animal varieties or essentially biological processes for the production of plants or animals G-II, 5.4

Processes for the production of animals G-II, 5.4, G-II, 5.4.2

Antibodies G-II, 6

Inventive step of antibodies G-II, 6.2

Anticipation of amendments to claims B-III, 3.5

Appeal E-XII

Accelerated processing before the boards of appeal E-VIII, 6

Amended main/single request filed with the appeal E-XI, 7.4.2

Appeal against the fixing of costs by the opposition division D-IX, 2.2

Appeal fee

Refund of the appeal fee A-X, 10.2.6

Reimbursement A-X, 10.2.6

Reimbursement of appeal fees E-XI, 7.3

Appeal, interlocutory revision E-XI, 1, E-XI, 7.3

Appeal, surrender or lapse of the patent E-XI, 2

Appeal, time limit and form of appeal E-XI, 6

Appeals after surrender or lapse of the patent E-XI, 2

Appeals against the apportionment of costs E-XI, 3

Appeals against the decision of the opposition division on the fixing of costs E-XI, 4

Binding nature of decisions on appeals E-IX, 4

Examples, no amended claims filed with the appeal E-XI, 7.4.1

Fees for limitation/revocation, opposition, appeal, petition for review A-X, 5.2.6

Interlocutory revision E-XI, 7

Main and auxiliary requests filed with the appeal E-XI, 7.4.3

Persons entitled to appeal E-XI, 5

Persons entitled to appeal and to be parties to appeal proceedings E-XI, 5

Remittal to the board of appeal E-XI, 7.2

Remittal to the examining or opposition division after appeal E-XI, 9

Response to communication pursuant to Rule 58 filed with the appeal E-XI, 7.4.4

Rules of Procedure of the Boards of Appeal E-XI, 8

Stay of proceedings when a referral to the Enlarged Board of Appeal is pending E-VII, 3

Suspensive effect [E-XI, 1](#)
 Time limit and form of appeal [E-XI, 6](#)

Appearance before the national court [E-XII, 5.6](#)

Applicant

Admissibility of amendments made by the applicant [C-IV, 6](#)
 Amendments made by applicants of their own volition [C-III, 2](#)
 Applicant does not approve the text proposed for grant [H-III, 3.3.6](#)
 Applicant has not paid all further search fees [B-VII, 1.2.3](#)
 Arguments and evidence submitted by the applicant [G-VII, 11](#)
 Consequences for the applicant [F-V, 4.2](#)
 Contact between the applicant and the search division [B-II, 1.1](#)
 Death or legal incapacity of the applicant [E-VII, 1.1](#)
 Different applicants [A-II, 2](#)
 Documents cited or supplied by the applicant [B-IV, 1.3](#)
 Information concerning the applicant [A-II, 4.1.2](#)
 Information on the applicant [A-III, 4.2.1](#)
 Joint applicants [A-II, 2](#)
 Re-establishment of rights [A-III, 6.6](#)
 Standard marks for indicating amendments or corrections by the divisions, further communication with the applicant [C-VIII, 5](#)
 Transmittal of the abstract to the applicant [F-II, 2.6](#)

Application

Accelerated prosecution of European patent applications [E-VIII, 4](#)
 Accorded date of filing and content of the application still subject to review [G-IV, 5.1.2](#)
 Additional fee for divisional applications [A-III, 13.3](#)
 Additional fee for divisional applications of second or subsequent generations [A-IV, 1.4.1.1](#)
 Allocation of the application [C-II, 2](#)
 Amendment of application [A-V, A-V, 2](#)
 Amendments in the case of non-unity, further procedural aspects concerning Euro-PCT applications [H-II, 6.4](#)
 Analysis of the application [B-IV, 1.1](#)
 Analysis of the application and content of the search opinion [B-XI, 3](#)
 Application deemed withdrawn [C-V, 3](#)
 Application documents
 Additional fee (if application documents comprise more than 35 pages) [A-III, 13.2](#)
 Amended claims, missing parts (Rule 56) or erroneously filed application documents or parts (Rule 56a) [B-III, 3.3](#)
 Application documents filed under Rule 56 EPC, Rule 56a EPC, Rule 20.5 PCT or Rule 20.5bis PCT [B-XI, 2.1](#)
 Application documents filed under Rule 56 or Rule 56a [C-III, 1.1.1](#)
 Application documents for the supplementary European search report [B-II, 4.3.3](#)
 Correct application documents based on priority application, no change in the date of filing [A-II, 6.4](#)

Correct application documents or parts filed after the search has started [A-II, 6.7](#)
 Correction of erroneously filed application documents or parts [A-II, 6](#), [A-II, 6.1](#), [A-II, 6.2](#)
 Deficiencies [A-III, 16.2](#), [A-V, 2.2](#), [B-IV, 1.2](#)
 Erroneously filed application documents or parts under Rule 56a [H-IV, 2.2.3](#)
 For international (Euro-PCT) applications [B-III, 3.3.2](#), [A-XIV, 6.3](#)
 Later-filed correct application documents or parts when priority is claimed [A-II, 6.4.1](#)
 Missing parts of description, missing drawings or correction of erroneously filed application documents filed as corrections under Rule 139 [H-VI, 2.2.2](#)
 Parts [A-III, 13.2](#)
 Physical requirements of late-filed application documents or correct application documents or parts [A-III, 3.2.2](#)
 Withdrawal of correct application documents or parts [A-II, 6.5](#)
 Application filed by reference to a previously filed application [A-IV, 4.1.2](#)
 Sequence listings of an application filed by reference to a previously filed application [A-IV, 5.3](#)
 Application numbering systems [A-II, 1.7](#)
 Application of known measures? [G-VII, An, 1](#)
 Applications containing claims filed after the accorded date of filing [B-XI, 2.2](#)
 Applications falling under Rule 62a and lacking unity [B-VIII, 4.5](#)
 Applications falling under Rule 63 and lacking unity [B-VIII, 3.4](#)
 Applications filed by reference to an earlier application [H-IV, 2.3.1](#)
 Applications giving rise to a right of priority [A-III, 6.2](#)
 Applications relating to biological material [A-IV, 4](#)
 Availability of deposited biological material to expert only [A-IV, 4.3](#)
 Biological material [A-IV, 4.1](#)
 Deposit of such [A-IV, 4.1](#)
 Missing information [A-IV, 4.2](#)
 Notification [A-IV, 4.2](#)
 Requests for samples of biological material [A-IV, 4.4](#)
 Applications relating to nucleotide and amino acid sequences [A-IV, 5](#)
 Sequence information filed under Rule 56 [A-IV, 5.1](#)
 Sequence information filed under Rule 56a [A-IV, 5.2](#)
 Sequence listings of a divisional application [A-IV, 5.4](#)
 Sequence listings of an application filed by reference to a previously filed application [A-IV, 5.3](#)
 Applications resulting from a decision under Art. 61 [C-IX, 2](#), [H-IV, 2.3.3](#)
 Entitlement for certain designated states only [C-IX, 2.4](#)
 Original application no longer pending [C-IX, 2.2](#)
 Partial entitlement [C-IX, 2.3](#)
 Applications where a reservation has been entered in accordance with Art. 167(2)(a) EPC 1973 [C-IX, 3](#)
 Art. 61 applications [A-VII, 1.3](#)

- Art. 61 applications and stay of proceedings under Rule 14 A-IV, 2
 Authentic text of the application or patent A-VII, 8
 Certified copy of the previous application (priority document) F-VI, 3.3
 Claims fees payable on filing the European patent application A-X, 7.3.1
 Classification of the European patent application B-X, 5
 Confirmation of the intention to proceed further with the application C-II, 1.1
 Conflict with other European applications G-IV, 5
 Conflicting applications B-VI, 4
 Content of a European patent application (other than claims) F-II
 Content of the application as "originally" filed H-IV, 2.2, H-IV, 2.3
 Conversion into a national application A-IV, 6
 Copy of the previous application (priority document) A-III, 6.7
 Copy of the priority application A-II, 5.4.3, A-II, 6.4.2
 CPC classification of the application B-V, 4
 Date of filing of a divisional application A-IV, 1.2
 Determination of filing date in the case of erroneously filed elements or parts of the international application A-XV, 6.2
 Disclaimer disclosed in the application as originally filed H-V, 4.1
 Disclaimers not disclosed in the application as originally filed H-V, 4.2
 Divisional application C-IX, 1, H-IV, 2.3.2
 Documents cited in the application B-X, 9.2.7
 Documents filed after filing the European patent application A-VIII, 3.1
 Documents forming part of the European patent application A-VIII, 3.2
 Documents making up the application, replacement documents, translations A-III, 3.2
 Documents making up the European patent application A-VIII, 2.1
 Entitled persons A-II, 2
 Euro-PCT applications C-II, 1.2, C-III, 1.2, C-III, 1.3, F-V, 7, G-IV, 5.2, H-IV, 4.2
 European divisional application A-IV, 1, A-VII, 1.3
 European divisional applications, other formalities examination A-IV, 1.7
 European patent application C-III, 1.1, Part F
 European patent applications filed before 1 April 2009 A-III, 11.3
 European patent applications filed on or after 1 April 2009 A-III, 11.2
 Examination of a divisional application C-IX, 1.4
 Extension and validation of European patent applications and patents to/in states not party to the EPC A-III, 12
 Fees paid by bank transfer - application of Art. 7(3) and (4) RFees A-X, 6.2.1
 File inspection before publication of the application A-XI, 2.5
 Filing a divisional application A-IV, 1.3, C-III, 3.3
 Filing a new application A-IV, 2.5
 Filing of applications and examination on filing A-II
 Filing of applications by delivery by hand or by postal services A-II, 1.2
 Filing of applications by fax A-II, 1.1.2
 Filing of applications by means of electronic communication A-II, 1.1
 Filing of applications by other means A-II, 1.3
 Filing of applications in electronic form A-II, 1.1.1
 First application F-VI, 1.4
 Forwarding of applications A-II, 1.6
 Further action upon examination of replies, further action where a request for a translation of the priority application was sent earlier in examination proceedings C-IV, 3.1
 Identification of the European patent application and the search report type B-X, 4
 Industrial application B-VIII, 1, D-III, 5, F-II, 4.9, G-I, 1, G-II, 5.2, G-III, G-III, 1, G-III, 4
 Industrial application vs. exclusion under Art. 52(2) G-III, 3
 Intermediate publication of another European application F-VI, 2.4.2
 Intermediate publication of the contents of the priority application F-VI, 2.4.1
 International application H-IV, 2.3.4
 International applications (Euro-PCT applications) C-IX, 4
 International applications with supplementary search F-V, 7.2
 International applications without supplementary search F-V, 7.1
 IPC classification of the application B-V, 3
 Limitation of the option to withdraw the European patent application A-IV, 2.3
 Missing parts of the description or missing drawings are completely contained in the priority application A-II, 5.4.2
 Missing parts of the description or missing drawings based on the priority application, no change in date of filing A-II, 5.4
 Multiple priorities claimed for different inventions in the application with an intermediate publication of one of the inventions F-VI, 2.4.3
 Pendency of the earlier application A-IV, 1.1.1
 Persons entitled to file a divisional application A-IV, 1.1.3
 Persons entitled to file an application A-II, 2
 Physical requirements of applications filed by reference to a previously filed application A-III, 3.2.1
 Potentially conflicting European and international applications B-VI, 4.1
 Preclassification, IPC and CPC classification of European patent applications B-V
 Priority claim of a divisional application A-IV, 1.2.2
 Prosecution of the application by a third party A-IV, 2.4
 Publication of application A-VI, A-VI, 1
 Publication of application, no publication A-VI, 1.2
 Publication of bibliographic data before publication of the application A-XI, 2.6
 Publication of the international application A-XIII, 10.1
 Published European patent applications as "E" documents B-VI, 4.1.1
 Published international applications (WO) as "E" documents B-VI, 4.1.2
 Reference to a previously filed application A-II, 4.1.3.1
 Refusal of the earlier application A-IV, 2.6
 Scope of application of Rule 134 E-VIII, 1.6.2.3

Scope of first analysis for generally deficient applications [B-XI, 3.4](#)
 Search division has more than one member, further searches in a different technical field for a non-unitary application [B-I, 2.2.2](#)
 Search for conflicting European patent applications [C-IV, 7.1](#)
 Search, publication and request for examination of divisional applications [A-IV, 1.8](#)
 Searches on national applications [B-II, 4.6](#)
 Sequences of divisional applications [A-IV, 1.1.2](#)
 Special applications [C-IX, H-IV, 2.3](#)
 Specific rules applicable to Euro-PCT applications [B-III, 3.3.2](#)
 Subject-matter to be excluded is disclosed in the application as originally filed [H-V, 4.2.2](#)
 Subject-matter to be excluded is not disclosed in the application as originally filed (so-called undisclosed disclaimers) [H-V, 4.2.1](#)
 Subsequent application considered as first application [F-VI, 1.4.1](#)
 Substantive examination of a Euro-PCT application accompanied by an IPER [A-XIV, 6.3](#)
 Summary of the processing of applications and patents at the EPO [General Part, 6](#)
 Transfer of the European patent application [E-XIII, 3](#)
 Translation of previous application already filed [A-III, 6.8.4](#)
 Translation of the application [A-III, 14](#)
 Translation of the previous application [A-III, 6.8, F-VI, 3.4](#)
 Translation of the priority application [A-II, 5.4.4, A-II, 6.4.3](#)
 Unpublished patent applications [B-IX, 2.2](#)
 Voluntary filing of the translation of the previous application [A-III, 6.8.5](#)
 Where and how applications may be filed [A-II, 1](#)
 Where and how to file a divisional application [A-IV, 1.3.1](#)
 Where it is necessary to check whether the application from which priority is actually claimed is the "first application" within the meaning of [Art. 87\(1\) F-VI, 2.4.4](#)
 Withdrawal of application or designation [E-VIII, 8.1](#)

Approval of the proposed text [C-V, 2](#)
 Request for unitary effect [C-V, 2.1](#)

Arbitrary choice [G-VII, 10.1](#)

Arguments and evidence submitted by the applicant [G-VII, 11](#)

Arrangement of claims [F-IV, 3.5](#)

Arrows [A-IX, 7.5.2](#)

Art. 123 [D-X, 4.3.2](#)
 Allowability of amendments under [Art. 123\(2\) H-IV, 2](#)
 Allowability of amendments under [Art. 123\(3\) H-IV, 3](#)
Art. 83 vs Art. 123(2) [F-III, 2](#)
 Claims contravening [Art. 123\(2\)](#) or [Art. 76\(1\) B-VIII, 6](#)
 Conflicts between [Art. 123\(2\)](#) and [Art. 123\(3\) H-IV, 3.5](#)

Conflicts between [Art. 123\(3\)](#) and other requirements of the EPC [H-IV, 3.6](#)
[Rule 137\(3\)](#) in conjunction with [Art. 123\(2\) H-II, 2.3.1.2](#)

Art. 124 and the utilisation scheme [B-XI, 9](#)

Art. 61 applications [A-VII, 1.3](#)
Art. 61 applications and stay of proceedings under [Rule 14 A-IV, 2](#)
 Filing a new application [A-IV, 2.5](#)
 Limitation of the option to withdraw the European patent application [A-IV, 2.3](#)
 Partial transfer of right by virtue of a final decision [A-IV, 2.7](#)
 Prosecution of the application by a third party [A-IV, 2.4](#)
 Refusal of the earlier application [A-IV, 2.6](#)
 Stay of proceedings for grant [A-IV, 2.2](#)

Art. 83 vs Art. 123(2) [F-III, 2](#)

Art. 84 [D-X, 4.3.3](#)
 Claims ([Art. 84](#) and formal requirements) [F-IV](#)
[Rule 137\(3\)](#) in conjunction with [Art. 84](#) - missing essential feature [H-II, 2.3.1.3](#)

Artificial intelligence and machine learning [G-II, 3.3.1](#)

Ascertaining whether there is a fallback position [B-III, 3.2.5](#)

Asking for evidence [E-IV, 4.4](#)

Assessment

Assessment and possible review of the unity requirement [B-VII, 1.4](#)
 Assessment of impermissible extension of the protection conferred [H-IV, 3.4](#)
 Assessment of unity [F-V, 3](#)
 Determination of the invention first mentioned in the claims [F-V, 3.4](#)
 Grouping of inventions [F-V, 3.2](#)
 Non-unity and prior art [F-V, 3.1](#)
 Reasoning for a lack-of-unity objection [F-V, 3.3](#)

Associations [A-VIII, 1.2](#)

Authentic text of the application or patent [A-VII, 8](#)

Authentication and dates [B-X, 10](#)

Authorisations [A-IV, 1.6, A-VIII, 1.1, A-VIII, 1.7](#)
 Checking the identity and authorisations of participants at oral proceedings [E-III, 8.3.1](#)
 European divisional applications [A-IV, 1.6](#)
 Representatives [A-VIII, 1.1](#)

Authoritative text of documents [E-IX, 2.2](#)

Authorities (Taking of evidence by courts or ~ of the contracting states) [E-IV, 3](#)

Authorities of the Contracting States (Taking of evidence by courts or ~) [E-IV, 3](#)

Automatic debiting procedure [A-X, 4.3](#)

Auxiliary requests [H-III, 3](#)

Auxiliary requests, in examination

proceedings [H-III, 3.3](#)

Admissibility of auxiliary requests [H-III, 3.3.2](#)

Applicant does not approve the text proposed for grant [H-III, 3.3.6](#)

Complete text for auxiliary request

available [H-III, 3.3.5](#)

Complete text for auxiliary request not yet

available [H-III, 3.3.4](#)

Indication of the amendments made in the requests and of their basis [H-III, 3.3.1](#)

Preparing the decision [H-III, 3.3.3](#)

Auxiliary requests, in limitation proceedings [H-III, 3.5](#)

Oral proceedings [H-III, 3.5.3](#)

Written procedure [H-III, 3.5.2](#)

Auxiliary requests, in opposition proceedings [H-III, 3.4](#)

Oral proceedings [H-III, 3.4.2](#)

Written procedure [H-III, 3.4.1](#)

Auxiliary requests, in the search phase [H-III, 3.2](#)

Criteria for admissibility of auxiliary requests [H-III, 3.3.2.1](#)

Main and auxiliary requests [E-IX, 2.9](#)

Main and auxiliary requests filed with the appeal [E-XI, 7.4.3](#)

Neither main nor auxiliary requests

allowable [H-III, 3.1.3](#)

[Rule 137\(3\)](#) in conjunction with auxiliary requests [H-II, 2.3.1.4](#)

Timeliness and structure of auxiliary requests [H-III, 3.3.2.2](#)

Availability of deposited biological material to expert only [A-IV, 4.3](#)

Awarding of costs (Decision concerning the ~ by the opposition division) [D-II, 4.2](#)

B

Background art [F-II, 4.3](#)

Format of background art citations [F-II, 4.3.1](#)

Basic principles [H-IV, 3.1](#)

Basic principles of decisions [E-IX, 1](#)

Consideration of time limits [E-IX, 1.2](#)

Form and content [E-IX, 1.3](#)

Basis

Basis for substantive examination [A-XIV, 6.3.2](#)

Basis for the examination [D-VI, 2.1](#), [D-X, 4.2](#)

Adherence to the text of the European patent submitted or approved by the patent

proprietor [D-VI, 2.1](#)

Substantive examination (limitation) [D-X, 4.2](#)

Basis for the search [B-III, 3.1](#)

Basis for the search opinion [B-XI, 2](#)

Application documents filed under [Rule 56 EPC](#),

[Rule 56a EPC](#), [Rule 20.5 PCT](#) or

[Rule 20.5bis PCT](#) [B-XI, 2.1](#)

Applications containing claims filed after the accorded date of filing [B-XI, 2.2](#)

Basis of this ground for opposition [D-V, 6.1](#)

Bibliographic data [B-X, 9.1.1](#)

Allowability of the correction of bibliographic data [H-VI, 3.2](#)

Publication of bibliographic data before publication of the application [A-XI, 2.6](#)

Binding nature of decisions on appeals [E-IX, 4](#)

Biological material [A-III, 1.2](#), [A-IV, 4.1](#), [A-IV, 4.1.1](#),

[A-IV, 4.2](#), [B-IV, 1.2](#), [F-III, 6.1](#), [F-III, 6.3](#), [G-II, 5.2](#)

Application filed by reference to a previously filed application [A-IV, 4.1.2](#)

Applications relating to biological material [A-IV, 4](#)

Availability of deposited biological material to expert only [A-IV, 4.3](#)

Deposit of biological material [F-III, 6.3](#)

Inventions relating to biological material [F-III, 6](#)

New deposit of biological material [A-IV, 4.1.1](#)

Public availability of biological material [F-III, 6.2](#)

Requests for samples of biological material [A-IV, 4.4](#)

Biological processes [G-II, 5.4](#), [G-II, 5.5.1](#)

Essentially biological processes for the production of plants or animals [G-II, 5.4.2](#)

Plant and animal varieties or essentially biological processes for the production of plants or animals [G-II, 5.4](#)

Biotechnological inventions

Exclusions and exceptions for biotechnological inventions [G-II, 5](#)

Patentable biotechnological inventions [G-II, 5.2](#)

Boards of Appeal

Accelerated processing before the boards of appeal [E-VIII, 6](#)

Members [A-XI, 2.3](#)

Rules of Procedure of the Boards of Appeal [E-XI, 8](#)

Bonus effect [G-VII, 10.2](#)

Bringing the description into line with amended claims [H-V, 2.7](#)

Broad claims [B-III, 3.6](#), [F-IV, 4.22](#)

Clarity and interpretation of claims [F-IV, 4.22](#)

Subject-matter of the search [B-III, 3.6](#)

Burden of proof [G-IV, 7.5.3](#)

Burden of proof in relation to the possibility of performing and repeating the invention [F-III, 4](#)

Burden of proof, other "print equivalent"
publications [G-IV, 7.5.3.2](#)
Non-traditional publications [G-IV, 7.5.3.3](#)
Technical journals [G-IV, 7.5.3.1](#)

C

Calculation of claims fees [H-III, 5](#)

Calculation of time limits [E-VIII, 1.4](#)

Cancellation of the registration [E-XIII, 6.2](#)

Cancellation or maintenance of oral proceedings [E-III, 7.2](#)

Change of date, cancellation or maintenance of oral proceedings [E-III, 7](#)

Withdrawal of the request for oral proceedings [E-III, 7.2.2](#)

Carrying out the search [B-IV, 2.3](#)

Cascading non-unity [B-VII, 1.2.2](#)

Cases in which the proceedings may be interrupted [E-VII, 1.1](#)

Cases of loss of rights [E-VIII, 1.9.1](#)

Cases of oral description [G-IV, 7.3.1](#)

Matters to be determined by the division in cases of oral description [G-IV, 7.3.3](#)

Cases of partially insufficient disclosure [F-III, 5](#)

Absence of well-known details [F-III, 5.2](#)

Difficulties in performing the invention [F-III, 5.3](#)

Only variants of the invention are incapable of being performed [F-III, 5.1](#)

Cases under Rule 62a where claims fees have not been paid [B-VIII, 4.4](#)

Cases where all method steps can be fully implemented by generic data processing means [F-IV, 3.9.1](#)

Cases where method steps define additional devices and/or specific data processing means [F-IV, 3.9.2](#)

Cases where the invention is realised in a distributed computing environment [F-IV, 3.9.3](#)

Categories [F-II, 7.1](#), [F-IV, 3.1](#)

Categories of documents (X, Y, P, A, D, etc.) [B-X, 9.2](#)

Documents cited for other reasons [B-X, 9.2.8](#)

Documents cited in the application [B-X, 9.2.7](#)

Documents defining the state of the art and not prejudicing novelty or inventive step [B-X, 9.2.2](#)

Documents relating to the theory or principle behind the invention [B-X, 9.2.5](#)

Documents which refer to a non-written disclosure [B-X, 9.2.3](#)

Intermediate documents [B-X, 9.2.4](#)

Particularly relevant documents [B-X, 9.2.1](#)

Potentially conflicting patent documents [B-X, 9.2.6](#)

Claims in different categories [G-VII, 14](#)

Different categories [B-III, 3.10](#)

Kinds of claim [F-IV, 3.1](#)

Plurality of independent claims in different categories [F-V, 3.2.2](#)

Prohibited matter [F-II, 7.1](#)

Central industrial property offices, conversion [A-IV, 6](#)

Certificate [C-V, 12](#)

Certificate of exhibition [A-IV, 3.1](#), [A-XIII, 11.6](#)

Defects in the certificate or the identification [A-IV, 3.2](#)

Certified copies of documents from the files or of other documents [A-XI, 5.1](#)

Certified copy of the previous application (priority document) [F-VI, 3.3](#)

Chair [D-II, 2.3](#)

Change of date of oral proceedings [E-III, 7.1.3](#)

Change of date of oral proceedings at the instigation of the division [E-III, 7.1.2](#)

Change of date, cancellation or maintenance of oral proceedings [E-III, 7](#)

Cancellation or maintenance of oral proceedings [E-III, 7.2](#)

Changing the date of oral proceedings [E-III, 7.1](#)

Changes in claim category in opposition [H-V, 7](#)

Method claim to product claim [H-V, 7.3](#)

Method claim to use claim [H-V, 7.4](#)

Product claim to method claim [H-V, 7.2](#)

Product claim to use claim [H-V, 7.1](#)

Changes in the title [H-V, 8](#)

Changes of name [E-XIII, 5](#)

Registration of changes of name, transfers, licences and other rights [E-XIV](#)

Changing

Changing from one searched invention to another [C-III, 3.5](#)

Changing the date of oral proceedings [E-III, 7.1](#)

Change of date of oral proceedings [E-III, 7.1.3](#)

Change of date of oral proceedings at the instigation of the division [E-III, 7.1.2](#)

Defined notice period [E-III, 7.1.3](#)

Requests to change the date of oral proceedings [E-III, 7.1.1](#)

Changing the order of inventors [A-III, 5.6](#)

Characteristics of the search [B-III](#)

Opinions of the search division [B-III, 1](#)

Scope of the search [B-III, 2](#)

Subject-matter of the search [B-III, 3](#)

Charging of costs [D-IX, 1](#)

Costs to be taken into consideration [D-IX, 1.3](#)
 Decisions on the apportionment of costs [D-IX, 1.2](#)
 General principle [D-IX, 1.1](#)
 Principle of equity [D-IX, 1.4](#)

Checking the identity and authorisations of participants at oral proceedings [E-III, 8.3.1](#)

Checklist [F-II, 2.5](#)

Checklist for considering the abstract [F-II, An. 1](#)

Chemical and mathematical formulae [A-IX, 11.1](#)

Citation

Citation of documents corresponding to documents not available or not published in one of the EPO's official languages [B-VI, 6.2](#)
 Citation of prior art in the description after the filing date [H-IV, 2.2.7](#)
 Citation of video and/or audio media fragments available on the internet [B-X, 11.6](#)

Citing documents not mentioned in the search report [C-IV, 7.5](#)

Claims [C-IX, 1.6](#)

Abandoned claims [B-III, 3.4](#)
 Amended claims [F-V, 6](#)
 Amended claims, missing parts (Rule 56) or erroneously filed application documents or parts (Rule 56a) [B-III, 3.3](#)
 Amendments [A-V, 2.1](#), [A-V, 2.2](#), [B-VIII, 6](#), [C-I, 4](#), [C-II, 3.1](#), [D-IV, 5.2](#), [G-IV, 3](#), [H-II, 3.1](#), [H-IV, 2.2.4](#)
 Amendments in claims [H-V, 3](#)
 Amendments in claims, further cases of broadening of claims [H-V, 3.4](#)
 Anticipation of amendments to claims [B-III, 3.5](#)
 Applications containing claims filed after the accorded date of filing [B-XI, 2.2](#)
 Arrangement of claims [F-IV, 3.5](#)
 Bringing the description into line with amended claims [H-V, 2.7](#)
 Broad claims [B-III, 3.6](#), [F-IV, 4.22](#)
 Categories [F-IV, 3.1](#), [F-V, 2.1](#)
 Claim to priority [A-III, 6](#), [A-IV, 1.2](#), [F-VI, 3](#)
 Applications giving rise to a right of priority [A-III, 6.2](#)
 Certified copy of the previous application (priority document) [F-VI, 3.3](#)
 Copy of the previous application (priority document) [A-III, 6.7](#)
 Copy of the search results for the priority or priorities [A-III, 6.12](#)
 Date of filing [A-IV, 1.2.1](#)
 Declaration of priority [A-III, 6.5](#), [F-VI, 3.2](#)
 Examination of formal requirements [A-III, 6](#)
 Examination of the priority document [A-III, 6.4](#)
 Loss of right to priority [A-III, 6.10](#)
 Multiple priorities [A-III, 6.3](#)
 Non-entitlement to right to priority [A-III, 6.9](#)
 Notification [A-III, 6.11](#)

Priority [F-VI, 3](#)

Priority claim of a divisional application [A-IV, 1.2.2](#)

Priority period [A-III, 6.6](#)

Re-establishment of rights in respect of the priority period [F-VI, 3.6](#)

Translation of the previous application [A-III, 6.8](#), [F-VI, 3.4](#)

Withdrawal of priority claim [F-VI, 3.5](#)

Claiming refunds in Central Fee Payment [A-X, 10.3.3](#)

Claims (Art. 84 and formal requirements) [F-IV](#)

Clarity and interpretation of claims [F-IV, 4](#)

Conciseness, number of claims [F-IV, 5](#)

Examples of essential features [F-IV, An.](#)

Form and content of claims [F-IV, 2](#)

Kinds of claim [F-IV, 3](#)

Support in description [F-IV, 6](#)

Claims comprising technical and non-technical features [G-VII, 5.4](#)

Examples of applying the COMVIK approach [G-VII, 5.4.2](#)

Formulation of the objective technical problem for claims comprising technical and non-technical features [G-VII, 5.4.1](#)

Claims contravening Art. 123(2) or Art. 76(1) [B-VIII, 6](#)

Claims directed to computer-implemented inventions [F-IV, 3.9](#)

Cases where all method steps can be fully implemented by generic data processing means [F-IV, 3.9.1](#)

Cases where method steps define additional devices and/or specific data processing means [F-IV, 3.9.2](#)

Cases where the invention is realised in a distributed computing environment [F-IV, 3.9.3](#)

Claims fee [A-II, 6.9](#), [A-III, 9](#), [A-III, 16.2](#), [A-IV, 1.4.2](#), [A-X, 5.2.5](#), [C-V, 4.8.1](#)

Calculation of claims fees [H-III, 5](#)

Cases under Rule 62a where claims fees have not been paid [B-VIII, 4.4](#)

Claims fees due in response to Rule 71(3) communication [C-V, 1.4](#)

Claims fees payable before the grant of the European patent [A-X, 7.3.2](#)

Claims fees payable on filing the European patent application [A-X, 7.3.1](#)

Correction of erroneously filed application documents or parts [A-II, 6.9](#)

Crediting of claims fees [A-X, 11.2](#)

Due date for specific fees [A-X, 5.2.5](#)

Examination of formal requirements [A-III, 9](#)

Fees [A-IV, 1.4.2](#)

Fees to be paid within the second Rule 71(3) period [C-V, 4.8.1](#)

Indication of the purpose of payment in the case of claims fees [A-X, 7.3](#)

Separate crediting of the fee for grant and publishing and claims fees [A-X, 11.3](#)

Claims filed after accordance of a date of filing [C-III, 1.1.2](#)

Claims filed after the date of filing [H-IV, 2.2.4](#)

Claims for a known substance for a number of distinct medical uses [F-V, 3.2.6](#)

Claims in different categories [G-VII, 14](#)

Plurality of independent claims in different categories [F-V, 3.2.2](#)

Claims with explicit references to the description or drawings [B-III, 3.2.1](#)

Clarity [D-X, 4.3.3](#), [F-IV, 1](#), [F-IV, 3.4](#), [F-IV, 4.1](#), [F-IV, 4.5.1](#), [F-IV, 6.4](#), [F-V, 2.1](#)

Clarity of claims and support by the description [D-V, 5](#)

Common dependent claims [F-V, 3.2.4](#)

Consistent use of reference signs in description, claims and drawings [A-IX, 7.5.4](#)

Content [A-III, 3.2](#), [F-IV, 5](#)

Content of a European patent application (other than claims) [F-II](#)

Correction [A-V, 3](#), [A-VI, 1.3](#), [D-X, 4.3.3](#), [H-VI, 2](#), [H-VI, 2.2](#)

Correction of description, claims and drawings [H-VI, 2.2.1](#)

Correction of the translations of the claims [H-VI, 5](#)

Dependent claims [B-III, 3.7](#), [F-IV, 3.4](#), [F-IV, 3.5](#)

Dependent claims under Art. 54(5) [G-VI, 6.1.5](#)

Determination of the invention first mentioned in the claims [F-V, 3.4](#)

Different sets of claims [D-X, 10](#)

Errors in the description, claims and drawings [H-VI, 2.1.1.1](#)

Examples, no amended claims filed with the appeal [E-XI, 7.4.1](#)

Extent of protection [F-IV, 4.12](#)

Handling of dependent claims under Rule 62a [B-VIII, 4.6](#)

Independent and dependent claims [B-III, 3.7](#), [F-IV, 3.4](#)

Independent claims [F-IV, 3.1](#), [F-IV, 3.2](#), [F-IV, 3.3](#), [F-V, 2.1](#), [F-V, 3.2.1](#)

Independent claims containing a reference to another claim or to features from a claim of another category [F-IV, 3.8](#)

Interpretation of claims [B-III, 3.2](#)

Late filing of claims [A-III, 15](#)

Limitation is different for different contracting states because the claims as granted were different for different contracting states [D-X, 10.2](#)

Limitation of the claims [D-X, 4.3.1](#)

Limitation results in the claims becoming different in different contracting states [D-X, 10.1](#)

Novelty of "reach-through" claims [G-VI, 8](#)

Number of independent claims [F-IV, 3.2](#)

Opposition proceedings where the claims as granted are different for different contracting states [H-III, 4.5](#)

Order of claims [F-IV, 4.23](#)

Plurality of independent claims in the same category [F-V, 3.2.1](#)

"Reach-through" claims [F-III, 9](#)

Relationship between documents and claims [B-X, 9.3](#)

Search on dependent claims [B-III, 3.8](#)

Support for dependent claims [F-IV, 6.6](#)

Tables in the claims [A-IX, 11.2.2](#)

Translation [C-V, 1.1](#), [D-VI, 7.2.3](#), [E-VIII, 3.1.1](#)

Translations of the claims [C-V, 1.3](#)

Use claims [F-IV, 4.16](#)

Using the description and/or drawings to define unclear terms not defined in the claims [B-III, 3.2.3](#)

Clarification of a technical effect [H-V, 2.1](#)

Clarifications [H-IV, 2.2.8](#)

Clarity [F-IV, 4.1](#)

Clarity and interpretation of claims [F-IV, 4](#)

Broad claims [F-IV, 4.22](#)

Clarity [F-IV, 4.1](#)

"Comprising" vs "consisting of" [F-IV, 4.20](#)

Definition by reference to (use with) another entity [F-IV, 4.14](#)

Essential features [F-IV, 4.5](#)

Expression "in" [F-IV, 4.15](#)

Functional definition of a pathological condition [F-IV, 4.21](#)

General statements, "spirit of the invention", claim-like clauses [F-IV, 4.4](#)

Inconsistencies [F-IV, 4.3](#)

Interpretation [F-IV, 4.2](#)

Interpretation of expressions stating a purpose [F-IV, 4.13](#)

Interpretation of terms such as identity and similarity in relation to amino or nucleic acid

sequences [F-IV, 4.24](#)

Negative limitations (e.g. disclaimers) [F-IV, 4.19](#)

Optional features [F-IV, 4.9](#)

Order of claims [F-IV, 4.23](#)

Parameters [F-IV, 4.11](#)

Product-by-process claim [F-IV, 4.12](#)

Reference signs [F-IV, 4.18](#)

References to the description or

drawings [F-IV, 4.17](#)

Relative terms [F-IV, 4.6](#)

Result to be achieved [F-IV, 4.10](#)

Terms such as "about", "approximately" or

"substantially" [F-IV, 4.7](#)

Trade marks [F-IV, 4.8](#)

Use claims [F-IV, 4.16](#)

Clarity objections [F-IV, 4.7.2](#), [F-IV, 4.14.1](#)

Definition by reference to (use with) another entity [F-IV, 4.14.1](#)

Terms such as "about", "approximately" or

"substantially" [F-IV, 4.7.2](#)

Clarity of claims and support by the description [D-V, 5](#)

Sufficiency of disclosure and clarity [F-III, 11](#)

Classification

Classification of the European patent application [B-X, 5](#)

CPC classification of the application [B-V, 4](#)

IPC classification in cases of lack of unity of invention [B-V, 3.3](#)

IPC classification of late-published search reports [B-V, 3.1](#)

IPC classification of the application [B-V, 3](#)

IPC classification where the scope of the invention is unclear (e.g. a partial search) [B-V, 3.2](#)

Preclassification, IPC and CPC classification of European patent applications [B-V](#)

Verification of the IPC classification [B-V, 3.4](#)

Closest prior art and its effects on the search [B-IV, 2.5](#)**Closure of oral proceedings** [E-III, 8.11](#)

Adjournment of oral proceedings due to lack of time [E-III, 8.11.2](#)

Requesting postponement during oral proceedings [E-III, 8.11.1](#)

Combination of elements in a claim [B-III, 3.9](#)**Combination vs. juxtaposition or aggregation** [G-VII, 7](#)**Combining pieces of prior art** [G-VII, 6](#)**Comments and amendments in response to the search opinion** [B-XI, 3.3](#)**Commercial success** [G-VII, 10.3](#)**Commissioning of experts** [E-IV, 1.8](#)

Decision on the form of the opinion [E-IV, 1.8.1](#)

Objection to an expert [E-IV, 1.8.2](#)

Terms of reference of the expert [E-IV, 1.8.3](#)

Common

Common dependent claims [F-V, 3.2.4](#)

Common general knowledge of the skilled person [G-VII, 3.1](#)

Common provisions [A-VIII](#)

Form of documents [A-VIII, 2](#)

Representation [A-VIII, 1](#)

Signature of documents [A-VIII, 3](#)

Common representatives [A-VIII, 1.6](#)

Commonly designated states [G-IV, 5.3](#)**Communication** [A-VI, 2.1](#), [E-II, 1](#)

Admissibility in the examination procedure, after receipt of the first communication - [Rule 137\(3\)](#) [H-II, 2.3](#)

Agreement reached on a text - second [Rule 71\(3\)](#) communication [C-V, 4.7.2](#)

Amendments filed in reply to a [Rule 71\(3\)](#) communication [H-II, 2.5](#)

Amendments filed in reply to a [Rule 71\(3\)](#) communication, further course of proceedings [H-II, 2.5.2](#)

Amendments/corrections admitted and allowable - second [Rule 71\(3\)](#) communication sent [C-V, 4.6](#)

Communication in the event of deficiencies as described in [D-IV, 1.2.1](#) which, if not remedied, will lead to the opposition being deemed not to have been filed [D-IV, 1.3.1](#)

Communication in the event of deficiencies as described in [D-IV, 1.2.2](#) which, if not remedied, will lead to rejection of the opposition as inadmissible [D-IV, 1.3.2](#)

Communication of information contained in files [A-XI, A-XI, 3](#)

Consultation of the European Patent

Register [A-XI, 4](#)

Inspection of files [A-XI, 2](#)

Issue of certified copies [A-XI, 5](#)

Communication of observations from one of the parties to the other parties [D-IV, 5.4](#)

Communication under [Rule 71\(3\)](#) [C-V, 1](#)

Claims fees due in response to [Rule 71\(3\)](#) communication [C-V, 1.4](#)

Communication under [Rule 71\(3\)](#), other information in the communication under [Rule 71\(3\)](#) [C-V, 1.5](#)

Examining division resumes examination after approval of the text, further communication under [Rule 71\(3\)](#) [C-V, 6.2](#)

Grant and publishing fee [C-V, 1.2](#)

Text for approval [C-V, 1.1](#)

Translations of the claims [C-V, 1.3](#)

Communications and notifications [E-II](#)

Communications [E-II, 1](#)

Notification [E-II, 2](#)

Communications concerning formal deficiencies [A-V, A-V, 1](#)

Amendment of application [A-V, 2](#)

Correction of errors in documents filed with the EPO [A-V, 3](#)

Communications from the opposition division to the patent proprietor [D-VI, 4](#)

Communications from the opposition division [D-VI, 4.1](#)

Invitation to file amended documents [D-VI, 4.2](#)

Reasoned statement [D-VI, 4.1](#)

Communications/oral proceedings/refusal after resumption [C-V, 4.7.1](#)

Higher-ranking request not admissible and/or not allowable [C-V, 4.7.1.1](#)

Examination for deficiencies in the notice of opposition and communications from the formalities officer arising from this examination [D-IV, 1](#)

Examining division proposes amendments in second [Rule 71\(3\)](#) communication [C-V, 4.6.3](#)

Extent of the formalities officer's obligation to issue the above communications [D-IV, 1.3.3](#)

Filing of applications by means of electronic communication [A-II, 1.1](#)

First communication [C-III, 4](#)

Form of decisions, communications and notices [E-II, 1.3](#)

Invitation to the patent proprietor to submit comments and communication of opposition to the other parties concerned by the formalities officer [D-IV, 5.2](#)

Issue of communications by the formalities officer as a result of examination for deficiencies [D-IV, 1.3](#)

Issuing a further communication (no refusal) [C-V, 15.4](#)

Minutes as the first communication in examination [C-VII, 2.5](#)

Noting and communication of loss of rights [E-VIII, 1.9.2](#)

Number of communications [E-II, 1.2](#)

Opposition division's communications [D-VI, 3.1](#)

Request for amendments or corrections in reply to the [Rule 71\(3\)](#) communication [C-V, 4](#)

Request for amendments or corrections in reply to the [Rule 71\(3\)](#) communication, no payment of fees or filing of translations necessary [C-V, 4.1](#)

Response filed before first communication in examination [C-II, 3](#)

Response to communication pursuant to [Rule 58](#) filed with the appeal [E-XI, 7.4.4](#)

Rule 137(4) communication and response thereto [H-III, 2.1.1](#)
 Second Rule 71(3) communication based on higher-ranking request initially rejected in first Rule 71(3) communication [C-V, 4.6.2](#)
 Second Rule 71(3) communication reversing the amendments proposed by the examining division in first Rule 71(3) communication [C-V, 4.6.1](#)
 Standard marks for indicating amendments or corrections by the divisions, further communication with the applicant [C-VIII, 5](#)
 Time limits for response to communications from the examiner [C-VI, 1](#)

Comparative test results [A-XIV, 6.3.1](#)

Compensation [E-IV, 1.10.2](#)

Competence [E-IV, 2.3](#)

Complete

Complete search despite lack of unity [B-VII, 2.2](#)
 Complete text for auxiliary request available [H-III, 3.3.5](#)
 Complete text for auxiliary request not yet available [H-III, 3.3.4](#)

Completeness of the search [B-III, 2.1](#)

Composition and duties of the examining division

[E-XII, 3](#)
 Composition [E-XII, 3.1](#)
 Duties [E-XII, 3.2](#)

Compositions

[D-II, 2](#), [E-XII, 3.1](#), [G-II, 4.2](#)
 Chair [D-II, 2.3](#)
 Composition and duties of the examining division [E-XII, 3.1](#)
 Exceptions to patentability [G-II, 4.2](#)
 Legally qualified members [D-II, 2.2](#)
 Opposition division [D-II, 2](#)
 Substances and compositions [G-II, 4.2](#)
 Technically qualified members [D-II, 2.1](#)

Compound units [F-II, An. 2, 5](#)

"Comprising" vs "consisting of" [F-IV, 4.20](#)

Computer print-out [E-II, 2.1](#)

Computer programs [F-II, 4.12](#), [G-II, 3.6](#)
 Description (formal requirements) [F-II, 4.12](#)
 List of exclusions [G-II, 3.6](#)

Computer-implemented business

methods [B-VIII, 2.2.1](#)

Computers (Programs for ~) [G-II, 3.6](#)

Concept of "clear allowability" [H-II, 2.7.1](#)

Conciseness, number of claims [F-IV, 5](#)

Conditions

[A-X, 9.3.1](#), [A-X, 9.4.1](#)
 Conditions for valid payment [A-X, 7.1.1](#)
 Conditions if drawings are filed on paper [A-IX, 3](#)
 Reduction under the language arrangements [A-X, 9.3.1](#)
 Reduction under the scheme for micro-entities [A-X, 9.4.1](#)

Conduct of oral proceedings

[E-III, 8](#), [E-III, 8.2](#)
 Admission of the public to proceedings [E-III, 8.1](#)
 Closure of oral proceedings [E-III, 8.11](#)
 Discussion of the facts and of the legal position [E-III, 8.9](#)
 Facts, evidence or amendments introduced at a late stage [E-III, 8.6](#)
 Handwritten amendments in oral proceedings [E-III, 8.7](#)
 Non-appearance of a party [E-III, 8.3](#)
 Opening of oral proceedings [E-III, 8.3](#)
 Opening of the substantive part of the proceedings [E-III, 8.4](#)
 Participation of members of the division from different locations [E-III, 8.2.2](#)
 Participation of parties and their representatives from different locations [E-III, 8.2.1](#)
 Recording [E-III, 8.2.4](#)
 Right of the other members of the division to put questions [E-III, 8.10](#)
 Submissions by the parties [E-III, 8.5](#)
 Technical problems [E-III, 8.2.3](#)
 Use of Rule 137(4) for amendments filed during oral proceedings in examination [E-III, 8.8](#)

Conducting file inspections [A-XI, 2.2](#)

Confidentiality

[C-VII, 3.2](#)
 Confidentiality of the request [A-XI, 2.4](#)

Confirmation

[A-II, 3.1](#)
 Confirmation of the intention to proceed further with the application [C-II, 1.1](#)

Conflict

Conflict between abstract and source document [B-VI, 6.3](#)
 Conflict with national rights of earlier date [G-IV, 6](#)
 Conflict with other European applications [G-IV, 5](#)
 Commonly designated states [G-IV, 5.3](#)
 Double patenting [G-IV, 5.4](#)
 Euro-PCT applications [G-IV, 5.2](#)
 State of the art pursuant to Art. 54(3) [G-IV, 5.1](#)
 Conflicting applications [B-VI, 4](#)
 National prior rights [B-VI, 4.2](#)
 Potentially conflicting European and international applications [B-VI, 4.1](#)
 Conflicts between Art. 123(2) and Art. 123(3) [H-IV, 3.5](#)

Conflicts between Art. 123(3) and other requirements of the EPC [H-IV, 3.6](#)

Consequences for the applicant [F-V, 4.2](#)

Consequences of non-payment of the designation fee [A-III, 11.2.3](#)

European patent applications filed on or after 1 April 2009 [A-III, 11.2.3](#)

Conservation of evidence [E-IV, 2](#)

Competence [E-IV, 2.3](#)

Decision on the request and the taking of evidence [E-IV, 2.4](#)

Request for the conservation of evidence [E-IV, 2.2](#)

Requirements [E-IV, 2.1](#)

Taking and conservation of evidence [E-IV](#)

Consideration of the contents of the IPER [A-XIV, 6.3.3](#)

Consideration of time limits [E-IX, 1.2](#)

Considerations relating to specific exclusions from and exceptions to patentability [B-VIII, 2](#)

Methods for treatment of the human or animal body by surgery or therapy and diagnostic methods practised on the human or animal body [B-VIII, 2.1](#)

Subject-matter excluded from patentability under Art. 52(2) and (3) [B-VIII, 2.2](#)

Consistent use of reference signs in description, claims and drawings [A-IX, 7.5.4](#)

Consistent use of reference signs in drawings [A-IX, 7.5.5](#)

Consolidation of proceedings [E-VII, 4](#)

Consultations [C-VII, 2](#)

Consultation of a legally qualified member [C-VIII, 7](#)

Consultation of the European Patent Register [A-XI, A-XI, 4](#)

Communication of information contained in the files [A-XI, 3](#)

Inspection of files [A-XI, 2](#)

Issue of certified copies [A-XI, 5](#)

Consultation with other examiners [B-I, 2.1](#)

Informal nature of consultations [C-VII, 2.3](#)

Minutes as the first communication in examination [C-VII, 2.5](#)

Minutes of a consultation [C-VII, 2.4](#)

Persons participating in the consultation [C-VII, 2.2](#)

Real-time interaction on a document [C-VII, 2.6](#)

Shared area [C-VII, 2.6](#)

Contact between the applicant and the search division [B-II, 1.1](#)

Content [B-IX, 4.1](#), [E-IX, 2.7](#)

Accorded date of filing and content of the application still subject to review [G-IV, 5.1.2](#)

Analysis of the application and content of the search opinion [B-XI, 3](#)

Consideration of the contents of the IPER [A-XIV, 6.3.3](#)
Content of a European patent application (other than claims) [F-II](#)

Abstract [F-II, 2](#)

Checklist for considering the abstract [F-II, An. 1](#)

Description (formal requirements) [F-II, 4](#)

Drawings [F-II, 5](#)

Prohibited matter [F-II, 7](#)

Request for grant [F-II, 3](#)

Sequence listings [F-II, 6](#)

Title [F-II, 3](#)

Units recognised in international practice as determined by the President under

Rule 49(2) [F-II, An. 2](#)

Content of the abstract [A-III, 10.2](#), [F-II, 2.3](#)

Content of the application as "originally"

filed [H-IV, 2.2](#), [H-IV, 2.3](#)

Applications filed by reference to an earlier application [H-IV, 2.3.1](#)

Applications resulting from a decision under Art. 61 [H-IV, 2.3.3](#)

Citation of prior art in the description after the filing date [H-IV, 2.2.7](#)

Claims filed after the date of filing [H-IV, 2.2.4](#)

Clarifications [H-IV, 2.2.8](#)

Divisional applications [H-IV, 2.3.2](#)

Erroneously filed application documents or parts under Rule 56a [H-IV, 2.2.3](#)

Features described in a document cross-referenced in the description [H-IV, 2.2.1](#)

International applications [H-IV, 2.3.4](#)

Missing parts of the description or missing drawings filed under Rule 56 after the date of

filing [H-IV, 2.2.2](#)

Priority documents [H-IV, 2.2.6](#)

Sequence listings filed after the date of filing [H-IV, 2.2.5](#)

Trade marks [H-IV, 2.2.9](#)

Content of the extended European search report (EESR) [B-VIII, 3.3](#), [B-VIII, 4.3](#)

More than one independent claim per category (Rule 62a) [B-VIII, 4.3](#)

No meaningful search possible [B-VIII, 3.3](#)

Content of the notice of opposition [D-III, 6](#)

Content of the publication [A-VI, 1.3](#)

Contents of prior-art disclosures [B-VI, 6](#)

Citation of documents corresponding to documents not available or not published in one of the EPO's

official languages [B-VI, 6.2](#)

Conflict between abstract and source document [B-VI, 6.3](#)

Incorrect compound records in online databases [B-VI, 6.5](#)

Insufficient prior-art disclosures [B-VI, 6.4](#)

Decisions taken by the examining or opposition divisions [E-IX, 2.7](#)

Definitive content [F-II, 2.2](#)

Form and content [E-IX, 1.3](#), [F-II, 5.1](#)

Form and content of claims [F-IV, 2](#)

Intermediate publication of the contents of the priority application [F-VI, 2.4.1](#)

Non-patent literature arranged for library-type access [B-IX, 4.1](#)

Organisation and content of the documentation available to the search divisions [B-IX, 1.1](#)

Continuation

Continuation of proceedings [D-VII, 4.2](#)
 Continuation after a final decision [D-VII, 4.2.1](#)
 Continuation regardless of the stage reached in national proceedings [D-VII, 4.2.2](#)
 Continuation of the opposition proceedings in the cases covered by [Rule 84](#) [D-VII, 5](#)
 Continuation after the opposition has been withdrawn [D-VII, 5.3](#)
 Continuation in the case of surrender or lapse of the patent [D-VII, 5.1](#)
 Continuation on the death or legal incapacity of the opponent [D-VII, 5.2](#)

Contracting States

Contracting states to the EPC [General Part, 7](#)
 Designation of contracting states [A-III, 1.1](#), [A-IV, 1.3.4](#)
 Different claims, description and drawings for different States [G-IV, 6](#)
 Different texts in respect of different contracting states [H-III, 4](#)
 Limitation is different for different contracting states because the claims as granted were different for different contracting states [D-X, 10.2](#)
 Limitation results in the claims becoming different in different contracting states [D-X, 10.1](#)
 Opposition proceedings where the claims as granted are different for different contracting states [H-III, 4.5](#)
 Taking of evidence by courts or authorities of the contracting states [E-IV, 3](#)

Contribution to the known art [B-XI, 3.5](#)

Convention, on international exhibitions [A-IV, 3.1](#)

Conventional symbols [A-IX, 9](#)

Conversion [A-IV, 6](#)

Conversion fee [A-IV, 6](#)
 Conversion into a national application [A-IV, 6](#)
 Request for conversion [A-IV, 6](#)
 Request for conversion into a national application [A-IV, 6](#)

Co-operation (Legal ~) [E-IV, 3.1](#)

Copy

Copies to be made available with the search report [B-X, 11](#)
 "&" sign [B-X, 11.3](#)
 Citation of video and/or audio media fragments available on the internet [B-X, 11.6](#)
 Electronic version of cited document [B-X, 11.2](#)
 Patent family members [B-X, 11.3](#)
 Reviews or books [B-X, 11.4](#)
 Summaries, extracts or abstracts [B-X, 11.5](#)
 Copy of the previous application (priority document) [A-III, 6.7](#)
 Certified copy of the previous application (priority document) [F-VI, 3.3](#)

Electronic retrieval of priority documents [A-III, 6.7.2](#)
 Filing priority documents [A-III, 6.7.1](#)
 Copy of the priority application [A-II, 5.4.3](#), [A-II, 6.4.2](#)
 Correct application documents based on priority application, no change in the date of filing [A-II, 6.4.2](#)
 Missing parts of the description or missing drawings based on the priority application, no change in date of filing [A-II, 5.4.3](#)
 Copy of the search results for the priority or priorities [A-III, 6.12](#), [C-II, 5](#)
 Claim to priority [A-III, 6.12](#)
 Formal requirements to be met before the division starts substantive examination [C-II, 5](#)

Correct

Correct application documents based on priority application, no change in the date of filing [A-II, 6.4](#)
 Copy of the priority application [A-II, 6.4.2](#)
 Later-filed correct application documents or parts when priority is claimed [A-II, 6.4.1](#)
 Translation of the priority application [A-II, 6.4.3](#)
 Correct application documents or parts filed after the search has started [A-II, 6.7](#)
 Correcting an existing priority claim [A-III, 6.5.2](#)

Corrections [H-II, 2.6](#)

Amendments and corrections [Part H, H-II, 2.6](#)
 Amendments or corrections should be reasoned [C-V, 4.3](#)
 Amendments/corrections admitted and allowable - second [Rule 71\(3\)](#) communication sent [C-V, 4.6](#)
 Amendments/corrections filed in second [Rule 71\(3\)](#) period [C-V, 4.10](#)
 Correction and certification of the translation [A-VII, 7](#)
 Correction of deficiencies [A-III, 16](#)
 Period allowed for remedying deficiencies [A-III, 16.2](#)
 Procedure for formalities officers [A-III, 16.1](#)
 Correction of description, claims and drawings [H-VI, 2.2.1](#)
 Correction of erroneously filed application documents or parts [A-II, 6](#), [A-II, 6.1](#), [A-II, 6.2](#)
 Additional fee for pages [A-II, 6.8](#)
 Claims fee [A-II, 6.9](#)
 Correct application documents based on priority application, no change in the date of filing [A-II, 6.4](#)
 Correct application documents or parts filed after the search has started [A-II, 6.7](#)
 Date of filing changes [A-II, 6.3](#)
 On invitation [A-II, 6.1](#)
 Same-day corrections [A-II, 6.6](#)
 Withdrawal of correct application documents or parts [A-II, 6.5](#)
 Without invitation [A-II, 6.2](#)
 Correction of errors [A-V, H-VI](#)
 Amendment of application [A-V, 2](#)
 Communications concerning formal deficiencies [A-V, 1](#)
 Correction of errors in the decision to grant [C-V, 7](#)
 Correction of formatting/editing errors [H-VI, 4](#)
 Correction of the translations of the claims [H-VI, 5](#)
 Errors in publication [H-VI, 6](#)

Correction of errors in decisions [H-VI, 3](#)
 Admissibility [H-VI, 3.1](#)
 Allowability of the correction of bibliographic data [H-VI, 3.2](#)
 Correction of the decision to grant while opposition proceedings are pending [H-VI, 3.3](#)
 Procedural aspects [H-VI, 3.3](#)
 Correction of errors in documents filed with the EPO [A-V, 3](#), [H-VI, 2](#)
 Admissibility [H-VI, 2.1](#)
 Allowability [H-VI, 2.2](#)
 Missing parts of description, missing drawings or correction of erroneously filed application documents filed as corrections under [Rule 139](#) [H-VI, 2.2.2](#)
 Request for amendments or corrections in reply to the [Rule 71\(3\)](#) communication [C-V, 4](#)
 Request for amendments or corrections in reply to the [Rule 71\(3\)](#) communication, no payment of fees or filing of translations necessary [C-V, 4.1](#)
 Standard marks for indicating amendments or corrections by the divisions [C-V, An](#)
 Standard marks for indicating amendments or corrections by the divisions, further communication with the applicant [C-VIII, 5](#)
 Standard marks for indicating amendments or corrections by the divisions, further ways to accelerate examination [C-VI, 3](#)

"Corresponding documents" [B-X, 9.1.2](#)

Costs [D-IX, E-VI, 2.2.5](#)
 Appeal against the fixing of costs by the opposition division [D-IX, 2.2](#)
 Appeals against the apportionment of costs [E-XI, 3](#)
 Appeals against the decision of the opposition division on the fixing of costs [E-XI, 4](#)
 Charging of costs [D-IX, 1](#)
 Costs arising from oral proceedings or taking of evidence [E-IV, 1.9](#)
 Costs of taking evidence [E-IV, 3.5](#)
 Costs to be taken into consideration [D-IX, 1.3](#)
 Decision concerning the awarding of costs by the opposition division [D-II, 4.2](#)
 Decisions on the apportionment of costs [D-IX, 1.2](#)
 Enforcement of the fixing of costs [D-IX, 3](#)
 Fixing of costs by the opposition division [D-IX, 2.1](#)
 Procedure for the fixing of costs [D-IX, 2](#)

Could-would approach [G-VII, 5.3](#)

CPC classification of the application [B-V, 4](#)

Creations [G-II, 3.4](#)
 Aesthetic creations [G-II, 3.4](#)

Crediting

Crediting of fees paid voluntarily [C-V, 4.2](#)
 Crediting of fees under [Rule 71a\(5\)](#) [A-X, 11](#), [C-V, 6.3](#)
 Crediting of claims fees [A-X, 11.2](#)
 Crediting of fees under [Rule 71a\(5\)](#), further processing fee and crediting of fees [A-X, 11.4](#)
 Examining division resumes examination after approval of the text [C-V, 6.3](#)
 Fees [A-X, 11](#)

Separate crediting of the fee for grant and publishing and claims fees [A-X, 11.3](#)
 Crediting of the fee for grant and publishing [A-X, 11.1](#)
 Separate crediting of the fee for grant and publishing and claims fees [A-X, 11.3](#)

Criteria for admissibility of auxiliary requests [H-III, 3.3.2.1](#)

Criteria for admitting such amendments [H-II, 2.5.1](#)

Cross-references between prior-art documents [G-IV, 8](#)

Cross-sections [A-IX, 7.3](#)
 Hatching [A-IX, 7.3.2](#)
 Sectional diagrams [A-IX, 7.3.1](#)

Currencies [A-X, 3](#)

D

Data retrieval, formats and structures [G-II, 3.6.3](#)

Database management systems and information retrieval [G-II, 3.6.4](#)

Date

Date considered as date on which payment is made [A-X, 4](#)
 Automatic debiting procedure [A-X, 4.3](#)
 Deposit accounts with the EPO [A-X, 4.2](#)
 Payment by credit card [A-X, 4.4](#)
 Payment or transfer to a bank account held by the European Patent Organisation [A-X, 4.1](#)
 Date of filing [A-II, 4.1.5](#), [A-IV, 1.2.1](#), [G-VII, 2](#)
 Accorded date of filing and content of the application still subject to review [G-IV, 5.1.2](#)
 Applications containing claims filed after the accorded date of filing [B-XI, 2.2](#)
 Claims filed after accordance of a date of filing [C-III, 1.1.2](#)
 Claims filed after the date of filing [H-IV, 2.2.4](#)
 Correct application documents based on priority application, no change in the date of filing [A-II, 6.4](#)
 Date of filing as effective date [F-VI, 1.1](#)
 Date of filing or priority date as effective date [G-IV, 3](#)
 Documents published after the date of filing [B-VI, 5.4](#)
 Minimum requirements for according a date of filing [A-II, 4.1](#)
 Missing parts of the description or missing drawings based on the priority application, no change in date of filing [A-II, 5.4](#)
 Missing parts of the description or missing drawings filed under [Rule 56](#) after the date of filing [H-IV, 2.2.2](#)
 Of a divisional application [A-IV, 1.2.1](#), [A-IV, 1.2.2](#), [A-IV, 1.4.3](#), [A-IV, 2.5](#), [C-IX, 1.1](#), [C-IX, 1.4](#)
 Sequence listings filed after the date of filing [H-IV, 2.2.5](#)

Date of filing changes [A-II, 5.3](#), [A-II, 6.3](#)
 Correction of erroneously filed application documents or parts [A-II, 6.3](#)
 Late filing of missing drawings or missing parts of the description [A-II, 5.3](#)
 Date of filing of a divisional application [A-IV, 1.2](#)
 Priority claim of a divisional application [A-IV, 1.2.2](#)
 Date of interruption [E-VII, 1.3](#)
 Date of priority [A-IV, 1.2.1](#), [A-IV, 1.2.2](#), [A-IV, 2.5](#), [C-IX, 1.1](#), [C-IX, 2.1](#), [F-VI, 1.2](#), [G-IV, 3](#), [G-IV, 5.1](#)
 Date of publication [A-VI, 1.1](#)
 Date of receipt [A-II, 3.1](#), [A-II, 3.2](#)
 Date of receipt of the debit order [A-X, 4.2.4](#)
 Date of the stay of proceedings [A-IV, 2.2.2](#), [D-VII, 4.1.1](#)
 Stay of proceedings [D-VII, 4.1.1](#)
 Stay of proceedings for grant [A-IV, 2.2.2](#)

Dealing with different texts in examination [H-III, 4.1](#)

Death or legal incapacity [E-VII, 1.1](#)

Continuation on the death or legal incapacity of the opponent [D-VII, 5.2](#)

Debit

Debit orders filed with a competent national authority [A-X, 6.2.3](#)
 Debit orders for deposit accounts held with the EPO [A-II, 1.5](#)
 Debiting the deposit account [A-X, 4.2.3](#)

Decisions [C-VIII, 6](#), [D-VIII, 2](#), [E-X](#)

Basic principles of decisions [E-IX, 1](#)
 Binding nature of decisions on appeals [E-IX, 4](#)
 Correction of errors in decisions [H-VI, 3](#)
 Decision according to the state of the file [C-V, 15](#)
 Decision by means of a standard form [C-V, 15.2](#)
 Issuing a further communication (no refusal) [C-V, 15.4](#)
 Issuing a self-contained decision [C-V, 15.3](#)
 Request for a decision according to the state of the file [C-V, 15.1](#)
 Decision concerning the admissibility of an opposition, the patent proprietor being a party [D-IV, 5.5](#)
 Decision concerning the awarding of costs by the opposition division [D-II, 4.2](#)
 Decision on a notified loss of rights at the request of the person concerned [D-VIII, 2.3](#)
 Decision on closure of the opposition proceedings [D-VIII, 2.5](#)
 Decision on loss of rights [E-VIII, 1.9.3](#)
 Decision on re-establishment of rights [D-VIII, 2.4](#), [E-VIII, 3.3](#)
 Other decisions [D-VIII, 2.4](#)
 Re-establishment of rights [E-VIII, 3.3](#)
 Decision on request for revocation [D-X, 3](#)
 Decision on the documents on the basis of which the patent is to be maintained [D-VI, 7.2.2](#)
 Decision on the form of the opinion [E-IV, 1.8.1](#)
 Decision on the inadmissibility of an opposition or intervention [D-VIII, 2.1](#)
 Decision on the request and the taking of evidence [E-IV, 2.4](#)
 Decisions of the opposition division [D-VIII, 2](#)

Decisions of the opposition division [D-VIII](#)
 Final decisions on an admissible opposition [D-VIII, 1](#)
 Other decisions [D-VIII, 2](#)
 Decisions on the apportionment of costs [D-IX, 1.2](#)
 Decisions taken by the examining or opposition divisions [E-IX, 2](#)
 Analysing the parties' arguments [E-IX, 2.8](#)
 Authoritative text of documents [E-IX, 2.2](#)
 Content [E-IX, 2.7](#)
 Decision on the file as it stands [E-IX, 2.5](#)
 Facts and submissions [E-IX, 2.4](#)
 Late-filed submissions [E-IX, 2.10](#)
 Main and auxiliary requests [E-IX, 2.9](#)
 Reasoning of decisions [E-IX, 2.6](#)
 Refusal to admit amendments under Rule 137(3) [E-IX, 2.11](#)
 Requirements as to form [E-IX, 2.3](#)
 Right to be heard [E-IX, 2.1](#)
 Decisions which do not terminate proceedings [D-VIII, 2.2](#), [E-IX, 3](#)
 Decisions, notification [E-II, 2.1](#)
 Expiry of the term of the European patent [E-IX, 7](#)
 Form of decisions, communications and notices [E-II, 1.3](#)
 Information as to means of redress [E-IX, 5](#)
 Interlocutory decisions [E-IX, 3](#)
 Legal status of decisions [D-X, 8](#)
 Notification [E-IX, 6](#)
 Work within the examining division [C-VIII, 6](#)

Declaration of priority [A-III, 6.5](#), [F-VI, 3.2](#)

Correcting an existing priority claim [A-III, 6.5.2](#)
 Deficiencies in the priority claim and loss of the priority right [A-III, 6.5.3](#)
 Filing a new priority claim [A-III, 6.5.1](#)

Declaration replacing the translation [A-III, 6.8.6](#)

Defects in the certificate or the identification [A-IV, 3.2](#)

Deficiencies [A-II, 4.1.4](#), [A-III, 5.4](#)

Communication in the event of deficiencies as described in [D-IV, 1.2.1](#) which, if not remedied, will lead to the opposition being deemed not to have been filed [D-IV, 1.3.1](#)
 Communication in the event of deficiencies as described in [D-IV, 1.2.2](#) which, if not remedied, will lead to rejection of the opposition as inadmissible [D-IV, 1.3.2](#)
 Communications concerning formal deficiencies [A-V, A-V, 1](#)
 Correction of deficiencies [A-III, 16](#)
 Deficiencies in the priority claim and loss of the priority right [A-III, 6.5.3](#)
 Deficiencies which lead to the request being deemed not to have been filed [D-X, 2.1](#)
 Deficiencies which may no longer be remedied in accordance with Rule 77(1) and (2), resulting in the opposition being rejected as inadmissible [D-IV, 1.4.2](#)
 Deficiencies which may no longer be remedied, as a result of which the opposition is deemed not to have been filed [D-IV, 1.4.1](#)

Deficiencies which, if not remedied, lead to the opposition being deemed not to have been filed [D-IV.1.2.1](#)
 Deficiencies which, if not remedied, lead to the opposition being rejected as inadmissible [D-IV.1.2.2](#)
 Deficiencies under Rule 77(1) [D-IV.1.2.2.1](#)
 Deficiencies under Rule 77(2) [D-IV.1.2.2.2](#)
 Deficiencies which, if not remedied, lead to the request being rejected as inadmissible [D-X.2.2](#)
 Examination for deficiencies in the notice of opposition [D-IV.1.2](#)
 Examination for deficiencies in the notice of opposition and communications from the formalities officer arising from this examination [D-IV.1](#)
 Examination for deficiencies in the request [D-X.2](#)
 Formal deficiencies [B-IV.1.2](#)
 Issue of communications by the formalities officer as a result of examination for deficiencies [D-IV.1.3](#)
 Period allowed for remedying deficiencies [A-III.16.2](#)
 Subsequent procedure in the event of deficiencies which may no longer be remedied [D-IV.1.4](#)

Defined notice period [E-III.7.1.3](#)

Definitions [B-V.1](#)

Definition by functional and structural features [G-II.6.1.4](#)
 Definition by hybridoma [G-II.6.1.6](#)
 Definition by production process [G-II.6.1.5](#)
 Definition by reference to (use with) another entity [F-IV.4.14](#)
 Clarity objections [F-IV.4.14.1](#)
 Dimensions and/or shape defined by reference to another entity [F-IV.4.14.2](#)
 Definition by reference to the target antigen [G-II.6.1.2](#)
 Definition by structure of the antibody [G-II.6.1.1](#)
 Definition by target antigen and further functional features [G-II.6.1.3](#)
 Definition in terms of function [F-IV.6.5](#)
 Definition of essential features [F-IV.4.5.2](#)
 General remarks and definitions [G-II.5.1](#), [G-IV.1](#)

Definitive content [F-II.2.2](#)

Deletion of part of the claimed subject-matter [H-V.3.3](#)

Delivery of the decision [E-III.9](#)

Department responsible [D-VII.4.4](#), [D-X.4.1](#)

Procedure where the patent proprietor is not entitled [D-VII.4.4](#)

Substantive examination (limitation) [D-X.4.1](#)

Departments of the EPO (Taking of evidence by the ~) [E-IV.1](#)

Dependent claims [F-V.3.2.3](#), [G-VII.14](#)

Common dependent claims [F-V.3.2.4](#)

Dependent claims under Art. 54(5) [G-VI.6.1.5](#)

Handling of dependent claims under

Rule 62a [B-VIII.4.6](#)

Independent and dependent claims [B-III.3.7](#), [F-IV.3.4](#)

Search on dependent claims [B-III.3.8](#)

Support for dependent claims [F-IV.6.6](#)

Deposit

Debit orders for deposit accounts held with the EPO [A-II.1.5](#)

Deposit accounts with the EPO [A-X.4.2](#)

 Date of receipt of the debit order [A-X.4.2.4](#)

 Debiting the deposit account [A-X.4.2.3](#)

 Insufficient funds [A-X.4.2.4](#)

 Payments to replenish a deposit account [A-X.4.2.2](#)

Deposit of biological material [F-III.6.3](#)

 New deposit of biological material [A-IV.4.1.1](#)

Deposit of such [A-IV.4.1](#)

 Application filed by reference to a previously filed application [A-IV.4.1.2](#)

 New deposit of biological material [A-IV.4.1.1](#)

Refunds to a deposit account [A-X.10.3.1](#)

Safety provision for late replenishment of deposit accounts [A-X.6.2.2](#)

Derogations

Derogations from language requirements [D-III.4](#)

Derogations from the language of the proceedings in oral proceedings [A-VII.4](#), [E-V](#)

 Exceptions from sections 1 and 2 [E-V.3](#)

 Language of a contracting state or other language [E-V.2](#)

 Language used by employees of the EPO [E-V.5](#)

 Language used in the minutes [E-V.6](#)

 Language used in the taking of evidence [E-V.4](#)

 Use of an official language [E-V.1](#)

Derogations from the language of the proceedings in written proceedings [A-VII.3](#)

 Admissible non-EPO languages [A-VII.3.2](#)

 Documents filed as evidence [A-VII.3.4](#)

 Parties' written submissions [A-VII.3.1](#)

 Priority document [A-VII.3.3](#)

 Third-party observations [A-VII.3.5](#)

Description [A-II.4.1.3](#), [F-II.1](#)

Adaptation of the description [C-V.4.5](#)

Alteration, excision or addition of text in the description [H-V.2.6](#)

Amendment [B-VIII.6](#), [C-II.3.1](#), [C-III.2](#), [H-II.3.1](#), [H-IV.2.2.7](#), [H-V.2.2](#), [H-V.3.2](#), [H-V.3.2.1](#), [H-VI.2.1.1.1](#)

Amendments in the description [H-V.2](#)

Bringing the description into line with amended claims [H-V.2.7](#)

Cases of oral description [G-IV.7.3.1](#)

Citation of prior art in the description after the filing date [H-IV.2.2.7](#)

Claims with explicit references to the description or drawings [B-III.3.2.1](#)

Clarity of claims and support by the description [D-V.5](#)

Consistent use of reference signs in description, claims and drawings [A-IX.7.5.4](#)

Content [F-II.4.1](#)

Correction [A-V.3](#), [A-VI.1.3](#), [D-X.4.3.3](#), [H-VI.2](#), [H-VI.2.2](#)

Correction of description, claims and drawings [H-VI.2.2.1](#)

Description (formal requirements) [F-II.4](#)

 Background art [F-II.4.3](#)

Computer programs [F-II, 4.12](#)
 Industrial application [F-II, 4.9](#)
 Irrelevant matter [F-II, 4.4](#)
 Manner and order of presentation [F-II, 4.10](#)
 Physical values, units [F-II, 4.13](#)
 Reference in the description to drawings [F-II, 4.7](#)
 Reference signs [F-II, 4.8](#)
 Registered trade marks [F-II, 4.14](#)
 Rule 42(1)(c) vs Art. 52(1) [F-II, 4.6](#)
 Technical field [F-II, 4.2](#)
 Technical problem and its solution [F-II, 4.5](#)
 Terminology [F-II, 4.11](#)
 Description and drawings [C-IX, 1.5](#)
 Different description for different Contracting States [G-IV, 6](#)
 Errors in the description, claims and drawings [H-VI, 2.1.1.1](#)
 Features described in a document cross-referenced in the description [H-IV, 2.2.1](#)
 Late filing of missing drawings or missing parts of the description [A-II, 5](#), [A-II, 5.1](#), [A-II, 5.2](#)
 Matters to be determined by the division in cases of oral description [G-IV, 7.3.3](#)
 Missing parts of description, missing drawings or correction of erroneously filed application documents filed as corrections under Rule 139 [H-VI, 2.2.2](#)
 Missing parts of the description or missing drawings are completely contained in the priority application [A-II, 5.4.2](#)
 Missing parts of the description or missing drawings based on the priority application, no change in date of filing [A-II, 5.4](#)
 Missing parts of the description or missing drawings filed under Rule 56 after the date of filing [H-IV, 2.2.2](#)
 Non-prejudicial oral description [G-IV, 7.3.2](#)
 Reference to a previously filed application [A-II, 4.1.3.1](#)
 State of the art made available by means of oral description [G-IV, 7.3](#)
 State of the art made available to the public "by means of a written or oral description, by use, or in any other way" [G-IV, 7](#)
 Subject-matter taken from the description [H-IV, 4.1.2](#)
 Support in description [F-IV, 6](#)
 Tables in the description [A-IX, 11.2.1](#)
 Using the description and/or drawings to define clear terms given a definition different from their usual meaning [B-III, 3.2.4](#)
 Using the description and/or drawings to define unclear terms not defined in the claims [B-III, 3.2.3](#)
 Using the description and/or drawings to identify the technical problem [B-III, 3.2.2](#)
 Withdrawal of late-filed missing drawings or missing parts of the description [A-II, 5.5](#)

Designation

Designation fee [A-III, 11.2.1](#), [A-III, 11.2.2](#), [A-III, 11.2.4](#), [A-IV, 1.3.4](#), [A-IV, 1.4.1](#)
 Consequences of non-payment of the designation fee [A-III, 11.2.3](#)
 Designation fees, extension and validation fees [C-II, 4](#)
 European divisional application [A-III, 11.2.1](#), [A-IV, 1.3.4](#), [A-IV, 1.4.1](#)

European patent applications filed on or after 1 April 2009 [A-III, 11.2.2](#), [A-III, 11.2.4](#)
 Examination fee and designation fee [A-X, 5.2.2](#)
 Filing, search and designation fee [A-IV, 1.4.1](#)
 Indication of the purpose of the payment in the case of designation fees [A-X, 7.2](#)
 Payment of designation fee [A-III, 11.2.2](#)
 Designation of contracting states [A-III, 11](#), [A-IV, 1.3.4](#)
 European patent applications filed before 1 April 2009 [A-III, 11.3](#)
 European patent applications filed on or after 1 April 2009 [A-III, 11.2](#)
 Designation of inventor [A-III, 5](#), [A-IV, 1.5](#)
 Changing the order of inventors [A-III, 5.6](#)
 Deficiencies [A-III, 5.4](#)
 Designation filed in a separate document [A-III, 5.3](#)
 European divisional applications [A-IV, 1.5](#)
 Examination of formal requirements [A-III, 5](#)
 Incorrect designation [A-III, 5.5](#)
 Waiver of right to be mentioned as inventor [A-III, 5.2](#)
 Of Contracting States [A-IV, 1.3.4](#), [A-VI, 1.3](#), [C-V, 10](#)
 Withdrawal of application or designation [E-VIII, 8.1](#)
 Withdrawal of designation [A-III, 11.2.4](#)

Details and special features of the proceedings [D-VII](#)

Continuation of the opposition proceedings in the cases covered by Rule 84 [D-VII, 5](#)
 Intervention of the assumed infringer [D-VII, 6](#)
 Procedure where the patent proprietor is not entitled [D-VII, 4](#)
 Publication of a new specification of the patent [D-VII, 7](#)
 Request for documents [D-VII, 2](#)
 Sequence of proceedings [D-VII, 1](#)
 Transitional provisions for Art. 54(4) EPC 1973 and Art. 54(5) [D-VII, 8](#)
 Unity of the European patent [D-VII, 3](#)

Details of the entitlements of witnesses and experts [E-IV, 1.10.3](#)

Determination of filing date in the case of erroneously filed elements or parts of the international application [A-XV, 6.2](#)

Determination of the closest prior art [G-VII, 5.1](#)

Determination of the invention first mentioned in the claims [F-V, 3.4](#)

Determination of time limits [E-VIII, 1.1](#)

Determining priority dates [F-VI, 2](#)

Examining the validity of a right to priority [F-VI, 2.1](#)
 Priority claim not valid [F-VI, 2.3](#)
 Same invention [F-VI, 2.2](#)
 Some examples of determining priority dates [F-VI, 2.4](#)

Devising a search strategy [B-IV, 2.2](#)

Diagnostic methods [G-II, 4.2](#), [G-II, 4.2.1](#),
[G-II, 4.2.1.3](#)

Exceptions to patentability [G-II, 4.2](#)

Limitations of exception under Art. 53(c) [G-II, 4.2.1.3](#)

Methods for treatment of the human or animal body by surgery or therapy and diagnostic methods practised on the human or animal body [B-VIII, 2.1](#)

Surgery, therapy and diagnostic methods [G-II, 4.2](#)

Diagnostic uses under Art. 54(5) [G-VI, 6.1.3](#)

Diagrams (Sectional ~) [A-IX, 7.3.1](#)

Different categories [B-III, 3.10](#)

Claims in different categories [G-VII, 14](#)

Plurality of independent claims in different categories [F-V, 3.2.2](#)

Different sets of claims [D-X, 10](#)

Limitation is different for different contracting states because the claims as granted were different for different contracting states [D-X, 10.2](#)

Limitation results in the claims becoming different in different contracting states [D-X, 10.1](#)

Different text in respect of the state of the art according to Art. 54(3) EPC and Art. 54(4) EPC 1973 [H-III, 4.2](#)

Different text where a transfer of right takes place pursuant to Art. 61 in examination proceedings [H-III, 4.3.1](#)

Different text where a transfer of right takes place pursuant to Art. 61 or Rule 78 in respect of certain designated states [H-III, 4.3](#)

Different text where a transfer of right takes place pursuant to Art. 61 in examination proceedings [H-III, 4.3.1](#)

Different texts where a transfer of the patent in respect of certain designated states takes place in opposition proceedings [H-III, 4.3.2](#)

Opposition cases with different texts where a transfer of rights by virtue of a final decision pursuant to Art. 61 takes place in examination proceedings [H-III, 4.3.3](#)

Different texts in respect of different contracting states [H-III, 4](#)

Dealing with different texts in examination [H-III, 4.1](#)

Different text in respect of the state of the art according to Art. 54(3) EPC and Art. 54(4) EPC 1973 [H-III, 4.2](#)

Different text where a transfer of right takes place pursuant to Art. 61 or Rule 78 in respect of certain designated states [H-III, 4.3](#)

Different texts where national rights of earlier date exist [H-III, 4.4](#)

Opposition proceedings where the claims as granted are different for different contracting states [H-III, 4.5](#)

Different texts where a transfer of the patent in respect of certain designated states takes place in opposition proceedings [H-III, 4.3.2](#)

Different texts where national rights of earlier date exist [H-III, 4.4](#)

Different types of search report drawn up by the EPO [B-X, 2](#)

Difficulties in performing the invention [F-III, 5.3](#)

Dimensions and/or shape defined by reference to another entity [F-IV, 4.14.2](#)

Disclaimers [H-V, 4](#)

Disclaimer disclosed in the application as originally filed [H-V, 4.1](#)

Disclaimers not disclosed in the application as originally filed [H-V, 4.2](#)

Subject-matter to be excluded is disclosed in the application as originally filed [H-V, 4.2.2](#)

Subject-matter to be excluded is not disclosed in the application as originally filed (so-called undisclosed disclaimers) [H-V, 4.2.1](#)

Negative limitations (e.g. disclaimers) [F-IV, 4.19](#)

Disclosure

Cases of partially insufficient disclosure [F-III, 5](#)

Contents of prior-art disclosures [B-VI, 6](#)

Disclosures which have no date or an unreliable date [G-IV, 7.5.4](#)

Documents which refer to a non-written disclosure [B-X, 9.2.3](#)

Enabling disclosure [G-IV, 2](#)

Generic disclosure and specific examples [G-VI, 4](#)

Implicit disclosure and parameters [G-VI, 5](#)

Insufficient disclosure [D-V, 4](#)

Insufficient disclosure of the invention [D-V, 4](#)

Insufficient prior-art disclosures [B-VI, 6.4](#)

Internet disclosures [G-IV, 7.5](#)

Internet disclosures – technical journals [B-VI, 7](#)

Lack of support vs insufficient disclosure [F-IV, 6.4](#)

Non-prejudicial disclosure [B-VI, 5.5](#)

Of the invention [F-II, 4.1](#), [F-III, 1](#), [F-III, 2](#), [F-III, 3](#), [F-III, 6.1](#), [F-IV, 6.4](#)

Oral disclosure, use, exhibition, etc. as state of the art [B-VI, 2](#)

Subject-matter of the European patent extending beyond the original disclosure [D-V, 6](#)

Sufficiency of disclosure [F-III, F-III, 1](#)

Sufficiency of disclosure and clarity [F-III, 11](#)

Sufficiency of disclosure and inventive step [F-III, 12](#)

Sufficiency of disclosure and Rules 56 and

56a [F-III, 10](#)

Summary of the disclosure [F-II, 2.3](#)

Discoveries [G-II, 3.1](#)

Dislocation in delivery of mail [A-II, 1.6](#),
[E-VIII, 1.6.2.2](#)

Disparaging statements [A-III, 8.2](#), [F-II, 7.3](#)

Dispensing with the supplementary European search report [B-II, 4.3.1](#)

Display at an exhibition [A-IV, 3](#)

Certificate of exhibition [A-IV, 3.1](#)

Defects in the certificate or the identification [A-IV, 3.2](#)

Identification of invention [A-IV, 3.1](#)

Distinction between allowable and unallowable amendments [D-V, 6.2](#)

Divisional application [C-IX, 1](#), [H-IV, 2.3.2](#)

Abandonment of subject-matter [C-IX, 1.3](#)

Additional fee for divisional applications [A-III, 13.3](#)

Additional fee for divisional applications of second or subsequent generations [A-IV, 1.4.1.1](#)

Claims [C-IX, 1.6](#)

Date of filing of a divisional application [A-IV, 1.2](#)

Description and drawings [C-IX, 1.5](#)

European divisional application [A-IV, 1](#), [A-VII, 1.3](#)

European divisional applications, other formalities examination [A-IV, 1.7](#)

Examination of a divisional application [C-IX, 1.4](#)

Filing a divisional application [A-IV, 1.3](#), [C-III, 3.3](#)

Persons entitled to file a divisional application [A-IV, 1.1.3](#)

Priority claim of a divisional application [A-IV, 1.2.2](#)

Search, publication and request for examination of divisional applications [A-IV, 1.8](#)

Sequence listings of a divisional application [A-IV, 5.4](#)

Sequences of divisional applications [A-IV, 1.1.2](#)

Special applications [C-IX, 1](#)

Voluntary and mandatory division [C-IX, 1.2](#)

Where and how to file a divisional application [A-IV, 1.3.1](#)

Division's approach [F-V, 2.2](#)

Search division's approach [B-XI, 3.7](#)

Documents

Additional fee (if application documents comprise more than 35 pages) [A-III, 13.2](#)

Amended claims, missing parts (Rule 56) or erroneously filed application documents or parts (Rule 56a) [B-III, 3.3](#)

Amendment by submitting missing documents or by filing replacement pages [H-III, 2.2](#)

Application documents filed under Rule 56 EPC, Rule 56a EPC, Rule 20.5 PCT or Rule 20.5bis PCT [B-XI, 2.1](#)

Application documents filed under Rule 56 or Rule 56a [C-III, 1.1.1](#)

Application documents for the supplementary European search report [B-II, 4.3.3](#)

Authoritative text of documents [E-IX, 2.2](#)

Certified copies of documents from the files or of other documents [A-XI, 5.1](#)

Citation of documents corresponding to documents not available or not published in one of the EPO's official languages [B-VI, 6.2](#)

Citing documents not mentioned in the search report [C-IV, 7.5](#)

Correct application documents based on priority application, no change in the date of filing [A-II, 6.4](#)

Correct application documents or parts filed after the search has started [A-II, 6.7](#)

Correction of erroneously filed application documents or parts [A-II, 6](#), [A-II, 6.1](#), [A-II, 6.2](#)

Correction of errors in documents filed with the EPO [A-V, 3](#), [H-VI, 2](#)

"Corresponding documents" [B-X, 9.1.2](#)

Cross-references between prior-art documents [G-IV, 8](#)

Decision on the documents on the basis of which the patent is to be maintained [D-VI, 7.2.2](#)

Documents cited for other reasons [B-X, 9.2.8](#)

Documents cited in the application [B-X, 9.2.7](#)

Documents cited or supplied by the applicant [B-IV, 1.3](#)

Documents defining the state of the art and not prejudicing novelty or inventive step [B-X, 9.2.2](#)

Documents discovered after completion of the search [B-IV, 3.2](#)

Documents filed after filing the European patent application [A-VIII, 3.1](#)

Documents filed as evidence [A-VII, 3.4](#)

Documents filed in the wrong language [A-VII, 5](#)

Documents forming part of the European patent application [A-VIII, 3.2](#)

Documents found in the search [B-X, 9](#)

Categories of documents (X, Y, P, A, D, etc.) [B-X, 9.2](#)

Identification of documents in the search report [B-X, 9.1](#)

Identification of relevant passages in prior-art documents [B-X, 9.4](#)

Relationship between documents and claims [B-X, 9.3](#)

Documents in a non-official language [G-IV, 4](#)

Machine translations [G-IV, 4.1](#)

Documents making up the application, replacement documents, translations [A-III, 3.2](#)

Physical requirements of applications filed by reference to a previously filed application [A-III, 3.2.1](#)

Physical requirements of late-filed application documents or correct application documents or parts [A-III, 3.2.2](#)

Documents making up the European patent application [A-VIII, 2.1](#)

Documents open to file inspection [A-XI, 2.1](#)

Documents published after the date of filing [B-VI, 5.4](#)

Documents relating to the theory or principle behind the invention [B-X, 9.2.5](#)

Documents relevant only to other inventions [B-VII, 1.3](#)

Documents which refer to a non-written disclosure [B-X, 9.2.3](#)

Electronic retrieval of priority documents [A-III, 6.7.2](#)

Erroneously filed application documents or parts under Rule 56a [H-IV, 2.2.3](#)

Errors in documents [A-V, 3](#), [A-VI, 1.3](#), [H-VI, 2](#)

Errors in prior-art documents [G-IV, 9](#)

Evaluation of prior-art documents cited in the search report and late priority claim [C-III, 7](#)
 Excluded from file inspection [A-XI, 2.3](#), [D-II, 4.3](#)
 Filing of amended documents in reply to the notice of opposition [D-IV, 5.3](#)
 Filing of subsequent documents [A-VIII, 2.5](#)
 Filing priority documents [A-III, 6.7.1](#)
 Form of documents [A-VIII, 2](#)
 Form of documents, other documents [A-VIII, 2.3](#)
 Intermediate documents [B-VI, 5.2](#), [B-X, 9.2.4](#)
 Invitation to file amended documents [D-VI, 4.2](#)
 Language [A-VII, 5](#), [A-XIV, 6.3](#)
 Language of the documents cited [B-X, 9.1.3](#)
 Late receipt of documents [E-VIII, 1.7](#)
 Later-filed correct application documents or parts when priority is claimed [A-II, 6.4.1](#)
 Missing parts of description, missing drawings or correction of erroneously filed application documents filed as corrections under Rule 139 [H-VI, 2.2.2](#)
 Notification [E-II, 2.1](#)
 Particularly relevant documents [B-X, 9.2.1](#)
 Patent documents arranged for systematic searching [B-IX, 2](#)
 Physical requirements, other documents [A-III, 3.3](#)
 Potentially conflicting patent documents [B-X, 9.2.6](#)
 Priority documents [A-VII, 3.3](#), [A-XI, 5.2](#), [F-VI, 3.4](#), [H-IV, 2.2.6](#)
 Priority documents issued by the EPO [A-XI, 5.2](#)
 Procedure for amendments to documents [H-III, 2](#)
 Published European patent applications as "E" documents [B-VI, 4.1.1](#)
 Published international applications (WO) as "E" documents [B-VI, 4.1.2](#)
 Reference documents [F-III, 8](#), [H-V, 2.5](#)
 Relevant date for documents cited in the search report [B-VI, 5](#)
 Replacement documents and translations [A-VIII, 2.2](#)
 Request for documents [D-VII, 2](#)
 Signature of documents [A-VIII, 3](#)
 Standards and standard preparatory documents [G-IV, 7.6](#)
 Subsequent filing of documents [A-II, 1.4](#)
 Types of documents [B-IV, 2.3](#)
 Use of "P" and "E" documents in the search opinion [B-XI, 4.1](#)
 Withdrawal of correct application documents or parts [A-II, 6.5](#)

Double patenting [G-IV, 5.4](#)

Doubts about the state of the art [B-VI, 5.6](#)

Doubts about the validity of the priority claim [B-VI, 5.3](#)

Drawing up the search report [B-IV, 3.1](#)

Drawings [A-IX, F-II, 5](#)
 Amendments [A-V, 2.1](#), [A-V, 2.2](#), [A-VII, 2](#), [A-IX, 10](#), [C-I, 4](#), [C-II, 3.1](#), [G-IV, 3](#)
 Amendments derived from drawings [H-V, 6](#)
 Amendments to drawings [A-IX, 10](#)
 Claims with explicit references to the description or drawings [B-III, 3.2.1](#)

Conditions if drawings are filed on paper [A-IX, 3](#)
 Consistent use of reference signs in description, claims and drawings [A-IX, 7.5.4](#)
 Consistent use of reference signs in drawings [A-IX, 7.5.5](#)
 Content of a European patent application (other than claims) [F-II, 5](#)
 Conventional symbols [A-IX, 9](#)
 Correction [A-V, 3](#), [A-VI, 1.3](#), [H-VI, 2](#), [H-VI, 2.2](#)
 Correction of description, claims and drawings [H-VI, 2.2.1](#)
 Description and drawings [C-IX, 1.5](#)
 Different drawings for different Contracting States [G-IV, 6](#)
 Drawings of lines and strokes [A-IX, 7.1](#)
 Errors in the description, claims and drawings [H-VI, 2.1.1.1](#)
 Executing of drawings [A-IX, 7](#)
 Form [A-III, 13.2](#)
 Form and content [F-II, 5.1](#)
 General layout of drawings [A-IX, 5](#)
 Graphic forms of presentation considered as drawings [A-IX, 1](#)
 Graphic forms of presentation not considered as drawings [A-IX, 11](#)
 Grouping of drawings [A-IX, 2.1](#)
 Height of the numbers and letters in the drawings [A-IX, 7.5.3](#)
 Late filing of missing drawings or missing parts of the description [A-II, 5](#), [A-II, 5.1](#), [A-II, 5.2](#)
 Missing parts of description, missing drawings or correction of erroneously filed application documents filed as corrections under Rule 139 [H-VI, 2.2.2](#)
 Missing parts of the description or missing drawings are completely contained in the priority application [A-II, 5.4.2](#)
 Missing parts of the description or missing drawings based on the priority application, no change in date of filing [A-II, 5.4](#)
 Missing parts of the description or missing drawings filed under Rule 56 after the date of filing [H-IV, 2.2.2](#)
 Numbering of sheets of drawings [A-IX, 4.2](#)
 Photographs [F-II, 5.3](#)
 Presentation of the pages of drawings [A-IX, 4](#)
 Printing quality [F-II, 5.2](#)
 Prohibited matter [A-III, 8.1](#), [A-IX, 6](#), [B-IV, 1.2](#)
 Publication of drawings in the abstract [B-X, 7](#), [F-II, 2.4](#)
 Reference in the description to drawings [F-II, 4.7](#), [F-IV, 4.17](#)
 Representation of drawings [A-IX, 2](#)
 Reproducibility of drawings [A-IX, 2.2](#)
 Scale of drawings [A-IX, 7.4](#)
 Technical drawings [A-IX, 1.1](#)
 Text matter on drawings [A-IX, 8](#)
 Using the description and/or drawings to define clear terms given a definition different from their usual meaning [B-III, 3.2.4](#)
 Using the description and/or drawings to define unclear terms not defined in the claims [B-III, 3.2.3](#)
 Using the description and/or drawings to identify the technical problem [B-III, 3.2.2](#)
 Withdrawal of late-filed missing drawings or missing parts of the description [A-II, 5.5](#)

Due date [A-X, 5.1.1](#)
 Due date for fees [A-X, 5](#)
 Due date for specific fees [A-X, 5.2](#)
 Claims fees [A-X, 5.2.5](#)
 Examination fee and designation fee [A-X, 5.2.2](#)
 Fee for grant and publishing [A-X, 5.2.3](#)
 Fees for limitation/revocation, opposition, appeal, petition for review [A-X, 5.2.6](#)
 Fees payable for procedural and other requests [A-X, 5.2.7](#)
 Filing fee and search fee [A-X, 5.2.1](#)
 Renewal fees [A-X, 5.2.4](#)

Duration of the periods to be specified by the EPO on the basis of EPC provisions [E-VIII, 1.2](#)

Duties [E-XII, 3.2](#)
 Allocation of duties and appointment of members of the opposition division [D-II, 3](#)
 Allocation of individual duties [D-II, 7](#)
 Composition and duties of the examining division [E-XII, 3](#)
 Duties and powers of members [D-II, 6](#)

E

Economic effects [G-II, 4.1.3](#)

Effect of change in priority date [E-VIII, 1.5](#)

Effectiveness and efficiency of the search [B-III, 2.2](#)

Electronic

Electronic notification [E-II, 2.3](#)
 Electronic retrieval of priority documents [A-III, 6.7.2](#)
 Electronic version of cited document [B-X, 11.2](#)

Employees of the EPO (Language used by ~)
[E-V, 5](#)

Enabling disclosure [G-IV, 2](#)

End of search [B-IV, 2.6](#)

Enforcement of the fixing of costs [D-IX, 3](#)

Enlarged Board of Appeal (Stay of proceedings when a referral to the ~ is pending) [E-VII, 3](#)

Enlargement of the examining division [C-VIII, 7](#)

Enquiries [E-VIII, 7](#)

Entitlement

Entitlement for certain designated states only [C-IX, 2.4](#)
 Entitlement of parties to put questions at hearings [E-IV, 1.6.7](#)
 Entitlement to file the request [E-VIII, 3.1.2](#)
 Entitlement to oppose [D-I, 4](#)
 Entitlements of witnesses and experts [E-IV, 1.10](#)
 Details of the entitlements of witnesses and experts [E-IV, 1.10.3](#)

Expenses for travel and subsistence [E-IV, 1.10.1](#)
 Loss of earnings, fees [E-IV, 1.10.2](#)

EPO as designated or elected Office

Inspection of files [A-XIII, 10.3](#)

Erroneous elements filed under

Rule 20.5bis PCT [C-III, 1.3](#)

Erroneously filed application documents or parts under Rule 56a [H-IV, 2.2.3](#)

Errors

Error margins in numerical values [G-VI, 7.1](#)
 Errors in documents [A-V, 3](#), [A-VI, 1.3](#), [H-VI, 2](#)
 Correction of errors in documents filed with the EPO [A-V, 3](#), [H-VI, 2](#)
 Errors in prior-art documents [G-IV, 9](#)
 Errors in publication [H-VI, 6](#)
 Errors in the description, claims and drawings [H-VI, 2.1.1.1](#)
 Errors in the search report [B-IV, 3.3](#)

Essential features

Definition of essential features [F-IV, 4.5.2](#)
 Examples of essential features [F-IV, An.](#)
 Generalisation of essential features [F-IV, 4.5.3](#)
 Implicit features [F-IV, 4.5.4](#)
 Objections arising from missing essential features [F-IV, 4.5.1](#)

Essentially biological processes for the production of plants or animals

[G-II, 5.4.2](#)
 Plant and animal varieties or essentially biological processes for the production of plants or animals [G-II, 5.4](#)

Establishing the publication date [G-IV, 7.5.1](#)

Establishment and issue of the technical opinion [E-XII, 5.4](#)

Euro PCT

Euro-PCT applications [C-II, 1.2](#), [C-III, 1.2](#), [C-III, 1.3](#), [F-V, 7](#), [G-IV, 5.2](#), [H-IV, 4.2](#)
 Amendments in the case of non-unity, further procedural aspects concerning Euro-PCT applications [H-II, 6.4](#)
 Amendments relating to unsearched matter [H-IV, 4.2](#)
 Conflict with other European applications [G-IV, 5.2](#)
 International applications (Euro-PCT applications) [C-IX, 4](#)
 International applications with supplementary search [F-V, 7.2](#)
 International applications without supplementary search [F-V, 7.1](#)
 International preliminary examination report (IPER) [F-V, 7.3](#)
 Request for examination [C-II, 1.2](#)
 Restricted IPER [F-V, 7.4](#)
 Specific rules applicable to Euro-PCT applications [B-III, 3.3.2](#)
 Unity of invention [F-V, 7](#)

Euro-PCT cases [F-III, 6.5](#)

European divisional application [A-IV, 1](#), [A-VII, 1.3](#)

Authorisations [A-IV, 1.6](#)

Claiming priority [A-IV, 1.2](#)

Date of filing of a divisional application [A-IV, 1.2](#)

Designation of Contracting States [A-IV, 1.3.4](#)

Designation of the inventor [A-IV, 1.5](#)

European divisional applications, other formalities examination [A-IV, 1.7](#)

Fees [A-III, 11.2.1](#), [A-III, 13.1](#), [A-IV, 1.3.4](#), [A-IV, 1.4](#), [A-IV, 1.4.1](#), [A-IV, 1.4.3](#)

Filing [A-III, 14](#), [A-IV, 1.1](#)

Filing a divisional application [A-IV, 1.3](#)

Inspection of files [A-XI, 2.5](#)

Language [A-VII, 1.3](#)

Search, publication and request for examination of divisional applications [A-IV, 1.8](#)

European patent

Accelerated prosecution of European patent applications [E-VIII, 4](#)

Adherence to the text of the European patent submitted or approved by the patent proprietor [D-VI, 2](#)

Amendments [D-VIII, 1.4.1](#)

Certificate [A-XI, 5.1](#), [C-V, 12](#)

Claims fees payable before the grant of the European patent [A-X, 7.3.2](#)

Claims fees payable on filing the European patent application [A-X, 7.3.1](#)

Classification of the European patent application [B-X, 5](#)

Consultation of the European Patent Register [A-XI, A-XI, 4](#)

Content of a European patent application (other than claims) [F-II](#)

Conversion into a national patent [A-IV, 6](#)

Designation of the inventor [A-VI, 1.3](#)

Documents filed after filing the European patent application [A-VIII, 3.1](#)

Documents forming part of the European patent application [A-VIII, 3.2](#)

Documents making up the European patent application [A-VIII, 2.1](#)

European patent application [C-III, 1.1](#), [Part F](#)

European patent applications filed before 1 April

2009 [A-III, 11.3](#)

European patent applications filed on or after 1 April 2009 [A-III, 11.2](#)

European Patent Bulletin [A-III, 5.2](#), [C-V, 13](#)

Expiry of the term of the European patent [E-IX, 7](#)

Extension and validation of European patent applications and patents to/in states not party to the EPC [A-III, 12](#)

Factors affecting the unity of the European patent [D-VII, 3.2](#)

Grounds for opposition [D-III, 5](#)

Identification of the European patent application and the search report type [B-X, 4](#)

Indication that a European patent is sought [A-II, 4.1.1](#)

Infringement [E-XII, 1](#)

Inspection of files [A-XI, 1](#), [A-XI, 2.3](#)

Limitation of the option to withdraw the European patent application [A-IV, 2.3](#)

Maintenance of the European patent as amended [D-VIII, 1.4](#)

Opposition [D-I, 2](#), [E-IX, 7](#), [E-XIII, 4](#)

Payment or transfer to a bank account held by the European Patent Organisation [A-X, 4.1](#)

Preclassification, IPC and CPC classification of European patent applications [B-V](#)

Preparation of a decision to maintain a European patent in amended form [D-VI, 7.2](#)

Publication [C-V, 10](#), [C-V, 11](#)

Published European patent applications as "E" documents [B-VI, 4.1.1](#)

Register of European Patents [A-XI, 1](#)

Rejection of the opposition [D-VIII, 1.3](#)

Request from a national court for a technical opinion concerning a European patent [E-XIII](#)

Revocation of the European patent [D-VIII, 1.2](#)

Search for conflicting European patent applications [C-IV, 7.1](#)

Statement in the decision of the amended form of the European patent [D-VIII, 1.4.2](#)

Subject-matter of the European patent extending beyond the original disclosure [D-V, 6](#)

Term [E-IX, 7](#)

Text [D-VI, 2.1](#), [E-IX, 2.2](#)

Transfer during the opposition period or during opposition proceedings [E-XIII, 4](#)

Transfer of the European patent [E-XIII, 4](#)

Transfer of the European patent application [E-XIII, 3](#)

Unity [D-VII, 3.1](#)

Unity of the European patent [D-VII, 3](#)

European patent application [C-III, 1.1](#), [Part F](#)

Abstract [F-II, 1](#)

Accelerated prosecution of European patent applications [E-VIII, 4](#)

Additional fee [A-III, 13.2](#)

Amino acid sequences [A-III, 1.2](#)

Application documents [A-III, 13.2](#)

Application documents filed under [Rule 56](#) or [Rule 56a](#) [C-III, 1.1.1](#)

Assignment [E-XIII, 3](#)

Biological material [A-III, 1.2](#), [A-IV, 4.1.1](#), [A-IV, 4.2](#), [F-III, 6.3](#)

Claims ([Art. 84](#) and formal requirements) [F-IV](#)

Claims fees [A-III, 16.2](#)

Claims fees payable on filing the European patent application [A-X, 7.3.1](#)

Claims filed after accordance of a date of filing [C-III, 1.1.2](#)

Classification of the European patent application [B-X, 5](#)

Content of a European patent application (other than claims) [F-II](#)

Conversion into a national patent application [A-IV, 6](#)

Date of filing [A-III, 15](#), [A-IV, 1.2.1](#), [B-VI, 5.1](#)

Deficiencies [A-II, 4.1.4](#)

Designation of the inventor [A-VI, 1.3](#)

Documents filed after filing the European patent application [A-VIII, 3.1](#)

Documents forming part of the European patent application [A-VIII, 3.2](#)

Documents making up the European patent application [A-VIII, 2.1](#)

Drawings [F-II, 1](#), [F-IV, 1](#), [F-VI, 3.4](#), [G-IV, 3](#)
 European patent applications filed before 1 April 2009 [A-III, 11.3](#)
 European patent applications filed on or after 1 April 2009 [A-III, 11.2](#)
 Examination [C-II, 1](#)
 Extension and validation of European patent applications and patents to/in states not party to the EPC [A-III, 12](#)
 Filing [A-IV, 1.1](#)
 Filing fee [A-III, 13.1](#), [A-III, 13.2](#), [A-III, 16.2](#)
 Filing of the translation [A-III, 14](#), [A-III, 16.2](#), [A-VII, 1.1](#), [A-VII, 1.3](#), [A-VII, 7](#), [A-X, 9.3.1](#)
 Further processing [A-III, 5.4](#), [A-IV, 5](#), [A-VI, 2.3](#), [C-II, 1](#), [C-II, 1.1](#), [C-II, 1.2](#), [E-VIII, 2](#)
 Identification of the European patent application and the search report type [B-X, 4](#)
 Inspection of files [A-XI, 1](#), [A-XI, 2.3](#)
 International application as European patent application [A-XIII, 10.1](#)
 Languages [A-VII, 1.1](#)
 Limitation of the option to withdraw the European patent application [A-IV, 2.3](#)
 Nucleotide sequences [A-III, 1.2](#)
 Persons entitled to file European patent application [A-II, 2](#)
 Preclassification, IPC and CPC classification of European patent applications [B-V](#)
 Priority [F-VI](#)
 Provisional protection [A-XIII, 10.1](#)
 Publication [C-II, 1.2](#), [A-XIII, 10.1](#)
 Published European patent applications as "E" documents [B-VI, 4.1.1](#)
 Re-establishment of rights [A-III, 6.6](#)
 Refusal [A-III, 16.2](#)
 Request [A-VI, 2.2](#), [F-II, 1](#)
 Request for examination [C-II, 1](#)
 Requirements [F-II, 1](#)
 Search fee [A-III, 13.1](#), [A-III, 16.2](#)
 Search for conflicting European patent applications [C-IV, 7.1](#)
 State of the art [A-XIII, 10.1](#)
 Sufficiency of disclosure [F-III](#)
 Text [E-IX, 2.2](#)
 Transfer [E-XIII, 3](#), [E-XIII, 6.1](#)
 Transfer of the European patent application [E-XIII, 3](#)
 Unity of invention [B-II, 4.2](#), [B-VII, 1.1](#), [D-V, 2.2](#), [F-V, 1](#), [F-V, 2](#)

European patent applications filed before 1 April 2009 [A-III, 11.3](#)

European patent applications filed on or after 1 April 2009 [A-III, 11.2](#)
 Consequences of non-payment of the designation fee [A-III, 11.2.3](#)
 Designation fee [A-III, 11.2.1](#)
 Payment of designation fee [A-III, 11.2.2](#)
 Time limits [A-III, 11.2.1](#)
 Withdrawal of designation [A-III, 11.2.4](#)

European Patent Bulletin [A-III, 5.2](#), [C-V, 13](#)
 Mention of the publication of the European search report [A-VI, 2.1](#)

European Patent Organisation (Payment or transfer to a bank account held by the ~) [A-X, 4.1](#)

European patent specification

Mention of the inventor [A-III, 5.2](#)
 New [D-VII, 7](#)
 Publication [C-V, 10](#), [C-V, 11](#), [D-VII, 7](#)

European search report [A-VI, 1.3](#), [A-X, 9.5.1](#), [B-II, 4](#), [B-II, 4.3](#), [B-VII, 2.3](#), [B-X, 4](#), [B-X, 7](#), [C-II, 1.2](#), [C-II, 3.1](#), [C-IV, 7.3](#), [F-V, 7.1](#), [F-V, 7.2](#)

Application documents for the supplementary European search report [B-II, 4.3.3](#)

Content of the extended European search report (EESR) [B-VIII, 3.3](#), [B-VIII, 4.3](#)

Dispensing with the supplementary European search report [B-II, 4.3.1](#)

Mention of the publication of the European search report in the European Patent Bulletin [A-VI, 2.1](#)

Partial European search report [B-VII, 1.1](#), [B-VIII, 1](#), [B-VIII, 3](#), [B-X, 8](#), [F-III, 1](#)

Publication [A-VI, 2.4](#)

Response to the extended European search report (EESR) [B-XI, 8](#)

Separate publication of the European search report [A-VI, 1.5](#)

Subject-matter searched [B-VIII, 1](#), [B-VIII, 3](#), [B-X, 8](#)
 Supplementary European search report [A-X, 9.5.1](#), [B-II, 4.3](#), [B-VII, 2.3](#), [B-X, 4](#), [B-XI, 2](#), [B-XI, 8](#), [C-II, 1.2](#), [C-IV, 7.3](#), [F-V, 7.1](#), [F-V, 7.2](#)

Supplementary European search report is required [B-II, 4.3.2](#)
 Where the invention lacks unity [B-VII, 1.1](#), [B-VIII, 3.4](#), [B-VIII, 4.5](#)

European searches [B-II, 4.1](#)

Additional European searches [B-II, 4.2](#)
 Supplementary European searches [B-II, 4.3](#)

Evaluation of an expert opinion [E-IV, 4.7](#)

Evaluation of an inspection [E-IV, 4.8](#)

Evaluation of evidence [E-IV, 4](#)

Asking for evidence [E-IV, 4.4](#)
 Evaluation of an expert opinion [E-IV, 4.7](#)
 Evaluation of an inspection [E-IV, 4.8](#)
 Evaluation of the testimony of a witness [E-IV, 4.5](#)
 Evaluation of the testimony of parties [E-IV, 4.6](#)
 Examination of evidence [E-IV, 4.3](#)
 Types of evidence [E-IV, 4.2](#)

Evaluation of prior-art documents cited in the search report and late priority claim [C-III, 7](#)

Evaluation of the testimony of a witness [E-IV, 4.5](#)

Evaluation of the testimony of parties [E-IV, 4.6](#)

Evidence

Arguments and evidence submitted by the applicant [G-VII, 11](#)
 Asking for evidence [E-IV, 4.4](#)
 Conservation of evidence [E-IV, 2](#)

Costs arising from oral proceedings or taking of evidence [E-IV, 1.9](#)
 Costs of taking evidence [E-IV, 3.5](#)
 Decision on the request and the taking of evidence [E-IV, 2.4](#)
 Documents filed as evidence [A-VII, 3.4](#)
 Evaluation of evidence [E-IV, 4](#)
 Evidence taken by a competent court [E-IV, 3.2.2](#)
 Examination of evidence [E-IV, 4.3](#)
 Facts, evidence or amendments introduced at a late stage [E-III, 8.6](#)
 Facts, evidence or grounds not submitted in due time [E-VI](#)
 Language [A-VII, 3.4](#), [A-VII, 5](#), [E-VI, 3](#)
 Language used in the taking of evidence [E-V, 4](#)
 Means of evidence [E-IV, 1.2](#)
 Means of giving or taking evidence [E-IV, 3.2](#)
 Minutes of taking of evidence [E-IV, 1.7](#)
 New facts and evidence [E-VI, 2.2.1](#)
 Not submitted in due time [E-VI, 2](#), [E-VI, 2.2.1](#)
 Order to take evidence [E-IV, 1.4](#)
 Producing evidence [C-VII, 4.2](#)
 Request for the conservation of evidence [E-IV, 2.2](#)
 Taking and conservation of evidence [E-IV](#)
 Taking of evidence [C-VII, 4](#), [D-VI, 1](#), [D-VI, 7.1](#), [E-IV, 1.1](#), [E-IV, 1.3](#), [E-IV, 2.4](#)
 Taking of evidence by an appointed person [E-IV, 3.6](#)
 Taking of evidence by courts or authorities of the contracting states [E-IV, 3](#)
 Taking of evidence by the departments of the EPO [E-IV, 1](#)
 Taking of evidence on oath [E-IV, 3.2.1](#)
 Types of evidence [E-IV, 4.2](#)
 Written evidence [C-VII, 4.3](#)

Evident abuse [G-V, 3](#)

"Ex post facto" analysis [G-VII, 8](#)

Examination [C-II, 1](#)

Abstract in examination [F-II, 2.7](#)
 Accelerated examination [E-VIII, 4.1](#)
 Additional searches during examination [C-IV, 7.3](#)
 Amendments not admitted and/or not allowable, examination resumed [C-V, 4.7](#)
 Amendments not admitted and/or not allowable, examination resumed, no agreement reached on a text [C-V, 4.7.3](#)
 Auxiliary requests, in examination proceedings [H-III, 3.3](#)
 Basis for substantive examination [A-XIV, 6.3.2](#)
 Basis for the examination [D-VI, 2.1](#), [D-X, 4.2](#)
 By the examining division [A-III, 3.2](#), [A-VI, 2.4](#)
 Dealing with different texts in examination [H-III, 4.1](#)
 Different text where a transfer of right takes place pursuant to [Art. 61](#) in examination proceedings [H-III, 4.3.1](#)
 European divisional applications, other formalities examination [A-IV, 1.7](#)
 Examination as to formal requirements [A-III, A-III, 3.2](#)
 Abstract [A-III, 10](#)
 Claim to priority [A-III, 6](#)
 Claims fee [A-III, 9](#)
 Correction of deficiencies [A-III, 16](#)

Designation of contracting states [A-III, 11](#)
 Designation of inventor [A-III, 5](#)
 Extension and validation of European patent applications and patents to/in states not party to the EPC [A-III, 12](#)
 Filing and search fees [A-III, 13](#)
 Late filing of claims [A-III, 15](#)
 Physical requirements [A-III, 3](#)
 Prohibited matter [A-III, 8](#)
 Representation [A-III, 2](#)
 Request for grant [A-III, 4](#)
 Title of the invention [A-III, 7](#)
 Translation of the application [A-III, 14](#)
 Examination as to personal particulars [E-IV, 1.6.5](#)
 Examination as to *res gestae* [E-IV, 1.6.6](#)
 Examination by the EPO of its own motion [D-V, 2.2](#), [E-VI, E-VI, 1](#)
 External complaints [E-VI, 4](#)
 Late-filed submissions [E-VI, 2](#)
 Limits on the obligation to undertake examination [E-VI, 1.2](#)
 Observations by third parties [E-VI, 3](#)
 Examination fee [A-VI, 2.2](#), [A-VI, 2.5](#), [A-X, 10.2.3](#), [C-II, 1](#), [C-II, 1.1](#)
 Examination fee and designation fee [A-X, 5.2.2](#)
 Reduction in examination fee [A-VI, 2.6](#), [A-X, 9.3.3](#)
 Reduction of the examination fee where the international preliminary examination report is drawn up by the EPO [A-X, 9.5.2](#)
 Refund [A-VI, 2.5](#), [A-X, 10.2.3](#), [C-II, 1.1](#)
 Refund of examination fee [A-VI, 2.5](#), [A-X, 10.2.3](#)
 Examination for deficiencies in the notice of opposition [D-IV, 1.2](#)
 Deficiencies which, if not remedied, lead to the opposition being deemed not to have been filed [D-IV, 1.2.1](#)
 Deficiencies which, if not remedied, lead to the opposition being rejected as inadmissible [D-IV, 1.2.2](#)
 Examination for deficiencies in the notice of opposition and communications from the formalities officer arising from this examination [D-IV, 1](#)
 Forwarding of the notice of opposition to the formalities officer [D-IV, 1.1](#)
 Issue of communications by the formalities officer as a result of examination for deficiencies [D-IV, 1.3](#)
 Notifications to and observations by the patent proprietor [D-IV, 1.5](#)
 Subsequent procedure [D-IV, 1.6](#)
 Subsequent procedure in the event of deficiencies which may no longer be remedied [D-IV, 1.4](#)
 Examination for deficiencies in the request [D-X, 2](#)
 Deficiencies which lead to the request being deemed not to have been filed [D-X, 2.1](#)
 Deficiencies which, if not remedied, lead to the request being rejected as inadmissible [D-X, 2.2](#)
 Examination of a divisional application [C-IX, 1.4](#)
 Examination of amendments [C-IV, 5](#)
 Examination of amendments as to formalities [A-V, 2.2](#)
 Examination of evidence [E-IV, 4.3](#)
 Examination of novelty [G-VI, 6](#)
 First or further medical use of known products [G-VI, 6.1](#)

Second non-medical use [G-VI, 6.2](#)
 Examination of observations by third parties [C-VII, 6](#)
 Examination of oppositions [D-II, 4.1](#)
 Examination of replies and further stages of examination [C-IV](#)
 Admissibility of amendments made by the applicant [C-IV, 6](#)
 Extent of examination of replies [C-IV, 2](#)
 Further action upon examination of replies [C-IV, 3](#)
 General procedure [C-IV, 1](#)
 Later stages of examination [C-IV, 4](#)
 New submissions in reply to a summons [C-IV, 8](#)
 Search-related issues in examination [C-IV, 7](#)
 Examination of the admissibility of an intervention and preparations in the event of an intervention [D-IV, 5.6](#)
 Examination of the grounds for opposition [D-V, 2.2](#)
 Examination of the opposition during oral proceedings [D-VI, 6](#)
 Examination of the priority document [A-III, 6.4](#)
 Examination of the request for grant form [A-III, 4.2](#)
 Examination of the request for grant form, further requirements laid down by Rule 41(2) [A-III, 4.2.3](#)
 Information on the applicant [A-III, 4.2.1](#)
 Signature [A-III, 4.2.2](#)
 Examination on filing [A-II, 4](#), [A-III, 3.2](#), [C-II, 1](#)
 Filing of applications and examination on filing [A-II](#)
 Minimum requirements for according a date of filing [A-II, 4.1](#)
 Examination practice [G-II, 2](#)
 Examination procedure
 Admissibility in the examination procedure [H-II, 2](#)
 Admissibility in the examination procedure, after receipt of the first communication - Rule 137(3) [H-II, 2.3](#)
 Admissibility in the examination procedure, after receipt of the search report - Rule 137(2) [H-II, 2.2](#)
 Admissibility in the examination procedure, at an advanced stage of the proceedings [H-II, 2.4](#)
 Admissibility in the examination procedure, before receipt of the search report - Rule 137(1) [H-II, 2.1](#)
 Admissibility in the examination procedure, further requests for amendment after approval [H-II, 2.6](#)
 Substantive examination of a Euro-PCT application accompanied by an IPER [A-XIV, 6.3](#)
 Examination proceedings (ex parte) [E-III, 8.5.1.2](#)
 Examining division resumes examination after approval of the text [C-V, 6](#)
 Examining division resumes examination after approval of the text, further communication under Rule 71(3) [C-V, 6.2](#)
 Extent of the examination [D-V, 2](#)
 Final stage of examination [C-V](#)
 First stage of examination [C-III](#)
 Formal requirements to be met before the division starts substantive examination [C-II](#)
 Further action upon examination of replies, further action where a request for a translation of the priority application was sent earlier in examination proceedings [C-IV, 3.1](#)
 Influencing the speed of examination proceedings [C-VI, 2](#)
 International preliminary examination [A-XIV, 6.3.3](#)
 International preliminary examination report (IPER) [F-V, 7.3](#)

Invitation to file the translation before examination [A-III, 6.8.1](#)
 Invitation to file the translation in examination/opposition [A-III, 6.8.2](#)
 Late-filed requests after summons to oral proceedings in examination [H-II, 2.7](#)
 Minutes as the first communication in examination [C-VII, 2.5](#)
 Opposition cases with different texts where a transfer of rights by virtue of a final decision pursuant to Art. 61 takes place in examination proceedings [H-III, 4.3.3](#)
 Other procedures in examination [C-VII](#)
 Preliminary examination [E-XII, 5.2](#)
 Preparation of substantive examination [D-IV, 5](#)
 Procedure for the examination of the opposition [D-VI](#)
 Procedure in examination proceedings [E-III, 8.3.3.3](#), [E-III, 8.7.2](#)
 Procedure in the case of lack of unity during substantive examination [F-V, 5](#)
 Procedure up to substantive examination [D-IV](#)
 Purpose of examination [C-I, 4](#)
 Request for examination [C-II, 1](#)
 Request for examination and transmission of the dossier to examining division [A-VI, A-VI, 2](#)
 Response filed before first communication in examination [C-II, 3](#)
 Responsibility for formalities examination [A-I, 2](#)
 Scope of the examination [D-X, 4.3](#)
 Search and substantive examination [B-II, 1](#)
 Search at the examination stage [C-IV, 7.4](#)
 Search, publication and request for examination of divisional applications [A-IV, 1.8](#)
 Standard marks for indicating amendments or corrections by the divisions, further ways to accelerate examination [C-VI, 3](#)
 Substantive examination (limitation) [D-X, 4](#)
 Substantive examination (limitation), further stages of the examination [D-X, 4.4](#)
 Substantive examination of opposition [D-V](#)
 Summons to oral proceedings as the first action in examination [C-III, 5](#)
 Third-party observations during the examination [D-X, 4.5](#)
 Time limit for filing the request for examination [A-VI, 2.2](#)
 Time limits and acceleration of examination [C-VI](#)
 Use of Rule 137(4) for amendments filed during oral proceedings in examination [E-III, 8.8](#)
 When can a summons to oral proceedings be issued in substantive examination? [C-VIII, 5.1](#), [E-III, 5.1](#)
 When does the examining division resume examination after approval? [C-V, 6.1](#)

Examining

Examining division proposes amendments in second Rule 71(3) communication [C-V, 4.6.3](#)
 Examining division resumes examination after approval of the text [C-V, 6](#)
 Crediting of fees under Rule 71a(5) [C-V, 6.3](#)
 Examining division resumes examination after approval of the text, further communication under Rule 71(3) [C-V, 6.2](#)
 When does the examining division resume examination after approval? [C-V, 6.1](#)

Examining divisions, composition [C-VIII, 7](#)
Examining the validity of a right to priority [F-VI, 2.1](#)

Example 1 [G-VII, 5.4.2.1](#)

Example 2 [G-VII, 5.4.2.2](#)

Example 3 [G-VII, 5.4.2.3](#)

Example 4 [G-VII, 5.4.2.4](#)

Example 5 [G-VII, 5.4.2.5](#)

Example of a process not made publicly available [G-IV, 7.2.5](#)

Example of publicly available use [G-IV, 7.2.4](#)

Examples of applying the COMVIK approach [G-VII, 5.4.2](#)

Example 1 [G-VII, 5.4.2.1](#)

Example 2 [G-VII, 5.4.2.2](#)

Example 3 [G-VII, 5.4.2.3](#)

Example 4 [G-VII, 5.4.2.4](#)

Example 5 [G-VII, 5.4.2.5](#)

Examples of essential features [F-IV, An.](#)

Examples of further technical effects [G-II, 3.6.1](#)

Examples of quotation for non-patent literature [F-II, 4.3.1.1](#)

Examples of quotation for patent literature [F-II, 4.3.1.2](#)

Examples of the exercise of discretion under

Rule 137(3) [H-II, 2.3.1](#)

Rule 137(3) in conjunction with Art. 123(2) [H-II, 2.3.1.2](#)

Rule 137(3) in conjunction with Art. 83 [H-II, 2.3.1.1](#)

Rule 137(3) in conjunction with Art. 84 - missing essential feature [H-II, 2.3.1.3](#)

Rule 137(3) in conjunction with auxiliary requests [H-II, 2.3.1.4](#)

Examples relating to the requirement of inventive step [G-VII, An.](#)

Application of known measures? [G-VII, An., 1](#)

Obvious combination of features? [G-VII, An., 2](#)

Obvious selection? [G-VII, An., 3](#)

Overcoming a technical prejudice? [G-VII, An., 4](#)

Examples, no amended claims filed with the appeal [E-XI, 7.4.1](#)

Exceptional case where amendments must be admitted [H-II, 2.5.3](#)

Exceptions [D-VII, 1.2](#)

Exceptions from sections 1 and 2 [E-V, 3](#)

Exceptions to patentability [G-II, 4](#)

Considerations relating to specific exclusions from and exceptions to patentability [B-VIII, 2](#)

Matter contrary to "ordre public" or morality [G-II, 4.1](#)

Surgery, therapy and diagnostic methods [G-II, 4.2](#)

Exclusions and exceptions for biotechnological inventions [G-II, 5](#)

List of exceptions (Rule 28) [G-II, 5.3](#)

Excision of other inventions [C-III, 3.3](#)

Exclusions and exceptions for biotechnological inventions [G-II, 5](#)

General remarks and definitions [G-II, 5.1](#)

List of exceptions (Rule 28) [G-II, 5.3](#)

Microbiological processes [G-II, 5.5](#)

Patentable biotechnological inventions [G-II, 5.2](#)

Plant and animal varieties or essentially biological processes for the production of plants or animals [G-II, 5.4](#)

Executing of drawings [A-IX, 7](#)

Cross-sections [A-IX, 7.3](#)

Drawings of lines and strokes [A-IX, 7.1](#)

Numbers, letters and reference signs [A-IX, 7.5](#)

Scale of drawings [A-IX, 7.4](#)

Shading [A-IX, 7.2](#)

Variations in proportions [A-IX, 7.6](#)

Exhibitions

Certificate of exhibitions [A-IV, 3.1](#), [G-V, 4](#)

International exhibitions [G-V, 4](#)

Expenses for travel and subsistence [E-IV, 1.10.1](#)

Experts

Commissioning of experts [E-IV, 1.8](#)

Details of the entitlements of witnesses and experts [E-IV, 1.10.3](#)

Entitlements of witnesses and experts [E-IV, 1.10](#)

Hearing of parties, witnesses and experts [E-IV, 1.6](#)

Reimbursement for witnesses and experts [E-IV, 1.10.1](#), [E-IV, 1.10.2](#)

Reimbursement of expenses [E-IV, 1.10.1](#), [E-IV, 1.10.2](#)

Summoning of parties, witnesses and experts [E-IV, 1.5](#)

Taking of evidence [D-VI, 1](#), [E-IV, 1.3](#)

Witnesses and experts not summoned [E-IV, 1.6.2](#)

Expiry of the term of the European patent [E-IX, 7](#)

Expression "in" [F-IV, 4.15](#)

Extension [H-IV, 3.1](#), [H-V, 3.4](#), [H-V, 7](#)

Assessment of impermissible extension of the protection conferred [H-IV, 3.4](#)

Designation fees, extension and validation fees [C-II, 4](#)

Extension and validation of European patent applications and patents to/in states not party to the EPC [A-III, 12](#)

Extension and validation deemed

requested [A-III, 12.4](#)

National register [A-III, 12.5](#)

Time limit for payment of extension and validation fees [A-III, 12.2](#)

Withdrawal of the extension or validation request [A-III, 12.3](#)
 Extension and validation states [A-IV, 1.3.5](#)
 Extension of a time limit [E-VIII, 1.6](#)
 Extension of time limits set by the EPO under Rule 132 [E-VIII, 1.6.1](#)
 Extension of periods under Rule 134 [E-VIII, 1.6.2](#)
 Extension of periods under Rule 134(1) [E-VIII, 1.6.2.1](#)
 Extension of periods under Rule 134(2) and Rule 134(5) [E-VIII, 1.6.2.2](#)
 Scope of application of Rule 134 [E-VIII, 1.6.2.3](#)
 Extension to and validation in states not party to the EPC [General Part, 8](#)

Extent

Extent of examination of replies [C-IV, 2](#)
 Extent of generalisation [F-IV, 6.2](#)
 Extent of the examination [D-V, 2](#)
 Examination of the grounds for opposition [D-V, 2.2](#)
 Extent to which the patent is opposed [D-V, 2.1](#)
 Extent of the formalities officer's obligation to issue the above communications [D-IV, 1.3.3](#)

External complaints [E-VI, 4](#)

Extracts (Summaries, ~ or abstracts) [B-X, 11.5](#)

F

Factors affecting the unity of the European patent [D-VII, 3.2](#)

Facts

Facts and evidence
 New facts and evidence [E-VI, 2.2.1](#)
 Not submitted in due time [E-VI, 2](#)
 Facts and submissions [E-IX, 1.3.2](#), [E-IX, 2.4](#)
 Decisions taken by the examining or opposition divisions [E-IX, 2.4](#)
 Form and content [E-IX, 1.3.2](#)
 Facts, evidence or amendments introduced at a late stage [E-III, 8.6](#)
 Facts, evidence or grounds not submitted in due time [E-VI](#)
 Examination by the EPO of its own motion [E-VI, 1](#)
 External complaints [E-VI, 4](#)
 Late-filed submissions [E-VI, 2](#)
 Observations by third parties [E-VI, 3](#)

Failure to reply in time [B-VIII, 4.2.1](#)

Failure to respond within a time limit [E-VIII, 1.8](#)
 Time limits and loss of rights resulting from failure to respond within a time limit [E-VIII, 1](#)

Features described in a document cross-referenced in the description [H-IV, 2.2.1](#)

Features of the invention [F-IV, 2.1](#), [F-IV, 2.2](#), [F-IV, 4.5.1](#), [F-V, 2](#), [G-I, 1](#)

Fee for grant and publishing [A-X, 5.2.3](#), [C-V, 4.8.2](#)
 Crediting of the fee for grant and publishing [A-X, 11.1](#)
 Due date for specific fees [A-X, 5.2.3](#)
 Fees to be paid within the second Rule 71(3) period [C-V, 4.8.2](#)
 Refund of the fee for grant and publishing [A-X, 10.2.5](#), [C-V, 9](#)
 Separate crediting of the fee for grant and publishing and claims fees [A-X, 11.3](#)

Fee payments lacking a legal basis [A-X, 10.1.1](#)

Fee-related support measures for small entities and micro-entities [A-X, 9.2](#)

Fees [A-IV, 1.4](#), [A-X](#)

Additional search fees paid [C-III, 3.2.2](#)
 Administrative fees [A-XI, 1](#), [A-XI, 2.2](#), [E-XIII, 3](#)
 Applicant has not paid all further search fees [B-VII, 1.2.3](#)
 Calculation of claims fees [H-III, 5](#)
 Cases under Rule 62a where claims fees have not been paid [B-VIII, 4.4](#)
 Claims fees due in response to Rule 71(3) communication [C-V, 1.4](#)
 Claims fees payable before the grant of the European patent [A-X, 7.3.2](#)
 Claims fees payable on filing the European patent application [A-X, 7.3.1](#)
 Crediting of claims fees [A-X, 11.2](#)
 Crediting of fees paid voluntarily [C-V, 4.2](#)
 Crediting of fees under Rule 71a(5) [A-X, 11](#)
 Crediting of fees under Rule 71a(5), further processing fee and crediting of fees [A-X, 11.4](#)
 Currencies [A-X, 3](#)
 Date considered as date on which payment is made [A-X, 4](#)
 Designation fees, extension and validation fees [C-II, 4](#)
 Due date for fees [A-X, 5](#)
 Due date for specific fees [A-X, 5.2](#)
 Fees concerned [A-X, 9.4.2](#)
 Fees for limitation/revocation, opposition, appeal, petition for review [A-X, 5.2.6](#)
 Fees paid by bank transfer - application of Art. 7(3) and (4) RFees [A-X, 6.2.1](#)
 Fees payable for procedural and other requests [A-X, 5.2.7](#)
 Fees to be paid within the second Rule 71(3) period [C-V, 4.8](#)
 Claims fees [C-V, 4.8.1](#)
 Fee for grant and publishing [C-V, 4.8.2](#)
 Filing and search fees [A-III, 13](#)
 Filing, search and designation fee [A-IV, 1.4.1](#)
 Indication of the purpose of payment in the case of claims fees [A-X, 7.3](#)
 Indication of the purpose of the payment in the case of designation fees [A-X, 7.2](#)

Invitation to pay additional search fees combined with invitation to restrict the scope of the search [C-III, 3.2.3](#)
 Invitation to pay further search fees [B-VII, 1.2](#)
 Late payment of fees [A-X, 6.2](#)
 Limitation to searched invention, no additional search fees paid [C-III, 3.2.1](#)
 Loss of earnings, fees [E-IV, 1.10.2](#)
 Methods of payment [A-X, 2](#)
 No deferred payment of fees, no legal aid, no discretion [A-X, 8](#)
 Payment in due time [A-X, 6](#)
 Payment of fees [A-X, 2, A-X, 4.4](#)
 Purpose of payment [A-X, 7](#)
 Reduction of fees [A-X, 9](#)
 Refund [A-X, 10.2.1, B-VII, 2.1, C-III, 3.4](#)
 Refund of additional search fees [C-III, 3.4](#)
 Refund of fees [A-X, 10](#)
 Reimbursement of appeal fees [E-XI, 7.3](#)
 Renewal fees [A-IV, 1.4.3](#)
 Request for amendments or corrections in reply to the [Rule 71\(3\)](#) communication, no payment of fees or filing of translations necessary [C-V, 4.1](#)
 Request for refund of further search fees [B-VII, 2.1](#)
 Separate crediting of the fee for grant and publishing and claims fees [A-X, 11.3](#)
 Time limit for payment of extension and validation fees [A-III, 12.2](#)

Figure accompanying the abstract [A-III, 10.3, A-IX, 2.3, F-II, 2.4](#)
 Abstract [A-III, 10.3](#)
 Representation of drawings [A-IX, 2.3](#)

Figures (Numbering of ~) [A-IX, 5.2](#)

File inspection [E-XII, 5.5](#)
 Conducting file inspections [A-XI, 2.2](#)
 Documents open to file inspection [A-XI, 2.1](#)
 File inspection before publication of the application [A-XI, 2.5](#)
 Restrictions to file inspection [A-XI, 2.3](#)

Files

Certified copies of documents from the files or of other documents [A-XI, 5.1](#)
 Communication of information contained in the files [A-XI, 1, A-XI, 3](#)
 Inspection of files [A-XI, A-XI, 1, A-XI, 2, A-XI, 2.1, A-XIII, 10.3](#)

Filing

Accorded date of filing and content of the application still subject to review [G-IV, 5.1.2](#)
 Admissible languages on filing [A-VII, 1](#)
 Amendment by submitting missing documents or by filing replacement pages [H-III, 2.2](#)
 Applications containing claims filed after the accorded date of filing [B-XI, 2.2](#)
 Citation of prior art in the description after the filing date [H-IV, 2.2.7](#)
 Claims fees payable on filing the European patent application [A-X, 7.3.1](#)
 Claims filed after accordance of a date of filing [C-III, 1.1.2](#)

Claims filed after the date of filing [H-IV, 2.2.4](#)
 Correct application documents based on priority application, no change in the date of filing [A-II, 6.4](#)
 Date of filing [A-II, 4.1.5, A-IV, 1.2.1, G-VII, 2](#)
 Date of filing as effective date [F-VI, 1.1](#)
 Date of filing changes [A-II, 5.3, A-II, 6.3](#)
 Date of filing of a divisional application [A-IV, 1.2](#)
 Date of filing or priority date as effective date [G-IV, 3](#)
 Determination of filing date in the case of erroneously filed elements or parts of the international application [A-XV, 6.2](#)
 Documents filed after filing the European patent application [A-VIII, 3.1](#)
 Filing a divisional application [A-IV, 1.3, C-III, 3.3](#)
 Designation of contracting states [A-IV, 1.3.4](#)
 Extension and validation states [A-IV, 1.3.5](#)
 Language requirements [A-IV, 1.3.3](#)
 Request for grant [A-IV, 1.3.2](#)
 Where and how to file a divisional application [A-IV, 1.3.1](#)
 Filing a new application [A-IV, 2.5](#)
 Filing a new priority claim [A-III, 6.5.1](#)
 Filing and priority date [B-VI, 5](#)
 Documents published after the date of filing [B-VI, 5.4](#)
 Doubts about the state of the art [B-VI, 5.6](#)
 Doubts about the validity of the priority claim [B-VI, 5.3](#)
 Intermediate documents [B-VI, 5.2](#)
 Non-prejudicial disclosures [B-VI, 5.5](#)
 Verification of claimed priority dates [B-VI, 5.1](#)
 Widening of the search [B-VI, 5.3](#)
 Filing and search fees [A-III, 13](#)
 Additional fee (if application documents comprise more than 35 pages) [A-III, 13.2](#)
 Additional fee for divisional applications [A-III, 13.3](#)
 Payment of fees [A-III, 13.1](#)
 Filing by reference [A-VII, 1.2](#)
 Filing fee [A-III, 13.1, A-III, 13.2, A-III, 16.2](#)
 Additional fee as part of filing fee [A-III, 13.2, A-III, 13.3](#)
 European divisional application [A-III, 13.1, A-IV, 1.4.1](#)
 Filing fee and search fee [A-X, 5.2.1](#)
 Reduction of the filing fee [A-X, 9.3.2](#)
 Filing of amended documents in reply to the notice of opposition [D-IV, 5.3](#)
 Filing of amendments [A-V, 2.1](#)
 Filing of applications and examination on filing [A-II](#)
 Correction of erroneously filed application documents or parts [A-II, 6](#)
 Examination on filing [A-II, 4](#)
 Late filing of missing drawings or missing parts of the description [A-II, 5](#)
 Persons entitled to file an application [A-II, 2](#)
 Procedure on filing [A-II, 3](#)
 Where and how applications may be filed [A-II, 1](#)
 Filing of applications by delivery by hand or by postal services [A-II, 1.2](#)
 Filing of applications by means of electronic communication [A-II, 1.1](#)
 Filing of applications by fax [A-II, 1.1.2](#)
 Filing of applications in electronic form [A-II, 1.1.1](#)
 Filing of applications by other means [A-II, 1.3](#)

Filing of opposition after decision on limitation [D-X, 7.2](#)
 Filing of subsequent documents [A-VIII, 2.5](#)
 Filing priority documents [A-III, 6.7.1](#)
 Filing with a competent national authority [A-II, 3.2](#)
 Filing, search and designation fee [A-IV, 1.4.1](#)
 Additional fee for divisional applications of second
 or subsequent generations [A-IV, 1.4.1.1](#)
 First filing [A-III, 6.1](#), [A-III, 6.2](#), [E-VIII, 8.1](#), [F-VI, 1.3](#),
[F-VI, 1.4.1](#)
 Late filing of claims [A-III, 15](#)
 Minimum requirements for according a date of
 filing [A-II, 4.1](#)
 Missing parts of the description or missing drawings
 based on the priority application, no change in date of
 filing [A-II, 5.4](#)
 Missing parts of the description or missing drawings
 filed under [Rule 56](#) after the date of filing [H-IV, 2.2.2](#)
 Request for amendments or corrections in reply to the
[Rule 71\(3\)](#) communication, no payment of fees or filing
 of translations necessary [C-V, 4.1](#)
 Sequence listings filed after the date of
 filing [H-IV, 2.2.5](#)
 Subsequent filing of documents [A-II, 1.4](#)
 Time allowed for filing notice of opposition [D-III, 1](#)
 Time limit for filing the request for
 examination [A-VI, 2.2](#)
 Voluntary filing of the translation of the previous
 application [A-III, 6.8.5](#)

Final decisions on an admissible opposition [D-VIII, 1](#)

Maintenance of the European patent as
 amended [D-VIII, 1.4](#)
 Rejection of the opposition [D-VIII, 1.3](#)
 Revocation of the European patent [D-VIII, 1.2](#)

Final stage of examination [C-V](#)

Application deemed withdrawn [C-V, 3](#)
 Approval of the proposed text [C-V, 2](#)
 Certificate [C-V, 12](#)
 Communication under [Rule 71\(3\)](#) [C-V, 1](#)
 Correction of errors in the decision to grant [C-V, 7](#)
 Decision according to the state of the file [C-V, 15](#)
 European Patent Bulletin [C-V, 13](#)
 Examining division resumes examination after approval
 of the text [C-V, 6](#)
 Further processing [C-V, 8](#)
 Further requests for amendment after approval [C-V, 5](#)
 Grant of a patent [C-V, 2](#)
 No reply in time [C-V, 3](#)
 Publication of the patent specification [C-V, 10](#)
 Refund of the fee for grant and publishing [C-V, 9](#)
 Refusal [C-V, 14](#)
 Request for amendments or corrections in reply to the
[Rule 71\(3\)](#) communication [C-V, 4](#)
 Standard marks for indicating amendments or
 corrections by the divisions [C-V, An](#)
 Withdrawal before publication of the patent
 specification [C-V, 11](#)

First application [F-VI, 1.4](#)

Subsequent application considered as first
 application [F-VI, 1.4.1](#)

Where it is necessary to check whether the application
 from which priority is actually claimed is the "first
 application" within the meaning of
[Art. 87\(1\)](#) [F-VI, 2.4.4](#)

First communication [C-III, 4](#)

Admissibility in the examination procedure, after receipt
 of the first communication - [Rule 137\(3\)](#) [H-II, 2.3](#)
 Invitation to file comments and amendments [C-III, 4.2](#)
 Minutes as the first communication in
 examination [C-VII, 2.5](#)
 Reasoning [C-III, 4.1](#)
 Response filed before first communication in
 examination [C-II, 3](#)

First or further medical use of known products [G-VI, 6.1](#)

Dependent claims under [Art. 54\(5\)](#) [G-VI, 6.1.5](#)
 Diagnostic uses under [Art. 54\(5\)](#) [G-VI, 6.1.3](#)
 Products that may be claimed for a further medical
 use [G-VI, 6.1.1](#)
 Surgical uses under [Art. 54\(5\)](#) [G-VI, 6.1.4](#)
 Therapeutic uses pursuant to [Art. 54\(5\)](#) [G-VI, 6.1.2](#)

First stage of examination [C-III](#)

Amendments made by applicants of their own
 volition [C-III, 2](#)
 Evaluation of prior-art documents cited in the search
 report and late priority claim [C-III, 7](#)
 First communication [C-III, 4](#)
 Missing parts or elements [C-III, 1](#)
 Requesting information on prior art (not confined to
 priority) [C-III, 6](#)
 Summons to oral proceedings as the first action in
 examination [C-III, 5](#)
 Unity of invention [C-III, 3](#)

Fixing of costs

Appeals against the decision of the opposition division
 on the fixing of costs [E-XI, 4](#)
 Enforcement of the fixing of costs [D-IX, 3](#)
 Fixing of costs by the opposition division [D-IX, 2.1](#)
 Appeal against the fixing of costs by the opposition
 division [D-IX, 2.2](#)
 Procedure for the fixing of costs [D-IX, 2](#)

Form [B-X, 3.1](#)

Decision by means of a standard form [C-V, 15.2](#)
 Decision on the form of the opinion [E-IV, 1.8.1](#)
 Documents forming part of the European patent
 application [A-VIII, 3.2](#)
 Examination of the request for grant form [A-III, 4.2](#)
 Examination of the request for grant form, further
 requirements laid down by [Rule 41\(2\)](#) [A-III, 4.2.3](#)
 Filing of applications in electronic form [A-II, 1.1.1](#)
 Form and content [E-IX, 1.3](#), [F-II, 5.1](#)
 Basic principles of decisions [E-IX, 1.3](#)
 Drawings [F-II, 5.1](#)
 Facts and submissions [E-IX, 1.3.2](#)
 Order [E-IX, 1.3.1](#)
 Reasoning [E-IX, 1.3.3](#)
 Form and content of claims [F-IV, 2](#)
 Formulae and tables [F-IV, 2.4](#)
 Technical features [F-IV, 2.1](#)

Two-part form F-IV.2.2
 Two-part form unsuitable F-IV.2.3
 Form and language of the search report B-X.3
 Form B-X.3.1
 Language B-X.3.2
 Record of search strategy B-X.3.4
 Search summary B-X.3.3
 Form of decisions, communications and notices E-II.1.3
 Form of documents A-VIII.2
 Documents making up the European patent application A-VIII.2.1
 Filing of subsequent documents A-VIII.2.5
 Form of documents, other documents A-VIII.2.3
 Number of copies A-VIII.2.4
 Replacement documents and translations A-VIII.2.2
 Form of signature A-VIII.3.3
 Form of the opposition D-III.3.1
 Form of the request and applicable time limit E-VIII.3.1.3
 Graphic forms of presentation considered as drawings A-IX.1
 Graphic forms of presentation not considered as drawings A-IX.1.1
 Preparation of a decision to maintain a European patent in amended form D-VI.7.2
 Publication in electronic form only A-VI.1.4
 Requirements as to form E-IX.2.3
 Statement in the decision of the amended form of the European patent D-VIII.1.4.2
 Time limit and form of appeal E-XI.6
 Two-part form unsuitable, no two-part form F-IV.2.3.1
 Two-part form "wherever appropriate" F-IV.2.3.2

Formal

Formal deficiencies B-IV.1.2
 Communications concerning formal deficiencies A-V. A-V.1
 Formal procedure for limitation when the request is allowable D-X.5
 Formal requirements A-III.1.1, E-III.10.1
 Claims (Art. 84 and formal requirements) F-IV
 Description (formal requirements) F-II.4
 Examination as to formal requirements A-III, A-III.3.2
 Formal requirements to be met before the division starts substantive examination C-II
 Allocation of the application C-II.2
 Copy of the search results on the priority or priorities C-II.5
 Designation fees, extension and validation fees C-II.4
 Request for examination C-II.1
 Response filed before first communication in examination C-II.3

Formalities check E-XII.5.1

Formalities examination

European divisional applications, other formalities examination A-IV.1.7
 Responsibility for formalities examination A-I.2

Format of background art citations F-II.4.3.1
 Examples of quotation for non-patent literature F-II.4.3.1.1
 Examples of quotation for patent literature F-II.4.3.1.2

Format of oral proceedings E-III.1.2

Formulae and tables F-IV.2.4

Formulation of the objective technical

problem G-VII.5.2
 Formulation of the objective technical problem for claims comprising technical and non-technical features G-VII.5.4.1

Forwarding of applications A-II.1.6

Forwarding of the notice of opposition to the formalities officer D-IV.1.1

Functional definition of a pathological condition F-IV.4.21

Further action upon examination of replies C-IV.3

Further action upon examination of replies, further action where a request for a translation of the priority application was sent earlier in examination proceedings C-IV.3.1

Further processing C-V.8, E-VIII.2

Crediting of fees under Rule 71a(5), further processing fee and crediting of fees A-X.11.4

Further requests for amendment after approval C-V.5

Admissibility in the examination procedure, further requests for amendment after approval H-II.2.6

G

Games G-II.3.5.2

Schemes, rules and methods for performing mental acts, playing games or doing business G-II.3.5
 Schemes, rules and methods for playing games G-II.3.5.2

General authorisation A-VIII.1.8

General considerations B-III.3.3.1, C-VI.1.1

Amended claims, missing parts (Rule 56) or erroneously filed application documents or parts (Rule 56a) B-III.3.3.1
 Time limits for response to communications from the examiner C-VI.1.1

General layout of drawings A-IX.5

Numbering of figures A-IX.5.2
 Page-setting A-IX.5.1
 Whole figure A-IX.5.3

General Part General Part

Contracting states to the EPC General Part.7

Explanatory notes [General Part, 2](#)
 Extension to and validation in states not party to the EPC [General Part, 8](#)
 Preliminary remarks [General Part, 1](#)
 Summary of the processing of applications and patents at the EPO [General Part, 6](#)
 Unitary Patent protection [General Part, 9](#)
 Work at the EPO [General Part, 4](#)

General principle [D-IX, 1.1](#)
 General principles in opposition proceedings [E-VI, 2.1](#)

General remarks and definitions [G-II, 5.1](#), [G-IV, 1](#)

General rule for SI derived units [F-II, An. 2, 1.2.1](#)

General statements, "spirit of the invention", claim-like clauses [F-IV, 4.4](#)

General, further checks [A-III, 1.2](#)

Generalisation of essential features [F-IV, 4.5.3](#)

Generic disclosure and specific examples [G-VI, 4](#)

Grant

Grant and publishing fee [C-V, 1.2](#)
 Grant of a European patent
 Mention in the European Patent Bulletin [C-V, 2, C-V, 13](#)
 Request for the grant [A-III, 11.1](#), [A-VI, 2.2](#), [F-II, 1](#)
 Grant of a patent [C-V, 2](#)
 Request for unitary effect [C-V, 2.1](#)

Graphic forms of presentation considered as drawings [A-IX, 1](#)

Photographs [A-IX, 1.2](#)
 Technical drawings [A-IX, 1.1](#)

Graphic forms of presentation not considered as drawings [A-IX, 11](#)

Chemical and mathematical formulae [A-IX, 11.1](#)
 Tables [A-IX, 11.2](#)

Grounds for opposition [D-III, 5](#)

Amendments not related to the grounds for opposition [H-II, 3.2](#)
 Amendments related to the grounds for opposition [H-II, 3.1](#)
 Examination of the grounds for opposition [D-V, 2.2](#)

Grouping of drawings [A-IX, 2.1](#)

Grouping of inventions [F-V, 3.2](#)

Claims for a known substance for a number of distinct medical uses [F-V, 3.2.6](#)
 Common dependent claims [F-V, 3.2.4](#)
 Dependent claims [F-V, 3.2.3](#)
 Intermediate and final products [F-V, 3.2.7](#)
 Markush grouping (alternatives in a single claim) [F-V, 3.2.5](#)
 Plurality of independent claims in different categories [F-V, 3.2.2](#)

Plurality of independent claims in the same category [F-V, 3.2.1](#)

Guidance to persons heard [E-IV, 1.6.3](#)

H

Handling of dependent claims under Rule 62a [B-VIII, 4.6](#)

Handwritten amendments in oral proceedings [E-III, 8.7](#)

Procedure in examination proceedings [E-III, 8.7.2](#)
 Procedure in opposition proceedings [E-III, 8.7.3](#)

Hatching [A-IX, 7.3.2](#)

Hearing

Hearing of parties [D-VI, 1](#)
 Hearing of parties, witnesses and experts [E-IV, 1.6](#)
 Entitlement of parties to put questions at hearings [E-IV, 1.6.7](#)
 Examination as to personal particulars [E-IV, 1.6.5](#)
 Examination as to res gestae [E-IV, 1.6.6](#)
 Guidance to persons heard [E-IV, 1.6.3](#)
 Hearing of a witness no longer necessary [E-IV, 1.6.8](#)
 Separate hearings [E-IV, 1.6.4](#)
 Witnesses and experts not summoned [E-IV, 1.6.2](#)

Height of the numbers and letters in the drawings [A-IX, 7.5.3](#)

Higher-ranking request not admissible and/or not allowable [C-V, 4.7.1.1](#)

I

Identification of documents in the search report [B-X, 9.1](#)

Bibliographic data [B-X, 9.1.1](#)
 "Corresponding documents" [B-X, 9.1.2](#)
 Language of the documents cited [B-X, 9.1.3](#)
 Supplementary European search report [B-X, 9.1.4](#)

Identification of invention [A-IV, 3.1](#)

Identification of relevant passages in prior-art documents [B-X, 9.4](#)

Identification of the European patent application and the search report type [B-X, 4](#)

Impartiality of divisions [E-XI](#)

Implicit disclosure and parameters [G-VI, 5](#)

Implicit features [F-IV, 4.5.4](#)

Implicit features or well-known equivalents [G-VI, 2](#)

Inadmissibility at a later stage [D-IV, 5.1](#)

Inclusion in the file of any email exchange [C-VII, 3.3](#)

Inclusion of additional features [H-V, 3.2](#)
Intermediate generalisations [H-V, 3.2.1](#)

Inconsistencies [F-IV, 4.3](#)

Incorrect compound records in online databases [B-VI, 6.5](#)

Incorrect designation [A-III, 5.5](#)

Incorrect preclassification [B-V, 2.1](#)

Independent and dependent claims [B-III, 3.7](#),
[F-IV, 3.4](#)
Kinds of claim [F-IV, 3.4](#)
Subject-matter of the search [B-III, 3.7](#)

Independent claims

Independent claims containing a reference to another claim or to features from a claim of another category [F-IV, 3.8](#)
Number of independent claims [F-IV, 3.2](#)
Plurality of independent claims in different categories [F-V, 3.2.2](#)
Plurality of independent claims in the same category [F-V, 3.2.1](#)

Indication

Indication of amendments and their basis under Rule 137(4) [H-III, 2.1](#)
Amendments withdrawn or superseded in the Rule 137(4) period [H-III, 2.1.2](#)
Rule 137(4) and oral proceedings [H-III, 2.1.3](#)
Rule 137(4) communication and response thereto [H-III, 2.1.1](#)
Transitional provisions relating to Rule 137(4) [H-III, 2.1.4](#)
Indication of the amendments made in the requests and of their basis [H-III, 3.3.1](#)
Indication of the purpose of payment in the case of claims fees [A-X, 7.3](#)
Claims fees payable before the grant of the European patent [A-X, 7.3.2](#)
Claims fees payable on filing the European patent application [A-X, 7.3.1](#)
Indication of the purpose of the payment in the case of designation fees [A-X, 7.2](#)
Indication that a European patent is sought [A-II, 4.1.1](#)

Indicators [G-VII, An.](#)

Application of known measures? [G-VII, An., 1](#)
Obvious combination of features? [G-VII, An., 2](#)
Obvious selection? [G-VII, An., 3](#)
Overcoming a technical prejudice? [G-VII, An., 4](#)
Secondary indicators [G-VII, 10](#)

Industrial application [B-VIII, 1](#), [D-III, 5](#), [F-II, 4.9](#),
[G-I, 1](#), [G-II, 5.2](#), [G-III, 1](#), [G-III, 4](#)
Description (formal requirements) [F-II, 4.9](#)

Industrial application vs. exclusion under Art. 52(2) [G-III, 3](#)
Method of testing [G-III, 2](#)
Patentability [B-VIII, 1](#), [G-I, 1](#), [G-III](#)
Sequences and partial sequences of genes [G-III, 4](#)

Influencing the speed of examination proceedings [C-VI, 2](#)

Informal nature of consultations [C-VII, 2.3](#)

Information [A-XI, 1](#)

Communication of information contained in files [A-XI, A-XI, 3](#)
Communication under Rule 71(3), other information in the communication under Rule 71(3) [C-V, 1.5](#)
Database management systems and information retrieval [G-II, 3.6.4](#)
Information as to means of redress [E-IX, 5](#)
Information concerning the applicant [A-II, 4.1.2](#)
Information modelling, activity of programming and programming languages [G-II, 3.6.2](#)
Information on prior art [B-XI, 9](#), [C-III, 6](#)
Requesting information on prior art (not confined to priority) [C-III, 6](#)
Information on the applicant [A-III, 4.2.1](#)
Information to the public [D-I, 8](#)
Missing information [A-IV, 4.2](#)
Presentation of information [G-II, 3.7](#)
Sequence information filed under Rule 56 [A-IV, 5.1](#)
Sequence information filed under Rule 56a [A-IV, 5.2](#)
Supplementary technical information [H-V, 2.3](#)

Infringement, technical opinion for a national court trying an infringement action [E-XII, 1](#)

Initiation of exchanges by email [C-VII, 3.1](#)

Insignificant amounts [A-X, 10.1.3](#)
Refund [A-X, 10.1.3](#)

Insistence on inadmissible amendments [H-II, 3.4](#)

Inspection of files [A-XI, A-XI, 1](#), [A-XI, 2](#), [A-XI, 2.1](#), [A-XIII, 10.3](#)

Communication of information contained in the files [A-XI, 3](#)
Conducting file inspections [A-XI, 2.2](#)
Confidentiality of the request [A-XI, 2.4](#)
Consultation of the European Patent Register [A-XI, 4](#)
Documents open to file inspection [A-XI, 2.1](#)
Exclusion from inspection of files [A-XI, 2.3](#)
File inspection before publication of the application [A-XI, 2.5](#)
Issue of certified copies [A-XI, 5](#)
Publication of bibliographic data before publication of the application [A-XI, 2.6](#)
Restrictions to file inspection [A-XI, 2.3](#)

Instructions in Chapter

Instructions in Chapter [A-IV](#) ("Special provisions")
Certificate of exhibition [A-XIII, 11.6](#)

Instructions in Chapter A-VI ("Publication of application; request for examination and transmission of the dossier to examining division")

Publication of the international application [A-XIII, 10.1](#)

Insufficient

Insufficient disclosure [F-III, 3](#)

Cases of partially insufficient disclosure [F-III, 5](#)

Insufficient disclosure of the invention [D-V, 4](#)

Lack of support vs insufficient disclosure [F-IV, 6.4](#)

Insufficient funds [A-X, 4.2.4](#)

Insufficient grounds for lack of unity [F-V, 2.1](#)

Insufficient prior-art disclosures [B-VI, 6.4](#)

Interlocutory decisions [E-IX, 3](#)

Interlocutory revision [E-XI, 7](#)

Reimbursement of appeal fees [E-XI, 7.3](#)

Remittal to the board of appeal [E-XI, 7.2](#)

Intermediate

Intermediate and final products [F-V, 3.2.7](#)

Intermediate documents [B-VI, 5.2](#), [B-X, 9.2.4](#)

Intermediate generalisations [H-V, 3.2.1](#)

Intermediate publication of another European

application [F-VI, 2.4.2](#)

Intermediate publication of the contents of the priority application [F-VI, 2.4.1](#)

International

International (PCT) searches [B-II, 4.4](#)

International application [H-IV, 2.3.4](#)

Determination of filing date in the case of erroneously filed elements or parts of the

international application [A-XV, 6.2](#)

International applications (Euro-PCT applications) [C-IX, 4](#)

International applications with supplementary search [F-V, 7.2](#)

International applications without supplementary search [F-V, 7.1](#)

Potentially conflicting European and international applications [B-VI, 4.1](#)

Publication of the international application [A-XIII, 10.1](#)

Published international applications (WO) as "E" documents [B-VI, 4.1.2](#)

Translation [A-XIII, 10.1](#)

International exhibitions [G-V, 4](#)

International preliminary examination [A-XIV, 6.3.3](#)

International preliminary examination report (IPER) [F-V, 7.3](#)

Reduction of the examination fee where the international preliminary examination report is drawn up by the EPO [A-X, 9.5.2](#)

International search report (Amendments made in response to the WO-ISA, IPER or supplementary ~)

[C-III, 2.2](#)

International-type searches [B-II, 4.5](#)

Internet disclosures [G-IV, 7.5](#)

Burden of proof [G-IV, 7.5.3](#)

Disclosures which have no date or an unreliable date [G-IV, 7.5.4](#)

Establishing the publication date [G-IV, 7.5.1](#)

Internet disclosures – technical journals [B-VI, 7](#)

Problematic cases [G-IV, 7.5.5](#)

Standard of proof [G-IV, 7.5.2](#)

Technical details and general remarks [G-IV, 7.5.6](#)

Internet searches [B-III, 2.4](#)

Interpretation [F-IV, 4.2](#)

Interpretation of claims [B-III, 3.2](#)

Ascertaining whether there is a fallback position [B-III, 3.2.5](#)

Claims with explicit references to the description or drawings [B-III, 3.2.1](#)

Clarity and interpretation of claims [F-IV, 4](#)

Using the description and/or drawings to define clear terms given a definition different from their usual meaning [B-III, 3.2.4](#)

Using the description and/or drawings to define

unclear terms not defined in the claims [B-III, 3.2.3](#)

Using the description and/or drawings to identify the technical problem [B-III, 3.2.2](#)

Interpretation of expressions stating a

purpose [F-IV, 4.13](#)

Interpretation of expressions such as "Apparatus for ...", "Product for ..." [F-IV, 4.13.1](#)

Interpretation of expressions such as "Method for ..." [F-IV, 4.13.3](#)

Interpretation of means-plus-function features ("means for ...") [F-IV, 4.13.2](#)

Interpretation of terms such as "about", "approximately" or "substantially" [F-IV, 4.7.1](#)

Interpretation of terms such as identity and similarity in relation to amino or nucleic acid sequences [F-IV, 4.24](#)

Interruption [E-VII, 1](#)

Cases in which the proceedings may be

interrupted [E-VII, 1.1](#)

Date of interruption [E-VII, 1.3](#)

Interruption of periods [A-IV, 2.2.4](#)

Interruption of proceedings [E-VII, 1.3](#)

Interruption of time limits [D-VII, 4.3](#)

Interruption, stay and consolidation of the proceedings [E-VII](#)

Consolidation of proceedings [E-VII, 4](#)

Interruption [E-VII, 1](#)

Stay of proceedings under Rule 14 due to pending national entitlement proceedings [E-VII, 2](#)

Stay of proceedings when a referral to the Enlarged Board of Appeal is pending [E-VII, 3](#)

Responsible department [E-VII, 1.2](#)

Resumption of proceedings [E-VII, 1.4](#)

Resumption of time periods [E-VII, 1.5](#)

Intervention of the assumed infringer [D-I, 5](#),
[D-VII, 6](#)

Introduction of further examples and new effects [H-V, 2.2](#)

Invention [G-II](#)

Amendments in the case of non-unity, no restriction to a single invention searched [H-II, 6.3](#)

Antibodies [G-II, 6](#)

Burden of proof in relation to the possibility of performing and repeating the invention [F-III, 4](#)

Cases where the invention is realised in a distributed computing environment [F-IV, 3.9.3](#)

Changing from one searched invention to another [C-III, 3.5](#)

Claims directed to computer-implemented inventions [F-IV, 3.9](#)

Description [F-II, 1](#), [F-II, 4.1](#)

Determination of the invention first mentioned in the claims [F-V, 3.4](#)

Difficulties in performing the invention [F-III, 5.3](#)

Disclosure [F-II, 4.1](#), [F-III, 1](#), [F-III, 2](#), [F-III, 3](#), [F-IV, 6.4](#)

Documents relating to the theory or principle behind the invention [B-X, 9.2.5](#)

Documents relevant only to other inventions [B-VII, 1.3](#)

Examination practice [G-II, 2](#)

Exceptions to patentability [G-II, 4](#)

Excision of other inventions [C-III, 3.3](#)

Exclusions and exceptions for biotechnological inventions [G-II, 5](#)

Features of the invention [F-IV, 2.1](#), [F-IV, 2.2](#),
[F-IV, 4.5.1](#), [F-V, 2](#), [G-I, 1](#)

General statements, "spirit of the invention", claim-like clauses [F-IV, 4.4](#)

Grouping of inventions [F-V, 3.2](#)

Identification of invention [A-IV, 3.1](#)

Industrial application [F-II, 4.9](#), [G-III, 1](#)

Insufficient disclosure of the invention [D-V, 4](#)

Invention to be examined [C-II, 1.3](#)

Inventions relating to biological material [F-III, 6](#)

Biological material [F-III, 6.1](#)

Deposit of biological material [F-III, 6.3](#)

Euro-PCT cases [F-III, 6.5](#)

Priority claim [F-III, 6.4](#)

Public availability of biological material [F-III, 6.2](#)

Inventive step [B-X, 9.2.1](#), [F-IV, 4.22](#), [G-VII, 1](#)

IPC classification in cases of lack of unity of invention [B-V, 3.3](#)

IPC classification where the scope of the invention is unclear (e.g. a partial search) [B-V, 3.2](#)

Limitation to searched invention [C-III, 3.2](#)

Limitation to searched invention, no additional search fees paid [C-III, 3.2.1](#)

List of exclusions [G-II, 3](#)

Multiple priorities claimed for different inventions in the application with an intermediate publication of one of the inventions [F-VI, 2.4.3](#)

Novelty of an invention [G-IV, 1](#)

Objections to unsearched inventions [F-V, 5.2](#)

Only variants of the invention are incapable of being performed [F-III, 5.1](#)

Origin of an invention [G-VII, 9](#)

Patentable biotechnological inventions [G-II, 5.2](#)

Requirement of unity of invention [F-V, 2](#)

Restriction to a single, searched invention [H-II, 6.1](#)

Restriction to an unsearched invention [H-II, 6.2](#)

Same invention [F-VI, 2.2](#)

Selection inventions [G-VI, 7](#), [G-VII, 12](#)

Technical features [F-IV, 2.1](#), [F-IV, 2.2](#), [F-IV, 4.5.1](#),
[F-V, 2](#), [G-I, 1](#)

Title [A-III, 1.2](#), [A-III, 7.1](#), [A-III, 7.2](#), [B-X, 7](#), [F-II, 3](#)

Title of the invention [A-III, 7](#)

Unity [B-II, 4.2](#), [B-III, 3.12](#), [B-VII, 1.1](#), [B-VIII, 3.4](#),
[B-VIII, 4.5](#), [C-III, 3.2](#), [C-III, 3.2.1](#), [C-IX, 1.2](#), [D-V, 2.2](#),
[F-IV, 3.2](#), [F-IV, 3.3](#), [F-IV, 3.7](#), [F-V, 1](#), [F-V, 2](#), [F-V, 2.1](#),
[F-V, 3.2.1](#), [G-VI, 6.1](#)

Unity of invention [B-II, 4.2](#), [B-III, 3.12](#), [B-VII, 1.1](#),
[B-VIII, 3.4](#), [B-VIII, 4.5](#), [C-III, 3](#), [C-III, 3.2](#), [C-III, 3.2.1](#),
[C-IX, 1.2](#), [D-V, 2.2](#), [F-IV, 3.2](#), [F-IV, 3.3](#), [F-IV, 3.7](#), [F-V, 1](#),
[F-V, 2](#), [F-V, 2.1](#), [F-V, 3.2.1](#), [G-VI, 6.1](#)

Inventive step [B-X, 9.2.1](#), [F-IV, 4.22](#), [G-I, 1](#),
[G-IV, 5.1](#), [G-VII, 1](#)

Arguments and evidence submitted by the applicant [G-VII, 11](#)

Categories of documents (X, Y, P, A, D, etc.) [B-X, 9.2.1](#)

Claims in different categories [G-VII, 14](#)

Clarity and interpretation of claims [F-IV, 4.22](#)

Combination vs. juxtaposition or aggregation [G-VII, 7](#)

Combining pieces of prior art [G-VII, 6](#)

Conflict with other European applications [G-IV, 5.1](#)

Date of filing [G-VII, 2](#)

Dependent claims [G-VII, 14](#)

Documents defining the state of the art and not prejudicing novelty or inventive step [B-X, 9.2.2](#)

"Ex post facto" analysis [G-VII, 8](#)

Examples relating to the requirement of inventive step [G-VII, An.](#)

Indicators [G-VII, An.](#)

Invention [G-VII, 1](#)

Inventive step assessment in the field of biotechnology [G-VII, 13](#)

Inventive step of antibodies [G-II, 6.2](#)

Obviousness [G-VII, 4](#)

Origin of an invention [G-VII, 9](#)

Patentability [G-I, 1](#), [G-VII](#)

Person skilled in the art [G-VII, 3](#)

Problem-solution approach [G-VII, 5](#)

Secondary indicators [G-VII, 10](#)

Selection inventions [G-VII, 12](#)

State of the art [G-VII, 2](#)

Sufficiency of disclosure and inventive step [F-III, 12](#)

Inventor

Cancellation of the designation of the inventor [A-III, 5.5](#)

Changing the order of inventors [A-III, 5.6](#)

Designation [A-III, 5.1](#), [A-III, 5.2](#), [A-XI, 2.3](#)

Designation of inventor [A-III, 5](#), [A-IV, 1.5](#)

Form [A-III, 5.1](#)

Parts of the file not for inspection [A-XI, 2.3](#)

Waiver of right to be mentioned as inventor [A-III, 5.2](#)

Invitation [A-II, 5.1](#), [A-II, 6.1](#)

Invitation to appoint a representative and legal consequence of non-compliance [A-VIII, 1.9](#)

Invitation to file amended documents [D-VI, 4.2](#)
 Invitation to file authorisation and legal consequence in case of non-compliance [A-VIII, 1.10](#)
 Invitation to file comments and amendments [C-III, 4.2](#)
 Invitation to file observations [D-VI, 3](#)
 Opposition division's communications [D-VI, 3.1](#)
 Summons to oral proceedings [D-VI, 3.2](#)
 Invitation to file the translation [A-VII, 1.4](#)
 Invitation to file the translation before examination [A-III, 6.8.1](#)
 Invitation to file the translation in examination/opposition [A-III, 6.8.2](#)
 Invitation to indicate subject-matter for search [B-VIII, 3.1](#)
 Invitation to indicate which independent claim to search [B-VIII, 4.1](#)
 Invitation to pay additional search fees combined with invitation to restrict the scope of the search [C-III, 3.2.3](#)
 Invitation to pay further search fees [B-VII, 1.2](#)
 Applicant has not paid all further search fees [B-VII, 1.2.3](#)
 Cascading non-unity [B-VII, 1.2.2](#)
 Invitation to the patent proprietor to submit comments and communication of opposition to the other parties concerned by the formalities officer [D-IV, 5.2](#)
 Invitation under both [Rule 62a\(1\)](#) and [Rule 63\(1\)](#) [B-VIII, 5](#)
 Invitation under [Rule 70a\(1\)](#) [C-II, 3.3](#)
 Reply to the invitation under [Rule 62a\(1\)](#) [B-VIII, 4.2](#)
 Reply to the invitation under [Rule 63\(1\)](#) [B-VIII, 3.2](#)
 Reply to the invitation under [Rule 63\(1\)](#), no or late reply [B-VIII, 3.2.1](#)
 Without invitation [A-II, 5.2](#), [A-II, 6.2](#)

IPC classification

IPC classification of the application [B-V, 3](#)
 IPC classification in cases of lack of unity of invention [B-V, 3.3](#)
 IPC classification of late-published search reports [B-V, 3.1](#)
 IPC classification where the scope of the invention is unclear (e.g. a partial search) [B-V, 3.2](#)
 Verification of the IPC classification [B-V, 3.4](#)

Irregularities in the notification [E-II, 2.6](#)

Irrelevant matter [F-II, 4.4](#)

Irrelevant or unnecessary matter [F-II, 7.4](#)

Issue of certified copies [A-XI, A-XI, 5](#)

Certified copies of documents from the files or of other documents [A-XI, 5.1](#)
 Communication of information contained in the files [A-XI, 3](#)
 Consultation of the European Patent Register [A-XI, 4](#)
 Inspection of files [A-XI, 2](#)
 Priority documents issued by the EPO [A-XI, 5.2](#)

Issue of communications by the formalities officer as a result of examination for deficiencies [D-IV, 1.3](#)

Communication in the event of deficiencies as described in [D-IV, 1.2.1](#) which, if not remedied, will lead

to the opposition being deemed not to have been filed [D-IV, 1.3.1](#)
 Communication in the event of deficiencies as described in [D-IV, 1.2.2](#) which, if not remedied, will lead to rejection of the opposition as inadmissible [D-IV, 1.3.2](#)
 Extent of the formalities officer's obligation to issue the above communications [D-IV, 1.3.3](#)

Issuing a further communication (no refusal) [C-V, 15.4](#)

Issuing a self-contained decision [C-V, 15.3](#)

J

Joint applicants [A-VIII, 3.4](#)

K

Keeping the model [E-IV, 1.11.3](#)

Kinds of claim [F-IV, 3](#)

Alternatives in a claim [F-IV, 3.7](#)
 Arrangement of claims [F-IV, 3.5](#)
 Categories [F-IV, 3.1](#)
 Claims directed to computer-implemented inventions [F-IV, 3.9](#)
 Independent and dependent claims [F-IV, 3.4](#)
 Independent claims containing a reference to another claim or to features from a claim of another category [F-IV, 3.8](#)
 Number of independent claims [F-IV, 3.2](#)
 Objection under [Rule 43\(2\)](#) or [137\(5\)](#) [F-IV, 3.3](#)
 Subject-matter of a dependent claim [F-IV, 3.6](#)

L

Lack of support vs insufficient disclosure [F-IV, 6.4](#)

Lack of unity [B-III, 3.12](#)

Complete search despite lack of unity [B-VII, 2.2](#)
 Insufficient grounds for lack of unity [F-V, 2.1](#)
 IPC classification in cases of lack of unity of invention [B-V, 3.3](#)
 Lack of unity and [Rule 62a](#) or [Rule 63](#) [B-VII, 3](#)
 Minimum requirements for reasoning of lack of unity [F-V, 3.3.1](#)
 Procedure in the case of lack of unity during search [F-V, 4](#)
 Procedure in the case of lack of unity during substantive examination [F-V, 5](#)
 Procedures in cases of lack of unity [B-VII, 2](#)

Language

Admissible languages on filing [A-VII, 1](#)
 Admissible non-EPO languages [A-VII, 3.2](#)
 Authentic text of the application or patent [A-VII, 8](#)

Citation of documents corresponding to documents not available or not published in one of the EPO's official languages [B-VI, 6.2](#)
 Correction and certification of the translation [A-VII, 7](#)
 Derogations from the language of the proceedings in oral proceedings [A-VII, 4](#)
 Documents filed in the wrong language [A-VII, 5](#)
 Information modelling, activity of programming and programming languages [G-II, 3.6.2](#)
 Language of a contracting state or other language [E-V, 2](#)
 Language of proceedings [A-IV, 1.3.3](#), [A-VII, 1.3](#), [A-VII, 2](#), [A-VII, 3.2](#), [A-VII, 4](#), [A-VII, 8](#), [B-X, 3.2](#)
 Derogations from the language of the proceedings in written proceedings [A-VII, 3.2](#)
 Filing a divisional application [A-IV, 1.3.3](#)
 Form and language of the search report [B-X, 3.2](#)
 Languages [A-VII, 2](#), [A-VII, 4](#), [A-VII, 8](#)
 Language of the documents cited [B-X, 9.1.3](#)
 Language requirements [A-IV, 1.3.3](#)
 Derogations from language requirements [D-III, 4](#)
 Language to be used [E-XII, 4](#)
 Language used by employees of the EPO [E-V, 5](#)
 Language used in the minutes [E-V, 6](#)
 Language used in the taking of evidence [E-V, 4](#)
 Language(s)
 Language(s), EPO [A-III, 3.2](#), [H-III, 2.1](#)
 Languages of publication [A-VII, 6](#)
 Minutes of oral proceedings [E-III, 10.2](#)

Late

Late arrival, non-appearance and failure to connect [E-III, 8.3.3](#)
 Procedure in examination proceedings [E-III, 8.3.3.3](#)
 Procedure in opposition proceedings [E-III, 8.3.3.2](#)
 Late filing of claims [A-III, 15](#)
 Late filing of missing drawings or missing parts of the description [A-II, 5](#), [A-II, 5.1](#), [A-II, 5.2](#)
 Additional fee for pages [A-II, 5.6](#)
 Date of filing changes [A-II, 5.3](#)
 Missing parts of the description or missing drawings based on the priority application, no change in date of filing [A-II, 5.4](#)
 On invitation [A-II, 5.1](#)
 Withdrawal of late-filed missing drawings or missing parts of the description [A-II, 5.5](#)
 Without invitation [A-II, 5.2](#)
 Late payment of fees [A-X, 6.2](#)
 Amount of fee payable [A-X, 6.2.4](#)
 Debit orders filed with a competent national authority [A-X, 6.2.3](#)
 Fees paid by bank transfer - application of Art. 7(3) and (4) RFees [A-X, 6.2.1](#)
 Noting of loss of rights [A-X, 6.2.5](#)
 Safety provision for late replenishment of deposit accounts [A-X, 6.2.2](#)
 Late payments [A-X, 10.1.2](#)
 Late receipt of documents [E-VIII, 1.7](#)

Late filed

Late-filed missing parts when priority is claimed [A-II, 5.4.1](#)

Late-filed requests after summons to oral proceedings in examination [H-II, 2.7](#)
 Concept of "clear allowability" [H-II, 2.7.1](#)
 Late-filed requests in opposition proceedings [H-II, 3.5](#)
 Late-filed submissions [E-VI, 2](#), [E-IX, 2.10](#)
 General principles in opposition proceedings [E-VI, 2.1](#)
 Submissions filed in preparation for or during oral proceedings [E-VI, 2.2](#)

Later stages of examination [C-IV, 4](#)

Later-filed correct application documents or parts when priority is claimed [A-II, 6.4.1](#)

Leading lines [A-IX, 7.5.1](#)

Legal

Legal character and effect of the stay of proceedings [D-VII, 4.1.2](#)
 Legal co-operation [E-IV, 3.1](#)
 Legal Division [A-IV, 2.2.1](#), [D-VII, 4.4](#), [E-VII, 1.2](#), [E-XIII, 2](#)
 Legal nature and effects of the stay [A-IV, 2.2.3](#)
 Legal remedy [A-VI, 2.3](#)
 Legal status of decisions [D-X, 8](#)

Legally qualified members [D-II, 2.2](#)

Letters rogatory [E-IV, 3.1](#), [E-IV, 3.3](#)

Licence

Exclusive licence [E-XIII, 6.1](#)
 Licences and other rights [E-XIII, 6](#)
 Cancellation of the registration [E-XIII, 6.2](#)
 Registration [E-XIII, 6.1](#)
 Registration of changes of name, transfers, licences and other rights [E-XIV](#)
 Sub-licence [E-XIII, 6.1](#)

Limitation

Limitation and revocation procedure [D-X](#)
 Decision on request for revocation [D-X, 3](#)
 Different sets of claims [D-X, 10](#)
 Examination for deficiencies in the request [D-X, 2](#)
 Formal procedure for limitation when the request is allowable [D-X, 5](#)
 Legal status of decisions [D-X, 8](#)
 Multiple requests [D-X, 11](#)
 Rejection of the request [D-X, 6](#)
 Relation to opposition proceedings [D-X, 7](#)
 Substantive examination (limitation) [D-X, 4](#)
 Withdrawal of the request [D-X, 9](#)
 Limitation is different for different contracting states because the claims as granted were different for different contracting states [D-X, 10.2](#)
 Limitation of the claims [D-X, 4.3.1](#)
 Limitation of the option to withdraw the European patent application [A-IV, 2.3](#)
 Limitation procedure [D-X, 2.1](#), [D-X, 4.2](#), [D-X, 5](#)
 Amendments in limitation procedure [H-II, 4](#)
 Limitation results in the claims becoming different in different contracting states [D-X, 10.1](#)
 Limitation to searched invention [C-III, 3.2](#)

Additional search fees paid C-III, 3.2.2
 Invitation to pay additional search fees combined with invitation to restrict the scope of the search C-III, 3.2.3
 Limitation to searched invention, no additional search fees paid C-III, 3.2.1
 Relation to unity in search C-III, 3.2.1
 Limitations of exception under Art. 53(c) G-II, 4.2.1
 Diagnostic methods G-II, 4.2.1.3
 Surgery G-II, 4.2.1.1
 Therapy G-II, 4.2.1.2

Limits on the obligation to undertake examination E-VI, 1.2

List of exceptions (Rule 28) G-II, 5.3

List of exclusions G-II, 3
 Aesthetic creations G-II, 3.4
 Discoveries G-II, 3.1
 Mathematical methods G-II, 3.3
 Presentations of information G-II, 3.7
 Programs for computers G-II, 3.6
 Schemes, rules and methods for performing mental acts, playing games or doing business G-II, 3.5
 Scientific theories G-II, 3.2

List of professional representatives A-VIII, 1.2

Long-felt need G-VII, 10.3

Loss

Loss of earnings, fees E-IV, 1.10.2
 Loss of right to priority A-III, 6.10
 Loss of rights A-X, 6.2.5, E-VIII, 1.9, E-VIII, 1.9.1
 Cases of loss of rights E-VIII, 1.9.1
 Decision on a notified loss of rights at the request of the person concerned D-VIII, 2.3
 Decision on loss of rights E-VIII, 1.9.3
 Loss of rights and legal remedies A-III, 6.8.3
 Noting and communication of loss of rights E-VIII, 1.9.2
 Noting of loss of rights A-X, 6.2.5
 Time limits and loss of rights resulting from failure to respond within a time limit E-VIII, 1.9
 Time limits and loss of rights resulting from failure to respond within a time limit E-VIII, 1
 Time limits, loss of rights, further and accelerated processing and re-establishment of rights E-VIII

M

Machine translations G-IV, 4.1

Main and auxiliary requests E-IX, 2.9

Main and auxiliary requests filed with the appeal E-XI, 7.4.3

Maintenance of the European patent as amended D-VIII, 1.4

Statement in the decision of the amended form of the European patent D-VIII, 1.4.2

Taking of a final decision D-VIII, 1.4.1

Making suggestions B-XI, 3.8

Manner and order of presentation F-II, 4.10

Markush grouping (alternatives in a single claim) F-V, 3.2.5

Mathematical methods G-II, 3.3

Artificial intelligence and machine learning G-II, 3.3.1

List of exclusions G-II, 3.3

Simulation, design or modelling G-II, 3.3.2

Matter contrary to "ordre public" or

morality F-II, 7.2, G-II, 4.1

Economic effects G-II, 4.1.3

Offensive and non-offensive use G-II, 4.1.2

Prohibited matter G-II, 4.1.1

Matters to be determined by the division as regards prior use G-IV, 7.2

Agreement on secrecy G-IV, 7.2.2

Example of a process not made publicly available G-IV, 7.2.5

Example of publicly available use G-IV, 7.2.4

Use on non-public property G-IV, 7.2.3

Matters to be determined by the division in cases of oral description G-IV, 7.3.3

Meaning of opposition D-I, 1

Means

Means of evidence E-IV, 1.2

Means of giving or taking evidence E-IV, 3.2

 Evidence taken by a competent court E-IV, 3.2.2

 Taking of evidence on oath E-IV, 3.2.1

Means of searching systematically B-IX, 1.2

Mental acts

Schemes, rules and methods for mental acts G-II, 3.5.1

Schemes, rules and methods for performing mental acts G-II, 3.5.1

Schemes, rules and methods for performing mental acts, playing games or doing business G-II, 3.5

Merit of the request E-VIII, 3.2

Method claim to product claim H-V, 7.3

Method claim to use claim H-V, 7.4

Method of notification E-II, 2.2

Method of refund A-X, 10.3

Claiming refunds in Central Fee Payment A-X, 10.3.3

Refunds to a bank account A-X, 10.3.2

Refunds to a deposit account A-X, 10.3.1

Method of testing [G-III, 2](#)

Methods for screening potential medicaments and clinical trials [G-II, 4.2.2](#)

Methods for treatment of the human or animal body by surgery or therapy and diagnostic methods practised on the human or animal body [B-VIII, 2.1](#)

Methods of payment [A-X, 2](#)

Microbiological processes [G-II, 5.2](#), [G-II, 5.5](#), [G-II, 5.5.1](#)
 Animal varieties [G-II, 5.5.1](#)
 Exclusions and exceptions for biotechnological inventions [G-II, 5.5](#)
 Repeatability of results of microbiological processes [G-II, 5.5.2](#)

Minimum requirements for according a date of filing [A-II, 4.1](#)
 Date of filing [A-II, 4.1.5](#)
 Deficiencies [A-II, 4.1.4](#)
 Description [A-II, 4.1.3](#)
 Indication that a European patent is sought [A-II, 4.1.1](#)
 Information concerning the applicant [A-II, 4.1.2](#)

Minimum requirements for reasoning of lack of unity [F-V, 3.3.1](#)

Minutes

Minutes as the first communication in examination [C-VII, 2.5](#)
 Minutes of a consultation [C-VII, 2.4](#)
 Minutes of oral proceedings [E-III, 10](#)
 Formal requirements [E-III, 10.1](#)
 Language [E-III, 10.2](#)
 Request for correction of minutes [E-III, 10.4](#)
 Subject-matter of minutes [E-III, 10.3](#)
 Minutes of taking of evidence [E-IV, 1.7](#)

Missing

Missing information [A-IV, 4.2](#)
 Missing parts of description, missing drawings or correction of erroneously filed application documents filed as corrections under [Rule 139](#) [H-VI, 2.2.2](#)
 Missing parts of the description or missing drawings based on the priority application, no change in date of filing [A-II, 5.4](#)
 Copy of the priority application [A-II, 5.4.3](#)
 Late-filed missing parts when priority is claimed [A-II, 5.4.1](#)
 Missing parts of the description or missing drawings are completely contained in the priority application [A-II, 5.4.2](#)
 Translation of the priority application [A-II, 5.4.4](#)
 Missing parts of the description or missing drawings filed under [Rule 56](#) after the date of filing [H-IV, 2.2.2](#)
 Missing parts or elements [C-III, 1](#)
 Erroneous elements filed under [Rule 20.5bis PCT](#) [C-III, 1.3](#)
 Euro-PCT applications [C-III, 1.2](#), [C-III, 1.3](#)
 European patent applications [C-III, 1.1](#)

Missing elements and parts filed under [Rule 20.5](#) and [20.6 PCT](#) [C-III, 1.2](#)

Models

Keeping the model [E-IV, 1.11.3](#)
 Procedure [E-IV, 1.11.2](#)
 When may models be submitted? [E-IV, 1.11.1](#)

"mol_type" qualifier [F-II, 6.2.4](#)

Morality [A-III, 8.1](#), [G-II, 4.1](#), [G-II, 4.1.1](#)
 Matter contrary to "ordre public" or morality [F-II, 7.2](#), [G-II, 4.1](#)
 Morality or "ordre public" [A-III, 8.1](#)

More than one independent claim per category (Rule 62a)

[B-VIII, 4](#)
 Applications falling under [Rule 62a](#) and lacking unity [B-VIII, 4.5](#)
 Cases under [Rule 62a](#) where claims fees have not been paid [B-VIII, 4.4](#)
 Content of the extended European search report (EESR) [B-VIII, 4.3](#)
 Handling of dependent claims under [Rule 62a](#) [B-VIII, 4.6](#)
 Invitation to indicate which independent claim to search [B-VIII, 4.1](#)
 Reply to the invitation under [Rule 62a\(1\)](#) [B-VIII, 4.2](#)

Multiple priorities

[A-III, 6.3](#)
 Multiple priorities and partial priorities [F-VI, 1.5](#)
 Multiple priorities claimed for different inventions in the application with an intermediate publication of one of the inventions [F-VI, 2.4.3](#)

Multiple requests

N

National

National patent (Access to EPO documentation for the ~ offices) [B-IX, 5](#)
 National patent application
 Conversion into a national patent application [A-IV, 6](#)
 Information concerning national patent application [C-III, 6](#)
 National prior rights [B-VI, 4.2](#), [C-IV, 7.2](#)
 Conflicting applications [B-VI, 4.2](#)
 Search-related issues in examination [C-IV, 7.2](#)
 National register [A-III, 12.5](#)

Negative limitations (e.g. disclaimers) [F-IV, 4.19](#)

Neither main nor auxiliary requests allowable [H-III, 3.1.3](#)

New

New deposit of biological material [A-IV, 4.1.1](#)
 New facts and evidence [E-VI, 2.2.1](#)
 New submissions in reply to a summons [C-IV, 8](#)

No deferred payment of fees, no legal aid, no discretion [A-X, 8](#)

No meaningful search possible [B-VIII, 3](#)
Applications falling under [Rule 63](#) and lacking unity [B-VIII, 3.4](#)
Content of the extended European search report (EESR) [B-VIII, 3.3](#)
Invitation to indicate subject-matter for search [B-VIII, 3.1](#)
Reply to the invitation under [Rule 63\(1\)](#) [B-VIII, 3.2](#)

Non-unity and prior art [F-V, 3.1](#)
Non-unity and prior art under [Art. 54\(2\)](#) [F-V, 3.1.2](#)
Non-unity and prior art under [Art. 54\(3\)](#) [F-V, 3.1.1](#)

Non-appearance of a party [E-III, 8.3](#)
Checking the identity and authorisations of participants at oral proceedings [E-III, 8.3.1](#)
Late arrival, non-appearance and failure to connect [E-III, 8.3.3](#)
Opening the oral proceedings [E-III, 8.3.2](#)

Non-compliance with eligibility criteria [A-X, 9.3.4](#), [A-X, 9.4.3](#)
Reduction under the language arrangements [A-X, 9.3.4](#)
Reduction under the scheme for micro-entities [A-X, 9.4.3](#)

Non-entitlement to right to priority [A-III, 6.9](#)

Non-functional modification [G-VII, 10.1](#)

Non-patent literature arranged for library-type access [B-IX, 4](#)
Content [B-IX, 4.1](#)

Non-patent literature arranged for systematic access [B-IX, 3](#)
Periodicals, records, reports, books, etc. [B-IX, 3.1](#)

Non-patentability pursuant to [Art. 52](#) to [57](#) [D-V, 3](#)

Non-prejudicial disclosure [B-VI, 5.5](#), [G-V](#)
Evident abuse [G-V, 3](#)
International exhibition [G-V, 4](#)
Time limit [G-V, 2](#)

Non-prejudicial oral description [G-IV, 7.3.2](#)

Non-traditional publications [G-IV, 7.5.3.3](#)

Notices of opposition filed by fax [D-III, 3.3](#)

Notices of opposition filed electronically [D-III, 3.2](#)

Notification [A-III, 6.11](#), [A-IV, 4.2](#), [E-II, 2](#), [E-II, 2.1](#), [E-II, 2.5](#), [E-III, 6](#), [E-VIII, 1.9.2](#), [E-IX, 6](#)
Claim to priority [A-III, 6.11](#)
Communications and notifications [E-II, 2](#)
Communications and notifications [E-II](#)
Decisions [E-IX, 6](#)
Electronic notification [E-II, 2.3](#)

Irregularities in the notification [E-II, 2.6](#)
Loss of rights [E-VIII, 1.9.2](#)
Method of notification [E-II, 2.2](#)
Notification by postal services [E-II, 2.4](#)
Notification to representatives [E-II, 2.5](#)
Notifications to and observations by the patent proprietor [D-IV, 1.5](#)
Oral proceedings [E-III, 6](#)

Noting and communication of loss of rights [E-VIII, 1.9.2](#)

Noting of loss of rights [A-X, 6.2.5](#)

Novelty [G-VI](#)
Documents defining the state of the art and not prejudicing novelty or inventive step [B-X, 9.2.2](#)
Examination of novelty [G-VI, 6](#)
Generic disclosure and specific examples [G-VI, 4](#)
Implicit disclosure and parameters [G-VI, 5](#)
Implicit features or well-known equivalents [G-VI, 2](#)
Novelty of an invention [G-IV, 1](#)
Novelty of "reach-through" claims [G-VI, 8](#)
Relevant date of a prior-art document [G-VI, 3](#)
Selection inventions [G-VI, 7](#)
State of the art under [Art. 54\(2\)](#) [G-VI, 1](#)

Number

Number of communications [E-II, 1.2](#)
Number of copies [A-VIII, 2.4](#)
Number of independent claims [F-IV, 3.2](#)
Numbering of figures [A-IX, 5.2](#)
Numbering of sheets of drawings [A-IX, 4.2](#)
Numbers, letters and reference signs [A-IX, 7.5](#)
Arrows [A-IX, 7.5.2](#)
Consistent use of reference signs in description, claims and drawings [A-IX, 7.5.4](#)
Consistent use of reference signs in drawings [A-IX, 7.5.5](#)
Height of the numbers and letters in the drawings [A-IX, 7.5.3](#)
Leading lines [A-IX, 7.5.1](#)

O

Oath [E-IV, 3.2.2](#)
Taking of evidence on oath [E-IV, 3.2.1](#)

Objection of lack of support [F-IV, 6.3](#)

Objection to an expert [E-IV, 1.8.2](#)

Objection under Rule 43(2) or 137(5) [F-IV, 3.3](#)

Objections arising from missing essential features [F-IV, 4.5.1](#)

Objections to unsearched inventions [F-V, 5.2](#)

Obligation to give reasons [H-III, 3.1.2](#)

Observations by third parties [D-I, 6](#), [E-VI, 1](#), [E-VI, 3](#)
 Examination by the EPO of its own motion [E-VI, 1](#)
 Examination of observations by third parties [C-VII, 6](#)
 External complaints [E-VI, 4](#)
 Late-filed submissions [E-VI, 2](#)

Obvious combination of features? [G-VII, An., 2](#)

Obvious selection? [G-VII, An., 3](#)

Obviousness [G-VII, 4](#)

Offensive and non-offensive use [G-II, 4.1.2](#)

Official language

Citation of documents corresponding to documents not available or not published in one of the EPO's official languages [B-VI, 6.2](#)
 Official languages, of the EPO [A-VII, 1.1](#), [A-XIV, 6.3](#)
 Use of an official language [E-V, 1](#)

Omission of matter from publication [F-II, 7.5](#)

Only variants of the invention are incapable of being performed [F-III, 5.1](#)

Opening of oral proceedings [E-III, 8.3](#), [E-III, 8.3.2](#)
 Checking the identity and authorisations of participants at oral proceedings [E-III, 8.3.1](#)
 Late arrival, non-appearance and failure to connect [E-III, 8.3.3](#)

Opening of the substantive part of the proceedings [E-III, 8.4](#)

Opinion

Amendments made in response to the search opinion [C-III, 2.1](#)
 Analysis of the application and content of the search opinion [B-XI, 3](#)
 Basis for the search opinion [B-XI, 2](#)
 Comments and amendments in response to the search opinion [B-XI, 3.3](#)
 Decision on the form of the opinion [E-IV, 1.8.1](#)
 Establishment and issue of the technical opinion [E-XII, 5.4](#)
 Evaluation of an expert opinion [E-IV, 4.7](#)
 No search opinion is issued [B-XI, 7](#)
 Opinions of the search division [B-III, 1](#)
 Opinions in relation to the search report [B-III, 1.1](#)

Opinions on matters relating to limitation of the search [B-III, 1.2](#)

Positive opinion [B-XI, 3.9](#)

Priority claim and the search opinion [B-XI, 4](#)

Provisional opinion accompanying the partial search results [F-V, 4.1](#)

Request from a national court for a technical opinion concerning a European patent [E-XIII](#)

Response to the search opinion [A-VI, 3](#), [C-II, 3.1](#)

Scope of the technical opinion [E-XII, 2](#)

Search opinion [B-XI, B-XI, 1.1](#)

Search opinion is part of the EESR [B-XI, 1](#)

Search opinion where the search was limited [B-XI, 6](#)

Technical opinion [E-XII, 1](#)

Transmittal of the search report and search opinion [B-X, 12](#)

Unity in relation to the search opinion [B-XI, 5](#)

Use of "P" and "E" documents in the search opinion [B-XI, 4.1](#)

Opponent [D-I, 6](#), [D-III, 6](#), [D-IV, 1.2.2.1](#), [D-IV, 1.2.2.2](#)

Continuation on the death or legal incapacity of the opponent [D-VII, 5.2](#)

Death or legal incapacity of an opponent [D-VII, 5.2](#)

Request for oral proceedings by an opponent whose opposition is to be rejected as inadmissible or is deemed not to have been filed [E-III, 2.1](#)

Opposition [D-III](#)

Accelerated processing of oppositions [E-VIII, 5](#)

Activity of the opposition division [D-IV, 2](#)

Admissibility in opposition and limitation proceedings [H-VI, 2.1.1](#)

Admissibility in opposition procedure [H-II, 3](#)

Amendments not related to the grounds for opposition [H-II, 3.2](#)

Amendments related to the grounds for opposition [H-II, 3.1](#)

Appeal against the fixing of costs by the opposition division [D-IX, 2.2](#)

Appeals against the decision of the opposition division on the fixing of costs [E-XI, 4](#)

Basis of this ground for opposition [D-V, 6.1](#)

Changes in claim category in opposition [H-V, 7](#)

Communication in the event of deficiencies as described in [D-IV, 1.2.1](#) which, if not remedied, will lead to the opposition being deemed not to have been filed [D-IV, 1.3.1](#)

Communication in the event of deficiencies as described in [D-IV, 1.2.2](#) which, if not remedied, will lead to rejection of the opposition as inadmissible [D-IV, 1.3.2](#)

Communications from the opposition division [D-VI, 4.1](#)

Communications from the opposition division to the patent proprietor [D-VI, 4](#)

Content of the notice of opposition [D-III, 6](#)

Continuation after the opposition has been withdrawn [D-VII, 5.3](#)

Decision concerning the admissibility of an opposition, the patent proprietor being a party [D-IV, 5.5](#)

Decision concerning the awarding of costs by the opposition division [D-II, 4.2](#)

Decision on the inadmissibility of an opposition or intervention [D-VIII, 2.1](#)

Decisions of the opposition division [D-VIII](#)
 Deficiencies which may no longer be remedied in accordance with [Rule 77\(1\)](#) and (2), resulting in the opposition being rejected as inadmissible [D-IV, 1.4.2](#)
 Deficiencies which may no longer be remedied, as a result of which the opposition is deemed not to have been filed [D-IV, 1.4.1](#)
 Deficiencies which, if not remedied, lead to the opposition being deemed not to have been filed [D-IV, 1.2.1](#)
 Deficiencies which, if not remedied, lead to the opposition being rejected as inadmissible [D-IV, 1.2.2](#)
 Derogations from language requirements [D-III, 4](#)
 Examination for deficiencies in the notice of opposition [D-IV, 1.2](#)
 Examination for deficiencies in the notice of opposition and communications from the formalities officer arising from this examination [D-IV, 1](#)
 Examination of oppositions [D-II, 4.1](#)
 Examination of the grounds for opposition [D-V, 2.2](#)
 Examination of the opposition during oral proceedings [D-VI, 6](#)
 Fees for limitation/revocation, opposition, appeal, petition for review [A-X, 5.2.6](#)
 Filing of amended documents in reply to the notice of opposition [D-IV, 5.3](#)
 Filing of opposition after decision on limitation [D-X, 7.2](#)
 Final decisions on an admissible opposition [D-VIII, 1](#)
 Fixing of costs by the opposition division [D-IX, 2.1](#)
 Form of the opposition [D-III, 3.1](#)
 Forwarding of the notice of opposition to the formalities officer [D-IV, 1.1](#)
 Grounds for opposition [D-III, 5](#)
 Invitation to file the translation in examination/opposition [A-III, 6.8.2](#)
 Invitation to the patent proprietor to submit comments and communication of opposition to the other parties concerned by the formalities officer [D-IV, 5.2](#)
 Lapse of the patent [E-IX, 7](#)
 Meaning of opposition [D-I, 1](#)
 Notice of intervention of the assumed infringer [D-I, 5](#), [D-VII, 6](#)
 Notices of opposition filed by fax [D-III, 3.3](#)
 Notices of opposition filed electronically [D-III, 3.2](#)
 Opposition after surrender or lapse [D-I, 2](#)
 Opposition cases with different texts where a transfer of rights by virtue of a final decision pursuant to [Art. 61](#) takes place in examination proceedings [H-III, 4.3.3](#)
 Opposition Divisions [D-II](#)
 Administrative structure [D-II, 1](#)
 Allocation of duties and appointment of members of the opposition division [D-II, 3](#)
 Allocation of individual duties [D-II, 7](#)
 Allocation of tasks to members [D-II, 5](#)
 Composition [D-II, 2](#)
 Decisions taken by the examining or opposition divisions [E-IX, 2](#)
 Duties and powers of members [D-II, 6](#)
 Tasks of the opposition divisions [D-II, 4](#)
 Opposition division's communications [D-VI, 3.1](#)
 Opposition fee [D-III, 2](#)
 Opposition [D-III, 2](#)
 Opposition procedure (Admissibility in ~) [H-II, 3](#)
 Opposition proceedings

Auxiliary requests, in opposition proceedings [H-III, 3.4](#)
 Continuation of the opposition proceedings in the cases covered by [Rule 84](#) [D-VII, 5](#)
 Correction of the decision to grant while opposition proceedings are pending [H-VI, 3.3](#)
 Costs [D-IX, 1.1](#)
 Decision on closure of the opposition proceedings [D-VIII, 2.5](#)
 Different texts where a transfer of the patent in respect of certain designated states takes place in opposition proceedings [H-III, 4.3.2](#)
 Documents [D-IV, 5.6](#), [E-III, 8.7.1](#)
 General principles in opposition proceedings [E-VI, 2.1](#)
 Intervention in opposition proceedings [D-I, 5](#), [D-IV, 5.6](#), [D-VII, 6](#)
 Late-filed requests in opposition proceedings [H-II, 3.5](#)
 Opposition proceedings (inter partes) [E-III, 8.5.1.1](#)
 Opposition proceedings where the claims as granted are different for different contracting states [H-III, 4.5](#)
 Oral proceedings [D-VI, 3.2](#), [D-VI, 7.1](#), [D-VI, 7.2.3](#), [E-III, 3](#), [E-III, 8.1](#), [E-VIII, 3.1.1](#)
 Parties [D-I, 6](#)
 Parties to opposition proceedings [D-I, 6](#)
 Precedence of opposition proceedings [D-X, 7.1](#)
 Procedure in opposition proceedings [E-III, 8.3.3.2](#), [E-III, 8.7.3](#)
 Relation to opposition proceedings [D-X, 7](#)
 Request to stay opposition proceedings [D-VI, 8](#)
 Revocation proceedings [D-X, 2.1](#)
 Termination of opposition proceedings in the event of inadmissible opposition [D-IV, 4](#)
 Procedure for the examination of the opposition [D-VI](#)
 Rejection of the opposition [D-VIII, 1.3](#)
 Rejection of the opposition as inadmissible by the opposition division, the patent proprietor not being a party [D-IV, 3](#)
 Remittal to the examining or opposition division after appeal [E-XI, 9](#)
 Request for oral proceedings by an opponent whose opposition is to be rejected as inadmissible or is deemed not to have been filed [E-III, 2.1](#)
 Several oppositions [D-IV, 5.2](#)
 Signature of the notice of opposition [D-III, 3.4](#)
 Submission in writing [D-III, 3](#)
 Substantive examination of opposition [D-V](#)
 Territorial effect of the opposition [D-I, 3](#)
 Time allowed for filing notice of opposition [D-III, 1](#)
 Time limit for filing notice of opposition [D-III, 1](#), [D-IV, 1.2.2.1](#)

Optional features [F-IV, 4.9](#)

Oral

Oral disclosure, use, exhibition, etc. as state of the art [B-VI, 2](#)
 Oral proceedings [C-VII, 5](#), [D-VI, 1](#), [E-III, H-III, 3.4.2](#), [H-III, 3.5.3](#)
 Adjournment of oral proceedings due to lack of time [E-III, 8.11.2](#)

Amendments filed in preparation for or during oral proceedings [E-VI, 2.2.2](#)
 Auxiliary requests, in limitation proceedings [H-III, 3.5.3](#)
 Auxiliary requests, in opposition proceedings [H-III, 3.4.2](#)
 Cancellation or maintenance of oral proceedings [E-III, 7.2](#)
 Change of date of oral proceedings [E-III, 7.1.3](#)
 Change of date of oral proceedings at the instigation of the division [E-III, 7.1.2](#)
 Change of date, cancellation or maintenance of oral proceedings [E-III, 7](#)
 Changing the date of oral proceedings [E-III, 7.1](#)
 Checking the identity and authorisations of participants at oral proceedings [E-III, 8.3.1](#)
 Closure of oral proceedings [E-III, 8.11](#)
 Communications/oral proceedings/refusal after resumption [C-V, 4.7.1](#)
 Conduct of oral proceedings [E-III, 8](#)
 Costs arising from oral proceedings or taking of evidence [E-IV, 1.9](#)
 Delivery of the decision [E-III, 9](#)
 Derogations from the language of the proceedings in oral proceedings [A-VII, 4](#), [E-V](#)
 Examination of the opposition during oral proceedings [D-VI, 6](#)
 Format of oral proceedings [E-III, 1.2](#)
 Handwritten amendments in oral proceedings [E-III, 8.7](#)
 Late-filed requests after summons to oral proceedings in examination [H-II, 2.7](#)
 Minutes of oral proceedings [E-III, 10](#)
 Opening of oral proceedings [E-III, 8.3](#), [E-III, 8.3.2](#)
 Oral proceedings at the instance of the EPO [E-III, 4](#)
 Other procedures in examination [C-VII, 5](#)
 Preparation of oral proceedings [E-III, 5](#)
 Request for further oral proceedings [E-III, 3](#)
 Request for oral proceedings by an opponent whose opposition is to be rejected as inadmissible or is deemed not to have been filed [E-III, 2.1](#)
 Request for oral proceedings to be held on EPO premises [E-III, 1.3](#)
 Request to hold on-site oral proceedings at a particular site [E-III, 1.4](#)
 Requesting postponement during oral proceedings [E-III, 8.11.1](#)
 Requests to change the date of oral proceedings [E-III, 7.1.1](#)
 Rule 137(4) and oral proceedings [H-III, 2.1.3](#)
 Submissions filed in preparation for or during oral proceedings [E-VI, 2.2](#)
 Summons to oral proceedings [E-III, 6](#)
 Summons to oral proceedings as the first action in examination [C-III, 5](#)
 Use of computer-generated slideshows in oral proceedings [E-III, 8.5.1](#)
 Use of Rule 137(4) for amendments filed during oral proceedings in examination [E-III, 8.8](#)
 When can a summons to oral proceedings be issued in substantive examination? [C-VIII, 5.1](#), [E-III, 5.1](#)

Withdrawal of the request for oral proceedings [E-III, 7.2.2](#)
 Written submissions during oral proceedings by videoconference [E-III, 8.5.2](#)
 Oral proceedings at the request of a party [E-III, 2](#)
 Request for oral proceedings by an opponent whose opposition is to be rejected as inadmissible or is deemed not to have been filed [E-III, 2.1](#)

Order [E-IX, 1.3.1](#)

Changing the order of inventors [A-III, 5.6](#)
 Date of receipt of the debit order [A-X, 4.2.4](#)
 Debit orders filed with a competent national authority [A-X, 6.2.3](#)
 Debit orders for deposit accounts held with the EPO [A-II, 1.5](#)
 Manner and order of presentation [F-II, 4.10](#)
 Order of claims [F-IV, 4.23](#)
 Order to take evidence [E-IV, 1.4](#)

Ordre public

Inventions contrary to ordre public [G-II, 4.1](#)
 Matter contrary to "ordre public" or morality [F-II, 7.2](#), [G-II, 4.1](#)
 Morality or "ordre public" [A-III, 8.1](#)

Organisation

Organisation and content of the documentation available to the search divisions [B-IX, 1.1](#)
 Payment or transfer to a bank account held by the European Patent Organisation [A-X, 4.1](#)

Origin of an invention [G-VII, 9](#)

Original application no longer pending [C-IX, 2.2](#)

Other parts relating to formalities [A-I, 4](#)

Other procedures in examination [C-VII](#)

Consultations [C-VII, 2](#)
 Examination of observations by third parties [C-VII, 6](#)
 Oral proceedings [C-VII, 5](#)
 Taking of evidence [C-VII, 4](#)
 Use of email [C-VII, 3](#)

Overcoming a technical prejudice? [G-VII, An., 4](#)

P

PACE [C-VI, 2](#)

Page-setting [A-IX, 5.1](#)

Parameters [F-IV, 4.11](#)

Implicit disclosure and parameters [G-VI, 5](#)
 Unusual parameters [F-IV, 4.11.1](#)

Partial

Partial entitlement [C-IX, 2.3](#)
 Partial European search report [B-VII, 1.1](#)
 Partial transfer of right by virtue of a final decision [A-IV, 2.7](#)

Participation of members of the division from different locations [E-III, 8.2.2](#)

Participation of parties and their representatives from different locations [E-III, 8.2.1](#)

Particularly relevant documents [B-X, 9.2.1](#)

Parties to opposition proceedings [D-I, 6](#)

Parties' written submissions [A-VII, 3.1](#)

Patent applications

Accelerated prosecution of European patent applications [E-VIII, 4](#)

European patent applications filed before 1 April 2009 [A-III, 11.3](#)

European patent applications filed on or after 1 April 2009 [A-III, 11.2](#)

Extension and validation of European patent applications and patents to/in states not party to the EPC [A-III, 12](#)

Preclassification, IPC and CPC classification of European patent applications [B-V](#)

Published European patent applications as "E" documents [B-VI, 4.1.1](#)

Search for conflicting European patent applications [C-IV, 7.1](#)

Unpublished patent applications [B-IX, 2.2](#)

Patent documents arranged for systematic searching [B-IX, 2](#)

Patent family system [B-IX, 2.4](#)

PCT minimum documentation [B-IX, 2.1](#)

Search reports [B-IX, 2.3](#)

Unpublished patent applications [B-IX, 2.2](#)

Patent family members [B-X, 11.3](#)

Patent family system [B-IX, 2.4](#)

Patent proprietor

Adherence to the text of the European patent submitted or approved by the patent proprietor [D-VI, 2](#)

Communications from the opposition division to the patent proprietor [D-VI, 4](#)

Decision concerning the admissibility of an opposition, the patent proprietor being a party [D-IV, 5.5](#)

Invitation to the patent proprietor to submit comments and communication of opposition to the other parties concerned by the formalities officer [D-IV, 5.2](#)

Notifications to and observations by the patent proprietor [D-IV, 1.5](#)

Procedure where the patent proprietor is not entitled [D-VII, 4](#)

Rejection of the opposition as inadmissible by the opposition division, the patent proprietor not being a party [D-IV, 3](#)

Revocation of the patent in the event that the patent proprietor no longer wishes the patent to be maintained as granted [D-VIII, 1.2.5](#)

Patent Prosecution Highway (PPH) [E-VIII, 4.2](#)

Patent specification

Publication of the patent specification [C-V, 10](#)

Withdrawal before publication of the patent specification [C-V, 11](#)

Patentability [B-VIII, 1](#), [Part G](#), [G-I](#), [G-III, 1](#)

Considerations relating to specific exclusions from and exceptions to patentability [B-VIII, 2](#)

Exceptions [B-VIII, 1](#)

Exceptions to patentability [G-II, 4](#)

Industrial application [G-III](#)

Inventions [G-II](#)

Inventive step [G-VII](#)

Non-prejudicial disclosures [G-V](#)

Novelty [G-VI](#)

Observations by third parties [D-I, 6](#), [E-VI, 3](#)

Patentability requirements [G-I, 1](#)

State of the art [G-IV](#)

Subject-matter excluded from patentability under Art. 52(2) and (3) [B-VIII, 2.2](#)

Technical progress, advantageous effect [G-I, 2](#)

Patentable biotechnological inventions [G-II, 5.2](#)

Payment

Claiming refunds in Central Fee Payment [A-X, 10.3.3](#)

Conditions for valid payment [A-X, 7.1.1](#)

Date considered as date on which payment is made [A-X, 4](#)

Fee payments lacking a legal basis [A-X, 10.1.1](#)

Indication of the purpose of payment in the case of claims fees [A-X, 7.3](#)

Indication of the purpose of the payment in the case of designation fees [A-X, 7.2](#)

Late payments [A-X, 10.1.2](#)

Methods of payment [A-X, 2](#)

Payment by credit card [A-X, 4.4](#)

Payment in due time [A-X, 6](#)

Late payment of fees [A-X, 6.2](#)

Period for payment considered observed [A-X, 6.2](#)

Payment of designation fee [A-III, 11.2.2](#)

Payment of fees [A-III, 13.1](#)

Late payment of fees [A-X, 6.2](#)

No deferred payment of fees, no legal aid, no discretion [A-X, 8](#)

Request for amendments or corrections in reply to the Rule 71(3) communication, no payment of fees or filing of translations necessary [C-V, 4.1](#)

Payment or transfer to a bank account held by the European Patent Organisation [A-X, 4.1](#)

Payments to replenish a deposit account [A-X, 4.2.2](#)

Purpose of payment [A-X, 7](#), [A-X, 7.1.2](#)

Time limit for payment of extension and validation fees [A-III, 12.2](#)

PCT

Application documents filed under Rule 56 EPC, Rule 56a EPC, Rule 20.5 PCT or

Rule 20.5bis PCT [B-XI, 2.1](#)

Erroneous elements filed under

Rule 20.5bis PCT [C-III, 1.3](#)

International (PCT) searches [B-II, 4.4](#)

Missing elements and parts filed under Rule 20.5 and 20.6 PCT [C-III, 1.2](#)
 PCT minimum documentation [B-IX, 2.1](#)
 Response to PCT actions prepared by the EPO [C-II, 3.2](#)

Pendency of the earlier application [A-IV, 1.1.1](#)

Period allowed for remedying deficiencies [A-III, 16.2](#)

Period for payment considered observed [A-X, 6.2](#)
 Amount of fee payable [A-X, 6.2.4](#)
 Debit orders filed with a competent national authority [A-X, 6.2.3](#)
 Fees paid by bank transfer - application of Art. 7(3) and (4) RFees [A-X, 6.2.1](#)
 Noting of loss of rights [A-X, 6.2.5](#)
 Safety provision for late replenishment of deposit accounts [A-X, 6.2.2](#)

Periodicals, records, reports, books, etc. [B-IX, 3.1](#)

Persons

Person skilled in the art [B-X, 9.2.1](#), [D-III, 5](#), [D-V, 4](#), [F-II, 4.1](#), [F-III, 1](#), [F-III, 2](#), [F-III, 3](#), [F-III, 6.3](#), [F-IV, 6.4](#), [G-I, 1](#), [G-VII, 1](#), [G-VII, 3](#)
 Categories of documents (X, Y, P, A, D, etc.) [B-X, 9.2.1](#)
 Common general knowledge of the skilled person [G-VII, 3.1](#)
 Invention [G-VII, 1](#)
 Inventions relating to biological material [F-III, 6.3](#)
 Inventive step [G-VII, 3](#)
 Patentability [G-I, 1](#)
 Sufficiency of disclosure [F-III, 1](#), [F-III, 2](#), [F-III, 3](#)
 Support in description [F-IV, 6.4](#)
 Persons entitled to appeal and to be parties to appeal proceedings [E-XI, 5](#)
 Persons entitled to file a divisional application [A-IV, 1.1.3](#)
 Persons entitled to file an application [A-II, 2](#)
 Persons participating in the consultation [C-VII, 2.2](#)

Photographs [A-IX, 1.2](#), [F-II, 5.3](#)

Drawings [F-II, 5.3](#)
 Graphic forms of presentation considered as drawings [A-IX, 1.2](#)

Physical

Physical requirements [A-III, 3](#)
 Documents making up the application, replacement documents, translations [A-III, 3.2](#)
 Examination of formal requirements [A-III, 3](#)
 Physical requirements of applications filed by reference to a previously filed application [A-III, 3.2.1](#)
 Physical requirements of late-filed application documents or correct application documents or parts [A-III, 3.2.2](#)
 Physical requirements, other documents [A-III, 3.3](#)
 Physical values, units [F-II, 4.13](#)

Plant

Plant and animal varieties or essentially biological processes for the production of plants or animals [G-II, 5.4](#)
 Essentially biological processes for the production of plants or animals [G-II, 5.4.2](#)
 Plant varieties [G-II, 5.4.1](#)
 Exceptions to patentability [G-II, 5.4](#)
 Plants, patentability [G-II, 5.2](#)
 Processes for the production of plants [G-II, 5.4](#)

Plurality of independent claims in different categories [F-V, 3.2.2](#)

Plurality of independent claims in the same category [F-V, 3.2.1](#)

Points to be disregarded [D-X, 4.3.4](#)

Position of the examining division [B-XI, 1.2](#)

Positive

Positive opinion [B-XI, 3.9](#)
 Positive statements [B-XI, 3.2.2](#)
 Positive statements/suggestions [C-III, 4.1.2](#)

Postal services

Filing of applications by delivery by hand or by postal services [A-II, 1.2](#)
 Notification by postal services [E-II, 2.4](#)

Potentially conflicting European and international applications [B-VI, 4.1](#)

Published European patent applications as "E" documents [B-VI, 4.1.1](#)
 Published international applications (WO) as "E" documents [B-VI, 4.1.2](#)

Potentially conflicting patent documents [B-X, 9.2.6](#)

Precedence of opposition proceedings [D-X, 7.1](#)

Preclassification (for file routing and allocation) [B-V, 2](#)

Incorrect preclassification [B-V, 2.1](#)

Preclassification, IPC and CPC classification of European patent applications [B-V](#)

CPC classification of the application [B-V, 4](#)
 Definitions [B-V, 1](#)
 IPC classification of the application [B-V, 3](#)
 Preclassification (for file routing and allocation) [B-V, 2](#)

Predictable disadvantage [G-VII, 10.1](#)

Prefixes and their symbols used to designate certain decimal multiples and submultiples [F-II, An. 2, 1.3](#)

Preliminary examination [E-XII, 5.2](#)

International preliminary examination [A-XIV, 6.3.3](#)
 International preliminary examination report (IPER) [F-V, 7.3](#)

Reduction of the examination fee where the international preliminary examination report is drawn up by the EPO [A-X.9.5.2](#)

Preliminary remarks [General Part. 1](#)

Preparation of a decision to maintain a European patent in amended form [D-VI.7.2](#)

Decision on the documents on the basis of which the patent is to be maintained [D-VI.7.2.2](#)
Procedural requirements [D-VI.7.2.1](#)
Request for publishing fee, translations and a formally compliant version of amended text passages [D-VI.7.2.3](#)

Preparation of oral proceedings [E-III.5](#)

When can a summons to oral proceedings be issued in substantive examination? [E-III.5.1](#)

Preparation of substantive examination [D-IV.5](#)

Communication of observations from one of the parties to the other parties [D-IV.5.4](#)
Decision concerning the admissibility of an opposition, the patent proprietor being a party [D-IV.5.5](#)
Examination of the admissibility of an intervention and preparations in the event of an intervention [D-IV.5.6](#)
Filing of amended documents in reply to the notice of opposition [D-IV.5.3](#)
Inadmissibility at a later stage [D-IV.5.1](#)
Invitation to the patent proprietor to submit comments and communication of opposition to the other parties concerned by the formalities officer [D-IV.5.2](#)

Preparation of the decision [D-VI.7](#)

Preparation of a decision to maintain a European patent in amended form [D-VI.7.2](#)

Presentation of the pages of drawings [A-IX.4](#)

Numbering of sheets of drawings [A-IX.4.2](#)
Usable surface area of sheets [A-IX.4.1](#)

Presentations of information [G-II.3.7](#)

User interfaces [G-II.3.7.1](#)

Preventing publication [A-VI.1.2](#)

Principle of equity [D-IX.1.4](#)

Principles

Basic principles [H-IV.3.1](#)
Basic principles of decisions [E-IX.1](#)
General principles in opposition proceedings [E-VI.2.1](#)
Principles relating to the exercise of discretion [E-VI.2.2.3](#)

Printing quality [F-II.5.2](#)

Prior

Prior art

Citation of prior art in the description after the filing date [H-IV.2.2.7](#)
Closest prior art and its effects on the search [B-IV.2.5](#)
Combining pieces of prior art [G-VII.6](#)

Determination of the closest prior art [G-VII.5.1](#)

Non-unity and prior art [F-V.3.1](#)

Non-unity and prior art under Art. 54(2) [F-V.3.1.2](#)

Non-unity and prior art under Art. 54(3) [F-V.3.1.1](#)

Requesting information on prior art (not confined to priority) [C-III.6](#)

Prior right

National prior rights [B-VI.4.2](#), [C-IV.7.2](#)

Prior use

Matters to be determined by the division as regards prior use [G-IV.7.2](#)
Public prior use [G-IV.1](#)

Priority [B-VI.3](#), [F-VI.1.2](#), [G-IV.3](#), [G-IV.5.1](#)

Applications giving rise to a right of priority [A-III.6.2](#)

Certified copy of the previous application (priority document) [F-VI.3.3](#)

Claiming priority [F-VI.3](#)

Conflict with other European applications [G-IV.5.1](#)

Copy of the previous application (priority document) [A-III.6.7](#)

Copy of the priority application [A-II.5.4.3](#), [A-II.6.4.2](#)

Copy of the search results for the priority or

priorities [A-III.6.12](#), [C-II.5](#)

Correct application documents based on priority application, no change in the date of filing [A-II.6.4](#)

Date of priority [A-IV.1.2.1](#), [A-IV.1.2.2](#), [A-IV.2.5](#),

[C-IX.1.1](#), [C-IX.2.1](#), [F-VI.1.2](#), [G-IV.3](#), [G-IV.5.1](#)

Declaration of priority [A-III.6.5](#), [F-VI.3.1](#), [F-VI.3.4](#)

European Patent Application [F-VI](#)

Examination of the priority document [A-III.6.4](#)

Examining the validity of a right to priority [F-VI.2.1](#)

Further action upon examination of replies, further action where a request for a translation of the priority application was sent earlier in examination proceedings [C-IV.3.1](#)

Intermediate publication of the contents of the priority application [F-VI.2.4.1](#)

Late-filed missing parts when priority is claimed [A-II.5.4.1](#)

Later-filed correct application documents or parts when priority is claimed [A-II.6.4.1](#)

Loss of right to priority [A-III.6.10](#)

Missing parts of the description or missing drawings are completely contained in the priority application [A-II.5.4.2](#)

Missing parts of the description or missing drawings based on the priority application, no change in date of filing [A-II.5.4](#)

Multiple priorities [A-III.6.3](#), [A-III.6.7](#), [E-VIII.1.5](#), [F-VI.1.5](#)

Non-entitlement to right to priority [A-III.6.9](#)

Period of priority [A-III.6.1](#), [A-III.6.6](#), [A-III.6.9](#), [F-VI.1.3](#), [F-VI.3.6](#)

Priority claim [F-III.6.4](#)

Correcting an existing priority claim [A-III.6.5.2](#)

Deficiencies in the priority claim and loss of the priority right [A-III.6.5.3](#)

Doubts about the validity of the priority claim [B-VI.5.3](#)

Evaluation of prior-art documents cited in the search report and late priority claim [C-III.7](#)

Filing a new priority claim [A-III.6.5.1](#)

Priority claim not valid [F-VI.2.3](#)

Priority claim of a divisional application [A-IV, 1.2.2](#)
 Withdrawal of priority claim [E-VIII, 8.2](#), [F-VI, 3.5](#)
 Priority claim and the search opinion [B-XI, 4](#)
 Use of "P" and "E" documents in the search opinion [B-XI, 4.1](#)
 Priority date
 Date of filing or priority date as effective date [G-IV, 3](#)
 Determining priority dates [F-VI, 2](#)
 Effect of change in priority date [E-VIII, 1.5](#)
 Filing and priority date [B-VI, 5](#)
 Some examples of determining priority dates [F-VI, 2.4](#)
 Verification of claimed priority dates [B-VI, 5.1](#)
 Priority date as effective date [F-VI, 1.2](#)
 Date of filing or priority date as effective date [G-IV, 3](#)
 Priority documents [A-VII, 3.3](#), [A-XI, 5.2](#), [F-VI, 3.4](#), [H-IV, 2.2.6](#)
 Claim to priority [F-VI, 3.4](#)
 Content of the application as "originally" filed [H-IV, 2.2.6](#)
 Derogations from the language of the proceedings in written proceedings [A-VII, 3.3](#)
 Electronic retrieval of priority documents [A-III, 6.7.2](#)
 Filing priority documents [A-III, 6.7.1](#)
 Issue of certified copies [A-XI, 5.2](#)
 Priority documents issued by the EPO [A-XI, 5.2](#)
 Priority period [A-III, 6.6](#)
 Re-establishment of rights in respect of the priority period [F-VI, 3.6](#)
 Priority right [F-VI, 1.2](#), [F-VI, 1.5](#), [F-VI, 2.2](#), [G-IV, 3](#)
 Deficiencies in the priority claim and loss of the priority right [A-III, 6.5.3](#)
 Requesting information on prior art (not confined to priority) [C-III, 6](#)
 Right to priority [F-VI, 1](#)
 Right to priority [F-VI, 1.2](#)
 State of the art at the search stage [B-VI, 3](#)
 Translation of the priority application [A-II, 5.4.4](#), [A-II, 6.4.3](#)
 Validly claiming priority [F-VI, 1.3](#)
 Where it is necessary to check whether the application from which priority is actually claimed is the "first application" within the meaning of Art. 87(1) [F-VI, 2.4.4](#)

Problem-solution approach [G-VII, 5](#)
 Claims comprising technical and non-technical features [G-VII, 5.4](#)
 Could-would approach [G-VII, 5.3](#)
 Determination of the closest prior art [G-VII, 5.1](#)
 Formulation of the objective technical problem [G-VII, 5.2](#)

Procedural aspects [H-VI, 3.3](#)
 Amendments in the case of non-unity, further procedural aspects concerning Euro-PCT applications [H-II, 6.4](#)

Procedure after searching [B-IV, 3](#)
 Documents discovered after completion of the search [B-IV, 3.2](#)

Drawing up the search report [B-IV, 3.1](#)
 Errors in the search report [B-IV, 3.3](#)

Procedure before searching [B-IV, 1](#)
 Analysis of the application [B-IV, 1.1](#)
 Documents cited or supplied by the applicant [B-IV, 1.3](#)
 Formal deficiencies [B-IV, 1.2](#)

Procedure for amendments to documents [H-III, 2](#)
 Amendment by submitting missing documents or by filing replacement pages [H-III, 2.2](#)
 Amendments made by the EPO at the request of a party [H-III, 2.3](#)
 Indication of amendments and their basis under Rule 137(4) [H-III, 2.1](#)
 Withdrawal of amendments/abandonment of subject matter [H-III, 2.4](#)

Procedure for formalities officers [A-III, 16.1](#)

Procedure for the examination of the opposition [D-VI](#)
 Additional search [D-VI, 5](#)
 Adherence to the text of the European patent submitted or approved by the patent proprietor [D-VI, 2](#)
 Communications from the opposition division to the patent proprietor [D-VI, 4](#)
 Examination of the opposition during oral proceedings [D-VI, 6](#)
 Invitation to file observations [D-VI, 3](#)
 Preparation of the decision [D-VI, 7](#)
 Request to stay opposition proceedings [D-VI, 8](#)

Procedure for the fixing of costs [D-IX, 2](#)
 Appeal against the fixing of costs by the opposition division [D-IX, 2.2](#)
 Fixing of costs by the opposition division [D-IX, 2.1](#)

Procedure in examination proceedings [E-III, 8.3.3.3](#), [E-III, 8.7.2](#)
 Handwritten amendments in oral proceedings [E-III, 8.7.2](#)
 Late arrival, non-appearance and failure to connect [E-III, 8.3.3.3](#)

Procedure in opposition proceedings [E-III, 8.3.3.2](#), [E-III, 8.7.3](#)
 Handwritten amendments in oral proceedings [E-III, 8.7.3](#)
 Late arrival, non-appearance and failure to connect [E-III, 8.3.3.2](#)

Procedure in the case of lack of unity during search [F-V, 4](#)
 Consequences for the applicant [F-V, 4.2](#)
 Provisional opinion accompanying the partial search results [F-V, 4.1](#)

Procedure in the case of lack of unity during substantive examination [F-V, 5](#)
 Objections to unsearched inventions [F-V, 5.2](#)
 Review of non-unity findings [F-V, 5.3](#)

Procedure on filing [A-II, 3](#)Confirmation [A-II, 3.1](#)Filing with a competent national authority [A-II, 3.2](#)Receipt [A-II, 3.1](#)**Procedure up to substantive examination** [D-IV](#)Activity of the opposition division [D-IV, 2](#)Examination for deficiencies in the notice of opposition and communications from the formalities officer arising from this examination [D-IV, 1](#)Preparation of substantive examination [D-IV, 5](#)Rejection of the opposition as inadmissible by the opposition division, the patent proprietor not being a party [D-IV, 3](#)Termination of opposition proceedings in the event of inadmissible opposition [D-IV, 4](#)**Procedure where the patent proprietor is not entitled** [D-VII, 4](#)Continuation of proceedings [D-VII, 4.2](#)Department responsible [D-VII, 4.4](#)Interruption of time limits [D-VII, 4.3](#)Stay of proceedings [D-VII, 4.1](#)**Procedures before the competent authority** [E-IV, 3.4](#)**Procedures in cases of lack of unity** [B-VII, 2](#)Complete search despite lack of unity [B-VII, 2.2](#)Request for refund of further search fees [B-VII, 2.1](#)Supplementary European search [B-VII, 2.3](#)**Proceedings**Adjournment of oral proceedings due to lack of time [E-III, 8.11.2](#)Admissibility in opposition and limitation proceedings [H-VI, 2.1.1](#)Admissibility in the examination procedure, at an advanced stage of the proceedings [H-II, 2.4](#)Admission of the public to proceedings [E-III, 8.1](#)Amendments filed in preparation for or during oral proceedings [E-VI, 2.2.2](#)Amendments filed in reply to a [Rule 71\(3\)](#) communication, further course of proceedings [H-II, 2.5.2](#)Ancillary proceedings [D-II, 4.3](#)[Art. 61](#) applications and stay of proceedings under [Rule 14](#) [A-IV, 2](#)Auxiliary requests, in examination proceedings [H-III, 3.3](#)Auxiliary requests, in limitation proceedings [H-III, 3.5](#)Auxiliary requests, in opposition proceedings [H-III, 3.4](#)Cancellation or maintenance of oral proceedings [E-III, 7.2](#)Cases in which the proceedings may be interrupted [E-VII, 1.1](#)Change of date of oral proceedings [E-III, 7.1.3](#)Change of date of oral proceedings at the instigation of the division [E-III, 7.1.2](#)Change of date, cancellation or maintenance of oral proceedings [E-III, 7](#)Changing the date of oral proceedings [E-III, 7.1](#)Checking the identity and authorisations of participants at oral proceedings [E-III, 8.3.1](#)Closure of oral proceedings [E-III, 8.11](#)Communications/oral proceedings/refusal after resumption [C-V, 4.7.1](#)Conduct of oral proceedings [E-III, 8](#), [E-III, 8.2](#)Consolidation of proceedings [E-VII, 4](#)Continuation of proceedings [D-VII, 4.2](#)Continuation of the opposition proceedings in the cases covered by [Rule 84](#) [D-VII, 5](#)Continuation regardless of the stage reached in national proceedings [D-VII, 4.2.2](#)Correction of the decision to grant while opposition proceedings are pending [H-VI, 3.3](#)Costs arising from oral proceedings or taking of evidence [E-IV, 1.9](#)Date of the stay of proceedings [A-IV, 2.2.2](#), [D-VII, 4.1.1](#)Decision on closure of the opposition proceedings [D-VIII, 2.5](#)Decisions which do not terminate proceedings [D-VIII, 2.2](#), [E-IX, 3](#)Derogations from the language of the proceedings in oral proceedings [A-VII, 4](#), [E-V](#)Derogations from the language of the proceedings in written proceedings [A-VII, 3](#)Details and special features of the proceedings [D-VII](#)Different text where a transfer of right takes place pursuant to [Art. 61](#) in examination proceedings [H-III, 4.3.1](#)Different texts where a transfer of the patent in respect of certain designated states takes place in opposition proceedings [H-III, 4.3.2](#)Examination of the opposition during oral proceedings [D-VI, 6](#)Examination proceedings (ex parte) [E-III, 8.5.1.2](#)Format of oral proceedings [E-III, 1.2](#)Further action upon examination of replies, further action where a request for a translation of the priority application was sent earlier in examination proceedings [C-IV, 3.1](#)General principles in opposition proceedings [E-VI, 2.1](#)Handwritten amendments in oral proceedings [E-III, 8.7](#)Influencing the speed of examination proceedings [C-VI, 2](#)Interruption of proceedings [E-VII, 1.3](#)Interruption, stay and consolidation of the proceedings [E-VII](#)Language of proceedings [A-IV, 1.3.3](#), [A-VII, 1.3](#), [A-VII, 2](#), [A-VII, 3.2](#), [A-VII, 4](#), [A-VII, 8](#), [B-X, 3.2](#)Late-filed requests after summons to oral proceedings in examination [H-II, 2.7](#)Late-filed requests in opposition proceedings [H-II, 3.5](#)Legal character and effect of the stay of proceedings [D-VII, 4.1.2](#)Minutes of oral proceedings [E-III, 10](#)Opening of oral proceedings [E-III, 8.3](#), [E-III, 8.3.2](#)Opening of the substantive part of the proceedings [E-III, 8.4](#)Opposition cases with different texts where a transfer of rights by virtue of a final decision pursuant to [Art. 61](#) takes place in examination proceedings [H-III, 4.3.3](#)Opposition proceedings (inter partes) [E-III, 8.5.1.1](#)Opposition proceedings where the claims as granted are different for different contracting states [H-III, 4.5](#)

Oral proceedings [C-VII, 5](#), [D-VI, 1](#), [E-III, H-III, 3.4.2](#), [H-III, 3.5.3](#)
 Oral proceedings at the instance of the EPO [E-III, 4](#)
 Oral proceedings at the request of a party [E-III, 2](#)
 Parties to opposition proceedings [D-I, 6](#)
 Persons entitled to appeal and to be parties to appeal proceedings [E-XI, 5](#)
 Precedence of opposition proceedings [D-X, 7.1](#)
 Preparation of oral proceedings [E-III, 5](#)
 Procedure in examination proceedings [E-III, 8.3.3.3](#), [E-III, 8.7.2](#)
 Procedure in opposition proceedings [E-III, 8.3.3.2](#), [E-III, 8.7.3](#)
 Public proceedings [E-III, 8.1](#)
 Relation to opposition proceedings [D-X, 7](#)
 Request for further oral proceedings [E-III, 3](#)
 Request for oral proceedings by an opponent whose opposition is to be rejected as inadmissible or is deemed not to have been filed [E-III, 2.1](#)
 Request for oral proceedings to be held on EPO premises [E-III, 1.3](#)
 Request to hold on-site oral proceedings at a particular site [E-III, 1.4](#)
 Request to stay opposition proceedings [D-VI, 8](#)
 Requesting postponement during oral proceedings [E-III, 8.11.1](#)
 Requests to change the date of oral proceedings [E-III, 7.1.1](#)
 Resumption [E-VII, 1.3](#), [E-VIII, 1.4](#)
 Resumption after final decision in entitlement proceedings [A-IV, 2.2.5.1](#)
 Resumption of proceedings [E-VII, 1.4](#)
 Resumption of the proceedings for grant [A-IV, 2.2.5](#)
 Resumption regardless of the stage of entitlement proceedings [A-IV, 2.2.5.2](#)
 Rule 137(4) and oral proceedings [H-III, 2.1.3](#)
 Sequence of proceedings [D-VII, 1](#)
 Stay of proceedings [D-VII, 4.1](#)
 Stay of proceedings for grant [A-IV, 2.2](#)
 Stay of proceedings under Rule 14 due to pending national entitlement proceedings [E-VII, 2](#)
 Stay of proceedings when a referral to the Enlarged Board of Appeal is pending [E-VII, 3](#)
 Submissions filed in preparation for or during oral proceedings [E-VI, 2.2](#)
 Summons to oral proceedings [D-VI, 3.2](#), [E-III, 6](#)
 Summons to oral proceedings as the first action in examination [C-III, 5](#)
 Termination of opposition proceedings in the event of inadmissible opposition [D-IV, 4](#)
 Use of computer-generated slideshows in oral proceedings [E-III, 8.5.1](#)
 Use of Rule 137(4) for amendments filed during oral proceedings in examination [E-III, 8.8](#)
 When can a summons to oral proceedings be issued in substantive examination? [C-VIII, 5.1](#), [E-III, 5.1](#)
 Withdrawal of the request for oral proceedings [E-III, 7.2.2](#)
 Written submissions during oral proceedings by videoconference [E-III, 8.5.2](#)

Producing evidence [C-VII, 4.2](#)

Product claim

Product claim to method claim [H-V, 7.2](#)
 Product claim to use claim [H-V, 7.1](#)
 Product claim with process features [F-IV, 4.12.1](#)

Product-by-process claim [F-IV, 4.12](#)

Product claim with process features [F-IV, 4.12.1](#)

Products [F-IV, 3.1](#), [F-IV, 4.12](#), [G-II, 4.2](#), [G-II, 5.4](#), [G-II, 5.5.1](#)

First or further medical use of known products [G-VI, 6.1](#)
 Intermediate and final products [F-V, 3.2.7](#)
 Products that may be claimed for a further medical use [G-VI, 6.1.1](#)

Professional representatives (List of ~) [A-VIII, 1.2](#)

Programs for computers [G-II, 3.6](#)

Data retrieval, formats and structures [G-II, 3.6.3](#)
 Database management systems and information retrieval [G-II, 3.6.4](#)
 Examples of further technical effects [G-II, 3.6.1](#)
 Information modelling, activity of programming and programming languages [G-II, 3.6.2](#)
 List of exclusions [G-II, 3.6](#)

Prohibited matter [A-III, 8](#), [A-IX, 6](#), [F-II, 7](#), [G-II, 4.1.1](#)

Categories [F-II, 7.1](#)
 Content of a European patent application (other than claims) [F-II, 7](#)
 Disparaging statements [A-III, 8.2](#), [F-II, 7.3](#)
 Examination of formal requirements [A-III, 8](#)
 Irrelevant or unnecessary matter [F-II, 7.4](#)
 Matter contrary to "ordre public" or morality [F-II, 7.2](#)
 Matter contrary to "ordre public" or morality [G-II, 4.1.1](#)
 Morality or "ordre public" [A-III, 8.1](#)
 Omission of matter from publication [F-II, 7.5](#)

Proper names, trade marks and trade names [F-III, 7](#)

Property (Use on non-public ~) [G-IV, 7.2.3](#)

Proprietor of the patent

Death or legal incapacity [E-VII, 1.1](#)
 Joint proprietors [D-I, 6](#)
 Proprietor of the patent is not entitled [D-I, 6](#)

Prosecution of the application by a third party [A-IV, 2.4](#)

Protection

Assessment of impermissible extension of the protection conferred [H-IV, 3.4](#)
 Extent of protection [F-IV, 4.12](#)
 Protection conferred by the patent as granted [H-IV, 3.2](#)
 Provisional protection [A-XIII, 10.1](#)
 Unitary Patent protection [General Part, 9](#)

Provisional opinion accompanying the partial search results [F-V, 4.1](#)

Provisional protection [A-XIII, 10.1](#)

Public

Admission of the public to proceedings [E-III, 8.1](#)
 Information to the public [D-I, 8](#)
 Matter contrary to "ordre public" or morality [F-II, 7.2](#), [G-II, 4.1](#)
 Morality or "ordre public" [A-III, 8.1](#)
 Public availability of biological material [F-III, 6.2](#)
 State of the art made available to the public "by means of a written or oral description, by use, or in any other way" [G-IV, 7](#)
 State of the art made available to the public in writing and/or by any other means [G-IV, 7.4](#)

Publication

Burden of proof, other "print equivalent" publications [G-IV, 7.5.3.2](#)
 Non-traditional publications [G-IV, 7.5.3.3](#)
 Publication of a new specification of the patent [D-VII, 7](#)
 Publication of application [A-VI, A-VI, 1](#)
 Content of the publication [A-VI, 1.3](#)
 Date of publication [A-VI, 1.1](#)
 Preventing publication [A-VI, 1.2](#)
 Publication in electronic form only [A-VI, 1.4](#)
 Publication of application, no publication [A-VI, 1.2](#)
 Request for examination and transmission of the dossier to the examining division [A-VI, 2](#)
 Response to the search opinion [A-VI, 3](#)
 Separate publication of the European search report [A-VI, 1.5](#)
 Publication of bibliographic data before publication of the application [A-XI, 2.6](#)
 Publication of the international application [A-XIII, 10.1](#)
 Publication of the patent specification [C-V, 10](#)
 Withdrawal before publication of the patent specification [C-V, 11](#)

Published European patent applications as "E" documents [B-VI, 4.1.1](#)

Published international applications (WO) as "E" documents [B-VI, 4.1.2](#)

Purpose of examination [C-I, 4](#)

Purpose of Part A [A-I, 3](#)

Purpose of payment [A-X, 7](#), [A-X, 7.1.2](#)

Indication of the purpose of payment in the case of claims fees [A-X, 7.3](#)
 Indication of the purpose of the payment in the case of designation fees [A-X, 7.2](#)

Purpose of the abstract [F-II, 2.1](#)

Q

There are no expressions in this alphabetical keyword index beginning with this letter.

R

"Reach-through" claims [F-III, 9](#)

Novelty of "reach-through" claims [G-VI, 8](#)

Reallocation instead of refund [A-X, 10.4](#)

Real-time interaction on a document [C-VII, 2.6](#)

Reasoned objections [B-XI, 3.2.1](#), [C-III, 4.1.1](#)

Reasoning [B-XI, 3.2.1](#), [C-III, 4.1.1](#)

Reasoned statement [D-VI, 4.1](#)

Reasoning [B-XI, 3.2](#), [C-III, 4.1](#), [E-IX, 1.3.3](#)

Analysis of the application and content of the search opinion [B-XI, 3.2](#)

First communication [C-III, 4.1](#)

Form and content [E-IX, 1.3.3](#)

Positive statements [B-XI, 3.2.2](#)

Positive statements/suggestions [C-III, 4.1.2](#)

Reasoned objections [B-XI, 3.2.1](#), [C-III, 4.1.1](#)

Reasoning for a lack-of-unity objection [F-V, 3.3](#)
 Minimum requirements for reasoning of lack of unity [F-V, 3.3.1](#)

Reasoning of decisions [E-IX, 2.6](#)

Receipts [A-II, 3.1](#)

Receiving Office

Receiving Section, examination as to formal requirements [A-III, 3.2](#)

Recommendation to grant [C-VIII, 2](#)

Recommendation to refuse [C-VIII, 3](#)

Record of search strategy [B-X, 3.4](#)

Recording [E-III, 8.2.4](#)

Video recordings [E-IV, 1.12](#)

Redefining the searched subject-matter [B-IV, 2.4](#)

Reduction

Reduction in examination fee [A-VI, 2.6](#), [A-X, 9.3.3](#)

Request for examination and transmission of the dossier to the examining division [A-VI, 2.6](#)

Reduction of fees [A-X, 9](#)

Fee-related support measures for small entities and micro-entities [A-X, 9.2](#)

Special reductions [A-X, 9.5](#)

Reduction of the examination fee where the international preliminary examination report is drawn up by the EPO [A-X, 9.5.2](#)
 Reduction of the search fee for a supplementary European search [A-X, 9.5.1](#)
 Reduction under the language arrangements [A-X, 9.3](#)
 Conditions [A-X, 9.3.1](#)
 Non-compliance with eligibility criteria [A-X, 9.3.4](#)
 Reduction of the examination fee [A-X, 9.3.3](#)
 Reduction of the filing fee [A-X, 9.3.2](#)
 Reduction under the scheme for micro-entities [A-X, 9.4](#)
 Conditions [A-X, 9.4.1](#)
 Fees concerned [A-X, 9.4.2](#)
 Non-compliance with eligibility criteria [A-X, 9.4.3](#)

Re-establishment of rights [A-III, 6.6](#), [E-VIII, 3](#), [F-VI, 3.6](#)
 Admissibility of the request [E-VIII, 3.1](#)
 Claiming priority [F-VI, 3.6](#)
 Decision on re-establishment of rights [E-VIII, 3.3](#)
 Merit of the request [E-VIII, 3.2](#)
 Re-establishment of rights in respect of the priority period [F-VI, 3.6](#)
 Time limits, loss of rights, further and accelerated processing and re-establishment of rights [E-VIII, 3](#)
 Time limits, loss of rights, further and accelerated processing and re-establishment of rights [E-VIII](#)

Reference

Reference documents [F-III, 8](#), [H-V, 2.5](#)
 Amendments in the description [H-V, 2.5](#)
 Sufficiency of disclosure [F-III, 8](#)
 Reference in the description to drawings [F-II, 4.7](#), [F-IV, 4.17](#)
 Clarity and interpretation of claims [F-IV, 4.17](#)
 Description (formal requirements) [F-II, 4.7](#)
 Reference signs [F-II, 4.8](#), [F-IV, 4.18](#)
 Clarity and interpretation of claims [F-IV, 4.18](#)
 Consistent use of reference signs in description, claims and drawings [A-IX, 7.5.4](#)
 Consistent use of reference signs in drawings [A-IX, 7.5.5](#)
 Description (formal requirements) [F-II, 4.8](#)
 Numbers, letters and reference signs [A-IX, 7.5](#)
 Reference to a previously filed application [A-II, 4.1.3.1](#)
 Application filed by reference to a previously filed application [A-IV, 4.1.2](#)
 Physical requirements of applications filed by reference to a previously filed application [A-III, 3.2.1](#)
 Sequence listings of an application filed by reference to a previously filed application [A-IV, 5.3](#)
 Reference to sequences disclosed in a database [F-II, 6.1](#)

Refund [A-X, 10.1.3](#), [A-X, 10.2.1](#), [A-X, 10.2.2](#), [A-X, 10.2.6](#), [B-VII, 2.1](#), [C-III, 3.4](#)
 Claiming refunds in Central Fee Payment [A-X, 10.3.3](#)
 Refund of additional search fees [C-III, 3.4](#)
 Refund of examination fee [A-VI, 2.5](#), [A-X, 10.2.3](#)
 Request for examination and transmission of the dossier to the examining division [A-VI, 2.5](#)
 Special refunds [A-X, 10.2.3](#)

Refund of fees [A-X, 10](#)
 Method of refund [A-X, 10.3](#)
 Reallocation instead of refund [A-X, 10.4](#)
 Special refunds [A-X, 10.2](#)
 Refund of the appeal fee [A-X, 10.2.6](#)
 Refund of the fee for grant and publishing [A-X, 10.2.5](#), [C-V, 9](#)
 Final stage of examination [C-V, 9](#)
 Special refunds [A-X, 10.2.5](#)
 Refund of the further search fee [A-X, 10.2.2](#)
 Refund of the search fee [A-X, 10.2.1](#)
 Refund under Rule 37(2) [A-X, 10.2.4](#)
 Refunds to a bank account [A-X, 10.3.2](#)
 Refunds to a deposit account [A-X, 10.3.1](#)
 Request for refund of further search fees [B-VII, 2.1](#)

Refusal [C-V, 4.7.3](#), [C-V, 14](#)
 Communications/oral proceedings/refusal after resumption [C-V, 4.7.1](#)
 Issuing a further communication (no refusal) [C-V, 15.4](#)
 Refusal of the earlier application [A-IV, 2.6](#)
 Refusal to admit amendments under Rule 137(3) [E-IX, 2.11](#)

Register of European Patents [A-XI, 1](#)
 Entries [D-I, 6](#)

Registered letter [E-II, 2.4](#)

Registered trade marks [F-II, 4.14](#)

Registration [E-XIII, 6.1](#)
 Cancellation of the registration [E-XIII, 6.2](#)
 Registration of changes of name, transfers, licences and other rights [E-XIV](#)
 Changes of name [E-XIII, 5](#)
 Licences and other rights [E-XIII, 6](#)
 Responsible department [E-XIII, 2](#)
 Transfer of the European patent [E-XIII, 4](#)
 Transfer of the European patent application [E-XIII, 3](#)

Reimbursement for witnesses and experts [E-IV, 1.10.1](#), [E-IV, 1.10.2](#)

Reimbursement of appeal fees [E-XI, 7.3](#)

Rejection of the opposition [D-VIII, 1.3](#)
 Communication in the event of deficiencies as described in [D-IV, 1.2.2](#) which, if not remedied, will lead to rejection of the opposition as inadmissible [D-IV, 1.3.2](#)
 Rejection of the opposition as inadmissible by the opposition division, the patent proprietor not being a party [D-IV, 3](#)

Rejection of the request [D-X, 6](#)

Relation to opposition proceedings [D-X, 7](#)
 Filing of opposition after decision on limitation [D-X, 7.2](#)
 Precedence of opposition proceedings [D-X, 7.1](#)

Relation to unity in search [C-III, 3.2](#), [C-III, 3.2.1](#)
 Additional search fees paid [C-III, 3.2.2](#)

Invitation to pay additional search fees combined with invitation to restrict the scope of the search [C-III, 3.2.3](#)
 Limitation to searched invention, no additional search fees paid [C-III, 3.2.1](#)

Relationship between documents and claims [B-X, 9.3](#)

Relative terms [F-IV, 4.6](#)

Relevant date for documents cited in the search report [B-VI, 5](#)

Documents published after the date of filing [B-VI, 5.4](#)
 Doubts about the state of the art [B-VI, 5.6](#)
 Doubts about the validity of the priority claim [B-VI, 5.3](#)
 Intermediate documents [B-VI, 5.2](#)
 Non-prejudicial disclosures [B-VI, 5.5](#)
 Verification of claimed priority dates [B-VI, 5.1](#)
 Widening of the search [B-VI, 5.3](#)

Relevant date of a prior-art document [G-VI, 3](#)

Remittal to the board of appeal [E-XI, 7.2](#)

Remittal to the examining or opposition division after appeal [E-XI, 9](#)

Renewal fees [A-IV, 1.4.3](#), [A-X, 5.2.4](#)
 Due date for specific fees [A-X, 5.2.4](#)

Renunciation of rights [E-VIII, 8](#)
 Statement of withdrawal [E-VIII, 8.3](#)
 Surrender of patent [E-VIII, 8.4](#)
 Withdrawal of application or designation [E-VIII, 8.1](#)
 Withdrawal of priority claim [E-VIII, 8.2](#)

Repeatability of results of microbiological processes [G-II, 5.5.2](#)

Replacement documents and translations [A-VIII, 2.2](#)

Replacement or removal of features from a claim [H-V, 3.1](#)

Reply

Reply explicitly disapproving with the proposed text without indicating an alternative text [C-V, 4.9](#)
 Reply in time [B-VIII, 3.2.2](#), [C-V, 3](#)
 Failure to reply in time [B-VIII, 4.2.1](#)
 Reply to the invitation under [Rule 62a\(1\)](#) [B-VIII, 4.2](#)
 Failure to reply in time [B-VIII, 4.2.1](#)
 Reply filed in time [B-VIII, 4.2.2](#)
 Reply to the invitation under [Rule 63\(1\)](#) [B-VIII, 3.2](#)
 Reply to the invitation under [Rule 63\(1\)](#), no or late reply [B-VIII, 3.2.1](#)

Representation [A-III, 2](#), [A-VIII, 1](#), [A-VIII, 3.1](#), [D-I, 7](#)
 Associations [A-VIII, 1.2](#)
 Common provisions [A-VIII, 1](#)
 Common representative [A-VIII, 1.6](#)
 Examination of formal requirements [A-III, 2](#)
 General authorisation [A-VIII, 1.8](#)

Invitation to appoint a representative and legal consequence of non-compliance [A-VIII, 1.9](#)
 Invitation to file authorisation and legal consequence in case of non-compliance [A-VIII, 1.10](#)
 List of professional representatives [A-VIII, 1.2](#)
 Non-compliance [A-III, 2.2](#)
 Representation by a legal practitioner [A-VIII, 1.3](#)
 Representation by a professional representative [A-VIII, 1.2](#)
 Representation by an employee [A-VIII, 1.5](#)
 Representation of drawings [A-IX, 2](#)
 Figure accompanying the abstract [A-IX, 2.3](#)
 Grouping of drawings [A-IX, 2.1](#)
 Reproducibility of drawings [A-IX, 2.2](#)
 Requirements [A-III, 2.1](#)
 Signature of documents [A-VIII, 3.1](#)
 Signed authorisation [A-VIII, 1.7](#)

Representatives

Appointment of representatives [A-VIII, 1.1](#)
 Authorisations [A-VIII, 1.1](#), [A-VIII, 1.7](#)
 Common representatives [A-VIII, 1.6](#)
 List of professional representatives [A-VIII, 1.2](#), [A-VIII, 1.3](#)
 Notification to representatives [E-II, 2.5](#)
 Participation of parties and their representatives from different locations [E-III, 8.2.1](#)

Reproducibility of drawings [A-IX, 2.2](#)

Request

Admissibility in the examination procedure, further requests for amendment after approval [H-II, 2.6](#)
 Admissibility of auxiliary requests [H-III, 3.3.2](#)
 Admissibility of the request [E-VIII, 3.1](#)
 Amended main/single request filed with the appeal [E-XI, 7.4.2](#)
 Amendments made by the EPO at the request of a party [H-III, 2.3](#)
 Auxiliary requests [H-III, 3](#)
 Auxiliary requests, in examination proceedings [H-III, 3.3](#)
 Auxiliary requests, in limitation proceedings [H-III, 3.5](#)
 Auxiliary requests, in opposition proceedings [H-III, 3.4](#)
 Auxiliary requests, in the search phase [H-III, 3.2](#)
 Complete text for auxiliary request available [H-III, 3.3.5](#)
 Complete text for auxiliary request not yet available [H-III, 3.3.4](#)
 Confidentiality of the request [A-XI, 2.4](#)
 Criteria for admissibility of auxiliary requests [H-III, 3.3.2.1](#)
 Decision on a notified loss of rights at the request of the person concerned [D-VIII, 2.3](#)
 Decision on request for revocation [D-X, 3](#)
 Decision on the request and the taking of evidence [E-IV, 2.4](#)
 Deficiencies which lead to the request being deemed not to have been filed [D-X, 2.1](#)
 Deficiencies which, if not remedied, lead to the request being rejected as inadmissible [D-X, 2.2](#)
 Entitlement to file the request [E-VIII, 3.1.2](#)
 Examination for deficiencies in the request [D-X, 2](#)

- Fees payable for procedural and other requests [A-X, 5.2.7](#)
- Form of the request and applicable time limit [E-VIII, 3.1.3](#)
- Formal procedure for limitation when the request is allowable [D-X, 5](#)
- Further action upon examination of replies, further action where a request for a translation of the priority application was sent earlier in examination proceedings [C-IV, 3.1](#)
- Further requests for amendment after approval [C-V, 5](#)
- Higher-ranking request not admissible and/or not allowable [C-V, 4.7.1.1](#)
- Indication of the amendments made in the requests and of their basis [H-III, 3.3.1](#)
- Late-filed requests after summons to oral proceedings in examination [H-II, 2.7](#)
- Late-filed requests in opposition proceedings [H-II, 3.5](#)
- Main and auxiliary requests [E-IX, 2.9](#)
- Main and auxiliary requests filed with the appeal [E-XI, 7.4.3](#)
- Merit of the request [E-VIII, 3.2](#)
- Multiple requests [D-X, 11](#)
- Neither main nor auxiliary requests allowable [H-III, 3.1.3](#)
- Oral proceedings at the request of a party [E-III, 2](#)
- Rejection of the request [D-X, 6](#)
- Request for a decision according to the state of the file [C-V, 15.1](#)
- Request for amendments or corrections in reply to the [Rule 71\(3\)](#) communication [C-V, 4](#)
- Adaptation of the description [C-V, 4.5](#)
- Admissibility of amendments [C-V, 4.4](#)
- Amendments not admitted and/or not allowable, examination resumed [C-V, 4.7](#)
- Amendments or corrections should be reasoned [C-V, 4.3](#)
- Amendments/corrections admitted and allowable - second [Rule 71\(3\)](#) communication sent [C-V, 4.6](#)
- Amendments/corrections filed in second [Rule 71\(3\)](#) period [C-V, 4.10](#)
- Crediting of fees paid voluntarily [C-V, 4.2](#)
- Fees to be paid within the second [Rule 71\(3\)](#) period [C-V, 4.8](#)
- Reply explicitly disapproving with the proposed text without indicating an alternative text [C-V, 4.9](#)
- Request for amendments or corrections in reply to the [Rule 71\(3\)](#) communication, no payment of fees or filing of translations necessary [C-V, 4.1](#)
- Request for conversion [A-IV, 6](#)
- Request for correction of minutes [E-III, 10.4](#)
- Request for documents [D-VII, 2](#)
- Request for examination [C-II, 1](#)
- Confirmation of the intention to proceed further with the application [C-II, 1.1](#)
- Euro-PCT applications [C-II, 1.2](#)
- Invention to be examined [C-II, 1.3](#)
- Responsibility of the Receiving Section and the Examining Division [A-III, 3.2](#), [C-II, 1](#)
- Search, publication and request for examination of divisional applications [A-IV, 1.8](#)
- Time limit for filing the request for examination [A-VI, 2.2](#)
- Request for examination and transmission of the dossier to examining division [A-VI, A-VI, 2](#)
- Communication [A-VI, 2.1](#)
- Legal remedy [A-VI, 2.3](#)
- Publication of application [A-VI, 1](#)
- Reduction in examination fee [A-VI, 2.6](#)
- Refund of examination fee [A-VI, 2.5](#)
- Response to the search opinion [A-VI, 3](#)
- Time limit for filing the request for examination [A-VI, 2.2](#)
- Transmission of the dossier to the examining division [A-VI, 2.4](#)
- Request for further oral proceedings [E-III, 3](#)
- Request for grant [A-III, 4](#), [A-IV, 1.3.2](#), [F-II, 3](#)
- Examination of formal requirements [A-III, 4](#)
- Examination of the request for grant form [A-III, 4.2](#)
- Examination of the request for grant form, further requirements laid down by [Rule 41\(2\)](#) [A-III, 4.2.3](#)
- Filing a divisional application [A-IV, 1.3.2](#)
- Request for grant form
- Examination of the request for grant form [A-III, 4.2](#)
- Examination of the request for grant form, further requirements laid down by [Rule 41\(2\)](#) [A-III, 4.2.3](#)
- Request for grant of an EP, form [A-III, 13.2](#)
- Request for oral proceedings by an opponent whose opposition is to be rejected as inadmissible or is deemed not to have been filed [E-III, 2.1](#)
- Request for oral proceedings to be held on EPO premises [E-III, 1.3](#)
- Request for publishing fee, translations and a formally compliant version of amended text passages [D-VI, 7.2.3](#)
- Request for refund of further search fees [B-VII, 2.1](#)
- Request for the conservation of evidence [E-IV, 2.2](#)
- Request for unitary effect [C-V, 2.1](#)
- Request from a national court for a technical opinion concerning a European patent [E-XIII](#)
- Composition and duties of the examining division [E-XII, 3](#)
- Language to be used [E-XII, 4](#)
- Procedure [E-XII, 5](#)
- Scope of the technical opinion [E-XII, 2](#)
- Request to hold on-site oral proceedings at a particular site [E-III, 1.4](#)
- Request to stay opposition proceedings [D-VI, 8](#)
- Requesting information on prior art (not confined to priority) [C-III, 6](#)
- Requesting postponement during oral proceedings [E-III, 8.11.1](#)
- Requests for samples of biological material [A-IV, 4.4](#)
- Requests to change the date of oral proceedings [E-III, 7.1.1](#)
- [Rule 137\(3\)](#) in conjunction with auxiliary requests [H-II, 2.3.1.4](#)
- Second [Rule 71\(3\)](#) communication based on higher-ranking request initially rejected in first [Rule 71\(3\)](#) communication [C-V, 4.6.2](#)
- Sequence of requests [H-III, 3.1.1](#)
- Substantiation of the request [E-VIII, 3.1.4](#)
- Timeliness and structure of auxiliary requests [H-III, 3.3.2.2](#)
- Withdrawal of the extension or validation request [A-III, 12.3](#)
- Withdrawal of the request [D-X, 9](#), [E-XII, 5.3](#)

Withdrawal of the request for oral proceedings [E-III, 7.2.2](#)

Requirement of unity of invention [F-V, 2](#)
 Division's approach [F-V, 2.2](#)
 Insufficient grounds for lack of unity [F-V, 2.1](#)

Requirements as to form [E-IX, 2.3](#)

Requirements relating to sequence length and enumeration of residues [F-II, 6.2.1](#)

Residence or principal place of business [A-III, 2.1](#),
[A-VI, 2.6](#), [A-VII, 3.2](#), [A-VIII, 1.1](#), [A-VIII, 1.5](#), [D-III, 6](#),
[D-IV, 1.2.2.2](#), [D-VII, 6](#)

Response

Response filed before first communication in examination [C-II, 3](#)
 Invitation under [Rule 70a\(1\)](#) [C-II, 3.3](#)
 Response to PCT actions prepared by the EPO [C-II, 3.2](#)
 Response to communication pursuant to [Rule 58](#) filed with the appeal [E-XI, 7.4.4](#)
 Response to the extended European search report (EESR) [B-XI, 8](#)
 Response to the search opinion [A-VI, 3](#), [C-II, 3.1](#)
 Amendments made in response to the search opinion [C-III, 2.1](#)
 Comments and amendments in response to the search opinion [B-XI, 3.3](#)

Responsibility

Responsibility for formalities examination [A-I, 2](#)

Responsible department [A-IV, 2.2.1](#), [E-VII, 1.2](#), [E-XIII, 2](#)

Interruption [E-VII, 1.2](#)
 Registration of changes of name, transfers, licences and other rights [E-XIII, 2](#)
 Stay of proceedings for grant [A-IV, 2.2.1](#)

Restricted IPER [F-V, 7.4](#)

Restrictions

Restriction of the searched subject-matter [B-X, 8](#)
 Restriction to a single, searched invention [H-II, 6.1](#)
 Restriction to an unsearched invention [H-II, 6.2](#)
 Restrictions to file inspection [A-XI, 2.3](#)

Result to be achieved [F-IV, 4.10](#)

Resumption

Resumption of proceedings [E-VII, 1.4](#)
 Resumption of the proceedings for grant [A-IV, 2.2.5](#)
 Resumption after final decision in entitlement proceedings [A-IV, 2.2.5.1](#)
 Resumption regardless of the stage of entitlement proceedings [A-IV, 2.2.5.2](#)
 Resumption of time periods [E-VII, 1.5](#)

Review

Determination of filing date in the case of erroneously filed elements or parts of the international application [A-XV, 6.2](#)
 Review of non-unity findings [F-V, 5.3](#)
 Reviews or books [B-X, 11.4](#)

Revision of stated technical problem [H-V, 2.4](#)

Revocation

Revocation of the European patent [D-VIII, 1.2](#)
 Revocation for failure to notify the appointment of a new representative [D-VIII, 1.2.3](#)
 Revocation for failure to pay the prescribed fee for publishing, to file a translation or to file a formally compliant version of amended text passages [D-VIII, 1.2.2](#)
 Revocation in the event of requirements not being met until after expiry of time limits [D-VIII, 1.2.4](#)
 Revocation of the patent in the event that the patent proprietor no longer wishes the patent to be maintained as granted [D-VIII, 1.2.5](#)
 Revocation on substantive grounds [D-VIII, 1.2.1](#)
 Revocation of the patent [D-VI, 2.2](#)
 Revocation of the patent in the event that the patent proprietor no longer wishes the patent to be maintained as granted [D-VIII, 1.2.5](#)

Right

Amendments occasioned by national rights [H-II, 3.3](#)
 Cases of loss of rights [E-VIII, 1.9.1](#)
 Conflict with national rights of earlier date [G-IV, 6](#)
 Decision on a notified loss of rights at the request of the person concerned [D-VIII, 2.3](#)
 Decision on loss of rights [E-VIII, 1.9.3](#)
 Decision on re-establishment of rights [D-VIII, 2.4](#), [E-VIII, 3.3](#)
 Different texts where national rights of earlier date exist [H-III, 4.4](#)
 Licences and other rights [E-XIII, 6](#)
 Loss of rights [A-X, 6.2.5](#), [E-VIII, 1.9.1](#)
 Loss of rights and legal remedies [A-III, 6.8.3](#)
 National prior rights [B-VI, 4.2](#), [C-IV, 7.2](#)
 Noting and communication of loss of rights [E-VIII, 1.9.2](#)
 Noting of loss of rights [A-X, 6.2.5](#)
 Opposition cases with different texts where a transfer of rights by virtue of a final decision pursuant to [Art. 61](#) takes place in examination proceedings [H-III, 4.3.3](#)
 Re-establishment of rights [A-III, 6.6](#), [E-VIII, 3](#), [F-VI, 3.6](#)
 Re-establishment of rights in respect of the priority period [F-VI, 3.6](#)
 Registration of changes of name, transfers, licences and other rights [E-XIV](#)
 Renunciation of rights [E-VIII, 8](#)
 Right of priority [F-VI, 1](#)
 Applications giving rise to a right of priority [A-III, 6.2](#)
 Date of filing as effective date [F-VI, 1.1](#)
 First application [F-VI, 1.4](#)
 Multiple priorities and partial priorities [F-VI, 1.5](#)
 Priority date as effective date [F-VI, 1.2](#)
 Validly claiming priority [F-VI, 1.3](#)

Right of the other members of the division to put questions [E-III, 8.10](#)
 Right to amend [H-I](#)
 Right to be heard [E-VI, 2.2.4](#), [E-IX, 2.1](#)
 Decisions taken by the examining or opposition divisions [E-IX, 2.1](#)
 Submissions filed in preparation for or during oral proceedings [E-VI, 2.2.4](#)
 Rights of earlier date [D-I, 3](#), [H-III, 4.4](#)
 Time limits and loss of rights resulting from failure to respond within a time limit [E-VIII, 1](#)
 Time limits, loss of rights, further and accelerated processing and re-establishment of rights [E-VIII](#)
 Transfer of rights [E-XIII, 3](#), [E-XIII, 6.1](#)

Rule

Rule 137(3) in conjunction with [Art. 123\(2\)](#) [H-II, 2.3.1.2](#)
 Rule 137(3) in conjunction with [Art. 83](#) [H-II, 2.3.1.1](#)
 Rule 137(3) in conjunction with [Art. 84](#) - missing essential feature [H-II, 2.3.1.3](#)
 Rule 137(3) in conjunction with auxiliary requests [H-II, 2.3.1.4](#)
 Rule 137(4) and oral proceedings [H-III, 2.1.3](#)
 Rule 137(4) applies
 Rule 137(4) applies to amendments filed at this stage [H-II, 2.5.4](#)
 Rule 137(4) communication and response thereto [H-III, 2.1.1](#)
 Rule 137(5) [H-IV, 4.1](#)
 Rule 62a and/or Rule 63 cases [H-IV, 4.1.1](#)
 Subject-matter taken from the description [H-IV, 4.1.2](#)
 Rule 42(1)(c) vs [Art. 52\(1\)](#) [F-II, 4.6](#)
 Rules of Procedure of the Boards of Appeal [E-XI, 8](#)

S

Safety provision for late replenishment of deposit accounts [A-X, 6.2.2](#)

Same invention [F-VI, 2.2](#)

Same-day corrections [A-II, 6.6](#)

Scale of drawings [A-IX, 7.4](#)

Schemes rules and methods

Schemes, rules and methods for performing mental acts, playing games or doing business [G-II, 3.5](#)
 Schemes, rules and methods for doing business [G-II, 3.5.3](#)
 Schemes, rules and methods for performing mental acts [G-II, 3.5.1](#)
 Schemes, rules and methods for playing games [G-II, 3.5.2](#)

Scientific theories [G-II, 3.2](#)

List of exclusions [G-II, 3.2](#)

Scope

Scope of application of Rule 134 [E-VIII, 1.6.2.3](#)

Scope of first analysis for generally deficient applications [B-XI, 3.4](#)
 Scope of Part B [B-I, 1](#)
 Scope of the examination [D-X, 4.3](#)
 Art. 123 [D-X, 4.3.2](#)
 Art. 84 [D-X, 4.3.3](#)
 Limitation of the claims [D-X, 4.3.1](#)
 Points to be disregarded [D-X, 4.3.4](#)
 Scope of the search [B-III, 2](#)
 Completeness of the search [B-III, 2.1](#)
 Effectiveness and efficiency of the search [B-III, 2.2](#)
 Internet searches [B-III, 2.4](#)
 Invitation to pay additional search fees combined with invitation to restrict the scope of the search [C-III, 3.2.3](#)
 Search in neighbouring fields [B-III, 2.3](#)
 Scope of the technical opinion [E-XII, 2](#)

Search [A-III, 10.2](#), [A-VI, 1.3](#), [B-II, 4](#), [B-III, 3.1](#), [B-III, 3.2](#), [B-IV, 1.2](#), [B-IV, 1.3](#), [B-VIII, 3.4](#), [B-VIII, 4.5](#), [B-X, 7](#), [F-II, 2.2](#), [F-II, 2.6](#)
 Additional search [D-VI, 5](#)
 Aim of the search [B-II, 2](#)
 Amendments required by a limitation of the search under Rule 62a and/or Rule 63 [H-II, 5](#)
 Auxiliary requests, in the search phase [H-III, 3.2](#)
 Basis for the search [B-III, 3.1](#)
 Characteristics of the search [B-III](#)
 Complete search despite lack of unity [B-VII, 2.2](#)
 Completeness of the search [B-III, 2.1](#)
 Copy of the search results for the priority or priorities [A-III, 6.12](#), [C-II, 5](#)
 Correct application documents or parts filed after the search has started [A-II, 6.7](#)
 Documents discovered after completion of the search [B-IV, 3.2](#)
 Effectiveness and efficiency of the search [B-III, 2.2](#)
 Filing, search and designation fee [A-IV, 1.4.1](#)
 International applications with supplementary search [F-V, 7.2](#)
 International applications without supplementary search [F-V, 7.1](#)
 Invitation to indicate subject-matter for search [B-VIII, 3.1](#)
 Invitation to indicate which independent claim to search [B-VIII, 4.1](#)
 IPC classification where the scope of the invention is unclear (e.g. a partial search) [B-V, 3.2](#)
 Means of searching systematically [B-IX, 1.2](#)
 No meaningful search possible [B-VIII, 3](#)
 Opinions of the search division [B-III, 1](#)
 Opinions on matters relating to limitation of the search [B-III, 1.2](#)
 Procedure in the case of lack of unity during search [F-V, 4](#)
 Provisional opinion accompanying the partial search results [F-V, 4.1](#)
 Relation to unity in search [C-III, 3.2](#), [C-III, 3.2.1](#)
 Scope of the search [B-III, 2](#)
 Search and substantive examination [B-II, 1](#)
 Contact between the applicant and the search division [B-II, 1.1](#)
 Search at the examination stage [C-IV, 7.4](#)
 Search division has more than one member [B-I, 2.2](#)

- Search division has more than one member, further searches in a different technical field for a non-unitary application [B-I, 2.2.2](#)
- Where claimed unitary subject-matter covers more than one technical field [B-I, 2.2.1](#)
- Search divisions [B-I, 2](#), [B-II, 4.1](#)
 - Consultation with other examiners [B-I, 2.1](#)
 - Organisation and content of the documentation available to the search divisions [B-IX, 1.1](#)
- Search division's approach [B-XI, 3.7](#)
- Search division's dossier [B-XI, 3.1](#)
- Search documentation [B-II, 3](#), [B-IX](#)
 - Access to EPO documentation for the national patent offices [B-IX, 5](#)
 - Non-patent literature arranged for library-type access [B-IX, 4](#)
 - Non-patent literature arranged for systematic access [B-IX, 3](#)
 - Patent documents arranged for systematic searching [B-IX, 2](#)
- Search fee
 - Additional search fees paid [C-III, 3.2.2](#)
 - Applicant has not paid all further search fees [B-VII, 1.2.3](#)
 - European search [A-III, 13.1](#), [A-IV, 1.4.1](#), [A-X, 10.2.1](#), [F-V, 1](#)
 - Filing and search fees [A-III, 13](#)
 - Filing fee and search fee [A-X, 5.2.1](#)
 - Invitation to pay additional search fees combined with invitation to restrict the scope of the search [C-III, 3.2.3](#)
 - Invitation to pay further search fees [B-VII, 1.2](#)
 - Limitation to searched invention, no additional search fees paid [C-III, 3.2.1](#)
 - Reduction of the search fee for a supplementary European search [A-X, 9.5.1](#)
 - Refund of additional search fees [C-III, 3.4](#)
 - Refund of the further search fee [A-X, 10.2.2](#)
 - Refund of the search fee [A-X, 10.2.1](#)
 - Request for refund of further search fees [B-VII, 2.1](#)
 - Supplementary European search [A-X, 9.5.1](#), [A-X, 10.2.1](#), [B-VII, 2.3](#), [B-VIII, 3.4](#), [B-VIII, 4.5](#), [C-II, 1.2](#), [F-V, 7.1](#)
- Search for conflicting European patent applications [C-IV, 7.1](#)
- Search in neighbouring fields [B-III, 2.3](#)
- Search on dependent claims [B-III, 3.8](#)
- Search opinion [B-XI, B-XI, 1.1](#)
 - Amendments made in response to the search opinion [C-III, 2.1](#)
 - Analysis of the application and content of the search opinion [B-XI, 3](#)
 - Art. 124 and the utilisation scheme [B-XI, 9](#)
 - Basis for the search opinion [B-XI, 2](#)
 - Comments and amendments in response to the search opinion [B-XI, 3.3](#)
 - No search opinion is issued [B-XI, 7](#)
 - Priority claim and the search opinion [B-XI, 4](#)
 - Response to the extended European search report (EESR) [B-XI, 8](#)
 - Response to the search opinion [A-VI, 3](#), [C-II, 3.1](#)
 - Search opinion where the search was limited [B-XI, 6](#)
 - Transmittal of the search report and search opinion [B-X, 12](#)
 - Unity in relation to the search opinion [B-XI, 5](#)
 - Use of "P" and "E" documents in the search opinion [B-XI, 4.1](#)
- Search opinion is part of the EESR [B-XI, 1](#)
 - Position of the examining division [B-XI, 1.2](#)
- Search procedure and strategy [B-IV](#)
 - Procedure after searching [B-IV, 3](#)
 - Procedure before searching [B-IV, 1](#)
- Search report [B-II, 4](#), [B-IX, 2.3](#), [B-X](#)
 - Additional European searches [B-II, 4.2](#)
 - Admissibility in the examination procedure, after receipt of the search report - [Rule 137\(2\)](#) [H-II, 2.2](#)
 - Admissibility in the examination procedure, before receipt of the search report - [Rule 137\(1\)](#) [H-II, 2.1](#)
 - Amendments made in response to the WO-ISA, IPER or supplementary international search report [C-III, 2.2](#)
 - Application documents for the supplementary European search report [B-II, 4.3.3](#)
 - Authentication and dates [B-X, 10](#)
 - Citing documents not mentioned in the search report [C-IV, 7.5](#)
 - Classification of the European patent application [B-X, 5](#)
 - Content of the extended European search report (EESR) [B-VIII, 3.3](#), [B-VIII, 4.3](#)
 - Copies to be made available with the search report [B-X, 11](#)
 - Different types of search report drawn up by the EPO [B-X, 2](#)
 - Dispensing with the supplementary European search report [B-II, 4.3.1](#)
 - Documents found in the search [B-X, 9](#)
 - Drawing up the search report [B-IV, 3.1](#)
 - Errors in the search report [B-IV, 3.3](#)
 - European search report [A-VI, 1.3](#), [A-X, 9.5.1](#), [B-II, 4](#), [B-II, 4.3](#), [B-VII, 2.3](#), [B-X, 4](#), [B-X, 7](#), [C-II, 1.2](#), [C-II, 3.1](#), [C-IV, 7.3](#), [F-V, 7.1](#), [F-V, 7.2](#)
 - European searches [B-II, 4.1](#)
 - Evaluation of prior-art documents cited in the search report and late priority claim [C-III, 7](#)
 - Form and language of the search report [B-X, 3](#)
 - Identification of documents in the search report [B-X, 9.1](#)
 - Identification of the European patent application and the search report type [B-X, 4](#)
 - International (PCT) searches [B-II, 4.4](#)
 - International-type searches [B-II, 4.5](#)
 - IPC classification of late-published search reports [B-V, 3.1](#)
 - Opinions in relation to the search report [B-III, 1.1](#)
 - Partial European search report [B-VII, 1.1](#)
 - Relevant date for documents cited in the search report [B-VI, 5](#)
 - Response to the extended European search report (EESR) [B-XI, 8](#)
 - Restriction of the searched subject-matter [B-X, 8](#)
 - Searches on national applications [B-II, 4.6](#)
 - Separate publication of the European search report [A-VI, 1.5](#)
 - Supplementary European search report [B-X, 9.1.4](#)

Supplementary European search report is required [B-II, 4.3.2](#)
 Supplementary European searches [B-II, 4.3](#)
 Technical fields searched [B-X, 6](#)
 Title, abstract and figure to be published with the abstract (as indicated on supplemental sheet A) [B-X, 7](#)
 Transmittal of the search report and search opinion [B-X, 12](#)
 Search strategy [B-IV, 2](#)
 Carrying out the search [B-IV, 2.3](#)
 Closest prior art and its effects on the search [B-IV, 2.5](#)
 Devising a search strategy [B-IV, 2.2](#)
 End of search [B-IV, 2.6](#)
 Record of search strategy [B-X, 3.4](#)
 Redefining the searched subject-matter [B-IV, 2.4](#)
 Restrictions [B-IV, 2.1](#)
 Subject-matter of the search [B-IV, 2.1](#)
 Types of documents [B-IV, 2.3](#)
 Search summary [B-X, 3.3](#)
 Search, publication and request for examination of divisional applications [A-IV, 1.8](#)
 State of the art at the search stage [B-VI](#)
 Subject-matter excluded from search [B-III, 3.11](#)
 Subject-matter to be excluded from the search [B-VIII](#)
 Supplementary international search [B-III, 3.3.2](#)
 Where the EPO does not perform a supplementary European search [H-II, 6.4.1](#)
 Where the EPO performs a supplementary European search [H-II, 6.4.2](#)
 Widening of the search [B-VI, 5.3](#)

Searches on national applications [B-II, 4.6](#)

Searches under Rule 164(2) [C-III, 3.1](#)

Search-related issues in examination [C-IV, 7](#)
 Additional searches during examination [C-IV, 7.3](#)
 Citing documents not mentioned in the search report [C-IV, 7.5](#)
 National prior rights [C-IV, 7.2](#)
 Search at the examination stage [C-IV, 7.4](#)
 Search for conflicting European patent applications [C-IV, 7.1](#)

Second non-medical use [G-VI, 6.2](#)

Second Rule 71(3) communication based on higher-ranking request initially rejected in first Rule 71(3) communication [C-V, 4.6.2](#)

Second Rule 71(3) communication reversing the amendments proposed by the examining division in first Rule 71(3) communication [C-V, 4.6.1](#)

Secondary indicators [G-VII, 10](#)
 Arbitrary choice [G-VII, 10.1](#)
 Bonus effect [G-VII, 10.2](#)
 Commercial success [G-VII, 10.3](#)
 Long-felt need [G-VII, 10.3](#)
 Non-functional modification [G-VII, 10.1](#)
 Predictable disadvantage [G-VII, 10.1](#)
 Unexpected technical effect [G-VII, 10.2](#)

Sectional diagrams [A-IX, 7.3.1](#)

Selection inventions [G-VI, 7](#) [G-VII, 12](#)
 Error margins in numerical values [G-VI, 7.1](#)
 Inventive step [G-VII, 12](#)
 Novelty [G-VI, 7](#)

Separate crediting of the fee for grant and publishing and claims fees [A-X, 11.3](#)

Separate hearings [E-IV, 1.6.4](#)

Separate publication of the European search report [A-VI, 1.5](#)

Sequence

Sequence information filed under Rule 56 [A-IV, 5.1](#)
 Sequence information filed under Rule 56a [A-IV, 5.2](#)
 Sequence listing [A-III, 1.2](#), [A-III, 16.2](#), [B-IV, 1.2](#), [F-II, 6](#)
 Content of a European patent application (other than claims) [F-II, 6](#)
 Reference to sequences disclosed in a database [F-II, 6.1](#)
 Sequence listings filed after the date of filing [H-IV, 2.2.5](#)
 Sequence listings of a divisional application [A-IV, 5.4](#)
 Sequence listings of an application filed by reference to a previously filed application [A-IV, 5.3](#)
 Sequence of proceedings [D-VII, 1](#)
 Exceptions [D-VII, 1.2](#)
 Sequence of requests [H-III, 3.1.1](#)
 Sequences and partial sequences of genes [G-III, 4](#)
 Sequences of divisional applications [A-IV, 1.1.2](#)
 Sequences that need to be itemised in the sequence listing [F-II, 6.2](#)
 "mol_type" qualifier [F-II, 6.2.4](#)
 Requirements relating to sequence length and enumeration of residues [F-II, 6.2.1](#)
 Sequences comprising residues that are not specifically defined (n or X) [F-II, 6.2.2](#)
 Variants [F-II, 6.2.3](#)

Service

Filing of applications by delivery by hand or by postal services [A-II, 1.2](#)
 Notification by postal services [E-II, 2.4](#)

Shading [A-IX, 7.2](#)

Shared area [C-VII, 2.6](#)

SI

SI base units [F-II, An. 2, 1.1](#)
 Special name and symbol of the SI derived unit of temperature for expressing Celsius temperature [F-II, An. 2, 1.1.1](#)
 SI derived units [F-II, An. 2, 1.2](#)
 General rule for SI derived units [F-II, An. 2, 1.2.1](#)
 SI derived units with special names and symbols [F-II, An. 2, 1.2.2](#)
 SI units and their decimal multiples and submultiples [F-II, An. 2, 1](#)

Prefixes and their symbols used to designate certain decimal multiples and submultiples [F-II, An. 2.1.3](#)
 Special authorised names and symbols of decimal multiples and submultiples of SI units [F-II, An. 2.1.4](#)

Signature [A-III, 4.2.2](#), [C-VIII, 6](#), [D-III, 3.4](#)
 Examination of the request for grant form [A-III, 4.2.2](#)
 Signature of documents [A-VIII, 3](#)
 Documents filed after filing the European patent application [A-VIII, 3.1](#)
 Documents forming part of the European patent application [A-VIII, 3.2](#)
 Form of signature [A-VIII, 3.3](#)
 Joint applicants [A-VIII, 3.4](#)
 Signature of the notice of opposition [D-III, 3.4](#)
 Submission in writing [D-III, 3.4](#)
 Work within the examining division [C-VIII, 6](#)

Signed authorisation [A-VIII, 1.7](#)

Simulation, design or modelling [G-II, 3.3.2](#)

Skilled person (Common general knowledge of the ~) [G-VII, 3.1](#)

Some examples of determining priority dates [F-VI, 2.4](#)

Intermediate publication of another European application [F-VI, 2.4.2](#)
 Intermediate publication of the contents of the priority application [F-VI, 2.4.1](#)
 Multiple priorities claimed for different inventions in the application with an intermediate publication of one of the inventions [F-VI, 2.4.3](#)
 Where it is necessary to check whether the application from which priority is actually claimed is the "first application" within the meaning of [Art. 87\(1\)](#) [F-VI, 2.4.4](#)

Special applications [C-IX, H-IV, 2.3](#)

Applications filed by reference to an earlier application [H-IV, 2.3.1](#)
 Applications resulting from a decision under [Art. 61](#) [C-IX, 2](#), [H-IV, 2.3.3](#)
 Applications where a reservation has been entered in accordance with [Art. 167\(2\)\(a\) EPC 1973](#) [C-IX, 3](#)
 Divisional applications [C-IX, 1](#), [H-IV, 2.3.2](#)
 International applications [H-IV, 2.3.4](#)
 International applications (Euro-PCT applications) [C-IX, 4](#)

Special authorised names and symbols of decimal multiples and submultiples of SI units [F-II, An. 2.1.4](#)

Special circumstances [C-VI, 1.2](#)

Special name and symbol of the SI derived unit of temperature for expressing Celsius temperature [F-II, An. 2.1.1.1](#)

Special provisions [A-IV](#)

Applications relating to biological material [A-IV, 4](#)

Applications relating to nucleotide and amino acid sequences [A-IV, 5](#)

[Art. 61](#) applications and stay of proceedings under [Rule 14](#) [A-IV, 2](#)

Conversion into a national application [A-IV, 6](#)

Display at an exhibition [A-IV, 3](#)

European divisional applications [A-IV, 1](#)

Special reductions [A-X, 9.5](#)

Reduction of the examination fee where the international preliminary examination report is drawn up by the EPO [A-X, 9.5.2](#)

Reduction of the search fee for a supplementary European search [A-X, 9.5.1](#)

Special refunds [A-X, 10.2](#)

Refund of the appeal fee [A-X, 10.2.6](#)

Refund of the examination fee [A-X, 10.2.3](#)

Refund of the fee for grant and publishing [A-X, 10.2.5](#)

Refund of the further search fee [A-X, 10.2.2](#)

Refund of the search fee [A-X, 10.2.1](#)

Refund under [Rule 37\(2\)](#) [A-X, 10.2.4](#)

Special technical features [F-V, 2](#)

Specific rules applicable to Euro-PCT applications [B-III, 3.3.2](#)

Standard

Standard marks for indicating amendments or corrections by the divisions [C-V, An.](#)

Standard marks for indicating amendments or corrections by the divisions, further ways to accelerate examination [C-VI, 3](#)

Standard marks for indicating amendments or corrections by the divisions, further communication with the applicant [C-VIII, 5](#)

When can a summons to oral proceedings be issued in substantive examination? [C-VIII, 5.1](#)

Standard of proof [G-IV, 7.3.4](#), [G-IV, 7.5.2](#)

Internet disclosures [G-IV, 7.5.2](#)

State of the art made available by means of oral description [G-IV, 7.3.4](#)

Standards and standard preparatory documents [G-IV, 7.6](#)

State of the art [A-XIII, 10.1](#), [F-II, 4.3](#), [G-IV, G-IV, 5.1](#), [G-IV, 5.2](#), [G-VII, 1](#), [G-VII, 2](#)

Conflict with national rights of earlier date [G-IV, 6](#)

Conflict with other European applications [G-IV, 5](#)

Conflict with other European applications [G-IV, 5.1](#), [G-IV, 5.2](#)

Cross-references between prior-art documents [G-IV, 8](#)

Date of filing or priority date as effective date [G-IV, 3](#)

Description (formal requirements) [F-II, 4.3](#)

Different text in respect of the state of the art according to [Art. 54\(3\) EPC](#) and [Art. 54\(4\) EPC 1973](#) [H-III, 4.2](#)

Documents defining the state of the art and not prejudicing novelty or inventive step [B-X, 9.2.2](#)

Documents in a non-official language [G-IV, 4](#)

Doubts about the state of the art [B-VI, 5.6](#)

Enabling disclosure [G-IV, 2](#)

Errors in prior-art documents [G-IV, 9](#)

General remarks and definition [G-IV, 1](#)

Invention [G-VII, 1](#)
 Patentability [G-IV](#)
 State of the art at the search stage [B-VI](#)
 Conflicting applications [B-VI, 4](#)
 Contents of prior-art disclosures [B-VI, 6](#)
 Filing and priority date [B-VI, 5](#)
 Internet disclosures – technical journals [B-VI, 7](#)
 Oral disclosure, use, exhibition, etc. as state of the art [B-VI, 2](#)
 Priority [B-VI, 3](#)
 Relevant date for documents cited in the search report [B-VI, 5](#)
 State of the art made available by means of oral description [G-IV, 7.3](#)
 Cases of oral description [G-IV, 7.3.1](#)
 Matters to be determined by the division in cases of oral description [G-IV, 7.3.3](#)
 Non-prejudicial oral description [G-IV, 7.3.2](#)
 Standard of proof [G-IV, 7.3.4](#)
 State of the art made available to the public "by means of a written or oral description, by use, or in any other way" [G-IV, 7](#)
 Internet disclosures [G-IV, 7.5](#)
 Matters to be determined by the division as regards prior use [G-IV, 7.2](#)
 Standards and standard preparatory documents [G-IV, 7.6](#)
 State of the art made available to the public in writing and/or by any other means [G-IV, 7.4](#)
 Types of use and instances of state of the art made available in any other way [G-IV, 7.1](#)
 State of the art pursuant to [Art. 54\(3\)](#) [G-IV, 5.1](#)
 Accorded date of filing and content of the application still subject to review [G-IV, 5.1.2](#)
 Requirements [G-IV, 5.1.1](#)
 State of the art under [Art. 54\(2\)](#) [G-VI, 1](#)

Statement

Disparaging statements [A-III, 8.2](#), [F-II, 7.3](#)
 General statements, "spirit of the invention", claim-like clauses [F-IV, 4.4](#)
 Positive statements [B-XI, 3.2.2](#)
 Positive statements/suggestions [C-III, 4.1.2](#)
 Statement in the decision of the amended form of the European patent [D-VIII, 1.4.2](#)
 Statement of withdrawal [E-VIII, 8.3](#)

Stay of proceedings [D-VII, 4.1](#)

[Art. 61](#) applications and stay of proceedings under [Rule 14](#) [A-IV, 2](#)
 Legal character and effect of the stay of proceedings [D-VII, 4.1.2](#)
 Stay of proceedings for grant [A-IV, 2.2](#)
 Date of the stay of proceedings [A-IV, 2.2.2](#)
 Interruption of periods [A-IV, 2.2.4](#)
 Legal nature and effects of the stay [A-IV, 2.2.3](#)
 Responsible department [A-IV, 2.2.1](#)
 Resumption of the proceedings for grant [A-IV, 2.2.5](#)
 Stay of proceedings under [Rule 14](#) due to pending national entitlement proceedings [E-VII, 2](#)
 Stay of proceedings when a referral to the Enlarged Board of Appeal is pending [E-VII, 3](#)

Subject matter

Subject-matter excluded from patentability under [Art. 52\(2\)](#) and [\(3\)](#) [B-VIII, 2.2](#)
 Computer-implemented business methods [B-VIII, 2.2.1](#)
 Subject-matter of a dependent claim [F-IV, 3.6](#)
 Subject-matter of minutes [E-III, 10.3](#)
 Subject-matter of the European patent extending beyond the original disclosure [D-V, 6](#)
 Basis of this ground for opposition [D-V, 6.1](#)
 Distinction between allowable and unallowable amendments [D-V, 6.2](#)
 Subject-matter of the search [B-III, 3](#), [B-IV, 2.1](#)
 Abandoned claims [B-III, 3.4](#)
 Amended claims, missing parts ([Rule 56](#)) or erroneously filed application documents or parts ([Rule 56a](#)) [B-III, 3.3](#)
 Anticipation of amendments to claims [B-III, 3.5](#)
 Basis for the search [B-III, 3.1](#)
 Broad claims [B-III, 3.6](#)
 Combination of elements in a claim [B-III, 3.9](#)
 Different categories [B-III, 3.10](#)
 Independent and dependent claims [B-III, 3.7](#)
 Interpretation of claims [B-III, 3.2](#)
 Lack of unity [B-III, 3.12](#)
 Search on dependent claims [B-III, 3.8](#)
 Subject-matter excluded from search [B-III, 3.11](#)
 Technological background [B-III, 3.13](#)
 Subject-matter taken from the description [H-IV, 4.1.2](#)
 Subject-matter to be excluded from the search [B-VIII](#)
 Claims contravening [Art. 123\(2\)](#) or [Art. 76\(1\)](#) [B-VIII, 6](#)
 Considerations relating to specific exclusions from and exceptions to patentability [B-VIII, 2](#)
 Invitation under both [Rule 62a\(1\)](#) and [Rule 63\(1\)](#) [B-VIII, 5](#)
 More than one independent claim per category ([Rule 62a](#)) [B-VIII, 4](#)
 No meaningful search possible [B-VIII, 3](#)
 Subject-matter to be excluded is disclosed in the application as originally filed [H-V, 4.2.2](#)
 Subject-matter to be excluded is not disclosed in the application as originally filed (so-called undisclosed disclaimers) [H-V, 4.2.1](#)

Submissions

Submission in writing [D-III, 3](#)
 Form of the opposition [D-III, 3.1](#)
 Notices of opposition filed by fax [D-III, 3.3](#)
 Notices of opposition filed electronically [D-III, 3.2](#)
 Signature of the notice of opposition [D-III, 3.4](#)
 Submissions by the parties [E-III, 8.5](#)
 Use of computer-generated slideshows in oral proceedings [E-III, 8.5.1](#)
 Written submissions during oral proceedings by videoconference [E-III, 8.5.2](#)
 Submissions filed in preparation for or during oral proceedings [E-VI, 2.2](#)
 Amendments filed in preparation for or during oral proceedings [E-VI, 2.2.2](#)
 Costs [E-VI, 2.2.5](#)
 New facts and evidence [E-VI, 2.2.1](#)
 Principles relating to the exercise of discretion [E-VI, 2.2.3](#)

Right to be heard [E-VI, 2.2.4](#)

Subsequent

Subsequent application considered as first

application [F-VI, 1.4.1](#)

Subsequent filing of documents [A-II, 1.4](#)

Subsequent procedure [D-IV, 1.6](#)

Subsequent procedure in the event of deficiencies

which may no longer be remedied [D-IV, 1.4](#)

Deficiencies which may no longer be remedied in accordance with [Rule 77\(1\)](#) and [\(2\)](#), resulting in the opposition being rejected as inadmissible [D-IV, 1.4.2](#)

Deficiencies which may no longer be remedied, as a result of which the opposition is deemed not to have been filed [D-IV, 1.4.1](#)

Substances and compositions [G-II, 4.2](#)

Substantiation of the request [E-VIII, 3.1.4](#)

Substantive examination

Substantive examination (limitation) [D-X, 4](#)

Basis for the examination [D-X, 4.2](#)

Department responsible [D-X, 4.1](#)

Scope of the examination [D-X, 4.3](#)

Substantive examination (limitation), further stages of the examination [D-X, 4.4](#)

Third-party observations during the examination [D-X, 4.5](#)

Substantive examination of a Euro-PCT application accompanied by an IPER [A-XIV, 6.3](#)

Basis for substantive examination [A-XIV, 6.3.2](#)

Comparative test results [A-XIV, 6.3.1](#)

Consideration of the contents of the IPER [A-XIV, 6.3.3](#)

Substantive examination of opposition [D-V](#)

Beginning of the examination of the opposition [D-V, 1](#)

Clarity of claims and support by the description [D-V, 5](#)

Extent of the examination [D-V, 2](#)

Insufficient disclosure of the invention [D-V, 4](#)

Non-patentability pursuant to [Art. 52](#) to [57](#) [D-V, 3](#)

Subject-matter of the European patent extending beyond the original disclosure [D-V, 6](#)

Sufficiency of disclosure [F-III, F-III, 1](#)

[Art. 83](#) vs [Art. 123\(2\)](#) [F-III, 2](#)

Burden of proof in relation to the possibility of performing and repeating the invention [F-III, 4](#)

Cases of partially insufficient disclosure [F-III, 5](#)

Insufficient disclosure [F-III, 3](#)

Inventions relating to biological material [F-III, 6](#)

Proper names, trade marks and trade names [F-III, 7](#)

"Reach-through" claims [F-III, 9](#)

Reference documents [F-III, 8](#)

Sufficiency of disclosure and clarity [F-III, 11](#)

Sufficiency of disclosure and inventive step [F-III, 12](#)

Sufficiency of disclosure and [Rules 56](#) and

[56a](#) [F-III, 10](#)

Summaries, extracts or abstracts [B-X, 11.5](#)

Summary of the processing of applications and patents at the EPO [General Part, 6](#)

Summoning of parties, witnesses and experts [E-IV, 1.5](#)

Summons to oral proceedings [D-VI, 3.2](#), [E-III, 6](#)

Invitation to file observations [D-VI, 3.2](#)

Late-filed requests after summons to oral proceedings in examination [H-II, 2.7](#)

Oral proceedings [E-III, 6](#)

Summons to oral proceedings as the first action in examination [C-III, 5](#)

When can a summons to oral proceedings be issued in substantive examination? [C-VIII, 5.1](#), [E-III, 5.1](#)

Supplementary

Supplementary European search [B-VII, 2.3](#)

Application documents for the supplementary

European search report [B-II, 4.3.3](#)

Dispensing with the supplementary European search report [B-II, 4.3.1](#)

Procedures in cases of lack of unity [B-VII, 2.3](#)

Reduction of the search fee for a supplementary

European search [A-X, 9.5.1](#)

Supplementary European search report is

required [B-II, 4.3.2](#)

Where the EPO does not perform a supplementary

European search [H-II, 6.4.1](#)

Where the EPO performs a supplementary

European search [H-II, 6.4.2](#)

Supplementary European search report [B-X, 9.1.4](#)

Application documents for the supplementary

European search report [B-II, 4.3.3](#)

Dispensing with the supplementary European search report [B-II, 4.3.1](#)

Supplementary European search report is

required [B-II, 4.3.2](#)

Supplementary European searches [B-II, 4.3](#)

Application documents for the supplementary

European search report [B-II, 4.3.3](#)

Dispensing with the supplementary European search report [B-II, 4.3.1](#)

Supplementary European search report is

required [B-II, 4.3.2](#)

Supplementary international search [B-III, 3.3.2](#)

Amendments made in response to the WO-ISA,

IPER or supplementary international search report [C-III, 2.2](#)

Supplementary technical information [H-V, 2.3](#)

Support for dependent claims [F-IV, 6.6](#)

Support in description [F-IV, 6](#)

Definition in terms of function [F-IV, 6.5](#)

Extent of generalisation [F-IV, 6.2](#)

Lack of support vs insufficient disclosure [F-IV, 6.4](#)

Objection of lack of support [F-IV, 6.3](#)

Support for dependent claims [F-IV, 6.6](#)

Surgery [G-II, 4.2.1.1](#)

Methods for treatment by surgery [G-II, 4.2](#), [G-II, 4.2.1](#)

Methods for treatment of the human or animal body by surgery or therapy and diagnostic methods practised on the human or animal body [B-VIII, 2.1](#)
 Surgery, therapy and diagnostic methods [G-II, 4.2](#)
 Limitations of exception under Art. 53(c) [G-II, 4.2.1](#)
 Methods for screening potential medicaments and clinical trials [G-II, 4.2.2](#)

Surgical uses under Art. 54(5) [G-VI, 6.1.4](#)

Surrender of patent [E-VIII, 8.4](#)

Suspensive effect [E-XI, 1](#)

T

Tables [A-IX, 11.2](#)

Formulae and tables [F-IV, 2.4](#)

Tables in the claims [A-IX, 11.2.2](#)

Tables in the description [A-IX, 11.2.1](#)

Taking and conservation of evidence [E-IV](#)

Conservation of evidence [E-IV, 2](#)

Evaluation of evidence [E-IV, 4](#)

Taking of evidence by courts or authorities of the contracting states [E-IV, 3](#)

Taking of evidence by the departments of the EPO [E-IV, 1](#)

Taking of a final decision [D-VIII, 1.4.1](#)

Taking of evidence [C-VII, 4](#), [D-VI, 1](#), [D-VI, 7.1](#), [E-IV, 1.1](#), [E-IV, 1.3](#), [E-IV, 2.4](#)

Conservation of evidence [E-IV, 2.4](#)

Costs [D-IX, 1.1](#), [D-IX, 1.3](#), [E-IV, 1.9](#)

Costs arising from oral proceedings or taking of evidence [E-IV, 1.9](#)

Decision on the request and the taking of evidence [E-IV, 2.4](#)

Language used in the taking of evidence [E-V, 4](#)

Minutes of taking of evidence [E-IV, 1.7](#)

Other procedures in examination [C-VII, 4](#)

Producing evidence [C-VII, 4.2](#)

Taking of evidence by courts or authorities of the contracting states [E-IV, 3](#)

 Costs of taking evidence [E-IV, 3.5](#)

 Legal co-operation [E-IV, 3.1](#)

 Letters rogatory [E-IV, 3.3](#)

 Means of giving or taking evidence [E-IV, 3.2](#)

 Procedures before the competent

 authority [E-IV, 3.4](#)

 Taking of evidence by an appointed person [E-IV, 3.6](#)

Taking of evidence by the departments of the EPO [E-IV, 1](#)

Taking of evidence on oath [E-IV, 3.2.1](#)

Written evidence [C-VII, 4.3](#)

Taking of evidence by the departments of the EPO [E-IV, 1](#)

Commissioning of experts [E-IV, 1.8](#)

Costs arising from oral proceedings or taking of evidence [E-IV, 1.9](#)

Entitlements of witnesses and experts [E-IV, 1.10](#)

Hearing of parties, witnesses and experts [E-IV, 1.6](#)

Means of evidence [E-IV, 1.2](#)

Minutes of taking of evidence [E-IV, 1.7](#)

Models [E-IV, 1.11](#)

Order to take evidence [E-IV, 1.4](#)

Summoning of parties, witnesses and experts [E-IV, 1.5](#)

Taking of evidence [E-IV, 1.3](#)

Video recordings [E-IV, 1.12](#)

Tasks of the opposition divisions [D-II, 4](#)

Ancillary proceedings [D-II, 4.3](#)

Decision concerning the awarding of costs by the opposition division [D-II, 4.2](#)

Examination of oppositions [D-II, 4.1](#)

Tasks of the other members of the examining division [C-VIII, 4](#)

Technical

Technical details and general remarks [G-IV, 7.5.6](#)

Technical drawings [A-IX, 1.1](#)

Technical features [F-IV, 2.1](#)

 Special technical features [F-V, 2](#)

Technical field [F-II, 4.2](#)

 Search division has more than one member, further searches in a different technical field for a non-unitary application [B-I, 2.2.2](#)

 Technical fields searched [B-X, 6](#)

 Where claimed unitary subject-matter covers more than one technical field [B-I, 2.2.1](#)

Technical journals [G-IV, 7.5.3.1](#)

 Internet disclosures – technical journals [B-VI, 7](#)

Technical opinion [E-XII, 1](#)

 Establishment and issue of the technical opinion [E-XII, 5.4](#)

 Fee for a technical opinion [E-XII, 5.3](#)

 Request from a national court for a technical opinion concerning a European patent [E-XIII](#)

 Scope of the technical opinion [E-XII, 2](#)

Technical problem [E-III, 8.2.3](#)

 Formulation of the objective technical problem [G-VII, 5.2](#)

 Formulation of the objective technical problem for claims comprising technical and non-technical features [G-VII, 5.4.1](#)

 Revision of stated technical problem [H-V, 2.4](#)

 Technical problem and its solution [F-II, 4.5](#)

 Using the description and/or drawings to identify the technical problem [B-III, 3.2.2](#)

Technical progress, advantageous effect [G-I, 2](#)

Technically qualified members [D-II, 2.1](#)

Technological background [B-III, 3.13](#)

Termination of opposition proceedings in the event of inadmissible opposition [D-IV, 4](#)

Terminology [F-II, 4.11](#)

Terms of reference of the expert [E-IV, 1.8.3](#)

Terms such as "about", "approximately" or "substantially" [F-IV, 4.7](#)

Clarity objections [F-IV, 4.7.2](#)

Interpretation of terms such as "about", "approximately" or "substantially" [F-IV, 4.7.1](#)

Territorial effect of the opposition [D-I, 3](#)

Text for approval [C-V, 1.1](#)

Text matter on drawings [A-IX, 8](#)

Therapeutic uses pursuant to Art. 54(5) [G-VI, 6.1.2](#)

Therapy [G-II, 4.2.1.2](#)

Methods for treatment by therapy [G-II, 4.2](#), [G-II, 4.2.1](#)

Methods for treatment of the human or animal body by surgery or therapy and diagnostic methods practised on the human or animal body [B-VIII, 2.1](#)

Surgery, therapy and diagnostic methods [G-II, 4.2](#)

Third parties [D-I, 6](#), [E-VI, 3](#)

Examination of observations by third parties [C-VII, 6](#)

Observations by third parties [D-I, 6](#), [E-VI, 3](#)

Third-party observations [A-VII, 3.5](#)

Third-party observations during the examination [D-X, 4.5](#)

Time

Time allowed for filing notice of opposition [D-III, 1](#)

Time limit and form of appeal [E-XI, 6](#)

Time limit for filing the request for examination [A-VI, 2.2](#)

Time limit for payment of extension and validation fees [A-III, 12.2](#)

Time limits [A-III, 11.2.1](#), [G-V, 2](#)

Calculation of time limits [E-VIII, 1.4](#)

Consideration of time limits [E-IX, 1.2](#)

Determination of time limits [E-VIII, 1.1](#)

Extension of time limits set by the EPO under Rule 132 [E-VIII, 1.6.1](#)

Interruption of time limits [D-VII, 4.3](#)

Revocation in the event of requirements not being met until after expiry of time limits [D-VIII, 1.2.4](#)

Time limits covered [E-VIII, 3.1.1](#)

Time limits which may be freely determined [E-VIII, 1.3](#)

Time limits and acceleration of examination [C-VI](#)

Influencing the speed of examination proceedings [C-VI, 2](#)

PACE [C-VI, 2](#)

Standard marks for indicating amendments or corrections by the divisions, further ways to accelerate examination [C-VI, 3](#)

Time limits and loss of rights resulting from failure to respond within a time limit [E-VIII, 1](#)

Calculation of time limits [E-VIII, 1.4](#)

Determination of time limits [E-VIII, 1.1](#)

Duration of the periods to be specified by the EPO on the basis of EPC provisions [E-VIII, 1.2](#)

Effect of change in priority date [E-VIII, 1.5](#)

Extension of a time limit [E-VIII, 1.6](#)

Failure to respond within a time limit [E-VIII, 1.8](#)

Late receipt of documents [E-VIII, 1.7](#)

Loss of rights [E-VIII, 1.9](#)

Time limits which may be freely determined [E-VIII, 1.3](#)

Time limits for response to communications from the examiner [C-VI, 1](#)

General considerations [C-VI, 1.1](#)

Special circumstances [C-VI, 1.2](#)

Time limits, loss of rights, further and accelerated processing and re-establishment of rights [E-VIII](#)

Accelerated processing before the boards of appeal [E-VIII, 6](#)

Accelerated processing of oppositions [E-VIII, 5](#)

Accelerated prosecution of European patent applications [E-VIII, 4](#)

Enquiries [E-VIII, 7](#)

Further processing [E-VIII, 2](#)

Re-establishment of rights [E-VIII, 3](#)

Renunciation of rights [E-VIII, 8](#)

Timeliness and structure of auxiliary requests [H-III, 3.3.2.2](#)

Title [F-II, 3](#)

Changes in the title [H-V, 8](#)

Title of the invention [A-III, 7](#)

Examination of formal requirements [A-III, 7](#)

Requirements [A-III, 7.1](#)

Responsibility [A-III, 7.2](#)

Title, abstract and figure to be published with the abstract (as indicated on supplemental sheet A) [B-X, 7](#)

Trade marks [F-IV, 4.8](#), [H-IV, 2.2.9](#)

Clarity and interpretation of claims [F-IV, 4.8](#)

Content of the application as "originally" filed [H-IV, 2.2.9](#)

Proper names, trade marks and trade names [F-III, 7](#)

Registered trade marks [F-II, 4.14](#)

Transfer of rights [E-XIII, 3](#), [E-XIII, 6.1](#)

Opposition cases with different texts where a transfer of rights by virtue of a final decision pursuant to Art. 61 takes place in examination proceedings [H-III, 4.3.3](#)

Transfer of the European patent [E-XIII, 4](#)

Transfer of the European patent application [E-XIII, 3](#)

Transitional provisions for Art. 54(4) EPC 1973 and Art. 54(5) [D-VII, 8](#)

Transitional provisions relating to Rule 137(4) [H-III, 2.1.4](#)

Translation

Certification [A-VII, 7](#)
 Correction and certification of the translation [A-VII, 7](#)
 Divisional application [A-IV, 1.3.3](#), [A-VII, 1.3](#)
 Documents making up the application, replacement documents, translations [A-III, 3.2](#)
 Invitation to file the translation [A-VII, 1.4](#)
 Language of proceedings [A-VII, 2](#), [A-VII, 3.2](#), [A-VII, 7](#)
 Letters rogatory [E-IV, 3.3](#)
 Machine translations [G-IV, 4.1](#)
 Replacement documents and translations [A-VIII, 2.2](#)
 Request for amendments or corrections in reply to the [Rule 71\(3\)](#) communication, no payment of fees or filing of translations necessary [C-V, 4.1](#)
 Request for publishing fee, translations and a formally compliant version of amended text passages [D-VI, 7.2.3](#)
 Revocation for failure to pay the prescribed fee for publishing, to file a translation or to file a formally compliant version of amended text passages [D-VIII, 1.2.2](#)
 Translation of claims [C-V, 1.3](#)
 Correction of the translations of the claims [H-VI, 5](#)
 Translation of international application [C-II, 1.2](#), [A-XIII, 10.1](#)
 Translation of the application [A-III, 14](#)
 Translation of the previous application [A-III, 6.8](#), [F-VI, 3.4](#)
 Claim to priority [A-III, 6.8](#), [F-VI, 3.4](#)
 Declaration replacing the translation [A-III, 6.8.6](#)
 Invitation to file the translation before examination [A-III, 6.8.1](#)
 Invitation to file the translation in examination/opposition [A-III, 6.8.2](#)
 Loss of rights and legal remedies [A-III, 6.8.3](#)
 Translation of previous application already filed [A-III, 6.8.4](#)
 Voluntary filing of the translation of the previous application [A-III, 6.8.5](#)
 Translation of the priority application [A-II, 5.4.4](#), [A-II, 6.4.3](#)
 Correct application documents based on priority application, no change in the date of filing [A-II, 6.4.3](#)
 Further action upon examination of replies, further action where a request for a translation of the priority application was sent earlier in examination proceedings [C-IV, 3.1](#)
 Missing parts of the description or missing drawings based on the priority application, no change in date of filing [A-II, 5.4.4](#)

Transmission of the dossier to the examining division [A-VI, 2.4](#)

Transmittal

Transmittal of the abstract to the applicant [F-II, 2.6](#)

Transmittal of the search report and search opinion [B-X, 12](#)

Travel expenses [E-IV, 1.10.1](#)

Treaty

Two-part form [F-IV, 2.2](#)

Two-part form unsuitable [F-IV, 2.3](#)
 Two-part form unsuitable, no two-part form [F-IV, 2.3.1](#)
 Two-part form "wherever appropriate" [F-IV, 2.3.2](#)

Types

Types of documents [B-IV, 2.3](#)
 Types of evidence [E-IV, 4.2](#)
 Types of use and instances of state of the art made available in any other way [G-IV, 7.1](#)

U

Unexpected technical effect [G-VII, 10.2](#)

Unitary Patent protection [General Part, 9](#)

Units

Units recognised in international practice as determined by the President under [Rule 49\(2\)](#) [F-II, An. 2](#)
 Compound units [F-II, An. 2.5](#)
 SI units and their decimal multiples and submultiples [F-II, An. 2.1](#)
 Units and names of units permitted in specialised fields only [F-II, An. 2.4](#)
 Units used with the SI, and whose values in SI are obtained experimentally [F-II, An. 2.3](#)
 Units which are defined on the basis of SI units but are not decimal multiples or submultiples thereof [F-II, An. 2.2](#)

Unity

Unity in relation to the search opinion [B-XI, 5](#)
 Unity of invention [B-II, 4.2](#), [B-III, 3.12](#), [B-VII, 1.1](#), [B-VIII, 3.4](#), [B-VIII, 4.5](#), [C-III, 3](#), [C-III, 3.2](#), [C-III, 3.2.1](#), [C-IX, 1.2](#), [D-V, 2.2](#), [F-IV, 3.2](#), [F-IV, 3.3](#), [F-IV, 3.7](#), [F-V, 1](#), [F-V, 2](#), [F-V, 2.1](#), [F-V, 3.2.1](#), [G-VI, 6.1](#)
 Amended claims [F-V, 6](#)
 Assessment of unity [F-V, 3](#)
 Changing from one searched invention to another [C-III, 3.5](#)
 Divisional applications [C-IX, 1.2](#)
 Euro-PCT applications [F-V, 7](#)
 European patent application [F-V, F-V, 1](#)
 European search report [B-VII, 1.1](#)
 Examination of novelty [G-VI, 6.1](#)
 Excision of other inventions [C-III, 3.3](#)
 Extent of the examination [D-V, 2.2](#)
 Filing divisional applications [C-III, 3.3](#)
 First stage of examination [C-III, 3](#)
 IPC classification in cases of lack of unity of invention [B-V, 3.3](#)
 Kinds of claim [F-IV, 3.2](#), [F-IV, 3.3](#), [F-IV, 3.7](#)
 Lack of unity and [Rule 62a](#) or [Rule 63](#) [B-VII, 3](#)

Limitation to searched invention [C-III, 3.2](#)
 No meaningful search possible [B-VIII, 3.4](#)
 Procedure in the case of lack of unity during search [F-V, 4](#)
 Procedure in the case of lack of unity during substantive examination [F-V, 5](#)
 Procedures in cases of lack of unity [B-VII, 2](#)
 Refund of additional search fees [C-III, 3.4](#)
 Relation to unity in search [C-III, 3.2](#)
 Requirement of unity of invention [F-V, 2](#)
 Search report [B-II, 4.2](#)
 Searches under Rule 164(2) [C-III, 3.1](#)
 Subject-matter of the search [B-III, 3.12](#)
 Unity of the European patent [D-VII, 3](#)
 Factors affecting the unity of the European patent [D-VII, 3.2](#)

Unpublished patent applications [B-IX, 2.2](#)

Unusual parameters [F-IV, 4.11.1](#)

Usable surface area of sheets [A-IX, 4.1](#)

Use

Use claims [F-IV, 4.16](#)
 Use of an official language [E-V, 1](#)
 Use of computer-generated slideshows in oral proceedings [E-III, 8.5.1](#)
 Examination proceedings (ex parte) [E-III, 8.5.1.2](#)
 Opposition proceedings (inter partes) [E-III, 8.5.1.1](#)
 Use of email [C-VII, 3](#)
 Confidentiality [C-VII, 3.2](#)
 Inclusion in the file of any email exchange [C-VII, 3.3](#)
 Initiation of exchanges by email [C-VII, 3.1](#)
 Use of "P" and "E" documents in the search opinion [B-XI, 4.1](#)
 Use of Rule 137(4) for amendments filed during oral proceedings in examination [E-III, 8.8](#)
 Use on non-public property [G-IV, 7.2.3](#)

User interfaces [G-II, 3.7.1](#)

Using the description and or drawings

Using the description and/or drawings to define clear terms given a definition different from their usual meaning [B-III, 3.2.4](#)
 Using the description and/or drawings to define unclear terms not defined in the claims [B-III, 3.2.3](#)
 Using the description and/or drawings to identify the technical problem [B-III, 3.2.2](#)

Variations in proportions [A-IX, 7.6](#)

Verification of claimed priority dates [B-VI, 5.1](#)

Verification of the IPC classification [B-V, 3.4](#)

Version of the granted patent to be considered [H-IV, 3.3](#)

Video recordings [E-IV, 1.12](#)

Voluntary

Voluntary and mandatory division [C-IX, 1.2](#)
 Voluntary filing of the translation of the previous application [A-III, 6.8.5](#)

W

Waiver of right to be mentioned as inventor [A-III, 5.2](#)

When can a summons to oral proceedings be issued in substantive examination? [C-VIII, 5.1](#), [E-III, 5.1](#)

Preparation of oral proceedings [E-III, 5.1](#)
 Standard marks for indicating amendments or corrections by the divisions, further communication with the applicant [C-VIII, 5.1](#)

When does the examining division resume examination after approval? [C-V, 6.1](#)

When may models be submitted? [E-IV, 1.11.1](#)

Where and how applications may be filed [A-II, 1](#)

Application numbering systems [A-II, 1.7](#)
 Debit orders for deposit accounts held with the EPO [A-II, 1.5](#)
 Filing of applications by delivery by hand or by postal services [A-II, 1.2](#)
 Filing of applications by means of electronic communication [A-II, 1.1](#)
 Filing of applications by other means [A-II, 1.3](#)
 Forwarding of applications [A-II, 1.6](#)
 Subsequent filing of documents [A-II, 1.4](#)

V

Validly claiming priority [F-VI, 1.3](#)

Variants [F-II, 6.2.3](#)

Only variants of the invention are incapable of being performed [F-III, 5.1](#)

Where and how to file a divisional application [A-IV, 1.3.1](#)

Where claimed unitary subject-matter covers more than one technical field [B-I, 2.2.1](#)

Where it is necessary to check whether the application from which priority is actually claimed is the "first application" within the meaning of Art. 87(1) [F-VI, 2.4.4](#)

Where the EPO does not perform a supplementary European search [H-II, 6.4.1](#)

Where the EPO performs a supplementary European search [H-II, 6.4.2](#)

Whole figure [A-IX, 5.3](#)

Widening of the search [B-VI, 5.3](#)

Withdrawal

Statement of withdrawal [E-VIII, 8.3](#)

Withdrawal before publication of the patent specification [C-V, 11](#)

Withdrawal of amendments/abandonment of subject matter [H-III, 2.4](#)

Withdrawal of application or designation [E-VIII, 8.1](#)

Withdrawal of correct application documents or parts [A-II, 6.5](#)

Withdrawal of designation [A-III, 11.2.4](#)
European patent applications filed on or after 1 April 2009 [A-III, 11.2.4](#)

Withdrawal of late-filed missing drawings or missing parts of the description [A-II, 5.5](#)

Withdrawal of priority claim [E-VIII, 8.2](#), [F-VI, 3.5](#)

Claiming priority [F-VI, 3.5](#)

Renunciation of rights [E-VIII, 8.2](#)

Withdrawal of the extension or validation request [A-III, 12.3](#)

Withdrawal of the request [D-X, 9](#), [E-XII, 5.3](#)

Limitation and revocation procedure [D-X, 9](#)

Technical opinion [E-XII, 5.3](#)

Withdrawal of the request for oral proceedings [E-III, 7.2.2](#)

Without invitation [A-II, 5.2](#), [A-II, 6.2](#)

Witnesses

Details of the entitlements of witnesses and experts [E-IV, 1.10.3](#)

Entitlements of witnesses and experts [E-IV, 1.10](#)

Hearing of parties, witnesses and experts [E-IV, 1.6](#)

Reimbursement for witnesses and experts [E-IV, 1.10.1](#), [E-IV, 1.10.2](#)

Summoning of parties, witnesses and experts [E-IV, 1.5](#)

Witnesses and experts not summoned [E-IV, 1.6.2](#)

Work

Work at the EPO [General Part, 4](#)

Work of examiners [C-I, 2](#)

Work within the examining division [C-VIII](#)

Consultation of a legally qualified member [C-VIII, 7](#)

Decision [C-VIII, 6](#)

Enlargement of the examining division [C-VIII, 7](#)

Recommendation to grant [C-VIII, 2](#)

Recommendation to refuse [C-VIII, 3](#)

Standard marks for indicating amendments or corrections by the divisions, further communication with the applicant [C-VIII, 5](#)

Tasks of the other members of the examining division [C-VIII, 4](#)

Written

Written evidence [C-VII, 4.3](#)

Written procedure [H-III, 3.4.1](#), [H-III, 3.5.2](#)

Auxiliary requests, in limitation

proceedings [H-III, 3.5.2](#)

Auxiliary requests, in opposition

proceedings [H-III, 3.4.1](#)

Written submissions during oral proceedings by videoconference [E-III, 8.5.2](#)

Z

There are no expressions in this alphabetical keyword index beginning with this letter.

&

"&" sign [B-X, 11.3](#)

List of sections amended in 2026 revision

MAJOR AMENDMENTS

General Part	<u>General Part, 3.1</u>	New subsections on Euro-direct route to a patent
	<u>General Part, 3.2</u>	
	<u>General Part, 3.3</u>	New subsection on the law applicable to Euro-direct, Euro-PCT and international applications
	<u>General Part, 5</u>	New section on the use of artificial intelligence
	<u>General Part, 6.1</u> <u>General Part, 6.2</u>	New subsections on the procedural steps in the processing of Euro-direct applications

PART A	<u>A-II, 5.4.2</u>	Processing of colour drawings, OJ EPO 2025, A49 and A57
	<u>A-III, 3.2</u>	
	<u>A-IV, 1.2.1</u>	
	<u>A-V, 2.2</u>	
	<u>A-VI, 1.3</u>	
	<u>A-IX</u>	
	<u>A-IX, 1.2</u>	
	<u>A-IX, 2.1</u>	
	<u>A-IX, 2.2</u>	
	<u>A-IX, 3</u>	
	<u>A-IX, 4.1, 4.2</u>	
	<u>A-IX, 7.1</u>	
	<u>A-IX, 7.5.4</u>	
	<u>A-IX, 10</u>	
	<u>A-XI, 5.2</u>	
	<u>A-III, 6.7.3</u>	New subsection on invitation to file a certified copy
	<u>A-III, 6.8.6</u>	Clarification of practice, paragraph breaks inserted for easier legibility
	<u>A-III, 7.1</u>	Clarification of practice: disparity between title given on request for grant and abstract
	<u>A-VIII, 1.2</u>	Clarification of practice: previously, only professional representatives could be members of an association
	<u>A-VIII, 1.3</u>	Clarification of practice: legal practitioners can administer their details in MyEPO
	<u>A-VIII, 1.4</u>	New subsection on representation by an association of representatives
	<u>A-IX, 10.1</u>	New subsection on replacement drawings under Rule 58

	<u>A, XII-XV</u>	New chapters on Euro-PCT procedure
PART B	<u>B-III, 3.2</u>	Subsection amended in view of decision <u>G 1/24</u>
PART C	<u>C-II, 1.2.1</u> <u>C-II, 1.2.1.1</u> <u>C-II, 1.2.2</u> <u>C-II, 1.2.2.1</u>	New subsections on Euro-PCT applications with and without a supplementary European search report and related subsections on acceleration of the proceedings by waiving the right to the communication under <u>Rules 161(1) and 162</u>
	<u>C-III, 3.2.4</u>	New subsection on re-evaluation of the unity requirement in examination
	<u>C-III, 4.1.3</u>	New subsection on consideration of the contents of the IPER
	<u>C-VII, 2.6.1</u> <u>C-VII, 2.6.2</u>	New subsections on the process of a consultation using the Shared area and minutes of such a consultation
	<u>C-VII, 3.3</u>	Added clarification regarding valid signatures and personal data in email exchanges
	<u>C-IX, 1.4</u>	Clarification of the principles applied in assessing added subject-matter in divisional applications
	<u>E-III, 8.3.1</u>	New policy on individual authorisations
	<u>E-III, 10.1</u>	Information on the AI-assisted minutes pilot
PART E	<u>E-III, 10.3</u>	Handling of drawings in the minutes
	<u>E-IV, 4.1</u> <u>E-IV, 4.3</u>	Update regarding evaluation of evidence
	<u>E-VIII, 4</u> <u>E-VIII, 4.1</u> <u>E-VIII, 7</u>	Abolition of PACE for search
	<u>E-VIII, 4.2</u>	Bahrain added as a PPH partner office
	<u>E-IX</u>	Content moved to <u>A XII-XV</u>

PART F	<u>F-III, 10</u>	New section on further medical use claims
	<u>F-IV, 4.2</u>	Clarification in view of <u>G 1/24</u>
	<u>F-IV, 4.6,</u> <u>F-IV, 4.24</u>	Updated in view of case law
PART G	<u>G-II, 5.3</u> <u>G-IV, 7.2.2</u> <u>G-IV, 7.3.4</u> <u>G-IV, 7.5.2</u> <u>G-IV, 7.5.3</u> <u>G-V, 3</u>	Updates regarding free evaluation of evidence
	<u>G-IV, 2</u> <u>G-IV, 7.2.1</u>	Clarification in view of <u>G 1/23</u>
	<u>G-VI, 6.1.2.1</u>	New subsection on preclinical data and clinical trials in the prior art
	<u>G-VI, 6.1.2.2</u>	New subsection on patient groups
	<u>G-VI, 6.1.2.3</u>	New subsection on mechanistic definitions leading to a new clinical situation
	<u>G-VI, 7</u>	Removal of the reference to "seriously contemplate" and addition of reference to the "gold standard" in view of <u>T 1688/20</u>
	<u>G-VI, 7</u> <u>G-VII, 12</u>	Change of practice regarding assessment of novelty for selection inventions
	<u>H-II, 3.1</u>	Clarification that <u>Rule 80</u> is a non-discretionary substantive requirement
	<u>H-V, 2.2</u>	Section aligned with <u>G 2/21</u>
PART H	<u>H-V, 5</u>	Updates regarding colour drawings, <u>OJ EPO 2025, A57</u>

MINOR AMENDMENTS

General Part	<u>General Part, 1</u>	Added statement about the gender-neutral interpretation of any references to persons in the Guidelines
	<u>General Part, 1.1</u> <u>General Part, 1.2</u>	New subsections on updating and publishing the Guidelines and on suggestions for improvements
	<u>General Part, 2</u>	Updated section title
	<u>General Part, 2.1</u>	Updated information about the most recent updates and editions of the Guidelines
	<u>General Part, 2.2</u>	Updated section title and clarification regarding references to EPC 2000
	<u>General Part, 3</u>	Section restructured, with content partially moved to new subsections <u>3.4</u> and <u>3.5</u>
	<u>General Part, 4</u>	Updated heading and clarified content
	<u>General Part, 7</u>	Clarification that EPC contracting states are also PCT contracting states
PART A	<u>A-I, 1</u>	Updated to reflect the integration of the information on Euro-PCT procedures into <u>Part A</u>
	<u>A-I, 2</u>	Wording updated to align with General Part
	<u>A-II, 1.1.1</u> <u>A-VIII, 3.3</u> <u>A-X, 4.2.3</u>	Updated to reflect renaming of "MyEPO Portfolio" as "MyEPO"
	<u>A-II, 1.7</u>	Restructured by removing outdated subsection II, 1.7.1

	<u>A-II, 1.1.1</u> <u>A-II, 3.1</u> <u>A-II, 4.1.1</u> <u>A-III, 4.1</u> <u>A-IV, 5</u> <u>A-X, 5.2.4</u>	Updated to reflect decommissioning of EPO Online Filing (OLF)
	<u>A-II, 6.5</u>	Added information about physical deficiencies under <u>Rule 49(2)</u> in correct application documents
	<u>A-III, 1.2</u>	New OJ notice on the filing of sequence listings
	<u>A-III, 4.2.2</u>	Clarification regarding signature by representatives
	<u>A-III, 6.2</u>	Updated name of Taiwan
	<u>A-III, 6.7.2,</u>	Restructured by moving two paragraphs to new <u>A-III, 6.7.3</u>
	<u>A-III, 9</u>	Clarification regarding claims not incurring claims fees
	<u>A-III, 11.2.5</u>	Subsection deleted, information moved to <u>A-XIII, 5</u>
	<u>A-III, 11.3.1</u> <u>A-III, 11.3.2</u> <u>A-III, 11.3.3</u> <u>A-III, 11.3.4</u> <u>A-III, 11.3.5</u> <u>A-III, 11.3.6</u> <u>A-III, 11.3.7</u> <u>A-III, 11.3.8</u> <u>A-III, 11.3.9</u>	Subsections deleted to remove outdated information

	<u>A-III, 13.2</u>	Content partially moved to <u>A-XIII, 4.1, 4.1.1</u> and <u>4.1.2</u>
	<u>A-IV, 3.1</u> <u>A-IV, 4.1</u>	Updated information on recognised exhibitions
	<u>A-IV, 4.4</u>	Added information on waiver under <u>Rule 33(2)</u>
	<u>A-IV, 6</u>	Updated to reflect setting of conversion fee to zero, <u>OJ EPO 2024, A3</u>
	<u>A-VII, 7</u>	Clarification regarding corrections of translations and requirements for certifying translations
	<u>A-VIII, 1.1</u>	Subsection reworded for ease of reading
	<u>A-VIII, 1.7,</u> <u>A-VIII, 1.8</u>	Information on authorisations (<u>OJ EPO 2025, A45</u>)
	<u>A-VIII, 1.9</u>	Legal basis added
	<u>A-VIII, 1.10</u>	Subsection restructured
	<u>A-VIII, 2.4</u>	Subsection updated
	<u>A-VIII, 3.2</u>	<u>OJ EPO 2025, A52</u> on signature requirements
	<u>A-VIII, 3.3</u>	Information about enhanced electronic signature deleted
	<u>A-IX, 4</u>	Title updated
	<u>A-X, 4.3</u>	Updated to reflect improvements in automatic debiting procedure, <u>OJ EPO 2025, A18</u>
	<u>A-X, 5.1.1</u>	Wording aligned with the practice
	<u>A-X, 5.2.1</u>	Content partially moved to <u>A-XIII, 2</u>
	<u>A-X, 7.1.1</u>	Reference to <u>G, 1/12</u> and <u>H-IV, 2</u> added
	<u>A-X, 7.2</u>	Outdated information deleted
	<u>A-X, 9.2</u>	Clarification regarding application of fee reductions

	<u>A-X, 9.3.1</u>	Clarification regarding SMEs and micro-entities
	<u>A-X, 9.3.3</u>	Reference to <u>A-XIII, 7</u> added
	<u>A-X, 9.4.1</u>	Clarification regarding medium-size enterprises added
	<u>A-X, 10.2.5</u>	Clarification regarding dates of notifications
	<u>A-XI, 2.1</u>	Added information on European Patent Register
	<u>A-XI, 2.2</u>	OJ EPO 2025, A65 regarding administrative fees for file inspection
	<u>A-XI, 2.3</u>	Updated to reflect abolition of accelerated searches, <u>OJ EPO 2025 A69</u>
	<u>A-XI, 4</u>	Added information on the Register for unitary patent protection
PART B	<u>B-I, 2.2</u>	Updated title and clarified content
	<u>B-I, 2.2.2</u>	Revised wording
	<u>B-II, 4.3.1</u>	Added information on the situation if no supplementary European search report is drawn up
	<u>B-II, 4.3.2</u>	Added references to <u>Rule 62a</u> and <u>63</u>
	<u>B-II, 4.3.3</u>	Added clarification as to which claims the supplementary European search report is based on
	<u>B-II, 4.4</u>	Added reference to the PCT-EPO Guidelines
	<u>B-III, 3.11</u>	Change to wording for ease of reading
	<u>B-VIII, 4.1</u>	
	<u>B-X, 11.1</u>	Wording relating to MyEPO updated in view of <u>OJ EPO 2025, A27</u> and <u>A28</u>
	<u>B-X, 11.2</u>	
	<u>B-X, 11.4</u>	

PART C	<u>C-II, 1.2</u>	Content partially removed to avoid overlap with <u>A-XIV, 6.3</u> and <u>6.5</u>
	<u>C-II, 5</u>	Restructured by moving content from deleted E-IX, 2.3.5.1
	<u>C-III, 2</u>	Point (iv) moved from <u>C-IV, 5</u>
	<u>C-III, 4</u>	Updated in relation to invitations under <u>Rules 161, 162</u> and <u>Rule 70a</u>
	<u>C-IV, 3</u>	Clarification regarding refusal of applications
	<u>C-IV, 5</u>	Clarification regarding when applicants will be invited to remedy deficiencies
	<u>C-IV, 7.3</u>	Redundant information deleted
	<u>C-V, 4</u>	Clarification regarding communications under <u>Rule 71(3)</u> based on wrong application documents
	<u>C-V, 4.10</u>	Added information on repeated requests for amendment in reply to communications under <u>Rule 71(3)</u>
	<u>C-V, 15.1</u>	Added information on requests for a decision according to the state of the file during oral proceedings
	<u>C-VII, 2.2</u>	Added information on how to proceed when a person is not entitled to act before the EPO
	<u>C-VII, 2.4</u>	Information on contents of minutes of a consultation
	<u>C-VII, 2.6</u>	Additional information on the Shared area
PART D	<u>D-II, 2.1</u>	Additional information on participation in the proceedings for grant
	<u>D-III, 3.4</u>	Deletion of redundant information
	<u>D-IV, 1.2.2.1</u>	Clarification regarding standard of proof
	<u>D-IV, 2</u>	Wording corrected in line with <u>D-IV, 1.4.2</u>

	D-IV, 5.2	Update on annexed documents, OJ EPO 2022, A28
	D-IV, 5.4	
	D-VI, 4.2	Title adapted to Art. 101(1) and Rule 81(3)
	D-VI, 7.1	Added information on immediate decisions
	D-VII, 1.1	Deletion of redundant information
	D-VII, 1.2	Wording adapted to amended D-VII, 1.1
	D-VIII, 1.2.1	Added information on legal basis for revoking patent
	D-X, 7.1	Wording changed to include notification by Mailbox
PART E	E-III, 2	Wording changed to cover all types of notification
	E-VI, 2	
	E-VI, 3	
	E-III, 8.11.1	Additional information on requests for postponement of oral proceedings
	E-IV, 1.7	Updated to cover oral proceedings by videoconference
	E-IV, 2.2	Redundant information removed
	E-VI, 2.2.1	Additional information on admitting new auxiliary requests
	E-VIII, 1.8	
	E-VIII, 1.2	Additional information on time limits
	E-VIII, 5	Added information on accelerated processing of opposition proceedings once parallel court proceedings have ended
PART F	F-II, 4.1	Added information on formal acceptance of applications drafted in accordance with the CAF agreement
	F-II, 4.4	Title aligned with Rule 48 and F-II, 7.4
	F-II, 4.13	Added information on how to replace values not complying with Rule 49(2) (e.g. non-SI units)

	<u>F-II, 7.4</u>	Reference to "patent" removed to align content with <u>Rule 48(1)(c)</u>
	<u>F-III, 3</u>	Wording adjusted in view of <u>T 161/18</u> and <u>T 1191/19</u> and further detail added on basis of <u>T 1669/21</u> , Reasons 1.8, and in line with <u>F-III, 12</u>
	<u>F-IV, 3.3</u>	Additional information on <u>Rule 137(5)</u> as a matter of allowability
	<u>F-IV, 4.1</u>	Added positive definition of clarity based on Case Law Book II.A.1 and II.A.3.1
	<u>F-IV, 4.5.4</u>	Clarification that considerations for product claims equally apply to process claims
	<u>F-IV, 4.7.2</u>	Wording aligned with the general definition of clarity (<u>F-IV, 4.1</u>)
	<u>F-IV, 4.22</u>	Wording adjusted and aligned with <u>F-IV, 4.1</u> and <u>F-IV, 6.4</u>
	<u>F-IV, 4.23</u>	Added information on claims not consecutively numbered in Arabic numerals
	<u>F-IV, 6.5</u>	Reference to section on functional features added
	<u>F-V, 2.2</u>	Clarification that further search fees do not necessarily have to be requested in cases of lack of unity
	<u>F-V, 3</u> <u>F-V, 3.3.1</u>	Clarification regarding the assessment of unity of invention for alternative solutions to known problems
PART G	<u>F-VI, 2.1</u>	Added information on reviewing the validity of the priority
	<u>G-II, 4.2.1</u>	Updated in view of <u>Art. 53(c)</u> (<u>T 775/97</u>) to reflect that product claims formed only through a surgical step inside the body are not allowed
	<u>G-II, 6.2</u>	Clarification of the criteria for considering the requirements of <u>Art. 56</u> to be fulfilled
	<u>G-IV, 7.5.4</u>	Clarification regarding use of dates reported by a search engine

	<u>G-IV, 7.5.6</u>	Updated to reflect access to online multimedia citations via MyEPO (OJ EPO 2025, A41)
	<u>G-V, 4</u>	Clarification that recognised exhibitions will be published on the website
	<u>G-VI, 1</u>	Title changed in view of revision of <u>F-IV, 4.6</u> and deletion of <u>F-IV, 4.6.1</u> and <u>4.6.2</u>
	<u>G-VI, 6.1</u>	Passage moved to new, specific subsection <u>6.1.2.3</u>
	<u>G-VI, 6.1.2</u>	Cross-references to <u>G-VI, 6.1.2.2</u> added
PART H	<u>H-II, 2.3</u>	Clarification concerning prima facie assessment
	<u>H-II, 2.3.1</u>	Added examples relating to the use of <u>Rule 137(3)</u>
	<u>H-II, 2.3.2</u> <u>H-II, 2.3.3</u>	New subsections on <u>Rule 137(3)</u> in relation to non-unity
	<u>H-II, 2.5.4</u>	Updated information on the examining division's discretion when sending communications under <u>Rule 137(4)</u>
	<u>H-II, 2.6</u> <u>H-II, 3.2</u> <u>H-VI, 2.1</u> <u>H-VI, 3.1</u>	Harmonisation of wording throughout Guidelines after change to rule on notification
	<u>H-II, 5</u>	Clarification regarding refusal in situations where claims are not amended or cannot be searched, <u>Rule 62a/Rule 63</u>
	<u>H-IV, 2.2.5</u>	Adapted to <u>OJ 2023, A98</u>
	<u>H-IV, 4.1.2</u>	Clarification regarding claimed subject-matter
	<u>H-IV, 4.2</u>	Clarification regarding claimed subject-matter of a Euro-PCT application
	<u>H-VI, 2.2</u>	Updated information on corrections under <u>Rule 139</u>

	<u>H-VI, 3.3</u>	Added information on handling requests for more than one type of correction
	<u>H-VI, 3.3.1</u> <u>H-VI, 3.3.1.1</u> <u>H-VI, 3.3.1.2</u> <u>H-VI, 3.3.2</u> <u>H-VI, 3.3.2.1</u> <u>H-VI, 3.4</u>	New subsections on correction of errors in bibliographic data and their effect in opposition proceedings, on corrections filed at a late stage and on corrections under <u>Rule 140</u>

EDITORIAL CHANGES

General Part	<u>General Part, 9</u>
PART A	<u>A-II, 1.1.2; A-II, 1.2; A-II, 1.5; A-II, 5.5; A-II, 6.7; A-III, 1.2; A-III, 2.1; A-III, 3.3; A-III, 5.1; A-III, 6.5.3; A-III, 6.7.1; A-III, 6.8.1; A-III, 6.8.2; A-III, 11.2.1; A-III, 11.3; A-III, 12.1; A-III, 13.1; A-III, 14; A-III, 16.2; A-IV, 1.1; A-IV, 1.3.1; A-IV, 1.6; A-IV, 1.8; A-IV, 4.3; A-IV, 5.4; A-V, 3; A-VI, 2.2; A-VI, 2.3; A-VI, 2.4; A-VI, 2.5; A-VIII, 1.5; A-VIII, 2.1; A-VIII, 2.3; A-VIII, 2.5; A-VIII, 3.1; A-IX, 1.1; A-IX, 5; A-IX, 5.1; A-IX, 5.2; A-IX, 5.3; A-IX, 7.5; A-IX, 7.5.1; A-IX, 7.5.3; A-IX, 8; A-IX, 11.1; A-IX, 11.2.1; A-X, 1; A-X, 4.2.1; A-X, 5.2.2; A-X, 5.2.5; A-X, 5.2.7; A-IX, 9.4.2; A-IX, 9.4.3; A-X, 10.2.1; A-X, 10.2.6; A-X, 10.3.1; A-X, 10.3.2; A-X, 10.3.3; A-X, 11.1; A-XI, 1; A-XI, 2.5; A-XI, 3; A-XI, 5.1</u>
PART B	<u>B-II, 4.3; B-III, 3.3.2; B-IV, 1.2; B-IV, 2.3; B-VI, 4.1; B-X, 9.1.3; B-XI, 3; B-XI, 8</u>
PART C	<u>C-II, 3.2; C-III, 1.3; C-III, 2.2; C-III, 3.2.1; C-IV, 1; C-IV, 7.1; C-IV, 7.5; C-IV, 8; C-V, 1.1; C-V, 4.7.1; C-V, 14; C-V, 15.3; C-V, 15.4; C-VI, 2; C-VI, 3; C-VII, 2.1; C-VII, 2.3; C-VII, 3; C-VIII, 6; C-VIII, 7; C-IX, 4</u>
PART D	<u>D-III, 3.1; D-III, 3.2; D-III, 5; D-IV, 1.2.1; D-IV, 1.4.2; D-IV, 3; D-IV, 5.1; D-V, 2.2; D-VI, 3.2; D-VI, 7.2.2; D-VII, 4.1.2; D-VIII; D-VIII, 2.2</u>
PART E	<u>E-II, 1.1; E-II, 2.3; E-III, 6; E-III, 8.3.1; E-III, 8.5; E-III, 8.7.1; E-III, 8.7.2; E-III, 8.7.3; E-III, 9; E-IV, 1.4; E-IV, 1.2; E-IV, 1.6.1; E-VI, 2.2.4; E-VII, 3; E-VII, 4; E-VIII, 1.6.1; E-VIII, 3.1.2; E-VIII, 3.3; E-VIII, 8.4; E-IX, 1.3.3; E-IX, 2.2; E-IX, 2.3; E-IX, 2.4; E-IX, 2.6; E-IX, 2.9; E-IX, 3; E-IX, 7; E-XI, 1; E-XI, 7.1; E-XI, 7.4.1; E-XII, 5.2; E-XII, 5.4; E-XIII, 6.1</u>
PART F	<u>F-II, 2.7; F-II, 4.8; F-III, 6.5; F-IV, 2.4; F-IV, 4.4; F-IV, 4.10; F-IV, 6.5; F-V, 2; F-V, 3.2.1; F-V, 3.2.4; F-V, 7.1; F-V, 7.2; F-V, 7.3; F-VI, 3.3</u>
PART G	<u>G-II, 3.3.2; G-VII, 3.1; G-VII, 5.2</u>
PART H	<u>H-II, 2.1; H-II, 2.2; H-II, 6.2; H-II, 6.4.1; H-II, 6.4.2; H-III, 2.1.1; H-III, 2.1.4</u>

