



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

**Ausschuss für Europäische Patentpraxis**  
**European Patent Practice Committee**  
**Commission pour la Pratique du Brevet Européen**

27 March, 2019

## Report

### Quality subcommittee meeting (24.01.2019) in Munich

The main topic of agenda to this meeting was establishing quality criteria that should be provided to the EPO as feedback on its QMS. All participants at this meeting worked hard during this day and produced an initial list concerning criteria for assessing quality in the register, search, examination and opposition, guidelines and miscellaneous topics.

The initial version also was published on a forum for the broader consultation from the **epi** members. Thanks for everyone who contributed to it. The list then was sent to the **epi** Presidium for further consideration.

### 3<sup>rd</sup> SACEPO-WPQ meeting (07.02.2019) in Munich

The 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting of the SACEPO Working Party on Quality was held on 7th February 2019 at the EPO in Munich. The meeting opened with an overview of key findings of the EPO's user satisfaction survey. The conclusion was that there is a high overall level of satisfaction with the Office and a positive trend in recent years. However, the user satisfaction survey points to certain aspects/areas that could be improved further. Further presentations covered analyzing user feedback from 2018 and ongoing quality improvement measures and continual efforts to improve timeliness which is now 4.4 month for search, 22.3 months for Examination and 18.6 months for Oppositions proceedings.

Part of the meeting was devoted to discussing points raised by the working party's external members and following up on the actions resulting from the previous year's discussions. The workshop held in the afternoon part of the SACEPO-WPQ meeting aimed at better defining parameters essential in a high quality outcome at various stages of the procedure. The participants were split in three groups and invited to indicate what they believe would contribute to a quality improvement at the EPO. **epi** representatives were sent into 2 different workshop groups and both contributed to collecting criteria for search and examination; the register and guidelines were however not addressed during the workshop. **epi**'s contribution based on



the latest list of quality criteria was well received. The input in the three workshops is now being carefully analysed and channelled into the ongoing quality efforts of the Office.

ATTACHMENTS:

- SACEPO-WPQ USS Presentation
- SACEPO-WPQ User Feedback
- SACEPO-WPQ 4-19 Lessons learned and actions taken

Bogoljub Ilievski

Chair of Quality subcommittee