BRPTO’s backlog (2017)

TOTAL 261,035

CN Priorities
- 964 (0.37%)
- 492 (0.19%)
- 1,800 (0.69%)

KR Priorities
- 1,053 (0.40%)
- 811 (0.31%)
- 1,858 (0.71%)

GB Priorities
- 2,579 (0.98%)
- 2,351 (0.90%)
- 1,119 (0.46%)

FR Priorities
- 5,249 (2.01%)
- 6,685 (2.60%)
- 4,922 (1.86%)

JP Priorities
- 6,810 (2.60%)
- 7,861 (3.01%)
- 5,680 (2.17%)

DE Priorities
- 10,619 (4.07%)
- 11,431 (4.38%)
- 3,450 (1.32%)

BR Priorities
- 23,738 (9.09%)
- 19,946 (7.64%)
- 11,453 (4.38%)

OTHER Priorities
- 26,556 (10.17%)
- 18,876 (7.23%)
- 11,370 (4.40%)

US Priorities
- 32,032 (12.27%)
- 22,177 (8.49%)
- 19,073 (7.30%)

Life Sciences, Bio & Chemistry (avg. pendency 11 years)
Mechanics (avg. pendency 10 years)
Telecom & Computing (avg. pendency 14 years)
BRPTO’s pendency by division (2018)

Over 13 years

Art Group Unit

- AVERAGE: 10y3m
- Telecommunications (DITEL): 13y9m
- Pharmacy II (DIFAR II): 13y6m
- Pharmacy I (DIFAR I): 13y1m
- Computers & electronics (DICEL): 12y2m
- Mechanics (DIMEC): 11y7m
- Biotechnology (DIALP): 10y11m
- Inorganic chemistry (DINOR): 10y6m
- Oil & Chemical Engineering (DIPEQ): 10y4m
- Agrichemicals (DIPAQ): 8y3m

Time from filing to decision
### Administrative fast-track programs

Average pendency time for an application is of more than 10 years. Examination can be expedited at BRPTO through different programs, such as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule #217/2018</th>
<th>Rule #151/2015</th>
<th>Rule #175/2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applications related to diagnosis, prophylaxis and treatment of Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome (AIDS), cancer, (pre-defined) neglected diseases or rare diseases</td>
<td>(i) if a third-party’s application claims the same subject matter; (ii) in case of infringement of the pending patent application.</td>
<td>Applications covering environmentally friendly technologies of alternative energy, transportation, energy conservation, waste management and agriculture, based but not limited to the WIPO’s IPC Green Inventory.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Patent Prosecution Highway

### Current programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USPTO (Rule #154/2015)</th>
<th>JPO (Rule #184/2017)</th>
<th>EPO (Rule #202/2017)</th>
<th>PROSUR (Official Notice #224/MDIC)</th>
<th>SIPO (Rule #209/2018)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oil, gas and petrochemical technologies classified under specific IPCs.</td>
<td>IT technologies classified under specific IPCs.</td>
<td>Chemistry field or related to technologies applied to medicine*, classified under specific IPCs.</td>
<td>Not limited to a specific technical field. Not limited to specific IPCs**.</td>
<td>Chemical, measurement, packaging and IT fields*, classified under specific IPCs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-year term has been extended. It will close on **May 10th, 2018** and limited to 150 applications.

2-year term (until March 31st, 2019) limited to 200 applications.

2-year term (until November 31st, 2019) and limited to 300 applications per year.

1-year term (until June 31st, 2019).

2-year term (until January 31st, 2020) and limited to 200 applications, of which 20 can be Mottainai requests.

- *Drug-related applications are not eligible
- ** AR, BR, CL, CO, CR, EQ, PY, PE or UY priority

---

5
## Patent Prosecution Highway
### Comparing PPH INPI –USPTO Phases I and II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule #154/2015</th>
<th>Rule #218/2018 (published today)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In force up to May 10, 2018</td>
<td>In force from May 10, 2018 to April 30, 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Rule #154/2015**
  - Oil, gas and petrochemical technologies and classified under specific IPCs.
  - Limited to 150 applications.

- **Rule #218/2018**
  - Oil, gas and petrochemical technologies and classified under specific IPCs (comprising additional IPCs), and IT technologies and classified under specific IPCs.
  - Limited to 200 applications, of which 50 can use results from PCT to apply for the program. 1 request per month per applicant.
PPH BRPTO – USPTO
Only 67 requests and 39 allowed since December 2015

# of PPH requests notified by the BRPTO per month

- Notice of allowance
- Not accepted to the PPH program

Current legal status of PPH patent applications:
- Patents granted: 37
- Pending: 12
- Application allowed: 14
- Abandoned: 2
- Not accepted to the PPH program: 2

BRPTO’s average time to decide on PPH patent applications:
- 1 TO 12 MONTHS
- 1 TO 13 MONTHS
- 1.5 TO 15 MONTHS
- BRPTO NOTICE OF ALLOWANCE

Publication concerning the acceptance/refusal to the PPH program

Requests to enter the PPH program:

End of PPH program (May 10th, 2018)
PPH BRPTO – JPO

Only 42 requests and 17 allowed since April 2017

# of PPH requests notified by the BRPTO per month

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Notice of allowance</th>
<th>Not accepted to the PPH program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APR/2017</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUN</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUG</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOV</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAN/2018</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Requests to enter the PPH program:

- APR/2017: 18
- MAY: 11
- JUN: 1
- JUL: 3
- AUG: 2
- SEP: 3
- OCT: 0
- NOV: 2
- DEC: 0
- JAN/2018: 0
- FEB: 1
- MAR: 1

Current legal status of PPH patent applications:

- Pending: 22
- Application allowed: 4
- Patents granted: 13
- Not accepted to the PPH program: 3

BRPTO’s average time to decide on PPH patent applications:

- 1 TO 6 MONTHS
- 1 TO 4 MONTHS
- 4 TO 6 MONTHS
- PUBLICATION CONCERNING THE ACCEPTANCE/REFUSAL TO THE PPH PROGRAM
- FILING THE REQUEST
- BRPTO NOTICE OF ALLOWANCE

END OF PPH PROGRAM (MARCH 31ST 2019)
PPH BRPTO – EPO
Only 13 requests and 0 allowed since December 2017

# of PPH requests notified by the BRPTO per month

- **Notice of allowance**
- **Not accepted to the PPH program**

### Current legal status of PPH patent applications

- **Pending**: 8
- **Not accepted to the PPH program**: 5

### BRPTO’s average time to decide on PPH patent applications

- **Publication concerning the acceptance/refusal to the PPH program**
  - 1 to 1.5 months
- **Filing the request**
- **BRPTO notice of allowance**
  - Not available yet

END OF PPH PROGRAM (NOVEMBER 30TH 2019)

REQUESTS TO ENTER THE PPH PROGRAM

- DEC/2017: 10
- JAN/2018: 2
- FEB: 0
- MAR: 1
- APR: 0
- MAY: 0
- JUN: 0
- JUL: 0
- AUG: 0
- SEP: 0
- OCT: 0
- NOV: 0
- DEC: 0
- JAN/2019: 0
- FEB: 0
- MAR: 0
- APR: 0
- MAY: 0
- JUN: 0
- JUL: 0
- AUG: 0
- SEP: 0
- OCT: 0
- NOV/2019: 0
PPH BRPTO – SIPO
Only 62 requests and 0 allowed since February 2018

# of PPH requests notified by the BRPTO per month
- Notice of allowance
- Not accepted to the PPH program

Requests to enter the PPH program:
- FEB/2018: 62
- MAR: 0
- APR: 1
- MAY: 4
- JUN: 0
- JUL: 0
- AUG: 0
- SEP: 0
- OCT: 0
- NOV: 0
- DEC: 0
- JAN/2019: 0
- FEB: 0
- MAR: 0
- APR: 0
- MAY: 0
- JUN: 0
- JUL: 0
- AUG: 0
- SEP: 0
- OCT: 0
- NOV: 0
- DEC: 0
- JAN/2020: 0

Current legal status of PPH patent applications:
- 62 patent applications

- Pending: 57
- Not accepted to the PPH program: 5

BRPTO’s average time to decide on PPH patent applications:
- Publication concerning the acceptance/refusal to the PPH program: 1 to 1.5 months
- Not available yet
- Filing the request
- BRPTO notice of allowance
ANVISA’s Prior Approval
ANVISA’s prior approval: the early days

1994

1.186 “pipeline” applications filed within the one year window established by article 230 of the patent statute.

1996

MAY 15TH
Law 9.279/96 is effective as regards subject matter contained in article 230, which establishes the conditions for filing and granting “pipeline” patents.

DEC 30TH
Brazil signed and introduced the TRIPS Agreement into the domestic legal system through Decree #1,355 of December 30, 1994.

1997

MAY 15TH
Deadline for filing “pipeline” applications, article 230.

1998

1999

JUNE 16TH
INPI starts to grant “pipeline” patents.

IMPORTANT
257 “pipeline” patents were granted by the BPTO during the time frame of 12/28/1999 until 08/08/2000. Besides the “pipeline” patents subject to ANVISA’s prior approval system, in the same Official Gazettes, the BPTO also granted “pipeline” patents for the other three technologies contained in article 230 of the Law 9.279/96. Thus, all granted “pipeline” patents, that do not have as object medicaments of any kind, and the respective process for obtaining or modifying, are not subject to article 229-C (such as the “pipelines” of EMBRAPA, or the oner that have as object inventions of chemical products). Among the 257 “pipeline” patents granted, few more than one hundred may be subject to ANVISA’s prior approval system.
ANVISA’s prior approval:
the early days

**DECEMBER 15TH**
Provisional Ruling nº 2.006/99 published, amending Federal Statute 9.279 to include article 229-C in the patent statute.

**APRIL 2ND**
Opinion INPI/PROC 003/00 Revoked by the President of INPI. INPI implements official action 23.17 in INPI’s Gazette (RPI) for prior approval of “pipeline” through the official notice INPI/DIRPA 17/02/2001.

**MAY 21ST**
ANVISA starts its activities related to article 229-C. Rule nº 239, which alters Internal Rule of ANVISA, creating its Intellectual Property Commission, is published in the Official Gazette.

**JUNE 23RD**
ANVISA published Resolution RDC 45 establishing the procedure regarding prior approval of pharmaceutical applications.

**DECEMBER 28TH - AUGUST 8TH**
Time frame where INPI granted pipeline patents, issuing letters-patent for “medicaments of any kind, and the respective process for obtaining or modifying,” without ANVISA’s prior approval.

**2000**

**2001**

**2008**

17 months of silence, inactivity and indefiniteness from ANVISA regarding its role under the system of prior consent implemented by article 229-C.

**FEBRUARY 23RD**
Opinion INPI/PROC nº 003/00 of INPIs Attorney General, Ricardo Luiz Sichel:

Summary: pipeline application, non-applicability of art. 229-C of Provisional Ruling nº 2014-2/99.

1. The Patent Commissioner poses a question about the applicability of article 229-C of the Provisional Ruling nº 2014-2/99, as regards “pipeline” applications, for pharmaceutical products.

2. On the other hand, as regards the ANVISA’s intervention in the granting of question for pharmaceutical products and processes, it is verified the desired spirit of cooperation, which should exist in the Public Administration, in a way to reach the rules contained in art. 37 of the Federal Constitution.

3. However, as previously supported, I have observed that the “pipeline” applications are not subject to the examination as provided for in article 8º of the Industrial Property Law. Due to this fact, I do not foresee the need to send such patent applications to ANVISA. In this context, I notice the convenience of establishing a covenant between the INPI and the mentioned agency, aiming at balancing the relationship between the two entities, in a way to comply with the lawfulness doctrine, besides the public interest involved. To the consideration rendered by the Hon. President, suggesting the granting of normative effect to the present opinion.

Ricardo Luiz Sichel
The Commissioner of the bRPTO, José Gracã Araújo, rules on the normative nature of opinion INPI/PROC nº 003/00 of the Attorney General, deciding that “pipeline” patents for medicaments of any kind, and the respective process of obtaining or modifying are not subject to the prior approval mentioned in article 229-C of the Law 9.279/976.
ANVISA’s prior approval: the early days

On October 16, 2009 the Brazilian Attorney-General’s Office (AGU) published opinion #210/PGF/AE/2009 limiting ANVISA’s analysis and stating that it could not perform examination of patentability requirements.

On January 7, 2011 this position was reiterated in AGU’s opinion #337/PGF/EA/2010.

On May 24, 2012 the government published inter-ministerial Ordinance #1065 establishing the workflow between ANVISA and INPI regarding prior approval analysis.

On April 15, 2013 ANVISA published RDC #21 amending RDC #45 establishing standards for the analysis under art. 229-C.

On September 12, 2013 the Civil Class Action filed by the Federal Prosecutor’s Office seeking the nullity of AGU’s opinion #337/PGF/EA/2010 was rejected.
Interfarma’s class action

Interfarma sought to annul paragraph 1, item II and paragraph 3 of art. 4 of RDC #45/2008 (as amended by RDC #21/2013).

**Paragraph 1, item II** – “The patent application shall be considered against public health when: II - The patent application of pharmaceutical product or process is of interest to the public policies of access to medicines and pharmaceutical assistance of the Public Healthcare System (SUS) and does not meet patentability requirements and further criteria established by Patent Statute #9,279 of 1996”.

**Paragraph 3** – “The patent application for pharmaceutical product or process will be deemed as interest to the public policies of access to medicines and pharmaceutical assistance of the Public Healthcare System (SUS) when comprises, or results in, substance established in the Ordinances published by the Ministry of Health establishing the strategic products, for SUS, and your regular updates, as well as comprises, or results in, substance established to the therapeutic purpose listed in the mentioned Ordinances”.

Prior approval litigation against ANVISA

**Preliminary Injunction**
- Interlocutory Appeals
  - 2 Rendereed Moot by Favorable Decision
  - 1 Rendereed Moot by Unfavorable Decision
  - 2 Not Filed

- hearings: 31
- 87% Favorable decisions

**Judgments**
- Interlocutory Appeals
  - 6 Favorable
  - 12 Not Filed
  - 9 Rendereed Moot
  - 4 Pending

- hearings: 28
- 82% Favorable decisions from the Court of Appeals

**Total Cases**: 48
On April 12th, 2017, BRPTO and ANVISA signed Interagency Ordinance #1/2017 establishing new procedures for the agencies interaction regarding the prior approval of patent applications under art. 229-C of the IP Statute. The new ordinance entered into force on June 12th, 2017.

Rule #168/2017, issued by ANVISA, establishes on art. 4 that after receiving the patent application, ANVISA will perform its examination in light of public health, through a decision in the technical opinion submitted by the assigned unit inside the Agency.
Art. 9 of Interagency Ordinance #1 has the potential to turn off the pharmaceutical patent system by creating an Interagency Policy Group between the agencies to “harmonize” construing and the application of the Brazilian patent law.

Within the Interagency Policy Group, BRPTO and ANVISA will discuss common understandings on the interpretation of patentability requirements.

Currently, the ANVISA performs a more strict analysis on the following subject matters, when compared to the BRPTO:

- Selection patents;
- Polymorphs, co-crystals and enantiomers;
- Prodrugs
- New uses
Workflow
ANVISA’s prior approval and third-party observations proceedings

- BRPTO decides on Admissibility/Formal examination of the entry/filing petition
  - ACCEPTED
    - Pharma related application?
      - YES
        - BRPTO publishes the remittance of the application to ANVISA at the BRPTO’s Gazette
      - NO
        - BRPTO will issue its Office Action on patentability requirements
          - YES
            - BRPTO agrees with ANVISA’s third party observation?
              - YES
                - ANVISA will grant its prior approval
              - NO
                - BRPTO must issue Office Action addressing ANVISA’s arguments
            - NO
              - BRPTO will resume patent examination

- ANVISA analyzes public health risk under MoH’s lists of banned substances
  - YES
    - Product or result from process is a banned substance?
      - NO
        - Product strategic to SUS?
          - YES
            - ANVISA will analyze patentability requirements and issue a third party observation
          - NO
            - ANVISA publishes the denial of prior approval at the Federal Register

- BRPTO will publish ANVISA’s grant of prior approval at the BRPTO’s Gazette
  - NO
    - ANVISA publishes the grant of prior approval at the Federal Register
    - ANVISA publishes the denial of prior approval at the Federal Register

- Brazilian PTO (BRPTO)
- Brazilian FDA (ANVISA)
Another class action filed by the FPO

On April 17, 2018 the FPO filed a Civil Class Action, seeking to **annul art. 4 and art. 5 of Interagency Ordinance #1.**

**Art. 4º** Após recebimento dos pedidos de patente encaminhados pelo INPI, a ANVISA analisará tais pedidos à luz da saúde pública, mediante decisão consubstanciada em parecer técnico emitido pela unidade organizacional competente no âmbito da Agência.

**Art. 5º** Nos pedidos de patente que contenham produto ou processo farmacêutico considerado de interesse para as políticas de medicamentos ou de assistência farmacêutica no âmbito do SUS, a ANVISA poderá emitir parecer, com fulcro em requisitos de patenteabilidade, que corresponderá a subsídios, durante o exame pelo INPI, nos termos do artigo 31 da Lei nº 9.279, de 1996.

The FPO also seeks to establish that ANVISA has statutory authority to “**analisar os pedidos de patente de produtos e processos farmacêuticos do ponto de vista da saúde e interesse públicos e também para avaliar o preenchimento dos requisitos de patenteabilidade** (novidade, atividade inventiva e aplicação industrial), nos termos do art. 229-c, (...) tendo seu parecer caráter vinculante perante o INPI”
Judicially induced fast-track prosecution
Judicially induced fast-track prosecution - judgments

**TOTAL 80 cases**

- **47 JUDGMENTS ORDERING THE EXPEDITED EXAMINATION**
- **10 JUDGMENTS RENDED MOUT BY BRPTO’S COMPLIANCE**
- **9 JUDGMENTS DENYING BRPTO’S OMISION OR UNREASONABLE DELAY**
- **6 JUDGMENTS PENDING**
- **7 LACK OF STANDINGS TO SUE**
- **1 LAWSUIT WITHDRAWN**

**Judgments ordering the expedited examination**: 16 cases
- **Judgments rendered moot by BRPTO’s compliance**: 6 cases
- **Judgments denying BRPTO’s omission or unreasonable delay**: 9 cases
- **Lawsuit withdrawn**: 2 cases
- **Lack of standing to sue**: 1 case

**9th Federal District Court of Rio de Janeiro**

**Judges**: Hon. Ana Amelia Silveira Moreira Antoun Neto [4] [3]
- Assisted by Hon. Mariza Pimenta Bueno [1] [4], Hon. Celso Araujo Santos [1] [6] and Hon. Daniela Pereira Madeira [1] [0]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PATENTS</th>
<th>TRADEMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**13th Federal District Court of Rio de Janeiro**

**Judge**: Hon. Marcia Maria Nunes de Barros [1] [4] e Caroline Somesom Taub [1] [0]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PATENTS</th>
<th>TRADEMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**25th Federal District Court of Rio de Janeiro**

- Assisted by Hon. Luciana Cunha Villar [1] [0]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PATENTS</th>
<th>TRADEMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**31st Federal District Court of Rio de Janeiro**

- Assisted by Hon. Caroline Somesom Taub [5] [1]
- and Hon. Marcelo Soiter [1] [0]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PATENTS</th>
<th>TRADEMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Federal Court of Appeals**

**1st Specialized Panel**

- Decisions denying the expedited examination: 9 cases
- Pending: 4 cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPEALS BEFORE THE COURT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2nd Specialized Panel**

- Decisions denying the expedited examination: 15 cases
- Pending: 2 cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPEALS BEFORE THE COURT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Includes one case that was dismissed by the 9th Federal District Court of Sao Paulo. Includes four cases that are pending judgments, four granted and one with lack of standing to sue before the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 5th, Federal District Courts of Brazil.

*Excluded from the basis for calculating the success rate.*

**Licks ATTORNEYS**
The interpretation of art. 32 of the IP Statute
The interpretation of art. 32

Neste ponto cabe pontuar que a alteração voluntária para a redução da proteção após o pedido de exame não é inofensiva para a sistemática da proteção de patentes, tal como seria possível supor.

Isso porque tal possibilidade estimula a formulação de pedidos iniciais excessivamente amplos que geram impactos negativos na livre iniciativa e na livre concorrência.

Tal fenômeno pode ser facilmente compreendido quando se tem vista que durante o longo período que vai da formulação inicial do pedido excessivamente amplo, passando pelas restrições, até a definitiva concessão da patente, paira no mercado insegurança jurídica quanto à possibilidade/viabilidade econômica dos concorrentes explorarem invenções e modelos de utilidade similares.

(Class Action #0513584-06.2003.4.02.5101, page 1073; Federal Prosecutor Renato de Freitas Souza Machado; October 10, 2017)
The interpretation of art. 32

(...) Em adição, a consequência imediata de tal adoção se refletiria no indeferimento quase que automático de praticamente todos os pedidos de patente apresentados ao instituto. Fato este altamente comprometedor e contrário a qualquer política industrial, política pública ou política de acesso pela sociedade brasileira dos bens de consumo hoje disponíveis no mercado.

(...) Acreditar que a possibilidade de alteração voluntária estimula a formulação de pedidos iniciais excessivamente amplos que geram impactos negativos na livre iniciativa e na livre concorrência, demonstra desconhecimento do trabalho árduo realizado na DIRPA.

(Class Action #0513584-06.2003.4.02.5101, page 457; Julio Cesar Moreira; April 12, 2018)
EPO Validation System: An enhancing tool for efficiency
The European Patent Organisation Validation System

Since 2010, the European Patent Organisation (EPO) has signed validation agreements.

Most of the patent applications filed in Brazil originate from a first filing abroad. It is assumed that a significant percentage of these filings are also targeting the EPO, either in the context of a direct European patent application or an international application under the PCT.
Geographic coverage of the EPO Cooperation

**Member states (38)**
Albania
Austria
Belgium
Bulgaria
Croatia
Cyprus
Czech Republic
Denmark
Estonia
Finland
France
Germany
Greece
Hungary
Iceland
Ireland
Italy
Latvia
Liechtenstein
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Former Yugoslav Republic
of Macedonia
Malta
Monaco
Netherlands
Norway
Poland
Portugal
Romania
San Marino
Serbia
Slovakia
Slovenia
Spain
Sweden
Switzerland
Turkey
United Kingdom

**Extension states (2)**
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Montenegro

**Validation states (4)**
Cambodia
Republic of Moldova
Morocco
Tunisia

The Benefits of Validation

Some of the benefits of the EPO Validation System include:

▪ Reduce duplication of search and examination work.

▪ Enable national patent offices to prioritize first filings from national applicants.

▪ High quality and multilateral examination.

▪ Cost-effective and strategic filing option for applicants.