Patent offices around the world have granted millions of patents to multinational companies. Patent offices are rarely studied and yet they are crucial agents in the global knowledge economy. Based on a study of forty-five rich and poor countries that takes in the world’s largest and smallest offices, Peter Drahos argues that patent offices have become part of a globally integrated private governance network that serves the interests of multinational companies. He shows that the Trilateral Offices of Europe, the USA and Japan make developing-country patent offices part of the network through the strategic fostering of technocratic trust. By analysing the obligations of patent offices under the patent social contract and drawing on a theory of nodal governance, the author proposes innovative approaches to patent office administration that would allow developed and developing countries to recapture the public spirit of the patent social contract.

Peter Drahos is a professor at the Regulatory Institutions Network in the Australian National University and holds a Chair in Intellectual Property at Queen Mary, University of London.
THE GLOBAL GOVERNANCE
OF KNOWLEDGE

Patent Offices and their Clients

PETER DRAHOS
To Julie
CONTENTS

List of diagrams and tables xi
List of abbreviations xii
Preface xiv

1 Patent offices and the global governance of knowledge 1
   The patent ocean: Kiribati 1
   Global patent governance 3
   Definitional clarifications 5
   Patents as private taxation 7
   Collective action, co-evolution and diffusion: explaining the changes in patent office administration 10
   Patent offices: the business model approach 18
   Disclosure and social value: two versions of the patent social contract 27
   The duties of the patent office 33
   The fieldwork trail and some findings 38
   'Invisible' patent harmonization and why patent offices matter 47

2 Labyrinths and catacombs: Patent office procedure 55
   Welcome to the maze 55
   Filing routes 56
   A procedure, another procedure and yet more procedures 60
   Grant procedure 64
   Patent quality 69
   The dark heart of complexity: patent claims 79

3 The rise of patent offices 91
   Patent statutes 91
   Monopoly privileges 92
   Procedures for the grant of monopoly privileges 94
   The gap between patent law and patent administration 105
   The rise and spread of patent administration 110
CONTENTS

4 The Sun and its planets: The European Patent Office and national offices 114
   Europe’s national patent offices 114
   The birth of the European patent system 117
   The European Patent Convention 122
   Funding and fees at the EPO 124
   Surf’s up: PCT waves 128
   The EPO and national patent offices: from centralization to cooperation and competition 130
   Technical assistance and technocratic trust 134
   The effects of technocratic trust 138
   The echoes of empire 142

5 The USPTO and JPO 144
   The USPTO 144
   The US patent system in the blink of an eye 144
   The problems in 1845 149
   The problems today 152
   Gaming behaviour 155
   Patent fees 158
   In whom do we trust? 159
   The Japanese patent system: from diffusion to monopoly rights 162
   Joining the club 164
   On being a senior member of the club 167
   Becoming an IP nation 171
   Trust and automation 174

6 The age of Trilaterals and the spirit of cooperation 177
   Trilateral cooperation 177
   Overwork 180
   The spirit of cooperation: the Patent Cooperation Treaty 181
   The spirit of cooperation: companies and the PCT 183
   On being an international authority 188
   The Trilateral hub 189
   Superhighways of cooperation 191
   The superhighway elite: trust, cooperation and competition 193
   The manual is the message 195

7 The jewel in the crown: India’s Patent Office 199
   Integration 199
Contents ix

India: re-designing a colonial institution 200
The patent raj 206
India’s Patent Office: the jewel in the crown 207
Modernization 209
‘How can we win?’: India’s strategy on patents 212
From bright line rules to shades of grey 213
A patent-bright future? 217

8 The dragon and the tiger: China and South Korea 221
Patent law in the era of decline, rebellion and war. 221
Patents in communist China 223
Opening the door to patents 226
The great leap forward: the State Intellectual Property Office 230
The Asian Trilaterals 235
The tiger office 236

9 Joining the patent office conga line: Brazil 242
Brazil: the nineteenth century 242
Brazil the leader 245
Brazil’s Patent Office: ‘making the IP business much bigger’ 250

10 Islands and regions in the patent stream 257
The force of empire 257
New empires 260
New missionaries 264
Regional automation 272
Regional patent organizations 274
One patent god 282

11 Reclaiming the patent social contract 285
A private insider governance network 285
A counter network of outsiders 290
The separation of powers principle 293
New insiders for insider governance 294
An external audit check 295
Taking transparency seriously 298
Transparency registers 304
‘The ticket clippers’: regulating the patent attorney profession 308
Examiners and patent quality 314
CONTENTS

12  Patent administration sovereignty: Nodal solutions for small countries, developing countries  318
    Sovereignty matters  318
    Outsourcing the patent social contract  321
    Centralized regionalization: making regulatory capture easier  324
    Nodal governance  326
    Public nodal governance in patent administration  332
    Not raising one's head above the parapet: lost opportunities in a world of nodal governance  336

Index  341
DIAGRAMS AND TABLES

Diagrams

2.1 Paris Convention Route  57
2.2 Euro-PCT Route  59
2.3 Entering the network  60
2.4 Patent offices, patent attorneys and industry – co-evolving the patent system  85
4.1 The multinational inventor whale and its sucker fish  126
4.2 Leadership in examination  138
6.1 The hub and spoke model of patent office integration  192
11.1 Patent quality: an external audit check  297

Tables

3.1 The gap between patent offices and patent law  107
4.1 The British Empire patent re-registration system  143
7.1 The patent institution in Brazil, China and India  200
7.2 The PCT route in India  210
10.1 Extract from WIPO's Awareness Building and Human Resources Development Activities (Inter-regional) for 1998  266
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AIPN Asian Industrial Property Network
ANVISA National Sanitary Surveillance Agency of Brazil
APEC Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation
ARIPO African Regional Intellectual Property Organization
ASEAN Association of Southeast Asian Nations
Asian Trilaterals Chinese PO, Japanese PO, Korean Intellectual Property Office
CIS Commonwealth of Independent States
EAPC Eurasian Patent Convention
EAPO Eurasian Patent Organization
ECAP European Community-ASEAN Intellectual Property Rights Co-operation Programme
EEC European Economic Community
EPC European Patent Convention
EPO European Patent Office
EU European Union
EPAC External Patent Audit Committee
FDI Foreign Direct Investment
FTA Free Trade Agreement
GATT General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade
GCC Gulf Cooperation Council
ICC International Chamber of Commerce
IP Intellectual Property
IPEA International Preliminary Examining Authority
ISA International Searching Authority
ISO International Standards Organization
JPO Japanese Patent Office
KIPO Korean Intellectual Property Office
NGO Non-government Organization
MFN Most Favoured Nation
NIIP National Institute of Industrial Property
OAPI Organisation Africaine de la Propriété Intellectuelle
OECD Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
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<tr>
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</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Patent office administration would strike many a person as a dull topic. In fact this is wrong, for it is an excruciatingly dull topic. Yet like many such technical topics it explains why our world is the way that it is. States need tax bureaucracies to collect taxes, otherwise they would not last long as states. Multinationals need patent offices to grant patents, otherwise they could not raise private taxes. They would have to find other ways in which to gain monopolies over medicines, chemicals, seeds and software.

The importance of the topic, along with the realization that patent offices had largely been neglected in the regulatory literature, led me to undertake the study. My focus was not on one office in particular but rather on the interaction amongst patent offices and in particular between developed and developing-country patent offices. The development effects of intellectual property rights have become a major area of study, but we do not know much about how developing-country patent offices administer the standards of patentability that arrive in their countries through various treaty processes.

Administering a patent system is one of the few areas of intellectual property over which developing countries have considerable sovereign discretion. Patent offices might be one place in which one might find developing-country resistance to the hegemony that the US, EU and Japan exercise over patent standard-setting processes. Instead, I found that developing-country patent offices were being deeply integrated into a system of patent office administration that was being led by the patent offices of the US, EU and Japan. So while developing-country negotiators would contest the standard-setting games of the US, EU and Japan in places like the World Trade Organization (WTO) and the World Intellectual Property Organization, their patent offices were closely and quietly cooperating with the patent offices of these three countries. Much of the practical impact of the patent system is better understood by looking at what happens in patent offices than in a WTO negotiating room or the language of a patent statute. The world’s patent offices are participating in what one of my interviewees described as an ‘invisible’ process of
harmonization. Driving this process are pressures and demands coming from the multinational users of the system. They will benefit from this emerging system of global patent governance.

My home base, the Regulatory Institutions Network at the Australian National University, was an ideal place in which to undertake the study. With colleagues like John Braithwaite, Valerie Braithwaite, Neil Gunningham, Peter Grabosky and Hilary Charlesworth, one never has to wander too far for insightful comment on an issue. The work of Chris Arup and William van Caenegem, as well as their friendship and support, are continuing sources of help for me. My conversations with Michael Blakeney about intellectual property, as always, gave me insights and helped me to understand the dynamics of patent administration. Luigi Palombi and Hazel Moir were always prepared to give up their time to listen to my attempts to articulate an argument. Their suggestions improved this book. My thanks also go to Dr Ian Heath, the Director General of IP Australia until his retirement in 2007. His office was a research partner in this project under the Australian Research Council’s Linkage scheme. Dr Heath and the members of IP Australia were of great support to me. They helped to arrange for access to other patent offices and always met my requests for assistance and data with polite and unfailing cooperation. They will probably not agree with my analysis, but Ian Heath’s view was that independent long-term research was needed. If only universities understood the research process so well. I would also like to thank the patent examiners I spoke to who helped me to understand the job. It is a very important one, for which they do not receive sufficient recognition.

My Research Associate for most of this project was Ms Cecily Stewart. She was simply the best assistant that anyone could ask for, helping to track down material, organizing data, creating wonderful PowerPoint slides and generally bringing structure to chaos.

I have dedicated this book to my wife Julie Ayling. She had to listen to too many monologues from me concerning patent office administration. Somehow she was able to feign interest. Acting beyond the call of duty she read sections of the book. Her patient and loving support enabled me to start and finish the project.