

## Report on the 1st Conference for Japan-China Corporate Cooperation

### —Appropriate Way to Protect Trade Secrets in Japanese and Chinese Companies —

#### Fiscal 2005 Japan-China Corporate Cooperation PJ

As part of its activities, the Japan-China Corporate Cooperation PJ co-hosted the 1st Conference for Japan-China Corporate Cooperation with the Shanghai Intellectual Property Research Association on February 28, 2006 in Shanghai (over 40 participants, including 16 participants from Japan and over 20 participants from China). The theme focused on an appropriate way to protect trade secrets in Japan and China. In the morning, the keynote speech was given to introduce systems in Japan and China, and in the afternoon, group discussions were held in two groups with respect to the actual practice of trade secret management in both countries. Although Japan and China has almost the same idea of management, some differences were found in the details of management methods due to differences in the environment. Through discussion, both countries could increase awareness of the other party.

[This article appeared in pp. 787-791 of “*CHIZAI KANRI*” (Intellectual Property Management), Vol. 56, No. 5 (2006)]

---

## Response to Inadequate Claim Description Office Actions in Chinese Patent Application

#### The Third International Affairs Committee

In the Chinese patent application system, applicants often face difficulties in responding to office actions that point out inadequacies in the description of a claim.

As a result of analyzing the details of office actions and response approaches based on actual case examples, the committee concluded that there is a possibility of acquiring a patent for a broad scope of claims without unnecessarily narrowing the claims through submitting a strategic counterargument against office actions stating inadequate claim descriptions.

This article examines case examples of responses to office actions and the details of the examination guidelines to indicate examples of counterarguments and case examples of responses to office actions stating inadequate claim descriptions, points to consider when responding to office actions, office actions in specific technical fields and examples of pertinent counterarguments, and points to consider when amending a claim description.

[This article appeared in pp. 879-886 of Vol. 56, No. 6 (2006) and in pp. 1031-1039 of Vol. 56, No. 7 (2006) of “*CHIZAI KANRI*” (Intellectual Property Management).]