epi

Information

1 - 1988

epi

Institut der beim Europäischen Patentamt zugelassenen Vertreter
Institute of Professional Representatives before the European Patent Office
Institut des mandataires agréés près l'Office européen des brevets

Schriftleitung – *Editorial Board* – *Comité de Rédaction*

Jean Brullé · Joachim Herzog · Ken Veryard

Das Institut ist weder für Erklärungen noch für Meinungen verantwortlich, die in Beiträgen dieser Zeitschrift enthalten sind.
Artikel werden in der oder den Amtssprachen (deutsch, englisch, französisch) wiedergegeben, in der bzw. denen diese Artikel eingereicht wurden.

The Institute as a body is not responsible either for the statements made, or for the opinions expressed in this publication.
Articles are reproduced in the official language or languages (English, French or German) in which they are submitted.

L'Institut n'est pas responsable des opinions exprimées dans cette publication.
Les articles sont publiés dans celle ou celles des trois langues officielles (allemand, anglais ou français) dans laquelle ou lesquelles ils ont été proposés.

Postanschrift – *Mailing address* · Adresse postale

Postfach 26 01 12
D-8000 München 26
Tel. (089) 201 70 80
Telex 5216834 epi d

Editorial 1

Eignungsprüfung / Qualifying Examination / Examen de Qualification

EPI-Vorbereitungskurs 2
EPI Tutorials 3
Préparation EPI 4

Andere Kurse / Other courses / Autres préparations

ASPI (français) 5
VIPS/VESPA (Deutsch) 6
EPI/CEIPI Deutsch 7
English 9
Français 11

Difficultés différenciées pour devenir mandataire européen 13

A report on the activities of the Qualifying Examination Committee 15

Report from the EPPC 18

European Patent Office announcement 22

The new Greek patent law and the European patent system 25

Durée effective de protection des nouvelles spécialités pharmaceutiques commercialisées en France entre 1977 et 1987 29

The Community Patent 32

Freie Stellen / Positions vacant / Vacances d'emplois 34

EDITORIAL

Mailed with this edition, you will find an invitation to the Symposium to be held in Munich on May 30th to celebrate the 10th anniversary of this Institute. If you can attend it, it will be an opportunity of meeting your elected Council Members and your Board Members as well as many of the colleagues with whom you do business.

The programme is an interesting one and we hope to see you there.

Jean Brullé . Joachim Herzog . Ken Veryard

DIE EUROPÄISCHE EIGNUNGSPRÜFUNG
EPI-VORBEREITUNGSKURSE 1988-1989

Das EPI bietet erneut Vorbereitungskurse an, vorwiegend für diejenigen, die die Eignungsprüfung 1989 ablegen werden. Es ist wichtig, daß Sie Ihre Mitarbeiter auf die Möglichkeit dieser Vorbereitungskurse aufmerksam machen, da sie diese EPI-Information nicht zu Gesicht bekommen (es sei denn, Sie zeigen sie ihnen).

Wie letztes Jahr, werden wir die Prüfungsunterlagen eines bestimmten Jahres bearbeiten - dieses Mal die Unterlagen A, B, C und D des Jahres 1987. Die Kosten hierfür werden die gleichen wie letztes Jahr sein, d.h. DEM 200,- für einen Vorbereitungskurs mit nur den Unterlagen A und B oder C und D, und DEM 300,- für einen Vorbereitungskurs mit allen vier Unterlagen.

Wie letztes Jahr, wird der Vorbereitungskurs darin bestehen, daß den Kandidaten Tutoren zugeteilt werden, die, geographish gesehen, so nah wie möglich bei den Kandidaten wohnen und, wenn möglich, auf dem gleichen technischen Gebiet tätig sind. Die Kandidaten werden dann gebeten, bis zum 15. Oktober 1988 die Antworten schriftlich zu übersenden. Anschließend werden die Tutoren mindestens ein Treffen, an dem üblicherweise zwei Tutoren und sechs bis acht Kandidaten teilnehmen, organisieren, um die Antworten zu besprechen.

1987 haben 62 Kandidaten und 19 Tutoren am Vorbereitungskurs teilgenommen.

Es sei darauf hingewiesen, daß die den Kandidaten in Rechnung gestellte Gebühr zur Deckung der Verwaltungs- und Reisekosten bestimmt ist, die beim EPI entstehen. Die Tutoren werden für ihren Zeitaufwand und ihre Arbeit nicht bezahlt.

Kandidaten, die an den Vorbereitungskursen interessiert sind, werden gebeten, dies dem EPI-Sekretariat so bald wie möglich, jedoch auf keinen Fall später als dem 1. Juni 1988 mitzuteilen. Sie brauchen die Gebühr jetzt nicht zu zahlen, da sie einen Fragebogen bekommen werden, den sie ausgefüllt zusammen mit der Gebühr vor dem Einsendetermin zurücksenden müssen.

A.H. Duncan,
Vorsitzender des Ausschusses für die Europäische Eignungsprüfung

THE EUROPEAN QUALIFYING EXAMINATION
EPI TUTORIALS 1988 - 1989

The EPI is again offering tutorials, primarily for those who will be sitting the Qualifying Examination in 1989. It is important that you draw the attention of your pupils to the existence of these tutorials as your pupils do not (unless you show it to them) see this EPI-Information.

Like last year, we shall be considering the papers of a specific year - this time papers A, B, C and D of 1987. The cost will be the same as last year, that is to say, DEM 200 for the tuition only in papers A and B, or only C and D, and DEM 300 for tuition covering all four papers.

Like last year the tuition will consist of the candidates being allocated to tutors placed geographically as close as possible to them, and as far as possible in the same technical field. The candidates will be asked to submit written answers to the questions by 15 October 1988. Then the tutors will arrange at least one meeting, usually of two tutors and six to eight candidates, to discuss the answers.

In 1987 there were 62 candidates and 19 tutors.

It must be emphasised that the fee charged to the candidate is to cover the EPI administrative and travelling costs. The tutors receive no payment for their time and work.

Candidates who wish tutorials must notify the EPI Secretariat as soon as possible and at all events no later than 1st June 1988. There is no need to send the fee yet as you will be sent a questionnaire to complete and to return, with the fee, before the deadline.

A.H. Duncan,
Chairman of the European Qualifying Examination Committee

EXAMEN DE QUALIFICATION

PREPARATION EPI 1988 - 1989

L'EPI propose à nouveau une préparation destinée à ceux qui passeront l'Examen de Qualification en 1989. Il est important que vous attiriez l'attention de vos collaborateurs sur l'existence de cette préparation, car ils ne reçoivent pas EPI Information (à moins que vous ne la leur montriez).

Comme l'an dernier, nous traiterons les épreuves d'une année - cette fois, les épreuves A, B, C et D de 1987. Le prix sera le même que celui de l'an dernier, à savoir 200 DEM pour la préparation relative aux épreuves A et B ou C et D, et 300 DEM pour la préparation relative aux quatre épreuves.

Comme l'an dernier, les candidats se verront attribuer des tuteurs résidant géographiquement le plus près possible d'eux et travaillant, si possible, dans le même domaine technique. Il sera demandé aux candidats d'envoyer leurs réponses par écrit pour le 15 octobre 1988. Les tuteurs organiseront au moins une réunion qui rassemblera habituellement deux tuteurs et six à huit candidats, réunion au cours de laquelle les réponses seront commentées.

En 1987, 62 candidats et 19 tuteurs ont participé à la préparation.

Il convient de noter que le droit d'inscription demandé aux candidats sert à couvrir les frais d'administration de l'EPI et les frais de déplacement. Les tuteurs ne sont pas rémunérés pour leur temps de travail.

Les candidats désirant participer à la préparation sont priés d'en informer le Secrétariat le plus rapidement possible, au plus tard le 1er juin 1988. Il n'est pas nécessaire de régler dès à présent les frais de participation à la préparation ; le candidat recevra un questionnaire qui devra être retourné, accompagné du droit d'inscription, au Secrétariat avant la date limite.

A.H. Duncan,
Président de la Commission pour l'Examen Européen de Qualification

PREPARATION A L'EXAMEN EUROPEEN DE QUALIFICATION

ASPI - PARIS - FRANCE

L'ASPI organise à nouveau, cette année 1988, une préparation pratique à l'examen européen de qualification qui aura lieu en 1989.

Cette préparation a pour but de permettre aux candidats qui s'y seront inscrits, de tester leurs connaissances en répondant par écrit à des épreuves qui sont celles déjà données à l'examen européen et d'avoir une idée de l'atmosphère de cet examen européen lors d'un examen blanc qui sera organisé en fin de préparation.

Les corrections des épreuves donnent lieu à deux rencontres entre candidats et correcteurs.

La première partie de la préparation est constituée par la réponse par écrit aux épreuves de l'examen 1987.

La deuxième partie de la préparation : "examen blanc" sur la base des épreuves de 1988, aura lieu en novembre 1988.

* * * * *

Il est demandé aux membres de l'EPI de donner cette information à leurs collègues susceptibles de passer l'examen européen de qualification en 1989 ou plus tard.

Pour toute information complémentaire appeler le secrétariat de l'ASPI - 9, rue Richepanse - 75008 PARIS - Tél. 33-1-42601018.

V I P S

Verband der Industrie-Patentanwälte in der Schweiz

V E S P A

Verband der beim Europäischen Patentamt
eingetragenen freiberuflichen schweizerischen Patentanwälte

VORBEREITUNG AUF DIE EUROPÄISCHE EIGNUNGSPRÜFUNG 1988

Seit mehreren Jahren organisieren die oben genannten Verbände gemeinsam ein Prüfungstraining, das eine Vorbereitung auf die europäische Prüfung erlaubt und durch eine simulierte Prüfung unter praxisnahen Bedingungen gekennzeichnet ist (vgl. EPI-Information 4-1986). Die bisherigen Teilnehmer aus verschiedenen Vertragsstaaten erachten diese Art der Vorbereitung als komplementär zu anderen Kursen, die zur kurzfristigen Vorbereitung auf die europäische Eignungsprüfung angeboten werden. Anmeldungen für das Programm zur Vorbereitung auf die Prüfung 1989 werden bis zum 22. April 1988 angenommen und sollten an Herrn D. Mohnhaupt, c/o Dietlin, Mohnhaupt & Cie S.A., rue des Epinettes 19, CH-1227 Genf (Schweiz), Tel. 0041-22-42.66.30 gerichtet werden. Bei ihm können auch nähere Informationen über die Durchführung des Trainings eingeholt werden. Die Teilnahmegebühr beträgt SFr. 750,-.

WEITERE MITTEILUNG DES EPI UND CEIPI ÜBER EINE GRUNDAUSBILDUNG IM EUROPÄISCHEN PATENTRECHT

1. Anfang Oktober 1987 hat für 60 Teilnehmer in 8 Städten der Vertragsstaaten der Europäischen Patentorganisation eine von EPI und CEIPI gemeinsam organisierte Grundausbildung im europäischen Patentrecht begonnen (Antwerpen, Brüssel, Düsseldorf, Frankfurt, Leverkusen, Ludwigshafen, München, Paris; im übrigen läuft in Paris bereits seit Januar 1987 ein Pilotprojekt dieser Ausbildung). Eine gemeinsame Mitteilung von EPI und CEIPI über diese Grundausbildung ist im ABl. EPA 1987 S. 44 ff. und in der EPI-Information 4/1986 S. 25 ff. veröffentlicht worden.

2. An verschiedenen Orten war es bisher leider nicht möglich, einen Kurs zu organisieren, da sich nicht die Mindestzahl von 3 Kandidaten in einer Region zur Teilnahme entschlossen hatte.

3. Diese Grundausbildung, die u.a. Interessenten das Bestehen der europäischen Eignungsprüfung erleichtern soll, ist berufsbegleitend und dauert zwei Jahre; sie soll kurz nach dem Eintritt des künftigen Patentspezialisten in eine Kanzlei oder Patentabteilung beginnen.

4. Die Ausbildung erfolgt im Prinzip im Selbstunterricht mit aktiver Unterstützung ortsansässiger "Tutoren". Diese Tutoren, erfahrene Fachleute auf dem Gebiet des europäischen Patentrechts, diskutieren an jährlich 20 Abenden zu je 3 Stunden mit den Teilnehmern die von diesen vorher bearbeiteten Themen und Fälle, beantworten Fragen und geben Anleitungen zum weiteren Studium.

5. Grundlage der Ausbildung ist ein umfangreicher Themenkatalog, der sämtliche Prüfungsgebiete der europäischen Eignungsprüfung umfaßt und Hinweise auf die zu verwendende Literatur gibt. Darüber hinaus werden den Teilnehmern umfangreiches, meist nicht veröffentlichtes Ausbildungsmaterial des EPA und des CEIPI sowie Unterlagen anderer Organisationen mit Analysen und Zusammenfassungen von Beschwerdeentscheidungen des EPA zur Verfügung gestellt.

6. Nach Abschluß dieser Grundausbildung soll der Kandidat sich in zusätzlich angebotenen Kursen oder durch eigenes Studium der Vervollkommnung seiner Kenntnisse und speziell der Vorbereitung auf die Eignungsprüfung widmen (z.B. anhand der EPI-Vorbereitungskurse (ABl. EPA 7/1985, S. 229 f., 6/1987, S. 257) und der je eine Woche dauernden CEIPI-Kurse in Straßburg (Anzeige im ABl. EPA 9/1987). Es wird ausdrücklich darauf hingewiesen, daß die Grundausbildung nicht die weitere Vorbereitung auf die Eignungsprüfung ersetzt, sondern ein umfangreiches Grundwissen über das europäische Patentrecht und seine internationale Verflechtung vermittelt.

7. Weitere Kurse sollen auch in den kommenden Jahren jeweils im September/Oktober an verschiedenen Orten der Vertragsstaaten beginnen, wenn mindestens drei Interessenten daran teilnehmen und geeignete Tutoren sich zur Verfügung stellen. Der Unkostenbeitrag beträgt pro Jahr 5.000,- französische Francs, also für die zweijährige Ausbildung 10.000,- Francs.

8. Um die Kurse rechtzeitig organisieren zu können, werden die Interessenten gebeten, sich möglichst bald an das CEIPI zu wenden, spätestens jedoch bis 1. Juni 1988.

Schreiben Sie bitte - auch für weitere Informationen - an:

Madame Pouvatchy, CEIPI
Université Strasbourg III,
Place d'Athènes,
F - 67000 Strasbourg
Tel.: (88) 61 56 04 oder (88) 61 18 18.

Dr. Romuald Singer

FURTHER INFORMATION FROM EPI AND CEIPI

CONCERNING BASIC TRAINING IN EUROPEAN PATENT LAW

1. At the beginning of October 1987 EPI and CEIPI jointly launched basic training courses in European patent law in the Contracting States of the European Patent Organisation. Sixty participants are attending these courses in Antwerp, Brussels, Düsseldorf, Frankfurt, Leverkusen, Ludwigshafen, Munich and Paris (a pilot project has been running in Paris since January 1987). A joint notice from EPI and CEIPI concerning this basic training was published in OJ EPO 1/1987, p. 44 et seq., and in EPI Information 4/1986, p. 25 et seq.

2. At some centres it has unfortunately not so far proved possible to organise a course because there has not been a minimum of three candidates.

3. The scheme, which is intended inter alia to help candidates to pass the European Qualifying Examination, lasts two years and is designed to start shortly after the future patent specialist has begun training with a professional representative or patent department.

4. The basic training courses will take the form of private study supervised by local tutors, all experienced specialists in European patent law, who twenty evenings a year for three hours at a time will discuss topics and cases previously prepared by participants, answer questions and set further topics for study.

5. The list of topics to be covered will encompass the whole European Qualifying Examination syllabus and indicate the reference material to be used. Comprehensive, mostly unpublished EPO and CEIPI training material and documentation from other sources analysing and summarising EPO Board of Appeal decisions will also be made available.

6. On completion of the course candidates are expected to round off their training and prepare for the Qualifying Examination by means of private study or by attending other courses on offer. For example, EPI organises preparatory courses (see OJ EPO 7/1985, p. 229 et seq.;

6/1987, p. 257) and CEIPI offers one-week courses in Strasbourg (see notice in OJ EPO 9/1987). Readers are reminded that the basic training course does not dispense with the need for further intensive study for the Qualifying Examination; it provides candidates with no more than a broad grounding in European patent law and its international ramifications.

7. It is planned to hold further courses each year beginning in September or October at various centres in the Contracting States if there is a minimum of three participants in each case and suitable tutors are available. The cost will be FRF 5.000 per person per year (FRF 10.000 for the two-year course).

8. To enable the courses to be organised in good time those interested are asked to contact CEIPI as soon as possible and in any event not later than 1 June 1988 at the following address (from which further details can be obtained):

Madame Pouvatchy, CEIPI
Université Strasbourg III,
Place d'Athènes,
F - 67000 Strasbourg
Tel.: (88) 61 56 04 or (88) 61 18 18.

Dr. Romuald Singer

NOUVELLE COMMUNICATION DE L'EPI ET DU CEIPI RELATIVE A L'OPPORTUNITE D'UNE FORMATION DE BASE EN DROIT EUROPEEN DES BREVETS

1. Début octobre 1987, 60 participants ont commencé à suivre une formation de base en droit européen des brevets organisée conjointement par l'EPI et le CEIPI dans huit villes des Etats membres de l'Organisation européenne des brevets (Anvers, Bruxelles, Düsseldorf, Francfort, Leverkusen, Ludwigshafen, Munich et Paris ; préalablement, un projet pilote avait d'ailleurs déjà été lancé à Paris en janvier 1987). Une communication conjointe de l'EPI et du CEIPI relative à cette formation de base a été publiée dans le JO de l'OEB 1/1987, p. 44 s. ainsi que dans le bulletin de l'EPI "Information" n° 4 de 1986, p. 25 s.

2. Malheureusement, en différents autres endroits, il n'a jusqu'à présent pas été possible d'organiser des cours, le nombre minimum de participants, fixé à trois, n'ayant pas été atteint.

3. Cette formation de base, destinée notamment à permettre de passer plus facilement l'examen européen de qualification, est prévue pour accompagner l'exercice de la profession et durer deux années ; il importe qu'elle commence pour le futur praticien en brevets le plus rapidement possible après son entrée dans un cabinet de mandataire agréé ou dans un service brevets.

4. La formation fait en principe appel à l'initiative de l'intéressé, placé sous la supervision active d'un "tutor" local. Les "tutors", praticiens expérimentés du droit européen des brevets, ont avec les participants, vingt fois par an, une séance d'environ trois heures qui a lieu en fin de journée et au cours de laquelle les thèmes et cas préalablement étudiés sont discutés, en même temps qu'il est répondu aux questions posées et que sont donnés les conseils nécessaires pour la suite de la formation.

5. Une liste détaillée de thèmes portant sur l'ensemble des domaines concernés par l'examen européen de qualification et assortie de renvois à la littérature spécialisée pertinente donne l'orientation de cette formation. Un jeu important de documents didactiques annexes communi-

qués par l'OEB et le CEIPI, pour la plupart non publiés, ainsi que des documents provenant d'autres organismes et comportant des analyses et des résumés de décisions des chambres de recours de l'OEB sont en outre mis à la disposition des participants.

6. Une fois achevée cette formation de base, les candidats sont censés s'employer à parfaire leurs connaissances et spécialement à préparer l'examen de qualification, soit en suivant des cours de perfectionnement, soit isolément (l'EPI propose par exemple des programmes et des séances de préparation (JO 7/1985, p. 229 s., 6/1987, p. 257) et le CEIPI organise à Strasbourg des séminaires d'une durée d'une semaine chacun (annonce publiée dans le JO 9/1987)). Il est expressément rappelé que la formation de base, qui ne saurait remplacer cette préparation complémentaire à l'examen de qualification, vise par contre à l'acquisition de connaissances fondamentales et étendues du droit européen des brevets et de ses liens d'interdépendance avec les autres systèmes sur le plan international.

7. Les cours continueront à avoir lieu lors des prochaines années dès septembre/octobre en différentes villes des Etats contractants, à condition qu'au moins trois personnes soient disposées à y participer et que des "tutors" qualifiés puissent assurer la formation. Le montant de la contribution annuelle aux frais de formation s'élève à 5.000 F, soit 10.000 F pour la durée de la formation qui s'étend sur une période de deux années.

8. Pour permettre d'organiser les cours en temps opportun, les personnes intéressées sont invitées à prendre contact avec le CEIPI le plus rapidement possible, au plus tard d'ici le 1er juin 1988.

   A cet effet, et pour de plus amples informations, prière d'écrire à

   Madame Pouvatchy, CEIPI
   Université Strasbourg III
   Place d'Athènes
   F - 67000 Strasbourg
   Tél. : (88) 61 56 04 ou (88) 61 18 18.

Dr. Romuald Singer

DIFFICULTES DIFFERENCIEES POUR DEVENIR MANDATAIRE EUROPEEN

par Madame Dafne Domenighetti, membre italien de l'EPI

L'examen d'aptitude est à juste titre sévère, vu que l'on a accepté d'un commun accord le principe selon lequel le titre de mandataire européen n'est accordé qu'à des personnes hautement qualifiées. Je ne désire donc pas analyser ici la juste sévérité de l'examen, mais s'il a, comme il le devrait, la même difficulté pour tous les candidats, ou bien si en raison de ses modalités intrinsèques, il ne présente pas une difficulté différente selon la langue maternelle des candidats.

Vu que les problèmes légaux et techniques qui sont à la base de chaque question sont les mêmes pour tous, on pourrait penser que la rédaction d'une réponse exacte demande la même concentration à tous les candidats. Si l'on analyse toutefois le déroulement réel des épreuves d'examen, en se mettant pratiquement à la place du candidat, on peut voir que pour rédiger une réponse il partagera le temps dont il dispose en trois parties qui correspondent aux phases d'élaboration suivantes : une première phase pour comprendre à fond le problème, une seconde pour trouver la réponse exacte et enfin une troisième pour l'exposer clairement par écrit.

Si l'on procède en sens contraire dans l'analyse de ces phases, on peut dire que la dernière, celle de la rédaction matérielle de la réponse, prend des temps équivalents pour tous les candidats ayant une préparation analogue, puisque le candidat peut aussi rédiger cette dernière dans sa langue maternelle.

La seconde phase (repérage de la réponse exacte) pour un candidat bien préparé est très brève, vu que le repérage de la réponse saute immédiatement aux yeux après avoir compris la question.

La première phase, celle de compréhension de la question pose au contraire de graves difficultés à tous les candidats qui ne sont pas de langue maternelle française, allemande ou anglaise. Ils devraient en effet être des traducteurs simultanés en au moins une des trois langues pour pouvoir comprendre les problèmes posés à la même vitesse que les candidats de langue maternelle.

Il serait donc nécessaire, pour équilibrer les difficultés, d'augmenter le temps pour les personnes qui ne sont pas de langue maternelle et leur permettre aussi l'emploi d'un dictionnaire de la langue choisie vers leur langue maternelle.

Une fois que le candidat qui n'est pas de langue maternelle est passé par la première phase, la plus difficile pour lui, il connaît la terminologie à utiliser, si bien que la rédaction en une autre langue de la réponse ne lui demande plus un gros effort. Il me semble en effet qu'une bonne partie des candidats qui ne sont pas de langue maternelle et qui ont passé l'examen ont rédigé le texte directement en français, anglais ou allemand.

D'autre part, je ne crois pas que l'augmentation du temps maximum pour chaque réponse puisse diminuer d'aucune façon le niveau qualitatif élevé de l'examen. On aura simplement des mandataires européens, qui ne sont pas de langue maternelle, qui traduiront plus lentement que les traducteurs simultanés : il ne me semble pas que l'examen européen doive aussi exiger cette qualification.

En outre, si l'on exige cette capacité exceptionnelle (traducteur simultané) pour quelques candidats, je ne vois pas pourquoi on ne la demanderait pas aussi aux candidats de langue maternelle allemande, française et anglaise, en les obligeant à utiliser à l'examen une des deux autres langues, n'importe laquelle. Mais même dans ce cas ils seraient encore avantagés par rapport à un candidat qui n'est pas de langue maternelle, car ils trouveraient toujours parmi les documents d'examen, au moins un document rédigé en leur langue, ce qui n'arrive jamais à un candidat italien, hollandais, suisse-tessinois, grec, espagnol, etc.

A REPORT ON THE ACTIVITIES OF THE QUALIFYING EXAMINATION COMMITTEE

1. Introduction

   The letter from Mr. Veldhuizen in Information 3-1987 was most welcome. As there is something from or about the Qualifying Examination Committee in almost every issue I thought perhaps the members would not wish to hear more but Mr. Veldhuizen shows that I was wrong. Below is therefore a summary of its activities over the past ten years.

2. First we must distinguish between this Committee and the Examination Board. It is the Board which sets the Qualifying Examination, marks them and issues the results; the Board is a joint EPO/EPI body (roughly half from each), and it controls three Examination Committees, Committee I being responsible for setting and marking Papers A and B, Committee II for Paper C, and Committee III for Paper D.

3. The Qualifying Examination Committee, on the other hand is a committee of the EPI, answerable to the Council of the EPI, and its terms of reference are, broadly, to monitor on behalf of the profession the operation of the Examinations system, to provide the President and Council with suitable nominations for EPI representation on the Examination Board and for examiners, to consider problems as they arise in connection with the Examination and to provide help to national and other organisations concerned in the training of candidates.

4. The hard work of writing the Examination Regulation was done before the EPI came into existence; after the principle that there should be a Qualifying Examination had been proposed by Dr. Haertel at Stockholm in 1971, the structure was outlined by the Committee of Nine (later to become the Group of Four) and then the Regulation was written by Working Party VI, in time for it to be ratified and signed on 21st October 1977, just three weeks after the Convention itself. Ten years of experience has shown that in general those who drafted it had done an excellent job.

5. One of the first tasks of our Committee, when it was set up under the Chairmanship of R.C. Petersen (with J. D'haemer as Secretary) was to

propose names from which EPI members of the Examination Board would be selected and to plan for the first examination to take place in November 1979, including settling the principle of offering questions in three technologies in Papers A and B, but not C and D. In 1980, to assist the Board in interpreting Article 7 (1) (2) (which specifies "a university level scientific or technical qualification") the members of the Committee, after a lot of work in their respective countries, came up with lists of institutions in each member state, the degrees from which would clearly fall within this definition, and of others which would qualify for requiring a seven-year service in the profession. This made the task of the Examination Board much easier in the majority of applications received for sitting the Examination, although a continuing task of the Committee has been to meet each February to give an opinion to the Board on individual cases which do not clearly fit into these categories. Another task in 1980 was to outline the type of degrees which were to be considered "technical or scientific"; those in mathematics, medicine and veterinary science are, but those sociology or social science are not.

4. The Committee finds it necessary to meet at least once a year (usually in February), but sometimes twice or three times, one of the meetings where possible being at the venue of a meeting of Council, to keep costs down. Members of the Examination Board are entitled to be present to keep a watching brief. Apart from the matters mentioned above, it responded to the Examination Board's plan for amending the Regulation to reduce the cost of the Examination, advising Council to resist strongly some of the proposals and to agree to others. Proposals from members of the EPI have been taken up and, where appropriate, put forward. For example we are currently pressing the idea that adequate certificates should be given to successful candidates instead of the present brief letter. The perennial problem of the apparent delay in the issue of the results has been thoroughly discussed with the Board, and consideration has been given to complaints that Paper C is unfairly biased against those who are primarily chemists.

5. Training

Early in its career the Committee considered the question of helping in the training of candidates for the Examination and initially it was felt

not to have sufficient resources, but undertook to give practical assistance to any national or other courses that may be set up. A number of meetings were held to help CEIPI in Strasbourg in this direction. Later the Committee felt that a specific body responsible for overseeing training should be set up and Council gave the Committee itself this function. As a consequence in 1985 EPI tutorials were set up, using volunteer members of the EPI acting as tutors who bring together small groups of students in their own areas; once in each session the tutors from all the countries get together to discuss the papers under the chairmanship of members of the Committee. The pass rate amongst those candidates who take the EPI tutorials is substantially higher than amongst those who do not. The fourth session will shortly begin (see the separate notice in three languages).

The Committee has recently been closely involved in helping CEIPI set up its own "on-the-spot" two-year education and training programme employing tutors from among the EPI membership.

Currently, following a comment from Switzerland, we are considering setting up a seminar, possibly in the autumn, to which will be invited all those bodies involved in formal training for the European Examination, so that they can exchange ideas.

6. Other Matters

The significant number of appeals filed by failed candidates is of concern to the Committee (as well as to the Examination Board) and the Committee is endeavouring to support the Board in finding ways of reducing the causes of this.

Amongst many other matters considered during the past ten years have been those of syllabus, check-lists for students, language, dictionaries (should they be allowed in the exam?), timing and venue of the examinations, mixed degrees (in particular mixed science-and-law or science-and a language degrees) and the position of candidates who qualify to practice independently in their own countries in three years but still, to comply the Regulation, have to work "full-time under the supervision of a person on the list" for a further year.

A.H. Duncan,

Chairman of the European Qualifying Examination Committee

NOTE ON EPPC MEETING - 29 OCTOBER 1987

PREPARATIONS FOR THE SACEPO MEETING ON 12/13 NOVEMBER 1987

A large majority of the Committee were against combining search and examination. The question was raised whether, as at present, a divisional application can be made from a divisional application under a proposed new Rule 25 (1). A minority thought division should be possible up to payment of the fees and not, as proposed, up to approval of the text of the parent application (at the SACEPO, subsequently, the latter was agreed). A proposed amended Rule 101 (4) will allow the EPO to set a period for supply of any missing authorisation. Extension of the time limit will be possible but not further processing as there is no direct loss of rights. The rule was accepted in principle. A proposal to refund the examination fee where no examination work had commenced was welcomed (75% only if the application had been already passed to the Examining Division). (Both of these were subsequently agreed by the SACEPO).

A number of further amendments to the rules were agreed with and these also were agreed subsequently by the SACEPO.

Rule 2 (1)	one month notice to use another official language.
Rule 35 (2)	the President to be empowered to decide how many copies of documents make up an application.
Rule 53	the President to determine technical preparations for publishing the patent are completed.
Rule 58 (4)	two months to state observations on an amended text for the patent after an opposition decision.
Rule 70	decisions to be signed by (and name) a competent employee.
Rule 71 (1) and 72 (2)	at least 2 months notice of summons to oral proceedings.
Rule 95a (3)	the President may determine the form of the files.
Rule 85c	the President to decide on reminders of periods of grace under Rules 85a and 85b, with the possibility to give a further respite if the Office fails to send a reminder in time.

However in Rule 57 (1) where an amendment is proposed to make it clear that admissibility of an opposition has not yet been decided when the patentee receives a notification of an opposition another amendment suggests that amendments are only to be made "where appropriate". In the present rule these words qualify the power of the Opposition Division to invite observations and filing of amendments. To avoid difficulties arising from the opponent making objections to amendments having been made at all, e.g. on the basis of exercise of discretion, which would be a new power, this was objected to by the Committee. Moreover it is also proposed to amend Rule 58 (2) to include discretion to refuse amendments to which the Opposition Division does not consent. A large majority was against such a restriction of the ability to amend. (EPO withdrew the proposal at the SACEPO meeting). Finally the EPPC warmly welcomed a proposal to amend Rule 58 by adding a paragraph 6 providing for a 2 month period of grace to pay the fee for reprinting and supply of a translation of any amended claims. (Subsequently agreed by the SACEPO).

EPPC is also in favour of a liberal interpretation of Rule 29 (1) carrying on the practice of the Examining Divisions now disapproved by the Electrical Board of Appeal in Decision T 162/82, even if this requires amendment of the rule. (This was subsequently confirmed by the SACEPO).

In connection with diagnostic methods, e.g. those involving computers, the examiner usually asks for a disclaimer whenever such a method seems to be applicable to the human body, even if this is not intended. It was decided to object to these disclaimers.

In connection with trilateral harmonisation discussions between EPO, USPTO and JPO the Committee desired this to go in the direction of the EPC. Nevertheless amendment of the EPC in a diplomatic conference is to be feared and it is hoped that any amendments can be made in a separate Protocol or only in the national laws.

EPPC objects to a possibility raised by the EPO to permit third parties to request an undelayed search as causing complications and delaying other searches. Instead all applications should be searched without delay.

LATE SUBMISSIONS IN APPEAL PROCEEDINGS

In Decision T 122/84 (Official Journal 5/1987, 177) the Chemical Board of Appeal 3.3.1 has invited comments on its decision under which criteria are given for examination of its own motion by a deciding body under Article 114 (1) and in which cases late submissions can be disregarded under Article 114 (2). In brief, the matter is one for discretion of the deciding body which need give no reasons. However if the late submission would change its decision it must be taken into account and failure to do this shows misuse of the discretion. In particular, a fresh ground of opposition is not submitted in due time if it is raised for the first time after expiry of the opposition period.

EPPC was in general agreement with this provided that late submitted material is actually considered and not completely disregarded whether crucial or not. Hence Article 114 (2) must be interpreted in the restrictive sense that the EPO must consider all late submissions and may only disregard them if not prima facie very relevant and not dealt with in its decision. Moreover there is no real distinction between new grounds and new facts or evidence. If a new ground is made out it must be admitted. EPPC will draw up a submission to send to the EPO.

LATE ISSUE OF FILING REQUESTS

The EPO admits that 2.2% of receipts are issued seven weeks or later than filing and about 7% six weeks or later. This is considered to be excessive and the EPO will be asked again why it takes so long for these cases.

RELEVANT DATE FOR CALCULATION OF GRACE PERIOD

In Decision T 173/83 (unpublished) the Board of Appeals stated that the question of whether the expression "filing date" used in Article 55 (1) refers to the actual filing date of the European application or its priority date is open in view of non-unanimity of doctrine. There was some support in the Committee for this position but the majority thought that if so it should have been stated thus in Article 89. There is nothing EPPC can do about the matter.

ORAL HEARINGS

It seems that the EPO has a list of applicants who always request an oral hearing. This causes unnecessary work. It is suggested that the EPO should issue a Legal Advice on the meaning of Article 116. It seems that one oral hearing is available as of right and the EPO may reject a request for both an interview and a hearing. The EPPC nevertheless felt sympathy with those who wanted to have an interview with the Examiner in spite of having routinely requested an oral hearing.

The matter will be discussed in the Liaison Committee on this understanding.

European Patent Practices Committee
John Beton, Reporter

ANNOUNCEMENT FROM THE EUROPEAN PATENT OFFICE

Microfiche digests of EPO Board of Appeal Decisions

In response to demand from the EPO's clients in industry and the patent profession, the Office will in April 1988 begin publishing digests of Board of Appeal decisions on microfiche and updated every six months. The digests will offer a cheap and convenient source of information permitting rapid retrieval and identification of all decisions.

There will be two separate digests:

1. Reported EPO Board of Appeal decisions

This will cover all decisions published or scheduled for publication in the EPO Official Journal in full-text, abridged or merely headnote form. It will appear in English and the decisions will be arranged in order of the relevant articles or rules of the EPC, Rules relating to Fees, PCT and other legislative texts. Each decision will thus normally appear under several entries.

The microfiches will contain the headnote, summarising the substance of the decision, together with

- case number
- Official Journal reference
- name of applicant
- headword(s)
- Board of Appeal involved
- language of the proceedings
- date of the decision
- application number
- keyword
- relevant provisions (articles or rules of the EPC, Rules relating to Fees and other texts).

This digest will appear twice yearly, in April and October, and will initially comprise a set of 7 microfiches. Since data on new decisions will also be inserted under the appropriate articles, each new batch will completely supersede its predecessor.

The digest will be available only on subscription which may be commenced at any time.

The introductory annual subscription rate is DEM 150.

2. Unreported EPO Board of Appeal decisions

This will cover all decisions not reported in the EPO Official Journal.

It will be published in two series for Legal Board and Technical Board of Appeal decisions respectively. Decisions are arranged by case number of the appeal in both series.

The microfiches will provide for each decision the following data in the language of the proceedings:

- case number
- applicant
- headword(s)
- Board of Appeal involved
- date of the decision
- application number
- title of the invention
- relevant provisions (articles or rules of the EPC, Rules relating to Fees and other texts).

This digest will also appear twice yearly, in April and October, and will initially comprise a set of 6 microfiches. Since it is arranged by case number of the appeal, only the last microfiche in each series will need to be replaced when the six-monthly batch containing the latest decisions is received.

It too will be available only on subscription which may be commenced at any time.

The introductory annual subscription rate is DEM 75.

3. Technical specifications for both digests:

Microfiches in A6 format (105 x 148 mm), reduction 1:24.

4. Ordering

Orders for the publications listed above should be addressed to:

European Patent Office
Department 4.5.2 (Distribution)
Erhardtstrasse 27
D-8000 Munich 2

and marked "Reported decisions on microfiche" or "Unreported decisions on microfiche" as appropriate.

Annual subscriptions (rates include postage) will be debited to each subscriber's deposit account.

A deposit account may be opened with the Cash and Accounts Department (4.2.2); conditions on request.

The European Patent Office
Distribution Department

THE NEW GREEK PATENT LAW AND THE EUROPEAN PATENT SYSTEM

by Helen Papaconstantinou
Greek Member of the EPI

With Law No. 1607/30.6.1986 Greece ratified the Munich Convention, effective as from October 1st, 1986. On ratifying this convention Greece entered a reservation whereby European Patents, insofar as they confer protection on pharmaceutical products as such, will not go into effect in Greece until October 7th, 1992. Regarding the Greek reservation, an applicant may file a separate set of claims at the European Patent Office, in accordance with the accepted practice. (Guidelines for Examination in the EPO C-III, 8.3).

The ratification of the Munich Convention was followed by the new Greek Patent Law No. 1733 of September 22nd, 1987 which became partially effective on that date and will be fully enforced as of January 1st, 1988.

The new Law represents an important step forward because it brings most of the provisions of Greek Patent Law into harmony with the Laws of the members of the European Convention.

We deem it therefore advisable to provide for your information the following comments on the new Patent Law. This summary highlights the new aspects of the Patent Law as compared to the old one which dated back to 1920.

1. Foundation of an independent ORGANIZATION OF INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY
   With article 1 of the new Law a new Organization is established under the name ORGANIZATION OF INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY (OIP) which will be the receiving office for patent applications, utility model applications, recordal of agreements regarding transfer of technology and recordal of any changes relating to patents and utility models.

2. UTILITY MODELS
   Protection of utility models (without prior examination as to novelty) for a duration of seven years is introduced.

3. INTERNATIONAL PATENT CLASSIFICATION
Use of international patent classification will be adopted.

4. The substantive legal provisions regarding concepts such as absolute novelty, inventive step and industrial application have been adopted.

5. SEARCH REPORT
As opposed to the prior system, according to which patents were granted with practically no examination, the new Law provides for a mixed system involving the introduction of a search report on the state of the art to be published along with the application in the Official Bulletin. We should point out, however, that the patent shall be granted, regardless of the contents of the search report on the state of the art. The search report shall be attached to the Letters Patent document. The new Law does not provide for opposition by third parties.

6. PRIORITIES
Translation of priority documents in their entirety is required. Several priorities may be claimed for one application, the date of the earliest priority claimed being the ruling one.

7. DURATION
The duration of the patent will be twenty years. The twenty year duration applies only to the patent applications to be filed after the passage of the new Law.

8. COMPULSORY LICENCE
The compulsory licence provisions established by the new Patent Law are as follows.
Cases in which compulsory licences may be granted:
a) Lack of or insufficient exploitation of the patented invention (after 3 years from the date of issuance or 4 years from the date of filing). The compulsory licence will be granted by the three-member Court of 1st instance after verification that the prerequisites of the Law apply. The same Court will also determine the amount of compensation to be paid to the patentee.
b) For reasons of Public Health or National Defence. The Minister of Industry, Energy and Technology may decide, with good cause, for imperative reasons of public health or national defence, and after

well-founded decisions by the relevant ministers, grant compulsory licences in favour of bodies of the public sector on patents which have not been productively exploited in Greece or when production is insufficient to cover local needs. The amount of compensation and the extent of exploitation will be determined by the same ministerial decision and based on the opinion given by OPI. In case of disagreement of the patentee regarding the amount of compensation, such compensation shall be determined by the one-member Court in the injunction proceedings.

9. SCOPE OF PROTECTION
Particular emphasis is placed by the new Law on patent protection.
a) In particular, the new Law provides for protection not only in case of an existing patent infringement but also in case of a threatened one.
b) The exclusive licensees are afforded the same rights as the patentees and can take action in their name.
c) Patent applications can be the basis for an infringement action. The Court can, however, order a stay of proceedings until the patent is granted.
d) If the invention relates to a process for the manufacture of a product, each product of the same nature is presumed to have been manufactured according to the protected process (irrespective of whether or not these products as such are patentable in Greece).
e) False representation that a product is protected by a patent shall be punished by imprisonment of up to one year or by fine or by both penalties.

10. Microbiological processes are patentable. No prior deposition of a specimen of the microorganism is provided for.

11. TECHNICAL INNOVATIONS
Technical innovation certificates may be granted for the solution of a specific technical problem to persons working in an enterprise.

12. TRANSFER OF TECHNOLOGY
Any transfer of technology agreement as specified in Article 21 of the Law shall be recorded with OPI. The same article specifies the clauses in patent licences which are unacceptable.

13. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONVENTION GRANTING EUROPEAN PATENTS

a) European patent applications and European patents have the same effect in Greece as Greek applications, provided that Greece is a designated country and the patent has been validated in its national phase in Greece. Since Greece is not a Member State of the PCT, European Patents obtained via international filing under the PCT (Euro-PCT applications) are not effective in Greece.

b) The provisional protection of Article 67 para 3 of the Convention is granted only when an appropriate Greek translation of the claims of the application has been filed at and published by OIP. The terms within which the translation is to be filed will be determined by the implementing regulations.

c) Issued European Patents are valid in Greece only if the patentee files at OPI an appropriate Greek translation within a period to be determined by the implementing rules.

d) According to the reservation made by Greece (Article 167 para 2a), European Patents, insofar as they confer protection to pharmaceutical per se, are ineffective.

14. IMPLEMENTING REGULATIONS

All questions relating to the national phase, such as periods within which the translation of the application (for provisional protection) and the translation of the issued patent are to be filed, as well as documentation required and possible special fees, will be dealt with in the Implementing Regulations which will be available shortly. Accordingly, further details of the requirements and procedures involved will be set out in a new note to be published in one of the next issues of the EPI Information.

DUREE EFFECTIVE DE PROTECTION DES NOUVELLES SPECIALITES PHARMACEUTIQUES COMMERCIALISEES EN FRANCE ENTRE 1977 ET 1987

(analyse par Alain PELC, Statisticien Economiste au SNIP)

1. Présentation

L'allongement de la durée nécessaire à la commercialisation d'un nouveau médicament et sa contrepartie à la réduction de la durée de la protection conférée par le brevet a conduit le Syndicat National de l'Industrie Pharmaceutique (SNIP) à entreprendre une enquête auprès des laboratoires pharmaceutiques implantés en FRANCE.

34 entreprises pharmaceutiques ont ainsi retourné, au SNIP, un questionnaire dans lequel ils indiquaient pour tous les nouveaux produits commercialisés entre le 1er janvier 1977 et le 30 août 1987 :

- le nom de la spécialité,
- le nom du principe actif,
- la date de dépôt du brevet,
- la date d'obtention de l'Autorisation de Mise sur le Marché (AMM),
- la date effective de commercialisation du produit.

Pendant les 10 années et demie 143 nouveaux produits brevetés ont été introduits sur le marché en France, représentatifs de l'ensemble des classes thérapeutiques.

2. Résultats

En moyenne, pour ces 143 produits, le temps nécessaire à la commercialisation, c'est-à-dire le temps s'écoulant entre la date de dépôt du brevet et la commercialisation s'établit à 10 ans et 7 mois. La durée de protection effective du brevet est donc de 9 ans et 5 mois.

La moitié des produits a pu être effectivement commercialisée en moins de 10 ans, ce qui leur laisse une durée de protection d'au moins 10 ans. En revanche pour 26 produits le temps nécessaire à la mise sur le marché

a été supérieur à 15 ans, la durée de protection s'avérant être alors inférieure à 5 ans. Trois produits n'avaient plus de protection lors de leur introduction sur le marché.

En France, la date de mise sur le marché ne correspond pas à la date effective de l'autorisation de mise sur le marché (AMM). Le temps total nécessaire à la mise sur le marché se décompose de la manière suivante :

- temps entre la date de dépôt du brevet et la date d'obtention de l'AMM : 8 ans et 7 mois.

- temps entre la date d'obtention de l'AMM et la date de mise sur le marché (obtention du remboursement par la Sécurité Sociale, étude des conditions économiques et/ou commerciales, inscription sur la liste des collectivités) : 2 ans et 1 mois.

Cette deuxième période de temps apparaît être, en FRANCE, très supérieure à ce qu'elle a pu être évaluée dans d'autres pays (par exemple en RFA, elle n'est que de 7 mois : voir EPI Information 3-1987 : p. 23-25).

Le tableau suivant montre l'évolution des temps s'écoulant avant la mise sur le marché ainsi que la durée effective de protection du brevet (sur la base de 20 ans) pour les nouvelles spécialités introduites entre 1977 et 1987.

Année d'introduction	Nombre de produits	Durée avant commercialisation	Durée restante de protection
1977	17	10 ans 3 mois	9 ans 9 mois
1978	16	10 ans 2 mois	9 ans 10 mois
1979	13	9 ans 3 mois	10 ans 9 mois
1980	15	10 ans 4 mois	9 ans 8 mois
1981	12	12 ans 1 mois	7 ans 11 mois
1982	8	9 ans 12 mois	10 ans
1983	18	9 ans 5 mois	10 ans 7 mois
1984	19	11 ans 8 mois	8 ans 4 mois
1985	15	12 ans 8 mois	7 ans 4 mois
1986	10	10 ans 7 mois	9 ans 5 mois
1987*	7	9 ans 9 mois	10 ans 3 mois

* 30.08.87

Conclusion :

La durée moyenne de protection du brevet subsistant après la mise sur le marché, pour les années 1977 à 1987, s'avère être de 9 ans et 5 mois.

La conclusion de la présente étude rejoint la conclusion de l'étude faite en RFA (EPI Information 3-1987 - p. 23-25) d'après laquelle, pour une durée de brevet fictive de 20 ans, la durée de protection du brevet subsistant après la commercialisation serait de 9,5 ans.

Elisabeth Thouret-Lemaître,
French member of EPI

THE COMMUNITY PATENT

In the handsome publication entitled "10 years European Patent Convention" is an article by Herr Krieger which claims so many virtues for the Community Patent, even for less than all of the Community countries, that the reader may be left mystified by the paradox that industry is not everywhere clamouring for its launch. Certain industries here and there may favour early launch, even on a mini-CPC basis, that is to say, for perhaps 9 or 10 countries only, but many more are likely to be swayed oppositely by considerations of the kind now to be set out.

How much can be gained by the simplification of only one renewal fee to cover a group of countries is to be weighed against the inflexibility of the principle of "all or nothing". As the patent gets older its effect may no longer be needed in all countries of the group. With national patents the renewal fees in the unwanted countries can be saved. But not with the Community Patent which, in the extreme case, will still have to be kept in force for one country alone; the cost would greatly exceed the national alternative for retaining protection in that country.

In the matter of costs is to be considered also that the designation fee in applying for the Community Patent, in the same way as the renewal fees, may perhaps be as little as a half of the total payable otherwise for the CPC group. But, when the translation of the whole specification into all languages is a probable requirement (although not yet settled) and the saving on renewal fees is uncertain because of the "all or nothing" principle, the only clear saving is on the designation fee which tends to be trifling compared with all the other costs. The financial incentive in fees therefore looks decidedly weak.

Then how about the COPAC Protocol and will it really lead to cheaper enforcement? It is ominous, as well as tragic, that the 1985 Luxembourg Conference rejected the case for European Patent Attorneys (even when restricted to those in Community countries) to have rights of sole representation before COPAC. Lawyers must therefore be present and by implication the Court will conduct its business with a high degree of formality; almost certainly it will be in Luxembourg too. Furthermore, COPAC is reached only via the national appeal court and the case goes back

there from COPAC; to some extent, an extra tier has been added and certainly a year or more will be added to the time which is taken to achieve a final result. Whether enforcement will be cheaper can be doubted.

For the patentee, it is a disadvantage that a revocation action can, at a single blow, knock out his protection in all of the CPC group. This vulnerability outlasts the 9 month opposition period applicable to the European Patent and can only be regarded by the patentee as a factor against choosing the Community Patent.

It is similarly wrong to imagine that the patentee will see anything advantageous for himself in any restriction in the scope for "forum shopping". Whether any restriction really applies with the Community Patent is debatable because, in common with an equivalent set of national patents, the Community Patent can be used to sue in any country in which infringement is taking place (even though without effect for the rest of the CPC group). A successful suit in a single country with a national patent may be enough to lead to a settlement between the parties where other countries are concerned. There seems no reason why the Community Patent cannot be deployed in the same way. Thus, even though deeper reflection on the restriction of "forum shopping" may eliminate disadvantage for the patentee, there will probably be no advantage for him either.

At least some of these considerations will weigh less heavily against the Community Patent when it applies to all Community countries. There is of course a contradiction in a Community Patent being for less than the whole, the more so when 1992 arrives to bring uniformity for so much else. But, that apart, the idea of testing with a launch for less than the whole is futile if barely anybody will test it on that basis.

J.U. Neukom,
British member of EPI

FREIE STELLEN
POSITIONS VACANT
VACANCES D'EMPLOIS

* * * * *

Bureau d'ingénieurs-conseils en Propriété Industrielle de Suisse romande cherche, pour le suivi de mandats de clients de langue allemande et française, un collaborateur

conseil en Propriété Industrielle

possédant parmi d'autres d'excellentes connaissances de chimie, la maîtrise écrite des langues française et allemande, ainsi que de bonnes connaissances d'anglais.

Modalités de collaboration à convenir. Nationalité suisse ou permis de travail nécessaire.

Veuillez adresser vos réponses, qui seront traitées confidentiellement, au Secrétariat de l'EPI, sous n° 01-CH-1/88.

* * * * *

EPI - AUSSCHÜSSE / EPI COMMITTEES / COMMISSIONS DE L'EPI

FINANZ	STANDESREGELN	EUROPÄISCHE EIGNUNGSPRÜFUNG	EPPC	DISZIPLINARRAT	GESCHÄFTSORDNUNG
---	---	---	---	---	---
FINANCE	PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT	EUROPEAN QUALIFYING EXAMINATION	EPPC	DISCIPLINARY	BYLAWS
---	---	---	---	---	---
FINANCE	CONDUITE PROFESSIONNELLE	EXAMEN EUROPEEN DE QUALIFICATION	EPPC	DISCIPLINE	REGLEMENT INTERIEUR
G. Arena	H. Bode	W. Ernest	W. Baum	M. Bellenghi	K. Draeger
A. Braun (Sen.)	G. Boelsma	A.H. Duncan	J.L. Beton	B. Dousse	C.E. Eder
J. Cagneaux	J. de Muyser	V. Farragiana	A. Casalonga	G. Edmunds	G. Edmunds
B. Feldmann	W. Ernest	J.F. Ibañez Gonzalez	A. Catherine	B. Fisher	C. Madeuf
S. Gasslander	D. Grisar	E. Jung	P. Claeys	E. Fobe	
J. Neukom	T.A. Kilimiris	J.F. Léger	M. Curell Suñol	H. Fritel	
H. Pawloy	A. Kransell	Th. Margellos	U. Dreiss	V. Gil Vega	
H. Vanderborght	E. Krause	L. Sjöö	P. Giannesi	W. Holzer	
C. Weening	J. Lecca	E. Thouret-Lemaître	F. Gibler	I.M. Lerner	
	E.J. Mebius	G.F. van der Beek	S. Hansson	C. Madeuf	
	K.H. Meyer-Dulheuer	W. Vandevelde	A.V. Huygens	G. Mannucci	
	M. Micheli	Stellvertreter	F.A. Jenny	A. Molin	
	A. Perani	Substitutes	A. Josif	J.Å. Nordén	
	G. Sevrell	Suppléants	P. Leitz	P. Révy von Belvard	
	R. Sgarbi		C.L. Ramon	M. Ruff	
	D. Vincent	T. Burman	Z. Schöld	G. Tasset	
	N. Waddleton	E. de Carli	A. Tsimikalis	H.A. Troesch	
	R. Wildi	S. Flaig	J.W. van Schaik	H.G. Urbach	
		M.R. Hirsch	S.D. Votier	J. van Buitenen	
		K. Hotz	G. Werner	G. van der Beek	
		P. Kliment	G. Widtmann	J. Waxweiler	
		L.W. Kooy			
		K.B. Weatherald	Special Committee for Micro-organisms		
		Beobachter	R.S. Crespi (GB)		
		Observers	W. Dost		
		Observateurs	A. Gallochat		
		R. Bijl	A.V. Huygens		
		M. Eudes	F.A. Jenny		
		H.G. Graf	W. Karau		
		R. Petersen	H. Meyer		
			G. Staub		
			G. Tasset		

AD-HOC AUSSCHUB BERUFLICHE HAFTUNG DER MITGLIEDER	SCHRIFTLEITUNG --- EDITORIAL BOARD --- COMITE DE REDACTION	
AD HOC COMMITTEE ON QUESTION OF MEMBERS' PROFESSIONAL LIABILITY	DATIMTEX	
COMMISSION AD-HOC RESPON- SABILITE PROFESSIONNELLE		
H. Bardehle	M. Guérin	J. Brullé
G. Bloch	F. Schouten	F.J. Herzog
F. Cavattoni	D.K. Speiser	K. Veryard
L.C. de Bruijn	A. van der Auweraer	
E. Fobe	K.B. Weatherald	
G. Modiano		
J. Nordén		
E. Piso		
R. Sadones Laurent		
A. Tsimikalis		
N. Waddleton		
Rechnungsprüfer Auditors Commissaires aux comptes		
C.E. Eder		
E. Jung		
Stellvertreter Deputies Suppléants		
L.A. Duran Moya		
M.R. Hirsch		

November 1987

VORSTAND	*BOARD*	BUREAU
Präsident	*President* *Jan D'haemer*	Président
Vize-Präsidenten	*Vice-Presidents* *Angus Duncan · Dieter Speiser*	Vice-Présidents
Generalsekretär	*Secretary General* *Christer Onn*	Secrétaire Général
Schatzmeister	*Treasurer* *Pierre Weyland*	Trésorier
Stellvertr. Sekretär	*Deputy Secretary* *Helen Papaconstantinou*	Secrétaire Adjoint
Stellvertr. Schatzmeister	*Deputy Treasurer* *Alain Catherine*	Trésorier Adjoint
Mitglieder	*Members*	Membres

Kurt Büchel · Axel Casalonga · Alberto Elzaburu
Wolfgang Ernest · Bernhard Feldmann · Daniel Grisar
Engbert Mebius · Richard Petersen · Renato Sgarbi

AUSSCHÜSSE	*STANDING COMMITTEES*	COMMISSIONS
Finanz	*Finance* *Chairman:* *Sten Gasslander*	Finances
Standesregeln	*Professional Conduct* *Chairman:* *Donald Vincent*	Règles de Conduite Professionnelle
Europäische Eignungsprüfung	*European Qualifying Examination* *Chairman:* *Angus Duncan*	Examen Européen de Qualification
Europäische Patentpraxis	*European Patent Practice (EPPC)* *Vorsitzender:* *Felix A. Jenny*	Pour la Pratique du Brevet Européen
Geschäftsordnung	*By-Laws* *Vorsitzender:* *Carl E. Eder*	Règlement Intérieur
Disziplinarrat	*Disciplinary* *Chairman:* *George van der Beek*	Discipline