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Objectives of Work-Sharing

- Work-sharing = Quality and Efficiency gains

- In 66% of cases, examiners found new prior art by sharing search reports from other offices (*Vancouver Group* examiner exchange).

- In 88% of cases, feedback resulted in additional citations. In 53% of cases, feedback resulted in changes to Written Opinion (*EPO progress report on PCT collaborative search and examination*).

- Collaborative work may increase initial costs, but overall costs decrease.
Work-Sharing Business Models

- **Centralized Examination**
  - One office examine applications, others accept the results, with some formalities, top-up search, or other procedures

- **Collaborative Examination**
  - Examiners from 2 or more offices work together to produce a single result, which is then used independently in each office

- **Mutual Recognition**
  - Examiners from a second office rely on the work of another office, perhaps with additional search and examination

- **Mutual Exploitation**
  - Examiners from a second office have access to the results of another office and may take them into account in their own work.

- **Unilateral Exploitation**
  - Examiners from a second office access the results of other offices via public online file inspection systems.

- **Outsourcing**
  - Applications are examined by another office or by an external company.
## Work-Sharing Business Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mutual Exploitation</th>
<th>Collaborative Examination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver Group</td>
<td>PCT Pilot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IP5 Pilots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralized Examination</td>
<td>Mutual Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARIPO, EPO, PCT?</td>
<td>PPH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outsourcing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIPO-ICE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Critical Factors

- Successful programs are office-driven
- Language issues must be overcome
- Examiner exchanges/studies help to build confidence and understanding
- Need for common standards for work products
- Need for quality control or quality metrics to increase confidence in results of other offices
- Access to search databases
- System to support sharing of information, data and documents
The ASEAN Context
### Patent filings in ASEAN offices

10-year averages

Source: WIPO Statistics Database – data missing for some offices, years and/or countries of origin
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ASEAN Context

- Approximately 15% of patent applications are first filings by local applicants.
- At least 75% of patent applications are filed, via the PCT, by foreign applicants from a small number of origins.

Possible priorities for ASEAN:
1. High quality service for national applicants
2. Efficient processing of parallel foreign applications
ASEAN Context

Possible priorities for ASEAN:
1. High quality service for national applicants
2. Efficient processing of parallel foreign applications

Possible models:
1. Outsourcing / Partnerships
2. Access to foreign search/examination documents
3. Collaborative examination of parallel foreign applications
Systems Requirements

- Digitization and storage of the relevant documents in IP Offices
- Identification of parallel applications
- Systems for secure sharing of data and documents with external partners
- Access to foreign search and examination results
- Language tools