

activities. The term “anti-counterfeiting alliance” means “joint efforts against acts of counterfeits by two or more enterprises or groups.”

The article further shows some examples of oversea anti-counterfeiting alliances as well as countermeasures against counterfeiting products in other Asian countries. At the same time, it discusses results of hearings conducted with Japanese industries and enterprises to summarize the past development of domestic anti-counterfeiting alliance efforts and various activities underway.

Based on these examples, the article discusses advantages and disadvantages as effects of anti-counterfeiting alliance. The article suggests feasible activities.

[This article has been published in “*CHIZAI KANRI*” (Intellectual Property Management) Vol.51, No.5, pp.775-786 (2001).]

---

## Study on Novelty and Inventive Step of Gene-related Inventions

The First Subcommittee,  
The First Patent Committee

This article discusses the status-quo of, and differences among the trilateral patent offices in US, Europe and Japan in their examination practices regarding the novelty and inventive step/non-obviousness of gene-related inventions. According to the “Trilateral Project B3b/ Comparative study on biotechnology patent practices: Nucleic acid molecule-related inventions whose functions are inferred based on homology search” published by the trilateral offices in November, 2000, it is recognized that there are considerable differences among the trilateral offices in their examination practices on the inventive step/non-obviousness. This article analyzes the background of such differences and predicts in some potential cases, the respective judgments on novelty and inventive step by the trilateral offices and then suggests how an applicant can deal with rejection on novelty and/or inventive step.

The article next speculates on the impact of the disclosure of human genome sequences on novelty and inventive step/non-obviousness of gene-related inventions at present and in the future.

The article finally discusses what should standard for judgment on inventive step of generated inventions be, seeking suggestions for achieving harmonization in substantive examination.

[This article has been published in “*CHIZAI KANRI*” (Intellectual Property Management) Vol.51, No.6, pp.885-909 (2001).]