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Introduction

On 2 March 2018 candidates were invited to participate in a survey concerning the European qualifying examination 2018. 1483 answers were received by 6 April 2018.

Among the candidates who participated in the survey, 909 took part in the EQE for the first time, 565 re-sat the examination.

Please note that a number of candidates have not answered all the questions, so that the totals are not always the same.

We wish to thank all candidates who participated in the survey. We appreciate that you have taken the time to complete the questionnaire.

The Examination Secretariat

Nous souhaitons remercier tous les candidats qui ont participé à l'enquête. Nous vous sommes reconnaissants d'avoir pris le temps de répondre au questionnaire.

Le secrétariat d'examen
The Questionnaire

Dear Candidate! Thank you for attending this years examination(s)! Please help us improve the preparation of the examination(s) in the future by filling in this survey. Mandatory questions are marked with a red star: *

Please provide your email address or your EQEReg number

* This information will not be used to correlate your name with your answer but is for authorisation purpose only

Q1) Did you participate in the examination(s) for the first time?

- [ ] yes
- [ ] no

Q2) In which centre did you sit the examination(s) 2018?

Please select

- [ ] Berlin
- [ ] Bern
- [ ] Helsinki
- [ ] Madrid
- [ ] Munich M.O.C
- [ ] Paris
- [ ] Rome
- [ ] Stockholm
- [ ] Taastrup
- [ ] The Hague
- [ ] Walsall

Q3) Examination centres - rating

Please rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accessibility of the examination hall and information signs</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>Very bad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identification check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lightning conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space for candidates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acoustic conditions and audibility of the invigilators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restroom facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitability of the examination hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q4) Examination centres - rating

Please rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Was it easy to find your seat in the examination hall?</th>
<th>Very easy</th>
<th>Easy</th>
<th>Indifferent</th>
<th>Difficult</th>
<th>I could not find my seat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q5) Examination centres - rating
Please rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hall temperature</th>
<th>Too warm</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Too cold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Q6) Additional comments about the examination hall and its conditions
Please add your comments

Q7) Which examination papers did you sit?

- Pre-examination
- Paper A
- Paper B
- Paper C
- Paper D

Q8) Examiners' report in the Compendium - rating
Please rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the examiners’ report in the Compendium give enough information to understand how an answer should be COMPOSED?</th>
<th>Enough</th>
<th>Indifferent</th>
<th>Not enough</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the examiners’ report in the Compendium give enough information to understand how the papers are MARKED?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q9) Elements of your personal preparation
Please indicate if you made use of the following and rate it

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Indifferent</th>
<th>Not important/Useless</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compendium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>epi studentship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General external courses regarding intellectual property</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialised courses for EQE papers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-house training course organized by your company</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated training given by your supervisor/employer as defined by Art. 11(2)(a) REE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study in small group with other candidates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mock pre-examination on EQE website</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q10) What other study aids did you use?


Q11) Here is a list of courses offered by the EPO or in collaboration with the EPO. Which one of these course(s) did you follow?

☐ EQE pre-examination 2018 - online training course (EPO)
☐ Guide to EQE papers (EPO)
☐ Commented answers to paper C for previous years (EPO)
☐ Daily D questions (EPO)
☐ Coffee-break questions (EPO)
☐ Time-limit questions (EPO)
☐ Seminars for the EQE pre-examination 2018 (Euro-CEIPI)
☐ Basic training in European patent law (Euro-CEIPI)
☐ Introductory course Papers A and B (Euro-CEIPI)
☐ Main seminar Papers A and B (Euro-CEIPI)
☐ Intensive last-minute course Papers A and B (Euro-CEIPI)
☐ Introductory course Paper C (Euro-CEIPI)
☐ Main seminar Paper C (Euro-CEIPI)
☐ Intensive last-minute course Paper C (Euro-CEIPI)
☐ Introductory course Paper D (Euro-CEIPI)
☐ Main seminar Paper D (Euro-CEIPI)
☐ Intensive last-minute course Paper D (Euro-CEIPI)
☐ Mock EQE (epi)
☐ Flexible tutorials (epi)
☐ Online course for the preparation to the pre-examination (epi)
☐ EQE Paper C three-day methodology course (DeltaPatents)
☐ EQE Paper C two-day guided exam course (DeltaPatents)
☐ EQE Paper D three-day methodology course (DeltaPatents)
☐ EQE Paper D five- or four-day guided mock examination course (DeltaPatents)

Q12) Other providers/courses (please specify)


Q13) How long before sitting the examination(s) did you start intensive focused study?

☐ More than two years in advance
☐ Between one and two years in advance
☐ Between six and twelve months in advance
☐ Between three and six months in advance
☐ Less than three months in advance

Q14) What was your greatest weakness when assessing your preparation for the examination(s) and your performance, and how, in retrospect, could you have overcome it?

Please describe your experiences
Q15) Do you have any comments or suggestions for other candidates preparing for the examination(s)?

Q16) In which EPC member state did you complete most of your training pursuant to Art. 11(2)(a) REE?
Please select

- AL Albania
- AT Austria
- BE Belgium
- BG Bulgaria
- CH Switzerland
- CY Cyprus
- CZ Czech Republic
- DE Germany
- DK Denmark
- EE Estonia
- ES Spain
- FI Finland
- FR France
- GB United Kingdom
- GR Greece
- HR Croatia
- HU Hungary
- IE Ireland
- IS Iceland
- IT Italy
- LI Liechtenstein
- LT Lithuania
- LU Luxembourg
- LV Latvia
- MC Monaco
- MK Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
- MT Malta
- NL Netherlands
- NO Norway
- PL Poland
- PT Portugal
- RO Romania
- RS Serbia
- SE Sweden
- SI Slovenia
- SK Slovakia
- SM San Marino
- TR Turkey

Q17) I completed most of the training (Art. 11(2)(a) REE) in

- Private practice
- Industry
Q18) How would you rate the support of your supervisor/employer in view of your preparation for the examination(s)?

Please rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support of your employer/supervisor</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>Very bad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Q19a) How much time did your supervisor/employer allow for your preparation for the examination(s) in total? Please indicate the number of working days:

- [ ] 1 - 4
- [ ] 5 - 10
- [ ] 11 - 49
- [ ] 50+

Q19b) How much time did your supervisor/employer allow for attending courses for your preparation for the examination(s)? Please indicate the number of working days:

- [ ] 1 - 4
- [ ] 5 - 10
- [ ] 11 - 49
- [ ] 50+

Q20) How would you rate the amount of time allowed by your supervisor/employer for attending courses?

Please rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of study leave allowed by your supervisor/employer</th>
<th>More than sufficient</th>
<th>Sufficient</th>
<th>Borderline</th>
<th>Too little</th>
<th>Inadequate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Q21a) How much time did you spend on dedicated training for the examination(s) with your supervisor/employer as defined by Art.11(2) (a) REE (i.e. the person who signed your certificate of training or employment)? Please indicate the number of working days:

- [ ] 1 - 4
- [ ] 5 - 10
- [ ] 11 - 49
- [ ] 50+

Q21b) Which percentage of the working days mentioned under 21a) did you spend during the first year of training? Please indicate the percentage:

- [ ] 0 - 20%
- [ ] 21 - 40%
- [ ] 41 - 60%
- [ ] 61 - 80%
- [ ] 81 - 100%

Q21c) Which percentage of the working days mentioned under 21a) did you spend during the second year of training? Please indicate the percentage:

- [ ] 0 - 20%
- [ ] 21 - 40%
- [ ] 41 - 60%
Q21c) Which percentage of the working days mentioned under 21a) did you spend during the third year of training? Please indicate the percentage:

- 0 - 20%
- 21 - 40%
- 41 - 60%
- 61 - 80%
- 81 - 100%

Q22) What would you suggest to supervisors/employers in order to improve candidates’ preparation for the examination(s)?

Q23) In how many opposition cases were you involved during your 3-year training period? Please indicate the number of cases:

- 0 case
- 1 case
- 2 cases
- 3 cases
- 4 cases
- 5 cases
- 6 - 10 cases
- 11 - 15 cases
- 16 - 20 cases
- > 20 cases

Q24) How did your supervisor/employer as defined by Art.11(2)(a) REE train you for paper C?

- Using opposition cases from my company
- Using other opposition cases
- Compendium
- No help from my supervisor
- Other:

Q25) How did you prepare for paper C apart from the training you received from your supervisor/employer?

- Using opposition cases from my company
- Using other opposition cases
- Compendium
- I have followed a course/courses
- Other:
Q26) Which of the following best describes the technical area you are working in?

- ☐ Biochemistry
- ☐ Chemistry
- ☐ Electronics
- ☐ Mechanics
- ☐ Physics
- ☐ Other:

Q27) Please rate the difficulty of the pre-examination paper you sat in 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Too easy</th>
<th>Easy</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Difficult</th>
<th>Too difficult</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-examination as a whole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-examination (legal questions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-examination (claim analysis)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q27a) What reference book was the most useful for the preparation of the pre-examination?
Multiple answers are possible

- ☐ EPC
- ☐ Guidelines for Examination in the EPO
- ☐ A commentary on the EPC
- ☐ Other:

Q27b) What reference book was the most useful while sitting the pre-examination?
Multiple answers are possible

- ☐ EPC
- ☐ Guidelines for Examination in the EPO
- ☐ A commentary on the EPC
- ☐ Other:

Q27c) How did you allocate the available time during the pre-examination?

- ☐ 30% or less of the time for the claim analysis section / 70% or more for the legal section
- ☐ 40% of the time for the claim analysis section / 60% for the legal section
- ☐ 50% of the time for the claim analysis section / 50% for the legal section
- ☐ 60% of the time for the claim analysis section / 40% for the legal section
- ☐ 70% or more of the time for the claim analysis section / 30% or less for the legal section

Q27d) What is your opinion about the time available for the pre-examination paper you sat in 2018?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Too much</th>
<th>Enough</th>
<th>Borderline Not enough</th>
<th>By far not enough</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-examination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q27e) Any comment on the pre-examination?
Q28) Please rate the difficulty of the main examination paper(s) you sat in 2018

|                | Too easy | Easy | Adequate | Difficult | Too difficult |
|----------------|----------|------|----------|-----------|---------------
| Paper A        |          |      |          |           |               |
| Paper B        |          |      |          |           |               |
| Paper C        |          |      |          |           |               |
| Paper D        |          |      |          |           |               |

Q29) Additional comments concerning the difficulty of the main examination papers


Q30) Did you feel time pressure during the main examination?

- yes
- no

Q31) What is your opinion about the time available for each of the main examination paper you sat in 2018?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Too much</th>
<th>Enough</th>
<th>Borderline not enough</th>
<th>By far not enough</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paper A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q31a) Do you think that the additional thirty minutes have improved your performance in the main examination paper(s) you sat?

- Yes
- Indifferent
- No

Please choose

Q31b) Do you think that even more time would have improved your performance in the main examination paper(s) you sat?

- Yes
- Indifferent
- No

Please choose

Q32) Do you have any comments concerning the time available for the examination papers?


Q33) How would you rate the following learning materials/courses?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>Very bad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EQE pre-examination 2018 - online training course (EPO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guide to EQE papers (EPO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Commented answers to paper C for previous years (EPO)
Daily D questions (EPO)
Coffee-break questions (EPO)
Time-limit questions (EPO)
Seminars for the EQE pre-examination 2018 (Euro-CEIPI)
Basic training in European patent law (Euro-CEIPI)
Introductory course Papers A and B (Euro-CEIPI)
Main seminar Papers A and B (Euro-CEIPI)
Intensive last-minute course Papers A and B (Euro-CEIPI)
Introductory course Paper C (Euro-CEIPI)
Main seminar Paper C (Euro-CEIPI)
Intensive last-minute course Paper C (Euro-CEIPI)
Introductory course Paper D (Euro-CEIPI)
Main seminar Paper D (Euro-CEIPI)
Intensive last-minute course Paper D (Euro-CEIPI)
Mock EQE (epi)
Flexible tutorials (epi)
Online course for the preparation to the pre-examination (epi)
EQE Paper C three-day methodology course (DeltaPatents)
EQE Paper C two-day guided exam course (DeltaPatents)
EQE Paper D three-day methodology course (DeltaPatents)
EQE Paper D five- or four-day guided mock examination course (DeltaPatents)

Q34) Please add any comments and suggestions regarding the learning materials/courses:

Q35 - Use of data The usefulness of the answers given would be greatly increased if we were to know whether or not you passed the EQE papers. We therefore kindly ask for your permission to correlate at a later stage your answers with your examination results. Please note that the use of this information will be restricted to a statistical evaluation only. Your name will not be tracked and your anonymity is guaranteed.

☐ I agree
☐ I do not agree

END OF SURVEY
Chapter 1 – Examination centres

1.1 Berlin (62 answers received)

Q3) Examination centres – rating

- Accessibility of the examination hall and information signs: 31 (Very good), 23 (Good), 6 (Adequate), 4 (Bad), 2 (Very bad)
- Identification check: 31 (Very good), 19 (Good), 4 (Adequate), 2 (Bad), 2 (Very bad)
- Lightning conditions: 24 (Very good), 24 (Good), 9 (Adequate), 2 (Bad), 2 (Very bad)
- Space for candidates: 19 (Very good), 19 (Good), 20 (Adequate), 2 (Bad), 2 (Very bad)
- Acoustic conditions and audibility of the invigilators: 15 (Very good), 26 (Good), 16 (Adequate), 2 (Bad), 2 (Very bad)
- Restroom facilities: 16 (Very good), 32 (Good), 9 (Adequate), 2 (Bad), 2 (Very bad)
- Suitability of the examination hall: 21 (Very good), 30 (Good), 8 (Adequate), 2 (Bad), 2 (Very bad)

Q4) Examination centres – rating

- Was it easy to find your seat in the examination hall?
  - Very easy: 48
  - Easy: 12

Q5) Examination centres – rating

- Hall temperature
  - Too warm: 14
  - Adequate: 46
  - Too cold: 0
Q6) Additional comments about the examination hall and its conditions

I had the luminaire right on top of me so my head was shading the paper I was filling. Luckily it was the pre-EQE so not much writing was involved. I guess it would be much worse for any main exam.

When all candidates are thumbing through the examination papers it generates a disturbing sound. The examination paper could be stapled separately (legal part, Claims Analysis, D1,D2...D4 etc)

I was sitting next to a the heating, which was quite hot and I turned it down to make it more bearable.

When I went to the bathroom during the exam, one other candidate were using a mobile phone in there. This was not fair towards the others. I remember that bathrooms in MOC in Munich were supervised. This was not the case in Berlin.

It was very cold on the Examination days outside and I assume that this was also the reason why the examination hall was too cold.

Everything good

Great conditions. Warm atmosphere.

The examiners were very helpful and provided additional lamp to improve the lightimg conditions

1. 2 Bern (53 answers received)

Q3) Examination centres – rating

![Graph showing examination centre rating](image)

- Accessibility of the examination hall and information signs: 37 Very good, 13 Good, 2 Adequate, 2 Bad, 2 Very bad
- Identification check: 36 Very good, 13 Good, 4 Adequate, 4 Bad, 4 Very bad
- Lightning conditions: 37 Very good, 11 Good, 5 Adequate, 5 Bad, 5 Very bad
- Space for candidates: 36 Very good, 14 Good, 2 Adequate, 2 Bad, 2 Very bad
- Acoustic conditions and audibility of the invigilators: 31 Very good, 14 Good, 8 Adequate, 8 Bad, 8 Very bad
- Restroom facilities: 40 Very good, 8 Good, 5 Adequate, 5 Bad, 5 Very bad
- Suitability of the examination hall: 40 Very good, 12 Good, 4 Adequate, 4 Bad, 4 Very bad
Q4) Examination centres – rating (n=53)

Q5) Examination centres – rating

Q6) Additional comments about the examination hall and its conditions

The venue was amazing, as far as patent examinations (both EQE and national examinations) go. The room was spacious, the desks were enormous, the temperature was just right, the lighting was good, there was a big clock at the front and the acoustics were perfect - no annoying echoes and, other than a guy in paper A aggressively stapling his papers, I couldn’t hear the other candidates. I sat the pre-exam in Walsall, UK last year which was fine, but the Bern venue is a much nicer place to take the exams!

Difficult to read the clock from the side of the front row.

Ideal.

Zufrieden

Bern Muri center is wonderful convenient a must to keep

Examination hall was great. But when I came in there was no-one at the entrance to check my admission letter and show me to my desk. So I just went to my desk. The invigilator was somewhere chit-chating and didn’t pay attention to who came in.

The candidates sat too close to each other. There was enough space for spreading the candidates more in the room

In the end of the exam time a reminder is given five minutes before end I think it is stressful because when you are concentrated writing these five last minutes are lost with the stress. my opinion is that it would be more efficient if we could have a reminder half an hour before end, thank you.

There was a lot of space on the table and next to the table for the books in the examination room in Berne. This was very helpful.

Fantastic location - optimal place.

The venue was amazing, as far as patent examinations (both EQE and national examinations) go. The room was spacious, the desks were enormous, the temperature was just right, the lighting was good, there was a big clock at the front and the acoustics were perfect - no annoying echoes and, other than a guy in paper A aggressively stapling his papers, I couldn’t hear the other candidates. I sat the pre-exam in Walsall, UK last year which was fine, but the Bern venue is a much nicer place to take the exams!

Difficult to read the clock from the side of the front row.

Ideal.

Zufrieden

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. 3 Helsinki (35 answers received)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q3) Examination centres – rating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Accessibility of the examination hall and information signs | 16 | 12 | 7 |
| Identification check | 21 | 9 | 5 |
| Lightning conditions | 17 | 17 | 1 |
| Space for candidates | 14 | 16 | 5 |
| Acoustic conditions and audibility of the invigilators | 20 | 12 | 2 |
| Restroom facilities | 19 | 12 | 4 |
| Suitability of the examination hall | 17 | 13 | 4 |

- Very good
- Good
- Adequate
- Bad
- Very bad

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q4) Examination centres – rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Was it easy to find your seat in the examination hall? | 27 | 7 | 1 |

- Very easy
- Easy
- Indifferent
- Difficult
- I could not find my seat
Q5) Examination centres – rating

![Hall temperature chart]

Q6) Additional comments about the examination hall and its conditions

- **Ergonomics was not perfect. Table was too high.** Papers that were a bit further away couldn’t be read because of the too high table. Also caused back pain.
- **Examination hall was good, and there was enough space. Noise was also not a problem since there were only about 20 participants.**
- **Examination hall was perfect. I could see very well the clock as time tracking is important.**
- **Generally adequate conditions. Morning light was bit bright when reflected from the windows of the house opposite the examination hall (across the street), but only momentarily. The biggest inconvenience was the chairs, which were a bit too high for my taste, so feet dangled in the air a bit too much. Haven’t been in the big centres in Munich etc, though, but presumably Helsinki is very quiet and comfortable compared to them. So no complaints, on a comparable scale, considering that I didn’t have to fly and book a hotel abroad. No hassle and I could concentrate on the subject-matter instead of worrying surroundings and facilities.**
- **I think the venue was very suitable for taking the exam.**
- **I was seated next to a ventilation unit, therefore there was quite a draft. I was glad that not only was I wearing a thick pullover, but also had decided to bring my warm woollen scarf into the hall. It was rather cold in the room.**
- **It was well organized.**
- **Sunlight came in a bit distractively for many candidates; for myself, only briefly during the examination time.**
  - *The used chair was a bit slippery and weirdly formed!*
- **The actual table consists of two separate, smaller tables. It was not good, it was also a little bit rockt. The table needs to be solid and rigid when you are doing the exam like the eqe, where you have books, files and papers on the table.**
- **The chair was quite low.**
- **The examination hall’s location was excellent and generally very good. I would have rated it as excellent except the one - and quite important - thing that could have been much much better was the actual table+chair combination. The table was way too high compared to the chair to write properly. Some other people said they had the same difficulty. The table should have been about 5 cm lower than it was. It actually would have been easier to write standing. Next time need to take a pillow on the chair to make it easier to write. The other improvement I’d make is to attach posters on the door of the building so that it’s clear where the exam is. Other than that everything was great especially the natural light in the room.**
  - *The table was too high/chair too low, so it was not the most ergonomical set-up.***
- **The writing desks are perhaps a little too high. If attending again, I will need a booster seat**
- **Ergonomics was not perfect. Table was too high. Papers that were a bit further away couldn’t be read because of the too high table. Also caused back pain.**
1. 4 Madrid (48 answers received)

Q3) Examination centres – rating

- Accessibility of the examination hall and information signs: 13 Very good, 19 Good, 11 Adequate, 4 Bad
- Identification check: 15 Very good, 24 Good, 7 Adequate
- Lightning conditions: 12 Very good, 23 Good, 10 Adequate, 2 Bad
- Space for candidates: 23 Very good, 18 Good, 5 Adequate
- Acoustic conditions and audibility of the invigilators: 5 Very good, 12 Good, 11 Adequate, 16 Bad, 3 Very bad
- Restroom facilities: 7 Very good, 18 Good, 19 Adequate, 3 Bad
- Suitability of the examination hall: 7 Very good, 23 Good, 14 Adequate, 3 Bad

Q4) Examination centres – rating

- Was it easy to find your seat in the examination hall?
  - Very easy: 28
  - Easy: 18

Q5) Examination centres – rating

- Hall temperature: 44 Adequate, 2 Too cold
Q6) Additional comments about the examination hall and its conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Works at the hotel, unbearable noise...5 hours of continuous hammer blows. Being next to the front door was horrible, the invigilator encouraged me, but it was too late, absolute catastrophe. Please do not allocate candidates next to the doors!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very noisy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too noisy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too many stairs to arrive at the examination hall. Nightmare for a disabled person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There were works in the surrounding which disturb the candidates. There were candidates using staplers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There was noise from construction work coming from the floor above (apparently this is a problem that occurs every year). There is a tablecloth on the table that makes writing on the papers difficult. No elevator for the floor where the examination hall is, need to go upstairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There was a hairdresser convention in the next room, nosisy and practicing in the toilets hair dying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The temperature was too warm, specially along the exam was developing. The initial temperature was fine, but it should be adapted along the time. It seems the thermostat was not inside the room for detecting and adapting automatically the temperature to the conditions in every moment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The table was cover with a tablecloth that made it difficult to write.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The table clothes are annoying. This year were heard noises from some works at the same building. It would have been better this didn’t happen the day of the exam, perhaps it could be avoided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The sound system did not work properly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The only thing is that there were construction going on with very bad sounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The examination hall was very good, the size of the tables was more than adequate. However, the tables were covered with a very unpleasant mat. Also, the hall being inside a hotel, had all sorts of noise and music (!!) coming in from the hotel hall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chief invigilator was barely intelligible. In addition, in spite of having been asked to turn down the hotel foyer music prior to the exam and another candidate complaining, only when I also complained was it turned down/off. Astonishingly, candidates were admitted to the examination hall with phones (last year they were collected at the door) and candidates were reminded to put them in a box at the front before the exam started. Moreover, the chief invigilator wore noisy hard-soled shoes, chatting at times in a jokey manner throughout the exam to inform candidates e.g. where he had placed the spare paper (which in previous years for other exams was distributed to us but this year we had to go to tables at the side to collect). Quite unprofessional.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank you for improving the space table!! it was just perfect this year!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tables are covered in cloth. It’d be more comfortable to write on a more appropriate surface. The event on the room next door was playing loud music that could be heard during our examination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some noises from works in the hotel where the exam take place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the next room of the examination room there was a convention with high music, which was very annoying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In relation to the acoustic conditions: there was noise from the outside all the time, like if someone was hitting the wall constantly. It was really annoying and distracting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In order to come into the examination hall in Madrid candidates have to go up some stairs. That is a little bit uncomfortable taking into account the luggague we are bringing into the exam. An elevator would be welcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everything was ok, as always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During the examination I was hearing background music coming from outside the examination room and people talking because there a Hairdressing convention in the next door. During some minutes I also heard some drill coming from upstair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction workers nearby made noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfortable tables and chairs. Mantle cloth a little bit uncomfortable for writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All candidates arrived ahead of time but there was no place to sit while waiting. It was just a big hall with an empty desk in front of a door.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. 5 Munich MOC (571 answers received)

Q3) Examination centres – rating

Q4) Examination centres – rating

Q5) Examination centres – rating
**Q6) Additional comments about the examination hall and its conditions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Windy and Cold</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Way to restroom is too long. Temperature was very cold.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was quite cold at the beginning. You might start heating a little bit earlier.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall clocks were not visible from my position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very, very cold!!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very noisy...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very noisy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good organisation. Too cold! My fingers were freezing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very Cold inside...</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very cold inside the hall. I understand that it was caused by very frosty outside temperatures but it was very unpleasant for me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varying temperature conditions, depending from the seating place, but usually (in 4 of 4 days of sitting an exam in M.O.C. Munich, including pre-EQE in 2017) it was too cold.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfortunately, it was way too cold for for staying concentrated under these circumstances. My feet were just freezing. Really poor conditions to be honest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too few clocks, too few restrictiv, too cold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>too cold, depending on the seat, one lost much time to go to the restrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Too cold Too many persons in one room, therefore high noise level</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Too cold</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too close to the neighbors. If the persons next too you are very noisy, this makes it even more complicate than the tasks itself. Sometimes this feels than more like a military task. It’s getting than really difficult to concentrate. There should be at least one table space free left to each side respectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilets not really clean + missing hand towels in the morning before the start of the exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This year it was too cold.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There were no clocks visible from where I sat, and the room was unacceptably cold.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There should be some rest chairs or benches in the for the people arriving early before examination. Also a cloak room would be convenient.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there should be more clocks for us to keep track of time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There should be a hot water source in the examination hall to prepare coffee or tea during examination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are not enough clocks. Without a personal watch - which is forbidden - it can be hard to keep track of the time. I could barely see one clock and it was that far away that i barely could identify the time. In my opinion this is the most serious shortage of the M.O.C. hall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the whole atmosphere was very awkward. but cannot be changed, i guess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The weather was really cold this year, so the hall was not enough warm. Taking the exam with a coat was not comfortable. Also at some seats, the watch can not be seen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The three copies of the papers should not be stapled together into one big lump of paper. I suggest to keep the documents separated, language by language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The temperature within the hall was absolutely unacceptable. I was freezing throughout the whole exam making it very hard to concentrate. My hands were so cold that I barely could hold my pencils anymore. Putting candidates through a 4 hours exam under these conditions is simply a disgrace to the EPO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The temperature was way, way too cold!!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The temperature was way too cold and my place in front of the exits was very draughty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The temperature was really too cold.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The temperature was much too cold!!!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The temperature was far too cold.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The temperature of the hall was not adequate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The temperature in the place was very low. I was cold the complete 5 hours and 30 minutes I spend there. Not adequate temperature for concentrating on the Exam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The tables could be bigger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The supervisory staff was walking around permanently passing by just one meter next to the desk so it was quite annoying seeing them running around all the time in the corner of the eye. This did not help to concentrate on the exam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the space for each candidate is not sufficient: the desk is too small and the space between two desks is too small as well (both the space to the neighbor on the left and right and the space between the different rows of desks; there are not sufficient restrooms for the event: you need to wait to use the restroom facilities and this takes candidates’ time of the exam; this time, it was extremely cold outside and itside it was also too cold, the heating was not adjusted to manage the cold temperature (I’m of the opinion, the exam should be scheduled during another time of the year, see comments below); the situation regarding is always very unsatisfying: after the exam candidates have to wait for a very long time (and this time it was very cold outside)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The room temp. was really cold. Therefore, it was really effecting negatively my concentrate even if I had my jacket already.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The restroom cleanliness could be improved. The restrooms were stinking all day on all 3 days of exam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The questions of the claim analysis part were not suitable for a true-false test as the pre-eqe since a larger number of the questions were interpreted ambiguously.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The outside temperature was very cold at the examination days in Munich. Maybe this was the reason why it was cold in the examination hall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the MOC in Munich is very big and hence there was a lot of open space which was not used for allocating tables. This open space should have been used for tables so that there is considerably more space in between candidates’ tables. There is just around 40 cm to the left and right of a table. Hence other candidates’ actions are in the field of view of a given candidate. This is a very bad exam condition. Moreover, in other exam centres for instance the one in the UK this is not a case. Very very bad. It reflects the disdain of European institutions towards the peoples of Europe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The low room temperature was pretty unsettling to the point of impacting my ability to focus on the exam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The table size was okay, but bigger tables would be appreciated to accommodate all the literature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The low outside temperature led to a cold examination room, which was a considerable drawback despite warm clothing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The location of the hall near station Freimann is remote from the center of Munich. It is one of the biggest risks of the exam to arrive there in time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The lighting made it relatively difficult to read the clocks. Additional clocks would have been useful. Overall a well spaced out exam hall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The hall was very cold at the first day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The hall was too cold. However, this takes place in the second half-time of the examination only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The hall was to cold.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The hall was partly cold. Although my seat was still OK, my colleague had to wear his jacket. On the 2nd day, between A and B parts, candidates had to leave the hall and it was not really comfortable to spend the lunch time in the Restaurant, because it was really full. Outside of the hall was also very cold. It may be great, if we could have stayed in the hall during the lunch break.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The hall was much too cold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The hall was cold, but I had been warned and took warm clothing. It was therefore cold but not too cold.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The hall is too big and consequently too cold.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The hall is really cold, motivation of exam was not possible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the hall is not relevant; the result of the EQE is relevant

The floor was way too cold. I had cold feet during the whole examination.

The floor felt cold.

The examination hall was very cold and even though I had a lot of clothing layers on, I was freezing. The AC was ON during the examination and was set on COLD mode. I felt the cold air at my feet during the exam and I was shaking. Every year I’ve sent this feedback and the examination hall conditions did not improve at all...every year is like this! Why should I bother to complete the EQE survey?

the examination hall was perfect despite the fact that there were no more paper towels available on the toilets after the first two hours

The examination hall is very large and there is only one small clock that was difficult to see from my seat. Given the restrictions on taking clocks or other timekeeping devices into the hall, it would be helpful to have other clocks for candidates, for example a clock at the front of each vigilator’s desk.

The clocks provided are too small to read from a distance i.e. when seated.

The chairs became uncomfortable after 4 hours of sitting.

Temperature was actually adequate, but there is often a strange current of cold air at low level (about half metre above the floor) that disturbs

-temperature only a little bit too cold

Tables too close together - there would be space to spread out a bit more.

table and space for each is small

Space between tables should have been bigger.

Slightly too cold and space between tables too narrow; tables themselves big enough

Since more and more people wear smart watches or have smart phones and don’t wear traditional wristwatches, more clocks should be placed so as to enable candidates to see the actual time.

Since digital watches are forbidden and mechanical not so common anymore it would be good to have more watches around the hall as keeping control of time is critical and some are not easily readable from parts of the hall.

Simply too cold in the hall. Other than that all ok.

Service persons were friendly and relaxed.

Relatively long way to tube station

Regarding temperature, I ought to say that in my humble opinion it was a bit too cold on the first day (paper D). Other days were Ok.

Recovery of phone after the exam was slow.

reclaiming stored mobile phones was only possible by queuing very long with many people jumping the queue. This could be organized in a distributed way similar to the seating blocks

really too cold.

Please note that this day there was breakdown of suburban Train traffic throughout Munich which made it very hard to reach the MOC in time (even though I managed). Second, due to the arctic temperature outside the hall temperature was MUCH too cold too.

Please do what is in your power to improve the low temperature in the hall. It is to be assumed that it will be cold outside in winter in Munich. The temperature in the hall was definitely too low, even if I came prepared with skiing socks, extra underwear, warm tea, and sat the exam with a wool scarf. After 3 hours into the pre-examination, my fingers were so cold that I could only turn the pages of the exam after licking one of them. Otherwise they had lost the sensibility required for such a simple task.

Please consider that desks touching a wall offer the candidate less space than others. An equal distance to wall and neighbouring desk would be fairer.

People were all friendly and helpful-professional, thank-you. However, I felt the examination hall conditions were hostile and, what’s worse, counter-productive to my (and supposedly others’) ability to deal with the given tasks: 1.) Potentially due to the extraordinarily freezing conditions outside, the floor was icy cold and the air-conditioning unpleasantly chilly. However, air was still not fresh, not going into details... Usually I never get ill, but after 3 days of survival training polar conditions I had caught a cold. --- 2.) What is even
more relevant: Like fellow candidates I had brought a collection of law books with me, especially for part D, of course. However, due to the tiniest tables, I did not feel that I could sensibly look things up. Even in those cases where I knew exactly on which page I would find the legal source to employ / cite. That is really upsetting. Given that the exam presented several documents (each of which to be looked at in different sections e.g. claims / figures / description) a major task turned out to be in terms of material handling and warehousing intelligence rather than in patent law and academia. If tables are so much smaller than under real-life office conditions, then exam configuration & layout ought to take this into account.

Particular the space on the table is much to small to organize all the documents as well as the needed equipment well. Then, I cannot see the need to use such long words for a lot of features inside the claims of the patent literature of the EQE. For us these all takes time to write them down again and again, but this spended time do not help to get a good result, therefore just lost time for nothing. By the way: It also seems, that the time of the year for the EQE in general is not choosen well. This because during the last years it become more and more cold, which really causes problems in train connections and travelling by feet in general ( i know what I am talking about). Particular for those, who come from other federal states (or were not able to find a hotel near enough to the examiation place), this all raises the stress up to a high level. Unimportant but helpfull note in this context: not everybody who joins the EQE lives in Munich or Den Haag. Last but not least most people are in fact sick during these time of the year, so the rate of those who are not able to take part of the already paid examination must be high - or those who take part, but are really ill, which is a very big disadvantage, like anybody of us know. Thanks.

Nothing to add.

Not hall but EQE-exam paper / sheets: the new bigger line distance is a big advantage, highly appreciated.

Not enough space between desks.... people highlighting/switching pens/eating snacks directly in my ear was very distracting. Would not want to sit an exam there again for that reason.

Not enough room between the desks. People changing pens and highlighters and even eating snacks during the exam was way too close for comfort and very distracting. I would not choose to sit an exam in this centre again due to the lack of space between desks.

not enough clocks. clock in the back of the hall difficult to be followed when facing forward.

none, organisation was perfect!

none

No Wall Clocks !!!

No Comment

NA

München M.O.C. in my opinin is a good place for the examination; and all was organized very professionally.

Much too cold. Nearly did not manage to get there on time due to break down of Munich city transportation

Much too cold!

Much too cold

MORE CLOCKS. MORE PAPER TO WRITE ON FROM THE START. SOME STAFF STAND OVER YOU AT THE END TRYING TO RUSH YOU TO PUT ANSWER SHEETS TOGETHER.

MOC was very, very cold. Especially at window aisles.

Moc was very difficult to reach with public transportation. In addition to being outside of the city and away from underground stations (it was -15 degrees on the week of the exam), every morning I had to let go at least two U6 trains because completely full. For the coming years, when choosing the venue please take into account the poor state of public transport in Munich.

MOC Munich is a big place with many halls. A signpost on the street outside “EQE this way” would help stop people taking the wrong entrance and getting lost in the building

Might have just been me, but I found the room extremely dry and became extremely thirsty (though I
obviously could have brought a bottle of water with me).

like in the past three years (incl. pre-eqe), it was too cold and i had to warm my fingers. That is a regular complaint at MOC. It is not understandable why you dont increase the temperature. just fine.

Its freezing in there

it would have been useful to know in advance when access to the examination hall will be granted in order to plan arrival time more precisely and to avoid standing around waiting in the crowded entrance. It was waaaayy too cold, half-way through the four hours my feet and hands had become slightly numb with it. It was very hard to watch the clock, I had to turn around over and over again. Since, any other clocks or watches are forbiden, the hall should be equiped with the sufficient number of clocks that allow everybody to see and control time. It was very coldly, I guess about 14 or 15 degrees. I had to wear my winter jacket and it was very cold from the floor and door, so this weren’t comfortable conditions for writing an exam. The table was too small. It was very cold.

It was very cold!!!

it was very cold outside in munich which meant the hall was a little chillier, however i am glad that the heating wasnt turned full because in my opinion it is easier to wear more layers than overheat and loose concentration. well done for finding balance. the spaces between desks could be a little more generous. It was very cold in the hall. Its quite hard to write a test under this conditiones.

It was very cold

It was too cold. We were sitting in the hall with our jackets on. Absolutely unaccepteble!!!

It was too cold but in Munich at that time was -14oC so this hall is difficult to be heated when outside it’s too cold.

It was too cold and no clock was visible from my seat

It was so cold in the hall! I was freezing.. a lot of people were freezing. That was a big minus!

It was really very cold!!

It was not as noisy as i would have expected, but it did get cold after sitting for a few hours... Suggestion for future candidates: bring a warm beverage in a thermal mug.

It was much too cold. Even some members of the commitee were sitting there in some kind of blankets.

It was inaccepetably cold in there!

It was horribly cold, nearly unbearable, not only “slightly”. This was a kind of painful experience

It was freezing-cold all the time, escpecially close to the windows.

it was freeking cold from the floor of the hall

it was a strange environment, that hasnt contributed to me performing better. but i do not see what to improve. it has to be like that

It is really incomprehensible that we pay 400 Euro for the examination and it is not possible to provide a suitable temperature in the examination hall. I had to wear two jackets and cap and was still freezing. Very modest conditions to write a challenging 4-hours-exam.

inaccepetably cold. it is very bad when it is so cold that it influences your concentration and when you have problems writing. it is also very distracting if you have to sit near the toilets.

in the restrooms inside the examination hall speakers should be installed. Many people go to the restroom just before the examination start where important information is given by the invigilators over the microphone.

In my opinion, it was far too cold inside the hall. After taking the exam I got a cold. It is not surprising at all, that temperatures in middle Europe can reach far below 0 degrees in February - so my understanding for poor heating of the hall is limited. I expected acceptable conditions as the focus should be only set on
taking the exam - which was challenging enough. I was required to wear my jacket which is not at all comfortable when taking an exam. Next year, we seriously consider taking sleeping bags with us to the exams, which should be understood as a hint for improving conditions (either properly heating or providing exams during a warmer season).

In my opinion the seats in adjacent rows were too close - this makes it difficult to concentrate and use books.

In general good. A few comments - the toilets constantly ran out of paper to dry your hands which is a bit annoying during an examination. Also, you are not given enough paper during the exam in the initial pack and then invigilators hand out 5 sheets a time which when writing double lined and with big handwriting is frustrating. I had to ask for more paper nearly ten times during one examination. Also was quite cold on one of the days I had to put my hat on during the exam. Also there are way too few clocks in the exam hall. The exam hall is massive and you can barely make out what time it is - a crucial element of the EQEs.


I was pleased with the examination hall and its conditions.

I understand that the temperatures in Munich during the week of the exams was exceptionally low. However, the temperature in the hall could have been adjusted accordingly (switching on the heating!). My hands and my feet were numb from the cold after spending the entire day writing; my fingertips are still numb! Please consider offering variable starting times for the exams, e.g. switching the order of A and B every other year and/or setting the start for papers C and/or D a little later. Morning sessions in combination with the less than optimal public transportation system/traffic situation in Munich are clearly discriminating against anyone who is not an "early bird" person.

I understand that it was quite cold in Munich. However, temperatures were not so low as to be completely unimaginable. At times during the exam, there were cold air flows on the ground resulting in uncomfortably cold feet.

I took the advice of using the 5 last minutes of the pre-exam to transcript my answers literally. Unfortunately, it appeared to me that 5 minutes for transcription of 80 answers was not enough (even if we only need to tick boxes). Providing an announcement 10 minutes before the end of the exam could be a good alternative in my opinion.

I prefer bigger desk for more space. Best regards

I had to sit in the 1st row and was very disturbed by the persons going to the toilet. I had the impression to write the exam in the middle of a train station.

I appreciate that additional paper was easily available. Thank you for the assistants going around!

I am not particularly short, but the desk was too high to write comfortably.

Height of chairs to height of table should be better adjustable.

Good Place but much traffic/waiting in restroom before Start.

Good event. Thanks for the good organisation.

Given the outside temperature was -12°C, it was freezingly cold inside the hall sitting there for 4 hours.

generally temperature was fine, but temporarily some cold supply air caused some feeling of cold

Further to Question Q5, it is not understandable, why the hall (M.O.C. Munich) was such a cold hall. I used some layers of clothes and it was still cold. This is very very inadequate, especially with regard to the reputation the EPO should has as a professional organisation. It was luck or maybe the warm tea that I prepared, because of the warnings of the pre-semesters that already wrote an examination in this hall, that I did not get a cold after sitting four hours in this cool hall. >:-(

From some seats it was hard to read the clock due to reflections from the lighting.

Freezing, and the clocks weren't visible from my seat. Nice large desks and attentive supervision.

freezing cold...

for the size of the hall it was adequate, surprisingly quiet and spacious table. the temperature was too low but i am not sure how easy it would be to adjust this.
For the candidates sitting A and B on Wednesday: it would be great if there would have been information about the presence of a restaurant in the MOC building and advice as to further lunch places around the exam hall. A lot of candidates brought own sandwiches and only realized that there was an actual restaurant only after having eaten up their dry lunch :( Further, I would have preferred that the exam hall remained open during the lunch break.

Feeling of coldness. WC: freezing.

Far outside from anything.

Everything perfect except the extremely low, freezing temperature.

During the 1 hour it was not that cold, but after that the air conditioning was switched on... we had -12°C outside the building, so it was too cold for air conditioning.

distances in neighboring rows too small - the tables of neighboring candidates too close

Distance to neighbors too short

Difficult to reach with public transport, too far from city center.

die Beschilderung innerhalb des MOC war irreführend und nicht ausreichend. Man konnte den Saal nur durch Fragen von Passanten finden.
could not see a clock

Comparing to previous years, this year Pre-exam was too hard to be called as pre-exam. There were lots of prior art documents but the total time was not enough to evaluate them properly.

Compared to past experiences in UK examination centres; the Munich venue is amazing. It’s perfect for the exam, great temperature room. It’s easy to get to and easy to find.
cold floor, maybe a carpet would be useful

Clocks were not easily visible from all seats.
clock was too far away.
clock not visible

Clock could not be seen (because of mirroring and lighting conditions), also not enough clocks available

break between A and B could be shorter

Bigger table necessary! The room was too cold all of the time.

Because of the light reflection, it was not possible to see the clock. Number of clocks are few and inadequate due to their location (they were far). Hall was a little bit cold. Acoustic was bad, it was very difficult to understand the announcements.

Because of everybody bringing their bags it was not easy to go to the toilets. More room between rows of tables would be nice.

Bathroom situation was bad: The paper towels in the men’s bathroom ran out even before the exam actually started. Besides, the bathroom was crowded sometimes.

As in the last year: After the beginning of the Exam the temperature dropped and became draughty and much colder. As if the the air conditioning had been started after some minutes.

all this questions are totally irrelevant to pass the exam - why do you ask this?

After 15 minutes no paper towels were available in the restroom, queues were forming because of missing facilities. Positively noted it was good that a cleaning lady took care of the restrooms, but still towels were missing.

adequate

accessibility in Feb/Mar always (especially this year and two years ago) difficult in view of the public transport situation in Munich, this year the heating was a problem due to the very low temperatures.

A way too cold
1. 6 Paris (149 answers received)

**Q3) Examination centres – rating**

- Accessibility of the examination hall and information signs
- Identification check
- Lightning conditions
- Space for candidates
- Acoustic conditions and audibility of the invigilators
- Restroom facilities
- Suitability of the examination hall

**Q4) Examination centres – rating**

- Was it easy to find your seat in the examination hall?

**Q5) Examination centres – rating**

- Hall temperature
### Q6) Additional comments about the examination hall and its conditions

| The temperature was too cold to me but it was particularly cold outside too, and also my place was next to the entry door so exposed to air flow. |
| The table was doing so much noise and it smelled like rotten fish. |
| The location in Saint-Ouen is quite difficult for people coming outside Paris, line 13 of Metro is quite difficult. |
| The hall itself is perfectly adequate save for the toilet facilities, of which there would ideally be more of them. Its location, on the other hand, is poor. The only Metro line anywhere close is Line 13, which is woefully overcrowded during optimal conditions and gets worse and worse with any kind of disruption. On day 3 I had to let six trains pass before being able to board. Moreover, the test center is at least two kilometers away from the nearest Metro station, yet due to construction turning traffic in the vicinity into a perpetual snarl it is the only option. Considering that examinees generally bring a suitcase-sized load of books with them, it is safe to say that this is a terribly difficult situation. |
| The examination site is is not easily accessible. |
| The desks were a bit too small. |
| Thanks to the change of seat due to cold wind, the temperature was good. |
| Tables were a little bit too tiny |
| spacious room, well organized |
| Some tables are wobbly |
| Some rows of tables were closer than others and when you have a neighbour who is doing noise it is not very convenient to stay focused. |
| Room was fine ; As external temperature was very cold during examination I particularly appreciated that room was opened and accessible well before the examination start. Therefore we could get warm and prepare our equipment well in advance. |
| quelques tables grinçaient, c’est assez pénible. |
| Plenty of space on the desks. I appreciated the instructions being given in English as well as in French. Temperature possibly a bit too cold for some people but better than being too hot in my view. Location - not the nicest part of Paris but adequately accessible. By all accounts an improvement on previous years in Paris. |
| outstanding team |
| only 1 or 2 bathrooms for the whole center with no fast way to dry one’s hands |
| none |
| No comment |
| Maybe it should be better to choose a place located inside Paris even if I know it is difficult to find room in Paris at a not too expensive rate. |
| Le lieu en lui même est bien mais l’environnement et l’accessibilité du lieu ne sont pas très satisfaisants |
| Le lieu d’examen est dans un quartier pas très accueillant... |
| Le centre d’examen n’est pas très central pour Paris, et la ligne 13 le matin est une source de stress supplémentaire. Il a fait excessivement froid cette année, avec de la neige en prime, et le trajet centre d’examen métro n’était pas des plus agréables. |
| La distribution de boissons chaudes etaient tres appreciables. Le personnel etait serviable et avenant. |
| L’insonorisation de la salle d’examen était très mauvaise. Beaucoup de bruit de rue... Puis les 5 dernières minutes ont été polluées par les avertissements/conseils/règles énoncé(e)s au micro par une personne du staff d’organisation. |
| It's sufficient To indicate when there la 15 minutes left or examination, it is not necessary to make announcment to indicate that it remains 1h30, then 1h, then 15minutes, then 5 minutes, it was quite disturbing. |
| it's not necessary to specify every hours how many hours it remains before the end of the examination.... it's sometimes disturbing... |
It is not in Paris. Too far from the metro station on the line 13 the worth of them (lot of delay and people). I will prefer an examination center inside Paris, ==> easier and less pressure to arrive on time it can be heard external sounds (like children playing) during few minutes. I was seat next to an heater so I didn’t need my pullover.

I was surprised no ID check was performed at entrance, only during the exam.

Good but the location of the examination hall (Saint-Ouen) could be improved: Hard to find something to eat after the examination / no grossery stores around there...

Exam hall in Paris is appropriate, and EQE invigilators organised and invigilated the exams well.

Difficult to access, as only one subway line is near, and this may cause problems in the future in case of (more than occasional) breakdown of this line.

Correct

Clean tables each day?

Children crying close to the examination hall makes difficult to get concentrated

Change the place. Far from the subway station. Also the line 13 is one of the most crowded line and it can be very difficult to ride it with a heavy suitcase (PaperD) People were very nice.

1. 7 Rome (78 answers received)

Q3) Examination centres – rating

![Graph showing examination centre rating](image)

Accessibility of the examination hall and information signs
Identification check
Lightning conditions
Space for candidates
Acoustic conditions and audibility of the invigilators
Restroom facilities
Suitability of the examination hall

Very good | Good | Adequate | Bad | Very bad
Q4) Examination centres – rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very easy</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I could not find my seat</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Was it easy to find your seat in the examination hall?

Q5) Examination centres – rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hall temperature</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Too warm</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too cold</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q6) Additional comments about the examination hall and its conditions

Too much cold

Too cold and commission too noisy

There is not external (i.e. natural) light in the examination hall. One day the hall was very cold, it was very difficult to write due to temperature condition. The day after all worked better because the committee has taken some actions. I hope that, as expressed during the examination, next years the examination hall will be more comfortable.

the temperature in the hall eas too low

the temperature was very very cold.

The temperature was very cold. Furthermore, depending on where you were sitting the sun that passed through the window could be annoying. Also bathroom was very cold.

The room was excessively cold, attendants carried out the exam (all four papers!) in their overcoats! Access to the hall is ridiculously hindered by the absence of elevators. It is a shame to have candidates charged with books and coats carry all their stuff up and down the stairs.

The hall was very cold. Several candidates were wearing the coat.

The hall was cold

The hall temperature was too cold in the first hour of paper A

the hall temperature was too cold and not adequate for an examination hall.
The examination hall was very uncomfortable. It was really cold, we have done the examination wearing our jackets and gloves. The hall is not cozy at all. The access to the hall is not easy, there is no lift and the only way to avoid the stairs is to go down through a very rigid ramp with ice over. The examination hall is, as usual, inadequate except for the room available for candidates. It has always been cold, but this year, due to the snowfall, was unbearable. It was necessary to keep coats and gloves on, which is clearly not comfortable when dealing with an examination that requires fast consultation of tons of paper.

The exam room was extremely cold. Not easy to take an examination under such condition. Considering the cost of the cost for enrolment to the exam, working in such condition was absolutely not good; a bad point for EPO

The exam room is located in a basement of a building that has been abandoned for years. The heating is almost zero, in the bathrooms you can not stay from the cold. Is it possible that throughout Italy there is no better room with better accessibility??

Not adequate

last rows quite cold because of the doors were necessarily open to allow the passage to and from the toilets. suggest to put some labyrinth barrier to cut the air flow

It was way too cold. I had to take my examination wearing my jacket.

It was freezing. The doors would not close properly.

I couldn’t see the watch of the hall

Extremely cold examination room

Examination hall was like a freezer. Bad acoustic and visibility condition - specially with regard to the small reference clocks.

Dirty Place.

difficult to access the examination room, almost impossible for people with reduced mobility

Cold temperature might have been due to damage to conditioner (snowy day Rome)

An entry was actually closed (blocked) and the alternative was not pointed at all

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. 8 Stockholm (51 answers received)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q3) Examination centres – rating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Accessibility of the examination hall and information signs](chart.png)

Very good | Good | Adequate | Bad | Very bad
---|---|---|---|---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification check</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Very good | Good | Adequate | Bad | Very bad
---|---|---|---|---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lightning conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Very good | Good | Adequate | Bad | Very bad
---|---|---|---|---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Space for candidates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Very good | Good | Adequate | Bad | Very bad
---|---|---|---|---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acoustic conditions and audibility of the invigilators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Very good | Good | Adequate | Bad | Very bad
---|---|---|---|---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Restroom facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Very good | Good | Adequate | Bad | Very bad
---|---|---|---|---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suitability of the examination hall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Very good | Good | Adequate | Bad | Very bad
---|---|---|---|---

34
Q4) Examination centres – rating

Was it easy to find your seat in the examination hall?

- Very easy
- Easy
- Indifferent
- Difficult
- I could not find my seat

Q5) Examination centres – rating

Hall temperature

- Too warm
- Adequate
- Too cold

Q6) Additional comments about the examination hall and its conditions

Too high and unsteady tables

The examination hall at the Swedish PTO works very well.

Stockholm is a great location.

It was good! I was a bit annoyed with a candidate seated next to me for writing so loudly, hammering his pen at the table. But that could happen anywhere. I used earplugs instead.

I recommend you give an earlier notice that the time is running up. 5 minutes is too short in my opinion. You should give a heads-up 15 min and 5 minutes before the end. Personally, I started to fill in the form with 13 minutes to go and needed exactly 5 minutes to do so. I did so to be sure on my answers before filling in. Had I waited until 5 min warning it would have been stressful. No matter the tactics chosen by the person sitting the exam, whether he or she fills the form as he/she goes along or chooses to transfer the answers by the end of time available, a heads-up a little bit earlier than 5 minutes would be better.

I am a tall person but anyway I find the table to be too high compared to the chairs. Why did you have to cram us together on B part when it was empty chairs. I would have liked to not have to sit next to examiner that I did.

Good location, nothing to complain about. Of course the tables could always be a bit larger but these were adequate.

Good conditions

Bad desk.

Access with elevator is necessary. Going up the stairs with a suitcase fulls with books in the snow was difficult.
1. 9 Taastrup (34 answers received)

**Q3 Examination centres – rating**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>Very bad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility of the examination hall and information signs</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification check</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lightning conditions</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space for candidates</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acoustic conditions and audibility of the invigilators</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restroom facilities</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitability of the examination hall</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q4) Examination centres – rating**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Very easy</th>
<th>Easy</th>
<th>Indifferent</th>
<th>Difficult</th>
<th>I could not find my seat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Was it easy to find your seat in the examination hall?</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q5) Examination centres – rating

![Graph showing hall temperature with most ratings falling in the Adequate category.]

Q6) Additional comments about the examination hall and its conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would like larger tables. Very good to have access to the examination hall an hour before start in order to get all papers/books in order.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When the sun shone it became very hot. Otherwise I think it was okay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The lighting conditions were generally good in the hall but my table (and the one in front of mine) had no lights above giving rise to a fairly dark table. Temperature is my only concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tables had a good size and were not placed too close. Proper sitting chairs and tables for eating lunch are required. I had to stand up as the resting chairs are unsuitable. Perfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No further comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would be nice, if the tables were a bit larger. It was not easy to see the clock from all seats - this could easily be improved. I sat in a corner and the light did not reach me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had seat number 1 in the corner at the very front of the room - this spot felt slightly claustrophobic, because the desk was right up against the wall on two sides. It would be preferable if no table was place in this spot in the future. Great - much better than any other I have attended. Extremely friendly and helpful staff. Surprising and nice spread of fruit and drinks. Good service with drinks and snacks, and helpfull staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both this year and last the invigilators insisted in walking around the room when reading out the instructions leading to that they have their back towards us wanting to hear a good part of the time. Why not just stand still in the font, or at the back of the hall, with the face towards the students reading out loud? Bonus points for the refreshments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.10 The Hague (147 answers received)

Q3 Examination centres – rating

Q4) Examination centres – rating

Q5) Examination centres – rating
Q6) Additional comments about the examination hall and its conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We could have been spread over a wider area, giving everybody more table space without having to sit in front of a table’s leg with our chairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of medical device was facilitated as agreed before.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilets are too far away from the auditorium. The lights are not proper lights for taking examinations. The are not placed correctly and as a result your own head makes shadow over the paper, which is quite annoying.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilets are far; microphones on desks are annoyingly taking space; during A exam there was a loud sound from the audio installation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There’s a lack of natural light. I would seriously consider to create training facilities including some natural light.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There was no lighting, but the lighting conditions were very good. ;-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There was an alarm during one of the exams, which was not related to the exam, but it was mistaken for the 5 minute signal before the end of the exam this gave some loss of time and quite some extra stress and loss of concentration so could have affected the score, not only for me but for the whole hall. Apologies were offered the next day, but this should be avoided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The timetable of exams should also be advertised outside the examination hall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The temperature was certainly more adequate than last year for the pre-examination (too cold).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The tables in the middle are too small for those exams that require you to spread out you papers. You therefore loose time finding the right information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The invigilator was completely unaudible from the seats in the ring. Would hve been better if the examination hall was open earlier.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The EPO building has two entrances only one of which was to be used to get to the examination hall. A sign could be put up outside the non-used entrance to direct candidates to the correct entrance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The conditions were excellent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chairs were very good, since the height could be adjusted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, I enjoyed sitting the exam in this venue. The desks in the middle of the hall seemed slightly more spacious than the ones around the perimeter, with the microphone etc getting in the way a little. No, it was fine for me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No further comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No fresh air, when entering the room, you could smell the A-part....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No complains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My desk - located on the outside of the room - appeared to have slightly less space than those in the center of the room. The mic etc. got in the way of spreading out books. More space is needed. Particularly in the circular desks surrounding the floor, merely allowing a single empty space between candidates is insufficient.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was too cold on Tuesday and Wednesday morning but rather hot on Wednesday afternoon. Thursday was ok.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was lucky to sit at one of the tables at the outer circles of the hall, which had much more space than the ones in the middle. I can imagine though that the people sitting on the tables in the middle are less positive about the hall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was first confused about the phones - it was unclear what to do with them. Other than that, I found my table extremely comfortable - more comfortable than the Bar exam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I very much appreciated the conditions in The Hague. The EPO staff was very friendly and professional, it was very well organized. Just one little remark: It would be helpful if you told candidates that even watches are not allowed in the examination room and that there a big clocks at the wall (at least in The Hague there were).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I sat the other papers in MOC, which was acceptable, but this center was quiet and friendly, a lot better.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I found it difficult to find the proper entrance to the building with the Examination hall due to construction.

Exam hall air quality was poor

1. 11 Walsall (253 answers received)

Q3 Examination centres – rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>Very bad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility of the examination hall and information signs</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification check</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lightning conditions</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space for candidates</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acoustic conditions and audibility of the invigilators</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restroom facilities</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitability of the examination hall</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q4 Examination centres – rating

Was it easy to find your seat in ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Very easy</th>
<th>Easy</th>
<th>Indifferent</th>
<th>Difficult</th>
<th>I could not find my seat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q5 Examination centres – rating

Q6) Additional comments about the examination hall and its conditions

Yet again... way too cold!!! I was unable to feel my feet by the end of the exam and my hands were freezing. I had to go to the toilet and run my hands under some warm water. This is a consistent feature of the UK exam halls and is completely unacceptable. The exams are held at the end of February/start of March where freezing temperatures are quite likely, so it shouldn’t be a surprise to organisers. The exam halls selected should be checked more carefully for heating and insulation. A football ground with single glazing windows and drafts everywhere is simply not good enough! You are letting UK candidates down.

Whilst I appreciate that the weather in the UK has been extremely severe, it is unacceptable that during the examinations I, and a number of other candidates, had to wear coats. It was known prior to this week that the weather conditions in the UK would be severe and measures should have been put in place to deal with this prior to the exams commencing. I was later told by one of the invigilators that the temperature in the hall was under 15 degrees Celsius. The invigilators were doing everything in their power to heat up the hall, even bringing in portable heaters, however even with these heaters the temperature was still well below what was reasonable. These conditions whilst present throughout all four of the main examinations, were particularly prominent in papers A, B, and C on Wednesday (28 February) and Thursday (1 March) in all three exams I had to wear my coat for a large portion of the examination.

This is not only distracting to myself but also to other candidates who were disturbed by people putting on layers of clothing. Candidates should not have to concentrate on staying warm whilst undertaking exams which are already extremely challenging. It was so severe at one point that I had to go to the toilets to warm my hands under the hand dryer and wipe my nose which was dripping due to the cold. I look forward to hearing whether and how these conditions will be taken into account whilst marking and also would be interested to see how many other candidates thought the conditions were unacceptable and prejudicial to their performance in the exams.

While the Hall temperature was on the cool side, I would rather it be too cold than too hot. one can always put on extra layers, but it is difficult to cool down if the air is too warm.

way too cold yet again

Walsall location is not good.

Walsall is very out of the way and time consuming to travel to. Actual hall is good though.

Walsall and the venue was not particularly easy to get to. Also, the location of the venue is not very convenient, as there are not many shops or food options available nearby. A more central location in a bigger city would be preferred.

Very uncomfortable conditions

Very good, please keep using this site.

Very cold, otherwise fine.

Very cold, especially on the Wednesday morning. Had to wear coat and multiple layers indoors, which made it hard to write. Temperature was a distraction.

Very cold, 15°C is poor for an exam.
Very cold conditions. Candidates had to wear hats and coats indoors. Heating was not adequate.

Very cold and uncomfortable. Had to wear my big coat and scarf while writing the papers. Feet were frozen and I could feel the cold breeze coming in. Extremely poor choice of venue.

Very cold

Unfortunately, due to the freak cold weather in the UK, in one of the 2 exam halls (my one!) it really was freezing. Trying to write with gloves on is not easy. It was frustrating because the other exam hall was very warm, so it was only an issue with one of them which felt a little unfair. Otherwise the exam conditions were fine.

Too much white noise and freezing!!!

Too far away from London

Too cold, although it was very cold outside.

They did try to provide heaters but it was still too cold and I spent 3 of the 4 exams wearing a down jacket. Hopefully it was just the freak weather. Invigilators talking at the entrance to the exam room disturbed me during one exam. I think that this is completely unacceptable. It was the same invigilator who disturbed my by talking in the pre-examination the year before. She should really understand that it is unacceptable to disturb candidates sitting the exams in this way.

There were two separate rooms in Walsall. One of these rooms was recorded at 11 degrees, no record was made of the temperature in the second room, although complaints were also made in that room about the cold. Minimum working temperature for office work in the UK is 16 degrees Celsius. As such, the room was certainly too cold for sitting still for five and a half hours and writing an exam. Citation http://www.hse.gov.uk/temperature/faq.htm It is unreasonable for optimum performance to be expected at five degrees below the minimum legal working temperature for office work. An exam invigilator was overheard saying that nothing would be done, since 11 degrees is not too cold - this was said by a person wearing multiple thermal layers and walking around the hall.

There were two rooms at the Walsall center. One was fine both days, the second was very chilly the first day and better, but still chilly the second day.

There were two examination halls, one warmer one colder. I was in the colder one and my feet went numb by the end of each exam. This was not helped by the adverse weather conditions. Attempts were made to improve the situation by the hiring of heaters but these were at the back of the hall and didn’t greatly affect the temperature. The other hall (which one had to walk through on the way out) was significantly warmer.

There were two exam halls in Walsall. One seemed much warmer than the other, for whatever reason. Unfortunately, I was in the colder one and it was freezing during all of the exams. It was especially cold during the drafts exam, when it was only 15°C. It was so cold in this exam that the invigilators had to audibly discuss what to do about the temperature, thus disturbing me. People then started to bring in heaters thus disturbing me even more! Whilst I appreciate that we had exceptionally cold weather during the EQEs, Walsall is just not a suitable venue for winter exams. I also disliked the fact that you had to carry all of your books up a staircase before getting to the exam halls - quite difficult when you’ve got a suitcase full of heavy books! I had difficulty getting more lined EQE paper in Paper D on the first day. I started asking for more paper halfway through the exam but was only given five pages at a time, meaning that I had to put my hand up multiple times throughout the remainder of the exam. At one point, an invigilator sitting behind me was so engrossed on his computer that he failed to see me frantically waving my hand in front of him. An invigilator from the front ended up walking down to give me more paper - less than satisfactory. I noticed that on the last day in Paper C, they handed out much more paper at a time - it seemed like they had been rationing the paper in the earlier exams but by the final exam, supplies were no longer rationed and paper was unlimited! A more even distribution of paper would have been appreciated.

There were only 2 rooms to go to the loos for each gender. for such a large venue that is not acceptable. I was sent away from one as someone was already in the loo alter already having got up and walked over, which lost me time, then I had to either wait, walk back again or walk to the other side of the room. I was then interrupted by the invigilator once it became available. Although I understand that it was well-meaning, I didn’t appreciate the interruption at the time. couldn’t there be some sort of a signal indicating when the toilets are in use without candidates having to get up and being told on the door that someone is already using it?

There was inadequate space to wait before we were allowed into the examination hall, it was necessary to climb the stairs to access the hall, most candidates bring multiple heavy bags full of materials (EPC Guidelines etc) so this was not ideal. In addition, whilst the venue is central in the UK and has a very close train station, at the station it was also necessary to carry all bags up and down steep external (icy) stairs to
There is not enough accommodation in the immediate vicinity of the exam hall.

There is no lift at the entrance. It was not easy for me to drag my suitcase (containing the notes and books) up the stairs.

There is a very limited selection of hotels near the Walsall exam centre is very limited. The nearest hotel is adjacent to a noisy motorway which is not conducive to a good sleep ahead of each exam.

There did seem to be some issues heating the two rooms at Walsall adequately, and the temperature was not consistently comfortable over the length of each exam - although the unusually cold weather obviously did not help.

The Walsall venue was very easy to access owing to the severe weather conditions it was slightly colder inside the venue but adequate overall. I suggest this had something to do with the fact that we experiences such adverse weather in the week of the exam. in summary though the walsall football stadium is in a very good location and up to a good spec internally.

The Walsall venue was split into two rooms. The second, larger room was far too cold. The thermostat read 11 degrees Celsius at one stage, and the vents were blowing cold air. Many candidates had to keep their coats and scarves on, whilst the invigilators were wearing ski jackets.

The Walsall venue was completely inadequate owing to the extremely cold temperature within the examination hall. The temperature in the hall was measured between 10 and 15 degrees Celsius across the three days of the EQE. I was so cold during the examinations that my hands could not write properly and I was constantly shivering despite wearing four layers of clothing. I moved places several times with the permission of the invigilator but all areas of the hall were too cold for sitting examinations. One of the men's toilets had ice on the floor. The other toilets were cold and damp. I have developed a cold and joint pains as a result of the conditions. The candidates who sat the EQE at the Walsall venue need to be compensated as it is beyond doubt that the temperature conditions would have affected marks.

The temperature in the hall I was in each day was fairly cold, but that is fairly understandable given the extreme drop in temperature over that week. The other hall at Walsall was much warmer, though.

The temperature during the exam was quite variable - sometimes it was warm, others cold. It was never too warm or too cold, but it could have been more comfortable.

The start time of the examination was not well communicated which caused a lot of confusion - a lot of candidates thought the exam started at 13.00 like previous years.

The room I was in was freezing cold for each of the 4 exams. I struggled to write for most of the papers because my hands were so cold and needed my large coat on. Heaters were brought in but they made little to no difference. Furthermore, the male toilets were in the football stadium concourse and during paper C a layer of ice formed on the floor by the entrance. I slipped on the ice but managed to stop myself by grabbing the wall. I could have really hurt myself and I was pretty shaken afterwards. Overall, the room made sitting the exams even more of a challenge than they already are.

The lightning conditions were excellent - I didn't get hit once!
The larger examination hall at Walsall was particularly cold. The weather conditions during the EQEs this year has been particularly bad, which does make it more challenging to maintain an adequate temperature. However, the conditions in the examination hall were particularly cold during several of the exams, particularly Paper C on 1st March 2018.

The heating provided absolutely no warmth below knee level. Everything on the floor (including feet) ended up frozen.

The heater above the door near my seat was exceptionally loud and needed to be turned down. Therefore we had to make a choice between quiet and warmth. Towards the end of the exam I needed to put gloves on. Fortunately I was doing the pre-EQE which did not require any writing.

The hall with seat numbers 1 to 110 was very cold. Even though additional heaters were brought in, these were ineffective in such a large space. I recognise that the unusually cold weather did not help as last year the temperature in that hall was fine.

The hall was excellent. Please keep this venue in future. The desks were large, multiple sets of toilets, the seats were comfortable. It was a little chilly, but i don’t think excessively so given that it was -6 degrees outside during the week of our exams. With a couple of jumpers and a shirt on, i didn’t notice the cold at all.

The hall was a sensible temperature on the first day (paper D) but absolutely freezing for Papers A and B. Although it had warmed up slightly for paper C it was still extremely cold. Lighting was acceptable. There was enough space on desks for books and paper work.

The hall is in a convenient location, and the temperature was fine despite outside being very cold.

The hall I was in was very unevenly heated - it was just about acceptable at desk level when the desk was underneath the heating vent, but my feet went completely numb at the end of the two 5.5 hour exams. Also, when I was sat at a desk further away from the heating vents (i.e. not directly below), it was quite cold.

The Hall had plenty of heaters; however, as many were rather weak portable heaters the temperature in the hall varied rather significantly. I sat in roughly two different areas: in one seat (towards the front and opposite a window), I took the whole exam with my coat and scarf on, whilst in the other seat (in the middle closer to the electrical heaters and in front of a concrete wall) I was rather hot. The hall through to the toilets was freezing on one day and very warm on another. On the final day of exams temperatures were below freezing in the toilet and there was a leak coming from one of the pipes in the toilet. Consequently, the leaking fluid froze and caused me to fall whilst entering the toilet hastily. No one was aware of this and no caution/warning sign had thus been put up, but clearly this is not acceptable as falling could have been very dangerous. Further, going to the toilet in below freezing conditions is far from ideal.

The hall for candidates in seat numbers 1-110 in Walsall was absolutely freezing on Wednesday and Thursday. My hands were blue on Wednesday as I attempted the drafting paper A! I was unable to stop shivering. Not conducive to concentration or good performance at all and I found it extremely difficult to write. I was wearing a long sleeved shirt, jumper, and scarf and had to put my gloves and coat on! Really not acceptable at all. It was similarly very cold on Thursday but not as extreme.

The facilities in the examination centre were generally good. It was cold due to the weather conditions, but the invigilators did their best to make it tolerable. However, having the only examination centre in the UK in Walsall is ridiculous. It is quite an isolated location, making it very stressful for candidates having to travel across the country to a remote area of a satellite town in order to sit their EQE finals exams. Even if the weather was normal, it’s a logistical nightmare for most candidates, both in terms of travelling and in terms of finding accommodation in Walsall that is close enough to the venue (the local hotel can only hold a small percentage of the candidates sitting the exams, leaving most candidates scattered across the region). If there is going to be only a single venue across the entire country it should be in a major city such as Birmingham or Manchester, where transport is more robust and reliable and suitable accommodation more available. In any case, the EQE exams should really be held in two locations, one in the south of the UK and another in the north. Expecting candidates to travel such long distances prior to sitting 18.5 hours of exams, simply in order to save money, is unfair and effectively discriminates against candidates that live further away.

The examination was split into two rooms, one was warm (seats 111 and up), the other was freezing. We had four small electric heaters for an immense room. I heard someone say the temperature went down to 15°C. My hands were freezing and my knuckles were bleeding by the end of the exams. I even stayed slightly longer in the toilets because of the hot air vent. I would strongly urge the Examination Committee to recommend bringing fingerless gloves or hand warmers to candidates in the future years. It was simply impossible to write accurately and as fast as usual due to the temperature in the hall.

The examination venue was too cold. Although the venue of 2016 in Bristol reputedly was much colder, the temperature was definitely low enough to make sitting the exams extremely uncomfortable and will have affected my performance negatively. Additional heaters were supplied eventually (after Paper A and before Paper B, I think), but even with the additional heaters the temperature did not rise to a comfortable or even
acceptable level. Spending 7.5 hours of a single day in a cold room without being able to move caused me to feel rather ill. The lunch break I spent in the other examination hall, which was marginally warmer, because there was nowhere else to go. By Wednesday evening the skin on my hands cracked due to continuous exposure to the cold. Sitting Paper C under the same conditions was, perhaps, a waste of time as by then I was struggling to even concentrate.

The examination hall was too cold. It was particularly cold on Wednesday 28th March, when we were sitting Paper A in the morning and Paper B in the afternoon. The invigilators organised for some heaters to be brought in for the afternoon exam, however it was a very large hall and only 3 or maybe 4 heaters didn’t make the difference required. My finger tips were blue by the end of the first examination in the morning. While I appreciate that it is a large venue to maintain a temperature, I would expect that this is something that should have been checked before the examination. While the invigilators can walk around in the hall and even have hot drinks, sitting still for 7.5 hours in such a cold temperature is quite chilling and definitely not the ideal conditions for sitting such important exams. I was perhaps more unfortunate than others as I was sat on the far corner of the room (closest to the back wall and the exit) on both Wednesday 28th and Thursday 1st March.

The examination hall was so cold it was difficult to concentrate at times.

The examination hall was far too cold. It was difficult to keep writing without being in pain - I had to stop writing regularly to warm my hands up.

The examination hall was far too cold to work in - never mind to do an important and time-pressured exam in - especially when candidates are sitting still for over 5.5 hours. Whilst I appreciate the weather was unusually cold during the week of the EQEs, I had to wear every layer I had for every exam (including multiple thermal layers, coat, fingerless gloves, scarf) and my fingers were still too cold in every exam to be able to write comfortably. This affected both the speed and legibility of my handwriting, particularly in Paper C. I believe the invigilators were walking around with a thermometer, and I would be very interested to see how low the temperature was. The examination hall was also far too noisy, due mostly to the heating system but also due to phones going off in the adjacent rooms and a phone alarm at the back of the examination hall. At one point I thought the heating vent behind me sounded more like a plane taking off than a heating system, and the heating vent also blew papers off my desk during Papers A and B. Personally, I do not think the tables are big enough given the number of documents and reference documents used during each exam. During each exam, I spent time reorganising things on my desk and struggled to get an overview of the documents I had. I do however appreciate that candidates are warned about the small table space in the IPREE.

The examination hall was extremely cold. We were also told to wait outside the venue when arriving early (as instructed to do so). This led to a rather cold experience for the whole day.

The examination hall itself was fine, but it was too cold. Having been warned by previous candidates, I bought extra clothing, but I was still too cold.

The exam hall was freezing cold due to a problem with the heating system. This was a particular problem on the day of papers A and B, when many of us spent the whole day wearing coats and hats.

The examination hall was extremely cold.

The conditions in the examination hall where seats 1-110 were located was much too cold throughout the three days of the examinations, with the last day (Paper C) being the worst. Measures should have been taken during the examinations to improve the temperature rather than letting them deteriorate throughout the week. It is completely unacceptable that the conditions in the examination hall adversely effected my performance in the examinations as was the case here. Moreover, it is unfair that those candidates seated in the alternative hall had an advantage given that the temperature in this room was more appropriate to sitting an exam rather. The issue of exam hall temperature has been raised time and time again by candidates sitting the EQEs in the UK. The Examination Secretariat, CIPA and epi should take note. This contemptuous attitude towards candidates should not be allowed to continue.

Temperature was only around 15 degrees Celsius for Paper A and similar for paper B, which made writing painful and difficult towards the end of each exam.

Temperature was a bit variable - fluctuated between adequate and then too cold

Temperature control fluctuated noticeably, due to high level split systems. There was no waiting area as such, and little information or signage before the hall itself.

Signage to the entrance to the examination hall could have been better. In fact, I do not recall actually seeing any signs at all.

Restrooms were cold but that was really my only issue. Overall was fine.

Put some WD-40 on the restroom door. Awful squeak. Candidates sat at the front of the hall beneath the large air vents were likely colder than candidates sat at the back. Candidates sat at the front were much more frequently disturbed by other candidates going to the restrooms (located at the front of the hall) than
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>candidates at the back.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proximity of exam hall to travel arrangements is difficult</strong> - Walsall isn’t close to a major travel hub. Also, there was inadequate communication about facilities before the exam. I would’ve liked to have known if there was space to leave other things such as my laptop outside the exam hall. Not everyone can but book a hotel room for two nights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pretty cold, but it was exceptionally cold for the UK at this time of year. The heating was not good enough for the large room (low seat number room).</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perfectly good venue - no longer using the ‘cold room’ like last year.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outside signage would have been helpful for candidates not familiar with the venue. Also the hall opened only about 30 minutes before the start of paper A - it would be helpful to open an hour before, especially in view of the wintry conditions.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Our room was freezing cold on Wednesday and Thursday, although the other exam room we had to walk through was warm. Must’ve been something wrong with the heating system which was very annoying. I had to wear six layers for the opposition paper!</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>One set of toilets was very nice. The other set which candidates on one side of the hall were always directed to (usually accessible to football crowds on the stands) was very cold (possibly unheated?) and consisted of stainless steel toilets without seats that could be washed by being hosed down. Since there were days when the temperature barely rose above freezing these toilets were not very satisfactory. The hall was cold on one day when the temperature had been -7 overnight and barely rose above freezing during the day (Wednesday 28th). I noticed it had reached about 17°C by 2 pm in the hall so it was very cold at 8 am when the first exam started. Extra heating was provided the following day which improved matters. With the extra heating the following day, and the temperature still around freezing outside, I was comfortable wearing two pairs of socks, double layer of trousers, and 3 jumpers in the exam room. The weather conditions during the exams were exceptional and the exam team did take measures (providing extra heating later) when it was so cold on Wednesday.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On the whole, pretty good. It was too cold, but the UK was going through an uncharacteristically cold period so this was difficult to deal with. More heaters on standby would have been helpful.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On more than one occasion during the examination people entered the examination hall to move large items (including heaters) directly adjacent to where I was seated. This type of distraction is unacceptable. These items were not used in the hall during the examination so this activity could have taken place at another time. Further, at one point during the examination the examination supervisors were whispering to each other at the front of the examination hall. This was unfairly distracting to those such as myself who were seated towards the front of the hall.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>None.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>no signs outside the Exam hall or leading to the Exam rooms. If I hadn’t been there before I wouldn’t have know I was in the right place or where to go. The Exam hall was too cold and I was shivering throughout two of the papers despite wearing additional layers.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>My seat in one of the exams was directly under one of the heating vents. The flow of air kept fluttering the papers on my desk so if the same venue is used next year perhaps the desks under these can be left empty. Apart from that was a good venue.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lighting could be better</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Last year the temperature in the hall was perfect, which was with external weather normal for this time of year. This year the temperature was a little cold, although it is to be noted it is unusually cold in the UK for end of February/beginning of March. Normally it is +5°C or warmer, it was around -5°C outside during the examinations. Overall the hall was very good and it is promising that the standard has been maintained from 2017.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Large amount of white noise from heaters.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>It’s a good venue, but was really cold and there’s not a great selection of things to do for the three days you’re down there for the exams.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>It would have been good to have a sign outside the football club saying “EQE this way” or something to that effect. I basically only found it because I followed the crowd of people with suitcases.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>It was very cold. To some extent this is understandable, as the weather conditions outside were quite extreme, but nonetheless its still offputting trying to keep warm in an exam. Overall good venue though (albeit in a random and fairly inaccessible part of the country not near London).</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>It was very cold throughout the exam, it actually felt like there was air conditioning on even though it was 0°C outside. It is a very inconvenient location to get to if you are not based in the south of England.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>It was very cold for papers a and c.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It was so very cold in the second room (seats 1-100ish) in Walsal as opposed to the first room (seat 100ish upwards) that a number of people in second room wore gloves. Very unfair to have us sitting in such conditions especially if conditions are so different between the two rooms. Having a warm room to sit in for 5 hours back to back would have been a lot more beneficial.

It should not be in Walsal. I doubt a single candidate lives in Walsal so the collective cost to the industry for hotels and trains must be ridiculous. Further, it’s such a random place that there is only really one hotel suitable for the early exam start. The rooms in that hotel are so noisy at night it is barely possible to sleep for the week. Add to that the only available food being burgers and pizzas and candidates are put through a hellish ordeal. I managed about 8 hours sleep the entire time I was there.

It may be better the have the venue closer to a mainline train station. Not the easiest of journies for those without a car.

I was uncomfortably cold for papers A, B and C

I was in the second room in Walsall. It was extremely cold for all of the main EQE exams and despite additional heaters being brought in the conditions were completely unsuitable for conduct of a professional examination. This has nothing to do with the attempts by the epi invigilators to help the situation (which are commendable) but the location is simply not an examination venue (a hall in a football stadium). How are candidates expected to concentrate on passing difficult and technical exams when it is impossible to ignore the fact that it is so cold one cannot feel their extremities? Exams should not and cannot be conducted in such a venue in the future. It is simply unfair to the candidates who have to endure such conditions.

I was freezing cold half way through my exam. The hall started off warm but there appeared to be a draft. My feet and hands were freezing. I had to put my gloves on in the end.

I think the front of the room was far too cold, my toes went numb and couldn’t concentrate properly! But apparently the back of the room was too hot. Otherwise excellent all round. Thank you!

I think “too cold” in no way conveys the severity of the chill in the examination hall. Candidates forced to wearing scarves and hats in order to retain some semblance of comfort during lengthy exams shows that this hall was not prepared for the weather that occurred during the examination week. I appreciate that “The Beast From The East” will have taken the organisers by surprise, however I was extremely disappointed with the resulting temperature in which candidates were forced to perform.

I really liked the Exam venue. I was sat by a door which gave a bit of a draught, but it was fine. My favourite of the recent EQE exam venues in the UK.

I had been before so knew where to go but I didn’t see any signage as to where to go. This is particularly strange as you go into a small door at the rear of the stadium.

I found it very cold.

I feel the temperature of the examination hall was slightly too cold as I had two jumpers on and was still not warm.

I appreciate that the timing of the recent winter storms cannot be predicted. However, the large room of the Walsall Examination centre was unacceptable. It was freezing cold for all papers but for paper A especially. I needed my winter coat on during each of the exams and my hands were cold throughout. Heaters were
brought in after paper A but they only helped the people sat directly in front of them. As you know, the main EQEs have a lot of time pressure. It is hard enough to write fast and legibly in normal circumstances but it was especially difficult in the cold. This was a severe disadvantage to the UK candidates who were sat in the large room. Furthermore, the male toilets were in the football stadium stand and were again incredibly cold. These toilets were so cold that during paper C a full layer of ice formed on the floor of the toilet entrance. I nearly slipped over on this ice and I was lucky not to crack my head or severely hurt myself. The toilet facilities were outright dangerous during paper C and could have prevented the paper if I’d slipped over. After the issues in Bristol two years ago it was very disappointing that we were subjected to these sort of conditions again.

Hall was very cold for Paper C. Invigilators, please, when I ask for more paper, GIVE ME LOTS! You’re not short of it, and 4 sheets is not enough.

Hall was upstairs - all candidates bring multiple texts which are heavy to carry up the stairs

Great location and facilities. The mini eggs on each desk for paper C were a nice surprise and made me smile! Thank you!

Good venue, carpeted floor helps keep background noise down.

Good location in centre of UK, with good road and rail access

Freezing

For paper D I was sat at the front of the hall and the temperature was just right however for paper C I was right at the back and it was very cold and draughty and quite disturbing with people walking past often to go to the toilet.

For Paper D (Tuesday), the temperature of the hall was fine, although on Thursday (Paper C), the air conditioning/heater unit was repeatedly blowing out cold air, which made my legs very cold and resulted in having to use my coat as a blanket. This was probably exacerbated by being sat directly underneath it, as overall the room was an acceptable temperature in spite of the negative temperatures outside.

For a person hard of hearing, the audio speakers were really really bad, I could not hear what the person was saying - even asked one of the supervising persons to ensure that the speaker spoke louder and I still couldn’t hear each and every word. I noted others had requested for the speaker to speak louder. For Paper C, I understand that the weather conditions were called but the exam hall on this day was extremely cold and may hands were turning purple with the cold. I requested for the heating to be turned up but had been informed that the heating was at the maximum already. They tried accommodating with a portable heater but they had issues with a power source and the portable heater was too small to be adequate enough.

Far too cold. Obviously the unexpected weather played a part in that as the same venue last year was fine.

Far too cold, the toilets were even colder and had no hot water, I found it very difficult to concentrate because I was shivering.

Far too cold!!

Far too cold in the exam hall. Also, for Paper C I had an air conditioning vent blowing directly down onto my desk which kept moving my papers around

Extremely cold weather was beyond the control of the invigilators / venue. The invigilators / venue did well to distribute heaters and radiators. However, it was still quite cold.

Examination Hall was a good temperature in 2017 (for the pre-EQEs). The venue was too cold this year, for at least paper A, probably due to an unseasonal coldness in the UK. Invigilators did well to put heating in place.

Examination hall was cold, and got colder throughout exam. Toilets exceedingly cold! Issue with layout of hall - I was seat number 1, so in very front row and far corner. often the invigilators couldn’t see me when my hand was raised as I was at their peripheral vision - once time I waited over 5 minutes with my hand raised and waving before invigilators saw I was trying to attract attention. This could be solved by moving all tables in the hall back slightly, so that all tables are in field of view of the centre front invigilator.

Exam hall was too cold for the drafting and amendment papers. This was probably due to unseasonal coldness in the UK. Toilets were very cold (think stadium toilets).

exam hall was cold, but then it was abnormally cold outside

Exam hall itself was fine inside - location of the exam hall is really the issue.

Even with the additional heaters, the room was so cold that even two pairs of socks and multiple layers of clothing couldn’t prevent shivering and freezing cold hands which made it difficult to write.
Easy train connections to Birmingham New Street which allows for easy travel to most other places in the UK.

Easy parking at the venue is key advantage

Drafty and very cold examination hall.

Clock projected on screen was very useful

Bearing in mind the examination is open book and everyone had huge suitcases containing many heavy books, the examination hall was located at the top of a sleep set of stairs. I struggled to carry my suitcase up and down the stairs and saw many others struggling too. I did not see any clear alternatives for ramped access etc.

As indicated, the hall was too cold for some of the exams. It further was not clear that the clear plastic bag that the exam paper was delivered in would have to be used again, so should not be torn when opening the paper.

Although the hall itself was good, it was in a strange location, which meant that everyone had to travel a long way to get there. The one problem with the hall itself was that it didn’t open particularly early, which meant that everyone had to go and wait in a hotel nearby. This wasn’t a problem in and of itself, but nonetheless didn’t seem right.

Although the examination hall itself was quite good, its location (in the country) was terrible! Everyone had great difficulty travelling there.

Although probably linked to the very cold weather during the week of the exams, I felt the second room in Walsall was colder than I would have liked. But desk space and other conditions were very good.

Although a slightly peculiar place to hold the examinations it was actually quite fine and well organised, easy to access. The building itself was poorly heated but heaters were provided and personally I was fine with the resulting conditions.

All fine.

All fine, though the ceiling fans were quite noisy. Most tuned this out during the exam however.

Air conditioning was full on - but with cold wind. I brought all the pieces of clothes that I had. I think I had three layers on top. For two of the exams, I sat right in the wind path so I had to manage paperweights so that my exam papers and answer sheets do not blow away. there had to be one person at a time in the toilet, which is fair but for one of the exams I had to wait 30 minutes after I raised my hand - one person did not come out for too long - the invigilators, due to the backlog of people, forgot about me.

Air conditioning was quite loud in places, but to be expected in the cold conditions and was not too much of a distraction.

Accessibility was not good - I had to climb several flights of stairs with my suitcase full of books. The venue would not be suitable for disabled people. The hall was adequately heated, although I still felt rather cold by the end of the exam. Plenty of space for books and materials. Good overall.

A little chilly on one day, but given the outside conditions candidates were expecting it and everyone had layers of clothing.
Chapter 2 Preparation for the EQE

Q7) Which examination papers did you sit?
Multiple answers are possible

Q8) Examiners' report in the Compendium – rating

Q9) Elements of your personal preparation
Q10) What other study aids did you use?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Aids</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youtube videos, very important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youtube (Cronin lectures), Previous exams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youtube</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you forget the most important and the only proper teaching material, the e-learning modules on the EPO website for each paper and other published by the EPO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visser’s The annotated EPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visser’s Book, Delta patents books, material from EPO website, Pete Pollard prepared material on his Salted Blog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visser’s “The Annotated EPC” is a well-organized book. Guidelines and summary documents of the subjects provided by courses are needed. Previous papers should be answered under time pressure. Experience is quite important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visser, the study guide on ege website, deltapatents question book for paper d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visser, Mulder PCT book, Pete Pollards guidelines, N law relating to EPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visser, Hoekstra, Delta Patents Questions, Salted Patents materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visser, Hoekstra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visser, Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visser, Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visser, Delta Patents textbooks (especially P book and L book)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visser, Cross-referenced PCT, my own notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visser book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visser book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visser annotated EPC; “Tactics for D” study book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visser Annotated EPC, Mulder Cross-referenced PCT, Delta Patents D book, CEIPI C book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visser annotated EPC, Mulder and Blokhuis “Tactics for D”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visser annotated EPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visser and Mulder books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visser and delta patents questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visser and Delta Patents Booklet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visser / Commentated EPC and PCT Books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutorials on Youtube for paper A and a video with presentation regarding the new format of papers A and B by EPO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainings at private companies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training books/ delta patents exam questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training books Delta Patents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
tips from colleagues

Time limits on EQE website

third party books

The Guidelines for Examination have much improved over the last years and - at the same time - it seems as if the exams tend to stick more to them. Therefore, the guidelines have been a major aid used for preparation. Further literature by Ceipi and Delta Patents used.

the daily D Questions from EPO

c book, patskills tutoring

The Annotated European Patent Convention, Derk Visser. Delta Patents Training material.
The Annotated European Patent Convention, Derk Visser. Delta Patents Training material.
The A book

Textbooks specifically designed for sitting the EQE

text books From CEIPI/Delta with dedicated questions and methodologies

Term “study aids” is not defined.

Tab own product

Studying litterature on my own

Study on my own

Study guides/books

Study by myself

Strasbourg paper D course, JDD revision courses. Significant levels of self-study using past papers from the EQE and mock papers for papers A and B.

Specialized books on EQE : books from G. Baque and D. Visser

specialized books like Gregory Baque’s book

Specialized books for EQE papers

Specialized books and Youtube

Specialized book for paper A.

Specialised material for EQE (by DeltaPatents)

Specialised course for EQE papers = EQE Online training course for the pre-examination paper (EPO, epi)

Solved past papers at home

Solved past papers at home

smart in C, Tactics for D, HELZE Ed.

separate seminars

self-studying

Self-study of guidelines for examination

Self-study

self-study

Self-study

self training

Self study

self studies

Revision guides

Reference to the European Patent Convention by J. Hoekstra

Reference books

Reading through Hoekstra/Visser

Reading commented EPC

Questions for paper D (Delta) + methodology for D (Cees Mulder et al.)

Q and A books + pre-examination e-learning

purchased courses specifically dedicated to EQE, rather than actual patent law
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous years’ examinations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Previous Pre-Exams, Delta Patents P-Book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous exams, Delta patents methodology books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous exam papers and delta patents questions for paper D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparatory Seminars EQE (CEIPI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-examination online course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Examination Course held by the EPO patent academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-EQE Online Training Course, Publications - Hoekstra &amp; Mulder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-EQE online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pray to god - pray the rosary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>praxis-cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice question textbooks:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal study - had very little external support this year. no courses and had no support from in-house training or supervisor/employer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past year papers, EPO online training course, Question Practice papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past papers, mark schemes and examination reports, DeltaPatents books, Chandler Paper C book.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>past papers, delta patents book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past papers and Delta patents material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past paper materials, Visser annotated EPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>past exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>past exam papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paper a book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ouvrage Gregory Baque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only external course, in singular.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>only course at epo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>online training of the EPO - Daily D questions and time limits questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Pre-EQE course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Course of European Patent Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>online course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the job training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure whether this is an aid - but practising handwriting is important as well as writing 20+ pages by hand is a challenge in itself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not any. Mainly old compendiums and practise at work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
My own knowledge of patent prosecution.

My main study material was the EPO online course - which was excellent.

Mostly an annotated EPC which was the best studying material looking back.

Most important: Guidelines for Examination

Methodology books Maastricht University / Delta Patents

Main Exam Questions for Paper D, DeltaPatents

Main exam questions for Paper D, CEIPI A-, C-, D-Book

Legal texts and books

legal texts (the original ones, not ones that summarize up)

Legal texts

Learned from books by myself. Using the compendium

Kley, Euro-PCT Tabellenführung, Delta Patents Basic Legal Questions

Kley, Düwel Tabellenbuch

Kley Kommentar; Euro-PCT-Tabellen

Kley for EPÜ matter; Ole Trinks for PCT

Kley

Klausuren der Vorjahre

JDD Consultants

Internet

internet eqe dedicated websites

intense self practice

Inputs from previous year’s candidates

I’m a CSP student, so this year I had a great couch (Katerina Hartvichova)

I worked with the Delta preparation material

I studied all available materials in addition to PreExam course materials of an external provider.

I read Visser annotated EPC

I read books on C exam

I participated in the CSP program (Candidate Support Project) organized by EPO

I participated in mock exam but was disappointed because we did not get any marks in C. In addition, mock D exam was way outdated.

Hoekstra. PCT applicants guide

hoekstra, visser, cas law book

Hoekstra, Mulder, PCT applicants Guide, Past Papers

Hoekstra, delta patents books
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hoekstra References; Cross-referenced PCT; EPO Guidelines; WIPO Guides; Case Law book; Delta Patents books; past papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoekstra commented EPC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoekstra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helze paper C book, Delta Patents Paper D questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helze 2017 edition of 'A Self-Study Guide for the Pre-Examination of the EQE - Part I: The Legal Questions' which I did not find useful at all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handbook or textbook of Delta Patents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand outs from specialised courses since they are C-paper specific. / General external courses regarding intellectual property are important to practice in the field of intellectual property. However, these courses are not are C-paper specific.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines, EPU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines, EPC 2000, PCT treaty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines, commentary, ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines for examination, EPO website, Visser.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines 2016, EPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory Baque manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good books and the EPO D questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GL; Visser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General willpower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frühere Prüfungsaufgaben</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>friends who already passed the EQE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forever alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For B only Compendium (and a little bit of GL Part F and G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External tutor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External reference book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External course DeltaPatents. Expensive, but useless for part D, because they did not know about the methodological change of DII.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced the German “Amtsjahr” (national qualification), especially working with the judges, as a good training to think more along legal aspects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise books - D book and Delta Patent books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exams from previous years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exam questions and reference book by Delta Patents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exam papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Patent Academy online lectures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Patent Academy - webinars, courses etc, time limit questions, Paper C detailed analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQE-pre examination training course hosted by the e-learning centre; Reading guidelines extensively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQELIBRIUM Mock Camps <a href="http://eqelibrium.org/">http://eqelibrium.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQELIBRIUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQE pre-examination paper 2018 PD01-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQE pre-examination paper 2018 - online training course PD01-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQE pre-examination online training course from European Patent Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQE online training course for the pre-examination paper by EPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQE Online Courses provided by the EPO. Daily D Questions, Time Limit Questions, Annotated past filing paper Cs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQE daily D questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ege coffee break questions, Weekly questions EGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQE coffee break questions, EQE daily questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQE Academy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EPÜ und PCT Tabellen; Verfahrenspraxis EPÜ und PCT

EPÜ Tabellenbuch

EPO's online preexam course

EPO's Candidate Support Programme courses and CEIPI and Deltapatents dedicated books for EQE preparation

EPO Pre-Examination Online Course, CEIPI Pre-Exam Course Straßburg

EPO pre-EQE online course

EPO PreEQE course, Verfahrenspraxis EPÜ und PCT

EPO Online Training for Pre-Exam, Guidelines, EPO coffee break questions

EPO Online training course, Delta Patents distance learning course

EPO online training course

EPO Online study course for the Pre-Exam

EPO online pre-EQE course

EPO online legal texts


EPO Online course and Maastricht University course for claim analysis part

EPO Online Course

EPO Homepage, esp. “Law&Practise” and “Learning and Events”

EPO Guidelines, Annotated EPC by Visser

EPO Guidelines

EPO elearning webpage

EPO e-learning center and WiPO’s youtube programs about the PCT

EPO elearning center

EPO CSP program

EPO course, past papers

EPO course

EPO coffee break and daily D questions

EPO Academy Course, Delta Patents book, Visser’s Annotated EPC

Epic course

epi Tutor session for Paper B, it was very useful, Coffee Break questions from EPO, Daily D Questions from EPO

EPI mock exam and EPI tutorials

epi courses, reading of guidelines

epi course

Epi course

EPC, guidelines, commentary

EPC, Guidelines for Examination

EPC reference book, Delta Patents flowcharts, Delta Patents example questions

EPC Commentaries

EPA e-learning center, Delta Patents

EP/PCT rules&guides

EP, PCT Tabellenbuch; EPO Guidelines for Examination

EP law texts, various books

E-Learning Course

Earlier exams

DP courses / Old exams
Different books
Did only participate Deltapantents for the Paper C
Derk. Visser.
deltapantents d book
Deltapantents’ tutoring, correction of papers
Deltapantents’ pre-exam book and paper D book
Deltapantents Questions
DeltaPatents Question Book
DeltaPatents Pre-Examination book. Seriously, it is the only thing you need to prepare for the pre-examination.
DeltaPatents Pre-Exam book
DeltaPatents Pre-Exam Book
Deltapantents pre-EQE text book
DeltaPatents pre-eqe course
DeltaPatents Paper D Book
Deltapantents model solutions, much more detailed than the examiner’s remarks.
Deltapantents Methodology C-Book
Deltapantents Legal Questions Book and Pre-EQE book
Deltapantents guides, flowcharts; Cross referenced PCT by Cees Mulder; Annotated EPC by Derk Visser
DeltaPatents D-Book
DeltaPatents courses in addition to L-Book and P-Book
DeltaPatents books, Daily D Questions, Kley
Deltapantents Books and model solutions
DeltaPatents books
Deltapantents book including main questions and answers to EQE D-part. CEIPI course in Strasburg
Deltapantents Book C
deltapantents book
Deltapantents and notes from many past papers
Deltapantents - Paper D main examination questions
Deltapantents
Deltapantents
Deltapantents
deltapantents
deltapantents
DeltaPatent text-books with updated exam questions were very useful.
DeltaPatent Documents
DeltaPatent course for papers A and D
DeltaPatent books
deltapatient
Delta, CEIPI
Delta Patents: Basic Legal Questions for Pre-Exam
Delta Patents, Guidelines
Delta Patents work books
Delta Patents text books, speaking to others who have recently sat the exams.
Delta Patents study guides
Delta Patents study guide
Delta patents resources
Delta Patents Questions

57
Delta patents questions
Delta Patents Questions
Delta patents Question book; laws comment EPÜ; teaching books PCT
Delta patents question book
Delta Patents Pre-exam Book
DELTA PATENTS pre-exam book
Delta patents pre-eqe materials
Delta Patents Pre-EQE book
Delta patents P-book
Delta patents paperD book
Delta Patents Paper D questions
Delta Patents Paper D questions
Delta patents paper D and pre-exam book, Delta patents pre-eqe questions book
Delta Patents Methodology
Delta patents materials for D paper
delta patents mainly
Delta Patents legal questions, EQE pre-examination paper 2018 - online training course, Delta Patents pre-examination book
Delta Patents L book
Delta patents for paper d
delta patents exam book
Delta Patents EQE documents, Hoekstra, Visser
Delta Patents D-Exam book
delta patents D questions, Daily D
Delta Patents D Questions
Delta patents D practice questions book
Delta patents D main exam questions; Comments EPU; Teaching books PCT
Delta Patents D Book, PCT EPÜ Tabelle, Kley annotated EPC
Delta Patents D
Delta patents courses
Delta Patents course and books
Delta Patents cours and book
delta patents books, visser, hoekstra, smart in C, tactics for D
Delta patents books, EPI course.
Delta Patents books, CEIPI books
Delta Patents Books
Delta Patents Books
Delta Patents Books
Delta patents books
Delta Patents Books
delta patents books
Delta Patents books
Delta Patents Books
Delta patents book, Visser
Delta patents book, own experience as examiner
Delta Patents Book, Looking at Past papers
Delta patents book questions
Delta patents book for D, A book, C Book and D-Book
Delta patents book B
Delta patents book “basic law questions for pre-EQE and paper D”
Delta patents book (D)
Delta Patents Book - Pre-Exam and Paper D
Delta Patents book
Delta Patents Book
delta patents book
Delta patents basic legal book and pre exam book
Delta patents basic legal book and pre exam book
Delta Patents and CEIPI BOOKs
Delta patents
Delta Patents
Delta patents
DELTA PATENTS
Delta Patents
Delta patents
delta patents
Delta Patents
Delta patent’s D book, and past papers
Delta Patent P book
delta patent courses
Delta Patent books
delta patent books
delta patent book with solved papers A
Delta Patent book and “Gregory Baque”’s Book
Delta patent / Ceipi
Delta D questions book, Hoekstra, CEIPI ABCD course materials
Delta D Book
Delta course C and D. But there was available nearly nothing on the new paper A.
Delta books
Delta and CEIPI materials
Delta A study material
Dela Patents Pre Exam Questions
D-book tactics, Visser, Kastner
D-Book by John Rudge, other commercially available training books
Daily work and discussion with supervisor was very helpful.
Daily Questions, coffee break questions
daily questions
Daily D questions, Books Delta Patents and CEIPI
Daily D questions very good, EPO/WIPO e-learning modules.
Daily D Questions
daily d questions
Daily D and EQE Coffee break questions
daily D - the problems are good and the tutor’s comments and discussions were very useful.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSP, EPO EQE Coffee Break questions, Daily D questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSP programme, Visser Book, Hoekstra Book, Mulder book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSP programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>csp program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSP program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>csp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course materials and studying with an epa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correction papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected papers Deltapatents, model solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments, D book, guidelines, ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments the EP and specially dedicated question books (e.g. by Delta patents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commented EPC2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commented EPC book and you tube</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commented EPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment to EPC (Kley) and Basic legal questions book provided by Delta Patents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee-break questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee Break Questions; several books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee break questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIPI training course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIPI Strasbourg EQE preparation seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIPI seminars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ceipi seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIPI program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIPI formation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIPI external courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIPI courses, EPO Guidelines, EPO Guidelines as PCT Authority, EPO Applicant's Guides, PCT Applicant's Guides, Visser's Annotated EPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIPI courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIPI courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIPI course over 2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIPI course in Straßburg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q11) Here is a list of courses offered by the EPO or in collaboration with the EPO. Which one of these course(s) did you follow? Multiple answers are possible

- EQE pre-examination 2018 - online training course (EPO) - 264
- Guide to EQE papers (EPO) - 194
- Commented answers to paper C for previous years (EPO) - 180
- Daily D questions (EPO) - 340
- Coffee-break questions (EPO) - 700
- Time-limit questions (EPO) - 235
- Seminars for the EQE pre-examination 2018 (Euro-CEIPI) - 108
- Basic training in European patent law (Euro-CEIPI) - 202
- Introductory course Papers A and B (Euro-CEIPI) - 74
- Main seminar Papers A and B (Euro-CEIPI) - 148
- Intensive last-minute course Papers A and B (Euro-CEIPI) - 32
- Introductory course Paper C (Euro-CEIPI) - 46
- Main seminar Paper C (Euro-CEIPI) - 127
- Intensive last-minute course Paper C (Euro-CEIPI) - 36
- Introductory course Paper D (Euro-CEIPI) - 38
- Main seminar Paper D (Euro-CEIPI) - 147
- Intensive last-minute course Paper D (Euro-CEIPI) - 30
- Mock EQE (epi) - 75
- Flexible tutorials (epi) - 37
- Online course for the preparation to the pre-examination (epi) - 47
- EQE paper A two-day methodology course (DeltaPatents) - 68
- EQE paper B two-day methodology course (DeltaPatents) - 65
- EQE Paper C three-day methodology course (DeltaPatents) - 129
- EQE Paper C two-day guided exam course (DeltaPatents) - 74
- EQE Paper D three-day methodology course (DeltaPatents) - 152
- EQE Paper D five- or four-day guided mock examination course (DeltaPatents) - 51
- Other providers/courses (please specify) - 201
**Q12) Other providers/courses (please specify)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day trace</th>
<th>Delta patents book</th>
<th>University Maastricht (C + D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delta patents pre-exam legal methodology and claim analysis courses</td>
<td>Candidate support project, including mentoring and Delta Patents seminars</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta Patents pre-exam courses</td>
<td>Delta patent courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-exam 2017 online training course (EPO)</td>
<td>JDD Consultants EQE courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDD consultants courses</td>
<td>JDD study courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDD EQE courses</td>
<td>JDD courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDD courses</td>
<td>CEIPi course for pre-examination - November 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPO in house weekend prep with CEIPi</td>
<td>Michalski Hüttermann</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIPi weekend workshop (EPO inhouse)</td>
<td>JDD Course, UK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mock EQEs by ASPI</td>
<td>EPO in-house week-end training organized by talent management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A, C, D weekend courses offered to EPO examiners</td>
<td>CEIPi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIPi</td>
<td>CEIPi DK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This year I only had this and hard time studying!</td>
<td>Weekend courses organised by EPO+CEIPi and EPO+Delta Patents in November 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP Akadamiet</td>
<td>JDD courses for all papers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta Patents pre-exam distance learning and preparation courses for legal and claim analysis part / CEIPi 2-year preparation course (2nd year only)</td>
<td>Delta Patent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta Patents</td>
<td>Preparation for the EQE paper A / B (for EPO examiners/CEIPi)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDD courses - UK (for A, B and C)</td>
<td>Course of Cees Mulder / Nyske Blokhuis for both C &amp; D in Maastricht</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>D- course with Cees Mulders at Univ. Maastricht</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://eqelibrium.org/">http://eqelibrium.org/</a></td>
<td>Methodology course provided in-house by EPO one year ago.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSP</td>
<td>JDD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPO/EPO online training course for the pre-examination paper</td>
<td>Michalski Hüttermann C- und D-kurs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIPi Special course on paper C</td>
<td>JDD D course (UK)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta Patents' full main exam course program</td>
<td>Delta Patents (books, not courses)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jdd (uk)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>delta patents pre-exam integrated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>just the entire deltapatents deal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eqe paper d provided by deltapatents at the epo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i participated in the csp program (candidate support project) organized by epo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eqe paper c and d course at university of maastricht (cees mulder &amp; nyske blokhuis)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jdd course in the uk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>delta patents methodology books on courses a and b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maastricht c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ci&amp;t&amp;m training - preparation for the eqe pre-exam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>csp training for papers a, b and d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maastricht university - claim analysis part</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>queen mary university london preparation for papers a, b, c and d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jdd eqe preparation course for a, b, c and d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>delta patents training for eqe pre-exam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>michalsky hütttermann c &amp; d part</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jdd courses for papers a, b, c and d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jdd courses for papers c and d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mock eqe (aspi)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-learning centre by european patnent academy paper a, b,c, d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>delta patents course on legal part and claim analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jdd paper a and b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maastrich c and d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jdd courses - introductory and main a-d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eqilibrium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u maastricht claim analysis for pre-exam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c &amp; d course in maastricht university</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>just to clarify: the other marked courses were attended in previous years, but i attended the 2-day paper d guided exam course last december.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deltapatent seminar d &amp; c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>delta patents, legal+claims</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>delta patents, how to pass the eqe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mastrich university</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>also two day course eqe paper d by deltapatents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 day deltapatents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>queen mary university</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>delta patents netherlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i follow several ouf these course thé previous year. but none this time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>correction of papers by delta patents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>correction 2 papers by deltapatents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>delta pre-examination course (1-day legal, 2-day claim)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>correction papers by deltapatents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>book by daniel herrmann: goal-oriented methodologies to pass the european qualifying examination (eqe)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d- and l-book from deltapatents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jdd consultants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>delta patents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>delta patents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deltapatents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>main exam d questions - deltapatents</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>delta patents and jdd</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>remote training - pre-exam by deltapatents</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ceipi strasbourg</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>i did a two day course from jdd</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>a and b by swedish tutor rut (also answered daily d online) ip akademin</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>paper c and paper d course by jdd</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>equilibrium</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2-day ceipi course</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>delta patents pre-eqe</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>deltapatents pre-exam legal methodology and claims analysis course</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>paper a course for epo examiners by erich wächelin</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>main questions for d paper book (deltapatent)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>the past eqe papers, examiner report and sample answers (eqe)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>strasbourg</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>jdd paper d course, queen mary university a,b and c course</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>delta patents distance learning course</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>delta patents pre-exam course</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>delta patents preexam course</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>deltapatents pre-exam course</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>deltapatents pre-eqe course</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>deltapatents legal course</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>deltapatent course</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>epo pre-exam course</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ceipi course</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>some of the above in the past (no time to prepare in recent years)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>jdd paper c and paper d course</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>jdd paper c two day course</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>jdd pre-examination course</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>jdd, queen mary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>maastricht university c-course</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>jdd paper d course</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>aspi for paper c (fr)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>deltapatents pre-examination eqe three-day training</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>candidate support project</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>maastricht c/d course</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>queen mary eqe two part course</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>eqe paper c five-day methodology course (deltapatents)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>deltapatent pre-exam integrated training</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>eqe paper d two-day guided exam course (deltapatents)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>eqe paper d two-day methodology course (deltapatents)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>university maastricht - c- &amp; d-course</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>delta patent seminar, aspi seminar</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>queen mary eqe course</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>delta patents pre-exam distance-learning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>eqe paper c methodology book (deltapatents)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>deltapatents pre-exam distance learning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>correction of paper (delta patents)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q13) How long before sitting the examination(s) did you start intensive focused study?

![Bar Chart]

- More than two years in advance: 59
- Between one and two years in advance: 77
- Between six and twelve months in advance: 243
- Between three and six months in advance: 497
- Less than three months in advance: 511
Q14) What was your greatest weakness when assessing your preparation for the examination(s) and your performance, and how, in retrospect, could you have overcome it?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weakness</th>
<th>Overcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writing more exams under time pressure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing speed.. I should have practiced writing more exams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing speed. I don't manage to write down within the time given all details of analysis expected by the markers to attract full points. What's the point in testing the candidate's handwriting skills?? The exam should test knowledge and. Writing speed does not (dis)qualify the ability to represent a client.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would have like to do more reading of the legal text for part D. Difficult to prepare for A &amp; B as the format only changed last year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working + studying leaves you few time for studying</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without the online training for Pre-EQE course I could not have handled the claim analysis part.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without any doubt - the situation as such. It is impossible to prepare for the situation when sitting the paperer. I have done papers, and had them professionally corrected, and passed them all. I was no way near passing now when sitting the exam.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whised i made more past papers ABC earlier, so i could only focus on D the last months before the exam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which commented EPC book to use; which language; what do I really need to print out and take to the exam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I did old exams, I always had at least 45min at the end to go through all questions again and double check my answers. In the present examination, I almost ran out of time as the claim analysis part was much more demanding as I expected and experienced in the previous exams. I thus had no time left for double-checking my answers. Retrospective, I should have put more time to check the legal questions when I answered them, not relying on spare time I might have after answering all questions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When doing previous exams for practising, it is not clear how it would be marked or assessed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When attempting to re-create exam conditions in my practice papers I did not think to perform in temperatures as low as those occurring on the day.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What aspects should be given importance and which could be treated more superficially is not always clear, critical since time available calls for making such a choice.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well since the exam committee changed the format of the D paper from every other year previous, I could have studied a year in advance and I still wouldn't have been prepared for that paper. The subject matter of papers C and A were also exponentially harder than any other paper I've seen or practised on. The exam committee screwed the 2018 candidates over big time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well since exam committee switched the format of the D paper compared to every other year, I could have studied for a whole year and not have been prepared for that paper. As for the C paper, again another very nasty surprise in terms of subject matter. The A paper was also horrible. The exam committee obviously decided to ditch the normal style of papers and screw over the 2018 group of candidates.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well at first I was most nervous about the Legal part of the pre-exam. However, through extensive studying this is now reversed and I fell like I forgot to study enough for the claims part of the pre-exam. This might have cost me a passing grade at the pre-exam. I do also find it more difficult too study for the claims part.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weakness: time and concentration Need to discuss solutions of earlier papers and must speed up reading the documents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weakness: reading and understanding a description (claim analysis) how to overcome it: more practising (take 4-5 descriptions without their claims; try to understand the essence of the invention; draft your claims; compare your claims with those of the granted patent)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weakness: problem solution test overcome (hopefully): practice with the compendium, supervised by a workmate (epi-member)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weakness: not enough time in the analysis part in the Examina Overcome: Train to perform Examina in total 3 hours, if doing it at home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weakness: Finding the relevant information in the books. Overcome: choosing the books carefully at the beginning and working only with the chosen books</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We'll really see when we get the results... What I can say right now is that for D paper preparation I didn't use much guidelines because I focused on specialised books.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was to nervous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Volume of material for paper D. Possible “non core” questions in C, which were very evident this year.

Update of all legal documents (EPC, PCT, Guidelines, Applicants Guide etc.)

understanding the time limits calculation

understanding the issue asked in DI questions, not only those explicitly mentioned but also to find a balance what to put in the answer which aspects of the question should be covered in the answer, and DII part, time management wit all papers

Understanding the clue of a question. I should have read better.

Understanding ranges, which is more a chemical patent attorney’s speciality, would have improved my marks I believe on this last examination.

Understanding of mechanics patents. More mock exams.

Understanding of certain technical engineering terms in the claim analysis section (I am a biologist).

Understanding methodology for paper C and how to attack inventive step

Understanding correctly the wording of the pre-eqe questions. Overcome by practice with the previous pre eqe and questions/quiz of the online course of the epo

Underestimating time management under pressure during the test

underestimated the complexity of paper D start at least 6 months before

Unability of writing fast. No idea, how to overcome this.

Tutor and/or dedicated courses.

trying to use too many different approaches, overanalyzing i should have worked more in small Groups with other candidates trying to solve past papers

Trying to learn my copy of Visser (annotated EPC). I think you need more time to be able to comfortably navigate it quickly, even if it is tabbed up well.

trying to get the time needed to study in advance - biggest problem for me has been the overpowering impact of my workload and travel. not being able to concentrate properly on preparing for the EQEs. this has really hampered me.

Trying to do Paper A. I can’t get the clues right.

Trying to be clever and not giving the simple answer.

Training with time.

Training on the job and real world problems are quite different from EQE problems. EQE papers, particularly A and B, demand solutions, which are often different from what one would do in real life. Hence, EQE problems appear detached and overly artificial. Could have focused more on adapting to EQE-thinking/mindset.

Training in time limits, that I should have done more. More mock exams needed.

Training and speed and routine

took to long to study convention in a “theoretical” approach. Retrospectively, the study should be more problem-based (i.e. similar question than in the pre-exam).

Too tight timetable, I didn’t have time to attend all courses that I wanted, e.g. provided by EPO.

Too slow. Learn to be fast and precise n understanding, replying to questions

Too slow, to inaccurate in answering d-questions => Practice, more practice

Too nervous and too little self-confidence. That became detrimental on D2, when I could not find information and thought it was my fault (turned out it was unclear in the exam), and then convinced myself I was wrong. That was very hard to come back from, and wasted a lot of time. I should not trust the exam to be error-free, and trust myself more. I think having proper mentors, and not grandparents who knows a lot less than me, would have helped with the self-confidence.

Too much things happening in my life, EQE was set aside and I mostly worked with I had already learned during previous years.

Too little training under exam conditions

Too little time on examination, I began with DII, then continued with DI - I had no time left when two of the DI questions still were unanswered.

Too little time für exercising claim analysis.

Too little claim analysis. Make a more structered concept for claim analysis.

too less working with the EPÜ2000
Together with my family and workplace it became possible to use about 240 hours from 1st October to 27 February dedicated to paper D only. Yet, in order to be sufficiently prepared more time would be necessary. Another weakness is that my arm gets exhausted of writing, and I find it difficult to write a readable answer at the required speed.

To understand the EPC is hard enough, but to understand the formulation of tricky questions with double negative clauses etc. is even harder!

To prepare the exam while working

To much work in my job. Too little time and no one to study with me.

to manage work and study

to find the time for intensive studying when you're in a job

To find enough time for preparation studies (besides work and family).

To find - beside work and family - sufficient time to prepare the exam.

to do it alone

Tiredness after UK exams (which are quite hard and require a lot of study)

Timing. I practised the previous pre-exams at home and had no problem to finish them in 4 hours at home. At the exam I ran out of time. I should have trained to be faster (e.g. to finish them at 2-2.5 h at home). Also, my background is biotech. I should have trained more to read and understand mechanics inventions (including the vocabulary used in mechanics, e.g. pivoting, bore ...).

Timing was my greatest weakest in the exam. When completing past papers, section B had never taken me longer than 2 hours but in the examination itself it took me longer and I was very rushed on the last two questions.

Timing in the actual exam was much more difficult than during practice exams. This could be difficult to overcome - perhaps more intense/realistic practice exams would have helped.

Timing for Paper C, and I don't know how to overcome it! I struggle to do this paper on time consistently. Being accurate enough when citing legal basis in Paper D - this came with practice and doing past papers, understanding the level of detail the examiners expect.

Timing and understanding each word

Timing and prepared more for examination conditions

Timing - I ran out of time in all the exams, but didn't when practising at home. I should have aimed to work to a shorter time at home.

Timekeeping, by doing more mock exams

Time, time, time and time

time spent on preparation insufficient, start earlier

Time Pressures

time pressure.

Time pressure and interpretation of the text (e.g. assessing whether a feature is essential or not)

time pressure

time pressure

Time pressure

time pressure

Time pressure

Time preassure.

Time organisation, more mock tests (did not work due to private problems)

Time managment. Exams too focused on mechanics, I have a chemical/biological background.

time management; I see no chance to overcome it as the D-Paper provides a complex matter which has to be solved in an unrealistic short time for weaker participants

Time management; could have been more methodical with analysis of claim features in A2-A6

Time management: difficult to manage a D paper in 5.5 hours. Difficult to give a general answer on how to overcome this issue. Practice and more practice I guess.

Time management. The Examination does not really assess your abilities in patent issues, but only tests your previous mistakes to face this inhuman examination, once again. In real life no time pressure exits, a different kind of Examination would be desiderable.

Time management. The exam paper was unusually long and with too many details to fit into the allowed
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time for the examination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time management. Strictly timing each question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time management. Practising with exam timing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time management. Practicing past papers in exam conditions (difficult to know how long to give myself due to the extra time), the more recent papers with extra time seem to all have an additional piece of prior art to consider which effectively negates the extra 30 mins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time management. I took too much time to reply correctly to all questions of DI, then panicked when I saw that so few time was left for DII. I would suggest to first reply to DII and then finish with DI even if not all DI questions can be replied to because of lack of time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time management. I should have practised more on doing the previous exams during time pressure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time management. I should have done more papers at real-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time management. I made it too complicated for myself by preparing all my answers on a separate paper, and then I did not have time to transfer all my answers. A step which I will not repeat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time management. For someone who is methodical and careful, it is very hard to provide the expected answer in time if (what the Examiners might think) a minor detail/inconsistency/misunderstanding throws the schedule off. I practiced and practiced on prior exams, both before taking the EQE the first time (failing) and this time, but I can’t seem to get fast enough. It is particularly a problem with Paper C - this years Paper C had a few minor tricks that the Examiners probably expected to add a few minutes of thought, but ended up taking a lot of time to figure out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time management. Doing past papers didn’t help, as it did not account for the stress and fatigue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Management, Learn to manage the time available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time management, I don’t know how I can improve it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time management, especially for C-paper. I should have to be trained better to read materials faster.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time management needed to be improved. Take more practice papers, but challenging as there is only a limited amount of relevant papers, especially for A and B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time management is the most important aspect of the EQE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time management during the exam. did not expect that under exam conditions I would be slower with answering the questions. I should have anticipated better on how to deal with inventive step attacks more quickly (being less thorough but at least get the core of the argumentation on paper)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time management during the exam and tension control. I had not sit exams for a long, it is a matter of getting used to it again.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time management during the 2018 pre-exam. I did all previous pre-exams, and I finished them ahead of time. Not the case for the 2018 pre-exam. I initially planned to spend 1h30 on the legal part, and 2h30 on the claim analysis, but I finally spent 2h on the legal part. Only 2h for the claim analysis was challenging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time management but don’t know how I could have improved that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time management - too much to do leaving insufficient time to articulate a good answer despite having assimilated all the key info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time management - difficult to answer questions without having some basic idea of what the answer is (paper D). Would have started studying earlier and/or applied to do a course. Though my law firm put a large workload on me and it was difficult to manage study time realistically.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TIME MANAGEMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Time limits are the main difficulties. I think I need more training in real time.
time limit and unforeseeable & surprise questions.

Time is very short. I don’t know any possibility to answer the question faster...

time for training

Time for the claim analysis part

Time flies. Why should I overcome that? The EPO should not limit time. After all, we do not need to limit time when we work on clients’ matters in real life.

Time constraint, especially in Paper D. The level of detail desired by the committee is not always certain.

Time and language

Time

time

time

This year resitter. When preparing for the first time I did not know how to start preparation and how to tackle B. It might have helped to visit a preparation course.

Thinking to know the answer, lacking to check the answer in the EPC or Guidelines. I tried to find a way of answering questions by looking for legal basis anytime.

There’s no way to get feedback on how well you’ve done in practice papers as no mark schemes are provided so it’s very difficult to understand where you’re losing marks and how to get better. Current employers have normally sat the EQEs so long ago that their understanding of the papers is outdated, so can only provide minimal advice.

There was a great deal of inconsistencies in marking of the claims analysis, so it was hard to tell whether I had the correct approach in attempting the questions. In retrospect, I would have gone over the same papers again to assess whether I had learned what approach to take with specific types of questions.

There is not much training material available for the claims analysis part of the pre-exam.

There is little information around the description part of Paper A and it is for me still unclear how to find out what parts of the described invention are absolutely necessary to reach the effect. Unfortunately none of the courses and books not the compendium could give me a reliable answer for these questions. Consequently I have no idea how to overcome it.

There are too many potential sources of information needed to be considered in the time allotted given the breadth of knowledge covered by the legal questions of this examination. Considering the amount of time I have worked full time in the patent profession, the number of EP responses and patent applications I have written, and the considerable amount of study I have undertaken for this particular exam, I do not consider this to be related to a failure to adequately prepare on my part. The continual edging of this exam towards the boundaries of the available time, the obscenity of subject-areas, and the likely experiences of candidates at this level (i.e. unlikely to have first-hand experience of appeals or oral proceedings) makes it appear to me that there is little a candidate can do to overcome these ‘weaknesses’. This is not paper D.

The work load and then comes the pressure was massive during the whole year before sitting the exam. the understanding of the subject matter of both papers A/B was very difficult, I would prefer to deal with a papers inherent to my background. Anyway there is no enough material for the preparation of the new format of papers A/B. Likely it could be useful make one additional intensive course besides the CEIPI preparation seminars for papers A and B

the timing is always difficult. Besides, the amount of information is becoming too much

The time pressure of the D-exam makes consulting annotated EPC-books almost impossible. I believe that you should prepare to allow spending only 30 minutes of the 5,5 hours of time for looking up information in a book. Otherwise writing out a response for each question becomes impossible... In order to overcome this, I believe that a very personalised and condensed set of topics + legal basis may overcome this problem.

The time that we have to have available for this kind of preparation is not always compatible with personal life and a healthy family time...

The time management during the examination is very difficult. I felt the text of the Exam C was longer than the ones of the Compendium and for a non-mother tongue person this is difficult to manage without training. I was completely destabilized and made terribly worst than I can really do. I really do not know how can
overcome this without training with same level compendium examples.

The technical part must be worked way in advance. I personally rather focused on the legal part months before the examination. I only worked on the previous exams from year 2012-2017. Unfortunately, it seems that it was at some points not enough. Daily work practice may help of course, but the exam is somewhat deviating from real life. My biggest weakness is the T/F style of the exam. One cannot argue in favor of its response so as to underpin its reasoning...

The speed. Need to develop soft skills to manage ambiguous questions built just as traps for attention rather than for evaluating the candidate’s analytical capacity - in light of time available. I made a mistake to consider past pre-examination for preparation.

The questions are sometimes really hard to understand. Especially, if claims I, II and claims III are build on each other I still had to double-check every time if minor changes have been conducted to the claims. It was to my opinion by far too much prior art that had to be considered.

The physical preparation for taking the full examination at a time. During studies, preparing by taking a few questions at a time, or even taking half of the examination (legal or claims) has proven to be much easier than taking the full 4 hours of examination at once when it involves the typical stress and focus of a real exam. I would definitely prepare more for on this aspect.

The part II section of Paper D was in a different format than usual and it was difficult to judge how many marks were awarded for each section of part II. As this was unexpected there was no way to prepare for this.

The most difficult part is “Claim analysis” part, because this time it was very technical and too difficult for chemist. I answered several times claim analysis questions of on-line course and previous exams. I studied this also from EPO guideline F, G and H part. If I could answer more time all claim analysis questions, then it would help. I could not use coffee-break questions.

The material to learn/use was not definitive. Nobody - neither tutors - knew exactly the scope of knowledge that is examined via EQE.

The legal part was a breeze. Honestly, it is just a matter of finding the right passage in Vlsser/Guidelines (therefore, indexed guidelines are very important! Either make your own, or use the one from Fireball Patents). The claims part was pretty hard, mostly because by then I was tired and it was fairly long and confusing. Greatest weakness was therefore failing attention span towards the second part of the claims part. In retrospect, I should have brought more coffee in a thermal mug.

The lack of time. I tried to get so ne freetime.

The knowledge concerning the PCT. It would have been better for me to invest more time in the preparation of the PCT questions, as the PCT takes a great amount of the DI paper.

The greatest weakness probably was not having studied mechanics (instead of chemistry), which has been the exclusive field of technology in all modules A-D and not being prepared for a change of concept of paper D-II.

The greatest weakness of mine was and is the analysis of claims. I had/have to learn how an Examiner thinks, when proofing/reviewing the documents!

The fact that paper C has become an exercise in reading a large amount of information and seeing how much can be remembered rather than focusing on how well a candidate can draft convincing argumentation. There is no preparation that can be done for this, it depends entirely on the people who write the exam and their competence to test what actually matters when drafting an opposition.

The fact that I am a chemist and the exam paper will be in chemistry and mechanical subjects. I couldn't overcome it

The exam was harder than past papers and everything took longer than expected. I did not have a contingency plan for managing my time in such a case.

The difficulty of the exam is too variable from one year to the next; no solution to propose as a candidate.

The course could have been much better in adding to what other sources already offer. The claim analysis training is particularly bad. The questions are obscure and the answers are also.

The could-would approach (and, to some degree, the problem-solution approach) and how the EPO wants these to be carried out remain somewhat arbitrary in the outcome even after attending four seminars on the topic. Apparently, even seasoned tutors (e.g. CEIPI tutors for 10 years) cannot reliably predict EPO's opinion on could-would issues. There are hardly any resources available from EPO to master the could-would approach and problem-solution approach in ways of self-study - although it is an important tool for daily work with European patent applications etc. whenever the question of inventive step is considered. Please,
dear people at EPO, add some resources on both problem-solution and could-would approach!
The combination of time and looking up the details in the EPC / GL
The claim analysis section. A lot of guidance and practice
The claim analysis part was my greatest weakness.
The Claim Analysis part was more difficult than the legal questions. In retrospect, a more thorough study of
the examiner report's of the old exams could have helped.
The claim analysis part in the 2018 pre-exam was very complicated. There were long and difficult texts to
read and the drawings were not as helpful as sometimes. I felt that my general knowledge in the topic was
adequate, I did not have any difficulties in answering the legal part. However, I did not have enough time to
complete the exam properly. Maybe I should have trained my reading skills more.
The claim analysis in the 2018 pre-exam was more considerably more difficult than expected. If, in
hindsight, I would've known this I could have practised and prepared my work speed better.
The claim analysis part at the pre-examination took me a lot of time. The available past mock exams were
not that time consuming, so I don’t think, retrospectively, I could have done more than I did.
The amount of time required to become familiar with all the material.
That the expectations changed over the years as well as the duration of the exam and the difficulty level,
which varies from year to year. For instance, C-paper 2001 had a completely different understanding of
inventive step than papers over the last 5 years. The amount of pages to read varies from paper to paper,
what is a bit an issue for non-native english speakers.
That I was told on 24 January 2018 that I had passed the Pre-exam and therefor was allowed to take paper
A, B , C and D, thus the I had only 4 weeks to prepare for the Exams.
Taking more time to review the Examiner’s report. Preparing templates much more in advance and
practicing with them as many papers as possible.
Stressing out too much about the studying!
stressed by time limit which leads to not reading the questions precisely enough
Stress management
starting too late
Starting preparation too late and starting too late to work with the right ressources (textbooks, guidelines,
etc). To be overcome by starting earlier to neglect children, partner, friends and job in favor of EQE
preparation ;)
Started with learning for Paper D, then did some papers A to C to realize that I forgot a lot of what I already
learned for paper D. So if necessary, do Paper D at the end!
started too late with intensive study, underestimated the claims analysis part and focused rather on legal
questions in my studies
started to late learning, motivation and fatigue after working day. Improper or adapted methodology for fast
assessing information. not focussed in the reply re the question asked. more practicing more studying konw
started earlier to study for paper D
Start preparing early for paper D; practice writing fast
Start earlier, reduce working time in office
Spend more time for training
Spend even more time doing D-legal questions.
speed of writing down answers
Speed in reading and understanding of the annexes and time / 2018 paper C was very long starting from A1
and including all the annexes.
Speed and assessment of the claim part tricks / training in real condition
Specific aspects in the claim analysis. More practical training on the job.
solitude, time, lack of systematic method
Slowness which could have been improved by doing more real-time compendium trainings.
slow reading in not own mother tongue: rather no remedy for that since courses for speed reading courses
would not help as deep analysis of information at exam required miscalculated number of days of
preparation and due to overload at work had no time to go through own study materials to revise mistakes -
possible overcoming: take time off before exam
Slow reading and slow writing
slow handwriting.

Slow handwriting - use computers?! Difficulty of papers was much higher than previous papers! Why? Why was it necessary to overload part DII with so much information about the contents of claims/description? Compared to previous D-Papers much more difficult

Since claim analysis accounts for 50% of the mark, I should have spend much more time on this. Temptation is to spend majority of time studying legal questions, but in reality it is an open book exam so as long as familiar with materials and general principles of the EPC then should do ok in this section. Claim analysis, on the other hand, seems to be more of a skill that can only be learned by practice. So I would recommend starting earlier on claim analysis and doing as much as possible. Also started studying less then three months in advance, but mainly because had to get UK exams out of the way first.

Simulating the time pressure of the exams.

Simply determining which elements of Paper D questions accrued marks. See British P2 mark schemes for clearer learning materials

Should have started earlier directly with doing the previous pre-exams.

Should have focussed on old exams earlier.

Should have focused more on the methodology for the claim analysis, especially as the claim analysis part was 5 pages (>20%) longer than in 2017 which I had not expected; I might have started with the claim analysis had I looked at the amount of reading before starting to answer the legal questions.

Should have done the previous exams in exam like conditions, due to other circumstances I only had 1-2 hours a day to study (ie no longer time periods).

Short length of time between the UK exams in October and the pre-EQE, not much candidates can do to change that.

short duration of training, I will start earlier if I fail.

Setting aside more regular time to attempt more past papers

Running out of time in Paper C. Happened also in Paper D but not really in Papers A or B. I expected Paper C to be more like Papers A and B in this sense.

Restricted time with supervisor specifically for exam training

reserve sufficient time for preparation parallel to work

Remembering my planned structure for Paper C analysis, and dealing with the altered format of Paper DII.

Recall of where to identify legal basis. Overcome, in retrospect, by repetition and greater exposure/preparation.

Read carefully the questions and statements. Overcame by doing past papers

Problem-solution-approach. There is no self-study book available, other than guidelines and old examination papers.

Probably little practical knowledge for DII. I tend to be slow in reading and analyzing documents.

Probably it would have been better to not prepare at all for the A-Part, since the old examination reports (from the year 2017 and the mock exam) do not give any hints, which phrases/features cause what kind of point deductions. This let to the situation that I was unsure if the formulation of the functional features in the process claim are essential or not or if by including them an unnecessary limitation is introduced.

Prepared to early and had to much work arriving at my desk the two months up til the exam.

Prepared little for A and B - would do more past papers, comparable with paper C

Preparation: lack of time due to unexpected death in the family. couldn’t be predicted. Performance: ran out of time, so had to rush through last inventive step attack. i guess i could have divided my time a bit better, but it’s hard to know in advance what types of attacks (fast novelty or slow inventive step) are needed. also, coming back to an already written attack to embellish it with for some extra points doesn’t seem very efficient, either.

Preparation was not really focused or followed a structured learning plan/syllabus. Wasted time studying or reading the articles and rules. Should have started directly with the questions from previous pre-exams.

preparation time was too short; more explanation needed

Preparation for PCT part difficult Claim analysis part - I should have attended a special course for preparation on the Claim analysis part.

Practise writing the exam papers in the given exam time (very frustrating to spend so much time on the EQE technique).
Practicing the job for almost 12 years I think for all people passing C is not that they do not know how to make an opposition but rather that C exam does not reflect the reality which makes many people fails the C exam.

Practicing more exercises for the D1 exam

Practice more to write by hand. A complete disaster to try to write fast by hand, when you never do it in your daily work.

Practical tips and tricks

Poor routine to answer the question accurately and quickly enough. More practice

Planning was done for preparation from September onwards. The greatest weakness was not sticking consistently to the planning and/or not freeing up enough time during the week when more urgent private activities prevented studying at the time slots planned.

Personal circumstances

Perhaps not enough practice

Performance Paper A: Deciding on the correct category and suitable wording of claim, in particular as a chemist I find the new mixed paper challenging as I rarely deal with mechanical themes, Figures, Devices, means plus function etc. Paper C: spending too much time on assessing priority and which prior art valid for claims. Underestimating the time it takes to read through all the pages and assimilating information. Preparation: The examiners reports could be more thorough and provide more detail to what gave points and what loses points. It seems to me that unless you are willing to pay for expensive training courses offered externally, if you do not have a mentor or someone with experience of marking the exams, you are left to your own devices to decipher from exam reports how to do the exams. I don’t think just practising past papers is sufficient.

PCT: part of D exam - dedicated training sessions (for instance CEIPI) Additionally, second part of D-exam - again, dedicated training sessions.

PCT: differences to EP law and procedures; overcome: dedicate more time for preparation of PCT - some pre-examination papers showed 2 (out of 10) questions concerning PCT.

PCT, more preparation and annotation on PCT

PCT (I do not know exactly how I could have overcome it) and claim analysis ().

PCT

Patience to complete practicing

Parts A and B: to know what is expected --> solve under real conditions lots of old exams Part C: managing the tasks --> elaborate a clear time table and overviews for the most relevant topics (novelty, inventive step, priority, amendments) Part D: legal knowledge --> read the legal texts and applied learned in solving (lots of) old exams

Paper C requires to combine pieces of information like pieces in a jigsaw-puzzle. In previous years (I did sit Paper C in 2007 for the first time) the time-pressure aspect was a further requirement. In my preparation, first of all, I personally should have focused to train my abilities to cope with the combination of both requirements.

Paper D1: In many cases I knew the answer of the question but I did not know the legal basis of the answer as precisely as required. This is particularly the case for PCT-questions.

Paper D Short questions, stay calm in the exam


Paper C: time management --> needed to make more exercises against the clock, I need to optimize versus time Paper D: not being prepared for the change in the DII paper

Paper A, as a whole. I do not know how I could have overcome it since the changes introduced in 2017 leave little room for practicing earlier exams. It is said that papers A and B are now a mixture of Chem and EM but I find them rather EM (also from 2017). Being this my weakness (given I'm Chem), I tried to practice old EM papers, which decreased my confidence level. I am not familiar with lots of functional claiming and I guess for the sake of fairness, it should not be required in these mixed papers. I am afraid in 2018 it was expected to, but I do hope the Chemist's weakness is taken into consideration. For D- it is a mess to know where to begin or stop in open questions. 2018 was especially open in D1. This requires a strategy of the candidates to decide how far to go. I guess it is not ok because it gives the feeling that you may be missing out the core of the answer, even though the (core of the) question is unclear. Looking back now, I still have no clue how I could have prepared better for this... Frustrating!

Panic, sample to much information in short time
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Panic on the day which you cannot replicate at home when attempting past papers</td>
<td>Overthinking things and focusing too much if there is a trick in the question or not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlooking trivial features</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall it is hard to learn for EQE while having a full job, particular as a single self-employed German Patent Attorney. As I know, industrial employees get paid holidays and preparation courses, specialised in passing the EQE For me: Maybe the use of more shortcuts during writing, because - in my view - time is still the greatest problem to pass the EQE.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over rating importance of dependent claims, used too much time on them in exam, was left with almost nothing for the description.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organising the pages of the patent application and state of the art documents. It helps to lay all pages with figures next to each other to have a better overview.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not understanding the questions and always thinking about the meaning behind the questions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not to pass the eqe, cheering ups from my bosses that the examen is not easy and making old examens together</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not studying all important tasks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not spending enough time for mock trials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reading the question or reference texts properly. Read the question and reference texts properly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not quick enough in searching through Guidelines / books. Not enough preparation to draft opinion for DII part.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not putting on clothes suitable for the extreme temperatures of a polar expedition. Seriously though, I was not sufficiently prepared for the sheer extent of the claims part and to analyze the questions in the given timeframe.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not knowing what to expect. The exam syllabus is to big to overcome this. You cannot be 100% prepared over the whole scope.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not knowing legal details. I overcame it by practice work on legal questions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not knowing how the marks are allocated in the papers, especially in case D, in which it was difficult to do self-assessment because there is no detailed description on how the points are distributed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not knowing how exactly what marks are awarded for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not having enough time to fit in study due to work commitments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not having an epo language as a native language. Paper C was endless reading of minutiae and not enough time to reason and write down properly reasoned answers. Extremely unbalanced against non native speakers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not having a plan, and therefore revision was not focused enough. Although I started doing past papers quite early on, due to the nature of the exam, it seemed hard to know how to structure revision and what to focus on. I would probably have started Paper D revision a lot sooner.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not focussing enough on part II of paper D - it meant i couldn’t adapt to the new style of this part introduced this year quickly enough to give an adequate answer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not expecting a complete change in style of the D-II questions. Not much to do about that, it quite complicated the D paper without good reason</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough work on the guidelines for examination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough training material for claim part</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough time to study.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough time to study.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough time to study, I had to take vacations in order to prepare the last 2-3 weeks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough time to study -- begin earlier or take holidays for study focus more on previous exams and not theory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough time to study - start earlier if possible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough time to prepare because of unexpectedly increased workload in the weeks before the examination. How to overcome: I had to quit my job.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough time to practice the papers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough time to exercise DI questions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough time to dedicate to the preparation of paper D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not enough time spent on studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not enough time invested in correcting the mock pre-exams from previous years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough time for the preparation due to work, family...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough papers for new paper a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not doing enough earlier papers (which were much longer)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not choosing an adequate commentary to the epo at an early stage.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not being able to read the Examiner’s mind, at least within the time available Could have overcome it by discussing the paper with the Examiner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not allocating enough time to claims analysis preparation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-native speaker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None. I identified my weaknesses one month in advance, asked for advice, and corrected my preparation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no support from the supervisor or any person with whom I could discuss the hard topics or the issues not clear to me</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No matter how early I had started, I think the greatest weakness is to have time enough to study on top of a full time job. The hardest was actually to find out which way was the best for me to study and what worked for me - not necessarily the same as my study mates. I felt quite well prepared. However, the exam was considerably more study than previous years and even with a dedicated and focused study period of 7 months, I am now not sure whether the result turns out to be good or bad. I do not think that I could have overcome that with more studying.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No good tutor for discussing andersen explaining legal questions. Also PCT-Topics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no closed Loop Feedback on number of marks that would have been achieved in the old exam papers used for preparation not enough time to try and do a thorough self-correction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New decisions of the board of appeal. Especially the G-decisions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nerves and loss of sleep due to extreme nerves. Only had 3 hours of sleep each night, affected my focus (or lack thereof)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>need more detail examiner solution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My work doesn’t involve too many procedural aspects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My wife and I had a baby 5 weeks before the exams, which adversely affected my studying. Also, a heavy workload at work meant I got less time to prepare for the exams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My understanding of the PCT is clearly not at a sufficient level (compared to EPC). The PCT legal texts are much more difficult to read, navigate and understand. EPO did a great job in writing the EPC although it’s not perfect and could be clearer sometimes... but much more easier to handle than the PCT.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My time plan, got a Little bit short of time. Which was surprising, since when I performed the previous pre-Exams (found online), time was never a problem.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My susceptibility to migraine.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My preparation was complete. I passed all past papers neatly in 5 h or less. However, on the day of the exam nothing worked the way it did for past papers, which raises the question of whether the papers were fair. Paper C was an utter wall of text and only rewarded candidates who can read fast, unlike myself. The paper felt like a reading competition as opposed to an opposition exam. I wonder if the Opposition Division and Boards of Appeal will start doing without the criterion of allowing parties to familiarise themselves with fresh facts and evidences in line with the EQE.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My preparation was adequate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My mentors changed too much during the years. I was involved in too many different projects at work to be able o adequately focus my attention on the EQE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My greatest weakness was timing (I ran out of time for Paper D and Paper C). This was surprising because, having sat 6 past papers to time for each of the exams, I had never run out of time before. I therefore do not know how to improve this weakness.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My greatest weakness was the time management, both during preparation tests and my exam. I think I could overcome it by better focusing my attention only on the very important passages of the exam.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My greatest weakness was the claims analysis. I work in biotechnology, claims structure are completely different and it costs me a lot of misunderstanding. I tried to overcome this by taking more time in analysis, be very careful on what is claimed, and by reread my copy if I have time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
My greatest weakness was that I had too little experience with Paper D questions. Should have started earlier.

My greatest weakness is assessing ambiguous features in paper A. For me it is the least straightforward paper, compared to B and D.

My greatest weakness in jurisdictional, sort-of rushed exams, precipitates in a difficulty related to the artificiality of exams, especially in combination with exam parts lacking clarity. I'd call this exam-construction artifacts. I sort of like to write decent stuff only or rather remain silent if in doubt. Unfortunately (or fortunately with respect to the rest of the time) I get along much better in real-life situations. In this type of jurisdictional exams - different to our fundamental education in science and/or engineering - I find one gets put under time pressure to produce markable passages having to sacrifice reliability of the result. If I have improved my performance, then by ignoring this sensation and trying to accept that it just is an artificial exam. Having said this; I am fully aware of how difficult it is to prepare a proper and fair exam. Still, my personal preference: less paper & less documents.

My employer did not leave me much time to prepare.

More time. I felt like I ran out of time on most papers. I wish the last 5 minutes could be used to finish the paper as opposed to number pages and make papers ready for handing in.

More time needed pm claim analysis section because not having an Engineering background I was at a disadvantage

More time dedicated to study

More routine in doing the different papers.

More reading of the EP/PCT rules as there is not enough time to check only few details from documents. As I have never hurry at work and do not make such rare mistakes which need such problematic corrections or strategies. But in real life the oppositions and office actions are sometimes technically more difficult to draft. Handwriting without relevant possibility to edit was the main factor why the time was a bit too limited to make best quality answers. Plenty of scrapped paper was thus produced.

More practice would have prepared me much better for the claim analysis questions in the pre-examination paper

More practice part I D questions earlier. This took the vast majority of the preparation time.

More hours per week to study Make too few compendium papers

More free time to prepare in the weeks before the exam

More focussing on time limits by really knowing them by heart so that I would remember them even under pressure and with my head swirling from nervousness.

More exam questions to time. Greater number of Dii mock questions available in addition to compendium/official past papers.

More efficient recordation of information in a matrix to write down the attacks in amore efficient manner.

More claim analysis practise.

Method...Because, i didn’t attend particular training.

Method, time management

memorizing the law

Mehr unterschiedliche Methoden für Dii üben, um flexibler auf die Aufgabenstellung reagieren zu können

Mehr Übung in der Patentanalyse

Mechanical devices - It is difficult for chemist/biologist to understand mechanical inventions at the same level as people specialized in mechanical inventions. It was difficult to prepare for A and B with only one past paper of the new format. The A and B mock papers not being available, and past mechanical papers being really hard to practice alone.

Mechanical claims analysis

managing the time

Managing the amount of information in Paper C Applying the problem-solution-approach without much real-life practice, so mainly based on textbook knowledge

Managing lots of data in too short time. I think I did the best I could in my possibilities, considering that I was not preparing an exam testing my hard core managing skills but my knowledge and working skills in human conditions.

Manage the time to answer all the questions.
Malgré une préparation intense de la partie “analyse des revendications”, je n’étais pas suffisamment préparé au vue de la difficulté de l’épreuve 2018

**Maintaining motivation to sit mock exams properly to time**

Main problem was: where to start? There is so much to learn, it was difficult to see where to begin. On line course and course materials definitely helped.

**Little experience with claim interpretation in the field of mechanics and only few case studies available to practice these skills**

Limited time to make the papers this year and too many information that needed to be read during the paper. Thirty minutes extra for each paper would have made a big difference.

**Limited time is the greatest concern/weakness. solution: more training**

Limited dedicated training opportunities as working for a small company. JDD course was very useful but I also like to be able to have access to a mentoring scheme to gain additional insight to the requirements of the exam and feedback regarding past papers etc.

Les compendiums ne sont pas assez détaillés pour pouvoir s’auto évaluer tout seul (sauf pour celui sur A)

**Legal questions**

Legal questions. I have overcome it by reading the Anotated EPC and guidelines.

**Learning to cope with noisy neighbors during the examination. Preparations was very good again, so sometimes the tasks and the way the informations are provided seem to be a bit exaggerated “thinking out of the box”. In the end, EPO likes to know whether candidates understand applying the law and demonstrate routine work. Nobody is really interested to participate in “world championship of riddles & hide/seek games”**

**Learning plan scheduled too short (8 months)**

Late start in actually writing whole papers at home (December). A bit earlier would have been better.

**Law practice**

Lack of understanding how claims related to mechanics are constructed.

Lack of training the answers that are expected i.e. with the special wording expected. I would had been able to train properly before the examination if I had access or did know of the e-learning platform provided by The European Patent Academy for Paper A, B, C and D. I have been lucky to have got a cooperation with another EPA who has given me a hint to another proper material provided by EPO. Further the expectations to proper answers changed over the years and only recently some proper teaching material has been provided. See above.

**Lack of timing consideration, insufficient training, lack of mock exam sessions**

Lack of time. The exam is too long and yet if an error is made in the beginning it has fatal consequences for the rest of the exam.

Lack of Time. I could have overcome it by acquiring better automatism for the technical part of the pre-exam.

Lack of time. Difficult to overcome if you have three small children and a job.

**Lack of time. Added 24 hours extra a week**

Lack of time to study wrt amount of material Could have been overcome by not trying to combine with remodelling the house

**Lack of time to prepare**

Lack of time for the preparation in view of all the work responsibilities I have in my 14th year in this business as a patent attorney. Maybe I should have a few weeks off from work to train specifically for the exam. Also we have quite a large lack of support within our company regarding policies and internal training groups regarding the EQE. It remains mainly in every candidate’s personal responsibility to find time and rehearse/study for this exam.

**Lack of time for studying, while during performance difficulties in concentrating I should study for a longer time (at least one year)**

**Lack of time due to work- and family related matters. Could have started studying earlier.**

**lack of time**
Lack of sufficient time to study when you have family, work, etc....I would take time off from my work to prepare it and I would use more EQE courses if they were available in my city and less expensive.

Lack of sleep and too much work - hopefully to have a more sensible work schedule.

Lack of preparation time in view of normal business operation.

Lack of practice under exam conditions

Lack of practice regarding paper A. Not enough mock papers to practice the strategy of the new paper. I would ask for more papers to be provided to aid the candidates pass the new general A.

Lack of practice of previous practice under exam conditions

Lack of on the job training and experience to know how to deal with drafting and amendment, e.g. invention spotting, WHAT to claim (method, kit of parts, product etc), defining essential features, adding matter etc. The only (cost effective) way to overcome this is through using the past papers compendium - although knowing how to deal with issues on past papers may not be helpful for (unknown) issues on upcoming papers.

Lack of motivation. Can’t judge whether or not that qualifies as a weakness with an impact on my performance; need to know the results first.

Lack of familiarity with the guidelines.

Lack of extensive preparation work. I should have started earlier my preparation for the exam, i.e. from June 2017, instead of September 2018

Lack of experience because it was my first time sitting papers C and D. The solution was making previous years exams

Lack of experience

Lack of motivation. Can’t judge whether or not that qualifies as a weakness with an impact on my performance; need to know the results first.

Lack of concentration. Being more disciplined

Komplexität des Stoffs; Zeitdruck bei den Prüfungen. Früh beginnen zu lernen.

Knowledge of the PCT in general - could have been overcome by studying more intensive

Knowledge of the PCT and the overlap between international and regional/national phase

Knowledge of specific G decisions. Could have been overcome by preparing a summary of each decision.

Knowledge of EPC Rules. The Annotated EPC helped me a lot to understand all those Rules I was not familiar with

knowledge in IP could be improved by studying during a longer time

Knowledge from guidelines regarding special situations; concept of “comparative tests” (B exam)

Keeping my focus during the claim analysis section. I could have practised time management more.

keep concentration on a really high level (which was needed from my point of view) Not sure how to overcome it; Practice extensively to read relevant documents and filter its information quickly.

job and EQE

It’s annoying to draft answers when it’s so inconsistent which comments will attract marks for a particular question, and which won’t.

It would have been nice to have had the opportunity to work with a small group of other candidates and share experiences with them. Since I am the only trainee in my office, I could have taken part in a course for this.

It was very difficult to assess A and B due to the recent change.

It was sometimes hard to follow (e.g. while using the compendium of the previous pre-examinations) the interpretation of the Examiner’s view with regard to claim analysis. Also I recognized often an insufficient clarity of the questions of the pre-examinations, so that not in every time a precise answer (if true or false) was possible. But maybe this is intended.

It was sometimes difficult to understand the actual meaning of the question in the context of true or false. I could overcome this in parts by reading the disciplinary board decisions.

It was really difficult to know the legal bases to be cited in the D-I part of the D-Paper. It was not easy to know what exactly to answer and how answers are marked/awarded. I worked a lot of past papers in order to solve the first issue, but the way the questions are awarded it is still unclear

It was quite hard to keep the focus on the four papers at once while studying, and quite exhausting writing four exams in three days. But I do not regret sitting them all.

It was difficult to take time to prepare this exams in real condition, mainly because the exam duration is long

It was difficult to find a block of 6 hours to train with paper C.
It was difficult to access whether I would have passed the paper I was practicing, so I never knew if it was good enough. That should definitely be improved by showing where you’ll get the points.

It took me some time to understand the way how the claim analysis questions have to be answered. In my opinion, the only way to overcome this weakness is practice practice practice. Unfortunately, apart from the earlier pre-exams, there are (to my knowledge) no exercise questions publicly available.

It requires too much time writing past papers and checking the answers. The new A papers format is very different from past papers and what is being required from us is not straight forward. One main misunderstanding is why multiple independent claims in the same category is not allowed and only the worst one is being marked. The marking scheme is too rigid and patent claims can be drafted in many ways but it seems only one way is being considered acceptable.

It is no longer possible for me to practice doing past papers for paper C under realistic conditions, because I’ve done all the past papers going back 16 years (for the past 8 cases I’ve now done them twice), and I can remember the answers. It is not possible to overcome this problem because the EQE does not offer any mock Paper C papers.

It is idiotic to prepare all the papers like guidelines, case law. I come with 2 suite cases.

It is hard to know which text books to bring into the exam. If you were to take all the reference texts that you are supposed to be familiar with you could hardly carry them. In the end I think I found a happy balance with 4 different reference books.

It is hard to estimate how much time it will take to read through the material. Often I underestimated the time it took to read a section because it was few pages long. However, some concepts require time to “sink-in”. I also found it hard to plan my study. Where to start? How to harmonise study with my learning profile (I tend to prefer a learn-by-doing approach than just reading concepts and apply them later) which is more “hands-on”?

It is hard to attain to the time limit given for the exam. Even if having trained more, it would still be difficult to complete the paper in the time given, bearing in mind that under the strain of the exam conditions, one performs differently (and loses more time due to nerves).

It is difficult to begin studying almost immediately after the UK exams in October.

Inventive step questions in claims analysis part. Overcome by educated guessing.

Interpretation/ Understanding of questions which have not been as clear as necessary for a true/ false answer

Insufficient preparation time, lack of training.

Initially focusing only on EM past papers. Could have been overcome by doing more Chem papers

Indecisiveness caused by inability to gauge what the examiners intended with the questions for claim analysis. This cannot be overcome by preparation - preparation does not improve the question-setting ability of the EPO.

Inadequate time between the UK professional exams in October and the Pre-EQE in February

In the EQE it is hard to fulfill all the tasks in the shortness of time. Stress, coldness and a flush of information make it hard to get the wished answers.

In the claims part: understand how actually certain questions are to be interpreted.

In lack of easily accessible and fully indexed textbook such as the pre-eqe booklet of DeltaPatents. Could have saved me time during the examination.

In D, practising timed answering, to avoid unnecessarily writing too much/whole sentences, and in DII organising my answer. In B, also practising timing.

In C, I could not find the term “oder” (it was at the beginning of a line). Sometimes, people (me!!) are simply “blocked”.

In C the time available is very limited, specially if you create a summary data table

In addition to past papers, it is possible to prepare for the law questions using, for example, Delta patents books or the EPO “Daily D” questions. In contrast, there are no additional materials to aid preparation for the claim interpretation questions.

In A, the greatest obstacle is that it is difficult to assess what the expected scope of protection is. The wording of the letter of the applicant in respect to essential features and whether an entire window or just a glass pane should be claimed (and what the essential features therefore are) is open to a wide range of interpretations. Whether this is the weakness of the candidate or of the paper can be discussed.

I’m too slow

If I had less work to accomplish I could prepare specifically and successfully for the exam
If I got an answer right when studying I didn’t spend a long time working out why I was right. It’s just as important as working out why you are wrong.

Identifying the coa under time restraints


I’m re-sitter, I sit for fourth time and every time I miss several points to pass and it is not because I do not have knowledge, I deserve to pass. The problem is that I’m chemist and need more time to understand the invention in claim analysis part. This year 5 people from my company sat the exam and probably all of us will fail because EPO does not think that chemists understand with difficulty mechanical papers. In plus we are all not native speakers, we have other than French, English and German mother tongues. It is not fair to have same time for the claim analysis like a German person! EPO Secretariat does not thing on these points

I would like to have more (mock ?) pre-examination papers than in the compendium or at least more online specific questions for the legal part.

I would have liked to practice by writing more papers on one go. Now I got really tired and somehow confused at about three hours, and I think I made a mess of the exam.

I would have liked to have attended more courses in preparation for the exam papers but did not have time

I would have liked more in depths training on PCT proceedings in the EPO course. However, this proved irrelevant since only euro-pct questions were asked.

I will see with the results

I was very well prepared and it was a nicely designed exam. I had a fantastic feeling when I left the hall. A few hours later I went through the exam in my head and realised I oversaw something and did a fatal mistake: I did not include the epoxy resin in my claim. Next time I will leave the Basis of amendments section for last and I would likely have spotted my mistake on time. Also, on another note, the supervisors at the examination hall sat during the whole exam, but for the last 20 minutes or so started walking around and this can be quite disturbing. If they did it throughout the whole exam it would be ok, but doing at the end creates some stress, because you know your time is running up, but not quite, you still can do a lot in 20 minutes. The fact that they stand next to you suspecting that you will not stop writing when the exam is finished is quite nerving.

I was really tired after three hours of exam and should have trained to do a whole exam at once instead of doing legal part and claim analysis separately.

I was really surprised by this year’s paper. I sat every single mock paper available and passed every single one with time to spare. The second half of the paper was radically longer and harder than the part of papers in previous years. My view had been that performance in past papers was a good way to prepare, but now I think that may be naive, as it seemed that actually it was the prerogative of the exam board to vary the length and difficulty of the papers at will. My weakness was therefore pegging my own performance to the past papers too much.

I was quite surprised that in D-II-paper a rather deep knowledge of Rules of Procedure of the Boards of Appeal was expected from the candidates (at least according to the solution, proposed by DeltaPatents). The greatest weakness was that I probably spent too much time, solving D-I-questions. Due to it, I did not have time to sit the old papers. For the D-II it was only 2016 and 2017 papers, which had a bit different structure than this years paper.

I was quite confident having done the past papers, but the exam itself required far more time that my practice papers.

I was only using compendium but it is not possible to succeed without taking a course dedicated to EQE preparation

I was not well prepared for the claim analysis. I should have practiced more on it. in particular, I was lacking a strategy to be time effective...

I was able to recognize my mistakes in the last exam, and concentrated on fixing those mistakes.

I was a bit biased by my job as a patent examiner and underestimated the complexity of the technical part. During my preparation, I predominantly focused on the legal part. In retrospect, I would have focused a bit more on the technical part.

I underestimated the difficulty of the claim analysis part, since there are tricky questions based on details and you need time to adapt to the nature of those questions.

I trained for A and B using old papers in Chemistry and Mechanics. This was not very helpful. I should have
spent more money on courses or training papers offered by CEIPI or Deltapatents, which are adapted to the new combined style of papers A and B.

I took too long for me to answer the legal questions with the result of having less than two hours for the claims analysis. Particularly, as 2 hours did NOT seem to be enough for preparing the claims analysis this time, thorough reading and understanding the subject-matter was not possible.

I took the past format of part two of Paper D to be fixed (as it hasn’t changed since the papers, Di and Dii, merged). This meant part two of this year’s paper took me entirely by surprise.

I thought my preparation went well and covered all the relevant material in sufficient detail.

I think that I wasted a lot of time to read my reference book instead of doing exercises.

I think my preparation was suitable. I could not have done anything more.

I think my preparation for the pre-EQE was adequate - the UK PEB exams are very rigorous and provide a good foundation of knowledge for the European exams.

I think I started too early.

I think I knew the answers, but did not have time to write them all down. So the weakness is that I focused on learning the law and not focused on how to write in short to get points.

I tend to fail tricky questions, drawn only to make sure candidates are capable of properly reading exactly what is being asked.

I still do not know what I should answer the open questions as written in paper D2.

I started transferring my answers onto the official answer sheet too late, leave at least 15 mins at the end of the exam for the transfer of answers if using a separate sheet.

I started my preparations in the beginning of November. In January I got stress symptoms and had to slow down. However, at that time, I felt that I was in time with my Schedule. If I have to do paper D again I would focus on questions (Daily, coffee break, time limit) etc in a higher degree.

I started doing past papers too late. In retrospect, I would have done one right at the beginning, just to get a feel for what I needed to do.

I spent less time than needed on claim analysis. I focused on legal part too much.

I should improve my methodology for the claim analysis part and, during the exam, I should better manage the time spent per question. One should aim to spend ca. 1h30 on the legal part to have enough time to go through all the reading material of the claim analysis part. I spent more than 2 hr on the first part and since claim analysis was very lengthy, I had not enough time to calmly answer all the questions and became stressed and made mistakes.

I should have trained mock papers with more attention to time management.

I should have taken more time to be more thoroughly prepared.

I should have taken more past papers in exam condition.

I should have started studying a month earlier than I did (so in December, rather than January) as I found myself being quite rushed to get through all the necessary material, and also do a sufficient number of past papers.

I should have started preparing a bit earlier.

I should have started earlier. It is a challenge to combine EQE studies with a full time job and family. However, I do think that it is an advantage to have some work experience when studying for the exam. It gives a better understanding of the subjects instead of just learning by heart.

I should have started earlier to study old D-papers.

I should have started before.

I should have prepared an annotated reference paper on my own to quickly access relevant information.

I should have done more mock exams and found /decided on a good strategy to answer the papers.

I should have done more legal questions.

I should have dedicated more time in preparing, especially sitting past papers in mock exam conditions (respecting deadlines).

I prepared the law very thoroughly in preparation for the pre exam the previous year and, focussing on practising the skills needed to answer the other papers, neglecting the Law and leaving little time to practice Paper D questions. I could find things in the reference materials in the quiet calm environment at home doing mock papers, but panicked under exam conditions. Reference texts worked for me in the the pre-EQE but it would have been helpful to have more prepared materials for paper D rather than reference texts.

I only sat the UK exams in October 2017 meaning that I only began revising intensively for the EQEs in
November 2017. That being said, revising for the pre-EQE the previous year had given me a good foundation, especially for Paper D.

I made a summary of essential elements in the last two weeks before the exams, i probably should have made these earlier and use the two weeks before the exam to repeat them again. Now i made them, and hardly had time to look through then again.

I m a biologist and not an engeneer,

I have not exchanged enough with my fellows to know what are the expectations and books to use for training

I have a two year old daughter so I have little time for revision. There is nothing I can do about this. The exams unfairly discriminate against people in this position by requiring too high an amount of preparation for an exam that has little relation to the day to day job.

I had trouble with some of the more open questions in paper D (please advise...), I was too slow thinking of all the steps to take. In retrospect, I could have made lists of typical situations to structure my answers more.

I had to work, no free days for learning, I have a family with two kids

I had problems with two issues: - Careful and fast reading of questions (which were party very long) and at the same time understading the very subject of the question - Answering questions in brief (avoiding long sentences)

I had no idea how to write the answers and how to analyse the information of prior art. Tips from colleagues help a lot. Delta Patents is not so good. Also it is difficult to prepare if you don't know for what points are given. It's always a wild guess.

I had no idea at all about the EPÜ law in particular. I studied quite hard.

I had difficulty choosing the most suitable literature to use for preparation (e.g. which of the many available commentaries to the EPC).

I guess I was enough prepared, but it seems to me I should have revised even more, especially regarding appeal procedure

I got overwhelmed by the lenght of the paper and by the fact that I am not familiar with the technology described, so I lost a lot of time in reading and understanding the state of the art documents. Nothing I could do against this, I guess. I was very very well prepared.

I found the hardest part of the pre-examination to be the claim analysis questions. I would have spent more time considering, in detail, the mark schemes provided for the claim analysis questions.

I found my self rather well prepared. Maybe I could done more DI questions, but I don't whether that would have led to any substantial improvement.

I find it hard to keep motivation all day long when intensively studying during several weeks.. I would like to have much more time to train !

I felt well prepared. I was just a bit short in time in the end. I would try to have better time management during the pre-exam by checking all pages of the claim analysis before starting this part.

I feel that I should have focused more on papers A and B

I expected type of questions too similar to ones of compendium

I don't think I could have prepared much better given the time constraints with also having a full time trainee position and preparing for my UK exams in October 2017. I had taken all of the past papers under exam conditions and passed them all with a good margin, therefore I believed I was capable of passing the exam in 'real-life'. Perhaps I could have tried to increase the speed in which I answered the legal questions, however I had never felt short of time during the mock papers.

I don't grasp the full meaning of the questions. Sub-questions are hidden in the obscure wording of the main question(s).

I don't know

I do not read and write fast enough. Do not know.

I do not like drafting a claim, because I have drafted too many applications in real life. I have no way to love claim drafting.

I didn't have neither a tutor nor a European Patent Attorney at the company that I am working. So it was very difficult to decide on how to prepare, what to expect etc. However thanks to Candidate Support Program I received all the materials that I need to prepare for the exam. Besides most importantly I have enrolled for the online training program which is completely a great chance for all the candidates. I have never seen such an intense and correctly targeted online training opportunity. The presentations, forum
discussions, quizzes, reading materials. They really helped me very very much for overcoming my problem of not having a tutor. So I appreciate both the candidate support program and specifically the online training opportunity.

I didn’t have neither a tutor nor a European Patent Attorney at the company that I am working. So it was very difficult to decide on how to prepare, what to expect etc. However thanks to Candidate Support Program I received all the materials that I need to prepare for the exam. Besides, most importantly I have enrolled for the online training program which is completely a great chance for all the candidates. I have never seen such an intense and correctly targeted online training opportunity. The presentations, forum discussions, quizzes, reading materials... They really helped me very very much for overcoming my problem of not having a tutor. So I appreciate both the candidate support program and specifically the online training opportunity.

I didn’t anticipate such a messy part DII and I could not have overcome it.

I did not prepare enough for some papers

I did not invest enough time for claim analysis part. Too much focussed on legal topics.

I did not gather all of my reference materials for use in the actual examination until quite late in my preparation. If I were to do this again, I would prioritise gathering my resources before starting focused study so that I could also gain practice at referring to my resources from the start.

I did not enough exams under time pressure-> more focus on mock exams under time pressures I require more training in my hand writing and writing style-> I have no answer to that question yet. Finished the preparation of the reference books to late-> making up, if possible the books earlier. I didn’t work on my mental attitude

I couldn’t easily work out which reference materials I would need to take into the exam

I could perhaps have studied the problem-solution and in particular the selection of closest prior art a bit more extensively.

I could have studied the PCT Articles and Regulations in greater detail.

I could have done more of the previous years’ pre-examination papers in preparation of my own pre-examination (I did 1 and a half).

I could have attempted more past paper-style questions, and had more practice looking up my references if I started this earlier. However, I am satisfied with my preparation.

I concentrated too much on past papers, and therefore was thrown by the unusual elements this year

I compared my own previous exam (C,D 2017) with other candidates who passed in 2017.... I was disappointed how fast your are loosing points even your are knowing the answer and answered the questions correctly... This makes that people with DE,FR,EN as mother language has an advantage. The compendium should give the full check-list so we can prepare the exams even more...

I attended the C paper for the second time. I have been training for many months and I did all previous papers from 2004 to 2017, many of them two times. I was able to make them on time but at the exam I I have been too slow in reading the paper and the prior art and in understanding it. I found it too long and complicated. So I don’t know how I could overcome it. With the C papers I have the feeling that it doesn’t matter how much a person study, a big component is the luck.

I am too slow to write the answer

I am simply too slow and this weakness unfortunately cannot be overcome. I’ve tried everything.

I am now in the stage I know everything as I have studied seriously the last 5 years. But I am a wreck. Normally a cool person but I get sooo stressed by the time limit that my brain stop working. Always after the exam I have the whole answer in my head. But in the exam it is blacked out. I think the stress is too much. If I were superfluent in English just that extra time that gives me would do it.

I am not a native speaker of any of the exam languages, so both my reading and writing are slow. I guess I haven’t overcome it.

I am impatient to write previous papers under exam conditions, but apparently, I should have.

I am an employee in a pharmaceutical company and working hard even after the regular working hours. Therefore, it is very difficult to spare the time for intensive study. Besides, it is not always possible to attend the courses due to the high costs (foreign currency). I had to schedule an annual leave of 1 week before the exam. Furthermore, expertise in different fields has also effect in timing. Questions are generally based on mechanic fields. Even you do not have expertise in this field, you have to answer the questions within the same time limit. This is extra problematic if any of the official languages of the exam is not your native language. I tried to get used to the terms by answering mechanical claim analysis questions before the exam.
How to start and with which material

How to provide for essential and fast answers

how to get an overview

How to make a strange set of claims. Paper A is so synthetic that is a totally different approach with respect to real Life.

How am I supposed to know my performance when I do not have any results? I expect to have passed B, might well have passed C and D, and might well not have passed A. I expected A and B to be tougher than C and D since I believed to have suitable methodology skills for the latter. However, it turned out that I felt (!) like B was the easiest of the 2018 papers. A matched my expectation in being the hardest. C felt (!) like it was more to read that in previous years, resulting in bigger time pressure than expected. Further, I (again) felt like there was quite some information that turned out to be useless for my attacks - at least I didn’t find a way how to use it which made me feel uncomfortable although I found attacks for all claims and which felt right.

High workload in office

Having two kids and being a very slow writer. Regularly practicing writing by hand

Having to write so much and so fast, also having worked as an examiner for a long time, forgetting how much detail needs to go in an answer. (Things that are obvious for us). Also repeating a lot of things in D2, such as relevance of each document, very repetitive, and keeping the focus

Having to study at evenings, nights and weekends

Having to do it in a non-mother tongue language.

Having papers marked provides a much more accurate perception of the adequability of answers

Having a private Life and Loving it

Having a family and a full time job limits the time for preparation,

Hard to answer without knowing the result...

Handwriting

Had very good results when completing 4-5 C papers from previous years, but on the day it did not go very well. So maybe practice more past papers.

Had too little time and no internal aid sources for sparring

Greatest weakness: Time management! Overcome by: Exercising by doin old papers with stop watch.

Greatest weakness: Relatively weak legal knowledge. How to overcome: - give myself more time to prepare

Greatest weakness: procedural parts I’ve never seen in my worklife

Greatest weakness: Not enough Material to prepare according to the new A method - which resembles paper C. I tried to overcome the weakness by doing old papers, which are either too chemical (selection Invention, many Claim categories) of too mechanical ( functional Claim drafting)

greatest weakness: high time pressure due to late start of intensive focused study

Greater emphasis on planning your answer at the start of each exam.

Going too much into detail at the start of my studying and running out of time to cover all of the topics. I do not think that this had a negative impact on my performance but I would have felt more confident if I had started my studying sooner.

Going straight to the point in the claim analysis part, rather than loosing too much time analysing the document

going for misleading information, not understanding.

Giving complete answers as required in the Examiner’s report in DI/DII At a certain point it is impossible to provide complete answers. So 20-25 points for D1 are very good.

Getting to grips with the answers expected. Overcome by question practice.

Getting intimidated by the grading system and the initially apparent amount of content to study for the legal questions. The grading system actually allows for 15 errors, which is plenty of error margin and the EPO-related questions can (mostly) be answered by the articles and rules of the EPC. The PCT is quite challenging to study on its own, but then again, you are allowed to use annotated reference books and to make some errors.

Getting intensive focused study started

Getting familiar with question formulation. Trying to understand what is the actual question and the language used in the questions do not match with the terminology regularly used in the guidelines or EPC.
Get into the mind setting of the exam. Overcame thanks to practice.

Formulating and structureing my answers

For the juridic part, I think I was prepared but for the study of patent, perhaps it would have been necessary to practice more A Papers!

For the A, it is difficult to study. Once you have tried all previous exams, there is not much more you can do. One can only review ones strategy and try and find out what specific parts of the analysis or exam that re ones weakness

For paper D: too much focus on DI vs DII during preparation whereas more marks awarded for DII

For Paper B, the major weakness was that the client’s instructions may be interpreted differently, and the Examination Committee often chooses interpretations which do not appear to relate to real-life practice. However, I have overcome this issue by discussing the issue with the Tutor after the Mock EQE. He explained me that the EQE has certain Unwritten Rules because it simplifies the marking, and explained me some of these Unwritten Rules. For Paper D, some widely recommended books are not very clear or complete in some chapters. I could have benefited from knowing which parts are better in which books. Another weakness was in that I do not have enough practice with procedural mistakes, oppositions and appeals, while Paper D somehow focused on these extremities. Probably, I need to practice in a firm where mistakes from all sides (i.e. from clients, epo examiners, and representatives) is a way of life.

For me the hardest part about the pre exam was working out precisely what some of the questions were asking. Some questions seemed to have a degree of ambiguity.

For D, I had problems to give structured answers in the required level of detail under time pressure. Therefore, I should practice more to answer questions as required for the exam, i.e., in very high detail, but also under time pressure, which I didn’t do (enough) in my preparation.

Followed the Delta patents excellent methodology for the C-exam, however I would have needed to focus lots harder on reducing the amount to write. There just is not enough time to write a sensible argumentation. A bullet-point approach I now believe would have made more sense.

Focused to much on Legal questions

focus more on legal questions to determine time ranks.

Flexibility - no ability to quickly adapt strategy and time allocation on the fly. Perhaps not sufficiently prepared for doing D1 questions as fast as required.

Fitting in the practice of full examination papers around a busy work schedule and personal life - it can be difficult to find multiple dedicated 5.5hr periods to attempt papers under examination conditions. Overcome this by insisting on having uninterrupted time, despite this possibly upsetting others or not being able to meet other deadlines.

Finding time to train under exam conditions.

Finding time to practice. Paper C is 5.5 hrs long so whole days are required to be set aside to attempt back papers (if doing these thoroughly then they often take longer).

Finding the time to sit past papers to time in full. It’s difficult when you can only find time on a weekend to fit the full five hours in. I would have liked to have done more in preparation. To overcome, I should have worried less about running out of past papers to do, and started earlier.

Finding it difficult to mark my own papers.

Finding informations about D-1 questions My solution : quick response in D-1 in order to concentrate on D-2

Finding enough time for studies.

Finding all the required definitions in Paper C. It felt like there were a lot of them required this year and a more organised table would have helped.

Few relevant A and B papers to practice

Fever during exams. Time utilization was bad.

Fatigue. Fatigue causes stress. Fatigue and stress result in errors. Start preparations earlier.

Family commitments. Difficult to overcome, since situation is given.

Failed A last time since I did not realise how the new paper was marked

exclusive preparation time beside the daily business - save dedicated time slots for preparation

Exam stress

Everyday work had no variety.

Euro-PCT; Could have focused more on this part in general, however the amount of questions concerning Euro-PCT was unexpectedly high this year. Time pressure; Compared to previous exams, this year took
more time and therefore it may have been helpful to think about a time strategy a bit more, however again this was unexpected and a surprise to everyone.

**Efficient use of time**

During the simulation of paper C at home I had no problems

Due to the many years of writing on the computer, the (my) writing speed with the pen was clearly too slow for the exam.

Due to my daily work, I intend to make claim interpretations broader than they are intended. I try to overcome it by working with the examples in EPO learning materials.

**D-Teil: Einspruchs- und Beschwerdeverfahren**

Doing more exercises focused in the practice part of the claim analysis

Distribution of time per paper.

**Disability to focus and sit for 5.5 hours straight to tackle a whole paper at once.**

Difficulty to motivate myself to self-studying. Knowing this in advance, I overcame this by participating the course, which forced me to focus on the matter during the course days. Effective, but costly.

**Difficulty to remember topics and corresponding articles/rules for a well based answer (by citing all the necessary legal bases - DI)**

**Difficult to know reqs of each paper when one must focus on D**

**Difficult to allocate enough time for preparation combined with full work.**

**Difficult to accurately reproduce exam conditions - everything takes more time in a real exam, and there is more stress. In retrospect, I could have prepared a more exam-like environment to attempt the past papers.**

**Die manchmal versteckten Hinweise “muss” und “kann” finden und für die “Prüfungswelt” korrekt einordnen.**

**Die größte Herausforderung liegt darin trotz immenser Zeitnot und unruhiger Prüfungsumgebung, die sich bei mehreren Hundert Prüflingen im Raum nicht vermeiden lässt, ruhig und konzentriert zu arbeiten. Um damit in etwaigen zukünftigen Prüfungen besser klar zu kommen, werde ich versuchen mir in Zukunft mehr Routine zu erarbeiten, indem ich mehr Altprüfungen in gegebener Zeit bearbeite. Je nachdem, welche Prüfung ich wiederholen muss, werde ich zudem einen externen Kurs (Delta oder CEIP) besuchen.**

**Didn’t use tutors or attended dedicated courses. More training on time use.**

**Didn’t leave enough time.**

didn’t have enough time to finish C and D - even with 5h30 it is very hard

**Did not start in time**

**Did not spend enough time on preparation due to workload**

**Did not have enough time for preparation, particularly for D1, but also for C and (lesser degree) for A and B. As it was due to tragic family event, nothing I could have done about it for this exam. I am sure I would have been well prepared if I followed study plan**

**Did not focus enough for training the amendment base part for paper B**

**Devote more time to the Guidelines**

**Der Stil des neuen A-Teils. Als Maschinenbauer ist es schwierig mit dem Stil, der in chemischen Patenten zum Einsatz kommt, zurecht zu kommen.**

**Dealing with the mere quantity of information in the given time, and avoiding “easy” mistakes under the time pressure, were the most problematic aspects for me in this one (somewhat similarly to my first C sit in 2017).**

**Dealing with panic and being overwhelmed with nuances in language of paper c**

**Daily work load did not allow me to start preparing the EQE earlier. Little support by supervisor in preparing the EQE. I took 3 weeks holidays for last minute preparation but it would have been desirable to have some spare time and energy for preparing the EQE besides normal work starting from autumn.**

**daily work and study - no chance to overcome it - impossible**

**Cumulate revisions and work during a long period of time without been discharge of some files by my supervisors.**

**Could have used more practice for claim analysis questions.**

**Control Time**

**Consistency of claim analysis question difficulty between years was not great so hard to know whether I was...**
Improving after completing each past-paper.

Concentrate more to Part 2

Completing an entire past paper in one sitting. Overcame this by revising in the presence of a colleague.

Completeness of answers and learn how to answer the questions just in time

Claims part. Often very tricky (as 2018 one :))

Claims interpretation in general and understanding of Art. 123(2) EPC. It would have served myself if I had spent more time on solving claims analysis cases.

Claims analysis questions are difficult to practice for as they are not related to my field at all.

Claims questions: study A and B compendium

Claim analysis. Need more teachings around analysing topics such as clarity and inventive step

Claim analysis. Maybe I have to go training to understand EPO question

Claim analysis. I don’t think this area should be assessed using a multiple choice exam as the subject matter is subjective and often there is not a right or wrong answer.

Claim analysis. Difficult as biologist

Claim analysis, less Time, previous pre eqe’s did not need so much time for the claim analysis

Claim analysis was the weakest point. I have spent much time on legal questions, thinking 50% time will be enough for claim analysis, as in previous exams. This approach was wrong. In the claim analysis part there was a lot of text to read and analyse. I had no time left to analyse and answer two last questions.

Claim analysis was my major weakness. The only way to pass the exam is to study more and memorize the convention.

Claim analysis was greatest weakness, especially since it was much harder this year compared to the previous years. Should have already studied mechanics paper A/B from previous years

Claim analysis under pressure, especially inventive step which is difficult in a true/false situation where we cannot detail our reasoning.

Claim analysis too academic

Claim analysis questions - ????

Claim analysis part. Could have been overcome by more thorough studying of the EPO guidelines for examination

Claim analysis part trying to find and solve more claim analysis part cases than those available in the compendium

Claim analysis part as it needs lots of practice which is not enough available in my everyday work. I did all previous pre-examines multiple times but it might have been better to focus on the main exam too e.g. Part B

Claim analysis I have to look for more examples

Claim analysis - hard to prepare for this as there is a limited amount of past papers. Best way to prepare is to do past papers under time pressure, as I felt short of time on the day.

Claim analysis - guidelines for examination

Claim analysis - for such a subjective topic, I cannot believe it is tested through the use of a multiple choice exam. I could not prepare effectively enough for this year’s exam due to the low number of past papers, and the difference in difficulty between this years paper and the past years papers

Claim analysis

Choosing the proper closest prior art.

Change of strategy on the day of exam

Careful reading of solutions in compendium / comparing against own solutions. Small details may make a big difference.

Being enough fast to execute the exam in the timing

Being a partner of small patent agency in Estonia the workload is huge and therefore it was very complicated to find time to prepare for the pre-exam properly.

Being a biotechnology trainee. Doing mechanical work.

Before taking part in the intensive course C I did not really have a clue how to get the marks. This I just got by the tutor showing us. I think, without having experienced tutors or former candidates helping someone it is nearly impossible to pass the exams. Not because the task are too hard, but because the specific way,
how the answers are supposed to be written. Nearly impossible is not impossible, but much harder. Having taken part for the second time, well and I guess I will do again next year, I still think it is ok, because exams for so many people need to follow a scheme.

Because of the new format of paper A, it is very difficult to prepare for it. You never know what claim categories are wanted. As I prepared I studied old A exams (E/M) and there are never any use claims or kit claims even if those were useful. So it’s basically trial and error every time.

Because I had been doing low level studying (with the local CEIPI tutorials) for the two years since I joined the profession I thought that I would be relatively prepared for the pre-EQE, this was not however the case and by the time I realised that they were not enough I had already missed the first half of the EPO online course so I spent the next 3 months studying intensively and trying to catch up which left me short of time to complete all the past exam papers before the actual exam.

Be profitable in paper A. I think I will follow a specialized course and I will use the materials prepared by EPO in collaboration with the British institute.

Based on the previous exams I considered the claim analysis part to be “easy” and didn’t practice this part intensively. In 2018, however, this part was considerably more difficult and would have required a more detailed preparation from my side.

Based on previous exams, I underestimated the exam. When practicing the exams of previous years, I always had enough time to finish the exam. This year I came into serious time problems which negatively affected my score. I would focus more time management during the exam.

Balancing work and personal obligations with test preparation.

Bad time planning at the examination situation. I got really stressed at the end which affected the performance.

Available time. Even though 30 min. extra time has been provided, I am not sure that the exam committee appreciated that especially the C exam this year was almost impossible to complete in 5 hours. As a result, the exams appear to have been made based taking into the extra 30 min rather than the 30 min being extra time.

Available claim analysis questions/exercises from past papers and the on-line EQE pre-course did not fully prepare me for the claim analysis task within the actual paper I sat. Was full into a false sense of security, especially on time required compared to the paper I sat. Availability of more examples better matching the actual would have been helpful.

Availability Of the documents for the exams are so limited.

Availability of study materials. For example, an updated copy of visser only published two months or so before the exam so this could not be used for revision before this time.

Attempting past papers in the allocated amount of time. Could have been overcome by allocating time periods in the week to sit each paper, but it can be difficult to know how much time is allowed for each past paper because it does not say this on the examination paper. Also marking the papers was difficult because often only a general idea of the marks are given.

Assuming that the precedent set by the previous two years past papers would be followed in this years paper. That is, previously the amount of time required for the claim analysis section took between 90 minutes and 120 minutes whilst this year’s paper took considerably longer and thus lead to questions in this section being answered poorly.

Assessing technical effect and determining problem to be solved in the claim analysis. Having more questions to practice would help (there aren’t many past papers).

As I got through only paper B in EQE 2017, I put in much more time to prepare this round. Having now sat for the EQE 2018, I do not believe my weakness to particularly be in my knowledge, ability to find information, or preparation. Rather, I find the problem to be the excessive amount of information in the exam papers to process, and the impossibility of getting the answers down on paper, quickly enough and in legible handwriting, before time runs out. (Also see point 29 later.)

Anxiety and having not enough time at the exam. I had very clear plan how I’ll interpret the documents. I had even written a note to myself the exam morning on one important aspect. Then in the actual exam I did not follow my plan due to anxiety and ended up choosing wrong cpa document all though on hindsight the choice was obvious - and as I had learnt in my preparations. I don’t know how to prepare for that. Perhaps taking mock exams if they weren’t directly old papers. I’ve done and studied those. Number two reason for my most probable failure this year was that I ran out of time again. I had to cut corners with the response letter to make sure I have enough time to write the inventive step argumentation. In the end, I ran out of time again and did not write as I had wanted to. So, my greatest weakness seems to be coping with the time pressure and stress in the exam. I’d be interested to learn some helpful ways to tackle that. Are there any
tips you could share? In the exam I analyse the documents, use highlighting pens for marking things in the them and write short notes about the documents and claims. For some reason I seem to run out of time even though extra 30 mins were given.

answering questions within limited time (this year’s pre-eqe, in particular the claim analysis part, was more time consuming than ever before.) More training in less than 4 hours could possibly have helped.

Q15) Do you have any comments or suggestions for other candidates preparing for the examination(s)?

You will not have enough time to write good answers to all questions. 2017, I began with DI and had not enough time left when I continued with DII, 2018 I began with DII instead which was a much better decision.

You should not go unprepared.

You need to know your books well to find the right information when answering the questions

You must train a lot even if you are well prepared to traduzione Fastweb in another language and

Without knowing whether I passed or not, I have no idea if my preparation was effective, so no advice at this stage.

With regard to the legal part, one should be prepared to answer detailed questions, on procedural matters. With regard to claim analysis, one should be prepared to spend a lot of time reading the documents. Some questions are formulated in an unnecessarily complicated way.

Visser is great

Visit the online course of the epo!!

Use the EQE pre exam course notes for paper D. They are easy to read and contain most of the information needed.

Use the EPO online course for the pre-exam. It is very good. The Delta Patents courses and materials are extremely excellent. For this pre-exam I only used the Hoekstra book during the exam - all the answers to the legal questions where there, and I did not need to use any other resources.

Use the compendium and try to do past years exams under real exam conditions

Use the annotated EPC by Hoekstra

Use compendium and prepare study material according to questions and answers

Unfortunately, did not remove the staple from the material provided which turned out to be a huge disadvantage when doing the claim analysis. This was because I simply did not know if I am allowed. May be I missed it, however, if not, a statement on this matter I would consider very helpful.

UK candidates can’t start EQE preparation until after the UK exams in October (the UK exams are closed book and so require a lot more preparation). Therefore for UK candidates it is a good idea to put in a lot of preparation for the pre-exam, aiming for well over the necessary 70%, to make life a bit easier for the EQEs.

Üben üben üben. Am Ende alte Klausuren in Echtzeit

Time management during exam is very important

Try to understand the question in short time

Try to give the syllabus (using the EPI course, for example) at least one read through before attempting practice questions, you should then be familiar with the subject matter of pre exam legal questions, and be able to locate them in your reference texts more easily. Go through the claim analysis questions of previous years and really try to understand the parts you get wrong - you need to get into the same mindset as the Examiners.

Try to get some time off from work, i.e. to be able to study during working hours a normal work week...

try to find out how the EPO wants the guidelines to be interpreted and how the EPO wants questions to be answered. many questions should be answered with “yes, but...” or “no, but...” which is not possible in the pre-EQE.

Try to figure out how to in short write to get points

Try to do all previous exams.

To try to complete the past papers in 3.5 hours to give yourself an extra 30 minutes in the real exam to allow for nerves/ a different style of question e.g. a slightly longer question that in previous years.

Try not to think as in real life when you are working in real cases; because eqe is far from real profession
Try not to stress yourself  
Try like-exam exercises or compendia and improve methodology (obviously after a careful study)  
Try different B papers from the compendium to what is really needed and how to answer effectively.  
Try at least one time to do an entire exam in the real conditions of the exam.  
Training and training  
Train yourself To be fast !  
Train the compendium exams with the real time of the exam  
To train themselves a lot with former papers  
To focus on the most recent past papers - all papers before 2016 give only limited assistance as the demand of the paper has increased over time.  
To focus on each small detail during the exam. Prepare intensively at least 3 months in advance.  
Timed attempt of questions  
Time Management is very important  
Time management is essential! If the complexity of the claim analysis part stays the same in the coming years a considerable longer time slot (approx. 2,5) hours should be reserved for it.  
Thorough understanding of the system is helpful. Tutoring also, the tutor should concentrate on the problematic issues for the candidate.  
Think less about accurate legal basis and write more ( ergo faster) even if trivial things. You will get more points. Damage!  
They should answer at least 3 previous papers under time pressure. However, this is still not adequate. Because, the questions may vary in large extent. For example, in 2018, there were 42 pages despite the number of pages in previous years were 30, 34 or 37 at most (time limit did not change and questions were harder by the way). Therefore, they should answer as many tests as possible in order to solve the time pressure issue. They shoud bring only the documents they are familiar with having good indexing. Short notes are very useful. At least 1 month of intensive focused study in advance is required.  
There will hardly be enough time to really think through the questions.  
There is lots of high-quality reading material available. And there is not enough time and no need either to study them all. For me it took quite a lot of time to find out what is suitable for me. Therefore I would say, that it is important to review as early as possible all available study materials and then choose carefully which on to use.  
There is enough material to practise the legal questions but not for the claim analysis - try to get more practise there.  
The online EPO pre-exam course is a great tool for preparation.  
The most useful aspect of revision is to answer lots of questions, and annotate your reference book as you do so.  
The exams of previous years are very useful. Be sure to be familiar with the material you bring. I relied upon Visser and figured that was sufficient for the pre-exam.  
The exams mostly test the following aspects: - writing by hand swiftly - efficiently processing huge amounts of information - capacity of memorising arbitrary keywords commonly used by examination committees to guide you to an expected answer - ability to compartmentalize the information in the exam papers from information in the real world. A thorough understanding of European patent law is useful, but it is not as important as the previous points.  
The exam is getting progressively more difficult - start studying early  
The Eqe is not the most important thing in the world, and keep focus on e.g. guidelines and articles and rules, don’t put too much time on case law  
The EPO pre-EQE online course materials are excellent, and the past papers / commentary provided in the Delta Patents book are also extremely helpful to assess your progress / readiness for the exam.  
The EPO EQE pre-examination course with the questions was really helpful, as it explained how the right answer is derived from the articles and rules of the EPC. Once I had a decent grasp and feel of the legal questions, I focused on getting routine, speed and a general feel for the intended answers in the claim analysis part. The most important advice for me was to read the texts in the claim analysis part completely and thoroughly only once and to keep an eye out for keywords and -phrases in the text and to mark those phrases, so that you can come back to them later. This helped to save a lot of time, which can then be used to go into the details on the more challenging questions.
The earlier you start intensive focused study, the best.

The Delta Patents books are useful.

The Compendium is very helpful. And I found the Delta Patents books excellent, especially with respect to parts C & D, e.g. learning for real-life tasks in a patent law firm.

The compendium is the best source for preparation.

Talk to people that have passed the exams recently to give you tips and motivation. Books are helpful tools if you cannot get on a course.

Taking time to read the books

Take your time and sit down. Study the EPC, the Guidelines and look at the exams from the previous years.

Take two dedicated weeks for studying the EPC right up till the exam.

Take them seriously and study, especially for Paper D

Take mock exams

Take it as a game: you against the clock in solving absurd EPO-style text puzzles. The exam has nothing to do with reality. The only thing that makes it hard is the time pressure.

Take at least 6 months to get prepared

Take a methodology training course, it is essential to understand what the examiner’s want.

Sure. As with any exam, start preparations early, and ensure to practice past papers, including sitting for them under exam conditions. But, especially for the EQEs, i) I would also recommend learning to rush through the paper (without fully understanding the question or scenario) because the exams are not really for people who try to fully understand the questions and do a thorough job. There is simply no time for that. Rather, it almost seems like rushing through, trying to understand only the gist of it, and writing some sort of response is likely to give you a much better chance of getting some points and eventually passing the paper over several resits. ii) Secondly, you will also very likely need Fast-and-Clear-Handwriting Miracle Dust. Despite your ability to completely understand and analyses the questions, and despite knowing the answers or where to find them, all that counts for nothing if you cannot get it down on paper. Despite practicing past papers under exam conditions well in advance of the exams, you may still not be able to write fast and clearly enough (due to average human physical limitations). Without this Miracle Dust, chances of passing are significantly reduced. By the way, I’m still looking for this product.

Study!!! Practice writing by hand.

Study the examiner’s reports on the 2017 A and B papers and 2016 Mocks, and the video interview on the merged Chemistry and Mechanical papers, in detail. Try part two of the 2018 paper D as it was a significant departure from the paper Ds of recent years.

Study old exams

Study long and hard until you pass out.

study hard

Study every detail

Study compendium

Structure and one main book is key

strongly advice them to do at least 5 papers for each part, also at least 2 of them under time pressure, to find a time balance

Stop having a private life

Stay in a hotel close enough to the Examination center in order to be independent or external conditions (weather, strikes, mechanical breakdown...)

stay calm; know your own (best) way to practice - everybody learns differently; choose a good source book, which suits you best; Make a plan which material is to be studied in a defined amount of time

stay calm in the exam

Starting to prepare by looking up Articles and Rules, e.g. regarding terms related to everyday work early on and constantly will be very helpful; making oneself familiar with at least a single previous examination in order to know what is roughly expected at an early stage of the qualification period seems to be reasonable and will avoid bad surprises.

Starting in the spring before the exam is recommendable. Learn regularly starting early

Starting answering DII question before moving to DI questions. By the end, a lack of 30min to finish paper D
is much more prejudicial when applied to DII (~30pts), compared with DI (10 pts).

Start writing old exams and use the resources available from EPO and WIPO.

Start well in time and focus on mechanics papers and their claim language and interpretation, as chemistry apparently is not being tested anymore.

Start studying much time before the exam!

Start studying early. Get a pro-active tutor!

Start studying early

Start study sooner, insist on getting practical experience relevant for the papers, not sitting the papers too soon in one's career.

Start studying early enough.

Start soon enough :-)

Start revising early. Make the most of any in-house tutorials and feedback - having another perspective can be hugely beneficial.

Start preparing right after you finish the pre-exam. Start by solving the questions of the previous years. That is more than enough.

Start preparing in time - answer a lot of legal questions - solve past pre-examination papers

Start preparing early!

Start preparation rather sooner than later; Delta question and methodology books are good tools for systematic preparation. Try to take as many practice papers as possible; develop your own approach for taking each paper.

Start learning early enough!

Start intensive focused study at least six months in advance

Start in time! Study focussed, consider to prepare for two or three exams and pass them, instead of preparing for all four and maybe fail all

Start early; make a study plan; find the right resources - for me a mixture of reading, group work, exercises worked well. EPO has many great online tools that are great in the prep phase - coffee break questions, Daily D questions, timelimit etc.

Start early. Take the exam once you feel ready, not at first opportunity

Start early, use the courses (esp. the online training by EPO)

Start early, learn in small doses

Start early, do many D1 questions, then some old D2 parts. The last three months should be spent on doing old exams for all papers, at least two per paper on time to get a feeling for time management.

Start early, do continuously a bit of preparation instead of a massive amount towards the end

Start early, communicate with other students about all aspects of the exam

Start early, and do the previous exams

Start early! dealing with EPC law and EP application processing on a daily basis for is necessary.

Start EARLY!

Start early with studying. Practise exams of previous years.

Start early practising with old papers.

Start early find others to study

Start early enough, which would be at least 6 months in advance for D if you cannot study during your working ours

start early enough

Start early Do the past papers

Start early directly with the exam questions, e.g. from previous pre-exams.

Start early and try to find your personal preferences for tackling the papers during examination.

start early and pray to god

Start early and do prepare “peu-à-peu” is better than a last rush at the end of the preparation time.

Start early (about 3 months before the exam). Tab up your reading materials well. Make sure you do all of the recent past papers, as they seem to be getting more difficult.

Start earlier your preparation. Mind the time during examination.
Start earlier than you expect. Exam is very difficult.

Start earlier than I did - I started 2.5 months before, because I need a break after the UK exams. This wasn't enough time.

Start earlier than February even though you have two weeks of ceipi course.

Start earlier if possible though it’s easy to delay starting until October-November. Paper D in particular needs some serious preparation time. Start doing practice questions early as this is the best way to learn material. Don’t just spend time reading the guidelines or whatever.

Start doing exercises in good time (at least half a year before the pre-exam), studying by reading is not enough.

Start as early as possible. Also make use of epi tutorials. I didn’t use them this year and they depend very much on the tutor but they have been helpful in the past.

Start as early as possible, especially if you have a demanding job with a heavy workload. It would be preferable to just continue working on legal knowledge after sitting the pre-exam rather than taking a break from the books. I had to take a break to focus on national qualification exams a few months later, but if possible, keeping the momentum going after the pre-exam would help immensely.

Start as early as possible.

Spend enough time. Don’t start too late e.g. 2 month before the examination Date.

Spend enough time for the preparation

Spare enough time for the claim analysis part, plus a safety margin - it could turn out more time-consuming than what you’d expect from previous years.

Solving past year’s exam questions

Solve the previous pre-exams under exam conditions. Study the Guidelines. Use a EPÜ / PCT Book that works with tables and a useful Index. Take the EPO Online pre-exam training, but ideally a year in advance and not right before the exam, unless you have unlimited time or no job.

Sit the EQE pre-examination 2018 - online training course (EPO) then print out the course notes, including quizzes and answers, annotate, and bring to the exam. I found this to be a good first port of call. Because of sitting the course, I was very familiar with material. Second port of call was EPC Guidelines. Third was annotated EPC book (in my case Visser). This hierarchical approach seemed an efficient way to address legal questions.

Sit down and write trial cases from the compendium with the real time limit.

Sit all pre-exams available on the website under realistic conditions (4h, small desk, etc.) and start with the oldest one.

See above. Focus on the strategy to get as fast as possible but in a structured way.

See above and do the old papers

See above - do as many past papers as possible!

Sadly and honestly, you have to know basic EPC but the most important aspect to pass the exam is to study just for the format of the exam. Go courses teaching you how to pass the exam, not courses teaching you EPC and how to apply it.

Revisit your occupational choice! - EQE is the hardest screening I am aware of in the professional world.

Revise early. Do a course. Expect the worst. Don’t have any form of life for the first 3 years of your career. Probably don’t think about having children until you’re 30.

Remind people that it is a legal and not a technical test.

Relax and don’t panic.

Regarding the pre-exam of this year which was quite long compared to the previous ones, try to do the previous exams in the provided time

Really work on the technical part too... That was way more difficult than the previous year, not only regarding the difficulty of the questions as such, but most importantly the length of the exam... quite difficult to make it one time. This requires in any case an appropriate preparation.

Read the questions very carefully - do not anticipate the questions during reading of the task.

Read the Guidelines first before going deeper into the subjects, and keep returning to them to refresh your mind. Prepare well for the Pre-exam, and then keep studying and keep up to date with legal changes.

Read the guidelines

Read Guidelines; start at least 3 months before, solve at least a DI question a day over a long time
**read faster in not your mother tongue**

**Read each question two or three time before strating to write your answer!!**

**Read and practice**

- Put on your skiing clothing before entering the hall.
- Put 100% in the first time, it is difficult to get motivated the second time around.
- Previous exams are the best overview of the types of questions and help you get a feel for the timing if done under exam conditions.
- Prepare your reference materials so you can quickly find any information you may require during the exam.
- Prepare your own standard clauses to cut and paste them into your paper; saves writing time and you are sure to stick to an appropriate structure.
- Prepare your own commentary of the EPC, this deepens your understanding of the legal principles and interconnections a lot more than any ready-to-use annotated EPC can do.
- Prepare with the exams of the last years and additionally work with the guidelines more often.
- Prepare with 5-6 months advance to A and B, get papers marked.
- Prepare standard sentences for answering. Will help to structure your answer during the exams.
- Prepare more for part 2.
- Prepare for taking the previous exams under real timelimit of 4 hours. Spend enough time preparing.
- Prepare early and use the Delta patents course. Don’t assume the exam will be easy just because early past exam papers are easy.
- Prepare by doing the more recent past papers (2016 and 2017) as the EPO are making the tests harder each year.
- Prepare an annotated reference paper (EPC lazy dog) by your own to quickly access relevant information when sitting the exam.
- Prepare all mock exams, buy an EPC book and familiarise yourself with the content.
- Prepare a study plan and adhere to it. During the intensive preparation phase, try to do 1-2 papers per week over 6 months.
- Preparation of a general out-line of the answer with suggested wording for different possible issues helped me a great deal, mainly for the Amendments Section. For preparing such a document I took several old exams (E/M and Ch) and closely studied the model answer afterwards. Otherwise, concentrate on understanding the PSA.
- Preparation is important and mock exams in real conditions.
- Pre-EQE is easy, get familiar with a good annotated version of EPC and print off the PCT applicant’s guide and EPO Guidelines and you’ll be fine.
- pray to god
- Practise, practise, practise.
- Practise lots of papers to time. Make sure you’re well rested.
- Practise in making quick but sound assessments and writing them down quickly once you’ve made them. Speed is an important factor, if you want to actually put down on paper what you’ve decided to write.
- Practise Hans writing for many hours in a row.
- Practise and exercises.
- Practise a lot of questions.
- Practice, practice, practice. And read the Guidelines again and again.
- PRACTICE, PRACTICE, PRACTICE
- practice, practice, practice
- Practice writing by hand and take courses to learn fast-reading. The biggest problem is the lack of time, there is just NO chance to read and analyze the text as you usually do in your normal work. You have to read, make a decision and start writing and still you will not have time to answer all questions. Thus, you will easily panic at the exam and make crucial mistakes.
- Practice with the compendium and study the Guidelines for Examination particularly part G and H.
- Practice past papers to time.
- Practice papers for the new combined papers A and B are few and far between. Need to practice past papers in a different discipline to the one you are used to, e.g. chemists should practice past mechanics.
papers.

- practice mock pre-examinations under realistic conditions (time pressure)

Practice looking up the answer to every question even if you think you already know the answer as in the exam you won’t be so confident in yourself and will look up things you already know to be sure. Can throw off your timings.

- practice by doing as many former exams as available also try to get your hands on as many mock exams as possible. always discuss your answers with an experienced colleague as you might get the answer right but not the complete reasoning behind it by just reading the examiners report.

- Practice as much past papers as possible.

Practice and practice. Ask detailed feedback of your answers.

Practice all past exams and mock exams in real examination conditions and focus your studies on the important aspects you learned from the past/mock exams.

Practice a methodology for answering

Practice a lot of questions for the D exam.

Practice

- Please take care: For the pre-exam you don’t need to know the legal basis. You only need to know the answer. For paper D1, it is absolutely necessary to know the legal basis also. This means: when you prepare for the pre-exam it strongly recommended to learn the legal basis also, because you need it for paper D1.

- Please reduce the prior art numbers or pages

planning, organization, meticulousness, regularity

Plan carefully.

Pick a good annotated version of the EPC as your central source of information, index it well, and do soon a couple of the oldest past exams to understand what is required. From there, fine-tune your learning strategy and sources. Finally, do all past exams under real timing conditions.

Personally, I think pre-eqe is an unfunny puzzle game the EPO prepares just to make cash. Good luck. personal investment in time and money always higher

Pay great attention to timing constraints

Past papers are a good method of preparation but they must be marked by a third party to ensure a realistic mark.

Particularly if you are not an engineer, do as many practice claim analyses as possible to make sure you are familiar with the terminology and style of questions.

Participate in mock exams.

Paper C is about luck, nothing more. For the others, just learn the law and practice a few papers and you will be fine.

Pack extra socks

- only legal knowledge is not enough , please focus on claim analysis part

Only for my cooperation partners.

One of the most important parts of the preparation is doing previous papers. It is very important to understand what is expected in each part of the examination.

Once you’ve gone through the materials once or twice, immediately go through all previous pre-exams and any other mock exams you can find.

Not really: just use the old examination papers to train your personal time management. Also study the sample solutions for these papers to understand, which structure is required.

Not really.

- not really

Not focus too much on practising past papers. Exam committees apparently feel the urge to be original in their choice of topics from time to time.

- none

- No.

- No intensive studying in the week before EQE
Never give up!

- need to prepare as much as possible in advance - this seem obvious but it's not always possible to do owing to family, work, travel commitments.
- Ne pas hésiter à faire énormément d’annales et d’exercices pour la partie “analyse des revendications”
- Must have a tutor and attend to dedicated courses.
- More practice part I D questions earlier. This took the vast majority of the preparation time.
- More clearer guidance for claim analysis.
- More “Claim analysis” exercises could be prepared. There are many legal questions available but regarding to “claim analysis” only those of previous exams
- Methodology, methodology. Even paper B is a puzzle that needs to be solved, as much as Paper C. It is not a real life office action, so train to focus on the highest marked sections.
- Mark the guidelines well - prepare an overview on time Limits regarding EPC and PCT - prepare an overview on which time limits are possible for further processing/reinstallation
- Mandatory to take a course on the papers as based on regulations or previous papers it is not clear what is expected.
- Make the pre-exam mock paper quite early to see what is expected
- Make sure you have alphabetical indexes of everything. It’s easier to look in an index than to flip through hundreds of similarly coloured tabs.
- Make sure to sit at least 3 papers in the allocated time, especially papers C and D
- make sure the answer sheet is filled out on time; avoid getting under time pressure and making copying-mistakes
- Make compendium papers, study examiner reports and candidate answers!
- Lucky and patiente! and asudy of course!!
- Look into examiners report early in the preparations to see how the exam should be answered. Use daily D questions.
- Long term study with a regular question solving
- Learn to use your reference book from the start if your preparation.
- Learn by answering questions.
- Learn as much as you can off by heart, because you will always want to look it up in the exam because you can, even if you are 95% sure. If you know the answer, put that. This is a test of arrogance just as much as, if not more than, knowledge. Recently and infuriatingly it has become just a second paper D. It seems that it must be treated that way to pass.
- learn a fast way to write
- La bible, ce sont les directives. Je dirais que 90% des réponses aux questions y sont. Utiliser seulement les Visser et Baque quand certains points des Directives ne sont pas claires ou pas assez exemplifiées. Mais pour l’examen et la préparation, il faut connaître les Directives et savoir trouver rapidement l’information. Pour la compréhension des questions dans D penser à lire “Tactics for D” de Cees Mulder et Nyske Blokhuis; et “Smart in C” des mêmes auteurs
- Knowing the Guidelines inside out, there is no time to look thinks up. Know the EPC inside out, there is no time to look thinks up. Prepare yourself for following situation: Teach your body to survive without food & drinks for 5,5 h, without using the bathroom - simply because there is no time. Try to write meaningful sentences without thinking about it, because there ist simply no time. Just function without thinking about what you are doing. Try to write while you are reading at least 5 pages at the same time, because there is simply no time.
- Know your reference text very well. It will save you when something unusual comes up in Paper D.
- know how answer must be set up in view of question. write “only” if it is targeted to get marks.

**Key is the assessment of the information (annexes A1-A6). Find a way (e.g. matrix on A3 paper) to organise the information (features, claims etc.) and use a standard problem-solution approach. Prepare these in advance.**
Just pay for the courses to pass the EQE, even though they're really expensive and even if (as with me) it's your own money. The EQE has nothing to do with reality. Candidates need to be taught how to stop thinking like patent attorneys and start thinking like EQE candidates. There is a small group of for-profit vendors that are tightly integrated with the EQE (see, for example, tutor's report). They have unique private knowledge and influence - basically selling a “recipe to pass.” Just pay them and get over the unfairness.

join a course before December to identify weaknesses
It's very important to know how marks are given.
It's important to study, but if you are not English, German or French, you need to improve your language skill.
It's advisable to learn in a group in order to reflect the studied matter.
It would be useful for there to be an official / suggested material to take into the examination for the PRE exam. For example, the EPI course had varying opinions as to whether it was necessary to take the Impact on national Law book into the Exam. This seems like overkill for the pre exam and clarification on whether a pre exam question would require an answer which could only be found in this would have been useful.

it was fun!

It is very important to plan very well the time we have for studying and be aware of the time we need for each part
It is not easy but during the exam you need to be methodic in order to save time and open-minded in order not to miss points
It is never too early to start studying. Read the Guidelines.
It is needed to work very much and maybe they have 3 or more resources
It is important to have an understanding both at work and at home for the studies, and to have scheduled time for studies. Start to study several months Before the exam.
It is good to participate in a course when studying for exam as well as make timetable for studies.
It is essential to do as many previous papers under realistic conditions (especially regarding time management).
It is a rather long process. Start studying early enough.

Is it worth it? I have learned a lot by trying each year. And in the beginning I did not know but now I do. I do not like that so much effort has to be put on how to not reply so your not waisting your time.

invest as much time for correcting mock pre-exams as for the exams themselves
In preparing for the EQE pre-exam, I found doing past papers very helpful in the later stages of preparation.
In paper A, it appears that a claim that is too broad is punished much more severely than a claim that is too narrow, so it appears to be safer to make the claim narrow if unsure.
In comparison to previous years, in 2018’s pre Exam problem-solution approach and could-would approach covered a substantially bigger share - whatever resources you find for practicing these, use them!
If you think you are starting to prepare early, you aren’t. Start earlier. Much earlier. Time is your enemy both in preparation and in the examination hall.
If you struggle with mechanical claims analysis, be super-well prepared for the legal questions. One must not allow to be sloppy in the preparation because the legal questions will make the difference between pass and fail. One will lose many points in the claims analysis part anyways. It's highly recommended to practice all past past pre-exams and Mock exams. Also, finding a study group and discussing answers makes a big difference.

If you struggle between family and work, start early.
I would suggest to start studing from EPC, EPO Guidline, WIPO Articles and Rules, WIPO Guidline at least 1 or even 2 years before you plan to sit pre-examination. 2 years would be necessary for these, who must do this exam in foreign language. I would suggest EPO on-line course and DeltaPatents questions books “Pre-exam book” and “Basic legal questions for pre-exam and paper D. Coffee-break questions are also certainly good, but this year I could not use this possibility. On-line course took a lot of time.
I would suggest to other candidates to follow the Delta Patents course where they can learn a good methodology to solve the C paper.
I would recommend taking part in a course as well as doing as much legal questions as possible, the latter being much more important, in my opinion.
I would advise to attend a D paper training course in which there is a individual correction and where an
individual mark is given. I regret that even after attending main course and intensive course (from Ceipi) the first mark I will get for a D paper will be the one from the real exam. Tutors from A, B, C papers made the effort of making individual corrections and delivering individual marks (even if quite approximate) which makes assessment easier, and shows if we are ready or not.

I was told to attempt at least five past papers for each exam. I agree that after four or five papers, taking careful note of the examiners comments and proposed answers for each, it became much clearer what was expected. For paper D it would have been helpful to prepare more abbreviated synopses of a typical PCT application, typical EP direct application, etc, possibly with references to details in the reference texts to help keep a grip on reality when under pressurized exam conditions.

I think that the nature of the A, B, C and DII-exam is such that you have to absorb a lot of information at once. You reach this “climax” after reading all the documents. This is a point where you can easily panic, because at that moment you “have all the information” in your head, but no oversight. It is essential that you are aware that this moment exists in these exams, and may cause you to panic.... It is essential that you keep your cool at this moment :-(

I studied casually 2-3 weekend per month for 2 years, started studying intensively 2-3 months in advance. I strongly recommend the Delta Patents book of questions for the pre-EQE and main exam.

I myself konow now how to tackle the time problem and which details I need to check more for the next time. Training the prior papers in time limited manner would make a big difference:

I highly recommend the Cees Mulder Book Self Study Guide for the PreExam, as well as the DeltaPatents PreExam Book

I found the preparation under long seminar made by CEIPI really useful!

I did all d-papers 2013 to 2017 intensively. But compared to this years paper-DII it not much effect. That was because of the completely unexpected DII this year. I can only ask a BIG WHY

I believe my suggestions will not be much different from the ones every tutor would preach: spend sufficient amount of time solving the earlier EQE examples, especially for C and D part, for you have to come up with your own personalized system which you use at the exam and which effectively helps you to save time, sort the information from the paper and most importantly keep a good overview over the huge amount of information provided in the paper.

Have suitable template sheets with standard phrases and A3 tables for organizing Information for each paper Do a lot of past papers Develop Timing schedules for each paper and stick to them to make sure you finish on time Develop a consistent colour code for the documents Use erasable Frixion highlighters in the papers in case you need to cut out and use parts of the exam paper Make sure you have worked long enough with your favourite annotated EPC Version and complement it by your own notes and remarks

Have some thing to relax

Have a time management plan and stick to it. Consider what to do if things take longer than expected.

Good preparation of your EPC, PCT and guidelines are very important. Make the compendium exams directly before the real examination under real conditions.

Good physical and mental condition before the examiantion day.

Good luck. You will most likely do very well on the legal part with good preparation. However, no matter how hard you prepare, you will most likely lose many marks on the claim analysis part due to vague or subjective questioning, hence good look in trying to gauge the true intent of the question setters in those questions.

Good luck.

Good luck!

Go in the CEIPI course!

Get used to read mechanics inventions early in the preparation phase (if you are not from the field of mechanics, to be sure you understand the invention quickly). Train the previous pre-exams under more time pressure than you have in the exam. The stress situation makes you doubt and check more things (and thereby use more time) than you would at home.

-Get the reference material you plan on using early and train in exam conditions. Time yourself, as lack of time is a huge problem for most. -Prepare checklists, they save time and give you a safe structure if you are stressed. -Courses (I did CEIPI C and D) are very useful to check that you aren’t completely on the wrong track in your preparation. -Use the compendium (and/or special preparation material) to train. Real life work does not really prepare you for the exam - the exam is a puzzle to be solved, and you often have to find the hidden clues that lead you to the only expected solution, which is quite different from normal work.

get physically fit

Get help from experience persons, and by experienced I mean experience with the EQE. Study the
examiners report, to see how to get the marks, focus on this. Do not try to write linguistically appealing textes. It is ok to use the same syntax over and over again. It is not an essay.

Get an idea about the kind of questions by going through an exam of the previous years. Find a good resource for finding shortcuts. Study by answering questions to all relevant aspects and read the relevant texts.

Früh genug intensiv lernen (mindestens 8-10 Monate vor den Prüfungen 25h pro Woche) und alte Prüfungen bearbeiten, um Methodik für das Lösen der Aufgaben innerhalb der Prüfungszeit zu entwickeln.

Forget how good you are at being an attorney, how good you are at drafting, amending, putting oppositions together or giving advice. That is irrelevant in the world of EQE’s. Suck it up.

For the pre exam, candidates should read Visser, Guidelines and Case law as much as possible, in the summer time or before. However after September, it is the best to focus on the online training materials. They are more than enough for the focused study. Until the exam, I was concerned that I did not read as much as necessary from the other sources but than I realized after September it is only possible to focus on the online training and it is actually more than enough.

For the pre exam candidates should read Visser, Guidelines and Case law as much as possible, in the summer time or before. After September it is the best to focus on the online training materials. They are more than enough for the focused study.

For the main D-paper start preparation at least 7 months before the exam day. Attend CEIPI D course and do mock exams (delta patents). Do the 6 latest D-exams in the compendium.

For pre-examination: When preparing by doing old pre-examinations from the compendium, answer the legal questions like you would answer the legal questions of a D paper; i.e. by looking up the legal basis for the answer, even if you know the answer. In that way it is possible to learn where (articles, rules, guidelines) and how to find answers.

For pre examination training Daily D questions are very useful to review basic legal knowledge as well as coffee break questions

for paper D, at least one year of study and attending preparation courses

For paper A, attempt both Mechanics and Chemistry past papers

For paper A make sure you spend time on both the product and process claims. They are probably going to be equally important.

For each thought and argument, try to remember the corresponding article and rule

For candidates writing in German, I recommend using the actual version of the book “EPÜ- und PCT-Tabellen” written by Düwel/Gabriel/Renz/Teufel (costs about 76 €). Moreover I recommend taking part in the EPO online training course and taking the documents therefrom into the examination together with the above-mention book and the EPC.

Follow the “EQE pre-examination paper 2018 - online training course” offered at the “E-learning centre of the European Patent Academy”

Focus on understanding the subjects that came up in old pre-exams extensively. While studying, make a list of what a wording of a question in previous pre-exams was supposed to mean in the old exams and be aware that this does not always coincide with the commonly understood meaning of this wording.

Focus on the law to ensure you don’t fail D. No one wants to do that twice.

Focus on exam technique/ papers to time

Finding a suitable method by practicing Compendium

Find a study group that keeps you committed and on track

Find a good course for both, the legal part and especially the claim analysis part, which is many times very grey and subjective. I don’t know which course this would be.

Expect the unexpected. I mean that the pre-exam claim analysis part was not the level to entry the examination process as a pre-exam should have been, but rather a solid EPC knowledge a practice was expected.

Expect the unexpected.

Expect the unexpected

Expect the exam to be much harder. Everyone thought it was unexpectedly difficult.

Expect the exam to be harder than the previous year

Expect anything in paper D. That paper is not consistent with previous years and practice previous old papers D (before pre examination) in the time of new papers D (after pre examination) in order to try to have
any chance to pass it.

exercising the old papers is by far the most effective way to prepare

Exercise fast writing.

exercise fast answering of the legal questions

Exams of previous years must be tried in real conditions (4 hours time limit). Understanding the reasoning leading to the correct answers is important.

Especially for part D to start preparation earlier than I did :-) And to review the latest amendments to the guidelines (e.g. its amended version, or list of major amendments), because a lot of topics can be found there which eventually will be basis for an exam.

EPO online course in combination with the CEIPI seminars provide a solid preparation.

EPO does not think that chemists understand with difficulty mechanical papers. In plus EQE is difficult for not native speakers, with other than French, English and German mother tongues. EPO Secretariat does not thing on these points

Ensure you know your exam material well and can navigate through it quickly and easily. Practice the claim interpretation sections carefully.

Ensure you have a model solutions with structure for several different attacks ready to be copied, but make sure these contain as few words as possible to write. Preparing for the C-exam using as many old exam papers as possible, and actually doing at least 3-4 under the correct exam timing gives the best preparation for how little amount of time there actually is. Important to note what mistakes are made and learn mainly from those.

Ensure that you take all of the mock examinations under exam conditions. Use the online EPO course and take an active part in the forum discussions as it really helps. Start revision early and get very comfortable with the texts you intend to take into the exam.

Eight to six months start writing longer texts with the pen.

Early start is important, training courses are worth the money.

Early in the preparation try to get a good overview of all documents required. This way you are not surprised later in the preparation that “another” book exists which you should also know. And get used to finding your way in the “paper versions” of these books (instead of using for instance the PCT applicants guide on the internet to check data while learning).

Early focus on claim analysis questions.

dont underestimate claim analysis and work through the type of question and try to figure out how to target the questions without reading through the whole material before in hope to get it clicked in

Dont stress about A and B. Teile A und B sind Glückssache, vorausgesetzt dass man die Methodik der Prüfung verstanden hat.

Dont start too early with the old preeqe tests cause there are not much and they are important to try time donot start, give up

Don’t get sick! Sleep sufficiently, eat right, keep away form plague-bearers, and continue your usual exercise regime, even if it means less study time. Back off if you get study-fatigue, and make sure to rest up mentally (and not study) the last few days before the exam(s). Do as many practice exams and questions as possible. Delta Patents have very good compendiums (real exams, but with detailed analysis) and books with practice questions. On D1 it seems that the points roughly equate to 1/3 for right answer, 1/3 for correct application of the law and reference thereto, and 1/3 on “extras”, i.e. information that was not directly asked for but somehow still expected. Only by doing a whole lot of practice questions is it possible to figure out what kind of information is wanted for the last 1/3.

Don’t worry, relax…It does not matter how much or how you prepared the Examination, that day will be noisy works in the building, and….if your seat is near the doors, start thinking about next year. Don’t give up!!

Don’t worry too much, and there is no need to start intensive revision 6 months in advance for the pre-EQEs.

Don’t waste much energy in being afraid of the EQE. It’s not that bad. Many people may fail because they have the wrong motivation. Don’t go into your exams for not passing them. Attend the exams to pass them! Don’t worry, when other candidates tell you, how many hours they spent in preparing. The best preparation is your own preparation. Don’t spend money for courses, if you are not the “course learning type”. At a certain point (in my case one month) you will realize, that your skills will not increase that much if you spend more time learning. In your preparation your main focus must lie on “how do the Examiners want me to answer?” and not “how would i act in my professional life?”. Use the Compendium. Try to study the reports of the Examiners and try to figure out what is really important for them. Try to write fast but not unreadable.
Try to think fast and not too much on small issues.
Don’t use past papers as a guide as to the nature of the exam, as you will be misled.
Don’t try and read the EPO Online course materials like a book but definitely use them for reference. The materials are really good for that.
Don’t think as a patent attorney, but be prepared what the examination committee wants you to tell them.
Don’t study if you have kids in the age from 0 to 6. These first years of your kids life are more important than the EQE - you can do it later.

Don’t start too early - a few months before is enough!
n’m not rely on old papers only, try and do as many questions from different sources
Don’t overly focus on D Section 1.
Don’t overdo it, there’s no point to it.
don’t marry, don’t have children, don’t go to work

Don’t give up! :-) If you fail an exam, you will repeat the studies and thereby get a deeper knowledge.
Don’t get lulled into a false sense of security ...the earlier examination papers (2012,2013 etc.) are CONSIDERABLY easier than the later exam papers ...in particular 2016, 2017 and 2018 were more and more challenging every year.

Don’t forget about the rest of your life - make sure you build in time for fun activities outside EQE preparation

Don’t do this quizz.
Don’t assume that the format won’t change!
do your studies early and talk to other people who have done the exams - you’ll find useful info and what can be best for you

Do your best, but do not give up your life and relationships over this exam. It is important but it is not fundamental.

Do your best with the legal part, since the claim analysis one is less reliable.

Do the previous pre-Exams and plan your studying from that.
Do the previous exams in exam conditions. Try to have a good studying pace starting at least 3-4 months in advance.

Do the past papers. Be prepared for the exam to be more difficult than previous years. Make use of the epo guidelines, alongside your reference books such as Visser.

Do the past papers and try and deeply understand the reasons for your wrong answers. Learn how to look up rules and articles quickly and get a general feeling for the EPC and why the rules are necessary. Try and get experience of unusual procedures in your day job.

Do the exams from the previous years under examination conditions
Do the exam step by step, e.g. consider not to write all papers within one year. Consider the special requirements of paper C. If you work thoroughly (=slowly) in your daily work - paper C is likely to become a challenge for you.

Do the EPO course and past papers
Do paper exam in real condition (timing)

Do not use or rely on your working experience. Study EQE-compendium in detail to learn, what the EPO wants to see.

Do not underestimate.

Do not try the preparation on your own, work with in-house colleagues and tutor(s), especially patent attorney's who passed the EQE in the last years. Make sure to start on time and spend the needed effort.

do not try the EQE with small children

Do not think that the previous papers are sufficient for preparations. Part DII was very and unnecessarily messy.

Do not overanalyse questions

Do not let yourself scare by the comments of tutors - especially during CEIPI-courses. A lot of information provided there, for example that one must write at least 10 C-papers in preparation, otherwise one would fail, seems to be overdone. Do not underestimate the stamina you need to sit the whole 18 hours.

Do not learn alone.
Do not give up!

Do not expect the next exam to be like the previous ones!

Do not bring too much documents for the pre-examination. Just use the strict necessary documents that you did the training with. You will not have time to use them all during the exam.

Do not anticipate a similar question style to occur in your year as had occurred in the previous 7 to 8 years of EQEs, as any academically minded person would anticipate. Do all past exam papers for more than the last 10 years (approximately 170 hours plus of study in itself). Do not anticipate exams of a consistent/standardised difficulty compared to previous years, as any academically minded person would anticipate. Expect the standard to be more difficult and expect lower pass rates than previous few years without warning and without a reason.

Do most of the previous exams

do mock exams in real time conditions

Do lots of past papers to time and attend a training course specifically designed to address the unique problems (and style thereof) of the EQE that do not tend to arise very often in practice.

Do lots of past papers and read the examiners comments thoroughly.

Do lots of old exams and read (preferably work through) the original legal texts (EPC, PCT, Guidelines)

Do coffee break Questions and the daily D and take the deltapatent course.

Do as much as possible EQE from previous years. Try to do at least 3 under exam conditions. Take into account you should finish them with 0.5-1h less than the real exam => even if you're fully prepared, you will run out of time ... Study in group

Do as many past papers and practice questions as possible

Do as many past C-papers as possible, particularly the ones from the last 7 years.

Do as many papers to time as possible

Do all the previous exams and prepare your own notes for the exam.

Do a preparatory course, preferably the Deltapatents one.

Do a lot of Quizzes!

Do a lot of old papers and as many legal questions as possible
do a lot of mock questions

Do a lot of exercises.

Do a dedicated EQE course for each paper you will sit. Practice papers of previous years and analyse examiner's reports.

Discuss a study plan of action with supervisors and ensure that the workload in the two months before the examination is not too high

Die Fähigkeit schneller lesen zu können, sollte verbessert werden.

Devil is hidden in the details

Develop a suitable workflow and practise previous papers under real-time exam conditions to the extent possible.

Develop a good methodology for claim analysis Keep track of the time during the exam. If you are not ready with the legal part after 1h30, start claim analysis and get back to the legal questions after you have finished claim analysis.

Delta patent course

Dedicate more time than you think you need for the PCT - it is just as important as learning the EPC.

Decide in advance how long time you should spend on the first part so that you get time left for part 2.

D is the only paper where “knowing” really matters. So invest on D as much as you can.

Crucial is to go through all the previous exams, understand the answers and, for the legal part, create a cross-reference table from the answers to the EPC and GL.

Consider the short time and get familiar with answering in a short time.

Consider attending an pre-examination course organized by one of epi, CEIPI or Delta Patents.

Concentrate a lot on exam technique - do all of the past papers you can get your hands on.

Compendium

Claim analysis questions are often lengthy and tricky. So, in addition to thorough preparation, time management during the exam is very important.
Chose one methodology and practise a lot with the past exams.

Choose to visit the dedicated preparatory courses of CEIPI or Delta Patents to prepare for the EQE.

check the time, and check you have all the pages of the examination paper

CEIPI courses and Compendium.

Candidates, really need to understand the terms and language used in paper’s scenarios as this may not be how an phrases or term would generally be interpreted in real life, or in real life may be open to further/different interpretation.

Candidates who sat the exam for the first time should start to intensive focused study before between one and two years in advance.

Candidates should early get an overview about international and european patent law and should early try to understand the methodology of the Examen questions.

C is more about getting the routine going than the other exams

Buy the Visser commented EPC

Browse all possible exam preparation material

Bring warm clothes and gloves. For preparation of paper D, ensuring you know your references very well, to rely on as few references as possible. In preparation of the other papers, doing past papers are possibly the best way, in addition to preparation courses.

Bring warm clothes

Bring coffee in a thermal mug. You don’t need to study lots for the pre-exam, just start 2-4 weeks in advance on the weekends and use DeltaPatents book to do the older pre-exams and see there comments, particularly on the answers you got wrong! It should not be hard if you go through their whole book. Do not waste time just reading the guidelines or Visser, you will not know which parts are important and will just get lost in too much info.

Bon courage...

Better make sure you wearing proper clothes as it might be getting really cold on that day. Also, make sure to fill out the answer sheet straight away after each question. 5 mins at the end of the exam won’t suffice to get this sorted.

Being prepared well is one thing, it is also crucial to be physically fit when sitting the exams. Take time to “feed your brain” during the exams, 5,5 h is a long time!

Become well-acquainted with your choice of reference book.

Become familiar with your reference texts.

Be ready for changes in future papers with respect to past papers. Be calm and sleep well

Be quick, be smart, be lucky and pray, if believer.

Be patient, time will fly when writing the real thing.

Be over-prepared, as difficulty and time pressure seem to rise substantially at intervals of about 2 years. Probably new attorneys will have to be much more competent than old ones

Be lucky enough to be mother language in one of EPO official languages.

Be Focus, Keep the pace.

Be carrefful to the time!

Be carefull of the time! it is more and more longer each year! Prepare well all your reference books and be organize.

Attend to a DeltaPatents course, and try to find best ways to study from your colleagues or tutor. Also read other sources than just Visser and PCT book.

Attend courses and maybe sit a trial

As an examiner, I found that the C-exam was most like my daily work, so I found it easiest to prepare for (of the pre, A, B and C); I only needed to learn in how much detail the answers need to be written down, not any more how to pick CPA, formulate tech prob, etc. Although I read through the DeltaPatents C book, I found it didn’t add all that much; lots of the information in the book is unnecessary to absorb to pass any of the last 6 years’ C exams. what you need to become good at is reading the annexes with a set of target features and problems in mind.

All chemists should find a tutor who can teach them claims analysis relating to mechanical topics.

A preparation time of at least 6 months before is really recommended

All Klausuren sollten immer unter Zeitdruck geschrieben werden

All chemists should find a tutor who can teach them claims analysis relating to mechanical topics.

A preparation time of at least 6 months before is really recommended
Chapter 3 Training/Emplyment under Article 11 (2)(a) REE

Q 16) In which EPC member state did you complete most of your training pursuant to Art. 11(2)(a)REE?

Q17) I completed most of the training (Art. 11(2)(a) REE) in

- Private practice (973)
- Industry (406)
Q18) How would you rate the support of your supervisor/employer in view of your preparation for the examination(s)?

![Support of your employer/supervisor chart]

- Very good
- Good
- Adequate
- Bad
- Very bad

Q19a) How much time did your supervisor/employer allow for your preparation for the examination(s) in total? Please indicate the number of working days:

![Total preparation time chart]

Q19b) How much time did your supervisor/employer allow for attending courses for your preparation for the examination(s)? Please indicate the number of working days:

![Course preparation time chart]
Q20) How would you rate the amount of time allowed by your supervisor/employer for attending courses?

Amount of study leave allowed by …

- 112: More than sufficient
- 561: Sufficient
- 241: Borderline
- 201: Too little
- 210: Inadequate

Q21a) How much time did you spend on dedicated training for the examination(s) with your supervisor/employer as defined by Art.11(2) (a) REE (i.e. the person who signed your certificate of training or employment)? Please indicate the number of working days:

- 0 - 125: 476
- 1 - 4: 320
- 5 - 10: 193
- 11 - 49: 155
- 50+: 73

Q21b) Which percentage of the working days mentioned under 21a) did you spend during the first year of training? Please indicate the percentage:

- 0 - 20%: 754
- 21 - 40%: 217
- 41 - 60%: 118
- 61 - 80%: 63
- 81 - 100%: 60
Q21c) Which percentage of the working days mentioned under 21a) did you spend during the second year of training? Please indicate the percentage:

![Bar chart showing percentage distribution.]

Q21d) Which percentage of the working days mentioned under 21a) did you spend during the third year of training? Please indicate the percentage:

![Bar chart showing percentage distribution.]

Q22) What would you suggest to supervisors/employers in order to improve candidates' preparation for the examination(s)?

Working in the industry, the A and B exams are pretty easy as that is what you work with daily. C and D is not something you work with. Thus the methodology to write short C and D answers giving points should be the focus. Opposition is not even done by the legal team in our country, but by a few in Germany...

Within the last 5 years of preparation for EQE we (those which are not registered attorneys) have had for one year an internal course of two female colleagues which was phantastic. 3 hours a week, and we got every question answered. Both colleagues left the IP department. I will never ask my chief any question again, that causes a weakness in the yearly performance estimation.

With regard that most of the Supervisors/Employers have much more experiences in this working area, it would be good if these people would take more time to explain their candidates some main topics of the EPC or PCT by a direct conversation/teaching. This helped me a lot.

Well, studying is a lot easier in the beginning because then you don’t have that much work to do. In the third year you are supposed to actually contribute and the work takes a lot of energy which is not put on EQE. So maybe it would be better to plan for keeping the work load at a more reasonable level, at least if they wish for their employees to pass.

We were not provided any dedicated training for the pre-EQE. However, we are provided dedicated training for the EQE. This seems appropriate.
Wake up and train your employees appropriately. If one of your employees fails the EQE, this is more expensive than him/her becoming an EPA.

Vary training, focus on legal aspects of EPC & PCT

Try to diversify the everyday work to cover most topic i believe learning by doing is most successful

Try to answer recent papers.

Training courses should be paid.

to the EPO: start supporting your employees! If exempted from doing the pre-exam one was not even allowed access to the in house preparation weekends

To show all non-standard cases (applications) ever experienced before the EPO, they somehow tend to fix in one’s memory very easily.

To provide them with material and a study guide and be a guidance for their students

To provide more continuous and organized in-house training

To perform some of the paper together with the candidate (during the preparation period) in order to give more practical suggestions on how to improve candidate preparation. Moreover, in this way the supervisor would be able to see what the candidate is lacking and he could give to the candidate practical-work that could further help the candidate in his preparation.

To pay courses (CEIPI, Deltapatents, ...)

To not rush candidates and to prepare them well, by means of spending time together reviewing the doubts and answering their questions properly

To let more day off so they could train themselves with former papers in real conditions (5h30 for paper C or D is not possible in an office day)

To hold some dedicated training with several candidates on a regular basis, e.g. once a month, during full qualification period in order to have some Q & A followed by discussion

To give personal training days outside the office (= without regular work responsibilities) for maybe a couple of weeks. Organized internal training groups and feedback from the colleague or tutor.

To focus in claim analysis and not so much in Epc

To explain the candidates the way the EQE committee interprets the Claim Analysis.

To draft an education course which courses to attend and how much time to use on preparation etc.

to deal with the amount of learning stuff at an early stage and point out relevant questions

To be involved in the training

To allow dedicated study time.

To allow candidates to get some working days for the trainings or courses

To allow candidates to dedicate several hours a week during working hours to preparation and to monitor/guide progress.

Time for preparation should be allowed during workday

Time and training opportunities have to be given to study this exam

Throw them in the deep end

This examination has reached a ridiculous level ridiculously quickly. If you wish to have your employees pass this exam, do not underestimate the time and effort they will now have to put towards passing it. Questions in papers produced from 2011 to 2016 drastically under-represent the vagueness and obscurity of the questions presented in the 2017 and 2018 papers. Exam stress seems to not be considered at all in the preparation of these papers, therefore the less insecure your candidates are about the answers they know, the more time they will have to complete the ever increasingly vague, long, and reference management based claims analysis section.

They should keep themselves up to date. They should be familiar with recent papers and how to solve them. They should give the candidates a feeling for patent law. And they should candidates to be very familiar with the rules and articles of the EPC. They shall not tell that is necessary to know sooo many decisions by heart. But they shall tell candidates how to find them quickly.

They should grant candidates more time to prepare for the examination.

There need to be concrete provisions for supervisors to allocate a certain amount of days/hours to candidates’ studying/training for the exam.

There is nothing you can do to improve your position if the EPO are going to set ridiculously long and difficult claim analysis. You can be the most prepared candidate in Europe and still the EQE is unrealistic
that enables the candidate to finish in time.

There is a perception that the Pre-Exam is very easy amongst supervisors, this is no longer true, it would be useful if supervisors were aware of this and ready to reduce workloads in the lead up to allow time at home in the evenings to study.

There are hardly any resources available from EPO to master the could-would approach and problem-solution approach in ways of self-study - although it is an important tool for daily work with European patent applications etc. whenever the question of inventive step is considered. Due to the important role of these algorithms, I can only advise using whatever resources you find for practicing these.

The previous questions were not relevant in my case as I am an EPO employee.

The previous questions relating to the supervisors make no sense for EPO-examiners.

The examination requires intensive focused study of at least 3 months. Furthermore, last 1 month should be dedicated to the practise under time pressure. They should allow the candidates adequate time for the preparations. Courses are highly recommended.

The exam did not have much to do with every day practice, at least I never encountered an office action containing multiple negations to confuse the addressee. Hence, more money for prep courses and more time to prepare will be needed, if this is going to continue.

The epo provided this year a weekend course for private attendance which was appreciated. perhaps more courses could be provided in house to give follow up support or provide contact points to answer specific questions or provide a marking service.

The employing two law firms of my first two years clearly ignored their obligations. It is outrageous how patent attorneys take the utmost advantage of candidates as low-cost staff. As I had already worked as a manager in industry & business, I dare criticize this since other companies do support and develop their staff responsibly, see this as their obligation even. I still spent alot of time to prepare for the EQE intensively in my third year, i.e. the Amtsjahr at DPMA & the German Patent Court. However, this is a sort-of privately financed phase as you will well know (without any income for a full-time internship).

Tell the candidates that the EQE is very artificial and that real life experience hinders the successful completion of the EQE.

Taking the EQE and preparing for it is a valuable professional development which helps EPO employees, specifically examiners, to better understand the “other side of the desk”. Instead of allowing EQE training only outside working hours, it should be possible to do it actually within working hours; after all, it is definitely work-related and improves our service to the applicants when we understand them better.

Take your time and invest in your students.

Take the Delta patents courses and the EPO online course, and do the questions associated therewith. This is more than adequate for getting a good score on the pre-exam.

Take EPO-PreEQE course at the beginning of the training

Take care at all

Take an interest in the training. It is not just a formality of signing the candidate’s form.

Support candidate by reducing work load, particularly weekend workloads in the last several weeks leading up to exam. Reserve regular time to discuss specific legal questions

Supervisors usually don’t have time to spend on specific training for the EQE.

Supervisors should be more honest about their time and interest in training someone. If they lack both, candidates should be allowed to participate in seminars as much as they feel necessary.

Supervisors have only limited idea of the level required to pass the pre-examination. They may believe that the required level is still the same as it was during the years from 2012 to 2014 and that pre-examination is only a formality. Please, encourage your trainee early enough.

Suggest and pay for courses

Study actual papers... Time passes!

Strict focus on the problem-and-solution approach in all office action replies. Involve your candidates into an opposition proceeding.

Stress the fact that normal legal knowledge, which you use in your daily work is not enough. You need to practice exam methodology, because the exam is very different from normal patent attorney work.

start focused training 6 month before and make a realistic plane for the preparations

Spend time going over past papers

Spend more time training during working hours, more courses and days off to study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special holidays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sorry but this question and the ones under Q21 are a bit misleading as referring to the first-third year of training only and not applicable to to my and many others’ situation (many years of patent practice and EQE undertaken Step-by-Step, according to work and personal possibility of studying)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some (a) intro AND (b) some “dedicated exam hints” could have been given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since I am EPO examiner all these questions do not apply and should be delted from the staticisics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting past paper goals and marking them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sent your people to CEIPI courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Send them to specialized courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>run some seminars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remind the candidates to start preparing for the exam early. Candidates should excercise “on the job” working on EP-cases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly discuss legal (exam- ) questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular schedualed training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular discussion on latest EPC changes. How to apply the EPC in your daily work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce workload to allow for revision time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce the workload.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce the workload for exam candidates in the months before the exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce the normal workload for exam candidates in the months before the exams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce the normal workload for EQE candidates in the months before the exams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognize that this is a terribly stressful period and that sometimes you need to back off because preparing for the test would be difficult enough if one were doing it instead of working a full-time job rather than along side it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realize that training takes time. If the candidate is to have enough time to train, properly, other tasks must be eased during training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realise that it takes time to prepare and that it is hardly possible to produce at least 100% at work, be a good parent and study to be sufficient prepared.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing at least a little bit of time to prepare for the EQE would improve the preparation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide them sufficient support (financial and time) for the external training, especially when they are grandfathers, who did not pass any EQE exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide the necessary days for attending courses and pay for the related expenses. Provide at least 1 day before the examination day and the examination day, as normal paid working days.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide the candidate with its own EPC annotated book well in advance of the examination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide some Training time at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide some time to prepare the exam and some budget for training. I prepared alone on my spare time, week-ends and holidays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide more time dedicated to past papers and not real life situations as the EQE does not reflect real life situations. Try and seek input from an Examiner or someone who has recently marked the papers to understand what is expected from the EQE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide more support my marking past papers, or allow more study time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide methodological training, be it by in-house tutors or by external courses, and clearly defined and sufficient time slots for practising, at least if attaining the qualification is part of a job description and/or professional development plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide materials to candidates; speak with candidates about keypoints; help candidates to create group of study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide leave for preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide for inhouse training and support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide focused training for examinations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provide dedicated hours for the preparartion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a continual series of training throughout the year, attempting and discussing past papers continually, rather than focussing only on a few papers just weeks before the exam which leaves little time to assimilate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and develop technique.

**Probably best, to reserve an entire work day per week in the 3rd year for study. Would certainly be advantageous if training is done one on one involving discussions, rather than merely correcting work on actual files**

pray to god and drink sometimes a pint of beer

**Practise and exercises**

*Practice at work is very important if not essential to pass the exams*

*Practice (i.e. doing attorney-like work, especially filing of applications and working on office action) rather than a sole theoretical preparation is essential.*

please provide us with a reminder half an hour before end of the exam not five minutes because this is stressful

**Please provide time and money to attend specialized courses for the preparation of the EQE**

**Please create comparable exams over the years.**

**Please bear in mind I work as an examiner, therefore there is no provision for supervisor/employee specific preparation. This renders the previous questions regarding this issue n/a**

Please appreciate that your role and support is essential

**Permit time for trainees to practice examinations, provide fee earners with time to properly mark practice exams and give advice to the trainee. It's too easy for everyone to be too busy to help and there should be a culture of valuing support.**

**Perhaps more study leave. 1 day per exam may be sufficient to study for foundation and pre-EQE level exams but is insufficient for higher level papers which often require greater levels of preparation. Students often overcome these issues by taking holiday to study (as opposed to dedicated study leave) which means that work/life balance can suffer as a result during periods with lots of exams (I for example have taken approximately 2 weeks of personal holiday this year for the purpose of studying).**

**Pay for the epi course.**

Past paper and examiner’s comments are the only real way to practice, so do lots of them.

**Particularly for SMEs in private practice - it would be helpful to have structured tutorial sessions, not just completely self learning**

**Oral presentations of Case Law**

Only 50% of the course days were paid time, 50% was vacation. 100% of the course time should be working time, this way there remain some days of vacation to prepare before the exam

**One of the most important things is to have an EQE culture in the company. In order to do that you need at least 2 people who has enrolled for the exams. This way they will start talking about the exams and motivate themselves without even being aware of it. Having multiple people who take the exam in the same company is crucial for having a culture and the success of the candidates.**

One of the most important things is to have an EQE culture in the company. In order to do that you need at least 2 people who has enrolled for the exams. This way they will start talking about the exams and motivate themselves without even being aware of it. Having multiple people who take the exam in the same company is crucial for having a culture and the success of the candidates.

**Offer to mark past papers that candidates have answered.**

**Offer paid on line courses (e.g Delta Patents course)**

Nothing. Just getting to know your way around Hoekstra/Visser books well, and the PCT applicants guide is sufficient. Nothing can really help with the claim analysis part. Even performing tasks which involve analysing claims doesn’t mean you’ll necessarily agree with the EPO’s analysis. Actually, to the contrary, you can end up overthinking the claims questions if you have good knowledge of claim analysis at the stage you take the exam.

**Nothing really, the employer provides the resources and it is well known that it is up to the candidate to prepare for the exam. Perhaps support in terms of attending a course would be nice.**

**Nothing for the Pre-EQE**

Nothing / excellent

Nothing - it was good

**Not only to Focus on legal Training but also on training how to pass the EQE (to understand the methodology of the Examen)**

not applicable
No one takes the pre-EQE very seriously and everyone tells you it will be very easy - I think this is changing and the exam is getting much harder so employers will need to spend more time training specifically for the exam.

No comments.

Need much more time

Need more study leave time.

NA

N/A

More varied work

More time to study.

More time to study

More time off.

More time off to study. A dedicated study day a week would be useful. It would mean we can focus on work for 4 days without being distracted by examinations. Tutorials could be arranged for the weekly study day so they do not intrude on work time.

More time for studying at home/attending courses

More time for preparation

More time for my preparation

more time - more topics - more particular cases to study

More study leaves days

More study leave

more structured training and support

More strict enforcing of problem solution approach

More solved "Claim Analysis" exercises.

More practice

More practical examples.

More in house revision sessions to force people to revise

more explanation on why he/she answered a certain Written Opinion or EPO communication this way (or the other) or with other words why the reply I had prepared was not sufficient

Mock papers in work. Tutorials. Adequate study leave. Reduced workload at the time of exams.

Methodology is everything.

Mark papers themselves and give feedback

Many qualified attorneys underestimate the pre-EQE, given its historically high pass rate. Year on year, the exam increases in difficulty, but there seems to be an expectation that everyone will pass ("Piece of cake, don’t worry about it"), which results in significant stress.

Make them start as early as possible.

Make sure you keep up to date with the exam every year. It’s only a disadvantage to have a supervisor who refers to their exam from eg. 1995 every time the exam comes up.

Make sure to make sufficient time, it is really helpful. allow for external dedicated EQE paper training.

chall enge the student on a daily basis.

Make sure that workloads does not get in the way of good intentions. Having an EPA later on pays off.

Make sure that the candidate has someone to study together with, as this helps greatly with the motivation.

make mandatory the attending training before to pass the examination
Make an individual plan with the employee who would like to pass the EQE. If the amount of time the employee can afford is insufficient it should be possible to go on leave without payment. Some students require more time than other. To some extend the EQE tests whether a student is fit to practice, but 40-50% is exam technique. For some students it is also necessary to have a solid understanding of the underlying material whereas other can acquire a sufficient level by answering questions - the latter method is far more efficient, but the trade off is off-course that you will not be as savvy in the EPC.

Make a study plan and follow it.

Let them take time to prepare for the exam, it’s hard working during the day and studying at night

Let them go to the preparation courses. It is with it.

Let them go on technique courses, not much else you can do.

Let the candidate “grow” his experience in patentability issues (novelty & inventive step mostly) by triggering his thought mechanisms by means of simple questions on a very regular basis. Every candidate needs to “grow” by starting with simple examples.... Having to start with the “exam-grade” exercises is too much of a step up (at least it was for me)

Let candidates experience a broad spectrum of work, including writing applications, responding to office actions, being involved in appeals, oral proceedings, opposition, all with a significant degree of responsibility. Then, in my experience, relatively little study time is needed for the pre-eqe.

less focus on revenue, more focus on training

Les superviseurs sont souvent bon techniquement mais n’ont pas de pédagogie ou n’ont pas envie de former les candidats. Comme ils sont passés l’examen ils pensent que c’est facile pour tout le monde. Je pense que ceux qui viennent de passer l’examen et qui ont envie de former devrait être sollicités pour former le candidats. En effet, 4 ou 5 ans après avoir passé l’EQE, beaucoup de superviseur oublient l’intensité de l’examen et l’effort requis.

Leave them a predetermined amount of time to study at home.

Kontinuierlich zu lernen

Keep track of preparation.

Just provide study time - and then help with questions they have.

It’s not enough to offer the days for EQE training, if one cannot take those days due to work load.

It’s very important to analyse and explain to the trainee all the steps of procedures before EPO or PCT and explain the reasons for the decisions that supervisor take while advising the clients.

It would be helpful to have a system of tutorials and support within the workplace in addition to being able to attend a taught course, (2 days + 3 days) which was my sole support in terms of preparation for the exams. I did not get any feedback on a single answer I wrote in preparation for any of the exams. The quality of the examiners reports and suggested answers the EPO provides were essential for me to prepare and try to improve the quality and direction of my answers for the exams.

It is very important to train with the supervisor and to have free days for learning. However, I didn’t get this possibility.

It is so different to take the exam than doing the attorney work. You need to practise how to do the exam, even though you manage the topics. Give time to him/her to practise for the exam.

It is crucial that supervisors/employers provide (more) time for candidate training, and also be (more) closely involved in training candidates, especially those candidates who do not have much IP experience. It is easy for employees to overlook the requirements of a candidate for training, and be too focused on day-to-day work (which in itself is not sufficient for EQE preparations). A well-trained candidate is undoubtedly much more efficient at work, and the investment in their training pays off in the long run.

Invite them to follow the daily work in connection with the different steps in prosecution.

Invest more time

Invest in your staff and you will reap the reward.

Internal preparation during weekly seminars 3 months before to take the exams. About 1h-1h30

Instructions and support

In-house tutorials and feedback are invaluable.

In-house supervisors should have more understanding about the physical and mental draining effect that the EQEs can have on a candidate. Be more understanding and reduce workload at least in the final days leasing up to the exams. Allow time off, so that candidates do not need to use such a large portion of their annual leave quota.
In the previous questions it was suggested you “get time off” to study. In my case I had to “take time off” to prepare. The “normal” workload should be adjusted to allow room for the study. If the work doesn’t allow this enough this means that (all) the personal time gets taken over by the study. It should be a balance between work and private time, and especially in industry the “knowledge” of what preparation for the EQE implies is sometimes less “it’s just another course, not?”.

In my case, I was no under my supervisor during the pre-exam because I changed the job after having the enough time under supervision.

In industry the tendency is to let patent attorneys learn by doing. This approach is very good as life experience but very inefficient for EQE training.

In house tutorials organised throughout the year, not just a couple of weeks before exams.

If they are just “grandfathers” allow their students to attend every possible courses for the preparation of the EQE. The CSP was a very good opportunity for me, as a Hungarian student. Without it, I couldn’t have progressed so far.

I’m not sure dedicated training for the pre-exam with a supervisor is necessary. General ‘on-the-job’ training from your supervisor is more important but should be complemented by self-study directly for the pre-exam.

I would suggest to give candidates different kinds of tasks, and for chemists also something relating to mechanics.

I would like to have gone on the Delta Patents courses.

I was impressed with the epi course.

I think the EPO pre-EQE online course should be a mandatory part of the training for all trainees, this would force both supervisors and trainees to commit adequate time to the training in advance of the last minute rush which many candidates experienced. If it were possible to do this then maybe it would be possible to count participation on the course as a % of the overall pass mark thereby making the whole training schedule less stressful for candidates.

I think the EPO misunderstands employers. Employers want profitable employees who are obligated to work for them. Employers do not want additional competition. Supervisors/employers want trained, independent employees (e.g., someone who is sitting the EQE) but they do not actually want candidates to _pass_ the EQE. The ideal employee handles most work without supervision and bills time effectively - a typical EQE candidate. However, once a candidate passes, she is no longer obligated to work for her professional representative. She can renegotiate her compensation (likely set pursuant to her need to have a professional representative sign off on her candidature). She can move elsewhere (having established independent credibility). The master/servant model breaks down when the servant herself becomes a professional representative. Thus, I don’t think firms actually want candidates preparation to improve. Candidates are trying to pass the EQE to give themselves a better negotiating position with their employers. As a result, employers often do not provide employees any meaningful support - time, training, expenses. My employer made it very clear that my priority was my docket of cases. I trained on my own time. I paid for my own expenses. I paid for my own EQE courses.

I think supervisors should focus on training for the actual job. The candidate needs to prepare for the exams themselves (they’re related skills but not the same). To do this the candidate needs the materials (books etc) and time (so can’t be doing overtime on billable work in the run up to the exam).

I think going through section B of the past papers with your supervisor is extremely helpful.


I need time to study!
I have nothing to compare it to at the time but my employer was useless. Pretty unsupportive, and very much focussed on improving billing performance at all other costs (for example, over more study leave). This is not appropriate training and it is only having now left and discussed with others that I’ve realised just how bad it was.

I had all the support needed an a great team to learn from!

I had a very good supervisor. A lot of practice on real cases straight from the first day. Nevertheless, maybe the initial basic explanations could have been more focused. Maybe a kind of “introduction course” from EPO could facilitate this initial period. Something like a “kick-off” for new students so that the basic is already more focused in the direction of the examination itself.

I could suggest a lot, but my suggestions will not be heard. I talked to several candidates from different patent attorney firms, there are no patent attorneys that would be very keen to spend their precious time to prepare candidates for the EQE. EQE has several specifics, which have to be usually exploited by the candidates themselves or at various courses (offered by DeltaPatents for example).

I can’t tell my boss how to run his company.

I am an examiner and did not have a supervisor. Hence, all the answers I had to give in regard to supervision are incorrect

Hold a number of tutorials to force candidates to prepare and evaluate their answers. Go through examiners comments to explain what is expected. Discuss examination strategy, what worked for different EPAs discuss with the student how they plan to attempt the papers and provide feedback on their proposed approach.

Help navigate the guidelines for examination, discuss legal bases

He is offering the best the conditions allow.

Having a 1 day per week to prepare exams

Have them send you to courses where your responses are marked by a third party, because if you mark your own response you will always rate yourself too highly (even if you have a model solution and try to stick to it).

Have a structured training program.

guidance is very important

Greater focus on setting and marking mock papers. Maybe additional mock papers could be made available by the EQE to allow this?

Giving candidates sufficient time to study and reducing their workload in accordance.

giving at least some time for the preparation besides the daily work...

Give working days for preparing the exam

Give us the time we need for preparation!

Give us enough time. Time is limiting. The material and informaion is easy to find, but it takes lots of time to go through it and master it.

Give trainees lots of EP/PCT cases, and try and expose trainees to a variety of work, from filing, prosecution to grant. Being able to see a case progressing over my 2.5 years of training has been really useful for me.

Give time to study off work....

Give time to candidates

Give time for training. It pays off for both the trainee and the train8ng firm.

Give time and pay courses

Give them time to study. Lower workload.

Give them some more time for preparation.

Give them more time off to study

Give them more exam oriented tasks.

Give them less work.

Give the Chance to attend at a recommended training session.

Give the candidates some time to learn (perhaps with regular In-house practice or less workload on e.g. one day in a week); of course it is useful to do clients work, but more confidence in the exams could be achieved, if candidates do have enough time to practice specifically for the exam; Taking all your holidays for exams is frustrating and energy-sapping; plus it causes quite a lot of pressure to assimilate all the materials in a short time;
Give the candidates some full working days as study days. It is difficult to find time next to work and in order to practise previous exams you need several hours non-stop to be efficient (ideally including correction on the same day).

Give more time for preparation
Give him time
give enough time to prepare for EQE at working days.
Give days off for study
Give candidates more study leave. I was given one day of study leave per exam. In total, I had to take around one month of holiday to prepare for sitting all four of the main exams. It is incredibly tiring have to work a full day and then also have to study in the evening.

get them some days off before the exam for practising
From talking to study mates, it is my impression that this task is generally not done and candidates need to self-study for the examination. Only training is provided as on-the-job training

Forced study days, without other work interfering.
For the pre-exam, I don’t think any days off are essential.
For preparation for the pre-exam, it would be useful to have a supervisor who knows about it (mostly the more experienced colleagues didn’t have to pass it).

For paper A: - go to external courses - do as much as Claim drafting internally as possible

Follow up the exams, sit down and ask what you can do to help. Help the candidate to plan the time, it is important both for the candidate and the employer that the exams are a success.

Find a good course.

External preparation
External courses in early stages of training are all well and good, but in a firm where there is a wealth of experience in passing the EQE, in-house training should be provided regularly and often.

Exposure to diverse EP prosecution issues
Excuse more days absence from work over the year, for practising long papers like C and D under real time conditions.

Examination is different from daily practice. Important to remember.
Exam specific training from supervisors, more time off to study.

Especially in Patent Law to give more cases to students which at first sight seem to be not fruitful, like (most important) PCT cases such as trouble with priority declarations, or any trouble or questions arising with PCT. I didn’t have much insight into that in advance, which was also due to the fact, that these questions practically always occur in between the secretary and the attorney. This would help in learning a lot of things in practice rather than in studying for the EQE.

EPO course and past papers
Ensure that sufficient time is allowed for candidates to attend courses and carry out personal study (not just at the weekends), and help candidates manage their workloads so that they do not have to stay very late at work in the weeks leading up to the exams

Enrol them on the EPO online course and buy them adequate books
Encourage attending a course.

Employers should understand that the value of providing a candidate with support for the preparation will be in any case higher than the resources the employer will have to invest.

Employer should organize something, e.g. mock exams.

E-learning platform is required!!!!
Either put more effort into in-house training, or provide more opportunities to attend external training
Earplugs for the candidates!! It is a good present

Don’t overload them with work in the weeks approaching the exam, even if they are re-sitters.

Don’t know the best way, sadly.

Don’t be too frugal giving out days off to prepare for the exam. They will be very well spend if you pass the exam on a first sit.

Don’t be a grandparent. Don’t micromanage - different people learn better in different ways, let them decide how the time is best spent.
Does not apply for me. I am a patent examiner at the EPO.

Do varied tasks with candidate. Start early with claims analysis and drafting.

Do not underestimate the value of just encouraging and discussing EPC & PCT matters from an EQE perspective. Show that the exam will have a value for the organization.

Do not think so much about money and cost, let the candidate’s have time for studies on working time.

Do not push candidates into sitting examinations at the earliest opportunity Do not expect candidates to perform well if they are not given extensive practical experience relating to the papers, it is no wonder candidates struggle with paper A when they have never drafted a specification, or struggle in paper DII when they have never dealt with a commercial situation and had to assist a client and improve their position.

Do not hire IP beginners/candidates if you do not want/if you are not interested in, or if you do not have the time to train them.

Do more to relieve candidates workload at work

Do a variety of real work (as I have done)

Discuss the exams and exam strategy as well as the effect of the mismatch between real world and “EQE land” as well as a even stronger focus on clearly setting out and applying the problem/solution approach in a more advanced stage of training.

discuss cases more efficiently, give specific and diverse cases, provide some anecdotes from time regarding important objections and outcomes and how to tackle them

Develop a system that leads to the candidates having enough training and safety valves when needed (workload off before the exams). The employer who needs prof.reps. should take a serious responsibility of each employee to be trained as EPA.

Develop a better understanding of the Pre-exam.

Decrease the amount of normal work.

Days off prior to exam date

Create a topic / learning plan together . Dedicate at least 1 day per week for prep . Recurring check if learning Portion was understood.

Correct Old exams together

Continue the way you do, Great!

can’t really comment as I have had no direct supervision. and have mostly been self-studying

Buy them the Delta patents books

Buy a copy of all available standard preparation course material.

Broad range of practical experience

Become more familiar with the structure and type of the exam

Become familiar with the requirements of the exam

be there when candidates need them

Be pro-active and involve the trainee in as many different projects as possible.

Be mindful of candidates’ workload in run up to exams. You don’t need to give them more time off but it’s good to be able to leave work on time to study in the evenings.

At least in private practice candidates are usually just another employee. Supervisors should explain more in detail what is the core of a mistake a candidate made and explain the solutions using the EPC. It would be very helpful if supervisors at least told candidates which Article/Rule is applicable to the problem or/and where to find it in the guidelines. Generally supervisors should remember more how they felt as a candidates and that we are all just starting and problems, which might not even appear as a problem to them, are a big problem for the candidate.

Assume their responsibility and prepare the students

As I’m sure everyone else will say - give more time for studying. Reduce billing targets for a few months before the exams. Seriously, you can’t expect good performance from your trainees when you expect them to do all of their studying in their won time. You have to invest in your employees if you want them to grow - and if that means they earn a little less money for you than normal in the preceding months, deal with it.

Art. 11(2)(a) REE does not apply in y case, rather Art. 11(2)(b) REE

Allowing time to practice past papers and marking those attempts is invaluable (even if the mark is arbitrary, pass/fail).

Allowing the candidate to have plenty of experience answering examination reports etc. really helps with the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>claims analysis section. However, the main bulk of the exam preparation is down to the candidate practicing the papers and putting the time in themselves.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allowing candidates to work less hours, at least during a short period prior to the exam, as well as reducing the workload expected from candidates - that would have really helped to reduce stress and improve the concentration while studying/working.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow your candidate to go to as many trainings as needed : preparation for D from CEIPI is different and to my opinion complementary to training for D paper by DeltaPatents Allow your candidate sufficient time for training. Training should be partly on personal time but partly too on work time. You will benefit from it later ! Decrease the amount of work for the last 6 months before the EQE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow working charge to be adequate for a preparation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow to attend in courses focused on mock exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allow to attend dedicated courses and be everyday support in preparation. one day off a week during two months before exam would be ideal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow time to sit at least 5 mock exams under realistic conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow them self studying during working time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow the students to take external courses. Be willing to discuss various aspects of the EPC with the students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow study time when in the office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow study leave, lessen the workload so not all studying has to happen in personal time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow more working days for study preparation. Reduce workload during run-up to exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow more time, practice the EQE themselves at least once every 3 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allow more time to study/practice past papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow more time out of the office for dedicated study and preparation to avoid trainee burn-out. For example, I was allowed 4 study days for ABCD. A candidate I spoke to at the exams was allowed 4 weeks for studying.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow more time for preparations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow more time for preparation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow more time and less focus on financial targets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow more study time during office hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow more study leave, even for candidates who are qualified in their own member state. Obviously employers want locally qualified attorneys to be doing real work, but training for further exams should not be compromised just because you’ve already proven that you have capability or relevant qualifications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow more study leave as it is tricky to find a long enough stretch of time to do a past paper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow more study leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow more paid leave to study (I had one day)., or allocate study hours during working hours, pay for training courses. If sufficient numbers of trainees, arrange a mock exam for all trainees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow for taking time off.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow for 1 working day to study and not to work. Allow to attend courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow extra time for a pre-examination course (epi or similar).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow enough time for preparation, in case of pre-EQE 1-2 months at half, or half that time at full intensity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow enough time for learning and courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow enough preparation time before the exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow candidates to work on cases with interesting, non-standard legal configurations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow candidates to set aside time to study for the exam and attend courses. One day of study leave is not enough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow candidates to have several hours study time per week.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allow candidates more time to prepare for the eqe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow at least 5 x 4h to sit old exams under realistic conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow 1 day/week preparation over 6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocating more time for preparation would be highly appreciated. All preparation has been done outside office hours. For preparing for the exam, it was unfortunate that the main exam coincided with (Dutch)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
school holidays.
Allocate more time to study
Allocate more time
Allocate dedicated weekly hours of training and stick with the plan.
Alleviating work load before the exam. Give personal advice one month or two before the exam.

Acknowledge the Exams.
Acknowledge that some pieces of unfamiliar procedure can be useful as training, but you need to agree with the candidate that they are to be used for training purposes rather than expecting them to carry them out as normal jobs. i.e inform them that you are expecting a researched answer, rather than randomly ask questions.

Accord enough time EVERY WEEK to allow candidate preparation.
A lot of Supervisors never sat the pre-exam and therefore are not familiar with the requirements.
A dedicated EQE study day once a month starting after 1 year in the profession or something similar
A coach who did the EQE before

6 - 8 weeks free of work to prepare intensively for the examination

- Sit down with the candidate regularly (fixed dates), and be sure you have the time to give him thorough advice.
- Give the candidate tasks that help her/him to develop a better understanding of the EPC and also might help for the EQE.

**Q23** In how many opposition cases were you involved during your 3-year training period? Please indicate the number of cases:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases Range</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 case</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 case</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 cases</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 cases</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 cases</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 cases</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10 cases</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15 cases</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20 cases</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 20 cases</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q24) How did your supervisor/employer as defined by Art.11(2)(a) REE train you for paper C?
Multiple answers are possible

Q24) Other:

Whilst I did not have any specific training for any of the papers from my supervisor, perhaps quarter of my time in private practice has been spent working on oppositions in some way or other

Weekend class in EPO
tutorials
Tutorials
support in sending me to dedicated training
Sent me to our client who was an ex-examiner for training
Review of their own strategies in passing the exams
Review of past papers from compendium
Provided old notes
Previous years' candidates gave advice/shared resources
Payed for the Ceipi C-course
Past papers
Past exam papers
own suggestions/tipps
Organizing common training sessions during working time
No help from my supervisor for paper C specifically, but I have been handling several opposition cases the past few years.
N.A.
Modified Delta Patents C course
methodology
massive number of third party observations
Marked past papers
Marked papers
looked at 1 of my C mock papers
Legal examples
Learning by doing.
Just self studying
internal tutorial and buying a book for preparation
Internal Paper C tutorials
I worked on opposition cases. Not specifically tailored to paper C.
I was allowed to write one Opposition in 3 years
I used the opposition case by myself. No help from my supervisor
I did all C papers starting 2003
I consulted compendium cases with my supervisor
I always could asks questions relating to C-papers.
Hosted fake opposition proceedings
his experience (which however is more useful for the daily practice (for which it is extraordinary helpful) than for the EQE)
Going through template for determining prior art combinations for inventive step
Going through past papers in detail
general discussion of strategy
Experience with real work, no specific training for the exam
EPO, own preparation
documents provision
Discussion regarding exam strategy
Delta Patents Book, CEIPI Book, Smart in C Book
Courses
Courses
Courses
Basic help provided. (Though the difficulty with PaperC was in no way due to any insufficiency of training.)
Attended JDD course
Answering specific cases / exam questions, you don’t really understand...
Answering some random questions

Q25) How did you prepare for paper C apart from the training you received from your supervisor/employer?
Multiple answers are possible

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Using opposition cases from my company</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using other opposition cases</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compendium</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have followed a course/courses</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q25) Other:

- Trying past papers and reading the examiners reports afterwards.
- training with old exams
- train the acquired methodology on past papers
- The real opposition cases were a good training for the real life, but not for the EQE. For EQE paper C you have to learn a specific methodology to be able to solve the paper C in time. Also the real life experience
does not hold to solve paper C. You have to solve past C papers from the compendium.

Taking part in the fake opposition proceedings

Studying the law

studied lots together with colleagues also taking the exam

Special C-exam training Maastricht

Smart in C book

Smart in C

self-study of books

Self-study

QMUL course, my own technics, and _many_ practice Exams

Practised papers

Practicing papers, self study based on Examination reports and other material

practice papers

Practice on my own.

Past papers

past papers

past papers

Past papers

Past papers

Papers C from the previous years

Our firm provided in house training

old exams

Old exams

occasional training inhouse by capable colleague

no time as mentioned

Methodology book

JDD Course, Practised past papers

JDD Course

I intensively studied the Delta material, did about 20 old exams

I have no supervisor/employer

I did all C papers starting 2003

EQE-experience from colleagues

Epi tutorial

Earlier exams

discussion with attorneys at another Firm

Deltapatents Methodology C-Book

Delta Patents C book

Delta Patents Book, CEIPI Book C, Smart in C book

Delta Patent methodology C book

CEIPI C Book

CEIPI book

cceipi book
Chapter 4 – EQE Papers

Q26) Which of the following best describes the technical area you are working in?

![Bar chart showing the distribution of technical areas]

**Q26) Other:**
- Telecomunications and Biomedical technology
- Telecomunications
- Telecomunications
- Telecomunications
- Telecom
- Software
- Software
- processrelated
- Pharmaceuticals
- Pharmaceuticals
- Pharmaceuticals
- Pharma
- Patent Examination

My speciality is mechanics/physics; but I have worked on cases related to all of the above and others (CII).
- Mixture of all
- Mix of all possible tech areas
- mining
- Medical Materials Science
- Medical
- Med Tech
- med tech
- mechanics, physics, electronics
- Mechanics and Chemistry and Physics
- Mechanics AND Chemistry
- mechanics and chemistry
- Mechanics
Educated in biochemistry but works mostly in mechanics and some in chemistry

Q27) Please rate the difficulty of the pre-examination paper you sat in 2018
Q27a) What reference book was the most useful for the preparation of the pre-examination?  
Multiple answers are possible

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book Title</th>
<th>Number of Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EPC</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines for Examination in the EPO</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A commentary on the EPC</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Visser
Verfahrenspraxis EPÜ/PCT
Verfahrenspraxis EPÜ und PCT: Übersichten-Entscheidungspfade-Musterformulierungen Gruner, Leopold Joachim
Verfahrenspraxis EPÜ und PCT
Verfahrenspraxis EPÜ und PCT
Verfahrenspraxis EPÜ
third party book
The Annotated European Patent Convention - D. Visser
The annotated guide to the EPC (Visser)
The Annotated European Patent Convention,
The Annotated European Patent Convention by Derk Visser
The annotated european patent convention - Derk Visser
The Annotated EPC, by Visser
The annotated EPC by Derk Visser
table book with references
Table Book to EPC and PCT
Tabellenbuch EPÜ und PCT; DÜWEL
Tabellenbuch
Speich
References to the European Patent Convention - Delta Patents (Hoekstra)
References to the European Patent Convention
References to the EPC, Jelle Hoekstra
References to the EPC by Hoekstra
References to the EPC (Hoekstra)
References to the EPC (Hoekstra)
References to the EPC
References to the EPC
Reference to EPC by Hoekstra
Reference of the EPC
Readings provided by the EPO online course
pre-exam course papers
pre-exam course papers
Pre-Exam Book DeltaPatents
PCT Kastner
PCT Applicants Guide
PCT Applicant's Guide
Own book
Online course reading materials
Online course material
Q27b) What reference book was the most useful while sitting the pre-examination? Multiple answers are possible

Q27b) Other:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wolters Kluwers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visser's The Annotated EPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visser's Annotated EPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visser; The Cross-Referenced Patent Cooperation Treaty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visser, annotated EPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visser, and suprisingly, Euro-PCT Guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visser annotated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visser and the X-ref PCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visser and Hoekstra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visser and EPO course notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visser + Delta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visser - Annotated EPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>visser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>visser</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Verfahrenspraxis EPÜ/PCT**

- Verfahrenspraxis EPÜ und PCT: Übersichten-Entscheidungspfade-Musterformulierungen Gruner, Leopold Joachim

- Verfahrenspraxis EPÜ und PCT
- Verfahrenspraxis EPÜ

**third party book**

- The Annotated European Patent Convention - D. Visser
- The annotated guide to the EPC (Visser)
- The Annotated European Patent Convention,
- The Annotated European Patent Convention by Derk Visser
- The annotated european patent convention - Derk Visser
- The Annotated European Patent Convention

**The Annotated EPC, Visser**

- The annotated EPC by Derk Visser
- The annotated EPC by D. Visser

**Table book on EPC and PCT**

- Tabellenbuch EPÜ und PCT; Düwel
- Tabellenbuch
- Tabellenbuch

**Speich**

- References to the European Patent Convention - Delta Patents (Hoekstra)
- References to the EPC, Jelle Hoekstra
- References to the EPC (Hoekstra)
- References to the EPC (Hoekstra)
- References to the EPC
- References to the epc
- References to the EPC
- Reference to EPC by Hoekstra
- pre-exam course document
- pre-exam course document

**PCT- und EP-Tabellenbuch, documents from EPO online course**

- PCT Tabellenbuch
- PCT Applicants’ Guide
- PCT applicants guide
- PCT Applicant’s Guide

**Own book**

- online training materials and Visser as the commentary
- Online course reading materials
- Notes which I made by my own (more structured combination of EPC, Guidelines and Comments)
- My own notes

**Kley**

- J. Hoekstra - References to the EPC

**How to get a European patent, Guide for applicants**

hoesktra
Q27c) How did you allocate the available time during the pre-examination?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allocation</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30% or less of the time for the claim analysis section / 70% or more for the legal section</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40% of the time for the claim analysis section / 60% for the legal section</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% of the time for the claim analysis section / 50% for the legal section</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60% of the time for the claim analysis section / 40% for the legal section</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70% or more of the time for the claim analysis section / 30% or less for the legal section</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q27d) What is your opinion about the time available for the pre-examination paper you sat in 2018?

![Bar chart showing time allocation for pre-examination paper]

- Too much: 113
- Enough: 143
- Borderline: 153
- Not enough: 58
- By far not enough: 58

Q27e) Any comment on the pre-examination?

With respect to the German version, questions could be formulated more clear and concise. It does not appear to be helpfull, if one needs to spend more time in interpreting the question, than answering it.

Very very very difficult for chemists: no chemistry question at all. Very mechanical. It is a huge disadvantage for chemists and extremely unfair. You should not have said “chemistry and mechanics were merged” but told the truth “chemistry was abolished completely”

Very hard and long...

True or false questions should be black or white, not grey. The legal questions are clear. The claim analysis questions are often not. Some of the questions do not discriminate between those of us who know and don’t know the law and can analyze a tex or cannot. On some questions, we have to pick on every detail, for others, the question should be resolved simply. The question becomes what the person who wrote it was trying to get at, which should not be the point. The examiner’s reports many times do not explain some claim terms for example (that is, why they are missin in the prior art and the claim is still not new), or do not properly justify some answers. Some times there is an alternative answer. This should not be so. The question and the answer should be very clear, but the claim analysis part is often not clear at all. Even in the real world, very experienced judges cannot agree on the interpretation of the law, and we should resolve a question in 3 min? In addition, this year the claim analysis part had too many elements and was too long. I ran out of time and could not think my last 5 questions, I had to rush. In my training, I passed all previous pre-exams, solving them in 3 hours. This year, I did not have enough with 4 hours. Not fair in my opinion. I have put myself and my family under a huge strain to prepare for this exam for a whole year, and to have to potentially wait for another year is not fair. I am a registered US agent. In the US, we had access to an electronic version of the guidelines during the exam. This is how we work in the real world. Having real books is so old fashioned I cannot believe this is the way it works in Europe. Also, being able to take the exam once a year, is also old fashioned. In the US, it is offered on a rolling basis, much more convenient.

Too many question in the claims analysis where one could not give a clear cut answer “False” or “True”. Too many details in the documents that could have had two meanings. On top of all that the time available was not enough which added a plus of pressure on me. D1-D4, the client’s application and the questions 11-20 should have been stapled separately in order to avoid flipping through the documents during the exam. Flipping through the documents while being on a time pressure was very annoying and costed me a few wrong answers.

Too many prior art document to read. Some (legal and claim) questions seemed to be a little ambiguous.

Too long, too much to read in the claim analysis; some questions difficult to understand and interpret.

too lengthy claim analysis section with not enough time to thoroughly read the subject-matter, which was moreover subject to interpretation ! I did all past pre-exam papers since 2012 when preparing for the exam, and always had enough time to read and/or re-read the claims carefully in order to answer the questions.
This one was the most difficult claim analysis part I ever did and did not manage to finish! I also would like to stress that for chemists, like me, the pre-exam as well as the A-C papers have nonsense for us, especially since the time is the critical factor in these exams. A chemist need much more time to read and understand the subject-matter presented at the exams. It is unfair for us to deal with mechanical engineering subject-matter! I really hope the chemical and mechanical papers will be re-introduced.

Timing was a huge issue this year. Because of the many embodiments in the claim analysis, it was very confusing. I lost my line of thought many times.

Time was a big issue compared to other pre-exams. Also many questions of the analysis part and a few questions of the legal part were ambiguous, especially compared to earlier pre-exams.

Time maybe enough, if I might practised more claim analysis exercises at home.

This year was much harder than years past. I don’t think I’m alone in thinking this. My practice scores were always in the 80% range and I barely passed.

This year claim analysis part was too long with too many prior art documents, each of them having more than one embodiments and with multiple claim sets, each directed to a different combination of embodiments of the application and relevant for a different prior art embodiment. Said application was not clearly presenting all embodiments. The combination of these factors lead to confusion and loss of precious time even when more than 50% of the total time was dedicated to claim analysis.

This pre-examination was quite confusing compared to the previous pre-examinations. A lot of questions were confusing due to the numerous back-and-forth between the documents D1-D4 and thee different embodiments of the invention which change for every statement to analyse. Furthermore, the subject was quite long. Thus the time available was really borderline. No time to check and verify some statements was available.

This is probably the most-heard comment: surprised by the increased length of the claim analysis part. For me, based on try-outs with earlier pre-eqe exams, the legal questions part is more challenging than the claim analysis part. So I simply allotted 60% of my time for the legal questions part and started with the hardest part (for me) first, without even considering the claim analysis part, ending up with the unpleasant frenzy of being forced to complete the second part in ninety minutes. So for me it was primarily the length of the claim analysis part and only secondarily its difficulty level that surprised me, ending up with probably equal scores (about 38/50) for both parts, while I scored 42 and 46 for the claim analysis part in my try-outs (pre-eqe 2016 and pre-eqe 2017, respectively).

This exam took me more than 1 hour in total compared to all exams I made during the preparations. I needed to the full 4 hours, and did not have time to double-check my answers. In particular the claim analysis part took me much longer than expected.

There were a number of questions in the claim analysis section where the statement (to which we had to answer true or false) could have been argued either way, which is not ideal.

There was not enough time especially due to a lot of (long) documents to read in the claim analysis part.

There was not a sufficient time for completing the claim analysis part.

There was no time for recheck for the answers.

There was by far not enough time available. Too many questions in the Claims Analysis part could have been argued both ways (FALSE ? or TRUE ?) The goal of the examination must probably be to evaluate whether a candidate is able to distinguish among the EPC rules rather than test whether the candidate is able not to fall in a “trap” of technical details.

There was a lot of ambiguity, which meant that a lot of time was spent trying to figure out what the question meant rather than working out the answer. There also seemed to be a lot of combinations of embodiments and prior art vs claim numbers, which made it easy to get lost and spend lots of time flicking through the question sheet rather than analysing the prior art.

There are too many questions on grey areas and which are very arguable in the true/false format. It is not an appropriate format.

The whole pre-examination was much longer than in previous years: 2015 - 30 pages, 2016 - 34 pages, 2017 - 34 pages, 2018 - 38(!) pages (i.e. pages with questions/texts/etc. and discounting the cover, instructions and calendars), which made it much harder to finish in time. In fact, I was able to finish exams from previous years just in time, while this time I had to answer 3 or 4 questions randomly in this pre-examination. The claim analysis part was way too confusing with figures not matching the describing text passages. Some reference numbers were wrong, too. In conclusion, the pre-exam seems to be getting harder but not really in a way which enables better distinguishing of candidates.

The true or false format does not work for claim analysis - the questions are either too easy to avoid
The technical part was very difficult to finish in the time.

The second half of the pre-examination this year was much, much longer than most, if not all of the claims analysis sections previously. The paper was, as I understand it, 38 pages long, compared to a usual length of 30 or less pages. Making the paper that much longer causes the problem of time management; in my case I had to GUESS the last two questions, because I ran out of time, and this had not happened before in this paper, ever. My understanding of the purpose of this examination is that it is a filter or gateway prior to taking the actual EQE exams and therefore had the aim of ensuring a particular level of attainment had been reached. This level should, I think, have a degree of stability, and is as I think I did. I have come unstuck as a result of a “ramped up” second section, this seems a bit unfair, as had the paper been of a similar level of attainment, an expected pass of about 85% would have been on the cards. The experience therefore has been a wholly negative one, as the paper seems to have been adjusted in a manner which makes a nonsense of a fairly thorough set of preparations. I know that my experience of this paper is extremely widespread so as almost to be unanimous, not only from talking to people afterwards, but also from reading blogs such as the Delta patents one on the pre-exam. Sorry to be so negative, but I am a strong preparer for things, and it surprised me in a very negative fashion.

The pre-examination, especially the claim questions, was by far too difficult and too long.

The PreExamination 2018 was the most difficult of all times. I did not have much difficulty when practising the PreExams of the previous years, but in this years pre-examination I run out of time, because the claim analysis part took so much more time than I expected. In my opinion, the pre-examination 2018 was only directed to candidates who know mechanics. The exam was very unfair to chemists who never have to read such documents or do any such kind of tasks in real life. It takes much more time to read and try to understand something that is from completely different technical field that you are use to and educated. I hope that next year the claim analysis part could be directed to chemistry and not pure mechanics again. Please, make the next pre-examination more fair to chemists than it was this year.

The technical part was extremely long... Obviously I spent 2/3 of my time on it without unfortunately being successful.

The legal questions were more difficult than in the previous years, but borderline ok. Some questions were a bit unclear in their wording (for example: how to interpret “gültige Option” - does that mean it is a clever or an allowed option?) The claim analysis part was atrocious. The amount of documents given was way too much for the given time and much more complex than in the last years. Ambiguous wording of the questions, features were not clearly described in the documents. If I am not mistaken, it was the first time that there were embodiments of the invention without drawing - but nowhere was stated whether embodiments 2 and 3 have otherwise the same properties than embodiment 1 except for the described difference -> How to then judge this? The characteristics of the elements were not straightforward to compare (to check whether a pipe is straight or curved, in contact with the ground or not... is more straightforward and therefore much less time consuming than to check whether a detector detects something from the open to the closed state or vice versa). All other pre-exams took me a maximum of 3 hours, whereas I could not finish this one during the 4 hours - had to guess the last three questions. The fact that the non official model solutions of gewerblicher Rechtsschutz (http://gewerblicher-rechtsschutz.gg-ip.eu/2018/02/26/vorpruefung-2018/) and delta patents (http://pre-exam.blogspot.nl/2018/02/pre-exam-2018-our-answers-to-claims.html) in the claim analysis part differ by 10 points (5 statements given differently) - (20% of the total points in the claim analysis part and 10/35=28.6% of the points needed to
obtain 70% in the claim analysis part -> if only those questions are answered wrongly, the candidate remains with only 40 points in the claim analysis part) proves that the questions/documents were highly ambiguous even for people answering the questions without time pressure / without being under exam conditions / having some experience as delta patents tutors with respect to the pre-exam. And those people were able to discuss the solutions. I would say that the ambiguity does not stop at those 5 statements...

The legal part was okay. However, the claim analysis of 2018 felt considerably more difficult and ambiguous than for the previous years. I’m certain my grades would’ve been higher if I had been advised that the claim analysis would be changed, by allowing me to better prepare and manage my available time. Please consider that most students regard the past pre-exams as a baselines during studies, so changing parts of the exam without any warning whatsoever feels very unfair.

The legal part was for me not difficult, although I made mistakes because of exam situation. Claim analysis part was too difficult, because it was too technical. If the inventions would include chemical composition of filter, then it would be fair from chemist’s point of view. There was too much reading. This was problem for me, because I had to sit this exam in foreign language. I managed to finish all 15 minutes before the end, but I could not check claim analysis part at all. I still could correct one mistake in legal part.

The legal part was easier than the last few years. In the claim analysis section, there were too many claim sets, and too many embodiments to keep track of. The actual questions were not difficult, but it was confusing to keep track of everything, so in the end it was more a question of “bookkeeping” than patent law knowledge that was tested.

The claims section was significantly more difficult than previous years. Specifically, the questions and prior art documents were very ambiguous such that it took longer to answer the claims sections. Typically, when practicing past exam papers I was spending about 2hrs on the legal questions, 1.5 hours on the claims questions and 0.5 hours for checking. This year I spent 2hrs on the legal and the remaining 2hrs on the claims questions, which was only enough time to rush through the later questions without actually finishing. I feel that a multiple choice format is by no means the best format for such claims analysis, particularly when the questions/prior art are ambiguous. In addition, I feel that unless adequate time will be given to properly process the presented information, the exam will not entirely reflect the ability of the candidate (very few of the other candidates I spoke to had time to fully complete the exam or check answers for obvious errors).

The legal part was as one could expect, whereas the claims analysis part was very extensive. Lots of prior art with several embodiment and complex claim set made the bookkeeping crucial. I think an extra half hour would be adequate.

The exam was too difficult in comparison with previous years. A lot of the questions could of had two answers to them, which made the questions ambiguous. These grey areas are not the right areas if the law that should be tested in a multiple choice exam.

The exam was fine as it is, a part of the point-system where e.g. 4 correct answers gives 5 points makes no sense at all. If unlucky one could answer 75% of the 80 questions correct, yet still fail the exam with 60 points!

The discussions afterwards have shown that there were several questions, where you could argue for true or false. Such questions may be interesting for the main exam (where you can argue in the exam) but are quite frustrating in the pre-exam format. It should be avoided that you have to justify your answer with a G decision in the pre-exam. The amount of additional claim sets and documents with hardly any intellectual impact on the questions was an unnecessary burden and just added confusion and the danger of getting lost considering the limited time.

The difficulty of the pre-eqe seems increasing during the last years...

The claims part was quite long compared to the other years. Difficult to review the given answers. For comparaison 2017 pre exam : 1h15 for claims analysis part, for 2018 pre exam : more than 2h00-2h15

The claims part was considerably more difficult than previous years. Many of the answers could have been argued either way, as both True and False, depending on view point. These types of questions do not work well in a multiple choice examination. The sharp increase in the number of embodiments in the patent
documents in the claims part of the paper took up too much time to become familiar with in order to answer the questions effectively.

The claims part had too much prior art to analyze.

The claims analysis was ridiculously difficult for a pre-exam. Too many mechanical details and intricacies to comprehend in the time available.

The claims analysis questions were particularly hard. Many statements felt arguable and relied on assumptions, which does not feel fair for a T/F exam format.

The Claims Analysis part was demanding in keeping track of many sets of claims and multiple prior art documents.

The Claim section comprised of more embodiments, claim sets, and prior art documents for consulting, compared to previous examinations.

The claim interpretation section felt arbitrarily difficult, confusing, with too many arguable questions which don’t fit the true/false nature of the exam. Additionally there was far more material to consider than in previous years, to the extent that I didn’t have time to fully consider all of my answers to the extent I wanted to. The legal section also had some questions with no clear legal answer (e.g., 4.4, the examining division CAN consider such 3rd party observations if the case come under their jurisdiction in e.g. limitation proceedings, as the observations would be placed on file. However it was not clear from the question whether such a scenario should be considered in answering the question. Additionally, the fact that the ED will not consider 3rd party observations after the decision to grant is issued is not explicitly set out in Guidelines 2016 (the text in force for the exam), ONLY IN GUIDELINES 2017 (not a legal text in force for the purposes of the exam). It is unfair to ask candidates true/false questions to which no clear legal basis for a true/false answer can be found in the syllabus texts.

The Claim analysis was to difficult for Biochemists. The Questions were not that easy than in the last years ... (no questions about clarity, containing/consisting of etc...) Claim analysis was too difficult the time was too little!

The claim analysis was much more difficult than in the previous years. It was very complex and mechanical, and because of that I felt it was unreasonable for the chemists. It was also very long and had numerous embodiments so it was challenging to get it done in 4 hours. I could have easily used the whole time for just the claim analysis part. It was a big surprise how difficult the claim part was and I was not at all prepared for it. The legal part was ok and as I had expected.

The claim analysis was a real step up from the previous years - I found it much more difficult than all of the past papers. There was too much to do in the time allowed and many candidates commented that they ran out of time at the end.

The claim analysis section was very long in terms of material to read

The claim analysis section was harder than in previous years which I feel we should have been warned about so that we could improve our planning

The claim analysis section was far more difficult than the former years. Even if I did the claim analysis section of all the former years exams without too much difficulty, the 2018 pre-exam was more complexe. In particular, many questions were really unclear, and for some of them both “false” and “true” could be answered depending on your own interpretation of the question. A multiple choice exam is not adapted at all for such questions.

The claim analysis section was considerably more difficult and longer than in any previous years, despite comments from the Examiners in 2017 that the demand in 2016 & 2017 was considered to be at the correct level.

The claim analysis section took far too long and I therefore had no time time to answer a significant number of answers with sufficient consideration. It was not possible to predict that the claim analysis section would take this long based on previous past papers. The number of claim sets and embodiments to be reviewed made this section of the paper significantly too time consuming. Furthermore, the level of analysis required in this section seemed biased towards candidates with mechanical backgrounds. Candidates with chemistry backgrounds were significantly disadvantaged in this section.

The claim analysis questions were not too hard as such, but the convoluted nature of the questions and amount of information to process and manage made it challenging to complete in the time, it also appeared to require more analysis effort than previous papers.

The claim analysis questions are too vague. There were a number of questions that can be argued both ways validly.

The claim analysis part was very long, it required a lot of reading, therefore it remained less time to answer the questions and no time to double-check the answers at the end of the exam. For non-native speakers it
was difficult to read and properly analyse such long text.

The claim analysis part was too time consuming. There too many set of claims and too many embodiments in each prior art document. This consideration in made considering the level of the past pre-exams, with reference only to the claim analysis.

The claim analysis part was too long (or the time to short). It takes long time to read and fully understand an exam in a non-native language. This constitute a huge disadvantage for non french/german/english speakers, because the reading is slower and some vocabulary is not known.

The claim analysis part was too complicated i.e. to many combinations, to be done within the given time (e.g. 30 min more would have been adequate)

The claim analysis part was longer than the other years

The claim analysis part seems too tough for candidates without long experience as EPO patent examiners.

The answers given in the form e.g. “the subject of claim X is novel over D1” instead of “true/false”-markings would reduce the risk of incorrect marking of the related fields.

The analysis claims part was much long and difficult

The amount of state of the art documents was too high...at some point the exam is not testing the claim analysis understanding of the students anymore but their fast reading capabilities.

The “cluster” marking scheme made sense when the pass rate was 50%, but now seems unnecessarily stressful and complicated. I see no reason why each question cannot be given a single mark with the pass mark set slightly higher, for example, 75%.

Taking into consideration the 2018 claim analysis - by far not enough time. 30 minutes spent on the legal and 3.5 h on the claim analysis. This was a joke considering the previous years papers had less material to read.

Still some ambiguous wording and language that could probably be avoided.

Starting with the claim analysis section which took a lot of time (2,5h) because of little details which had to be looked up over and over again to assign them to the correct document there was much too less time left for the legal part (1,5h so I stressed myself and therefore skiped important details in the questions of the legal part. Due to this I answered wrong in cases although knowing the correct anwer which is very depressing. Seems to be the second time that I failed by less than 5 points just due to stress caused by the time limit :(

Some questions were very ambiguous and could not be answered clearly by a yes or no. I think there will be 3 questions which are appealable.

Some questions were not cleary described, so you had to choose in which direction the question should lead and what the answer should be. In the claim part you had often to switch from one to another page. In some old exames it was easier, because you had the questions and the texts next to the questions . Additional this years the claim part had some more pages and it was a lot to read and to understand. And there were embodiments, which only was described so you had to read the text again and lookin for the answer of the questions to this embodiments.

Some questions on the claim analysis were dependent on interpretation and could be defended as true or false. For instance whether the counter increments from “open to closed” is disclosed implicitly by one that increments from “closed to open”. Also the embodiment level analysis was unexpected and required keeping track of many different aspects and documents simultaneously. Also given that the results are processed by machines, a swift communication of the results would be appreciated

Some questions of the claim analysis part were unclear which make it difficult to answer. I respectfully consider that this kind of questions (claim analysis) can not be answer by a true or false answer

Some of the questions in the claim analysis section were quite ambiguously worded and not suitable for a simple true / false answer.

Some of the claim analysis questions where ambiguous and could have been argued either way, in my opinion.

Some of the claim analysis questions were ambiguous. That’s not usefull to test candidate’s knowledge nor character.

Some answers in the claim analysis part could be argued either way.

Smelled like rotten fish in the hall.

Seemed like there was a huge amount of prior art and claims to read in comparison to other years.

Reading material should be reasonable for examination time, it is more and even more complex each year, without the examination time being adapted.
Q 4.4 was ambiguous.

Pre-examination was very difficult. Documents of claim analysis was very lengthy, and there were a lot of confusingly questions. At the end of the pre-examination the time was not enough.

Plenty of time for all the questions, not enough to go through all of them again to recheck. But then again, there is nothing impeding you from getting the questions right the first time.

Over the past few years, it has become harder and harder to guess what the examiners might consider true or false in the claim analysis section.

obviously it was far too long, confusing and misleading.

Obvious differences between language versions

Not fair for a biochemist

none (it is difficult to prepare for the examination if the private practice you work at has one or two EP applications a year and when the mentor is a professional who became a Eur. patent attorney by means of the grandfather clause)

No

My comment is on the EQE as a whole: The exam aims only at forming patent attorneys that interact with the EPO exclusively, and does not take care of forming attorneys that do preminently in-house counseling, for which it is not necessary to enter in tiny details about patent filing and prosecution, instead patent infringement, license contract drafting, portfolio management, etc. would be preferrable. In an ideal world, the EQE should be divied in two different worlds: one for those candidates who preferably work in application drafting and prosecution and opposition of granted patents and one for those candidates who need to know the basics of the EPC and to perform their daily work into a company legal counsel, interacting with external drafting and prosecuting law counsels. For teh second type of candidate passing the pre-examination would be perfectly sufficient.

Most of the questions of the claim analysis part were in my opinion too complex and ambiguous for a multiple choice test.

Many unclear and ambiguous questions in the theory part and too many docs with extra embodiments for the analysis for the claim analysis part in a short time.

Many things where unclear, I will wait to see the official results and reasoning in order to determine whether it was me who did not prepare properly or whether the exam was inadequatelly planned for the True/False question style.

Many of the questions in the claims interpretation section are not black and white, and could be argued either way. There should not be such a degree of arguability for true or false questions.

Many of the claim analysis questions were open to interpretation, which is quite tricky for giving a T/F answer

Many of the answers are arguable either way

Many different and confusing embodiments in each document

Make it happen more than once a year. Waiting a full year just for this is nonsense.

Less claim sets in the claim analysis. There was too little time to focus on the individual claim sets.

Legal section seemed in line, if not slightly easier, compared to previous years. However, claim analysis section was considerably harder in my opinion and required a much greater amount of reading, and therefore time, than previous years. Whilst the overall time of around 4 hours would have been sufficient had I known how long the claim analysis section would take, since I had previously allowed approximately 2.5 hours for the claim section in previous papers which I found to be ample time, following a similar tactic in the latest paper meant I had to rush the 2nd part of the paper as I think 2.5 hours was not enough for the claim analysis section. Luckily I finished the legal section sooner than expected and so I did have time to fully complete the paper. However, at the time it would have been very easy to spend extra time checking answers in the legal section without realising that a good 3 hours would likely be required to do the claim analysis section to the levels that I expect.

Legal questions were not very different than the previous examinations but there were several small points that took too much of my time while trying to confirm if I am doing it right. So I was left with 2 hours for the claims analysis and that time was definitely not enough for sufficiently considering the answers.

Legal questions were not very different than the previous examinations but there were several small points that took too much of my time while trying to confirm if I am doing it right. So I was left with 2 hours for the claims analysis and that time was definitely not enough for sufficiently considering the answers.

Legal questions appears far easier than previous years in general (only a couple of questions that needed looking up) Claim analysis was far harder than previous years. Particularly questions relating to whether a
particular argument is valid. Such situations appeared to have arguments on both sides and so it was difficult in a TRUE / FALSE question to be certain of the answer.

Lack of clarity in the claims suggested in the claim analysis questions are incredibly frustrating. Our day-to-day job includes being able to argue interpretation of a claim, and with vague or badly written claims, the TRUE/FALSE format simply doesn’t work, as it is very open to interpretation. Similarly, the marking format is strange, I can understand why the marks were allocated like this (5 marks for 4 correct questions etc) when the pass mark was 50%, but now that the pass mark has gone up, and the claim analysis part often seems quite open to interpretation, it seems overly harsh to have such a marking structure.

La partie “analyse des revendications” était particulièrement difficile cette année, sans commune mesure avec les annales disponibles sur le site de l’OEB, en plus d’être particulièrement longue.

It was ridiculous this year. Claims analysis did not lend itself to black and white answers. It seems to get tougher year to year.

It is important that the questions are made to be as clear as possible.

In the claim analysis part the questions at numbers 18-20 (technical effects, arguments in support of inventive step) are very often too grey to give a one-way answer like true or false. This year the grey area has spread over some of the novelty questions. Also, a great number of claim sets and prior art embodiment were given, with only a few questions on each set, and so it took a lot of time to get familiar with each set before addressing the specific questions. On the other hand, questions on lack of clarity and added subject matter seemed to me to be defined better than in previous years.

In the claim analysis it is difficult to find the right level of conservatism in evaluating inventive step - It seems to differ from year to year in the evaluation of the past pre-examinations.

In order to make the paper harder it seems that the examiners both increased the number of claim sets and prior art and reading in general which is not representative of real life but I suppose an legitimate way to reduce the numbers of people passing, they also seem to have made the legal questions much vaguer and far more open to interpretation. This seems unfair in a T/F exam. If the aim is to reduce the pass rate then add in more legal questions, not just badly designed questions.

In my view the exam was not designed for 4 hours. Lack of time negatively affected my score.

In my opinion, it was too hard for a previous examination. Moreover, the claim analysis was too repetitive and easily for making mistakes.

In my opinion, it was so hard for a pre-exam with too much material.

In my opinion it is unfair when the claim analysis part is so demanding as in the 2018 pre-exam. You don’t have the opportunity to show your knowledge in EPC as expected because you are spending much time on reading difficult texts (not in your native language), finding information out of intricate drawings and trying to understand many complex embodiments.

I’m re-sitter, I sit for fourth time and every time I miss several points to pass and it is not because I do not have knowledge, I deserve to pass. The problem is that I’m chemist and need more time to understand the invention in claim analysis part. This year 5 people from my company sat the exam and probably all of us will fail because EPO does not think that chemists understand with difficulty mechanical paper and need more time for the invention description. In plus we are all not native speakers, we have other than French, English and German mother tongues. It is not fair to have same time for the claim analysis like a German person!

I am really upset that this examination 2018 was the most difficult one (together with the one of 2016).

I was running out of time in the end. I think the claim analysis part was too long this time.

I was quite surprised there was no single question directed to matter from “National law relating to the EPC” - unlike any other previous year - so it was a not the best choice to use so much time to practice these topics. For me, the claim analysis part’s later questions were really difficult to answer for I did not find clear statements to base my judgment upon. In previous exams, it appeared to me there were always more or less clear hints to answer these question whereas this time one was left to interpret the language to a greater degree. For interpreting unclear and soft language, a candidate needs much more time than for finding phrases that point out the issue in question straight away. In conclusion, the claim analysis was much more demanding than in the past.

I was caught by surprise of how much extra time was needed this year to finish the claims section of the pre-exam. In practice I typically need only 60-90 min (and approached this years pre-exam accordingly), but that was not even close too being enough time this year and I was really rushing through the final questions.

I think there were too many borderline questions/answers. Pre-examination should primarily focus on
I think that the claim analysis part was rather difficult, with many prior art documents disclosing many embodiments. I think that in order to better understand all the questions, I would have needed some time more.

I think that the claim analysis part of this years pre-EQE was far too difficult compared to previous years - too many technical details (especially for those of us that do not work in mechanics), many pages, too little time and many questions were confusing. I am very disappointed and think that the exam should have been better cross-checked by the committee before using it for the real exam. I simply do not know what it is you want to obtain by making it this difficult - to me the pre-EQE is no longer a step on the way to the real exams, but more a real exam in itself, which I presumed was not really the intention. A actually think the the concept of having the pre-EQE is good - it forces us candidates to start studying more intensively earlier in our qualification period. But I don’t think that the level of this years exam was right.

I think that the claim analysis is too subjective to be answered with MCQ as in practising reality there is usually room for an argument and possible another correct (or partially correct) answer and in the MCQ there is no possibility to quantify answers.

I think that the 2018 pre-exam was poorly designed. The claim analysis part was very complicated and there was not enough time to complete it. I ended up randomly guessing on the last 3 question sets. This is unacceptable. As a patent attorney, one must think, not answer based on instinct. A candidate should have ENOUGH time to answer the questions and double-check the answers.

I think it is useful for assessing the overall level of understanding of the EPC and Examination Guidelines. For the amount of study needed it should give access to a certificate (or be simplified). Minimum 70% passing grade is too high.

I think it is about the right level of difficulty this year. In 2017 the legal questions were too hard. This year the legal questions felt suitably challenging. The claims analysis was a bit long since there were so many prior art documents but it didn’t feel too hard since there wasn’t much combining of those documents.

I started with the legal part which took me 1h40min. I thought that 2h20min should be enough for the claim analysis part (as it used to be enough when I trained the previous pre-exams at home), but I considered the claim analysis part way more complex and difficult than the previous years. Therefore I didn’t plan in enough time for the claim analysis and ran out of time in the end, I could not finish the exam due to that. I could have done the legal part a bit faster if I knew about the complexity of the claim analysis part.

I spend a lot of time for the legal questions i actually wouldn’t have needed. Could have done them quicker, but i though the claim analysis would take me 2 hours max, since this was the case for the older exams. Therefore it was quite a suprise, the claim analysis was that complex. I finished the claim analysis part but i was in quite a hurry which resulted in two errors by the transfer of the answers into the answer sheet. Therefore time management was quite an issue for me, which was unfortunate and wouldn’t have had to happen if i knew about the complex claim part.

I sat all pre-exams from the last years as preparation and never needed more than three hours. I needed the whole 4 hours in the 2018 exam. The claim analysis part was 5 pages (~22%) longer than the 2017 pre-exam, indicating that the claim analysis part was much more extensive than in all previous years. I did not have time to double check some answers that I would have liked to check.

I have heard some people complaining about how “involved” and lengthy the claim analysis part of the exam was, however I do not think that this was particularly difficult or lengthy. Plus, it is the aim of the pre-EQE exam to prevent people from sitting the final exams who are simply not ready. I believe that if people struggled to get 70% in this exam then they would also struggle much more in the final exams. So the exam worked as intended.

I have also inserted my feelings in response to previous questions. Overall, the exam seems aimed at people with much more experience than necessary at this stage. This is a pre-exam that allows you to take the main exams, and thus should not be aimed so high that suitable candidates for some of the mains (such as papers A and B), are continually rebuffed by a true/false farce such as this exam. The pre-eqe is now more akin to another paper D. Over the past few years the questions have become increasingly vague and as such further removed from those that would be considered appropriate for answering in a true or false fashion. Needless to say, the older past papers are hugely inappropriate for preparing for the more recent papers, and completing them in exam conditions beforehand without on-the-day stress only allows candidates to greatly underestimate the amount of time they will use in the actual exam. It seems that candidate’s confidence in their knowledge matters more than the level of care they take in giving the correct answer. A sentiment that is entirely counteracted by the marking regime. It should not be adequate to pass or fail candidates on their self confidence instead of their ability to obtain correct answers to the questions. The pre-eqe has gone much further than an exam taken to establish competence and ability in the minimum language requirements needed to adequately attempt the main exams.
I have a 12-year experience in pharmaceutical IP field. I am a national patent attorney. I have dealt with many EP applications and all of them have been granted. I had answered all of the previous papers under time pressure. I did not have any time related issue in any of them. I got more than 90 marks at these exams. When I sat in 2018 pre-exam, legal part seemed parallel to the previous papers in terms of both difficulty of the questions and the time required to answer them. However, when I started to read the claim analysis questions, I realized that the texts and the questions are so long and requires at least half an hour more time to answer them (i.e. 4.5 hours). When I checked the previous papers after the exam, I could notice that the number of pages were 30, 34 or 37 at most. However, 2018 pre-exam has 42 pages (28 out of 42 pages are coming from claim analysis part). If a rough calculation has been made, the pre-examination would require at least half an hour more time. Besides, the claim analysis questions were pretty harder and time-consuming. Accordingly, time available for the paper was by far not enough. Furthermore, questions were not clear and they were open to interpretation. Even the examiners and the course providers providing support for the preparation of the exam could not be sure about the right answers after the exam. These kind of questions should not take place in an examination applied under time pressure. These kind of questions have not been seen in the history of EQE. This makes us think that the purpose of the exam is not to distinguish the ones who have knowledge, ability and experience to deal with EP applications from the ones who do not, within a reasonable period of time anymore. Indeed, it seems that the purpose of the exam is to eliminate more candidates as possible. Although there was not any matter in the exam about which I do not have knowledge or experience, I may be at risk of fail due to the time problem and the present marking system does not help in this matter (in each question, 1 wrong answer takes away 2 points). Because there was not balance between the questions and available time, I hope you can provide balance in the calculation of the marks. You may apply different methodology in calculating the marks or compensate the damage caused by inadequate available time in any other way of calculation. Because, the reputation and prestige of this examination require such an effort for providing balanced examination system for the candidates who gave their valuable time and effort (and money, no need to mention about it) for this examination.

I found the legal questions to be okay, but I thought that the claims part was more difficult than normal. However I am better at the legal questions as I find them to be more Black and White

I found the claim analysis too long, too much long prior art, figures with a lot of details, six different sets of claims!!! It took already a long time just to read everything, let alone to think about it. I started with the claim analysis and when that was done, my head was already pretty empty and I was very exhausted. That has never happened to me like this, when I took mock-exams or old pre-eqe papers.

I found the claim analysis part much more difficult than those of the previous years. The legal part was as expected with the exception of the questions regarding the production and sale of a product in a contracting state. I felt that these questions are beyond the knowledge required for the pre-exam. I do not feel that a candidate has to know the patent law of Italy and Germany for EQE pre-exam.

I found the claim analysis too long and more difficult than in the previous exams

I found a few of the questions of the claim analysis part not black or white, but rather in the grey zone with respect to the answer, which is not opportune if you can only answer true or false.

I felt the claims analysis section is too ambiguous, and doesn’t lend itself to true or false format in the way the questions are phrased. For example, for many questions it is stated: “it is a valid argument...” and in many instances you could - and should as a good attorney - argue either way. This years exam was particularly bad for this when compared to past exams. It was harder, but not in a way to differentiate candidates by their “attorney” skills, or knowledge of patent law.

I felt the claim analysis part to require more time than what was needed in previous pre-exams (from 2014 to 2017). The description of the invention was 3 page long, there were 4 documents with many embodiments to keep record of. Also, I felt a lot of questions could be answered both ways.

I felt that the claim analysis part was more difficult (more information in the D1-D4 docs, more detailed questions) than in the previous years. I also needed far more time in the exam than in any of the former done as mock trials.

I felt that section B of the pre-examination this year was harder than in previous years and required more than 2 hours to complete.

I appreciate the high expectations on the candidates, however it is not very satisfying that most candidates I know did not have enough time for thorough reading of the claims part. Even excellent students were required to make first guesses in the claims analysis. In the end, a patent attorney working under real conditions may take his individual time to thoroughly study the facts of a case in view of the law and to provide grounded arguments of which he needs to be convinced. Candidates should NOT be trained to make first guesses due to lack of time - in the real world, the questions should be answered correctly by 100%; 70% would be a fail for an attorney. By the way, a bad candidate would not reach many points anyway.
Having passed all of the past papers, under exam conditions, with good margin, I went into this 2018 pre-exam feeling confident and well prepared. The legal questions were okay, although I did think of them were quite ambiguous. I spent two hours exactly on the legal questions. During all of the past papers I have only needed just over an hour for the claims analysis section, leaving plenty of time for checking my answers. Based on this experience, I should have had more than enough time to complete the section in the two hours I had left. However, it took me the full two hours and I felt I wasn’t able to carefully consider the questions as there wasn’t time - I felt I had to go with my ‘gut instinct’ on q. 19 and 20 as there really wasn’t time to consider the questions in any more detail. Seeing the time disappear left me feeling shocked and panicked which surely didn’t help me with the questions. The content of the claims analysis section was far too long. It was at least four pages longer than previous papers, which I imagine is where a lot of my time disappeared. The prior art contained many different embodiments for each document. I felt like the questions were not suitable for a true/false response. I would happily have been able to provide my reasoning - I felt I could provide detailed arguments either way on some questions so it was incredibly frustrating to know I had to simply select ‘true’ or ‘false’. It felt very unfair, and didn’t feel like the exam tested my abilities properly. I left the exam, as did everyone that I spoke to, feeling annoyed, upset, dejected. According to the delta patents blog, my answers have just scraped a pass. I hope that I have passed. Following my success in the past papers, I do not think I could have prepared any better or had any reason to think that I should have.

Having done all the pre-exam past papers in preparation, I think that the 2018 pre-exam was more time consuming than the previous pre-exam papers.

Had practiced exams of previous years, and always found 2hrs enough for each part. At actual exam, 2hrs was by far not enough for claims analysis part. Was not able to finish on time. Difficulty level of claims analysis part was not comparable to that of previous years.

For the pre-examination, legal question were not basic at all. Infringement and opposition by far the most difficult ones. The claims analysis was too long, too lengthy. Too much prior art documents were provided (4 documents - D1 to D4) and many embodiments per document (D1 and D2 have 3 embodiment each). Previous years candidates has been given only 3 prior art documents containing one or two embodiments maximum. When assessing claims novelty there are many checks to be done. When assessing inventive steps many combination. In addition, a lot of text to be assess when looking for claims amendments supported by the disclosure or extension of subject matter.

For the Claim Analysis: I think that embodiments that can not easily be technically understood should be avoided. The purpose of the exam should, I think, be on the capability of the candidate to use their legal knowledge in relation with application documents, not on their capability to technically understand how mechanical/electrical elements are working. Spending too much time to understand such mechanisms, particularly if they are not clearly identified in a drawing, may unfairly penalise a candidate that has however sufficiently prepared (legal/procedure knowledge) for the pre-exam.

Even though the questions in the Legal Section was very easy and thus, easy to finish quite quickly, time was not enough for the Claim Analysis part. This was specially because it was more mechanical than previous years and it looked as if the “style” of the questions has changed compared to last years. The number of claim sets presented was more than previous years. Furthermore, the presence of embodiments without figures, convoluted questions in combination with the increased number of claim sets made it very difficult to make the correct analysis in reasonable amount of time, even though the “type” of the questions were straightforward and typical of a Pre-Exam.

Dramatically harder than all previous pre-EQE exams.

Difficulty of claim analysis lied in the number of claims sets and embodiments in prior art documents. I have the feeling that the evaluation was more about finding the right set of claim and the right embodiment corresponding to the question, rather than being able to provide a proper analysis of the claims and documents.

Dear Committee, please, please do test runs of the exam before approving it. The claims part was waaaaaaaaay too difficult. The legal part was fine, even a bit easier than the last couple of years.

Concerning the claims analysis, the wording of the questions is often not clear and can be subject to discussion. I feel uncomfortable with that examination because of these meaningless questions.

Complexity of the claim analysis part was too high.

Complexity and compendium seems to be increasing continuously. Reading and analyzing various documents through the different questions by going through the many pages back and forth all the time does not seem necessary to examine. For me some answers wer not clearly to differentiate into true and false.
Compared with previous exams, this years exam seemed to be much harder to solve.

Compared to the past papers I did, it felt rushed and a little bit borderline/grey for the claim analysis part.

Claim analysis part was too difficult for pre exam paper, answers were not black or white. Too many grey areas. there was no balance in the paper one part too simple other way difficult

Clearer answer possibilities in the claim analysis part would be appreciated. Not too many slightly differing claim sets with confusing deviations and hard-to-identify features, please.

Claims section was difficult to manage - lots of embodiments and lots of claim sets. Some answers seemed arguable either way.

Claims part was longer than usual

Claims analysis, though generally more favored by me, appeared to be harder than in earlier examinations

Claims analysis was significantly more difficult than in previous years

Claims analysis was disproportionally more difficult than previous years

Claims analysis question were not clear, many questions could be both true or false

Claim questions were very confusing so problems could easily arise by mixing up the referred document

Claim interpretation section too long - why do you need six (6) different claim sets for ten (10) questions? There was too much material to read and absorb (client’s patent + four prior art docs).

Claim interpretation had some grey areas.

Claim analysis was much harder than in previous years: 6 sets of claims is too much, too many embodiments in the prior art, ambiguous answers to choose from. I orientated myself on the difficulty level of previous years, and was subsequently underprepared for the level of mechanical understanding that was needed to grasp the invention quickly.

Claim analysis was far too difficult for a pre-EQE exam. The invention was very confusing and far too complex for 2-2.30 hours. The prior art (inc drawings) and various embodiments was very confusing which does not give any confidence to answers to some questions. The biggest issue with this year is that claim analysis is far too long and many candidates ran out of time including me. I ended up having to rush and guess the last 3 questions because there was not enough time left. I believe I score highly on legal but the complexity and time constraints of claim analysis year meant that many competent candidates may fail not because they couldn’t do the exam but because they ran out of time and had to rush and guess.

Borderline candidates will feel very aggrieved with this paper. Pre-EQE should give candidates sufficient time to answer. Previous pre-EQE papers did not have this challenging time. The claim analysis for 2018 needs to be carefully reviewed. It was too complex for the time given. It will be unfair if candidates fail because they had to rush the last few questions due to insufficient exam time given.

Claim analysis was far too complex and difficult. Prior art and embodiments along with the drawings were so confusing and complex that it was difficult to complete it within 2-2.5 hours. The biggest issue is that not enough time has been given in the exam to do the claim analysis. I had to guess the last 2/3 questions because there was insufficient time left. I believe I score highly on legal but the confusion and timing constraint of the claim analysis means that many competent candidates may fail not because they couldn’t do the questions, but because they had to rush and guess the last few questions as they ran out of time. It is demoralising that the claim analysis was so much more confusing and that makes it difficult to have confidence in the answer. Not enough time was given and many ran out of time as there was far too much material to go through. Previous pre-EQE does not have this time constraint. The committee should carefully review the claim analysis for 2018. It is far too complex and more time should have been given to complete the claim analysis questions. Many borderline candidates will feel very aggrieved by this paper. We urge the board to review the claims part for 2018.

Claim analysis was far too ambiguous.

Claim analysis took too long. It needed much more reading and analysing than previous pre-examinations.

Claim analysis took significantly longer than in previous years. I had done all the past papers in under 2 hours, but this one took me the whole four hours because of the claim analysis part. Some of the questions, particularly in claim analysis, felt very subjective. The exam therefore did not test my knowledge of how to apply the law in that respect. Instead I spent a long time in the exam attempting to gauge the intent of the examiners in questions that could be both T or F.

Claim analysis section was noticeably more difficult this year. Several question were particularly ambiguous.

Claim analysis section in pre-examination could be arranged in mother language for All participants.

Claim analysis required more reading than in previous years. I did well while practising the previous pre-exams and managed to finish in the 4h time limit, but for the 2018 edition, I did not have time to study the
questions and prepare my answers thoroughly. I became stressed and I made mistakes that I would have avoided if I'd had more time. I spoke to other candidates and they share my impression about claim analysis. According to the answers that have been published by unofficial sources I get 42/50 for the legal part and only 24/50 for claim analysis. This means that I do not pass if the bar is maintained at 70 %. I expect that the passing rate will be lower than in previous years. I would be interested to know if the level of difficulty was raised on purpose and for what reason.

Claim analysis questions were too unclear for true/false answers

Claim analysis part was way more difficult compared to last exams. Too much claim sets and documents to read, and tricky details. Some of the questions were imho poorly formulation and open to interpretation. Not adequate for a F/T exam. I wonder if there will be successful appeals on some questions.

Claim analysis part was not as clear cut as in the previous years. Some questions seemed a bit ambiguous.

Claim analysis part was much longer and more difficult than expected compared to previous year. Could not finish on time. Last two questions had to be filled randomly without having time to reflect on them.

Claim analysis part was much harder than expected. I made all pre-exams under exam conditions and passed with marks between 78 and 95. So I entered the examination hall with a self-confidence. Now I see low chances to pass. Language is an issue. People who can make the examination in their mother tongue have much higher chances than those who have to additionally use dictionaries to understand the specific terms used in the claim analysis texts. Therefore I suggest providing an additional 10-15 minutes for students whose language is other than EN, DE or FR.

Claim Analysis Part took more time compared to past exams. Lots of reading material in total. Arrangement of questions also forced one to go back and forth which also took some time.

Claim analysis part too long. Claim analysis part not fair for a Biologist/Chemist in comparison to an engineer.

Claim analysis part requires more than 2 hours.

Claim analysis far too vague. Appear to be translation differences that affect the answers.

Claim analysis exercise was much more difficult to understand than last years, especially for persons who are chemists. Four prior art documents (D1-D4) required more time than usual to answer Claim analysis questions. I think that the examination should include more questions concerning chemistry/pharma/medical technical fields.

Claim analysis comprised too much text, which made it more difficult than necessary.

Both the legal as well the claim analysis part were too long. The difficulty of the claim analysis was reasonable but there where too many unclear questions like the new ground in the opposition proceeding (Question 3.4) or other questions like that. I believe that most of us know that Art. 100 EPC comprises 3 different grounds of opposition. The question regarding the new ground of opposition (Question 3.4) does not check the candidate’s level of knowledge. You have to check in about 2 min what is meant by this question. Maybe this question also relates about the admissibility of the new ground... This is just very confusing for candidates and very time consuming. Also question 1.2 does not check the understanding of the candidate regarding Art. 123(2) EPC. For me, intermediate generalisations (IG) are never allowable and the guidelines does not explicitly dispute that but gives examples in which case a feature is disclosed for every embodiment (see H-V 3.2.1). For me, if a specific feature does not have a structural and functional relationship between the other features it won't be an intermediate generalisation and thus allowable. So the question 1.2 does not check the understanding of Art. 123(2) EPC but only check whether the candidate hits the same definition of a specific term. Moreover, it seems that the claim analysis part was designed for candidates in the field of engineering only. For other candidates without such a background, like candidates that work in chemistry, the claim part was way to difficult. The reading of the claims was very time consuming since the functional definitions were too complex for the time we had.

Bad experience. Need an extension of time duration of pre-exam. Alternatively, shorter exam (more balance with available time). Claim analysis part too artificial and uncomperably more difficult with respect to previous years.

As in every exam, there is always a great difference between preparation and the real exam. Time in an exam is always running out and questions always seem to be much more difficult.

Appeared to me much more difficult than any previous pre-examination, in particular in terms of lack of available time.

Analyze of claims was too difficult and to long, compared to the other years. I d’ont understand why to make this part so difficult.

Ambiguous statements in claims analysis part again (as acknowledged by Delta Patents). It cannot be that qualified attorneys provide different answers for the statements. Ambiguous statements may only be dealt
with setting out the reasons why one option was chosen over the other, never in test exams. Our knowledge is not being examined here so it all comes down to a lucky guess.

After preparation I did the exams from the recent years (from the EPO homepage). I thought I will have enough time to resolve the exam in 4 hours. But the exam this year was very confusing, especially part 2, claim analyses: Too much back-refences to special embodiments of the different citations, too much sets of new claims (the exam itselfs was about 40 pages in length). So the preparation was not representative for the real conditions. It was very cold in the MOC (Munich).

4 prior art documents and 6 set of claims was a bit too much. Some questions seemed to me ambiguous. Even knowing perfectly the considered rule for the question and knowing how to apply it, I had some troubles choosing True or False. Both answers seemed acceptable with different arguments.

30 minutes more will be perfect

Q28) Please rate the difficulty of the main examination paper(s) you sat in 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Too easy</th>
<th>Easy</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Difficult</th>
<th>Too difficult</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paper A</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper B</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper C</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>184</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper D</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q29) Additional comments concerning the difficulty of the main examination papers

Zusammenlegen von E/M und Chemie erhöht die Schwierigkeit signifikant.
Without the results of the EQEs, Q28 is an impossible question. I have given answers (they were mandatory) but the answers are worthless. How can I know whether it was hard without knowing how I did? If I got 100% then it was easy. If I got 10% then I clearly missed the answer and the exam was hard.

With a scientific background in biology and chemistry, why paper A is a specific Mechanic paper? Why such a discrimination?

When compared to previous years even more material to read and handle in C-paper. The paper should not be a test of a reading speed! For candidates having non-EPo language as their mother tongue the difficulty of the paper is multiplied due to the large amount of material to be read!

What’s the aim of giving additional 30 minutes if you increase the difficulty / number of pages to read in the same time? Definitely to many sheets for C DII was way too difficult : appeal, reformatio in peius, 10 days rule. It was more like DI part … Besides the structure was so different : no opponent, but someone interested into selling its own patent application.

We were supposed to have 30min more time than in previous years. However, this year’s paper C was so badly drafted that about 1.5 h (i.e. 6.5 h in total) would have been needed to complete it. Thus, the claims and Annexes A1-A6 were too lengthy and there was too much information. More importantly, the inventive step attacks did not fit well. In my view, this was the 1st time that in a paper C really far-fetched IS attacks were expected. Normally in paper C, if you find the correct IS attack, you know it. This year, this was not the case at all, which (at least for me) led to a huge loss of time. Combined with the length of the paper, it was difficult (for me impossible) to finish in time.

Way too much reading in some papers. Especially for non-native speakers, there were some tricky sentences that could have been misinterpreted.
Unlike other years, there seems to have been a large increase in the length of the prior art documents provided in Paper B and Paper C. There also appears to have been too narrow focus on one particular area in Paper D (Appeals). Paper A was made such that it required at least two independent claims (if not more). The difficulty was significantly increased over previous years, and it appears as though the extra 30 minutes which were provided last year (without an increase in difficulty) were used this year to increase the length of the cited documents and difficulty of the exams.

Toutes les épreuves étaient trop longue en particulier C avec des documents très long à lire et plusieurs objets à retenir et A avec la demande entière à rédiger.

Tooo little time and have to wait another year to do it... I know it now but my brain stop working due to the timestress.

Too much text to read!

Too much opposition and appeal content in paper D - not where trainee get experience - not an area you get much experience of even when qualified!

Too much material/information in the Annexes. 7 pages more than 2017.

Too much interpretation possibilities in the claims and the texts (at least to them who are not native speakers), clearer claims would be fair.

Too much interpretation (means for) Prior art documents were too long (longer than the prior art documents of the previous papers) The technical subject matter was not as easy as in the previous paper (not an object of the current life so it took more time to understand the subject matter) The expected inventive step argumentations were too long or to many (changes in the closest prior art for dependat claim, partial problems) ->The paper was far too long to be done in 5,5h.

Too much information in A1-A6 and a lot of superfluous information. Most of the time is spend to organise the information and not in thinking of real arguments for inventive step. This is because of time pressure.

Too much information given in A1 and prior art documents. Prior art documents were too long.

too much data for given time.

Too much cross-link information in Paper C

too much ambiguity

Too many time-consuming information to handle.

too many things to do. it is very hard to answer all questions “correctly” in the time allowed. the shape of D2 was different and time consuming for paper C, i couldn’t finish and do correct attacks for the last items to attack due to lack of time available.

Too many documents, quite long.

Too many alternatives, I saw alot of possible ways and answers but there just was too much and too little time to actually assess. Especially in paper C and D.

Too long, it’s useless to add time and make papers longer.

too long too many functional features - disadvantage for chemists too much text - too long claims, e.g. impossible to use ceipi method too many effects even for a single feature. I did the last 11 years compendium in real condition, with rather good results, but was not of any help for 2018.

Too long to read

too long text to read and process.

too long and complex.

Too difficult. People have lives to live and jobs to study around. It’s unfair to expect every nuance of Epc to be known. Most trainees have very little involvement in appeals or oral proceedings. There is basically no work training for those types of situations! Most of us put on weight during exams and all this stress and health impairment for basically nothing makes us question whether the supposed pot of gold at the end of it is worth the hassle.

To much and too long annexes for the amount of time available.

To many misleading information.

Time v Amount of info v No. of issues to be addressed. Both C & D papers this year were much longer than
in recent years, very messy set up for each, big departure from previous recent paper….. soul destroying

Time seemed shorter than in 2017 as I am someone who can write fast and I finished just in time. It is difficult that paper A becomes more and more a question of finding the features necessary to reach the effect of the invention rather than novelty, inventive step, clarity and unity of the invention. In my view paper A in 2017 and even more in 2018 is rather a question of interpreting text and not so much the test on patentability questions it should be.

Time pressure. Not enough time to think and write

Time management difficult

Time limit and handwriting by pen were the main factors limiting my success.

Time is the main issue related to the difficulties of the Paper

time is not enough for these questions. and in D2 there are many surprise questions and cases that cannot be seen in previous D2 questions.

Time in paper C. Subject matter in paper A and C.

Though I understand that language skills are crucial in passing these papers and in this specific profession, too much to read in a limited examination time could be a huge disadvantage for those not having the papers in their native languages.

This year, Paper D includes a mix of different topics resulting in a high (higher than before) number of information, feature combinations and modifications thereof, of which each had to be marked by a specific date. This leads to difficulties while trying to organize all information and renders the focus more on the organizing and maintaining the overview over the complex patent situation - but away from handling dates, priorities and disclosure issues. In my opinion, a smaller number of information and feature combinations and modifications thereof would also be appropriate to test the candidates abilities to handle dates, priorities, disclosure issues and the like. Further, questioning the subject-matter, rather than the single patents (as it was asked this year), is a more natural and realistic way of analyzing a complex patent situation. Further, the high focus on certain technical information and modifications thereof were obscure. For instance, in German "trompetenförmig" is subgroup of "konisch", which seems to be defined different by Paper D. Reviewing this issues takes time, but does not help to solve Paper D.

This year the secordn part was very strange and it takes me long time to put in context all the information.

This year paper C was too long.

This year it wasn’t difficult but the problem is that it was too long. Too much pages to read, too much information to remember. And, I always write the same thing: you have to give more time for non mother tongue people! Even if italian people everyday works in english, but the pressure of the exam makes everythig much more difficult.

This examination is excessively based on luck. When you can obtain very high marks on a paper and too low marks on the same paper, depending on the year, it derives that the papers are not representative of the preparation of the candidate. The main problem is that papers are written with the precise aim to confund the reader, to make it difficult to understand the information and the time is so short (or the papers are so long) that the candidate has not enough time to provide a complete and completely correct answer. It makes no sense in view of the aim of the examination. Notwithstanding the fact that it has nothing to do with the current practice of a Patent Attorney, being actually an exercise of enigmisitic skills

They’re always difficult. Marking is fine-tuned afterwards, so you can’t know the issues you’re supposed to concentrate and present on paper, in the limited amount of time available. For a non-native CS candidate, there’s the additional factor of mental translation (which is not affected by your skills in the three official EPO languages). How does the exam compensate for this?

They were too long - paper C was absurd. It is a shame to not be able to finish a paper because you run out of time, rather than because the subject-matter is too difficult.

There were severe drafting problems this year. The paper was unclear and far more difficult than previous years. Made particularly the content of paragraph 12 which had different meanings in different languages

There was too much to read in paper C

There was some lack of clarity (at least in the English version) with I presume was unintentional and likely caused some candidates unnecessary confusion regarding what was expected. Paper C was unexpectedly long compared to past papers, without any warning. Paper D, Part II, was unexpectedly complicated/legal-based compared to past papers.

There was not enough time to finish the paper, at all. To me, it seems like the time extension from last year has completely been filled again.
There was no chemistry at all. The problematics was mechanical ones. In chemistry, we do not use to write this type of claims.

There was a lot of time pressure for papers B and D.

There was a lot of text in paper C compared to papers from previous years. Took a long time to read and it was easy to get lost if you had not extracted/marked ALL relevant information from appendices in first go.

There are some important parts of the examination, especially in paper A where translation were a little different (e.g. French and English)

the understanding of the subject matter of both papers A/B was very difficult, I would prefer to deal with a papers inherent to my background.

The type of exam of the Paper D was quite different than the last 5-6 years. Too many questions regarding to appeal in the short questions and also in the D-II part

The topic (fuse) was easy to understand. But there was not enough time; the paper was very long, many pages to read, and three prior art documents to deal with. Having to argue extensively with respect to 3 documents takes 3/2 of the time than for just 2 documents. At least. Because instead of just 2 single docs and one combination, actually 3 single docs and 4 possible combinations had to be assessed. I could have used at least 30min extra, better 1h extra. In the end, I scribbled very fast, but still couldn’t finish.

The time pressure is way too high. It does not allow you to answer adequately all questions. Moreover this time pressure is not a factor in “real life”. Patent attorneys will not combine their responsibilities with the ones of liner jet pilots, right?

The text of the claims was pretty long so that the examination was pretty long in order to write down all the features and to justify all the answers with the appropriate references

The style of the papers this year was very different to the past papers. It is the second year after papers A and B were combined and I feel that the level of difficulty has gone up a lot for all papers. Although candidates are now given an extra half an hour, it was obvious that the amount of material to read had also increased, making the stated purpose of giving candidates the extra half an hour pointless. I was pushed for time for ALL papers, whereas this was not the case when doing the past papers. I noticed that the margins for some of the papers had been decreased, so effectively more text was fit onto one page. Paper C 2017 (and the older Paper Cs) and Paper C 2018 were not on the same level (of difficulty). Equally, Paper D 2018 was also very different and a lot more difficult than e.g. Paper D 2017. It came as a complete shock to many of us. While I am not against the EPO gradually increasing the level of difficulty of the EQEs, I did not appreciate this abrupt change.

The structure of DII was different to the past years. In the past years, the report stayed that the patent analysis was to be conducted by subject matter. This year, the DII asked to conducted the patent analysis by patent. DII comprised a part on Opposition and Appeal that in past was not comprises in DII.

the shortage of time is the main difficulty, this applies to all papers. This year, for D and C in particular

Thé questions are not clear.

The quality of translations for papers A and D were poor. It was clear that they were written in German and essentially “transliterated”. Many of the sentences were difficult to read, with the operative part of the sentence coming at the end (which is not natural for English speakers). In many instances, important information was presented in the form of “double negatives”, rather than positively reciting the relevant information. It is understandable that it will never be perfect given the language requirements of the examination, but compared to the past examinations I feel that this year was particularly poor. Paper C contained a lot of information, much of which did not appear to be relevant to the solutions. Paper C is very demanding from the perspective of time management, and I feel that having a larger amount of information to process than pervious years was unfair. I feel it is also unfair to present part 2 of Paper D in the format chosen for the 2018 paper, without providing candidates with an total for the number of marks available for each question. Why is it deemed appropriate to tell candidates in part 1 that a certain question is worth 10 marks, but not in part 2? Particularly, this year part 2 included a portion which was entirely separate to the main part of the question. Essentially, this acted like a further part 1 question, however it was not clear how many marks were available. Time pressure is tough in paper D, and therefore candidates should be told how many marks are available in each section of part 2 so that they can apportion their time accordingly.

The problem is that you never know what the committee expects, in the compendium you get the impression that the comitee wanted a certain answer, although I thing some, quite different, would also be ok

The prior art in paper C was quite frankly bizarre in some cases, for example a cow walking across a river? It seems that instead of assessing candidates’ ability to put together an opposition, what is being tested is our ability to deal with obscure prior art and nonsensical subject matter. Furthermore, the subject matter of the claims was very mechanical/electronics based with a lot of “means for” language, which is very inaccessible for those with a background in chemistry. Indeed, the subject paper of the papers is never
The papers this year were all more difficult than in previous years. The primary reason is the increase in length of the papers, which was quite spectacular for papers B and C, and part II of paper D. The Examiners will perhaps claim that the papers were simpler. Even if this were true, this does not (really) matter: even the simplest paper must be read carefully, and given thought, so the longer the paper, the more time is required to perform this work. Paper A was poorly written/translated, and the paper seemed to contain many points of ambiguity that did not seem to have been deliberately included. Paper B involved amendments that departed quite significantly from those the client suggested. In previous years, smaller adjustments have been required. Furthermore, the extensive use of comparative examples puts non-Chemistry candidates at a significant disadvantage. Being able to interpret such examples is not a skill that is of use to the majority of candidates, and it is not, therefore, clear why it is being tested in the exam. Paper C involved a tricky priority issue, and it was not clear whether candidates were expected to consider partial priority. If so, the issue was far too complex; I am not convinced that the law is even settled in this respect. Furthermore, if a novelty attack based on A5 was expected, this attack, although spotted, was so far-fetched that it did not seem to be intended. The first part of paper D was in line with previous years, but the second was not. There were far too many legal issues to consider, and the scenarios were extremely unusual for a Part II (appeals, accidentally filed drawings, etc.).

The papers B and C were far too long in page count, exceeding all previous records.
The papers are too different from one year to another. Testing is NOT relevant to day to day practice. In consequence, despite the official goal, EEQ does not test the professional fitness but is designed to artificially limit the number of practitioners, which is unacceptable.

The paper was too long and with too many information. The claims had too many features and implicit features. The effects related to the D2 papers were not clearly stated as in previous papers. The novelty attack on claim 4 based on A5 was difficult to identify because it was not immediately clear that the feature “soaking the teats of the animal outside a milking robot” could be attacked considering the “river”. After two years of preparation it is not yet clear to me what the paper C wants to test and at which level: argumentation? Speed? Accuracy? Thinking out of the box? Legal issue?

The paper was not difficult per se, however it was not well formulated/translated (in German), thus essential features were more difficult to spot. In addition, it was not really clear (if you have thought briefly about the technology) if some features (even though they were described as essential) are really needed (e.g. height demand of the protrusions). Hence, I also read the English version, which was much clearer, which however cost time... Probably write it next year in English.

The paper was composed differently than I expected it to be. Part 1 questions were for the most part longer than expected and with different parts to attend to per question (a and b), what I didn’t expect either. Part 2 contained two separate problems to be solved (appeal and separate analysis of named applications, whereby the opposed patent was not part of the analysis), whereas in the last years always only one “big part” was to be treated. Further the analysis of the applications was directed towards the applications and not the claimed subjects. In addition I have to say that the naming of the applications was bad (monotonous and thus confusing).

The paper should target testing the legal knowledge of the candidates. If the subject matter chosen is not-familiar for the candidates, as it was not this year, candidates need to invest too much time in understanding the technology first. Also, the state of the art documents were too long, the choice of the closest state of the art documents much less straightforward than for previous papers, the claims, and therefore the key features to comment on way too long. I have worked on all the exams from 2002 on, and I can fairly say that this was the most complex.

The paper itself may not seem difficult but with the added time pressure and nerves of an exam I found it difficult to complete in the time.

The paper D-II was a little surprising compared to previous exams. During my training I first found it easy to address “per application”, however all the previous years were asked “per subject matter”. So I revised my strategy to be able to cope with the “per subject matter” approach. So this year again “per application” ;). Also not so straightforward in competition with a competitor, as previous years.

The paper C was impossible in time. The Prior Art documents were too long, making impossible a correct analysis, and a detailed annotation in a summary data table to create later the attacks to the claims.

The Paper C exam is a test that does not assess the skills of the people in the field of filing oppositions to a European patent. I can not understand the strategy of this exam (difficult topics to digest (milking robots), hiding words and relevant terms. I have the feeling that it’s just to raise money. It is sad to reach this conclusion after working more than 20 years in an IP department.

The main difficulty was the length of the paper (or the insufficient amount of time for the examination). I did not manage to finish the paper.

The main difficulty lies in the fact that the exam does not correspond to real-life cases due to the constructed cases in order to test several aspects of the EPC.

The legal part of paper D was a bit segmented and the short questions of paper D were rather more involved than usual. Paper A was a bit tricky as there was very little guidance from the scenario as to what was expected.

The Legal opinion was particularly difficult and complicated to be faced within 3 or 3 and half hour. So the percentage of not ending the opinion was great.

The invention lie in the ability to induce photo-induced absorption of the glass to create a monolithic protrusion and then using a cooling stream of air to get a regular convex shape to the protrusion (paragraphs 8, 13 and 18 of the client letter). As mentioned, UV and/or IR are merely described in the client letter as types of lasers that “can be used to cause photo-induced absorption – see paragraph 3 of D1. D1 is described as “a more detailed illustration of photo-induced absorption” (see paragraph 8 of the client letter), so should provide the candidate with all the information they will need to understand photo-induced absorption. D1 states that photo-induced absorption is caused “when irradiated with a laser having a suitable wavelength” (paragraph 2 of D1), which clearly envisages the possibility of using a laser having any wavelength (not just UV or IR). D1 mentions UV and/or IR as types of lasers that can be used, but does not state that only UV and IR can be used with glass. Thus, D1 does not make clear that only UV and/or IR...
must be used, or, that these are the only types of lasers that will work. Thus, I consider that specifying the laser as a UV and/or IR lasers is not an essential feature based on the client letter or D1. Candidates should therefore not be penalised if they included UV and/or IR or not, so long as it is clear that the laser caused photo-induced absorption to create a protrusion. Further, although the paper (client letter, paragraph 18) states that for satisfactory performance as “insulating glazing”, there should be “multiple” protrusions of “100 microns or more”, the glass and method is novel and inventive if just one convex monolithic protrusion of any height is made. The paper (client letter, paragraph 1) says that “glazing manufactures could be possible licensees”, so other licensees using the glass for different applications are therefore clearly anticipated by the client. Moreover, the paper (client letter, paragraph 1) states that the client wants the “widest protection scope”. Thus, including as essential features either: (i) multiple protrusions, or (ii) at least 100 microns would unduly limit the utility of the invention to only glazing, which is only one of the possible applications envisaged by the client. As neither of these features is needed for patentability, (i) the repeating step of the method to create multiple protrusions, and (ii) protrusions of at least 100 microns, should not be considered as essential features in the independent claims. For Paper B, the choice between D1 and D3 as CPA was particularly close this year and therefore should not affect a candidates ability to score highly if they have produced convincing arguments starting from either. For Paper C, as mentioned below, there seems to be a lot more to do than in previous years and that it led to the end of the paper being rushed. For Paper D, section B was difficult and not in line with the framework of previous years. The law underlying the appeal procedure question up-front seemed particularly unclear, which led to the question being very time consuming. I expect this first question would have taken a lot of candidates precious time and may even have rattled their confidence for the remaining questions of the paper. Overall, Papers D and C were very time pressured - even with the extra half hour. As an English speaker sitting the exam in English, I fear that candidates sitting the exam in their second language would have struggled to finish Papers C and D in time. There also seemed a lot more to do in these papers compared to previous years - in terms of difficult of the paper, and length of reading material. If the purpose of the extra half hour is to give second-language candidates the chance to finish the paper, as I understand it to be, it does lead us to wonder what point of the extra time is if the difficulty of the paper is to be increased, and if there is more read material...

The format of Paper D this year was different from all of the past papers that I had used to practice and I was rushed for time to get answers down for everything. For Paper C I felt there was quite a bit of ambiguity with the Annexes that could be used to attack so finding the closest prior art was difficult and I spent too long debating added subject matter for claim 5.

The facts given in DII were unclear. The issue tested with first question of DII -admissibility of appeal / statement of grounds by reference to first instance submissions- addressed only by T decisions. Too hard for exam.

The Exams are supposed to be difficult. This is accepted.

The exams (especially C) were really difficult for a chemist. Long explanations about mechanical / electrical components makes you uncomfortable from the beginning. I does not seem right that a chemist would need to practice a lot more dealing with mechanical inventions just in order to pass the EQE.

The exam was unlike any previous exam and the embodiments were far too complicated to identify, separate and advise upon. This level of difficulty in the examination seems unfair, and was certainly not following established expectations. Making the exam questions simpler to understand would still allow candidates to show their fitness to practice. The goal in this paper seemed to be to confuse the candidate away from the answer rather than allow the candidate to eliminate incorrect answers and focus on the correct ones. Quite disappointing, and in retrospect, almost exhibiting spitefulness - very unfortunately.

The DII paper was not adequate. Especially after many years of the same format (Discussion of several embodiments, improvement of each embodiment situation and exploitation) it was not fair for this year’s candidates to be confronted with a completely new format including e.g. very difficult case law of appeal procedures. Last year’s DII paper was very nice and fair and everybody expected a similar paper.

The difficulty of the tests is essentially that they are much too long to be treated properly.

The difficulty lies in the fact that papers C and D are too long for getting them done properly in 5.30 hours

The difficulty is in view of the time available, I did not manage to complete any of the exams, entirely due to lack of time.

The difficulty is in me writing too long answers, thus not enough time to provide answers on the full papers.

The Content was too much

The content of Paper D II was somewhat different than earlier years. Art. 100b EPC.

The combination of Chemistry and E/M in the B-Exam was not very felicitous

The change in format of part ii of Paper D was a little unfair. This section has been of similar format for the last 4 or 5 years and to change it to include a complicated question about appeals was confusing.
The C paper is difficult because of the lack of time, not so much because of complexity. With half an hour more, I would have been able to make more attacks, especially inventive step attacks.

The bias of marking toward a single claim allows little flexibility and excessively penalises small errors. This may be the goal of the examination in attempting to distinguish candidates with high accuracy.

The available time for the examination continues to be the major hurdle - I think the examination does not reflect any kind of proper preparation in writing an opposition in real life and in my opinion, what is tested is how you handle stress, and not how well you are at making cogent or stringent arguments when filing an opposition.

The annexes to be used in paper C were too long and tricky. After having read the annexes it was difficult to highlight the main features of each document due to the high number of pages and text contained therein.

The aim of the EQE is to test the ability of candidates to manage “in the EPO way” patent drafting, search report replies, oppositions, etc in the real life. I am of the opinion that for achieving this aim are not required complicated and too articulated subjects for the Papers. The “robotic farm” with several features linked to several devices of Paper C of this year was something too complicated compared to the “cork screw” of a past year. Keep in mind also that we are not all English, French or German mother tongue. I would be fair (more than the unique Paper A) to choose subjects easy to understand for all the candidates of each State. I think that the passing of EQE should depend on the understanding of the subject of the Paper, but mainly in the way a candidate manage the Paper (irrespective of the subject).

Sudden change of choice of topics compared with previous years. Of course appeals are a very important topic and it is ok to give it so much weight, but a gradual increase of this topic during the past years would have avoided this big shock. Also the different structure of the questions (position per application iso per subject) in D2 was unpleasant. The 2018 D exam when compared to 2013-2016 (2017 appeared to be similar but less extreme) seemed to be made to have a lot of people fail, not to test peoples knowledge....

Such a ridiculous time pressure. Makes it impossible for me as a generally slower person to pass this exam, despite long and intensive preparation. Time pressure forces me to make mistakes and doesn’t give me the chance to show what I have learned and that I am actually fit to practice (which my advisors and clients would confirm). This exam is just a joke. It is unfair because it doesn’t give people who work rather slow and precise the chance to pass, but lets other fast Wirkung people pass with only minimum preparation (and knowledge). The exam should simply test whether we’re fit to practice, which however is not related so much to time pressure in praxis as the exam suggests. The exam rather tests which candidate can work with a high hourly rate, which the EPO should leave to the firms or companies to test. I wish there would be an exam where I can show what I can. Which is not going to happen. Year for year. Damaging my career. And everybody around me appreciates my work. Frustrating.

Subject matter in C complicated and not straightforward to understand.

Studying the previous A papers on Mechanics did not really set the track to tackle this year’s A paper Paper C too complex for the time provided.

Starting the DII with an opposition appeal question was a true shock for me. It was hard for me to recover from that, because I was really not prepared for such surprise. To me it feels unfair that after all the intense studying we were faced with such a big surprise in the DII part, which was really different from all the other DII exams in the new style.

Spotting the paper C subtlety in the time given and under pressure proved too much, especially as it hadn’t been mentioned in any of the past papers or preparation material that I studied. The change in paper D2 format compared to all previous years threw me.

Some sentences in paper D2 were not clear for me: Too many pages to read with too many confusing aspects. Too less time to answer all questions adequate, which is very disappointing.

SM in paper D part II difficult to understand. In paper A and B there were no chemical topics. So difficult and time consuming to understand the SM for non E/M people.

Since the format has changed, the available material for preparation is not enough. In particular, not enough past papers.

See, when I say paper A is too easy, that doesn’t mean I am sure I got a passing grade: it’s not hard to spot the invention and to spot what the “possible” essential features are. But then the difficulty starts: should all these candidates for essential elements be in the main claim? If you don’t put it in while you should have, you lose lots of marks. If you put it in while you shouldn’t have, you lose fewer marks. The paper might ridiculously over-emphasise (cooling air), or simply say once that IF THIS THEN THAT, where the THAT is rather essential (perpendicular laser). So the best bet is to incorporate all potential essential features - but it’s unlikely that all were actually intended as essential. I feel the paper should give more guidance about which choices you should make. There’s no time pressure here, it’s just that the paper doesn’t give enough info to make the informed choice. So now you’re waiting for months to await whether your choices got you a
passing grade or not, independent from your actual ability to draft a good application.

See comment regarding paper A regarding essential features above.

See above. Too many paper stacks & too much super-reading for too little time. Unfriendly working conditions. Sometimes there remained doubt (in spite of accepting the Rule that one should not bring in personal knowledge of the subject area) if a feature (e.g. “orthogonal” laser in Paper A) is to exam-meant to be treated as essential and characterizing, although it might be a limitation one would rather avoid in real-life IP.

Ridiculously long and convoluted as compared to past years papers. Too much reading and processing of details that prima facie look very similar. Too many false trails and ambiguous interpretations. Not enough time to properly process the information and write down well reasoned arguments, particularly when one does not read in his native language.

Regarding papers C and D, the exams were makeable, but there was simply an enormous problem with time.

Regarding C, the exam once more was geared towards civil or electronic engineers. How can it be the continuously chemists, pharmacists and biologists are disadvantaged? In the real world we rarely, if at all, deal with non-chemical cases.

Re A paper: There were too many different possible embodiments to claim, multiple in one category. Further, since last year, there are embodiments wished by the client that are unclaimable due to lack of novelty. Further wished embodiments seem to not solve a problem. This is very confusing, not straight-forward and partly very misleading. Also, there are no more true “red flags” or a leitmotif to follow as the interpretation of the same words (“must”) seems to be diverting for two different paragraphs within the client’s letter. Altogether, I assume, the straight marking sheet as previously applied, is completely useless for this new type of A papers as introduced in 2017, in particular the interpretive dominance as carried out therein.

Questions regarding problems which have never been asked before in paper D and which therefore I had only prepared insufficiently.

Question Q28 should be asked after receiving the results of the exam

Puzzle pieces in C did not seem to fit smoothly as in previous C exams.

Please check the difficulty level compared to other years. In the light of the training with the old exams (2014-2017) I thought I was good prepared. Unfortunately, the old exams were not comparable with the difficulty of 2018-D-paper.

Perhaps it is not so much a question of difficulty but more of too much information in too little time

Part II to paper D was unexpected in that it included a legal situation/analysis more like I would expect in part I. It was unclear the level of analysis required, because the number of marks to be allocated to each question in DII are not displayed. Given the other questions in DII were similar to previous years, it seemed as though not much should be spent on the legal situation question, however on reflection it appears as if the legal analysis could have been very in depth. It was not clear that this in-depth analysis was expected.

Part II of paper D was slightly confusing due to its divergent structure: In the last years, DII was always clearly designed around two competing parties, that wasn’t the case this time.

Part II of paper D was much harder than previously. Part a) of part II was like an additional part I question. All of the questions in part I were really long, and took longer to read than usual.

Part II of paper D was in a different format to normal. It made it difficult how much time and discussion to allow for each subsection since no indication of marks was given

Part II of D was quite different to previous years

Part DII of paper D was unusual. Part A was complex.

Part D: too complicated cases in DII which are unnecessary in my opinion. It is easy to be confused. Part C: Often the attacks are not clear and it is a matter of interpretation of the annexes. What is important is to know how novelty and inventive step argumentation work. The candidate should easily fin the attacks and mainly focus on how to structure the argumentation.

Part 2 of D exam was too loose in its questioning (not giving the examinee a clear view on what was actually needed in the answer), and too vague in the background information (which further confuses on what the answer should be, as the vague information doesn’t allow for a lot of points of opinion you could strongly support).

Papers tend to get longer every year. It gets harder and harder to finish them on time. Extra 30 mins doesn’t help at all. I would rather have 30 min less and less pages to read. Paper C this year was 40 pages long, which is 20% more than in previous years. Paper B was 22 pages long, 40% longer than last year. What is the point of giving us 30 min extra when we have so much more to do?!
Papers felt very constrained with time (especially C and D) which made them more difficult. A felt quite ambiguous, struggled to know what products should be claimed in addition to method, and essential features were ambiguous.

Papers D and C were way too long. The amount of text and Information should be reduced.

Papers A and B appeared to be a lot more subjective than previous years. There were several decision points on which the exam paper did not provide sufficient clues to allow candidates to make a clear decision. Paper C was of a comparable level of difficulty to previous years, but was very long (over 40 pages of content to digest), which even with the additional time allowance was still a lot of content to process. Paper D Part I was of a comparable level of difficulty to previous years. However, Part II was significantly harder (in particular the question regarding the pending appeal). This made the exam substantially more difficult since the allocation of marks in part II appears to be different to previous years.

Papers A & B weren’t difficult per se, but the sheer volume of information you had to read through in the time allotted was an issue. Paper B in particular had 40% more pages to read than last year. Paper D was “very” difficult. I was expecting it to be difficult, but nowhere near as difficult as it was. It didn’t help that in part 1 there was a huge amount of information to read per question (in particular compared to previous years), and that the questions themselves were often vague e.g. “Advise the client”. It is difficult to know where the marks are for such questions, and so a lot of time is wasted covering all bases. Part 2 was significantly harder than usual, for several reasons. Firstly I was thrown by Q1, which was just like a very vague Part 1 question and required detailed analysis. Then the fact that the subject matter was broken down into applications rather than subject matter made it much more difficult to analyse the situation. Finally the fact that there were no competing applications meant that (unlike previous years), the suggestions to improve the client position were much less obvious. So the increased difficulty in Paper D was overall due to the vagueness of the questions, as well as the sheer amount of information to read plus the change in format of Part 2. Paper C was also difficult, in particular the G1/15 priority assessment. Again there was the problem that there was just far too much information to read through in the allotted time. I’m not surprised that people missed out features in prior art documents, because there just wasn’t enough time to read through each of them in detail. You therefore had to try and skim for features you were looking for, which is difficult when the terms are often unclear. In summary, these papers seemed more useful at testing how fast you can read/write rather than whether you would be a good patent attorney.

Paper DII: The Legal opinion was formulated for the first time in different way comparing with the previous D exams. This caused some problem in approaching the text. Furthermore questions part D1 were doable but they took long time for answers.

Paper DII was strange for the question analysis

Paper DII involves too many unclear issues on patentability of the inventions (Art. 83, Art. 56). This distracts from solving the real legal questions: Paper C was a mess of information; too long and links from every document to all others; confusing All in all the EQE is an awful exam based merely on time pressure, not legal knowledge.

Paper D’s difficulty was adequate Paper DII was quite different from that of recent years so that created difficulties in the approach. The exam conditions are so particular in terms of stress and time pressure that this influenced the overall result

Paper D: The importance of PCT was not reflected into the questions. Appeal as a subject appeared unexpectedly often in the paper, when compared to the real-life practice.

Paper D: - was concentrating less on patent law and very much on material law (novelty & inventiveness) -> while those are doubtless important things, there are papers A - C to test it and I don’t see the point in testing them in paper D in such a broadness Paper C: - the 2018er exam was very much on the edge of how much a single mind can comprehend in the given time - also the number of definitions, needed to explain wether a feature is disclosed or not was very high -> and therefore increased the necessary time of writing the reasoning extremely => by trying to spoil any systematic approach to Paper C (Deltapatents, CEIPI, etc) which makes paper C to easy it is in danger of getting more and more useless to really test candidates’ ability to write an opposition

Paper D, Part II besides being difficult, was rather unclearly written.

Paper D, part I, legal questions: 5 questions are ok, but the text/information per question (up to one page is too long) Paper D, part II, legal opinion: The way how the technical features where expressed are very long and this is inconvenient, as it takes very long during writing the assessment when repeating them again and again; technical features should be short (like A+B+C, see EEP 2015 and EEP 2017); organizing the answer by patents/patent application is very inconvenient; it is much better to organize the answer by items (entities); the description of the problem should be short and clear like in part 2 (legal opinion) EEP 2016 (2,5 pages problem description, 0,5 pages question)
Paper D was very untypical. I felt very uncomfortable with it. Paper C just took me too long.

Paper D was in a very weird format. A complex opposition case in DII is out of line with previous papers. Also, a question with a lot of text to digest followed by a simple “Advise the client” for 10 marks is not a fair way to examine candidates.

Paper D was different this year and more complex.

Paper D was a somewhat different from the last years - surprising and hard to prepare for. In paper A, I saw several possibilities to get a novel claim without clear cues to which features were expected; drafting several independent claims like this has nothing to do with my practical experience.

Paper D this year was very different to previous papers.

Paper D part II was a very different style from previous years. Paper C was not as well signposted as some years have been.

Paper D part II did not follow the style of previous years and left me feeling unprepared in spite of adequate preparation.

Paper D of this year was the most extended and difficult of the new paper D format (after pre examination). It has no sense having two questions of appeal (paper D 2018) above all in D2 part. It seems that it is required the same extension than in old D2 papers (before pre exam) where the time was 7 hours with a pause, but doing it in 5:30 without any pause.

Paper D is just difficult, and this years paper was different (the D2 part) from previous sets, and therefore more difficult. When you are under time pressure even a small change in the set can be a huge challenge.

Paper D format was very different to previous years and threw off confidence. Paper A and B format, although using the new combined E/M and Chem papers, still different from last year’s format.

Paper C: too time consuming case.

Paper C: many pages per annex

Paper C: Long list of claim features and a lot of information to be handeled - too much, even for the extended time frame of 5,5hs. There was not enough time left to give structured and comprehensive grounds for opposition.

Paper C: 5-hours, to attack 6-claims having 3-independent claims, Klasse ! Paper D: if without any drawing, why have so many technical features ? donnot understand.

Paper C wasn’t very difficult but too many mixed information and teachings away made impossible to finish within the examination time. Paper D II was in fact split into two separated exams, where the part related opposition was very unclear.

Paper C was way too large in terms of hints to follow in the allocated amount of time.

Paper C was very unstructured this year, compared to the preceding years (at least the last 6 C-Papers). It was very hard to find suitable combinations for inventive step, because multiple combinations were possible but somehow all of them seemed (under pressure) not as suitable as the combinations in the preceding years (somehow "flawed"). Furthermore the need to cross check the “first application” A6 under A. 87 (1) b) cost much time which was not adequately considered in regard to the ambiguous accumulation of lengthy documents A2 – A5 and claims with many non trivial features. Frequent use of the location of where features are to be used (inside outside somewhere) did not make it easier - even if you know by heart the something is suitable to be used somewhere if it is portable ... – this also cost a lot of argumentation time. Paper D was hard (a lot of unusual appeal questions/problems) but overall it seemed fair (this impression could change due to harsh marking regarding questions on the edge of the required knowledge). Paper B was adequate and had a nice technical focus. Paper A was also a little more ambiguous than previous years.

Paper C was very detailed and therefore much time was needed to find nuances.

Paper C was unsettling ; I found it much more difficult than the previous years. I’m aware that pressure is higher on the day of the real exam, therefore probably things seem more difficult ; nevertheless I think that was not the only reason.

Paper C was really just ridiculous - the amount of time and money that go into preparations is completely wasted, not by the lack of ability from the candidate, but by exam papers that are exercises in reading and memory. In real life, I might dedicate 5 hours to analysing two documents, not 6. This year in particular was extremely difficult and very unclear. There was far too much information which made it impossible to determine what the right answer was (we all know that there is a right answer and that good arguments can only get you so far, so it is laughable for the EPO to profess otherwise). This is particularly disappointing as in real life, I know I am very good at drafting oppositions and I understand the technique very well. Paper D part II this year was also very odd - also very unclear in many parts, which led candidates wasting time on thinking about what the examiner’s are trying to say, rather than spending that time on working out the right
answer and showing how a situation can be improved. D Part II was good and tested a range of aspects. A and B were also fair.

Paper C was much longer than the papers form the previous years, and there were more “traps”. It seemed impossible to process it within 5.5 hours. Paper D was more complicated than in previous years. D1 questions were very long and complex.

Paper C was much longer than previously, and the prior art were all very close. Part 2 of paper D went against the direction of the part 2’s of previous years, and was a bit of a curve ball.

Paper C was far too long. 7 additional pages compared to the previous year and 1.5 pages claims were far too much. I practiced all papers from 2010 onwards and finished them in 4 to 4.5 hours so I considered myself well-prepared but I struggled to finish the C paper due to its length. In this year’s C paper, the selection of CPA was rather strange which much added to the time loss. E.g. Claim 2 could be well attacked using A3 or A4 as CPA and both led to useful attacks. Paper A and B were somewhat of a surprise package and everyone I talked to had a totally different solution with regards to claim drafting in paper A and selection of CPA in paper B for example. Although I can understand it that the composers of the exam don’t want the papers to become a routine, I was somewhat surprised by DII. No competitors, no nothing. Very different compared to the last 10 years in this regard. Only two patent families to be “saved” apart from the patent under appeal (too much appeal by the way!). These kind of remedies or possibilities to attack competitor patents appear to be rather easy points and I sorely missed those. Especially, since if you misinterpreted the appeal brief, then most of the points of question 1 of DII seem lost.

Paper C this year was tight for time. I have never had that issue before and this made it oddly hard. Many candidates had to rush arguments to ensure they finished. I expect the examiners will have to deal with unusually quantities of poor handwriting or incomplete answer scripts as a result). Non official EPO language speakers (I am not one) will have been put at a tremendous disadvantage. More notably, Paper D, part two changed question format. This came as a total surprise. I don’t really understand why the format of the major part of a paper was changed without some warning to candidates (this seems a change on a par with the merger of specialties on A and B, which was very well advertised). Focused preparation on part two’s answer format was more or less rendered pointless by this change (which is odd as examiner reports have stressed the importance of format several times in recent year’s examination reports). I will very surprised if the unexpected change does not severely affect this year’s paper D pass percentage (the change had the effect of removing all the “easy” marks in part two of Paper D).

Paper C the technical content for this year was not easy to understand. we should be able to understand what the content is based on the information given in the paper. I feel that anyone with a general, engineering or physics background would fare much better in these types of papers than someone with chemistry, biochemistry background. I struggled to understand the content simply because of the type of language used. apparatases, and devices etc.

Paper C required too much reading.

Paper C had a lot of details to retrieve from the documents. Further I found the Effective dates of the claims har to deal With With respect og A6. Confusing to add the the filing fee had not been paid.

Paper C felt longer than previous years - no-one that I have spoken to managed to finish the paper. The change in format of the Paper D Legal Opinion seemed unfair. I did not think the way the questions were asked was unfair per se, but given that previous years have not followed this format, it was unclear to candidates what the Examiner’s actually wanted to see in the answer for each part. Question I also seemed more like a DI question than a DII question. Paper A (and to a lesser extent Paper B) seemed more ambiguous than previous years regarding what features were essential to the invention. There were at least 5 features which I and other candidates disagreed about being essential or inessential. Again, if we were expecting this style of exam, this might not have been unreasonable, but this seemed contrary to the style of every past paper or mock paper that I have seen.

Paper C felt harder to get through than previous years - having a lot of content and confusingly similar prior art documents

Paper C - trying to catch us out with hidden priority issues is not necessary Paper D - too much reliance of obscure situations, more in depth basics would be more realistic for practice

Paper C - Far too long, too much information Paper DII - Far too long and too complicated

Paper A: too many ambiguities. Required to kind-of “decrypt” not only the content of the paper but also ambiguous expressions and links between variables. Even though this should not be required according to the examination rules, we were left to assume which characteristics were essential, and which ones were not. Which one were critical as such and which one were critical in combination. Unfair. This is pure lottery.

Paper A: no Chemistry at all. Very unclear what were essential features. This is not fair at all. There have to be keywords, that one can rely on. Or there have to be guidelines how this is dealt with in the new combined
Paper A: In most years for EQE paper A examinations, the words “Must” and “Essential” are clear flags for those features which are required in claim 1. This year, that was not the case. Instead, the paper often stated that certain features were essential and then later in the paper talked about how they were not required (I am not referring to the ‘uneconomical’ continuous laser). This did not happen only for one or two features, but for quite a few. The difficulty of the paper in this, an other respects, is telling from the huge variation in the claims which were put together by the students. For previous years, the variation I have heard in claim answers was not far ranging, but this year the paper was particularly challenging. That said, I, personally, found the amount of time provided for this paper to be just right. I had time to make a fair attempt at the paper and write a good description without rushing at the end. Paper B: I, and others with whom I have spoken, found this paper not to be unreasonably difficult when it comes to making the main amendments to overcome the prior art, however, I have heard large numbers of students starting from either of D1 or D3 of this exam. The choice this year seems to have been particularly challenging, with D1 representing the most simple starting point for modification and D3 representing a starting point with (arguably) a closer purpose, i.e. to block the reflow. I suspect that the answers given will be highly divisive between at least these two documents. In addition, there were many pointers which encouraged the exam participants to narrow the claims to 10 - 20 % Cu by weight, however, the incorporation of experimental evidence in table 2 provided clear experimental basis that the embodiment of 5 - 25 % Cu by weight did provide the advantage of the second embodiment, and thereby provided for basis for a broader claim scope. This, at least, was my opinion. However, this particular way of providing basis for such an amendment (if that was, indeed, the intention) seemed particularly unfair to those who work in mechanical/physical/computing backgrounds, as it is vanishingly rare for those in our backgrounds to ever see experimental results. It is not known by many whether such experimental results do provide for basis for such an amendment or not. The client stated that there were significant problems with 5% and 25% values, however, nothing was mentioned for 6-9, nor 21-24%. As such, I believe that, if the examiners intended an amendment to 10 - 20% to be correct, then penalising those who amended to 5 - 25% would be unreasonable based on the above. I, and many others I spoke with, found that we only just finished this exam within the provided time limit, and less time would not have been sufficient. I am a native English speaker and have not had problems with time limits in mock paper B exams. My only conclusion is that this exam was longer than previously, despite suggestions that the exam content would not be increased and that the additional half hour would be provided to assist those who are non-native English, French or German speakers. Paper C: This exam was extremely time pressured. I have not spoken with a single person who finished the examination properly and many final arguments were rushed (particularly claim 5, which should have been a partial problems attack but many people did not have time to make this). I do not understand how the examiners can claim that the examination was no longer in content with an additional half-hour provided for non-native speakers. I do not think the subject matter of the exam was too difficult, but there simply was not enough time to do the subject-matter justice. For this reason, I believe there will be more people failing this exam than there should be. Paper D: I felt the first section of this exam was well done with some difficult questions but the questions were not at all unreasonably challenging. I, personally, know I have made some mistakes, but I feel the first section was a good and reasonable test of my understanding. I also feel like I had sufficient time to complete the first half. The second half of the paper (herein DII) was a complete departure from the structure of the examinations in previous years. There was not a comparison of claim to competitors’ patents and, thus, there was no requirement to compare and contrast the patentability of rights with respect to one-another. This comparison of rights is normally worth a lot of marks, as is the novelty/inventive step analysis. Instead, the format was completely different. There was also an opposition/appeal which appeared to be just entirely separate to the main scenario which was (one gets the feeling) added in to fill up some extra marks because the examiners realised that the main thrust of the question, in its different structure to previously, did not provide candidates with enough marks to fill up 60% of the whole paper. As such, the section on appeal felt entirely out of place and more appropriate for the first section of the exam. Further to the above, the subject matter in DII examinations is almost always representative by a shorthand such that it can be referred to in the answer script as subject matters “A”, “B” or A + B. This year, that was not the case and instead one was continuously rewriting “A dough mixer with a trumpet shaped nozzle”. This was overly time consuming and frustrating for candidates while
Paper A was very confusing as to what were the essential features. Did not seem thought out well.

Paper A was unclear

Paper A was too Mechanical this year and not at all mix field as announced. Paper B was way too long, due to an extra D3 document. when you are not used to mechanical devices it takes longer to assess the invention, it was really hard to finish the office action on time, it was too long. Paper DI was ok, but DII was really long, the first question of DII was really ambiguously drafted, it is difficult to know what was meant by "the client referred back to the opposition letter", without knowing what was in the actual letter. Paper C this year was highly difficult and way too long, the main document A1 was at least 4 pages longer than usual, some prior art documents were more than 4 pages long...it was difficult to read all of it in the time frame of the examination. In addition, the subject matter of the claims was not clear and distinct as normal. The paper was weirdly drafted, effects present in A1 could not be found in the prior art documents at all, resulting in a lack of time to finish everything. Several time it seems that the closest prior art should not be the starting point of the problem solution approach. This paper was really unfair and way too difficult compared to other years. Already paper C is a really hard paper to pass (passing rate being already really low), it was really unfair to provide such a paper with increase difficulty and ambiguously to candidates. In my case, the CEIPI methodology could not be applied successfully. I am highly disappointed.

Paper A was too mechanical and vague. Felt difficult for me as a chemist.

Paper A was to hard understanding words for not native speaking english and dictionary showed several options for exampl for glazing. Could be just a glass window or with a frame. And too much text to read. C was to remote technical field for normal people. To hard fond cpa and like not fare or reasonable hard, much unclear and wage. Very disappointed.

Paper A so very poorly translated into English! I am sure it was originally written in German. The English version even lacked one verb in one sentence. Luckily I know German. I had to simultaneously read the German version to fully grasp the idea of the invention. It took time...

Paper A was quite confusing and extremely difficult compared to the mock and 2017 papers. Paper D was a bit vague in some questions. Part 2 was very complex in comparison to the past papers I did.

Paper A was difficult because the text provided was confusing. The main challenge in paper C was the time, which didn’t seem enough given the large volume of text to read, and the length of the claims. I also thought the questions in paper D, particularly part 2, were more difficult than usual.

Paper A is more difficult now that everyone sits the same paper.

Paper A- if more time, it could be doable, too much details and parameters given to consider, not clear disclosure of some technical features (see par [018 and 019]) Paper B- too much prior art, also included in the paper Paper D- very long questions in DI part, too many details, not doable to manage to consider them and aswear in 5.5 hours, for DII part, appeal topic was not present in last papers, D paper should be formulated similar to D2017 or like this with shorter questions of DI part. Not possible to prepare based on old papers if the Exam Committee change the format so often.

Paper A exam / description was contradictory in itself. Paper C amount of materials / claims / definitions was too great to successfully attack all claims.

Paper A concerned quite a different approach of what was needed compared to recent years, in particular relating to method claims and number of independent claims.

Paper A - There were many instances where terms were used throughout the paper, e.g. convex, and then for a definition to suddenly appear in the paper. It was not clear whether this was supposed to be for the
**benefit of the candidate or whether this meant that the term was unclear and the clarifying definition to be used instead. Paper B - Seemed very chemistry focused in the issues that needed to be tackled. I don’t have any day to day experience with chemistry issues. Paper C - This paper was too long. The information content was too confusing given the number of possible teachings for combining and possible teachings away. Paper D - The style of this paper was not consistent was previous papers and felt like a different person had written the paper. The overall clarity of the questions was poor. The length of the questions in part one were longer than usual. A lot of the questions were simply “discuss...” which is not consistent was the style of question in past papers. This made it difficult to know what the examiner was expecting in the answer. In part two, the method claims were verbose and thus ambiguous. I had difficulty in determining novelty in some cases because of the lack of clarity. This has never been the case in a part two question that I have done in past papers.**

**Paper A - lots of options for what was essential to include. It seems there were justifiable arguments either way for a lot of the features described in the paper. This made it unclear what features had to be in the main claims, Paper C - more issues with priority/added matter than usual - normally it is one or the other and not both Paper D - including a question about appeals within DI1 was unexpected. A law type question has not been in any long part 2 question since D1 and D2 were separate papers. It therefore seemed a little unfair to include this based on the last several papers (2013-2017), which all followed a similar pattern regarding general patent strategy.**

**paper A - ambiguous this year paper D - this year paper D was weird**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall in all papers too much text, DE version of papers were linguistically not good written and vague e. g. antecedent - therefore hard to understand and intention of question not focussed and obvious In general, as the exam only takes place once a year, it would be highly appreciated to schedule the exam outside of the period of the cold and flu season, e.g. end of march</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall I felt the difficulty is adequate to the goals of the examinations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>nothing to add</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not too difficult but definitely too long.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not sure if I passed - hard to say it was Easy or Too Easy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not enough time for C and D, D exceptionally difficult because it focused mainly on appeals, and the answers were not straightforward found in Guidelines or Visser</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not enough time available for the amount of reading and writing, in particular for parts B and C</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No comments</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Never seen as difficult a subject matter before in any of the papers...made every other year look so simple. It's almost like the EPO intentionally want people to resit exams to make more money from exam fees.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>My writing speed is not fast enough</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>My Impression (without knowing if I passed or not) it appeared to be a fair but demanding exam.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Much misleading information, time not enough to write down answers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Much informations to read and understood. I think, that paper C has to reduced to those contents, where the examination committee can see, that the candidate is able to analyse documents, their time line and possible prior problems, followed by finding arguments for Art. 54(2) and (3) as well as for Art. 56 and Art. 123. The keyword seems to be “standard”. Because all additional difficulties, like another patent application from the same applicant as for the contested document, and so are just special situations which are not able to let the candidate show, that he really can handle an (mostly standard) objection against a patent adequate. Therefore, all those specials are just made to let a lot of candidates fail the examination, because they get unsure and spend to much time to find and handle the artificially generated problem. But just my two cents.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>More time is required for both papers.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>more time for the exam would be appreciated</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maybe it was not too difficult, but you have to understand that when you have studied a number of hours and then have one shot a year to pass it the pressure is enormous. Failing does not only affect you, but your family (it will take time from them one more your if you fail). The papers are actually not that hard, but the situation as such is - for me personally - unmanageable. I regret even going into the patent profession. I have passed 4/5 papers and I have passed them (except for PreExam) when I haven’t been studying for them (paper D included) and when you have nothing to lose, but when I have been studying I only fail. Also, the level of difficulty between each your vary too much. For C, do you really consider paper C 2017 to be as hard as paper C 2018? Why the amount of text to be read? What is it that you want to test? I real life the amount of text does not matter, you work the same way anyway, but when you have a limit amount of time</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
at an unnatural paper the amount of time is critical. What was the purpose with all these text? The more text there is the more important is “EQE Paper C methodology” and the less important is knowing how to draft an opposition.

Many annexes with really long texts to analyse. Difficult vocabulary to understand for candidates not using their mother tongue. Not enough time to deal with all the information provided in the Annexes. Annex 5 was too long and it contains messy information difficult to understand.

Longer than the past year, too many documents to analyse comment and study.

long reading disallowed to properly attack the claims, which solution was known to me

long and some differences between the language between FR/EN

lack of time and stress render difficult to find solution - too much precision required for legal basis comparing to the short of time

La difficulté de ces épreuves est essentiellement liée à la (très) forte contrainte temporelle.

It’s important to maintain a similar structure to exams from year to year, so that candidates know how to approach each paper and apply their knowledge accurately. Drastically changing the style of questions or the answers required is not a fair test of a candidate’s abilities, and only serves to prevent them from demonstrating their knowledge. This was the case with part II of paper D this year. The style of the question was very different to almost every single previous year over the last decade, and left a lot of perfectly capable candidates angry that an otherwise consistent testing style had been so unexpectedly upended.

There also seems to be a tendency now towards the EQE trying to “trick” candidates with suggestive wording towards an incorrect answer. This is more typical of the UK qualifying exams, and is not a good way to test a candidate’s knowledge. I also feel it runs the risk of discriminating against those candidates for whom English, French, or German is not their first language.

It was too long with respect to the other years and too technical.

It was to difficult to understand it for a chemist

It was hard work simply analysing the paper, even before I got to attempting to demonstrate my argumentation skills. If the analysis was more straightforward I’d have more time to demonstrate my argumentation skills (which I thought was the point in paper C).

It was disconcerting that the format of the long question of paper D was different this year. Even as a native English speaker I was under time pressure for every exam, particularly Paper D.

It seems that the examiners are just making the papers harder and harder each year looking for ways to trick the people taking the exams. I am not sure whether the aim is to prepare us for practice or to make us experience the worst three days of our life. It was definitely an unnatural setting and not enjoyable.

It is too much to read. Please let us think more. I am very slow reader but I would say I am good with the practice. My time is lost because of all the reading and I can not analyze. You should think what you want to examine. The actual format is in my view useless and does not show whether you are good practician.

It is not the technical content that is difficult. But guessing the “one correct” solution to the paper is very difficult. Because in real life there are several okay solutions and at EQE there is only “one”.

It is never clear which claim categories are wanted and how long the introduction should be.

It is inappropriate to evaluate the difficulty of the examination papers without knowing the expected answers or the results.

It is hard to prepare for A and B at the moment considering the recent change. More advice from the eqe and practice papers would make it easier.

It is difficult too say without knowing what answers are expected: - DI was ok and well drafted. DII was very unclear what was expected. It is unclear if PCT-BB2 contains a selection invention. this is even for the delta patents tutors or Pete Pollard The unclear drafting resulted in very time consuming reading of the guide lines and checking case law Furthermore, it was unclear whether trumped shaped is specific variant of conically shaped nozzels. All this unclear definitions/descriptions made it very difficult to to draft proper answers, because there were many ways to interprete the DII scenario. In my opinion the DII part was not drafted too unclear. DII should be drafted in clear way so candidates could solve the questions in time. Otherwise the questions are drafted in an unfair way

It is difficult to know whether it was too difficult or not when I don’t know whether I have passed. My problem before was that I do not seem to understand how to give an answer in the “correct manner” citing the right
articles etc. Things that I consider obvious should be disclosed and some items I would never have understood that they were to be cited.

It is difficult to comment until the mark schemes are released. I thought there were several features with reasonable arguments for and against inclusion in the independent claims, and I do not yet know how severely candidates will be punished for coming to the wrong conclusion.

It is abundantly clear that the combined EM/CH papers A and B are still in their utmost infancy and the papers won’t be near perfect measures for testing candidates for many years. There seemed to be, once more, holes and clarity issues with the drafting of these papers. It seems as though A was written by an EM attorney who merely went to ask a chemistry friend for some buzzwords to insert to make the paper seem more balanced. The opposite is true of B - it was very clearly a chemistry paper. Paper C was awful. Even having an EPO language as my mother tongue, there was far too much text yet nowhere near enough time to read and analyse the documents, then choose and write out fully reasoned attacks to digest in the 5.5 hours available. I cannot imagine C being passable by someone without an EPO language as their first native language. The technology was far too abstract and nonsensical. D was marginally harder than previous years, particularly D-II, which was far more involved. I think separate DI and DII papers would be far more sensible than one combined paper. In summary, it seems that ever since the extra 30 minutes of time were introduced to “account for those who aren’t native speakers of an EPO language”, the papers have got correspondingly harder/longer/more complex in terms of the content a candidate is required to analyse, untangle and discuss. This was not supposed to be the case, at least according to the announcement, but this nevertheless is what has happened.

It appears that the material for reading in the C and D papers this year was in excess of previous years - spent too much time reading.

Insufficient guidance as to how to approach new-style A and B papers: unclear whether approach to be followed is along the lines of old chemical papers or old mechanical papers. For instance, in chemical “A” papers, counterparts to all claims are required but not in mechanical papers. Similarly, mechanical “A” papers rarely violated Rule 43(2) EPC but that is common in chemical papers. Another example is that, in paper B, detailed discussion of the prior art is required for the “novelty” section in chemical but is not required in mechanical papers. As we are unclear what is required, we are forced to try to address all aspects of both mechanical and chemical-type papers and there is insufficient time to consider all these issues in detail.

Instead of an extra 30 minutes I would prefer to have less time and less documents to read through. Information overload, so much more to process and collate the essential points

Insane. Completely out of touch with reality

In the C paper, there was a lot to read, this is not easy for non-native EPO language students, who on top need time to read carefully due to some limitation, this adds to the complexity. I feel the paper is made overcomplicated by hiding key passages throughout the documents. I wonder if the paper does not overshot its own ambition =/> test if candidates are fit for practice! The actual test is: can the candidate read fast enough while absorbing the content (hidden and obvious) and write out a full Notice of opposition against the clock. Content in the form of quality seems less important as it is a race against time and not a race to obtain the best notice of opposition possible. This I find sad and worries me, as said not all candidates can read fast and well due to some personal handicap and these suffer. Although the content could be absorbed if less prior art documents were given or more time was provided, so that the candidate would have a real chance to prove his abilities to be fit for practice.

In paper A quite many features appeared essential (Art. 84 EPC) to the invention, as I understood from how the description was drafted, while some of those features probably were not.

In paper A our client asked us to ensure the “broadest possible protection”. In my view this means to include in the independent claims only the absolutely essential features, i.e. to exclude any features which might be necessary for a particular application such as VIG-glazing but not necessary for other potential applications. The glass pane with protrusions might also be used elsewhere. This requirement for the “broadest possible protection” made paper A quite tricky - I could not tell whether the broadest protection with respect to the particular application was sought after or the broadest protection in general.

In my opinion, for Paper A, the Examining Committee’s practice concerning “essential features” is not clear which presents some difficulties in the Exam. In the past you seem to loose more marks for lacking an essential feature than for unduly limiting the claim. Therefore you feel like you are second guessing the examining committee about what features they think will be essential. This is not like real life, where you would, if in doubt, leave a feature out of the main claim (provided the claim was still novel and inventive), as it is easier, from the standpoint of added matter, to put the feature in later, than it is to remove it. I think less points deductions should be made if a claim lacks essential features provided the claim is still novel and inventive. This would solve the problem and make the exam more like real life.
In my opinion much variations in difficulties, eg compare C and D papers of 2016 with those of 2017.

In my experience, both parts of paper D (in particular part 2) were more difficult and time-consuming than in the papers 2013-2017 in the compendium.

In general, seemed more difficult than the last few years.

In DII part it was not clear what is disclosed in the different patent applications. Also it was not clear from the content of the first application EP-BB2 if the trumpet-shaped nozzle was similar to the one of EP-BB3. This is because PCT-BB2 indicated that it is crucial that the nozzle (of EP-BB2 and of PCT-BB2) is combined with the screw conveyor, whereas the nozzle of EP-BB3 does not require the screw conveyor. I therefore understood that the shape of nozzle of EP-BB3 is different from the nozzle of EP-BB2 and of PCT-BB2.

In dem neuen A-Teil ist es schwierig einzuschätzen, welche Merkmale wesentliche Merkmale sind und ob der Schwerpunkt auf dem Verfahrensanspruch oder dem Vorrichtungsanspruch liegt.

In all honesty both papers had very little chemical subject matter. Paper A felt like a cross between physics and mechanics whilst the only aspect of paper B that felt chemistry related was the Aluminium copper alloy for a fuse. It was hard to prepare for these papers due to the lack of availability of past papers.

Identifying the closest prior art is such a subjective thing that I think there should be less of an emphasis on awarding zero marks when the Examiner’s choice is not selected but the candidate gives good argumentation as to why it is the closest prior art. It is not always black or white and there is very little guidance as to what the “similar purpose/effect” is. Reasoning for the closest prior art is often not very detailed in the Examiner’s comments provided.

I’d prefer a check on counseling abilities over the pure check on managing the tasks within the given time limit. Being fast enough doesn’t mean being a responsible attorney.

I was well prepared going into this examination. I had practiced on numerous pervious Paper A past papers both from both the ch and em technical specialisms as well as the 2017 combined paper and the mock examination (a total of 15 past papers). However, from my perspective, I found this year’s paper to be very badly constructed. I felt that I spent most of my time having to contend with a series of what I found to be very unclear and ambiguous statements as to whether a feature is essential or preferred (and without being able to reach any satisfactory conscious). I had not encountered such difficulties on the 15 past papers I had practised with. For this reason, I do not feel that this examination was a fair test of a candidate’s ability to draft a patent application. Indeed, from my point of view, there was too much focus on having to almost guess what the examiner’s might have meant from numerous statement which I personally found to be too ambiguous. I personally hope that this year’s paper is not going to be indicative of the future format for the combined paper A.

I thought A was very poorly drafted - there were a lot of features where it wasn’t clear at all if they were essential or not (candidates’ interpretations were pretty evenly split, so it wasn’t just me who had problems). B was fine, though the prior art was hard to choose. C was just much too long. What’s the point in giving extra time if there is just more text to read that immediately takes up the extra time? Plus - if I’m right about what attacks were expected - some of them were just ridiculously far-fetched. More realistic (as in: could actually be used in real life without the opponent just having a laughing fit) state of the art would be nice. D was ok, though the changed form of the long advice question (DII) probably threw off a lot of people - but that’s fair, there is no guarantee that the style remains the same.

I think that papers C and D are getting closer to testing candidate’s time management skills rather than candidate’s knowledge and capabilities in working conditions. Nobody in real life (in Europe) has to stand the enormous time pressure conditions required by the present papers C and D.

I think paper D was a little unfair. For every year for the last 20 years, the style of part II has been identical. Courses are based around teaching a dedicated strategy to tackling this part. The style was incongruous this year which put this year’s candidates at a disadvantage compared to every previous year. I trust this will be taken into account in the mark moderation. Employers who have spent a lot of money training their candidates will want to know why their trainees were put at this disadvantage and what has been done to compensate for it.

I think it would be better if paper D Part I questions focused more on core topics such as patentability, priority, opposition etc. I felt that a lot of the Part I questions were quite obscure and unrelated to my day to day work, and there wasn’t sufficient time to find the answers in my books.

I think it was a nicely designed exam. Time is always an issue though, specially if you do not have experience in the mechanical field, you need some extra time to understand what a fuse is, what a fuse track is and how the mechanism works.

I think D1 was adequate but D2 difficult.

I realize it’s very hard to set and grade these tests. At the same time, having spent thousands of hours of my life obsessing on these tests, pass/fail often seems to hinge on what, in the big picture, is a fairly minor
misunderstanding. Please do not take offense, but with all the papers, the challenge is the inconsistency among grading in the prior exams. With each prior exam, the Examiners’ Report and candidate’s answer (which matches the Examiners’ Report), awards marks for certain behavior and does not award marks for other behavior. This good/bad allocation changes each year - not a lot, but enough that, during the test, you think “which way do they want me to work this?” During the test, it takes so much time to figure out “what are the Examiners awarding/penalizing this year.” In some years “an additional attack was not expected” – in other years “an additional attack was expected.” Paper A applies extremely harsh penalties for behavior that, in real life, is relatively harmless. Technically it’s fairly easy: the challenge is parsing words from the viewpoint of the “Examiners’ answer key” and minimizing loss of marks. A missing feature that Examiners’ want in claim 1 can result in failure, even if that feature is in claim 2 (depending on claim 1). Purposely lack of novelty over a simple misunderstanding of the construction of a single word (and what the Examiners think art teaches) can result in failure. The challenge with Paper A is drafting the claim the Examiners’ want, regardless of whether other claims are just as good. Will client _never_ be able to get pulsed laser to work (and thus abandoning use of continuous laser is fine)? If future competing products made with continuous laser take market share (and client’s claims require pulsed laser) - simply because at one point client couldn’t reproduce D1 - do I really risk this? I’ve learned that we’re not supposed to claim more than what the client asks for, but there must be some limits. Cooling air is necessary for “convex” but is convex an inevitable result of cooling air? Is convex an essential feature or just preferable? Is client’s definition really enough to distinguish (i.e., D1 “irregular” _cannot be_ convex?), or should I go with hemispherical? Could you have a small glazing unit with just one protrusion? If these protrusions are so good what about insulated glazing? If a claim must be inventive over the prior art (not just novel), does it matter how? Improved manufacturing or better transparency? It takes so much time to guess what answer the Examiners are looking for without making the EQE-fatal mistakes. IPREE wants “broadest possible protection” but Paper A actually wants “broadest reasonable protection” - i.e., narrower than broadest possible. In past exams, the brutal penalty for lack of unity resulted in prior E/M Paper A having the “correct” claim 1 having a functional distinguishing technical feature (in some years, ostensibly result to be achieved) in order to cover structural differences. In prior Chem Paper A, a structural claim 1 was easier, and so unity was not so much of a problem (and thus multiple independent claims were not only ok, they were expected). This year one challenge was between a product-by-process claim (avoiding the unity-penalty of past E/M vs. scope (and risk) of several independent claims. “Cooling air” in method claim vs. “monolithic convex” in device claim – will I lose marks for breaking unity or lose marks because my product-by-process claim depends from (what could be) a bad method claim? After failing all these tests the first time, then paying for these expensive prep. courses, the best advice I ever got about answering EQE papers: “The very next thing you get from the EPO should be the Rule 71(3) Communication.” Why not just say so? Paper B: I struggled with the consistent dicta from prior Examiners’ Reports re: “claims that were not based on the client’s draft provided no marks at all” vs. client’s proposed amendments. 123(2) and essential features aside, client’s desire for explicit recitation of the performance in the claim was difficult to resolve. Client letter explicitly guided toward preferred Cu content, and client’s claims clearly said “I want performance in the claim.” Performance requires essential features to achieve that performance. I spent some time thinking about whether or not (for EQE) claiming property was ok. Prior E/M claims had a DTF that was always functional, whereas prior Chem claim 1 were virtually always structural. Sufficiency/examples seemed to support property limitation, and (per below) client should not be contradicted. The “EQE-specific” challenge was between i) adding epoxy cover layer over fuse track and 10-20%Cu and using (resulting) good SRI performance as a Technical Effect (i.e., in the arguments, not in the claim), vs. ii) explicitly reciting the property (reframing quality score to SRI) per the client’s wishes. This was even more of a challenge because i) unwilling to disobey client (remove performance from claim 1) and get no marks, it seemed necessary to incorporate SRI into claim 1, but ii) having done so (SRI thus becoming part of DTF) - it’s almost a “too easy” argument section. Past reports speak to fewer marks when narrower claims yield easier arguments, but it’s hard to know which is worse. It seemed like a decent EQE-style IS argument could be made for a claim not having a recited SRI - just based on combination of epoxy resin cover layer covering fuse track + 10-20% Cu, with TE supported by SRI, especially with creative explanation of why not partial problems. However, the risk “claims that did not follow the client’s wishes received NO MARKS” is hard to fight. This sort of decision pressure is very difficult to deal with. I don’t think the Examiners realize how much time we spend struggling with these decisions. CPA choice, distinguishing technical feature, technical effect, lack of motivation - I know they want all this (and the material is in the various documents) but it was hard to get to it in the allotted time. Paper C was just brutal. So many marks come from the inventive step attacks, but it’s so hard to get everything done to do these attacks properly. The “closest prior art” choices are SO similar these days. It really has become “technical-effect matchup” from A1 and the correct 2ndary reference (thus identifying the CPA that needs this DTF). Below are things I struggled with (and as a result, ran out of time for the IS attacks). I was so ready to do good IS attacks but just didn’t have time. I did not realize early on that it would be so difficult to process and organize all the subject matter. I should have spent a lot less time on effective dates and explaining the “A6 not 54(3) but also not first application” rationale. This year, the
I found that there was not enough time to complete the paper C exam, although time keeping had not been a problem when working through past papers. I also felt time pressured in Paper D despite the additional
Paper D seem to be heavily focused on Opposition and Appeal procedures, more so that in past papers.

I found paper C to be extremely difficult this year, compared with recent past papers. The annexes were very similar, which made identification of the closest prior art overly time consuming. The lack of viable novelty attacks also meant more inventive step attacks, which are in general much more time consuming, such that even at five and half hours, many candidates were rushing to finish the exam or did not finish at all. Couple this with the poor conditions of the Walsall venue, and I would be interested to compare the pass rate of this exam with those of the year before.

I found paper C has too many Information to deal with. Annexes were quite longer than those of previous papers C, as well as the claims of A1. I ran out of time.

I found Paper A confusing, at least in English. I got a feeling it was written in German originally and that some of the clues got lost confused in the translation. That would at least be a reason for what I felt was a lack of consistency in terms and so on

I felt very insecure during B, which I didn’t in the practise exams. Think it was much more ambiguous than previous papers.

I felt like the exams were written this year to account for the extra 30 minutes. So really, the time pressure wasn’t lessened at all. It’s just a longer exam with more to read and analyse. This was frustrating as my understanding of the additional 30min was that it was intended to reduce time pressure on candidates. Paper C in particular felt like it had far far more to read and analyse than any of the past papers. Paper B was very difficult to determine the closest prior art. There were valid arguments as to why it could have been any of the three. More time was spent trying to work this out than usual and this took time away from other parts of the paper, which only added to the time pressure. Paper D part 2 was very different to previous years. It is frustrating that examiners continuously stress in their comments that they want candidate to assess part 2 by invention, not patent, but then the question split up the answer by patent. The first question also felt like it belonged in Part 1. There wasn’t the same inter-relation of competing patents and this made it harder to pick up marks.

I don’t think that changing the format of the DII was fair.

I did not prepare for paper D, but plan to resit next year with proper preparation. Thus, I cannot comment on D. A and B derived their difficulty from deviating from work practice and by combining mechanics/electronics and chemistry. Demanding ranges in independent claims goes against proper praxis in mechanics/electronics. C was ok, but claim wording was awkward and, thus, hard to cast into a good feature matrix.

I did not have time to finish paper B and C. Would have been nice to be able to read the exercises properly and think about the answer before time is up and you have to move on to the next one.

I cannot judge this without knowing my mark or the answer.

I am not sure if this year’s paper was difficult (I think I am failing, though). I think the structure of the exam was ok. The balance between sorting out the usable prior art, added subject-matter and first application issues compared to time needed for attacks was balanced.


How could I possibly rate the difficulty prior to receiving my results? Since each of Papers A to C was dealing with subject-matter from the mechanics field, candidates from other technical areas (chemistry, physics, biotech, ...) had a significant disadvantage. This is not only due to potential difficulties regarding the technical understanding of the “inventions”. The manner in which claims are formulated, as well as the claim categories differ significantly from field to field. Returning to the “old system” with separate Papers for Mechanics and Chemistry would be appreciated.

highly complex questions in D1 and highly complex scenario in D2

High time pressure for non-native students, too much information.

high intensity of information

Having practised every one of the last D papers from 2011 to 2017, this year DII part was definitely more difficult and of different style, so that preparation and practising past papers D helped much less than for every other paper.

hard to judge until you know the answers

Format was very atypical

For paper D, all the examiners comments from the last few years state that candidates did better when they dealt (in part 2) with the inventions sequentially rather than dealing with the patents and applications.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparatory comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>However, the question we got asked us to deal with the patents and applications. Not very helpful!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For paper C the time is not enough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For me, the difficulty of the papers arises due to time trouble. Also I do not write very fast. However, I understand that this is one possibility to rate the knowledge of the students, as by this it is impossible to write all down which may be found in any literature. Therefore, organization and time management is one of the key knowledge to pass the EQE. As a matter of fact, I therefore will rate the time to be sufficient, as it is not the time itself lacking, but the time management of the respective candidate (such as I).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exam papers seem unnecessarily long and complicated. For example, PAPER C is often solved with candidates using either the analysis sheet method or the matrix method. However, the claims were unnecessarily long this time round, as were some of the Annexes (5 pages!). There was as such insufficient time to completely identify all relevant features for the matrix method. Meanwhile, using the analysis sheet method was also impractical as there were too many instances where the definitions for certain expressions lied in another annex. In other words, it seemed that Paper C was not adapted to be reliably solved by the methods a candidate could reasonably be expected to have trained with and used. As another example, in Paper D(part DII), candidates most often have to prepare a timeline to analyse the scenario. However, the scenario presented often results in a timeline with too many events bunched up in a particular place it was hard to see what was going on. This year, the complexities of an opposition appeal was thrown into the mix with dates also falling into this bunched up area. It was unduly difficult to understand the scenario, not because of the language or inability to understand a patent scenario itself, but primarily because DII was too long and the timeline that one could reasonably be expected to prepare had too much information bunched up in places to. It would seem that this is unnecessary. A better distribution of events in the scenario of paper D with would enable a candidate to prepare a meaningful timeline which is much more visual and useful, shifting the focus of the exam away from the candidate’s ability to write really small and squeeze in plenty of information next to each other, to the candidates true ability to analyse the patent scenario. Despite much practice, there did not seem to be enough time to analyse the scenarios especially of Paper C and D to a meaningful extent, nor to write down the answers fast enough to complete the papers. The feeling is that the papers are focused on how a bulk of information can be analysed quickly without as much regard to quality or completeness, as opposed to a limited and meaningful amount of information analysed completely to a reasonable level of quality. There also seemed to be insufficient time to write down the answers, and in attempting to write as quickly as possible resulted sometimes in their illegibility. It at present does not seem possible to write down a complete answer fast enough after attempting a meaningful analysis of the scenarios. I have no doubt that if the papers were shorter or more time was provided, I would succeed at these exams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every year there exist a surprise in the examination papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est-ce normal qu’en écrivant très rapidement avec les bons éléments, on arrive à peine à tout traiter ? Pour C, il semble impossible de faire plus d’une attaque par revendications. Ceci signifie que si l’on se trompe au mois 2 fois d’art antérieur le plus proche, on est presque sûr d’échouer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Especially the C-exam was way to lengthy. It is a shame if you completely see what is asked but do not have enough time to finish the analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>es ist mehr als demütigend miterleben zu müssen, wie man mehrmals trotz intensiver Vorbereitung an der EQE scheitert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQE lives from the absurd fragmentation of international patent law. In my humble opinion it has no relation to every day patent practise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Épreuve C : épreuve très longue, objets plus complexes et abstraits que nombre d’épreuves passées. Épreuve D : très longue aussi. Partie D-II : la philosophie semble très différente des trois années précédentes, ce qui m’a surpris ; le sujet à traiter était lui aussi plus abstrait et donc difficile à comprendre, ce qui réduit le temps alloué à la réflexion juridique. Toutes les épreuves : heureusement qu’il y avait 30 minutes supplémentaires, étaient-elles vraiment en bonus ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During my preparation, I passed all past papers and can confidently say that I would have had at least 70% in all of them (I tried past 6 years for papers D and C). I have never failed a single exam in my life. I however will definitely fail paper C and maybe D 2018. This raises the question of whether the exams were fair. For instance, paper C was an utter wall of text and only rewarded candidates who can read fast, unlike myself. The paper felt like a reading competition as opposed to an opposition exam. I wonder if the Opposition Division and Boards of Appeal will start doing without the criterion of allowing parties to familiarise themselves with fresh facts and evidences in line with the EQE. Paper DI quistions also seemed long compared to previous years. This trend is rather worrying and definitely does not reflect real practice. I wonder if it has to do with the extra 30 minutes allowed for sitting the exams, in which case it defeats the whole purpose of said 30 minutes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due to the English of the second language, I would need a little bit more time to write the responses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Does not represent life; eqe should really assess other aspects. How many passed but no European practice? It's a shocking statistic - please refer to the 'register’

Documents too large; too much information to be gathered into to little time.

do you know how many relationship had been gone for the EQE? why are there so differnet levels from year to year? Why is passing the EQE a dice game?


DII-2018 very different to every other DII on past papers - made it difficult. Also an extra D1-type question (re. appeal) was added on to the start of DII, which seemed unnecessary.

DII was rather different from previous years

DII was a lot more difficult than previous years, DI was OK.

DII very unclear - should be drafted in more comprehensive way like the last years

DII seemed very different, and possibly harder, than DII questions from 2012-2017. A correct course of action was less clear than in previous years.

DII has too much features. I lost the overview

DII format changed more than unexpected. Very confusing case with a lot of ambiguously staff, not really something adequate for an examination. DII had nearly double the text to get through than the old examinations. A well prepared candidate writes at least 5 old examinations - and expects at least something similar...

DII changed again, which is good and bad. Good in that we are tested in things that we have not seen before, bad in that preparation is more difficult and when you sit and read the paper, you are getting out of your comfortzone in that this type op paper you have not seen before

DII 2018 was completely unexpectable. Papers 2013-2017 were completely different and much more achievable with respect to the amount of time one has. Even the 30.min plus are not sufficient for a paper as DII 2018 (my mother tongue is german). DII was of the old 4 hour DII-style. To much legal questions. Again a BIG WHY The paper lacked information. Question 1 and 2 couldn’t truly be solved with the Information given. Have a look at the Blog for paper DII 2018 at deltapatents. The are specialists and have quiet the same opinion.

DII : Regardless of the difficulties of the subject, the change of the style is very disturbing for a candidate under pressure. Generally speaking, too much appeal questions. If a candidate is not very comfortable with Appeal questions, it does not mean that it is not a suitable practitioner. It may be more appropriate that more subjects are tested not a subject testing twice.

Difficulty was not in complexity but in time management.

difficulty tends to continuously increase

Difficult to decide how many independent claims, what features were essential, what aspects to chose for the dependent claims

Difficult and complex paper C It seems that the documents/annexes were longer (had more words) than the previous papers, thus time was very short

Die Vorbereitung auf B-D hilft für die Praxis bzw. kann aus der praktischen Erfahrung abgeleitet werden. Der A-Teil hingegen ist überhaupt nicht praxisrelevant.

DII was fair and fine. DII was messy, incomprehensible and unnecessarily difficult. I honestly do not understand how one could think that anyone becomes a better attorney merely because he/she passes such a paper.

DII questions were drafted comparatively open, therefore time consuming. Legal construction in DII complex and not clear.

DII questions seemed longer and more complicated that in previous papers. The D II part was unusual, since there seemed to be less easy points from use of information. The appeal question used up a lot of time.

DII more appeared like a DII. Moreover, DII had 5 questions, one of which having 25% of the DI marks. In order to assess as much knowledge as possible, there should be 7-9 smaller questions, so that a candidate does not master a topic, it doesn’t risk 25% (!) of the all DI marks.

Despite the fact that the time for all papers is kept very low, which additionally raises the difficulty to pass the papers. Some of the papers i sat could be improved by making the paper a little bit clearer. For example paper A which features do I have to choose? The client mentioned he just wanted to have a pulsed laser
configuration. But what does this mean for me when drafting the claims. The continuous laser also solves the problem but with disadvantages. What wants the examination committee to see. Keep the scope of the claims as large as possible, ignoring the wish of the client? Or respect the wish of the client an directly limit to pulsed laser configuration. What about the perpendicular arrangement is it needed to produce the monolithic Erhebungen or not. No clear indication in the paper.

Despite never running out of time when setting many past papers to time during revision, I ran out of time on paper D and paper C in the real exams. I had only practiced using recent versions of paper D so the change in style and format of part II of the 2018 Paper D compared to recent years threw me off balance. It would be useful if such substantial changes to the format of the exam occurred more frequently year-on-year rather than repeating the same style of question for 5 years only to suddenly change it. Comparing my performance on past-papers with the real thing, I felt like I had been lulled into a false sense of security. 2018 Paper C seemed much longer (i.e. too much prior art to read on top of verbose claims) than all 6 of the C past papers I had used to practice. As a result, I ended up running out of time and was unable to demonstrate my knowledge across all parts of the paper. This felt unfair because previous years did not suffer such a verbose paper and time pressure should not be the decisive factor when assessing competence. My downfalls have arisen from having an inaccurate image of what to expect based on the recent past papers I had practiced.

Description of paper A was unclear, especially regarding the essentiality of some features.

D2 I found very hard compared to previous papers

D1 was fine, D2 not so. D2 had one very difficult question regarding appeals that I certainly did not expect, and is far beyond what I deal with at work. But for me the biggest problem was that there was information needed to solve one of the problems in D2 that was suggested in the beginning of D2, but not found specifically later, and as I have come to expect based on previous D2 exams that you can only use information specifically given, I ended up spending a lot of time looking for it, and then looking for an alternative solution that did not exist.

D was completely different Part 2 then previous years

D - part B was far more difficult than previous years. The structure of it was very difficult to follow and write about in a clear way. It was weird to not have a competitor party that also had patents to compare / allow you to give advice to the client regarding improving their position. Also the sufficiency aspects of the patents mentioned were very vague and unclear, you couldn’t be sure whether the disclosure was sufficient or not, which then makes it difficult to be comfortable with answering the rest of the question. Part A was fine. C - I found there to be a lot more information provided than previous years so it took a lot longer to read and analyse things than previous papers. As a result, I did not have time to finish the paper. A - the method was fine, but it was much more difficult than last year to determine the second type of claim. People came out the exam with very different answers, B - amendments were generally fine, however, picking the CPA was more difficult as all three were incredibly similar.

Compared to the years before, C and D were way to difficult. No relation. In this view, partial marks shall be given in C, even when the closest prior art is wrong... not 0 points in general. Good argumentation shall be awarded, even though the prototype solution has not been provided.

Clarity issues are certainly a problem in the papers. When you combine that with the fact that important pieces of information are often scattered in the papers, and that the candidate is under time pressure, it is a recipe for disaster for several candidates even though they would deserve to pass.

Change of style of D part 2 meant that preparation for this section of the paper had been pointless. Legal questions in D part 1 also too difficult.

C: very long in extension to be read by a non-EPO language candidate. It gives no time enough to reason adequately, nor to write down a good and well reasoned answer. D: very different from former papers.

C: Longer and more complex prior art compared to previous years, technical effects more difficult to find D: change of DII style without prior notice! Unusual DII with +1 inventions and only one competitor’s patent

C was significantly harder than previous years

C paper annexes was very long in reading with a lot of irrelevant details.

Both papers A and B were more confusing than papers from past years in terms of what was supposed to be essential elements. Mixing of chemistry and mechanical-type subject matter (and what is expected for a mixed topic) also didn’t help.

Both for C and D, some of the information that had to be found throughout the paper was unclear, resulting in having to make a best guess of what was being meant, at the expense of loosing a lot of time

Being a chemist, the mechanics (!) papers A and B have been difficult in the sense that it consumes more time to interpret the technical contents, formulating claims as well as deciding on the multiple claims in the
The same category in this totally different technical area. Very unfair treatment of chemists at this point! Paper D-II was a surprise, after the years of similar style and strategy to be applied, suddenly introducing an appeal situation. Also, the official statement having 30 min more for non-native speakers is a joke, if the scope of the exam is as well extended by minimally 30 min!

As stated before: B was (unexpectedly) the easiest among the 2018 papers. A (expectedly) the toughest C and D were more difficult that expected due to the considerably higher amount of total information and information which I did not use (paper C) and due to the change in the structure of the paper (paper D).

As not being to fields of mechanics, paper A has been easy to understand. However there were some unclear clues for writing the claims.

As mentioned paper C was too long to read and assimilate by persons without mother tongue English/french or German. This was destabilizing. Paper DII was quite different from last compendium and was difficult to answer.

Applying to C only: I found the paper substantially longer than the previous papers from the compendium; I had quite a bit of a problem to deal with the sheer quantity of information in the given time, and from what I see from reflecting the paper after the exam by now, I have overlooked important bits of information, rendering me on false tracks at least in one or two attacks.

Appeal issues are difficult because they are not common in regular worklife; otherwise the paper was easier than 2017 D paper.

Annexes were quite long

Always feeling to lack of time while I finished the all compendium with 30min-1h in advance.

All four exams suffered from a lack of clear wording. It felt as if less care than usual had been put into their preparation and checking them. This created significant problems for candidates trying to work out which answer the examiners were looking for. In order to fair, especially in papers A and B, you will need to give credit to candidates who have gone down a different route to the one that you expected. Paper D: Part 1 was, in general, well written and doable, although I felt that time pressure was not easy Part 2 was ambiguous and an unfair departure from the previous style of part 2 papers without any warning to candidates that this would occur. In particular, the appeals question was very subjective, and has the potential to severely punish candidates who reasonably "went the wrong way" if you are not very careful marking it. Appeals are a topic with which very few candidates have any practical experience (through no fault of their own), so if you want to ask questions I feel it is only reasonable to ask that they are made more objective. Regarding the different inventions, asking candidates to work through by application rather than by invention (in a direct contradiction to the advice repeatedly provided in the compendium) was an unnecessary complication. Moreover, the scenario was too open ended, and left candidates with too much to do and too many scenarios to cover. Paper A Paper A was written with highly subjective language, related to complex subject-matter which penalised candidates who happened to know anything about it, and was too time pressured. Firstly, the instruction to submit "a patent application" was unfair. Art. 1(4) REE says that as a minimum the exam should cover the drafting of claims and the introductory part of a European patent application on the basis of information normally available to a professional representative for this task. This does not exclude being asked to write a full application. However sufficient time for this was not provided, and to do so would be to fly in the face of every single past paper in the compendium. If you wanted us to write a full application, then you needed to tell us this much more clearly in the client letter. If you didn't, then you shouldn't have asked us to submit a patent application. This ambiguity in the instructions had the potential to create severe difficulties for candidates who "went the wrong way". Equally, in contrast to normal, for a significant number of features, it was very ambiguous whether or not these should have been put in the claims. For example, "It is known from the conventional spacers in insulating glazing that the protrusions should have a height H of 100 µm or more so that satisfactory insulation properties can be expected". Should is too ambiguous a word with regard to a possibly essential feature. It is clear that this feature is unnecessary for patentability. However, it is not clear whether it would be judged that this feature was essential or not. Some insulation would still be provided by a protrusion of less than 100 µm, so there is still a technical effect without it, but it is clear that this sentence is suggesting that maybe this feature needs to be included. There were a very significant number of pointers suggesting that multiple protrusion should be claimed. I chose to follow these pointers and include multiple protrusions in my claims because I felt this was the answer that you were looking for. However, technically, it was very ambiguous what difference this would make. "Multiple protrusions" covers as few as 2 protrusions. A VIG pane with only two protrusions would achieve very little, if any, insulation, over a pane with one protrusion. The term "convex" was extremely unhelpful. I, through no fault of my own, happen to have had extensive arguments when prosecuting European patent applications with EPO examiners over the meaning of the term. By definition, any protrusion must be partially convex. It was clear from the context of the letter that you felt that the term "convex" implied some sort of "regularity" to a protrusion, but this is not the case. When convex is given its ordinary meaning (as required by EPO guidelines), a convex protrusion does not imply regularity, and would
not result in good optical properties. The reference to perpendicularity was also difficult to deal with. For anyone who knew anything about optics, it was very clear that a perpendicular beam was essential for a regular shaped protrusion with good optical properties, or something having a hemispherical shape. This was not emphasised in the letter, and created an unfair playing field for candidates from different subject areas. I'm sure that your reaction to the above comments will be that "you are applying specialist knowledge". However, there is a difference between unnecessarily adding detail that only you know to an answer, and being forced to override things that you know to be correct when providing one. To anyone who knew about optics, it was clear that a perpendicular beam was essential to ensuring good optical properties, and that the term convex itself was insufficiently limiting. It would have been far better to stick to really simple subject-matter where everyone has the same level of knowledge to create a more level playing field. When all of the above were combined with too much time pressure, an extremely difficult exam resulted. As a result of this difficulty, it seems only fair that you are prepared to accept a wide variety of differing answers this year, and minimise penalties for candidates who don't exactly agree with you as to what the answer is. Indeed, I hope that it is clear from your pre-marking procedure that this is necessary this year. By all means penalise a clear lack of novelty, or failure to cover your client's product correctly, but please consider the ambiguity of the paper when considering whether to deduct marks for claims that you either consider to lack essential features, or be "too limiting". If you fail to do this, then be prepared for a lot of appeals. Paper B Paper B was also highly subjective, and suffered from many similar problems to paper A. The issue of whether or not the range of 10-20% Cu should be included in the claim was ambiguous at best. There were many pointers in the client letter suggesting that the range should be included in the claim. Clearly the fuses worked best. However, claim 4 acted as a clear pointer to discuss obvious errors and include the cover layer in the claim without the range being included. Moreover, the client asked for the broadest possible scope of protection, and also stated that they didn't know what would happen if you had a Cu content of greater than 25% by weight. In terms of technical effect, this was present across the scope of the claim regardless - it can be seen from the difference between Q score or the SRI index of a fuse with and a fuse without an epoxy resin cover layer that this lead to reduced reflow regardless of the Cu content. It was interesting that when discussing with my colleagues after the exam, the majority of the engineers did not include the range, while the majority of the chemists did; again, not a level playing field. In view of this significant ambiguity, it seems only fair that deductions for candidates who "went the wrong way" should be minimised on this point. Equally, the selection of the closest prior art was far too ambiguous. D3 directly referenced metal reflow. However, it's structural arrangement and the way that it prevents reflow is very different. D1 also mentioned metal reflow, but focused on it less. It was however, structurally virtually identical and worked in exactly the same way. Moreover, D1 was the only document to propose a fuse that worked better in high humidity situations, like the present application. While the Boards of Appeal have emphasised that purpose is more important that structural similarity, the overwhelming structural similarity of D1, and the reference to high humidity operation juxtaposed against the functional similarity of D3 in a very difficult manner. All good candidates noticed all of these facts and were left sitting for ages with no idea which way they were expected to go on this point. The only fair solution is to give equal credit for the selection of either as the closest prior art. Indeed, this is exactly what would happen in real life. In opposition (or indeed in examination), it would be impossible to deflect an inventive step attack against claim 1 on the basis that the incorrect one of D1 and D3 had been selected as the closest prior art. Paper C Paper C, other than being about milking cows, which was a somewhat strange and amusing topic to examine, was generally a good paper. It did, however, suffer from several ambiguities in wording, and more time should have been spent checking the paper to tidy these up. Furthermore, time pressure was intense.

All exams seem fair. I for sure will need to retake Paper D, however reading over the questions after the exam I feel like all questions were fair-game.

Again, the examination seems more devoted to select candidates based on time pressure rather than selecting candidates that are fit to practice, as expected. Paper C was way long, impossible to finish for most of the candidates I talked with. Again, this is highly discriminatory against all the candidates whose native speaking language is not one of the EPO official languages, which results in an unfair evaluation among the candidates.

Again, not enough time to properly do the paper.

adequate difficulty regarding novelty & inventive step but determining the essential features was a huge gamble due to ambiguous statements in the paper

Additional time has been used forma increasing difficulty ans length of the papers sat.

A: Unclear wording as to whether features were essential or simply optional. B: Difficult determining the expected CPA, as all were similar. The most logical one made for the most challenging Inventive Step argument.

A: Flush of information according the own invention. Hard to work out the main points. “should have a height H of 100 micrometers or more for satisfactory insulation”. Should in German means “sollte” and means
"can", but not "has to". B: Too much text. Hardly possible to reach the argumentation for inventiveness. C: There is much argumentation, if Claim 4 should be attacked by novelty of A5 or missing inventiveness by A5+A3. I think the German A5 does not state "soaking the teats of the animal outside a milking robot (10), wherein at least two litres of a soaking fluid are used per animal". Instead it states, that "river 9, which is deep enough to reach almost the belly of the animal at the middle of the main extension of the animal, taking away any substance on the skin." So, the river reaches only almost the belly of the animal. There is no disclosure of soaking the teats. In the end, there is a problem with the German wording. "to reach almost half way up the belly of the animal" should be transalted with: "dass er fast die "obere* Bauch"hälffe* des Tieres erreicht." The link of "up" is not included in the German version implicitly. In any case not directly and unambiguously. I think, many Germans did an attack on A5+A3. For this reason I recommend to accept also the inventive step attack out of A5+A3 with full marks. D: DII was an unprepared change. I think, you should prepare the people who write the papers for any changes, because there is only one single chance per year to write the papers.

A lot of reading had to be done in papers B and C, so the time pressure was even more pronounced.

A lot of process claims in all of the papers (except B) C, D : not standard paper in comparison with previous years

A lot more time would have been needed to show more accurately a candidate's abilities and knowledge in dealing with patents.

A and B are completely not suitable for people from all technical backgrounds. People from and physics and/or engineering background were significantly advantaged in being accustomed to the technology, which was highly technical in those areas.

A - some unclear statements, C - way too many details to go through in order to find the information needed, documents were long to read D - D2 very unclear

5.5 hours time-frame may me adequate for candidates taking exam in their mother tongue - however for those who take it in Foreign language is surely not enough.

5 questions in D1 (legal questions) are ok, but the formulation of the problem was for some questions very long. D2 (legal opinion), like in recent years, the problem was too long. Good example for legal opinion to be managed in time is EQE 2016. Structure of the expected answer by patents/patent application makes in more difficult to provide a proper answer (structure by items (entities like A, A+B, A+B+C, is much better. The wording of the technical features was also to complicated and long. Technical features need to be repeated in the answer again and again and candidate will lose time, if wording of technical features is too complex (in the easiest case A, A+B, A+B+C,...) From the compendium it cannot be taken, which parts of the answer give scores and which not. The same applies for the sheets of the markers, you can take the max. amount possible and the scores you have obtained in total for each question (it would be helpful to know which statements and which citation of Art, Rules etc. attract how many marks. This cannot be taken from the examiner report nor from the marker's sheet. For D2 (legal opinion) there is no information in the exam (the problem) how many scores can be obtained maximal for each part (i.e. for each individual question). This lack of information provides additional difficulty on the question of time management.

Zusammenlegen von E/M und Chemie erhöht die Schwierigkeit signifikant.

Without the results of the EQEs, Q28 is an impossible question. I have given answers (they were mandatory) but the answers are worthless. How can I know whether it was hard without knowing how I did? If I got 100% then it was easy. If I got 10% then I clearly missed the answer and the exam was hard.

With a scientific background in biology and chemistry, why paper A is a specific Mechanic paper? Why such a discrimination?

When compared to previous years even more material to read and handle in C-paper. The paper should not be a test of a reading speed!! For candidates having non-EPo language as their mother tongue the difficulty of the paper is multiplied due to the large amount of material to be read !

What's the aim of giving additional 30 minutes if you increase the difficulty / number of pages to read in the same time ? Definitely to many sheets for C DII was way too difficult : appeal, reformatio in peius, 10 days rule. It was more like DI part ... Besides the structure was so different : no opponent, but someone interested into selling its own patent application.
Q30) Did you feel time pressure during the main examination?

Q31) What is your opinion about the time available for each of the main examination paper you sat in 2018?

Q31a) Do you think that the additional thirty minutes have improved your performance in the main examination paper(s) you sat?
Q31b) Do you think that even more time would have improved your performance in the main examination paper(s) you sat?

Q32) Do you have any comments concerning the time available for the examination papers?

| Zeitdruck ist zu heftig und im vorliegenden Maß aus meiner Sicht auch nicht nachvollziehbar. |
| You are examining the wrong skills. |
| With the degree of complication present in this paper, the time available was by far too little to accomplish the required solution and write it all down. |
| Why limit time at all. Let candidates work as long as they wish 7 am to 10 pm. Many will still not pass, but at least that will have nothing to do with the time pressure. Some of us work slower than others. Why should that work to our detriment? |
| Why do we have to write manual by pen, why is there no possibility to work with a computer, like in the common work? |
| What is the point in giving an extra 30 minutes if you just make the question papers and required answers longer? It seems that the papers are designed to exclude from qualification anyone who doesn’t speak one of the three languages as a first language. |
| What do you want to hear? You will not change it anyway |
| Well, it is an exam, so there has to be time pressure, I guess. so much depends on the marking later on...?! |
| We have 30 minutes more but the exams (at least c) seems to be longer |
| we are too old for that, without time for lunch and going to the toilets |
| we are human beings and not machines |
| Very frustrating that EQE is partly a competition on how fast you are. Usually you have at work some time to reflect on what you are doing. |
| Usually, 5 h and 30 min for the C paper are enough. This time, an additional hours would have been needed. If this paper was exceptionally complex, there is no need to modify the time available. |
| too short, not fair |
| Too much information for too little time. Don’t wonder if you cannot read the candidate’s handwriting. Trying to interpret unclear facts in the papers costs time. |
| Too much handwriting for paper C. |
| Too little time for the D exam, given the vagueness of the questioning in part II. |
| Time was too short and I was not able to complete my reply letter. |
| Time was short for paper C since it was rather difficult compared to previous years. |
| Time pressure is worst for candidates that their mother language is not En, FR, DE. So the papers are not evaluating the knowledge and skills of the candidate but how fast can read and write which in my opinion, is not the meaning of the exams |
Time may be ok if the documents were not too long. I found that the C paper 2018 is by far the longest I have done.

**Time is still an issue, here. Hand writing is time consuming and is unjustified**

Time is ok as it is now, it's just not necessary to increase even more the volume of the documents and amount of Information even further. In Paper C, it is really just a matter of luck which candidate picks which closest prior art because there is no way of going back and starting over with an alternative choice in the time given. Thus, even if one notices while writing that it is the wrong attack, he/she is stuck with it because by starting over from a different starting point he/she might lose even more points. This, however, goes beyond the goal of testing which candidate is fit for practice, because in the end is much more dependent on luck and not on actual skill.

Time is not enough to read and analyze all annexes. in the time of 2.5 hrs it is not sufficient to read and analyze and be ready for writing. in the remaining 3 hrs is not enough for writing lengthy attacks (good inventive step argumentation).

**Time is a big challenge**

Time does not reflect the real skills of candidate

Time availability in function of mother language?

Time available to answer everything is simply not realistic! What is the use of giving 30 minutes extra if the examination papers are made longer than in the past, nothing has changed compared to previous papers, there is much more to read, so no extra time is give to really solve the papers.

Time available for paper C was perfect, it allowed me to address all issues and perform a full analysis for each claim. I feel that for paper D this year, more time was needed due to the part II question being less clear than for the past 3-4 years, and the additional question concerning appeal procedure.

Time available for paper C is not sufficient as you have to read through a lot of material, find suitable attacks and write them down. This year’s paper had, in my opinion, many links between the annexes. Thus there were many possible attacks the candidates had to consider.

There’s not enough time for thinking of real arguments for inventive step. The brain activity focuses on finding the puzzle pieces from A1-A6 and write them down. No real thinking of real arguments.

There wasn’t nearly enough time to read through the material given, in particular for Papers C and D

There was not enough time for any of the papers. However, having papers A and B on the same day makes it an extremely difficult and long day and significantly affects performance in the afternoon paper.

There was no extra time, since there was more material to handle or not questions to answer/more complex questions. This just yields a more demanding examination but not “more time”

There is no point in providing extra time if you provide additional annexes or more complicated issues.

The time was a question of 10 minutes

The time provided for paper C is not enough. The additional 30 minutes that we have now of course helps, however, in my opinion, it is pointless to let us having more time to take the exam and prepare a longer exam. This year’s paper C has been much longer than previous years.

The time pressure forces the candidate to a trade-off between thorough work and complete work - and a readable hand writing. I feel sorry for the corrector...

The time issue is difficult enough but it was made harder by the fact that the room was so cold for each exam. It is hard to write fast and legibly at the best of times but when you’re hands are freezing for 5 hours it is even worse.

The time is not enough for processing the amount of text in the paper.

The time frame given is usually not enough for a complete answer, especially for non-native speakers who have the language barrier. Especially Papers D and C are really time consuming in order to cover all the cases and gain much points. I would highly appreciate even additional 30 mins for non-native speakers.

The time for part D of EEP 2018 was too short; part D of EEP 2016 is a good example for an exam paper which can be managed during 5,5 to 6 hrs.

The time for Paper A seemed fair for a native English speaker. Of course the more time that is provided, the better quality of answer that can be provided.

The time available is enough to have a good go at everything, but more time would still have improved my performance. I could have used it to find more of the required definitions in Paper C for example.

The time available for Paper D absolutely did not correspond to the difficulty of Part II of Paper D, especially
in view of its rather unclear condition and some rather unclear questions (“patent situation” is not a EPC term).

The problem is not in essence the length of the exam. The problem is making the time for reading information in the paper and processing it proportional with the time allowed for writing the answer, considering that people read and analyse at different paces but can nevertheless be equally bright and certainly fit for practising as a patent attorney. The threshold to passing the examination should not be time, but rather knowledge and analytical skill. It is not a good sign that whoever you ask, be it current or ex-candidates, the first comment on the EQE is always time pressure. The amount of text in paper C 2018 was ridiculous. I do not personally know anyone who has had to submit a notice of opposition in the last 5 h 30 min of the opposition period, and this can certainly not be said to be regular practice, so why on earth is there such an obsession in the EQE to impose time pressure? Can’t somebody come up with a more clever way of setting an exam passing threshold?

The paper is too long; to focus on so many aspects; it’s not represented in life

the old procedure of two hours, a break and then three hours seem better to me, naturally this makes only sense if the scope is adjusted too

The length of time should not be increased. Spending five and half hours on one exam or having seven and half hours of exams in one day is enough. The examination length should be decreased instead.

The length of the papers appears to have increased significantly more than the additional time available would warrant. Not only did this make the papers more difficult, it was not communicated to the candidates and so they could not prepare accordingly.

The lack of time skews the relevance of the skills and knowledge tested so that it does not really assure the competency but rather the speed of writing by hand.

the half an hour more for the paper B was not enough since a third document D3 was added as prior art.

The extra thirty minutes do not help, when the exams get more complicated (especially this years D part) or more extensive (this years C-part; where lots and lots of -perhaps useful- information in lengthy documents were provided, but time is just not enough to sort this lots of informations and to use it)

The extended time frames are ok, if not filled up over the limit with new tasks - Paper C, this year was counterproductive in this respect.

the exams format is the main issue not the time. Any well prepared candidate can do these exams in say 10 hours but that's not what the exams are designed for. It is important to re-assess the exam format and it is better to make them more practical and practice-oriented

The duration of the paper is sufficient, a longer duration would be very tiring, but, this year, the paper was not adapted to this duration.

The candidates having non-EPO language as their mother tongue should have at least extra 30 min just for having enough time to read the material. Examination papers should not concentrate measuring the reading speed!

The available time was never proportionate with the paper difficulty. This should not be a speed contest. Many candidates fail because they do not have time to make a proper analysis or to write the answers. This issue is by far the biggest problem with the EQE and it is always brought up by the candidates (including the successful ones) but the EPO remains deaf. Moreover, the 30 additional minutes are a bad joke: difficulty increased also, so they are useless.

The artificial rushing in part I of paper D is unnecessary. Marks are given for obscure points that there is not sufficient time to look up. There is only realistically time to have a quick scan so that questions have to be answered in a way which would be negligent in practice.

the amount of reading material in C and B was increased by more than 25 percent compared to last year, when the time to answer the papers was not. Resulting in a lack of time to fully assess the papers.

The additional time appears to have been accompanied by additional prior art documents to consider. Therefore the extra 30 minutes is spent considering this and doesn’t help alleviate the time pressure.

The additional 30 minutes has been made pointless by longer more complex papers. If you are going to provide more time, the papers should not become more complex as a result. This was very frustrating.

The 30 min. plus are by far not sufficient for a paper like DII 2018 (my mother tongue is german). DII 2018 was of the old 4 hour DII-style

The 30 minutes extra time could be useful, but lose all point if the papers are far longer than any previous paper in page count.

The 30 additional minutes are really helpful and allow a more thorough approach to the Paper. An additional
10min would have been nice, however in that case I would have only spent those for writing even more unnecessary paragraphs.

Text of questions / papers was longer than in previous years and confusing due to the inadequate, open to interpretation German language - therefore the time available was not sufficient

Sufficient time but this does not overcome the badly drafted paper. I urge the board to review the comments in the delta patents blog for this paper. The paper was too unclear this year

Some terms are in the German version significantly longer than in the English version. Having to write these long words by hand multiple times costs time. Abbreviations, suggested in the papers, as the “VIG” in paper A, are very helpful to overcome this issue.

Some are fast, some need more time to think. If “fit to practise” means that your’re superfast and can guess what the examination committee wanted you to write this time, what is the most important quality of EPA?

Since the exam is designed so that time is short, changing the time allotted for each exam is pointless.

Simply because the paper is longer does not mean that more should be crammed in to the paper. That defeats the purpose of extending the paper for those not sitting in their first language.

Seems fair enough. I was a bit stressed on D and C, and would have scored maybe slightly better if I had more time, but I feel the time should have been sufficient.

See previous comments. Time is the biggest issue. And it is not that if you increase time with 10% that will give 10% more points, the problem is that since you know you are under time pressure the second you make a mistake and loose a few minutes the pressure gets even worse. I knew I would fail the paper after 2,5 h since I had spent a little too much time on claim 1 and was so stressed out that I would not be able to cope with the claims remaining. The last two exams I have had corrected (by DeltaPatents) I had 73 and 59 points...

See notes on more complicate exam papers in 2018. If the exams are more complicated then more time should be given to candidates. For example, 2017 Paper C was comparatively easy compared to the 2018 paper C, and yet the same time was given to candidates in both!

See my previous comments on the exam contents. Paper A was fine for me. I finished a bit early, so the extra 30 minutes was probably right for non-native speakers. Paper B was also fine for me. I finished with about 5 - 10 minutes to spare but a bit more time would have meant I didn’t have to rush some of my final arguments and would have given me more time to re-read my answer. Paper C was far too long. The examiners must understand that when we say we need more time, it is for that particular paper. This particular paper certainly needed more than five and a half hours. I have not spoken with a single person who finished within the time (There were 8 candidates in my firm alone, and I also spoke to others from other firms). The amount of reading of number of claims to attack should be reduced, not the examination extended in length. Paper D timing was reasonable. I finished with a few minutes to spare, which was enough time to ensure that most of my handwriting was legible.

See my comment some questions before; Time management is crucial for passing the EQE. Therefore, I would not give more time for the EQE exams, as by this more worse prepared students will pass them. I might have passed my paper C last year if I would have had more time, as I were not able to write down two full attacks due to lack of time. However, this time better prepared I performed quite well and I find it quite satisfying to write an exam which is this difficult. The level of difficulty of the EQE would be significantly lowered if more time would be given, and the actual level is quite adequate. A further concern is, as I prepared myself this time face-to-face with another candidate who writes the exam in english, and I do in German, I noted quite well that it seems to be far quicker to write things down in english. Words are shorter, and most of the time, less words are necessary. This may also be seen in literature like the Office Journal, where you can see, that the english part typically is shorter than the german or french one. This seems to be a major advantage to those sitting the papers in english. I do not have any solution to this, but I think that it is not totally fair.

See last comment, I genuinely believe the extra 30 minutes has been written in to the papers now.

See earlier comment. The time limit should not be so constraining that your understanding of the subject-matter does not reflect your final grade.

see above. the eqe is not a test for attorney skills other than speed.
see above
Sad to see that the paper C exam committee hasn’t kept its promise of not increasing the length of the paper in response to the increased time.

Ran out of time for Paper C

Please, just scrap the “30 min more for non-native speakers” and replace it with the truth, that the exams have been extended scope wise by 30 min or rather forget about the 30 min and go back to the scope
before introduction of the 30 min. My feeling was, that before the “addtional 30 min for non-natives” the ratio scope/time was better.

Please see comments before. This was my first time taking all 4 papers, but I did not feel that I had something called “extra time”. Especially C paper seemed like a never ending story.

Please provide an extensive list of accepted abbreviations that would be accepted as this could save a lot of time. For example, apart of the already standard abbreviations like BoA, IA, FD... many other terms like subject-matter, priority, application, applicant, publication, closest prior art, provisional...etc could be abbreviated to sjm, prio, appln(or ap, apl, apn), apt, pub(ln), cpa, prov...etc. Writing speed. I don’t manage to write down within the time given all details of analysis expected by the markers to attract full points. What’s the point in testing the candidate’s handwriting skills?? The exam should test knowledge and . Writing speed does not (dis)qualify the ability to represent a client.

Please more Time

Please keep the lenght and difficulty of the papers the same over the years.

Please don’t make the exams longer - 5.5 hours is already too long. Lessen / change the content

Please check if the case is not too difficult as a hugh amount of information has to be reviewed in a very small time slot. I think that the cases were too difficult.

Peut-être, encore 30 minutes en plus pour avoir 6 heures en tout.

Perhaps providing extra 30 min would be a good measure, specially for non native speakers of one of the EPO languages.

People read and write in different pace. I don’t see the point in so short a time. In our daily work, we are not in such a hurry.

part D of EQE 2018 requires more time in order to precisely access all the problems presented (6.5 to 7 hrs). In this sense, exams are not equal, e.g. for part D of EQE 2013 probably 5,5 to 6 hrs are enough.

Papers D and C took much longer to complete than in previous years

Papers A and B are now okay time wise. Papers C and D are probably okay too but maybe 6 hours would enable all candidates to fully answer, especially those who are not a native speaker.

Paper D was impossible this year. Due to the change that in part D-II the subject-matter had to be understood & interpreted as well. If I am not taken wrong, in previous years the inventions were just named as such in brief titles.

Paper D time is inadequate

Paper D is too demanding. I would like to suggest less questions in less time.

Paper C: too time consuming case.

Paper C: 5-hours, to read 33 pages, attack 6-claims having 3-independent claims, Klasse ! Paper D: if without any drawing, why have so many technical features ? donnot understand.

Paper C, time definitely too short and too much to write

Paper C would not have been doable in the 5 hour time that it is nominally meant to take. It was barely doable within the 5.5 hours given. If you are going to provide more time, you need to make sure that the examination does not grow with it! The other papers are easier to manage in the time allowed.

Paper C would have been more achievable had time permitted.

Paper C was too much for the 5.5 hours. I would have had no chance with only 5h

Paper C was really too long.

Paper C was 7 pages longer than 2017, but no extra time!

Paper C seemed a lot longer than previous years

Paper C involved too much reading in the time available. The prior art documents were too long.

Paper C in particular was more time pressured than I had been expecting, given that it was supposedly a 5 hour exam with 30 minutes extra to assist non-native speakers.

Paper C has a cascading effect in terms of the amount of information given. The amount of text has been noticeably increased, but this has to be followed for mapping with each of the features in both independent and dependent claims. This makes the additional time given in paper C actually pointless.

Paper C and D were time consuming...too much time reading and understanding the material than time spent actually answering hence answers rushed and not upto the ability that should have been due to time pressure and having to throw something down on the paper and losing your train of thought.

Paper C always feels like too little time.
Paper B is difficult to be adequately solved in the available time frame. Too much pressure and forcing to accept decisions too quick.

Paper A and B has too much time allocated. Overall 7 hour exam on one day nearly impossible to fully concentrate.

One should go back to the old format and also go back to the old length of the papers. The papers just got longer thus you need the extra 30 min. For example, Paper B now had 21 pages and the DI questions contained a lot of text....

Obviously, there is no more time available overall. In fact, the complexity of part D II was increased proportionally.

Nothing

Not enough. For example C_2017, I managed to collect 92 points, but I spent on it more than 7 hours, having possibility to redo wrong attacks, when you noticing that at later stage. However in C_2018, I also noticed that I made some mistakes, but only 1 hour was left, and I was missing 2 attacks, so I chosen to finish the attacks, and not to correct the old ones. I was well prepared for paper C, but the filing is not good.

Not enough time. By far. See my comments above. The Story with the additional 30 minutes is the greatest joke. Why would you give 30 more minutes when at the same time increasing the workload by 1.5h. I would love to take back the workload from before and have only 5 hours. All the misleading information in the exam plus this ridiculous time pressure forces me to make mistakes, while every single mistake can be a killer in this exam. Killing all my long preparation. The fact that a certain amount of candidates pass every year is no acceptable reasoning for that.

Not enough for the quantity of pages to read and information to elaborate.

Not enough for C. I did not waste much time on wrong attacks or changing my mind, yet ran out of time.

No point in increasing time when the exams are becoming longer!

No further comment.

No comments

No

Need more time

My impression was that the additional DII question resorbed the additional time, so there was no gain.

My impression was that the additional 30 min have been used for providing more or more difficult questions (so in the end no gain in exam time)

My earlier comments on the difficulty of the Paper C exam apply here too. Given the complexity of this year’s Paper C there was simply not enough time provided.

More time would be greatly appreciated

More time should be given for Part D and C, in its complexity as in 2018.

More time needed

More time makes only sense if number of Annexes or number of pages of Annexes does not increase at the same time.

More time is only a good thing, if the quantity and length of the questions/exercises stay the same...

More time could be allocated for D and C, these are the cases where the time pressure is the most, and also most unrealisc compared to real practice.

More time available than passed years, but papers much longer, and too much information to treat in a too short time (especially for C and D).

More is needed on paper C if it is to be drafted in such a way that a large number of combinations/arguments are ruled unreasonable due to a few buried sentences (as opposed to the unreasonablenss being clear from the figures, or stressed throughout a disclosure, as has been the rule of thumb in previous years). If this does not happen, the possibility of non EPO official language speakers writing a complete answer in time will be effectively zero. Paper D needs far more time if it is intended to change the format of a major part without forewarning. Paper C and D are already excessively long. Hence, I strongly suggest the issues necessitating extra time are addressed at source, rather than covering them up by allocating extra time (which puts candidates with minor health issues, eg bad backs, at a disadvantage)

Maybe Another 30 minutes would do, however, one gets very tired during the exam and a longe paper requires longer focus and energy and I do not know if I could focus and concentrate if I had more than 6
Hours to do paper D.

Longer time only means decreasing concentration and being more tired. The real issue is that there is too much stuff to read and data to manage. It would be far more efficient to test knowledge and capabilities in a more straightforward way.

Legal work must provide well-considered advice but the exam is not a measure of that, rather a measure of how quickly candidates can locate an answer.

Just try to get back to more standard, than everything is well.

It's probably about right at the moment. It would be really helpful not to have paper A and B on the same day. My performance in paper B was seriously reduced just through exhaustion. 7.5 hours of exams on one day is too much.

It's a problematic combination of too few time available and handwriting issues and making decisions. Finally, the performance at the exam is far poorer than it could be, not due to a lack of knowledge, but due to time constraints.

It's time to say goodbye.

It's feasible, but there isn't much margin for reflection, let alone error.

It's a long session already, but the tight time frame is not something we experience with regular client work; thus, I think the time pressure issues and the quickness test in the exam should be decreased at least a bit.

It would be much better to have paper A and B on different days! Additional time would help a lot.

It would be good to have papers A and B in different days. As it is, it's 7.5 hours of exam in one day. I didn't sit D and C this year, but it would have been extremely exhausting to sit all 4 exams in 3 consecutive days.

It would be better to reduce the number of documents rather than increasing time to make the exam.

It seems that allowing the extra 30 minutes has produced an increase in difficulty in the papers.

It seems like the paper got longer to compensate for the extra half an hour so still not enough time.

It seems that the examination papers have more information to work out, so that the more time is used without any value added. To me, working under time pressure is no quality feature of an European patent attorney being fit for practice. Better would be: Less or same time, but much less clouds of information, that show nothing about one's fitness for practice.

It might have helped to split the available time better if it was known from the beginning what the distribution of marks would be; e.g. how many marks for 123(2), how many for inv. step, how many for clarity... but in general, simply giving more time would have been very very helpful.

It makes no sense to have an additional 30 minutes if one also has more to read. I'd rather have less time and less pages.

It is well known that teachers/professors, when making tests/exams, they should be able to resolve the exam(s)/test(s) in 1/3 of the time available for students/candidates. In some of the papers, I doubt that could be achieved.

It is very difficult to finish paper C within 5+1/2 hours. I wanted to have 30-45min more or one claim less to be attacked.

It is useless to increase the amount of time available and at the same time the amount of paper to read.

It is still too short.

It is somehow strange to be allowed 10% more time for paper C whilst the amount of reading is increased by 30%. Does not really "pay off" then for the candidates. I would then rather skip the additional time and have a shorter exam which is do-able without ambiguities.

It is not all about the time available to solve the paper, but also about how much text do we have to read and analyse! In paper C for example there were quite some passages in attachment 1, which I personally did not need for anything. For what reason there was the additional "Reizmittel" apart from the "Konditionierungsmittel", which also apperad in some of the other documents. But which was not included in the claims and therefore not needed for the attacks in my opinion.

It is hard to say if more time available would be beneficial. Maybe reducing the amount of information needed to be processed before answering would be a better solution than increasing the available time.

It is evident that, in these years, the level of complexity of Paper C is increased, so Examination Committee has to find a balance between two main things: quantity of information (i.e. paper length) and available time to candidates. I suggest to create specific rules in order to limit the length of the paper.

It is crazy that you do not have time to read the questions properly and analyse the situation before it is time to move on. It is too much luck if you pass or not - even though you have studied more or less daily in 1.75 years. You just have to hope that you understand the question directly (as the commitee wants you to...
It felt like there was more to read than in previous years, which threw my practised timings off significantly. It could be useful to have at least 6 hours for paper D and at least 4 hours for paper B (as per paper A). It came to feel that the tasks are analogous to the 30 minutes more with "grown". Instead of adding more time, simplify the papers so it can be completed in a shorter time frame, or consider releasing the reading material prior to the written part of the exam to allow candidates to assess it before entering. In real world practice all the documents are publicly available anyway!

Increasing the Time and at the Same time the content causes even more Time pressure

In theory, the exam has been extended 30 minutes. It's just theory. Prior art documents have been extremely long, many claims to attack and the patent to attack, has also been very long. It's a joke?

In some ways - more time to get lost and confused.

In Paper A, it was not clear what was expected, as the Paper did not specifically ask for an "introduction" and "claims" (in contrast to the last years). In fact, it gave the impression that it was asked to draft the whole patent. So, it was necessary to spend extra time in discussing figures and other elements of the patent beyond "introduction" and "claims", in order to draft the whole patent. This issue should be acknowledged for those, who drafted the whole patent and may had not enough time for other aspects of paper A.

In order to test a candidates ability to understand and assess the technical teaching of a text, it is neither necessary to have excessively long texts nor a huge amount of different documents. Reducing the required reading time seems not only possible but also beneficial for everyone involved.

In case of paper based on process claims, it takes more time to read the documents.

In paper C it is insufficient for non-EPO language candidates, specially in this year 2018 C paper.

If you extend the time available but if you also extend the texts to be read and processed and raise the bar in the completeness of the argumentation, there is no improvement for the people sitting the exam.

If there is too many confusing information given in the papers (as was the case in paper D) even 30 min more would not help if you once got lost to organize the information. Less conflicting details would make it much more easy to deal with the topics raised in a limited amount of time. The exam currently tests whether you are able to very quickly and efficiently organize loads of information although you do not know what kind of information you have to arrange (per application, per subject claimed, in view of prior art, in view of mistakes made by the applicant -"was disclosed by mistake" etc.). Once you get lost, it does not help that you would have been able to answer the questions if you had not got lost.

If the aim of an additional 30 min was to improve the number of pass candidates, all papers should not change their difficulty. This year the bonus time could not be spend to improve the quality of the answers, since the complexity of the papers (mainly D paper) consumed those 30 min, and was not enough to cover all questions. If the idea was also to increase the complexity of the exam, I would prefer to stay with previous time limits and stay with lower complexity of the papers.

If the additional 30 minutes are used to gain the documents than this is no help for the candidates. Especially in Paper C the patent in suit comprised 10 pages and 6 to 7 claims with 3 independent claims. Even the state of the art documents comprised together much more paper than old Pacer C of the compendium.

If paper D next year is composed like paper D this year definitely more time is needed!

If I would have more time available it would be very likely I would pass them. Now, I did not have enough time to properly go into detail when answering the questions.

If a candidate is under such strong pressure, the exam fails to test his real capability of analysing legal problem. Proposal: especially for non-DE/EN/FR native speaker, additional time shall be granted if he accepts a suitable penalty to marks. (a candidate shall be allowed to have enough time to complete his writing, even if he fails.)

I'm afraid I did not enjoy having to number all of the pages during the Examination. Time is always a pressure and I found I did not have sufficient time to number the pages, often rushing it and making mistakes in the numbering. I would much prefer the UK style, where the exam duration is just for answering the questions and time is allowed to number the pages after the Exam has finished. It is a shame that the EQE exam duration is not just for answering the questions and that the numbering of papers have to be done within this time limit even though no marks are available for such a task. I know its just a few minutes taken away from answering the question, but every minute helps towards getting marks!

I would like to advise the exam committee to consider when choosing a topic, how much additional writing that topic cost. For example, writing: "suitable for milking outside the milk cabin" at the time eats quite a lot of the available time. Same for "oilballs process ...... trumpet shaped ......". This actually doesn't test the
candidates abilities, but does cost a lot of the available time. Simple topics to write down, which require shorter sentences, helps to gain time during the exam. Also, try to make it clearer from the exam paper A & B if a Chemistry E/M type answer style is expected as the final marking scheme used to be different.

I was wondering who defines the work to be done in 5,5h?!?

I understand the purpose of having time pressure in paper D since you should have a lot of information and knowledge at hand in case your client asks something. Then you shouldn’t have to look everything up. However, I do not understand the necessity of time pressure in the other papers, especially in C. When do you have to draft an opposition in 6 hours time? Especially when you have to stick to so many rules as required for passing the Eqe. Analysing the documents and finding possible attacks and then not having the time to actually write all of them down is very frustrating. And it doesn’t prove you are not fit for practice.

I understand that the purpose of time pressure is to discriminate well-prepared candidates from others, but for non-native speakers of EN, DE or FR, the time pressure issue is even harder to beat.

I think the Examiners don’t realize that what they consider a “minor pitfall” can actually take a long time to resolve. Both Papers B and C reward the demonstration of problem-solution skills and inventive step analysis, but these analyses happen at the very end. Thus, the most important part of the marks bear the brunt of time problems.

I think the exam should be prepared in such a way that it could be done in 5,5 hours.

I think that the time cannot be longer. The exam should relate to general things that everyone knows about, when it deals with something that you do not have any knowledge about - you must read very careful and if you get stressed - you do not manage.

I think that the recent time increase has been matched by a corresponding increase in the time necessary for completing the papers, although that was not supposed to be the case.

I think that papers C and D were more difficult than usual, so the extra time was used trying to understand the increased difficulty of the papers - in particular paper C had a lot of text to read and the claims were very long. Extra time is surely only of benefit if the papers are maintained at the same difficulty level?

I think that paper A could be limited only to the set of claims

I think that it is useful to give more time for making the paper and then prepare a longer paper.

I think that additional time (up to 1h) would be very helpful for each of the Examination papers, especially for Papers C and D.

I think it’s a bit too short, and can fail people who would actually deserve to pass.

I think it would be reasonable to go back to 4 hours exam for the Paper B exam. In this exam you are so dependent on claim 1 that if you make one mistake you fail, while in C and D you have many options for succeeding. If you have more time to make sure you finish the exam then many mistakes due to lack of attention would be avoided.

I think is fair because it allows to reconsider some of the answers

I think I would have passed if I would have had an extra hour, now I think I failed as I did not have time to write down the answers even if I think I knew them. Next time I will in C start with doing the inventive step attacks instead of the novelty, as I think these give most points and I did not have time to write them well. Time pressure did not allow me to write all attacks. I found. And in D I spent too much time on the first part, not giving time to give a good answer on the second part.

I think any longer and I’d lose concentration maybe

I sincerely think that if the time for doing the paper is increased but proportionally to the time increasing, also the difficult is increased, it is better maintain the original difficult and the original time as well. Increasing the difficult proportionally the time increased does not make sense.

I seriously doubt on the relevance of applying such a high time pressure on EEQ candidates with the only purpose of evaluating their capacity to be good EP patent attorneys.

I lost time by debating what we’re the essential features in paper A. Had to rewrite first claim a few times.

I know oppositions and all the topics related to that but time was far too little and very unclear annexes and what you wanted?!?

I just finished all of them on time, but did not have time to read through and check. 30min extra and I would have had time for that, which probably would have gained me some extra points.

I have the impression that this exams has been adapted to fill out the additional 30 Minutes (applies for part C and D, not for A)

I have seen nobody leave the room early, even with the additional time. Time pressure favors native English speaking candidates.
I have sat the exams several times already. The time pressure is so stressful that it leads to a panic feeling, which makes you unable to think clearly and you make stupid mistakes. I have not even once finished neither a C exam nor a D exam. I would have passed the exams, if there would have been time to answer all questions. I have handed in several C and D exams (through epi tutorials and corrections papers to DeltaPatents) which I would have “passed”, but it is much more difficult to do in in the exam situation in the short time available.

I have already given in the other boxes. Give us back the other 30 minutes. 4h B 6h C and D.

I found the long announcement in the last 5 minutes a real distraction. All announcements should be read out before the exam. Only warning that 5 minutes are left should be given at the end.

I find the time very short to consider all the issues raised in the second part of D and think of solutions to the issues raised.

I find I’m too rushed - less material would be better than more time.

I feel that the paper C and D exams are too long. Adding extra time should have permitted extra reading time but it felt like the exam complexity was increased and therefore the time increase lost.

I feel as though I needed more time for Paper C and Paper D, Paper C in particular on this occasion

I feel although 30 mins has been added - there was a lot more to read and analyse. Information which was unescessary.

I don’t think it would be a good idea to increase time further - 5.5 hours is already very tiring as it is, and the quality of reasoning towards the end already drops pretty significantly. Instead, please just stop increasing the amount of text/information to digest and the length of the expected answer. Make the exam feasible in the timeframe, instead of adjusting the timeframe.

I didn’t finish (i.e. attempt all questions or make all points I knew I wanted to write about) papers A, C and D.

I didn’t find on the papers sat that I was twiddling my thumbs at all, even though there was the extra half hour. Consequently, I would have felt overly pressured without the extra half hour, and I could still have added extra points had there been even more time.

I did not complete any paper to my satisfaction - I had to throw something down for the last section for every one. I can type faster than I can write and it is hard to get enough practice at writing fast and thinking intensely. I was worrying at the end of each paper about being disqualified because I hadn’t finished numbering the pages and was caught writing after the bell. In the UK exams, candidates are allowed to number the pages at leisure after the examination is complete. This would reduce the stress at the end of the exam.

I did feel that with Papers B, C and D that I didn’t have enough time. I think these exams should be about testing our knowledge, not the speed at which we can write. Also, I don’t see why papers D and C need to be 5.5 hours long. Surely it must be possible to test a candidates ability with less questions and a slightly shorter, for example 4 hour long, exam?

I considered time pressure to be part of the exams

I believe that I could have improved my answers with more time. However, the EQEs seem to be regularly increasing in length. I am not convinced that the quality of examination, as tests of legal knowledge or quality of advice, is improved by increasing the endurance aspect of the exams, so I would not advocate making them longer.

I arrived 50 minutes late (due to snow conditions) so that I was very pressurized by the time but I think that the whole time would have been just engouh or barely enough to deal correctly with the 2018 paper C.

I and several participants I talked with had the feeling that the extra time is “consumed” by an increasing amount of information that has to be used during the examination (longer annexes in C compared to last years).

I’m quite sure that with more time I would get much better results in the EQE. Having to copy the claims in paper C several times by hand wastes a lot of time.

Handwriting nowadays is something the candidates hardly to outside the examination any longer ... Therefore, handwriting takes more time than you might think. Furthermore, if there is only 3 Minutes per Point (e.g. in D) - how should a candidate prove that he / she is able to apply the law ? Do you really expect that candidates know the EPC by heart (including all T. J. G etc. + GL + PCT ?? The format right now is almost close to a multiple choice format - without the cross boxes. // Suggestion: Make the cases more complicate, give the candidate really time to think about it, and than expect less papers to be handed in. Than candidates can demonstrate the learned abilities and would apply the framework of the EPC - instead of just running through something getting points for statements like “this is the first invention for XY”.

Half and hour extra per paper as has been allocated this year, even though it is tiresome to sit paper A and
Every year this question gets asked and nothing changes. We have 10% more time added now with 20% for day work.

Examination papers are only time management examination, that’s all. It does not reveal your real abilities for day-to-day work.

Every year this question gets asked and nothing changes. We have 10% more time added now with 20%
more info this year to process, what is going on? Where does 5.5 hours come from? We are all grown ups sitting these exams and are used to working a full 8 hours+ a day. Why not just give everyone a decent shot at doing the papers justice. It's complete madness that approx half candidates each year fail to pass when the pass level is 50%!!

even 30 min added, it's time consuming navigation and spotting the information in C and Part II in D

Especially for D paper, it should be more time

Either reduce the amount of reading or provide more time. The situation as it currently stands for paper C is a joke. Paper D is not as bad usually, but this year was noticeably more pressured.

Either allow for more time or reduce the amount of paper to be read (or both) could help. Also, Paper A and B on the same day is pretty exhaustive. maybe it could help to spread the papers over 4 days (Tu - Fri) and have only one paper per day. Helps also from a physical standpoint.

Easier (less features) or more time

durch den extremen Zeitdruck wird in erster Linie die Nervenstärke des Kandidaten getestet und nicht, wie es sein sollte, das Wissen.

Dont make the exam harder/increase the extent of the exam just because the time available changed.

Difficulty is mainly the time limit. I don’t understand why it seems important for the exam committee to limit the time for writing the exam to such an extent, I think time is not such a relevant factor to assess the quality of a suitable candidate, there should be provided more time to write.

difficult to manage and split time between DI and DII. time pressure causes bad calligraphy and possibly errors. some people suffer more than other this kind of stress so notwithstanding a good preparation someone is not able to demonstrate his ability.

Die letzten 5 Minuten, in denen die Lösung in den Umschlag und das Deckblatt unterschrieben werden muss, an die Prüfungszeit anhängen.

Despite never running out of time when sitting many past papers to time during revision, I ran out of time on paper D and paper C in the real exams. I had only practiced using recent versions of paper D so the change in style and format of part II of the 2018 Paper D compared to recent years threw me off balance. It would be useful if such substantial changes to the format of the exam occurred more frequently year-on-year rather than repeating the same style of question for 5 years only to suddenly change it. Comparing my performance on past-papers with the real thing, I felt like I had been lulled into a false sense of security. 2018 Paper C seemed much longer (i.e. too much prior art to read on top of verbose claims) than all 6 of the C past papers I had used to practice. As a result, I ended up running out of time and was unable to demonstrate my knowledge across all parts of the paper. This felt unfair because previous years did not suffer such a verbose paper and time pressure should not be the decisive factor when assessing competence. My downfalls have arisen from having an inaccurate image of what to expect based on the recent past papers I had practiced.

Despite having an extra 30 minutes per exam this year and being advised that the difficulty of the exams was not to be increased, this was not my feeling. Everyone I spoke to was writing up to the last minute.

Definitely too short for C and D, but especially for D

D paper is very big, concentration is lost over 4 hours, but for this year i would be grateful if it was 6h paper D. I think you should think in another kind of exame, everything that makes you stay 5h without a meal is bad for brain and health, and by consequence with your performance.

Concerning Paper D, I wonder if separating DI and DII as in the past, morning and afternoon, would allow for performing better (I never tested it). Even if I needed for more time, I was really exhausted during the last hour. I had to eat a lot.

Completely unfair and unrealistic expectations on adults with jobs and billing targets to meet.

Comme indiqué avant, j’ai eu l’impression que les sujets étaient conçus pour être traités dans le temps imparti avec les 30 minutes supplémentaires, c’est-à-dire que les 30 minutes supplémentaires n’étaient pas vraiment un bonus.

Cette année on a vraiment eu l’impression que les épreuves étaient plus longue peut-être à cause de la demi-heure en plus (surtout pour C avec des documents longs à lire et A avec la demande entière à rédiger)

certainly for both paper C and paper D time was an issue - if you are to properly answer the questions without rushing and missing certain points and feeling very nervous to try and get as much done as possible before the time runs out - is a depressing state to be in the exam, you miss certain points which had you been calmer in your thoughts you could have answered. this is incredibly frustrating. for paper C and D extra time is needed.

C seemed much more complex than the previous years.
C and D were far more complicated and much more info to analyse this year so the extra half an hour was cancelled out by that so it still wasn’t enough extra time.

By far too little for Paper C for non native speakers. Most of the points are scored after having read through all the material, in this case there was by far not enough time for processing and writing down the necessary information.

Better to limit the number of annexes than increasing the time available. To manage the 2018 exam I would probably have needed an additionally 2 hours to have been able to check responses properly. Also, writing electronically would also have made the exam so much easier. Cleaely should be possible in 2018.

Be fair about it, the extra half hour was more than consumed by making q1 of D2 way more difficult than usual in D2 and by making very texty questions in D1 some of which needed also an extreme amount of writing work (q1 of D1)

B felt rushed, the others felt fine

At one point more time doesn’t help because one is too tired.

As the papers were very long and accumulated a lot of unnecessary information, it took much time to read them. I am not native language reader.

As stated previously, there seems to have been a large increase in the length of the prior art documents provided in Paper B and Paper C. Paper A was made such that it required at least two independent claims (if not more). The difficulty was significantly increased over previous years, and it appears as though the extra 30 minutes which were provided last year (without an increase in difficulty) were used this year to increase the length of the cited documents and difficulty of the exams.

As stated before, I don’t understand why this pressure is necessary....

As said in my previous comment, the 2017 and 2018 papers seem to have got more difficult and complex, with more content to read and analyse since the extra 30 minutes were introduced, despite the fact that this was not originally the point of the extra 30 minutes.

As previously mentioned, time available is insufficient by far. Despite the additional 30min being provided, the Exam Comm. has not been careful not to make the papers longer/more difficult. What’s the use if candidates do not get the full benefit of the additional 30min?

As mentioned, the paper C was impossible in time. The Prior Art documents were too long, making impossible a correct analysis, and a detailed annotation in a summary data table to create later the attacks to the claims.

As mentioned previously, the extra half hour seems to have led the examiners to increase the amount of reading material and amount to do for Papers C and D. This is counterproductive and negates the point of the extra half hour.

As mentioned earlier, paper C was way too long. It seems that the people drafting the paper have considered the additional 30 min as an invitation to draft a lengthy paper with ridiculous attacks. I wish we had had only 5 hours as in past years but in turn a sensible paper C that was feasible to complete within the 5 hours, as the papers of previous years. I did C2017 and in the end had about 20 min left. So I did not feel too much time pressure last year (in the end I failed because the Examining Committee decided to award 0 marks for an IS attack on claim 2 which was actually well-founded and even suggested by Deltapatents as a possible solution).

As mentioned before, there is not enough time available. Especially near the end of the paper, one can still score a lot of points by finishing the remaining questions.

As long as a candidate must use handwriting the examination result depends very much on the speed of handwriting which does not correspond to the real life attorney work.

As I mentioned in my other answers, I ran out of time writing the response letter. Even then I had to cut corners when writing basis for amendments just to have enough time for the inventive step part. In the end I did not finish that properly and will lose lots of marks as I didn’t have time to mark the paragraphs where support was found. - reading the documents and then understanding how to amend took longer than before or when I practised past papers. The tables, terms (“Q”, “SRI”) took time to understand as those aren’t bread and butter in my area at work.

As already stated, not enough time for C and D. C was highly time-consuming as the prior art was very long to read. DII was particularly complex and therefore leads to not enough time to complete the exam

as already said, not enough time in view of the complexity of papers. I do not see the need of making the paper consciously not possible to pass with full marks because of time pressure.

An other view: a crucial problem is the determination of exam dates. It is in the middle of flu-season. Please consider this for planning in the NEAR future. A month later would be much better. Seriously.
An extra half an hour, in principle, was a good idea to reduce time pressure. However, much more care should have been taken to ensure that this half an hour was not simply filled by more questions to answer!

An extra 15 minutes will be perfect or just manage the questions to allow the candidates to finish on time.

Although my understanding was that, following the increase in time available for the examination papers, the length/difficulty of the papers would not change, this does not seem to have been the case. Papers B and C, and part II of paper D were all considerably longer than in previous years. It is therefore not clear how the additional time could possibly help candidates. At this rate, we will have soon have an additional 60 minutes, but the paper length will double!

Although half an hour is added to each paper, the amount of work is very difficult to get completed within the time allocated to the papers. This seems not to be a measure to decide whether a candidate is fit to practice.

Although 5:30h is a Long time, it still was not enough for Paper C

Already explained in my previous comment

Adequate at current levels

Add time

A, B, D was okay. C was pretty close.

A paper does not need more time, but all of the other will either have to have reduced material or more time. It's ridiculous that you are supposed to compose these answers in such short time when in real life if you prepare a response, or opposition you will most likely spend at least a day or more on it.

A 6 hour paper is not desirable. The difficulty of the paper should not at all be limited to being able to read long texts and how much information the candidate can process. So a "real" 5 hour paper would be adequate for C and D.

A = OK, more time wouldn’t help at all, it would only make your intro even longer (while drafting the intro for the exam is a weird and unrealistic thing) B = OK, could do with less time even C = OK but it took so much time to write all the ridiculous "a cow is an animal, as evidenced by A1[0001]" statements. Yet you need these to get full marks, or at least you need them on some occasions. Unfortunately you cannot know when it attracts marks and when it doesn’t, so you’re doomed to repeat these insulting statements for every attack, just to get a chance to gain marks. D = great lack of time, no chance to review earlier answers. But on the other hand: if you had more time, the exam would get too easy, so with paper D it’s kind of “by design” that you don’t have enough time, I guess.

5:30 for an examination (paper D) is a Long time. It is hard to stay concentrated all over the time. Not the time should be Extended. The Content of the Examen should be reduced. Furthermore the questions should be more clear and focused only on legal aspects.

5.5h is quite a lot and fatigue might set in for longer times. In particular, for paper C it is difficult to keep an overview over all material, notes, etc. while time is pressing. Content should be reduced in C.

5.5 hours could have been sufficient had the paper been drafted properly. With a DII like that one would have needed 8 hours.

4 hours for paper A is a lot, compared to the available time for the other papers. For paper D, it does not seem reasonable to increase the time available even more (it is too exhausting to sit more than 5½ h without a break). However, the level of complexity of part 2 must be consistent from year to year...

4 hours for B world be more adequate than the actual 3,5 hours
Chapter 5 – Training materials

Q33) How would you rate the following learning materials/courses?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Materials</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>Very bad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic training in European patent law (Euro-CEPI)</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-limit questions (EPO)</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee-break questions (EPO)</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily D questions (EPO)</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guide to EOE papers (EPO)</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQE pre-examination 2018 - online training course (EPO)</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Courses</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>Very bad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EQE Paper D three-day methodology course (DeltaPatents)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQE Paper C three-day methodology course (DeltaPatents)</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main seminar Paper D (Euro-CEPI)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main seminar Paper C (Euro-CEPI)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main seminar Papers A and B (Euro-CEPI)</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminars for the EQE pre-examination 2018 (Euro-CEPI)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commented answers to paper C for previous years (EPO)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q34) Please add any comments and suggestions regarding the learning materials/courses:

Would be nice to have all the material in the other two official languages (FR and DE), like coffee break questions.

Would be good if more detail could be provided in the Examiner's comments on how marks are given for parts of the problem and solution approach in inventive step arguments.

With the Delta-patent courses you really understand the methodology and background knowledge necessary to pass the exams.

we want to know the point sheet

very good the annotated EPC and very good teachers

Useful and helpful

Training course was very good and useful. However, the tutors did not know that claim analysis part will be so hard, and therefore they could not prepare us for this issue. This is a kind of discrepancy as the EPO organized both the training course and the exam.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Too short cession</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thought the course was very good. Only complaint was that some questions have ambiguities or errors. A couple of times these errors were fixed quickly (e.g. when the answer listed was wrong). However, the course tutors said that the ambiguities would be looked into to be fixed next year. Still this is just a minor nitpick.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a certain irony in organizing exams without disclosing the optimal preparation material. I taught a course at master level at university for four years and could never imagine not informing my students on this aspect. While I fully understand the reason for not disclosing it, I must comment that for me, the largest “gap” in the preparation was probably that I was not aware of any pre-eqe DeltaPatents book at all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There could’ve been more than just one mock training material for the combined A+B (and the 2017-exams) the webpage does not show Q 33 correctly. Compendium very useful, but could be improved by providing more sample scripts, commentary on any errors or nugatory effort in the script provided. Also ensuring all comments in the examiners comments are fully justified, rather than “X is not equivalent to Y” or “claims to X/Y were / were not expected” (with no explanation) “X was considered essential” (with no explanation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The tutors in the online training course did a fantastic job, both in the Virtual Classroom sessions, and in answering questions promptly and accurately on the forum. Thumbs up!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The pre-exam online training course was very good, but he amount of questions in the quizzes that required discussion and then correction was too many. Some of them were corrected following forum discussions, some of them were discussed and marked incorrect, but not actually updated. This left me confused several times and I wasted time second guessing myself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The online EQE training modules are excellent. Congratulations to all those involved! Please provide many more of these exercises so that candidates can benefit from them. They are indispensible for EQE learning!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The mock paper was good, however the examination report was way too short. It was not sufficiently explained how many points are deducted for which phrases. The old mechanical solutions were much more precise. During the exam, I had to ask myself whether the omission of functional features leads to a point deduction or the addition of functional features may lead to an unnecessary restriction, since the examination of 2018 did not specify any functional features in the sample solution (although there they could be formulated).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The methodology courses of DeltaPatents where extremely valuable. The course are on a top level compared with the pre-exam course of CEIPI which I attended for the pre-exam. The D-Book Questions of DeltaPatents was very helpful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The learning materials are very helpful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The intensive last minute course may have been enough to get me to pass A and B! Fantastic. For C I read over the previous exams and I think that was sufficient. D I prepared for, but did not answer the questions well - but that was not due to time pressure or lack of preparation, but failing to organize myself on the exam day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the few I’ve done are good, but to be honest i tend to ignore them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Examiners’ Reports in no way provide sufficient guidance with respect to expected answers. You should just come out and say “there is virtually no way to pass the EQE without paying a course vendor, so just pay the vendor.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the eqe paper D three-day course did not provide an “action plan” - sort of a guidelines how to assess in particular D2, a step-by-step approach to assess and identify the difficult issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The EPO needs to make more study materials for the claims analysis part available. There is an excess of revision materials for the legal part of the exam but due to the difficulty in putting together a mock claims analysis section the only way to practice is using the past papers. There are not enough past papers to prepare adequately for the claims analysis. Furthermore, as the claims analysis part is increasing in difficulty the earlier past papers become less relevant and provide a false sense of security. Therefore I think the EPO should publish an official workbook with multiple claims analysis sections to work through with detailed commentary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Delta Patents method focuses on writing the novelty completely (paper C style). I did it, but I have the feeling this was not necessary, only the differences were necessary. Useless use of my time that could be used elsewhere, but because I was in doubt, I did it the long version anyway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The d ceipi courses for D préparation take place too late. Would be better to have the main cours in october and the intensif in january is ok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The courses must be directed to time management...“time management”...“time management”...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the courses are helpful to give you guide on how to approach the exams etc but ultimately a candidate has to find his/her own methodology. Also, if enough preparation has not been done by the candidate themselves..they will get the least out of the courses. the delta patent approach is convoluted and time consuming and over the top (this can be hindering especially when you are struggling with time in the exams) . so something thats offers flexibility and again one can only develop a methodology after practising papers themselves and defining what works for the individual.

The course was OK but no where near sufficient to enable you to pass the exam.

The course could provide more content for claim analysis. It was a good course for the legal part, but it was weak on the claim analysis part.

The Compendium was the most helpful resource when preparing for Paper B. Especially the combination of the Examiner Letter with the model answer. Each of those documents alone not half as useful as both in combination.

The Compendium along with the answers/Examiner’s Reports are extremely useful, however the answers/Examiner’s Reports do suffer somewhat from not being entirely consistent in approach and analysis over the years.

The commented C papers are very helpful in explaining to you how to go about getting the marks you need to pass.

The commented answers was a good idea, however, more details on the marking would have been more help.

The commented answers to Paper C were a great addition - would be nice to have had more than two papers covered though obviously. Similar answers for other papers would also be appreciated, as knowing where marks are picked up (and lost) is invaluable as it is so easy to be capable of doing the task of the exam, but just missing out because you don’t know what you get marks for.

The coffee-break questions are too easy. They should be more exam-type questions to be useful, more difficult and maybe also in the exam style (4 subquestions per topic). I attended the “Basic Course European Patent Rights and Patent Practice” in Antwerpen, Belgium and it was not useful to me.

The classes were irrelevant slide presentations. They should bring something new and useful to the table. The material is not searchable, so it’s not that useful for the exam. Also, we were pretty much left on our own for the claim analysis training. They should train us for the exam, I felt this part was completely insufficient. But the teachers were nice.

The case studies for the claims analysis parts were not as clear and well-prepared as those in the past papers, and so they were not as helpful as they could have been.

The C methodology of delta was gold! The D was a good basis but hard to cover D in three days.

The book “Goal-oriented methodologies to pass the European Qualifying Examination (EQE)” by Daniel Herrmann was very helpful and very well written.

The basic training did not prepare for the pre-exam specifically. Basic training should be reformed.

The basic explanations of issues are very good in these notes. However, the level of knowledge required to answer the questions in the paper is greatly underestimated by the level of detail in these notes.

The advice about the combined chemistry and EM exam needs to be improved. More time should be spent showing how to spot claim categories and essentials features (not previously very important for EM candidates)

The accompanying C book was useful.

The A and B courses are still divided into “chemical” and “mechanical” subject-matters and are therefore unhelpful in providing guidance as to how to approach the mixed subject-matter papers.

Supervisors in the online course did a great job. However, please mention explicitly where to focus on. Maybe, some important chapters too busy and some minor important chapters too long, in view of the examination.

Structure for how to write sufficient answers in an as short way as possible would be needed.

Some questions looked a bit messy. Otherwise I was happy with them.

Some of the tutors of the CEIPI course in Cologne I attended were not well prepared and unmotivated.

Should provide commented papers for more than just Paper C, the comments should be detailed unlike what is currently available.

should be more exam centric

Regarding D, Euro-CEIPI: D1-questions are overdone, way too complex compared to D1 questions of the EQE. Tutors sometimes have issues to explain solutions beyond was is written in the solution handout,
indicating that they also have not fully understood the complex questions D2 preparation is very good by CEIPI, but way too little time is dedicated to the method (60 points in 1 1/2 days compared to 3 days for 40 points)!

Reading materials are very good for beginners. The online lectures were not adequate for beginners but rather for candidates who already worked through the reading materials. Maybe it would be helpful for beginners if the online lectures could be a “first guide” for beginners. They could then afterwards work by themselves with the reading material and questions.

Rather than referring to the learning material, I would strongly suggest to stop devastating forrests and candidate's backs making it necessary to have tons and tons of PRINTED texts with you at the examination. It’s 2018, the use of electronic devices, clearly OFFLINE, would be advisable.

Quality of the CEIPI course sessions very variable depending on the tutor. CEIPI course should maybe include more training sessions for the examination papers (I attended the CEIPI course for 2 years and had only one trainign session for paper A)

q33 gives no option to choose from... I used the pre-exam e-learning of the EPO to review the syllabus. That worked perfect. I also used the legal questions from Delta patents and the compendia from 2012-2017: all perfect

Q33 did neither name materials nor have radio buttons to click.

Providing materials such as “cheat sheets” to bring into the exam may be more helpful than just a bombardment of questions that usually reach an unnecessary level of detail (i.e. on the D course most of the answers are based on decisions / case law rather than Articles and Rules, this leads to a false impression of the exam).

Please, make this survey shorter

Please provide them all official langages of the EPC.

Please do not use/present the latest exams in such courses.

Please add more coffee-break questions!

Paper C methodology teaching style is outdated. Paper D teaching was dull - teach concepts as well as going through questions

Paper C - Too many annexes for the time given. Too much searching for definition of terms in many different documents. Paper D - Changing from analysis from subject matter to analysis by patent was very confusing.

Paper A course was rather bad, but this is likely due to the lack of suitable past exams, and the inherent lottery in “what were you supposed to do” which cannot be remedied with courses or study

online training course: reading material very useful - understandable

One day course (from 8am to 8.30pm, dispensed at the EPO) with 1/2h break for lunch is definitely not appropriate. Should have been two days.

Note very like the paper D questions, but at least more strictly marked.

no good methodology is proposed for B paper

Nice starting point.

nEED MORE

more training on the claim analysis part (Module 5)

More tests regarding the legal part and the claim analysis part needed. Basic calculation has been applied in the tests, however candidates need to know the marks in the real way of calculation.

More practise for the claim analysis part, in length appropriate to the paper in the exam. The practical cases in the courses are shorter than the real exam!

More practical papers and less theory.

More of a breakdown of the marking schedule in D past exam papers would have been helpful.

more mixed topic Chemistry and Mechanical "mock" papers and examiner reports would be helpful

More general concept on claim analysis

More focus on exam technique and how to structure an answer.

more example of good drafting

More could be done on the claims analysis section

More comprehensive and detailed examiner reports in the compendium. More detailed allocation of marks.

Mock EQE (epi): D exam way outdated. I would appreciate if the dates in the exam would be updated.
Maybe you could at least mix questions from different years and not just take an old exam of some year. C: Some idea of points would have been nice. Without points you don’t necessary know what went well and what didn’t. The feedback session should be before Christmas, now it was too late.

Mock EQE -- was a bit waste of time. I thought it would have been new papers designed especially for the purpose of mock exams.. especially for paper A and B in the new format. But they are just old papers, without even changing the dates (for paper D, so that there are outdated laws). Further I had practiced same papers so the result didn’t reflect the situation of my preparation.

Methodology courses by Delatapatents is the only place where you can hear what is actually expected from you which is not good since EPo should be the main source (via compendium or other ways possibly).

Maybe introduce learning material/courses/exercises/questions regarding parts A,B,C with SIMPLIFIED examples testing a limited number of aspects of the EPC in each question. In other words a very compact and simplified form of parts A,B,C.

Material provided by Deltapatents helps a lot for consulting during the Exam and to know what is expected in the paper.

Make the Pre-EQE Online training a free course available to all.

Knowing the solution of a question is not enough. I want to learn how to get to the solution. After consuming time doing these courses, you still need to prepare for the exam.

JDD Consultants course was exceptionally good. Outstandingly clear, cheap and high quality. Perhaps too short.

It would be very helpful if the online training course would be available in german also. I personally had to switch back and forth since all the supporting material i am using is in german. This added a lot of time and effort in order to translate back an forth.

It would be useful if there was a list of recommended texts for paper D because people take so much stuff and it’s never all going to be relevant.

It would be preferable to have a marked candidates paper available.

It would be helpful if CEIPI provided the opportunity to attend either the A or the B paper training separately (without having to also attend training for the other exam).

It would be great if EPO itself would offer more learning materials - especially for self-study.

It would be good to provide a more precise methodology to handle DII paper

It would be good to have some freely available claim analysis questions too.

It would be desirable to know in paper D how each part is qualified about the number of points.

It was the same questions as last year. Maybe they could be changed to next year?

It is sad that the most important thing to learn is not how to draft a good opposition but how to draft a paper C opposition according to a certain methodology.

It is a very good point to have the compendium and corrections in all 3 languages.

Introductory and Main prep course for C are very similar, would only do the first as it’s earlier. Only do the main for A, B and D.

In the EQE pre-examination 2018 - online training course the pdf-texts to the modules often had mistakes, that was so good, so you prepared it and then someone found a mistake and you had to change it.

In some ways it seems like the people making the exams and Delta Patents are in an arms race - Delta patents constantly trying to find the best way to break the code to pass the exams, and the exam makers to disable this. It would perhaps be better for us who take the exams if this was not so - if Delta Patents focused more on us learning the material and less on the prefect exam-taking skills - but then the exams would need to be written a little less like they are trying to “get” you too. On some of the D1 questions, for instance, too much extra information is wanted in addition to what is actually asked for.

In regard of the EQE pre-examination 2018 online training course, I respectfully consider that there is a high percentage of exercises in relation of the legal questions in comparison with the claim analysis, while in the PRE-EXAM, both parts are equal important. Hence, more claim analysis practice should be prepared by the teachers of the course.

In Mock EQE more recent papers should be used or at least the old papers should be updated so as to correspond to valid EPC.

In course there was easy questions that are not resembling the real D2 questions.

In case of the Compendium (past papers) it would be even better if in the “candidates answers” it would also be explained what mistakes are made by the candidates and how it should be corrected.
I'm following the course for fourth year, I like the reading material but if you look at the forum still there are a lot of mistakes in the reading material and in quizzes. We were trained by people who sill make mistakes in the reading materials, in quizzes, in virtual classrooms, it is not acceptable for the highest place for study - EPO Academy!

I would change the order of some modules of EQE pre-examination 2018 - online training course (EPO).

I was not Always convinced that all the bullets of the answers corresponded to “Point accrediting”. And subsequently it becomes confusing for the Learning process in what is actually required. The uncertainty of what is required in an answer is in my opinion what makes the examination difficult.

I took Paper A course last year but they really weren’t so sure about the new mixed format.

I think the time-limit questions had some mistakes. For instance, a deadline before the EPO ended on Easter Monday, which seems unlikely. Mistakes in this kind of thing are incredibly harmful to candidates using them to prepare.

I took Paper A course last year but they really weren’t so sure about the new mixed format.

I think the forum (Daily D) where students can upload answers is more or less useless. I only want to see the tutors answer.

I think the courses could have been more informative about why marks are being awarded. What do you need to write to get a mark for “use of information”?

I think the correction of papers from Delta Patents was very useful, since in addition to the comments, they also rated the answers in points giving an indication if it was realistic to expect to pass the exam.

I suggest to prepare before to go to the course. Because the course is very intensive and better if you know something about the Paper C theory before that.

I signed up for these but they stopped being sent after number 34 which was a big shame as they were very helpful. I had no way to contact anyone to see what went wrong. I also know this happened to another of my cohort this year.

I really miss the eqe online forum from the EPO.

I practiced almost all questions in the D book (Deltapatents) but I found them rather easy (compared to the "real" D I questions in the exams).

I liked the quizzes a lot, I think they are most useful. I felt that the claim analysis trainings were far removed from the actual exam questions. also there the answers/questions should be prepared more thoroughly to account for y/n answers.

I found the past papers and the delta patents question book the best material by far.

I find the Delta books very good. At present, their only weakness is the fact that no-one has much experience with the new A and B-style papers.

I don’t know if it didn’t work for me but I had to log in to see the daily D question every D, which was much more time consuming than receiving them for e-mail as I did the previous year for the coffee break questions. This meant I was much less likely to do them. It would be great to actually receive the question by email not a link to the website. The time limit questions were excellent and provoked thought.

I didn’t agree with some of the answers but did not have enough time to discuss my view (understand if I was wrong)

I did not find the webinars from the online course useful, but the rest of the course materials were very useful, especially the quizzes and explanations to the answers

I did not enjoy the videos in the EQE pre-examination 2018 - online training course (EPO). They were too slow and not straight to the point. I felt that everything was explained as if there was zero knowledge of the European patent system when participants are expected to have at least 1.5 year of contact with EP system.

I am still looking for a flow chart that incorporates all eventualities that could happen during patent prosecution proceedings.

I am a visual learner, and I would have appreciated the written material of the online training course (EPO) more if there were more tables, diagrams, use of bold typing, underlining, etc. In this sense I found the Hoekstra annotated version of the EPC very helpful. The quizzes at the end of each chapter of the online course were excellent, I always learned something new from them.

I already mentioned in previous question that I appreciated the efforts from tutors of A, B, C papers for delivering individual correction and marks. And I deeply regret that was not the same for D paper.

Great teachers, but the webinars were not very successful. Too much room for people enjoying to answer
every single rhetorical question “asked” by the Examiner. The reading material and the quizzes were very
good and helpful, though.

For paper D, of course the seminar was not preparing participants for the new style of D-II, as the change
came out of the blue as it seems. Interestingly also, is the sharp difference from interpreting claims and
mandatory features between chemists and mechanics. I would urge the persons drafting the papers to
participate (anonymisaly) the courses the learn that it is not possible to make one exam A / B for all without
 treating one part unfair.

For courses: smaller groups

Focus more on how to formulate answers short but still giving points. Following the methodology taught by
DeltaPatents steeatl time.

Financial constraints reduce the available training for industrial candidates.

Excellent, en faisant les exercices, on peut balayer l’ensemble de la CBE avec les calculs de délais les plus
courants. Cela permet de s’entraîner et de se rassurer sur le calcul de délais. En plus, les réponses
ressemble à priori à ce que le comité d’examen attend des candidats. On peut donc s’inspirer des réponses
produites pour se faire une liste de formulations types. Enfin, certaines question sont tirées du
Compendium. On s’entraîne donc directement à l’examen.

every one needs to find his own methodology

Euro-CEIPI offered by EPO on 1 day is too short. For the online questions: software could be improved

EQELIBRIUM is good source of work.

EQE pre-examination 2018 - online training course had many terminology issues and many mistakes. This
material should be review more carefully by the EPO.

EQE pre-examination 2018 - online training course (EPO) is very useful to get to understand the basic
aspects of EPC and PCT; enough to perform well on the legal part of the exam. I did not like the claim
analysis part of the course - these were very different to previous exam papers. In hindsight I should have
spent more time on this section of the course. Time-limit questions (EPO) were very good practise, and
reflected the level of knowledge needed for the pre-exam. Very useful! Basic training in European patent law
(Euro-CEIPI) is useful to gain an understanding o basic aspects of patent law, but the course is too
dependent on the quality of the tutors.

EQE online training course forum was great, the tutors were very responsive and helpful. However, there
were too many errors in the examples and questions which had to be pointed out by the candidates taking
the course, which meant that, rather than helping understanding, it was very confusing to try answering the
questions.

EPO should seriously consider to provide mock trial pre-eqe papers with a level of reliable difficulty to
prepare and face adequately the next year examination.

EPO should also offer the dayly questions and Support discussions in German language. It is difficult to
have the question in english and your law text in an other language

EPO online training course was very clear and well structured. The tutors are very helpful in answering
questions. I would recommend this course for anyone who does not have employer-provided training - it is
great for self-study.

EPO on-line course, EPC, EPO Guidline, WIPO Guidline, C. Mulder “The Cross-referenced Patent
Cooperation Treaty”.

Don’t waste my time with US law - we need more basic EPC stuff and Claim Analysis.

Do distribute more information about these learning materials. I noted that not many of those whom I talked
to were aware that these online courses exist. I participated and it helped me a lot. The commented
answers to paper C made me understand far better how marks are distributed in that paper, the D courses
were highly relevant for the exam.

Discerepency between the knowledge tested during EEO and day to day practice

DII courses were useless for may marks, because they focussed and prepared not for this years exam.

Difficulties to connect to each live session, unable to ‘replay’ the sessions

DeltaPatents’ A and B courses were OK. But since these courses were separate, there was much repetition
of rather simple patent law. DeltaPatents’ C and D courses (in German) are lifesavers due to very good
tutors.

Deltapatents are the best tutor ever!!

Delta overflows you with information. Too much too fast, for some candidates, at least. Where’s the red
herring? If you’ve prepared well before attending Delta’s course, you can “fine-tune” and score the points by showing legal basis (in D). If you’ve not yet had the chance to prepare (enough/well), you wonder what in the heck is expected of you when you start writing.

das schriftliche Unterrichtsmaterial ist in schlechtem Deutsch ausgeführt, zum Teil in so schlechtem Deutsch, dass Sätze keinen Sinn ergeben.

Daily D questions seemed to often use the guidelines as basis, at least moreso than the real exams. The rest of the above training materials were good.

Daily D Questions have been the same for the last two years. I understand it is difficult, but a new batch of questions might be helpful to resitters.

Daily D questions -> the responses given by the tutor should be drafted in an EQE manner, to help candidates understand what is expected at the examination. Paper C (Euro-CEIPI) -> not one methodology should be explained at the seminar. the methodology proposed by CEIPI based on effects did not work this year and takes way too much time (the subject matter of the claims became more complex every year, the method worked much better on earlier papers and on the last 3 years papers). at least ways to solve the papers should be given to candidates at those courses.

Daily D and Coffee break are good but are not a substitute for the real exam, I appreciated the past papers and especially the candidate answers the most. My suggestion would be to make available more material in the style of the main exams. Especially if changes are coming, like this years D2 paper. I know candidates should be prepared for everything, but in fact you only punish (surprise and badly affect) the student of the first year of the change.

Courses for C and D were great. The A-Course did not convince me.

could not rate Q 33. somehow the ticking boxes were missing

Commented answers to part DII for previous years.

Coffee break questions need updating, they are very old and sometimes have old law. I signed up to them in my first year of training and worked through the questions as part of my self study. I signed up again a few months ago, hoping they would be new, or at least with updated legal bases, but they seem to be identical to the emails I received back in 2014. CEIPI A and B were useful for learning where the marks are distributed, strategy, contingency plan, etc. CEIPI C probably would have been good if I had been in another group. My tutor showed up very late, skipped through 60% of the lecture material and didn’t really present in a logical manner, jumping back and forth between different topics. The insight to be gained from a voluntary tutor who passed C around 30 years ago, when the paper was drastically different, is probably limited. CEIPI D did not teach me anything other than how unprepared I was and how it was probably too late. I hear some other groups went over useful topics like Reformatio in peius, etc, but our group did not have so much discussion and working through answers was often too brief. The course should be held much earlier.

Coffee break EQEs haven’t been updated in last two years.

Coffee Brake s good for absolut beginners

CEIPI lectures need to make their lessons more interesting

CEIPI D was really bad, they didn’t even provide us with the answer for the D2 question we did in during the course. Also no introduction on how to do a paper D2, no notes, at all on general parts. Checklist could be provided, a schematic overview of time limit rules, or other common rules.

CEIPI course was great, but I suspect it had to to with the tutor. I learnt how to properly identify closest prior art.

CEIPI course lacks an overall structure/central theme - every tutor is structuring the material in his/her own way, and every module is very different,

CEIPI course is way too relax and gives the impression that paper is very easy... examiner report is very detailed what is good, but also demotivating, because you hardly can deliver half of the arguments and details...

CEIP course has to be more structured e.g. by using „professional“ course materials etc.

C-Book Helze

Candidates should oriented early enough with various materials - everybody has a different “favorite” one.

But even deltapatents cannot expect papers like DII-2018

Bla bla but not real guidance on how to write the answers.

Basic training is not focussed enough to be useful.

An excellent and highly recommended course

All of these courses basically amounted to being left alone to do questions. This is fine, but I was expecting
more guidance.

all know questions doesn’t reflect the reality of the EQE questions

Advertise the start date for the daily D course to candidates

a few sections were very helpful (4.1-4.5, 8.3) but the most part was only general information how the EPO wants the EPC to be understood. so most of the epi course was neither helpful for the pre-exam nor for the daily work.

A bit pointless really. Also, the online video’s seminars were incredibly dull, and put me off watching them in favour of doing my own revision.