Procedure for filing a request with IMPI regarding the Patent Prosecution Highway Pilot Program between Mexican Institute of Industrial Property (IMPI) and European Patent Office (EPO)

The trial period of this Patent Prosecution Highway (PPH) Pilot Program will commence on 6 January 2015 and will end on 5 January 2018.

The trial period may be extended if necessary until EPO and IMPI receive the sufficient number of PPH requests to adequately assess the feasibility of the PPH program.

The offices may also terminate the PPH Pilot Program if the volume of participation exceeds manageable level. Ex Ante notice will be published if the PPH Pilot Program is to be terminated.

Part I
PPH using the national work products from EPO

Applicants may request accelerated examination by a prescribed procedure including submission of relevant documents on an application which is filed with IMPI and satisfies the following requirements under the EPO-IMPI PPH Pilot Program.

When a request for participation in the PPH Pilot Program is presented, the applicant must file a free style writing to IMPI. (See section 3)

1. Requirements

(a) Both the IMPI application on which PPH is requested and the OEE application(s) forming the basis of the PPH request must have the same earliest date (whether this be a priority date or a filing date).

The applicant should write the earliest dates for the IMPI application and the OEE application(s) and explain the relationship between those applications in the free style writing above mentioned. (See section 3)

See Annex I for examples where the above requirement is satisfied.

(b) At least one corresponding application in EPO has one or more claims that are determined to be patentable/allowable by EPO.

Applicant should identify the relationship between the EPO application containing patentable/allowable claims and IMPI application.

Claims are considered patentable/allowable, when the EPO examiner clearly identifies the claims as patentable/allowable in the latest office action by the office, even if the application is not granted for a patent yet.
Office actions are:

i. A communication regarding the intention to grant a European patent (the heading of the communication is "Communication under Rule 71(3) EPC").

ii. If the communication under a) has not been issued yet, a positive opinion regarding the allowability of the claims is contained in the European Search Report, i.e. neither category X documents (including category PX, EX and OX documents) nor category Y documents (including category PY, EY and OY documents) are cited as to the claims. In particular as regards the European Search Report: if the European Search Report only contains “A” references, no “X” or “Y”, directed to a particular claim, then it is a “positive” ESR and that particular claim is considered allowable for the EPO and can be used as a basis for a PPH before an OLE, provided that the remaining PPH participation requirements are met.

Claims are also considered as patentable/allowable in the following situation: If the EPO office action does not explicitly state that a particular claim is patentable/allowable, the applicant must include an explanation accompanying the request for participation in the PPH Pilot Program containing technical analysis of that claim with respect to the prior art cited, indicating that there was no objection from the EPO regarding that claim, and therefore, the claim is deemed patentable/allowable by EPO.

(c) All claims in the IMPI application (for which an accelerated examination under the PPH Pilot Program is requested), as originally filed or as amended, must sufficiently correspond to one or more claims determined to be patentable/allowable in EPO.

Claims are considered to “sufficiently correspond” where, accounting for differences due to translations and claim format, the claims in IMPI are of the same or similar scope as the claims in EPO, or the claims in IMPI are narrower in scope than the claims in EPO. For example, a claim that is narrower in scope occurs when a EPO claim is amended to be further limited by an additional technical feature that is supported by the originally filed specification at IMPI (description and/or claims).

A claim of IMPI which introduces a new/different category of claims to those claims determined to be patentable/allowable in EPO is not considered to sufficiently correspond. For example, EPO claims only contain claims to a process of manufacturing a product, and then the claims in IMPI are not considered to sufficiently correspond if IMPI claims introduce product claims that are dependent on the corresponding process claims.

It is not required to include “all” claims determined to be patentable/allowable by EPO (the deletion of claims is allowable). For example, in the case where an application in EPO contains 5 claims determined to be patentable/allowable, the application in IMPI may contain only 3 of these 5 claims.

Refer to ANNEX III for the cases which are considered to “sufficiently correspond” and the cases which are not considered to “sufficiently correspond”.

Any claims amended or added after the submission of the request for participation in the PPH pilot program but before the first IMPI action must sufficiently correspond to
the claims indicated as patentable/allowable in the EPO application. Any claims amended or added after the first IMPI action need not to sufficiently correspond to the claims indicated as patentable/allowable in EPO in order to overcome the reasons for refusal raised by IMPI examiners.

(d) The IMPI application must have been published.

The publication in the Gazette must have taken effect, and the time period of six months provided in Article 52 bis of the Mexican Industrial Property Law (LPI) to receive comments from third parties must have ended.

(e) IMPI has not begun the substantive examination of the patent application at the time of request for participation in the PPH Pilot Program (the example is provided in ANNEX I, Figure N).

2. Documents to be submitted

Documents (a) to (d) below must be submitted by attaching them to the PPH request.

Note that even when it is not required to submit some of the documents below, the name of such documents must be listed on the request for participation in the PPH Pilot Program (Please refer to the example of free style writing below for details).

(a) Copies of all official actions (which are relevant to determining patentability in EPO), which were issued for the corresponding EPO application and translation of them.

It is not required to submit the office actions and translations thereof when those documents are available in English language via Dossier Access System (DAS) of EPO: European Patent Register (https://register.epo.org/regviewer).

(b) Copies of all claims determined to be patentable/allowable by EPO and their translations.

It is not required to submit the claims determined to be patentable/allowable and translations thereof when those documents are available in English language via Dossier Access System (DAS) of EPO: European Patent Register (https://register.epo.org/regviewer).

(c) Copies of references cited by the EPO examiner.

The documents to be submitted are those cited in the above-mentioned office actions. Documents which are only referred to as references and consequently do not consist of the reasons for refusal do not have to be submitted.

If the references are patent documents, the applicant does not have to submit them because the IMPI examiner usually can get them. When the patent document is not available to the IMPI examiner, it may be requested to the applicant.
Non-patent literature must always be submitted.

The translations of the references are unnecessary.

(d) **Claims correspondence table.**

The PPH applicant must submit a claims correspondence table, which indicates how all claims in the IMPI application sufficiently correspond to the patentable/allowable claims in the EPO 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 of the free style writing below).

3. **Request for accelerated examination under the PPH Pilot Program**

(a) **Circumstances:**

When an applicant submits a request to participate in the PPH pilot program with IMPI, must submit a free style writing explaining the circumstances for his participation, according to the guidelines described in this document.

The applicant must indicate that the accelerated examination is requested under the PPH pilot program. The applicant must indicate also the Mexican application number and the application number, publication number or patent number of the corresponding EPO application and explain the relationship between those applications.

In the case where a EPO application, which has one or more claims that are determined to be patentable/allowable does not directly belong to any of the categories (i) to (iv) of 1.(a) (for example, the divisional application of the basic application that belongs to any of the categories (i) to (iv) of 1.(a)), the application number, publication number, or correspondent patent of the EPO application which has claims determined to be patentable/allowable and the relationship between those applications must be written down.

(b) **Documents to be submitted:**

The applicant must list all required documents mentioned in section 2, on an identifiable way, even when the applicant is exempted to submit certain documents.
(c) Sample of free style writing (Spanish)

Instituto Mexicano de la Propiedad Industrial
Dirección Divisional de Patentes
PRESENTE

Por este conducto, se solicita la inclusión de la solicitud de patente con número de expediente MX/a/XXXX/XXXXX dentro del Programa Piloto del PPH IMPI-EPO, correspondiente a la solicitud de patente europea EP XXXXXX presentada ante la EPO y que cumple con la relación prevista en el punto 1.(a) (explique la razón por la que cumple con esa relación).

Para efecto de lo anterior, se enlistan los documentos que se anexan y los que no se anexan por ser documentos de patente.

(a) Copia de todas las acciones oficiales que fueron relevantes para determinar la patentabilidad de la solicitud de patente en EPO, que fueron emitidas para la solicitud EPO correspondiente y, en su caso, su traducción a saber:

1. Acción oficial 1
2. ...

(b) Copia de todas las reivindicaciones que han sido indicadas como patentables/otorgables por EPO y, en su caso, su traducción:

1. Las reivindicaciones patentables/otorgables son las originalmente presentadas ante EPO.

(c) Copia de todas las referencias citadas por el examinador de EPO:
1. EP XXXXXX (no se anexa por ser documento de patente)
2. US ....
3. CA ... etc.

(d) Tabla de correspondencia de reivindicaciones:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tabla de correspondencia de reivindicaciones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reivindicaciones en la solicitud en el IMPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XYY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nombre y firma del solicitante o apoderado.
Through this means, we request the inclusion of the application with file number MX/a/XXXX/XXXXXX into the PPH Pilot Program IMPI-EPO corresponding to the application EP XXXXXXX filed before the EPO and which has met the conditions provided in the paragraph 1.(a) (Explain the reasons why it complies with these conditions) and, for this purpose, we attach a list of the following documents:

(a) Copy of all EPO Office Actions which were relevant to patentability in the above-identified EPO application(s) and where appropriate, their translation.

1. Office Action 1
2. ...

(b) Copy of all claims which were determined to be patentable/allowable by EPO in the above-identified EPO application(s) and where appropriate, their translation.

1. The claims as originally filed and determined patentable/allowable by EPO.

(c) References cited by EPO, not annexed, as they are patent documents.

1. EP XXXXXX
2. US ....
3. CA ... etc.

(d) Claims correspondence table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Claims in the IMPI application</th>
<th>Claims in the EPO application</th>
<th>Explanation regarding the sufficient correspondence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>They are the same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XYY</td>
<td>XYZ</td>
<td>Justification of sufficient correspondence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name and signature of applicant or patent attorney
4. Procedure for the accelerated examination under the PPH Pilot Program

When the request for participation in the PPH pilot program complies with all the above requirements, it will be accepted and IMPI patent application may be advanced out of turn for examination, provided it complies with the publication established in Article 52 of the LPI and upon expiration of the period for third parties observations referred to in Article 52 bis of the LPI.

If the PPH request is filed before the expiration of the time period indicated above, IMPI shall determine whether the patent application may be entitled for accelerated examination under the PPH until this period ends.

In those instances where the request for participation in the PPH pilot program is not accepted because it does not meet all the above requirements, the applicant will be notified and the defects in the request will be identified. The applicant may resubmit the request up to one more time with the specified defects corrected.

If the second request submitted is not accepted, the applicant will be notified and the patent application will await its normal turn for examination.

IMPI will not notify the applicant of the acceptance for assigning a special status for accelerated examination under the PPH, but instead the applicant will be aware by the reception of an office action from substantive examination procedure resulting of accelerated examination.

Applications for utility models and industrial designs, as well as claims of patent applications containing material considered not patentable in accordance with Articles 4, 16 and 19 of the LPI are not subject to participation in the PPH pilot program.

The acceptance of a participation request in the PPH pilot program in a parent application will not carry over to a divisional application. The applicant must submit a new request of participation in the PPH pilot program for the divisional application and fulfill all the conditions set forth above in order to be accepted.

If any of the documents identified in 2 (a) to 2 (d) above has already been filed in the IMPI application, prior to the request for participation in the PPH pilot program, it will not be necessary for the applicant to resubmit these documents with the request for participation. The applicant may simply refer to these documents and indicate in the request for participation in the PPH pilot program when these documents were previously filed in the IMPI application.

All the correspondence concerning the accelerated examination procedure is presented at the IMPI must be clearly identified as relating to a PPH request to ensure that the correspondence is correctly processed. For these purposes, please prominently mark each page of the covering letter of the correspondence with the term "PPH".

It is recommended that when requesting accelerated examination under the PPH, applicants should not only focus on the claims, but on the application as a whole. The applicant should review the complete application and make the necessary amendments to be consistent all the information in the application, without adding new matter to the originally filed.
It is noted that all the amendments made to the application in order to be examined under the PPH will be entered regardless of whether the request for participation in the PPH pilot program is accepted or not.

The PPH program does not absolve applicants of all their duties under the Mexican Industrial Property Law and applicable legislation. Applicants must act in good faith, including the submission of information known by them to IMPI, which is relevant to determine the patentability of the invention.
Applicants may request accelerated examination by a prescribed procedure including submission of relevant documents on a patent application which is filed with IMPI and satisfies the following requirements under the IMPI-EPO Patent Prosecution Highway pilot program based on PCT international work products (PCT-PPH pilot program).

When filing a request for the PCT-PPH pilot program, an applicant must submit a free style writing at IMPI. (See section 3).

1. Requirements

The patent application filed with the IMPI and for which the applicant files a request under the PCT-PPH must satisfy the following requirements:

(a) The latest work product in the international phase of a PCT application corresponding to the application ("international work product"), namely the Written Opinion of International Search Authority (WO/ISA), the Written Opinion of International Preliminary Examination Authority (WO/IPEA) or the International Preliminary Examination Report (IPER), indicates at least one claim as patentable/allowable (from the aspect of novelty, inventive steps and industrial applicability).

Note that the ISA and the IPEA which produced the WO/ISA, WO/IPEA and the IPER are limited to EPO, but, if priority is claimed, the priority claim can refer to an application in any Office, see example A’ in ANNEX II (ZZ application can be any national application).

The applicant cannot file a request under PCT-PPH on the basis of an International Search Report (ISR) only.

In case any observation is described in Box VIII of WO/ISA, WO/IPEA or IPER which forms the basis of a PCT-PPH request, the applicant must explain why the claim(s) is/are not subject to the observation irrespective of whether or not an amendment is submitted to correct the observation noted in Box VIII. The application will not be eligible for participating in PCT-PPH Pilot Program if the applicant does not explain why the claim(s) is/are not subject to the observation. In this regard, however, this does not affect the decision on the eligibility of the application whether the explanation is adequate and/or whether the amendment submitted overcomes the observation noted in Box VIII.

(b) The relationship between the IMPI application and the corresponding international application satisfies one of the following requirements:

i. The application is a national phase application of the corresponding international application. (See Figures A, A’, and A” in ANNEX II)

ii. The application is a national application as a basis of the priority claim of the corresponding international application. (See Figure B in ANNEX II)

iii. The application is a national phase application of an international application claiming priority from the corresponding international application. (See Figure C in ANNEX II)
iv. The application is a national application claiming foreign/domestic priority from the corresponding international application. (See Figure D in ANNEX II)

v. The application is the derivative application (divisional application and application claiming domestic priority, etc.) of the application which satisfies one of the above requirements (i) – (iv). (See Figures E1 and E2 in ANNEX II)

(c) All claims on file as originally filed or as amended, for examination under the PCT-PPH must sufficiently correspond to one or more of those claims indicated to be patentable/allowable in the latest international work product of corresponding international application.

Claims are considered to "sufficiently correspond" when, considering the differences arising from the translation and/or claims format, the claims of the application are of the same or similar scope as the claims indicated as patentable/granted in the latest international work product or the claims of the application are narrower in scope than the claims in the latest international work product.

In this regard, a claim that is narrower claim occurs when a claim indicated as patentable/allowable in the latest international work product is modified to be even more limited by an additional technical feature that is supported in the specification (description and/or claims) originally filed at IMPI.

A claim of the application at IMPI, that introduces a new/different category of claims to those claims indicated as patentable/allowable in the latest international work product is not considered to sufficiently correspond. For example, the claims indicated as patentable/allowable in the latest international work product only contain claims to a process of manufacturing a product, therefore the claims of the application presented before IMPI are not considered to sufficiently correspond if the claims of the application introduce product claims that are dependent on the corresponding process claims.

It is not required to include "all" claims determined to be patentable/allowable in the latest international work product (the deletion of claims is allowable). For example, in the case where an international application contains 5 claims identified as patentable/allowable, the application at IMPI may contain only 3 of these 5 claims.

Refer to ANNEX III for the cases which are considered to “sufficiently correspond” and the cases which are not considered to “sufficiently correspond”.

Any claims amended or added after the submission of the request for participation in the PCT-PPH pilot program but before the first IMPI action must sufficiently correspond to the claims indicated as patentable/allowable in the latest international work product. Any claims amended or added after the first IMPI action need not to sufficiently correspond to the claims indicated as patentable/allowable in the latest international work product in order to overcome the reasons for refusal raised by IMPI examiner.

(d) The IMPI application must have been published.

The publication in the Gazette must have taken effect, and the time period of six months provided for in Article 52 bis of the LPI to receive comments from third parties must have ended.
(e) IMPI has not begun the substantive examination of the patent application at the time of request under PCT-PPH (See Figure F in ANNEX II).

2. Documents to be submitted

Documents (a) to (d) below must be submitted by attaching them to the PCT-PPH.

Note that even when it is not required to submit some of the documents below, the name of the documents must be listed in the request for participation in the PCT-PPH pilot program (Please refer to the example of free style writing below for detail).

(a) A copy of the latest international work product which indicates the claims to be patentable/allowable and their translations.

If the application satisfies the relation 1. (b) (i), the applicant does not need to submit a copy of the latest international work product or its translation because normally a copy of this document is already contained in the file-wrapper of the application or is available via "PATENTSCOPE®", unless is required by the IMPI.

(WO/ISA and IPER are usually available as "IPRP Chapter I" and "IPRP Chapter II" respectively in 30 months after the priority date.)

(b) A copy of a set of claims which the latest international work product of the corresponding international application indicated to be patentable/allowable and their translations.

If the copy of the set of claims indicated as patentable/allowable is available via "PATENTSCOPE®" (for example, the international Patent Gazette has been published), the applicant need not submit this document unless otherwise required by the IMPI.

(c) A copy of references cited in the latest international work product of the international application corresponding to the application.

Documents which are only referred to as reference and therefore do not provide reasons for refusal do not have to be submitted.

If the references are patent documents, the applicant does not have to submit them because the IMPI examiner usually can get them. When a patent document is not available to the IMPI examiner, it may be requested to the applicant.

Non-patent literature must always be submitted.

The translations of cited references are unnecessary.

(d) A claims correspondence table which indicates how all claims of the IMPI application sufficiently correspond to the claims indicated as patentable/allowable in the latest international work product.

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

3. Request for accelerated examination under the PCT-PPH pilot program.

(a) **Circumstances:**

When an applicant submits a request to participate in the PCT-PPH pilot program with IMPI, he must submit a free style writing explaining the circumstances for his participation, according to the guidelines described in this document.

The applicant must indicate that the application belongs to any of the categories (i) to (v) of section 1 (b), and that the accelerated examination is requested under the PCT-PPH pilot program. The international application number or international publication number must be indicated as well.

In the case that the international application has one or more claims that are determined to be patentable/allowable does not directly belong to any of the categories of subparagraphs (i) to (v) of section 1. (b) (for example, a divisional application of the basic application that belongs to any category of subparagraphs (i) to (v) of section 1. (b)), the international application number or international publication number of the international application which has claims determined to be patentable/allowable and the relationship between those applications must be indicated.

(b) **Documents to be submitted:**

The applicant must list all required documents mentioned in section 2, on an identifiable way, even when the applicant is exempted to submit certain documents.
Lugar y Fecha

Asunto: Petición para participar en el Programa Piloto PCT-PPH IMPI-EPO

Número de solicitud ante el IMPI

Fecha de presentación

Título de la invención

Solicitante

Apoderado, representante legal o mandatario

Domicilio para oír y recibir notificaciones

Instituto Mexicano de la Propiedad Industrial
Dirección Divisional de Patentes
PRESENTE

Por este conducto, se solicita la inclusión de la solicitud de patente con número de expediente MX/a/XXXX/XXXXXXX dentro del Programa Piloto del PCT-PPH correspondiente a la solicitud internacional XXXXXX y que cumple con la relación prevista en el inciso (X) del punto 1. (b) (explique la razón por la que cumple con esa relación).

Para efectos de lo anterior se enlistan los documentos que se anexan y los que no se anexan por estar disponibles a través del sistema PATENTSCOPE® o ser documentos de patente.

(a) Copia del último resultado de la fase internacional que indica las reivindicaciones que son patentables/otorgables y, en su caso, su traducción. (No se anexa por estar disponible en PATENTSCOPE®)

(b) Copia del capítulo reivindicatorio que de acuerdo con el último resultado de la fase internacional de la solicitud PCT correspondiente se indica como patentable/otorgable y, en su caso, su traducción. (No se anexa por estar disponible en PATENTSCOPE®)

(c) Copia de las referencias citadas en el último resultado de la fase internacional de la solicitud PCT correspondiente a la solicitud.

(d) Tabla de correspondencia de reivindicaciones:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reivindicaciones en la solicitud en el IMPI</th>
<th>Reivindicaciones otorgables/patentables en la solicitud internacional</th>
<th>Explicación sobre la suficiente correspondencia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>Son lo mismo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XYY</td>
<td>XYZ</td>
<td>Justificación de la suficiente correspondencia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nombre y firma del solicitante o apoderado.
(d) Sample of free style writing (English)

Mexican Institute of Industrial Property
Patent Division

Through this means, we request the inclusion of the application with file number MX/a/XXXX/XXXXXXX/ into the PCT-PPH Pilot Program IMPI-EPO corresponding to the international application XXXXXXX and which has met the conditions provided in subsection (X) of paragraph 1. (b) (Explain the reasons why it complies with these conditions) and, for this purpose, we attach a list of the following documents: (submission of some documents is omitted because they are available in PATENTSCOPE®.)

(a) Copy of the latest international work product which determines the patentability/allowability of some claims in the above identified international application(s) and where appropriate, its translation. (not annexed, as they are available in PATENTSCOPE®)

(b) Copy of all claims which were determined to be patentable/allowable by the latest international work product in the above identified International application(s) and where appropriate, their translation. (not annexed, as they are available in PATENTSCOPE®)

(c) References cited by EPO, in the latest international work product in the above identified International application(s), not annexed as they are patent documents.

(d) Claims correspondence table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Claims correspondence table</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Claims in the IMPI application</td>
<td>Claims patentable/allowable in the international application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XYY</td>
<td>XYZ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name and signature of applicant or patent attorney
4. Procedure for the accelerated examination under the PCT-PPH Pilot Program

When the request for participation in the PCT-PPH pilot program complies with all the above requirements, it will be accepted and IMPI patent application may be advanced out of turn for examination, provided it complies with the publication established in Article 52 of the LPI and upon expiration of the period for receiving third parties observations referred to in Article 52 bis of the LPI.

If the PCT-PPH request is filed before the expiration of the time period indicated above, IMPI shall determine whether the patent application may be entitled for accelerated examination under the PCT-PPH until this period ends.

In those cases where the request for participation in the PCT-PPH pilot program is not accepted because it does not meet all the above requirements, the applicant will be notified and the defects in the request will be identified. The applicant may resubmit the request up one more time with the specified defects corrected.

If the second request submitted is not accepted, the applicant will be notified and the patent application will wait its normal turn for examination.

IMPI will not notify the applicant of the acceptance for assigning a special status for accelerated examination under the PCT-PPH, but instead the applicant will be aware by the reception of an office action from substantive examination procedure resulting of accelerated examination.

Applications for utility models and industrial designs, as well as claims of patent applications containing material considered not patentable in accordance with Articles 4, 16 and 19 of the LPI are not subject to participation in the PCT-PPH pilot program.

The acceptance of a participation request in the PCT-PPH pilot program in a parent application will not carry over to a divisional application. The applicant must submit a new request of participation in the PCT-PPH pilot program for the divisional application and fulfill all the conditions set forth above in order to be accepted.

If any of the documents identified in 2 (a) to 2 (d) above has already been filed in the IMPI application, prior to the request for participation in the PCT-PPH pilot program, it will not be necessary for the applicant to resubmit these documents with the request for participation. The applicant may simply refer to these documents and indicate in the request for participation in the PCT-PPH pilot program when these documents were previously filed in the IMPI application.

All the correspondence concerning the accelerated examination procedure is presented at the IMPI, must be clearly identified as relating to a PCT-PPH request to ensure that the correspondence is correctly processed. For these purposes, please prominently mark each page of the covering letter of the correspondence the term "PPH".

It is recommended that when requesting accelerated examination under the PCT-PPH, applicants should not only focus on the claims, but on the application as a whole. The applicant should review the complete application and make the necessary amendments to be consistent all the information in the application, without adding new matter to the originally filed.
It is noted that all the amendments made to the application in order to be examined under the PCT-PPH will be entered regardless of whether the request for participation in the PCT-PPH pilot program is accepted or not.

The PCT-PPH program does not absolve applicants of all their duties under the Mexican Industrial Property Law and applicable legislation. Applicants must act in good faith, including the submission of information known by them to IMPI, which is relevant to determine the patentability of the invention.
ANNEX I

Examples of Mexican patent applications that may request the accelerated examination under the PPH before IMPI:

OEE is Office of Earlier Examination, in this case refers to EPO.
ZZ is any office
DO is Designated Office.

Example A:

Example B:
Example C:

```
OEE application

ZZ application

IMPI application

Indication of patentable/allowable claim(s)

Priority claim

Request for PPH
```

Example D:

```
OEE application

IMPI application 1

Divisional

IMPI application 2

Indication of patentable/allowable claim(s)

Priority claim

Request for PPH
```
Example E:

IMPI application

Priority claim(s)

OEE application

Indication of patentable/allowable claim(s)

Request for PPH

Example F:

IMPI application

Priority claim(s)

DO/OEE

Indication of patentable/allowable claim(s)

PCT application

Request for PPH
Example G:

- IMPI application
- ZZ application
- OEE application

Example H:

- OEE application 1
- OEE application 2
- IMPI application

Priority claim
Priority claim
Priority claim
Priority claim(s)
Domestic priority claim

Indication of patentable/allowable claim(s)
Indication of patentable/allowable claim(s)
Request for PPH
Request for PPH
Example I:

- ZZ application
- Priority claim
- OEE application
- Indication of patentable/allowable claim(s)
- IMPI application
- Request for PPH

Example J:

- ZZ application
- Priority claim
- OEE application
- Indication of patentable/allowable claim(s)
- PCT application
- DO/IMPI
- Request for PPH
Example K

ZZ application

PPH Request

DO/OEE

Indication of patentable/allowable claim(s)

DO/IMPI

Example L:

PCT application

No priority claim

PPH Request

DO/OEE

Indication of patentable/allowable claim(s)

DO/IMPI
Example M:

- PCT application
  - No priority claim

Example N:

- OEE application
  - Priority claim

- IMPI application

- First office action from substantive examination

- Not apply

- Request for PPH
ANNEX II

Examples of Mexican patent applications that may request accelerated examination under the PCT-PPH at the IMPI:

RO is Receiving Office
ZZ is any office
DO is Designated Office.

Example A

Example A’
Example A''

PCT application RO/ZZ

Priority claim

PCT Application RO/ZZ

ISA/EPO IPEA/EPO

Request for PCT-PPH

DO/IMPI

DO

Example B

IMPI application

Request for PCT-PPH

Priority claim

PCT application RO/ZZ

ISA/EPO IPEA/EPO

WO IPER

WO IPER
Example E1

PCT application RO/ZZ
ISA/EPO IPEA/EPO
WO IPER
DO/IMPI
DO
IMPI application
Request for PCT-PPH
Divisional

Example E2

IMPI application
Priority claim
PCT application RO/ZZ
ISA/EPO IPEA/EPO
WO IPER
IMPI application
Request for PCT-PPH
Domestic priority claim
Example F

Not apply

PCT application

ISA/EPO
IPEA/EPO

First office action from substantive examination

Request for PCT-PPH

WO IPER

DO/IMPI

DO

DO

ANNEX III
Examples of cases that are considered "sufficiently correspond" and cases that are not considered "sufficiently correspond".

1. The claims in the following cases (case 1 to case 4) are considered "sufficiently correspond" to each other.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Claim(s) &quot;patentable(s)/allowable(s)&quot;</th>
<th>Claim(s) at IMPI</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A+a</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A+b</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The claims in the following cases (case 5 and case 6) are not considered “sufficiently correspond” to each other.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Claim(s) &quot;patentable(s)/allowable(s)&quot;</th>
<th>Claims(s) at IMPI</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Product</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A+B</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>