



**COUNCIL OF  
THE EUROPEAN UNION**

**Brussels, 17 December 2004**

**16120/04**

---

**Interinstitutional File:  
2002/0047 (COD)**

---

**ADD 1**

**PI 77  
CODEC 1346**

**ADDENDUM TO "A" ITEM NOTE**

---

from: Council Secretariat  
to: Council

---

No. prev. doc.: 14574/04 PI 61 CODEC 962 + ADD 1 + ADD1 COR 1(en)  
No. Cion prop.: 6580/02 PI 10 CODEC 242

---

Subject: Proposal for a Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on the patentability of computer-implemented inventions  
- Common position  
- Statement of the Council's reasons

---

The Council will find in Annex the statements for entry in the minutes of the Council meeting at which the above-mentioned common position will be adopted.

Statements for entry in the Council Minutes

**1. Statement by the Commission**

The Commission considers that Article 6, read in conjunction with Recital 22, permits any acts as described by Articles 5 and 6 of Directive 91/250/EEC on the legal protection of computer programs by copyright, including any acts necessary to ensure interoperability, without the need for authorisation from the patent's right holder.

**2. Statement by Hungary**

(Translation in English provided by the Hungarian delegation)

Concerning the proposal for a Directive on the patentability of computer-implemented inventions, the Hungarian government agrees to the goals laid down therein, in particular to the following:

- strengthening legal certainty and hereby ensuring predictability necessary for taking economic decisions;
- securing the smooth functioning of the internal market by eliminating the differences in the case law of the Member States;
- strengthening the competitiveness of the European information technology industry on the global market;
- stimulating innovation and creative activities in this important field of technology.

Hungary supports the adoption of Community legislation on the patentability of computer-implemented inventions in order to establish clear conditions for patentability and to harmonise the different practices of Member States.

At the Competitiveness Council's meeting of May 17-18 2004, where amendments to the proposed Directive were adopted, Hungary underlined, in addition to the above-mentioned goals, that the Directive also has to take account of the interests of small and medium-sized enterprises. As the amendments adopted at that meeting followed this goal, Hungary supported the proposal with its vote in the debate.

However, Hungary pays particular attention to the interests of the market players, with special regard to small and medium-sized enterprises, to ensure that their interest should properly be reflected in the forthcoming stages of the co-decision procedure and in the course of the implementation of the Directive.

### 3. **Statement by the Netherlands**

The Kingdom of the Netherlands states that it considers the harmonisation directive on the patentability of computer-implemented inventions to be of high importance. On 18 May, the Netherlands, part of a qualified majority of member states, politically agreed with the text of a common position in first reading. The Dutch Parliament stated as its position that the political agreement offers insufficient guarantees to prevent proliferation regarding software patenting. This concern will be taken into account by the Netherlands in the further consideration of the directive in second reading.

The directive aims to harmonise the rules within the European Union on the patenting of computer-implemented inventions and to offer clarity on which inventions are patentable and which are not.

In this light, the Netherlands wishes to confirm explicitly that the directive should guarantee that non-technical, non-inventive inventions, business methods and pure software are excluded from patentability. This is because patenting of this nature will not make a positive contribution to the ability to innovate.

Recently, a lot of public and political debate has arisen on the proposed directive and the patenting of computer-implemented inventions in general. On further consideration of this directive in second reading, the Netherlands will confirm as it premises that the rules on and the implementation practice of the patentability for computer-implemented inventions are sufficiently clear and that the aforementioned undesirable forms of patenting are prevented.

Therefore, the Netherlands will in second reading be unable to support a directive text that disturbs the balance between patentability and non-patentability.

#### 4. **Statement by Latvia**

At the Competitiveness Council of May 17-18, 2004 Latvia supported the directive on the patentability of computer-implemented inventions as Latvia considers the directive to be of high importance and agrees to the aims proposed in the directive.

Latvia supports that legislation on the patenting of computer-implemented inventions should be harmonized at the level of the European Union and that there should be clarity which computer-implemented inventions are patentable and which are not.

In this light, Latvia wishes to confirm explicitly that the directive text now under consideration aims to exclude non-technical, non-inventions, business methods and pure software from patentability. This is because patenting of this nature will not make a positive contribution to the ability to innovate. The directive should ensure compliance with all international treaties.

Further discussions on the directive in Latvia has shown that the directive could greatly impact the small and medium-sized enterprises working in the field of information technology industry as well as the development of the entire domestic industry. The industrial circles have expressed their concerns that the present text still contains some uncertainties.

Taking into account the above-mentioned reasons, Latvia, in the future, will be able to agree with the directive on the patentability of computer-implemented inventions, if it maintains the balance between patentability and non-patentability of computer-implemented inventions.

---