Procedures to file a request to the JPO (Japan Patent Office) for Patent Prosecution Highway Program between the JPO and the EAPO (Eurasian Patent Organization)

Applicants can request accelerated examination by a prescribed procedure including submission of relevant documents on an application which is filed with the JPO and satisfies the following requirements under the JPO-EAPO Patent Prosecution Highway program based on the EAPO application. When filing a request for the PPH program, an applicant must submit a request form “The Explanation of Circumstances Concerning Accelerated Examination” based on the procedure prescribed in “the Guidelines of the Accelerated Examination and Appeal.” Under the PPH program, an applicant is not required to fill in the section “2. the disclosure of prior arts and comparison between the claimed invention and prior art” in “The Explanation of Circumstances Concerning Accelerated Examination”.

The PPH program was commenced on a trial basis on 15.02.2018 and will be fully implemented on a permanent basis on 01.05.2020.

1. Requirements
   (a) Both the JPO application on which PPH is requested and the EAPO application(s) forming the basis of the PPH request shall have the same earliest date (whether this be a priority date or a filing date).

   For example, the JPO application (including PCT national phase application) may be either:
   (Case I) an application which validly claims priority under the Paris Convention from the EAPO application(s) (examples are provided in ANNEX I, Figures A, B, C, H, I and J), or
   (Case II) an application which provides the basis of a valid priority claim under the Paris Convention for the EAPO application(s) (including PCT national phase application(s)) (examples are provided in ANNEX I, Figures D and E), or
   (Case III) an application which shares a common priority document with the EAPO application(s) (including PCT national phase application(s)) (examples are provided in ANNEX I, Figures F, G, L, M and N), or
   (Case IV) a PCT national phase application where both the JPO application and the EAPO application(s) are derived from a common PCT international application having no priority claim (an example is provided in ANNEX I, Figure K).

   The JPO application, which validly claims priority to multiple EAPO or direct PCT applications, or which is the divisional application validly based on the originally filed application that is included in (i)
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to (iii) above, is also eligible.

(b) At least one corresponding application exists in the EAPO and has one or more claims that are determined to be patentable/allowable by the EAPO.
The corresponding application can be the application which forms the basis of the priority claim, an application which derived from the EAPO application which forms the basis of the priority claim (e.g. a divisional application of the EAPO application), or an EAPO national phase application of a PCT application.
Claims are “determined to be allowable/patentable” when the EAPO examiner clearly identifies the claims to be allowable/patentable in the latest office action, even if the application is not granted for patent yet. The office action may be either:
(i) Decision to grant a patent (form 301)
(ii) Notification of readiness to grant a patent (form 300)
(iii) Decision on maintenance of Eurasian patent with amended claim(s) (form 500)

(c) All claims on file, as originally filed or as amended, for examination under the PPH must sufficiently correspond to one or more of those claims indicated as allowable in the EAPO.
Claims are considered to “sufficiently correspond” where, accounting for differences due to translations and claim format, the claims in the JPO are of the same or similar scope as the claims in the EAPO, or the claims in the JPO are narrower in scope than the claims in the EAPO.
In this regard, a claim that is narrower in scope occurs when an EAPO claim is amended to be further limited by an additional feature that is supported in the specification (description and/or claims).
A claim in the JPO which introduces a new/different category of claims to those claims indicated as allowable in the EAPO is not considered to sufficiently correspond. For example, where the EAPO claims only contain claims to a process of manufacturing a product, then the claims in the JPO are not considered to sufficiently correspond if the JPO claims introduce product claims that are dependent on the corresponding process claims.
Any claims amended or added after the grant of the request for participation in the PPH program need not to sufficiently correspond to the claims indicated as allowable in the EAPO application.

(d) The JPO has not begun examination of the application at the time of request for the PPH (an example is provided in ANNEX, figure O).

(e) A “Request for Substantive Examination” must have been filed at the JPO either at the time of the PPH request or previously.
2. Documents to be submitted

Documents (a) to (d) below must be submitted by attaching to “The Explanation of Circumstances Concerning Accelerated Examination”.

Note that even when it is not needed to submit documents below, the name of the documents must be listed in “The Explanation of Circumstances Concerning Accelerated Examination” (Please refer to the Example form for the detail).

(a) Copies of all office actions (which are relevant to substantial examination for patentability in the EAPO), which were sent for the corresponding application by the EAPO, and translations of them\(^2\) if they are not in English.

Either Japanese or English is acceptable as translation language.

(b) Copies of all claims determined to be patentable/allowable by the EAPO, and translations of them\(^2\) if they are not in English.

Either Japanese or English is acceptable as translation language.

(c) Copies of references cited by the EAPO examiner

If the references are patent documents, the applicant doesn’t have to submit them because the JPO usually possesses them. When the JPO does not possess the patent document, the applicant has to submit the patent document at the examiner’s request. Non-patent literature must always be submitted.

The translations of the references are unnecessary.

(d) Claim correspondence table

The applicant requesting PPH must submit a claim correspondence table, which indicates how all claims in the JPO application sufficiently correspond to the patentable/allowable claims in the EAPO application.

When claims are just literal translation, the applicant can just write down that “they are the same” in the table. When claims are not just literal translation, it is necessary to explain the sufficient correspondence of each claim based on the criteria 1. (c) (Please refer to the Example form).

When the applicant has already submitted above documents (a) to (d) to the JPO through simultaneous or past procedures, the applicant may incorporate the documents by reference and does not have to

---

\(^2\) Machine translations will be admissible, but if it is impossible for the examiner to understand the outline of the translated office action or claims due to insufficient translation, the examiner can request the applicant to resubmit translations.
attach them.

3. Example of “The Explanation of Circumstances Concerning Accelerated Examination” for filing request an accelerated examination under the PPH program

(1) Circumstances

When an applicant files a request for an accelerated examination under the PPH program to the JPO, an applicant must submit a request form “The Explanation of Circumstances Concerning Accelerated Examination” based on the procedure prescribed in “the Guidelines of the Accelerated Examination and Appeal”\(^3\).

The applicant must indicate that the application is included in (i) to (iii) of 1. (a), and that the accelerated examination is requested under the PPH program. The application number, publication number, or a patent number of the corresponding EAPO application(s) also must be written.

*In the case that the application which has one or more claims that are determined to be patentable/allowable is different from the EAPO application(s) included in (i) to (iii) of 1. (a) (for example, the divisional application of the basic application), the application number, publication number, or a patent number of the application(s) which has claims determined to be patentable/allowable and the relationship between those applications also must be written.

(2) Documents to be submitted

The applicant must list all required documents mentioned above 2. in an identifiable way, even when applicant omits to submit certain documents.

(3) Notice

Forms of “The Explanation of Circumstances Concerning Accelerated Examination” are different between on-line procedure and paper procedure. Please refer to the examples of forms when filling in (“Form 1 for Accelerated Examination” for on-line procedures, and “Form 2 for Accelerated Examination” for paper procedures.).

---

Example form of on-line procedures
(Example of the request based on the claims indicated patentable/allowable in the written opinion of the report on the state of the art)

【書類名】 早期審査に関する事情説明書

【提出日】 令和00年00月00日
【あて先】 特許庁長官殿
【事件の表示】
【出願番号】 特願0000ー000000
【提出者】 
【代理人】 
【早期審査に関する事情説明】

1. 事情
特許審査ハイウェイに基づく早期審査の申請を行う。
本出願はユーラシア特許庁への出願（特許出願番号000000000）をパリ条約に基づく優先権の基礎出願とする出願である。当該ユーラシア出願に対しては、ユーラシア特許庁により特許査定が発行されている。

以下において、「引用非特許文献1」とは、「村岡洋一著、「コンピュータサイエンス大学講座（第11巻）コンピュータ・アーキテクチャ」、第2版、株式会社近代科学者、1985年11月、p.123-127」である。

If the name of the document is long (over than 50 letters), it is impossible to write it down directly to the column “【物件名】”. Please write down the full name of the document in the column “【早期審査に関する事情説明】” and name it properly. Then write the name in the column “【物件名】”
【提出物件の目録】

List up the documents to be submitted

【物件名】PPH申請書 1
【物件名】XX年XX月XX日付の拒絶理由通知書の写し及びその翻訳文 1
【物件名】XX年XX月XX日付の特許査定の写し及びその翻訳文 1
【物件名】特許可能と判断された請求項の写し及びその翻訳文 1
【物件名】引用非特許文献 1 1

Use the same name as “【物件名】” under “【提出物件の目録】”

【添付物件】

Attach the document here as image file or text.

【物件名】PPH申請書

【物件名】PPH request form

【内容】

The list of attached documents
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PPH申請書
(Request FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE PATENT PROSECUTION HIGHWAY (PPH) (PILOT) PROGRAM)

A. 書誌事項  (Bibliographic Data)

出願番号 (Application Number) 特願0000-000000

B. 必要事項  (Request)

出願人による以下に基づく特許審査ハイウェイの申請:
(Applicant requests participation in the Patent Prosecution Highway (PPH) (pilot) program based on:)

先行庁
(Office of Earlier Examination (OEE))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>先行庁の審査書類形式</th>
<th>ユーラシア特許庁(EAPO)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(OEE Work Products Type)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ドシエ・アクセス・システム又はPATENTSCOPEにおいて、オフィスアクションの情報が提供されている (The office is requested to retrieve documents via the Dossier Access System or PATENTSCOPE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

先行庁の対応出願番号 (OEE Application Number) 00000000

C. 必要書類  (Required Documents)

I. 先行庁のオフィスアクションの写し及び、その翻訳文
(OEE Work Products and, if required, Translations)

1. ● 先行庁のオフィスアクションの写しを添付する
(A copy of OEE work products is attached; or)

2. ● 上記1.の日本語又は英語の翻訳文を添付する
(A translation of documents in 1 in a language accepted by the Office is attached; or)

II. 先行庁における特許可能な請求項及び、その翻訳文
(Patentable/Allowable Claims Determined by OEE and, if required, Translations)

3. ● 先行庁出願において特許可能と判断された全請求項の写しを添付する
(A copy of all claims determined to be patentable/allowable by OEE is attached; or)

4. ● 上記3.の日本語又は英語の翻訳文を添付する
(A translation of documents in 3 in a language accepted by the Office is attached; or)

III. 引用文献  (Documents Cited in OEE Work Products (if required))

5. ● 引用非特許文献を添付する
(A copy of all documents cited in OEE work products is attached (excluding patent documents); or)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IV. 先の提出書類の採用の表示 (Previously submitted documents)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. □ 上記において「添付する」とチェックした書類のうち、先に提出した書類を採用する</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(If any of the above mentioned documents have been submitted before, please specify.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(先行庁のオフィスアクションの写し、及び、その翻訳文)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(先行庁における特許可能な請求項、及び、その翻訳文)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(引用非特許文献)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| V. 提出物件（採用する物件を除く）(List of names of documents submitted) |
|早期審査に関する事情説明書に記載のとおり。|

| VI. 提出を省略する物件（List of names of documents omitted for submission）|
| (先行庁のオフィスアクションの写し、及び、その翻訳文) |
| | |
| (先行庁における特許可能な請求項、及び、その翻訳文) |
| | |
| (引用特許文献) |
| 米国特許第000000号公報 |
| ドイツ出願公開第00 0000 000 000.0号公報 |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
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D. 請求項の対応関係（Claims Correspondence）

□ 先行庁の特許可能と判断した請求項が、そのまま、または変更なく直接に同一の文書に記載される
（All the claims in the specification sufficiently correspond to the patentable claims in the OEE application; or）

□ 請求項の対応関係は、以下の表に記載（Claims correspondence is explained in the following table）

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>本出願の請求項 (Application Claims)</th>
<th>先行庁の対応請求項 (Corresponding OEE claims)</th>
<th>対応関係に関するコメント (Explanation regarding the correspondence)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. 見解書、予備審査報告の第8項（提出物件の目録）に対する釈明
(explaining any Box VIII observations of WO/ISA, WO/IPEA or IPER)

出願人又は代理人 (Name(s) of applicant(s) or representative(s))
早期審査に関する事情説明書に記載のとおり。

提出日 (Date)
早期審査に関する事情説明書に記載のとおり。

提出者 (Signature(s) of the applicant/representative)
早期審査に関する事情説明書に記載のとおり。

【物件名】 **年**月**日付の拒絶理由通知書の写し及びその翻訳文
Copy and translation of Notification of readiness to grant a patent in the EAPO on (date)

【内容】
Attach the copy of the document.

Use the same name as “【物件名】” under “【提出物件の目録】”

【物件名】 **年**月**日付の特許査定の写し及びその翻訳文
Copy and translation of Decision to grant a patent in the EAPO on (date)

【内容】
Attach the copy of the document.

【物件名】 特許可能と判断された請求項の写し及びその翻訳文
Copy and translation of the claims indicated patentable in Notification of readiness to grant a patent in the EAPO on (date)

【内容】
Attach the copy of the document.
Note that in the case of paper procedure, the pendency period (the period between the request for PPH and the first office action) tends to be longer than on-line procedure.

Attach the copy of the document.
A case meeting requirement (a) (i) - Paris route -

A case meeting requirement (a) (i) - PCT route -
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**C**

A case meeting requirement (a) (I)
- PCT route, Domestic priority -

**D**

A case meeting requirement (a) (II)
- Paris route -
E  A case meeting requirement (a) (II)
- PCT route -

F  A case meeting requirement (a) (III)
- Paris route, but the first application is from the third country -

XX: the office other than the EAPO
A case meeting requirement (a) (III)

- PCT route, but the first application is from the third country -

XX application

XX: the office other than the EAPO

A case meeting requirement (a) (I)

- Paris route & Complex priority -

 ZZ: any office
PPH using the national work products from the EAPO

(A) A case meeting requirement (a) (I)
- Paris route & divisional application -

(B) A case meeting requirement (a) (I)
- PCT route -

OK
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K A case meeting requirement (a) (IV)
- Direct PCT route -

L A case meeting requirement (a) (III)
- Direct PCT & Paris route -
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A case meeting requirement (a) (III)
- Direct PCT & PCT route -

M

N

A case meeting requirement (a) (III)
- Direct PCT & PCT route -
A case not meeting requirement (d)
- Examination has begun before a request for PPH -
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