Ref. : NP 603/87 III
Tel. : 27372273
Fax : 27301771

Secretary General<br>Legislative Council Secretariat<br>Legislative Council Building<br>8 Jackson Road<br>Central<br>Hong Kong<br>(Attn.: Mr S.C. Tsang)

Dear Mr Tsang,

## LegCo Panel on Commerce and Industry

List of outstanding follow-up actions

Thank you for your letter of 15 August 2002 enclosing a list of outstanding follow-up actions required of the Administration.
2. On Issue 1 of the list relating to the consultancy study on environmental technology in Hong Kong, you will note that we have already submitted to you our return dated 19 August 2002.
3. On Issue 2 of the list relating to the role and mission of the Hong Kong Productivity Council (HKPC), I would like to inform you of the developments since the Panel meeting on 8 July 2002.

## Complaint lodged by the Integrated Solutions Limited (ISL)

4. To recap, the gist of ISL's complaint is that HKPC had breached the payment and auditing terms of a joint development agreement with ISL, and had developed a similar software (titled "EPD") to compete with the software (titled "EPN") which was the subject of the joint development
agreement.
5. During July and August 2002, HKPC held several meetings with ISL to address its complaints. Relating to the financial record keeping of the licensing business transactions, ISL representatives were given an opportunity to review all project records, invoices and transaction reports. The result of the review indicated that HKPC had reported and settled all licensing business transaction fee to ISL. Assisted by their own software expert, ISL representatives also reviewed the programme characteristics and source code of the EPD. After the review, ISL agreed that the EPN and the EPD were different and were developed separately, and there was no source code imitating issue.
6. Both parties have now clarified and satisfactorily resolved the issues of the previous complaint. They have also agreed that a new contract to replace the existing one would be the best for a new start. A new joint development agreement, with better defined role of each party, was eventually signed in August.

## Complaint lodged by Waste and Environmental Technologies Limited (WETL)

7. To recap, the gist of WETL's complaint is that HKPC, being an implementation agent of the Patent Application Grant (PAG) Scheme administered by the Innovation and Technology Commission, had infringed the patent of WETL, which was an applicant of the PAG, and had developed a similar product (titled "AquaSed") for marketing.

## HKPC's explanation

8. The AquaSed, a wastewater treatment system, was developed by HKPC to help the construction industry comply with the Government's discharge requirement. The engineering design of AquaSed was based on previous wastewater treatment systems which HKPC designed for different factories as early as 1991. The Short Term Patent on HKPC's AquaSed is titled "Independent Treatment System for Treating the Waste Water of the Construction Site with the Chemical Coagulation Technology". On the other hand, the Short Term Patent on WETL's System is titled "Wastewater Treatment Chamber". The design of the two systems is fundamentally different. A note explaining the differences in the operating principle of the systems provided by HKPC is at Appendix A.

## Expert opinion

9. In view of the complaint, HKPC has sought third party expert
opinion of a patent attorney on the possibility of patent infringement. The expert opinion has concluded that HKPC's AquaSed does not contain some of the elements/limitations in the claim of WETL and therefore does not infringe on the patent of WETL. A copy of the expert opinion is at Appendix B.

## Meetings with WETL

10. HKPC has, since July, conducted six meetings with WETL to explain the findings and opinion of the patent attorney that the AquaSed does not infringe on the patent of WETL. During these meetings, compensation and settlement issues were raised verbally by WETL. However, based on the legal advice, HKPC has no ground to take such issues further. As at to date, HKPC has not received any formal written claim or notification from WETL or its patent expert to such effect. Nevertheless, HKPC will continue its dialogue with WETL in the hope to iron out differences.

## Conclusion

11. The first complaint has been resolved between the two parties. As regards the second complaint, dialogue between the two parties is ongoing. HKPC is continuing to explain to the complainant that infringement of his patent does not arise, as borne out by third party expert opinion.
12. To address the question of possible conflict of interest between HKPC's role as an implementation agent of PAG, and its involvement in developing and marketing patent products in competition with patent applicants, HKPC has decided that it will focus on technology transfer of its research and development outputs and technical know-how, and refrain from undertaking equipment or system manufacturing for marketing purpose.

Yours sincerely,

> (Mrs Shirley Lau)
> for Commissioner for Innovation and Technology

## c.c. SCIT (Attn. Ms Ellen Choy)

## Technical considerations

The AquaSed, a wastewater treatment system, was developed by HKPC to help the construction industry comply with the Government's discharge requirement. The engineering design of AquaSed was based on previous wastewater treatment systems HKPC designed for different factories as early as 1991. The system consists of a reaction chamber fitted with a motorised mixer which turns the wastewater at an optimum speed to facilitate effective coagulation and flocculation of the chemical with the suspended particles to form larger size flocs. The wastewater is then transferred into the sedimentation chamber where the larger flocs are settled at the bottom of the chamber under the laminar flow condition, and the supernatant is discharged through a $V$-notch weir at the top.

The operating principle of the wastewater treatment system of WETL, on the other hand, is the use of centrifugal force to remove the solids from wastewater. At the heart of its design is a conical shaped vortex reactor which is supposed to create a swirling effect to remove the solids. In HKPC's AquaSed, there is no vortex reactor, and tilted plate sedimentation system is used instead to remove the solids. The design of the two systems is fundamentally different. While the in-line mixer of the two systems may look similar or have similar functions, these mixers are available commercially in different sizes and shapes, and HKPC has used these mixers in many of its past projects. Indeed, the in-line mixer adopted in the AquaSed is based on a standard textbook design and is different from WETL's.
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Dear Mr．Tam，

## Re：Inffingement Opiniou

Pursuant to your instructions yesterday，we are submitting herewith an infringement opinion of the HKPC Aquased system（system diagram as attached herewith）based on Hong Kong Short Term Patent No． 1008464 registered by Leung Wai On of Fo Tan，New Territories and entitled Wasterwater Treament Chamber（旅澢污水庭理㗊）

## A．Claim Interpretation

The claims in a patent define the scope of protection by defining the elements that a patent owner considers his patent invention．An infringing system is one that contains all the elements and limitations recited in a claim．Thus，before we render our opinion，we provide hereinunder an analysis of the elements and limitations in Claim 1 of Hong Kong Short Term Patent 1008464.

Clain 1 is the only independent claim in this patent and the subsequent dependent claims are all narrower than Claim 1．Therefore，if the alleged infringing system does not infringe on Claim 1 the same opinion will be derived for all the other dependent ctaims．


[^0]Under Section 73 and 76 of the Patents Ordinance，the claim of a patent is to be interpreted in a fair manner．In general，a literal interpretation of a claim is first used for infringement analysis． If the device in question does not fall within the literal scope of the claim，then a purposive construction of the claim is further performed to include variants that fall outside the literal interpretation but which may be understood by one skilled in the ant to have no material effect upon the working of the invention．

Claim 1 contains the following elements and limitations；
1．一個上面安有進水管（2），下端陪布下出口（3）的漏斗機投（1）；
2．㠊架（4）；
3．速湝真片（2－2）設在進水管的管壁（2－1）；
4．注药孔甲 $(2-3)$ 設在管壁沿寏水ロ一端的管壁；
5．第（2－4）把管壁（2－1）與挶斗機殸（1）連挍一起；
6．注蒳孔乙（2－5）毅置在管上；
7．中心筞（5）設置於漏斗機毂（1）的中央沿中軸位置；
8．螺旋升水器（6）設置於中心管中；
9．雓形分锥器（7）毅竪在中心管的下端下面；
10．纉頂畄泥板（13）設畳於漏斗棲教（1）的上部；
11．㽯頂熷泥板起上蓝作用，封任末庭理的水；
12．放氯管（12）設置在泥板上；

14．消水箱（14）敦置在蛒頂揩泥板的上面；
15．凸合在漏斗機敬之外伸出；
16．出水箅（ 8 ）設於凸合的下面，用䇄出水．
B. Conclusion

Our opinion is that the HKPC Aquased system as shown in drawing ASII-01 and the supporting frame as shown in drawing 01012987/101 do not contain elementa/limitations 7, 9, 12 and 13 and therefore do not infringe on Claim 1 sven upon a purposive constructive of the claim. Claims 2 to 13 contain additional limitations and therefore do not cover the system described by the above identified drawings.




## END ELEVATION
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