



2022.07

QUARTERLY

NEWSLETTER

PANAWELL INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY



Cover: Interior of office block where Panawell locates

TABLE OF CONTENTS



Panawell Intellectual Property, consisting of Panawell & Partners, LLC and Panawell & Partners Law Firm, provide full spectrum of services in all fields of intellectual property rights, such as patent, trademark, copyright, computer software, anti-unfair competition, trade secrets, custom protection, domain name, license, assignment, enforcement, administrative and civil litigation, IP consulting and management.

03 INSIGHT

China's Amended Anti-Monopoly Law to Enter into Force on August 1, 2022

Nucleotide or Amino Acid Sequence Listings Should Comply with WIPO ST.26 Requirements from July 1, 2022

Chinese Patent Certificates Not Subject to Stamp Duty from July 1, 2022

The 11th to 15th Annuities of Chinese Design Patents and the Individual Designation Fees of International Design Applications

PPH Statistics of CNIPA

The Key IP5 Offices' Statistical Indicators of Received Patent Filings in 2021

07 SOLUTION

Discussion on Patent Application Drafting

13 CASE

Computer Software Infringement Determination

14 TIPS

Why Should a Foreign Company Register a Chinese Version for Its English/Latin Word Trademark and How?

China's Amended Anti-Monopoly Law to Enter into Force on August 1, 2022

On June 24, 2022, at the 35th meeting of the Standing Committee of the 13th National Congress, the Decision on Amending the Anti-Monopoly Law of People's Republic of China was approved, by vote, and the Anti-Monopoly Law, amended for the first time since its entry into force in 2008, will come into force on August 1, 2022, with an aim at maintaining fair competition, and improving a unified, open, competitive and orderly market system. The Amendment Decision, containing 25 Articles, purports to further improve the relevant rules and regulations of the anti-monopoly regime.

In terms of monopoly agreements, first, the rules for determining vertical monopoly agreements have been improved, and any vertical monopoly agreement reached between a business operator and its counterpart, if the former can prove that the agreement does not have the effect of eliminating or restricting competition, is not prohibited. Second, the safe harbor rules for monopoly agreements have been added. For a vertical monopoly agreement reached between a business operator and its counterpart, if the former's market share is lower than the prescribed standard and meets the other relevant conditions, the agreement will not be prohibited. The third is the addition of the provisions that a business operator shall not organize any other business operator to reach a monopoly agreement, or provide substantial assistance for the latter to reach a monopoly

agreement.

Regarding concentrations of business operators, first, the procedures have been improved for investigating and handling any concentration of business operators that does not comply with the declaration standards. For any concentration of business operators that does not comply with the declaration standards, but there is evidence proving that it has or could have the effect of eliminating or restricting competition, the monopoly law enforcement agency of the State Council may require the business operators to declare; if business operators fail to do so, the agency shall investigate under the law. Second, as the review of any concentration of business operators so requires, the system for "clock suspending" of review period has been introduced. The third is the added stipulation that the anti-monopoly law enforcement agency of the State Council shall improve the system for categorized and hierarchical review of concentrations of business operators, enhance inspection, under the law, of concentrations of business operators in such important fields as those concerning the national economy and people's livelihood, and improve the quality and efficiency of the reviews.

(Source: official website of the Xinhua News Agency)

Nucleotide or Amino Acid Sequence Listings Should Comply with WIPO ST.26 Requirements from July 1, 2022

To harmonize with the relevant WIPO resolutions,

from July 1, 2022, if a national patent application or PCT international application filed with the China National Intellectual Property Administration (CNIPA) contains a sequence listing in the patent application documents, the e-documents of the sequence listing in the XML format shall comply with the requirements of WIPO ST.26 standards.

When a national patent application is filed in the electronic form, a sequence listing document in PDF format should be submitted at the same time to facilitate calculation of the additional fees for excessive description.

For details of the WIPO ST.26 standards, see www.wipo.int/standards/en/sequence/faq.html.

(Source: official website of CNIPA)

Chinese Patent Certificates Not Subject to Stamp Duty from July 1, 2022

Pursuant to the Stamp Tax Law of the People's Republic of China that took effect on July 1, 2022, the "right, license certificates" are not subject to the stamp duty. Starting from July 1, 2022 (included), the CNIPA will no longer collect stamp duties in connection with the patent certificates and integrated circuit layout-design registration certificates. Where the grant fee is due on or after June 15, 2022, the patent certificate will be issued at a date later than July 1, 2022, and accordingly the patentee will not need to pay the stamp duty.

(Source: official website of CNIPA)

The 11th to 15th Annuities of Chinese Design Patents and the Individual Designation Fees of International Design Applications

China National Development and Reform Commission issued the Notice No. (2022)465 on March 25, 2022, to prescribe the official charge standard for the 11th to 15th annuities of Chinese design patents, and the individual designation fees of international design applications under the Hague system as follows:

- The 11th to 15th annuities of design patents will be CNY 3000 per year.
- For the international design applications designating China, the individual designation fee will be CNY 4100 for the first five years, CNY 7600 for the second five years (i.e. 6th to 10th years), and CNY 15000 for the last five years (i.e. 11th to 15th years).

This official charge standard will come into effect from May 5, 2022.

It is observed that the individual designation fee CNY 4100 for the first five years (which is the individual designation fee to be paid at the filing of international design application), equals the official filing fee CNY 500 plus the 1st to 5th annuities CNY 3600 for a regular national Chinese design patent. And the individual designation fees for the second and third term (which are the individual designation fees for the first and second renewal of an international design patent) respectively equal

the 6th to 10th annuities and 11th to 15th annuities of a regular national Chinese design patent.

(Source: official website of NDRC)

PPH Statistics of CNIPA

As of December 2021, the CNIPA had launched the Patent Prosecution Highway (PPH) pilot project with 29 national or regional intellectual property offices. These 29 countries and regions are the United States, Germany, Russia, Denmark, Mexico, Austria, Republic of Korea, Poland, Canada, Singapore, Portugal, Spain, United Kingdom, Sweden, Israel, Hungary, Egypt, Chile, Czech Republic, Eurasian Patent Office, Malaysia, Iceland, Argentina, Japan, the IP5 Offices (including the CNIPA, EPO, JPO, KIPO and USPTO), Norway, Saudi Arabia, Finland and Brazil.

According to the PPH statistics provided by the CNIPA, from 2011 until the end of December 2021, the CNIPA had received 48,884 PPH requests, of which applicants used the JPO's work results in 19,602 cases, the USPTO's work results in 17,677 cases, the EPO's work results in 6,852 cases, the KIPO's work results in 2,945 cases, the DPMA's work results in 469 cases, and the UKIPO's work results in 290 cases.

It took an average of 1.6 months from filing a PPH request with the CNIPA to issuing the first office action, and 10.7 months to granting a patent or to closing a case in rejection, with one OA issued on the average.

According to the PPH statistics provided by the various national patent offices, PPH requests for use of the work results of the CNIPA were filed in 12,306 cases, of which 7,553 PPH requests were filed with the USPTO (USA), 1,116 with the EPO (Europe), 1,098 with the JPO (Japan), 944 with the KIPO (Korea), 357 with the CIPO (Canada), 312 with the ROSPATENT (Russia), and 213 with the INPI (Brazil).

(Source: official websites of CNIPA and JPO)

The Key IP5 Offices' Statistical Indicators of Received Patent Filings in 2021

According to the 2021 statistics of the Key IP5 Offices, namely, the China Intellectual Property Administration (CNIPA), European Patent Office (EPO), Japan Patent Office (JPO), Korea Intellectual Property Office (KIPO), and United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO), patent filings in the world's major patent offices have resumed growth under the continued impact of the COVID-19 pandemic in 2021. It is noteworthy that the number of patent filings at the EPO rising by 4.6%, which reaching its highest level so far; Among that number, patent filings from China rising by 24.1%, which also set a new record for the Chinese applicants at the EPO. In the year of 2021, the number of patent filings in China reached 1,585,663, rising by 5.9% compared with 2020.

Moreover, the details of Key IP5 patent filings in 2021 and comparative statistical indicators with

2020 are shown in the following table:

Applicant Origin Receiving Office	EPC States	Japan	Korea	China	US	Other	Total
CNIPA	42,548 5.00%	47,010 -1.80%	17,691 5.80%	1,427,845 6.20%	42,266 11.60%	8,303 -11.20%	1,585,663 5.90%
EPO	83,775 2.90%	21,681 -0.70%	9,394 3.20%	16,665 24.10%	46,533 5.10%	10,552 4.10%	188,600 4.60%
JPO	20,895 9.00%	222,452 -2.20%	5,936 0.90%	9,369 11.50%	24,999 11.30%	5,549 6.50%	289,200 0.30%
KIPO	12,448 8.70%	14,165 1.10%	186,254 3.20%	6,294 47.50%	15,512 16.20%	3,325 4.10%	237,998 5.00%
USPTO	88,886 -4.60%	76,275 -3.70%	37,197 -2.00%	44,907 8.20%	283,331 1.50%	60,879 -7.90%	591,475 -1.00%

(Source: www.fiveipoffices.org)

Discussion on Patent Application Drafting

Ms. Zhaohong LIU, Patent Attorney, Panawell & Partners

A patent application is a set of documents filed by a patent applicant in relation to an invention-creation with the China National Intellectual Property Administration (CNIPA) in accordance with the law to be examined in the patent examination and grant process. The quality of a drafted application will affect the stability of the patent right, and impact the scope of patent protection. Therefore, the quality of patent application documents is crucial to the acquisition or grant and protection of the patent rights.

Generally speaking, drafting patent application documents mainly includes the following steps: understanding inventions-creations, working out technical solutions, developing claims, writing descriptions, and improving the overall structure of the application documents. In this article, several important aspects of a well-drafted patent application will be explored.

I. Importance of Search

In the domestic patent agency industry now, attention is often paid to communication with inventors on technical matters, and not to the work of search. This author believes that the search work plays a pivotal role in the entire patent drafting process. As the patent application documentation contains a wealth of technical information, preliminary search work based on the

accessible database before drafting will help reasonably draw on the wisdom of the predecessors and effectively improve the quality of the drafted application documents. In particular, search has the following important functions:

- (1) Conducting due diligence in search of obvious novelty to prevent unnecessary losses to the applicant.
- (2) Drawing a reasonable dividing line relative to the prior art to prevent "superfluously designated scope".
- (3) Learning the "legal terminology and syntax" of the claims, taking the essence, and improving the drafting skills.
- (4) Enriching the information of the application documents, using standard technical terms, duly working out the attached drawings, and improving the quality of the application documents.

II. Independent Claim Shall Present and Present Only Essential Technical Features Meant to Solve Target Technical Problem

When drafting an independent claim, it is necessary to clearly outline the complete technical solution under the basic concept of the invention in as concise and rigorous language as possible. The independent claim shall present the essential technical features meant to solve the target technical problem, but shall avoid introducing unnecessary technical features used for the purpose. Lack of essential technical features will

render the application documents contrary to the provisions of Rule 20, paragraph two, of the Implementing Regulations of the Patent Law, and presence of non-essential technical features will reduce the scope of protection claimed. Therefore, after the independent claim is drafted, it is necessary to determine whether each feature is an essential technical feature meant to solve the technical problem one by one. If so, keep it; if not, delete it. Then, final determination is made on whether the combination of all the reserved features as a whole really solve the technical problem the present invention is intended to. Following is a specific case study illustrating how to ensure that the independent claim only presents the essential technical features meant to solve the technical problem.

Case

An electronic device, the preliminarily drafted independent claim 1 is:

An electronic device comprising a display screen, a power supply unit and a microprocessor, wherein the microprocessor is used to process audio and video information to be played, characterized in that the electronic device further includes a switch unit, said switch unit is connected between the display screen and the power supply unit, the microprocessor is used to disconnect the switch unit when detecting that the information to be played is audio information, so as to disconnect the power supply of the display screen; the microprocessor also includes an

adjustment unit that automatically adjusts the volume of audio playback according to pre-stored user habit information.

The description states that in the electronic device of the prior art, such as a mobile phone, the power of the display and the speaker is relatively large when both are working, thus causing the problem of relatively short life of the battery. The present application is meant to solve this problem by saving the power consumed by the display screen to prolong the battery usage time, so as to deliver an electronic device with a long battery usage time.

Analysis

As is made known from the content described in the specific embodiment of the description, saving power consumed by the display screen is realized by selectively turning off the power supply of the display screen by judging the type of information to be played by the microprocessor.

Let's specifically analyze the features of the preceding claim:

Feature 1: *An electronic device, comprising a display screen, a power supply unit and a microprocessor, wherein the microprocessor is used for processing audio and video information to be played.* Feature 1 is the feature of the preamble, which defines the main components of the electronic device and also defines the function of the microprocessor. This application achieves the purpose by saving the power consumption of the display screen. The power supply unit is used to

supply power to the display screen. The function of the microprocessor "processing audio and video information to be played" is related to the timing of disconnecting the power supply of the display screen later. Therefore, Feature 1 is an essential technical feature closely related to the technical solution of the present invention, and is thus reserved.

Feature 2: The electronic device further includes a switch unit, said switch unit is connected between the display screen and the power supply unit, and the microprocessor is configured to disconnect the switch unit to disconnect the power supply of the display screen. Among them, the switch unit and the position of the switch unit are related to the power supply of the display screen, and disconnecting the power supply of the display screen when the video information does not need to be played can definitely save the power consumption of the display screen. Therefore, Feature 2 is also an essential technical feature, and is reserved too.

Feature 3: The microprocessor further includes an adjustment unit that automatically adjusts the volume of audio playback according to pre-stored user habit information. Although automatically adjusting the volume of playing music according to the user's habit information can provide better sound effects and meet the needs of users, it is not an essential technical feature for saving power consumption. It is a non-essential technical feature and should not be put in the independent claim, so

Feature 3 should be deleted in the original independent claim.

Accordingly, the amended or shortened independent claim goes as follows:

An electronic device, comprising a display screen, a power supply unit and a microprocessor, wherein the microprocessor is used to process audio and video information to be played, characterized in that the electronic device further includes a switch unit, which is connected between the display screen and the power supply unit, and the microprocessor is configured to disconnect the switch unit when detecting that the information to be played is audio information, so as to disconnect the power supply of the display screen.

Finally, to look at the independent claim as whole, the power supply of the display screen is controlled by a switch unit connected to the display screen and the power supply unit, and the display screen can be disconnected by disconnecting the switch unit when the microprocessor detects that the information to be played is audio information, so that the power supply can save the power consumption of the display screen, and prolong the service life of the battery. It can be seen that the above revised independent claim describes the essential technical features meant to solve the technical problem.

III. Essentials of Drafting Dependent Claims

One of the important tasks of the dependent claims is to use a reasonable median concept to relate the

broad generic concepts covered in the independent claims to specific embodiments. To reasonably arrange the protection scope defined by the dependent claims, two aspects need to be considered: one is the generalization of the technical features, which is carried out step by step from the upper level to the concrete; and two is the citation relationship of the dependent claims going gradually from the upper to the lower levels.

Specifically, taking into account the substantive examination procedure for patent applications and the possible follow-up procedure for patent invalidation, for larger room for amendment, the scope of protection underlined in dependent claims at all levels should be narrowed down step by step, with the technical features unfolding gradually and sequentially from the upper to the lower and from the general to the special. At the same time, the claims are set at multiple levels, with the lower-level claims referring to the upper-level ones and the same-level claims also possibly setting up multiple parallel ones. Finally, it is only in the lowest-level dependent claim that specific additional technical features are related.

IV. Sufficient Disclosure of Description

Article 26, paragraph three, of the Patent Law stipulates that the description shall describe the invention or utility model in such clear and complete terms as to enable those skilled in the art to carry it out. This is often referred to as "sufficient disclosure of the description".

"Insufficient disclosure of the description" is an issue requiring our special attention in the drafting process. For example, under all these circumstances where the technical content of the invention is ambiguously described in the description, the technical means for solving the technical problem and achieving the technical effect is not provided, the technical means given in the description is unclear or cannot solve the technical problem, the way of citation causes insufficient disclosure, and the drawings showing the key technical content of the invention are unclear and incomplete in the description, the defect of "insufficient disclosure of the description" will arise.

As we all know, in the patent practice in China, the examiners are very strict with "amendments exceeding scope". Once an application is pointed out as flawed with "insufficient disclosure of the description", it is often the case that amendment made to rectify the flaw will lead to "amendments exceeding the scope", and is not allowed. For this reason, "insufficient disclosure of the description" should be avoided as much as possible in the drafting process, as illustrated in the following example of "insufficient disclosure of the description".

Case 1

The invention claimed is a cigarette lighter using alternating current. Rather than converting alternating current into direct current, it directly drives the cigarette lighter with the alternating

current. The manual only says that the cigarette lighter can use alternating current, but does not mention the specific structure of the cigarette lighter.

Analysis

The cigarette lighters in the prior art are all driven by a DC power supply. As for the improvement made with the present invention, it is pointed out that the present cigarette lighter can be driven by AC power to light cigarettes. Since the description only gives a concept of the cigarette lighter using alternating current to drive ignition, and does not show its specific structure as the improvement of the cigarette lighter, it is impossible for those skilled in the art to know how the cigarette lighter of the present invention drives the cigarette lighter with alternating current from the content presented in the description. For this matter, the description of this application fails to clearly and completely describe the present invention; hence, those skilled in the art cannot carry out the invention according to the description.

Case 2

The invention claimed is a mechanical forging equipment, in which a component made of special steel is assembled in order to solve the technical problem raised in the description. Although a detailed description of the structure of the mechanical equipment is given in this description, the composition of the special steel which is critical to the realization of the present invention is

not disclosed.

Analysis

In this case, the applicant did not disclose the key technical feature of the present invention "the composition of special steel" for the purpose of protecting his "technical secrets", so only vague technical means were given in the description, which makes it impossible for those skilled in the art to carry out the technical solution of the present invention according to the contents described in the description; hence the disclosure of the description is insufficient.

In addition, the author believes that the background technology is also an important factor in determining whether the invention is sufficiently disclosed in some cases. An invention is always made on the basis of certain prior arts, and it is usually impossible for the applicant to describe all the prior arts involved in the description in much detail. Therefore, when the applicant's understanding of the relevant prior art is much better than those ordinarily skilled in the art, the description and citation of the relevant prior art may be omitted, which would result in "insufficient disclosure". The applicant may avoid this problem by making full use of the background technology, for example, adding the background documents that are closely related to the technical solution of the invention and that would affect the disclosure of the content of the invention to the part on background technology.

To conclude, the author has discussed how to draft patent application documents from four aspects: the importance of search, the independent claims required to present, and present only, the essential technical features meant to solve target technical problems, the essentials of drafting dependent claims, and the sufficient disclosure of the description, hopefully, for the benefit of our readers.

Author:

Ms. Zhaohong LIU

Ms. Liu received her degree of Bachelor of Science degree from Qufu Normal University in 2002, and her doctor's degree from Nankai University in 2007. Ms. Liu joined Panawell in January 2014. She specializes in patent search, drafting, prosecution, reexamination, invalidation, litigation and counseling in the field of optics, physics electronics, communication, and etc.

References:

- Guidelines for Patent Examination (2010)
- Chao LI (Ed.), Patent Attorneys' Practice: Electronics Volume
- The All-China Patent Attorneys Association (Ed.), Proceedings of the 2013 Symposium on Patent Examination and Patent Attorney's Practice: High Quality Patent Application Documents

Computer Software Infringement Determination

An Issue of Source Codes Comparison in Computer Software Infringement Case No. Jing 73/2018 in Minchu 661 (effective from Sept. 23, 2021, after second instance)

Case in Brief

Sinogrid, the copyright owner of the software WiseGrid Huimin Application Delivery Gateway System V4.1, alleged that Zhiheng, a network security company, obtained, without permission, its copyrighted software from Fan, a former employee of Sinogrid, and used said software in the Zhiheng Galaxy ADC Application Delivery Control System V5.0 Zhiheng had made and marketed. Sinogrid also claimed that, as the notarial certificate showed, the computer software embedded in the Zhiheng Galaxy ADC Application Delivery Control System V5.0 product made and marketed by Zhiheng was substantially similar to its copyrighted software of Huimin Application Gateway System V4.1, and it was likely for Zhiheng to have got the access to Sinogrid's said software from its former employee. The source code submitted by Zhiheng in this case was 50% similar to the alleged infringing software operating in the allegedly infringing product, and the technical investigator did not compare the source codes submitted by both parties for similarity.

It was ruled in the first instance that Zhiheng shall cease and desist from infringement, apologize to Sinogrid, and pay Sinogrid a total of RMB 500,000 yuan in compensation of damages and reasonable

expenses. The court of second instance ruled to have dismissed the appeal and upheld the ruling of first instance. The rulings were rendered under Articles 48.1 and 49 of the Copyright Law, and Rule 8.1 (2) ~ (5), Rule 9, Rule 23 (2), (4) and (5), and Rule 24.1 (1) and (2) of the Computer Software Protection Regulations.

Essence of the Ruling

In a computer software copyright infringement dispute, making a comparison between source codes is not mandatory in establishing whether the allegedly infringing software infringes the copyrighted software. The ruling on computer software copyright infringement should still be made following the infringement establishment standards of access plus substantial similarity. If the right holder has provided evidence proving that the allegedly infringing software has the same self-named information, design defects, redundant design and other unique information as those of the copyright software, the right holder could be deemed to have met his initial burden of proof, and the burden of proof is then shifted onto the accused infringer, who should provide evidence to the contrary to prove that the infringement is not committed. Where the evidence from the right holder preliminarily proves that the infringement is constituted, if the accused infringer fails to submit evidence to the contrary or the contrary evidence submitted is not sufficient to overturn the infringement determination, he shall be held liable for the infringement accordingly.

(Source: official website of Beijing Intellectual Property Court)

Why Should a Foreign Company Register a Chinese Version for Its English/Latin Word Trademark and How?

If a foreign company is planning to do business in China, particularly like supplying products or services in the Chinese market, trademark filing and registration at the CNIPA for the corresponding Chinese version of its English/Latin words is necessary and recommended.

Up to now most foreign companies are quite aware of the importance of registering in advance their English/Latin word mark in China to prevent squatting, however many of them overlook their brands in Chinese characters. Here are the reasons for registering in Chinese characters for their trademarks:

1. Trademarks in Chinese characters are certainly easier for Chinese consumers to identify and remember, and thus help spread the marks to the Chinese consumers.
2. Filing and registration in advance for the corresponding Chinese version of its English/Latin words will prevent those "smart heads" and "quick hands" to squat or imitate to profit from misleading or confusion.
3. Trademarks in Chinese characters can avoid bad nicknames.

In practice, if an English/Latin brand difficult for the Chinese people to read is widely welcomed by the

consumers in the Chinese market, the public may give some "nicknames" according to their pronunciation or composition in order to remember the brand. However, such "nickname" may have some negative meanings or some elements of ridicule and joking, which will lead to the damage of the brand.

Some previous cases show that Chinese consumers' nicknames may be more even popular than the original English/Latin brands. Therefore, some squatters will see the opportunity to preemptively register trademarks in Chinese characters, which may bring unnecessary trouble to the use and promotion of original English/Latin brands in the Chinese market, such as causing confusion among consumers about the source of the goods, or increasing the risk of using their Chinese nicknames to produce counterfeits. In the follow-up proceedings, the real brand owners have to put in a lot of money and time to protect or defend their rights, examples of such include "Google" v.s. "谷歌", "Mamma Mia!" v.s. "妈妈咪呀", and "Jordan" v.s. "乔丹", to name just a few.

Coming next, is how shall an English/Latin trademark be translated into Chinese. Normally the foreign applicant has three options: translation, transliteration or a combination of both translation and transliteration. The ideal method is to make the translation/transliteration positive and attractive while maintaining a strong connection to the original English/Latin, as the following examples show:

Transliteration: 拉菲(LAFITE), 迪士尼(Disney), 西门子(Siemens), 福特(Ford), 亚马逊(Amazon), 奥迪(Audi),

耐克(NIKE), 阿迪达斯(Adidas), 谷歌 (Google).

Translation: 步行者(WALKMAN), 空客(Airbus), 脸书(Facebook), 壳牌(Shell), 通用(General Electric), 大众(Volkswagen), 微软(Microsoft), 软银(Softbank).

Combination of Transliteration and Translation: 可口可乐(Coca Cola), 宜家(IKEA), 宝马(BMW), 奔驰(Mercedes-Benz), 保时捷(Porsche), 露华浓(REVLON), 爱马仕(Hermès), 家乐福(Carrefour), 领英(LinkedIn), 联合利华(Unilever), 达美航空(Delta), 百安居(B&Q), 赛百味(Subway).

Before last, the same filing and registration is also recommended in Hong Kong and Macao in addition to the Chinese mainland, and Taiwan as well, as Chinese are much more commonly used by the people there even if English or Portuguese are also the official languages in Hong Kong and Macao on the one hand, and the exchanges of people and business are much more frequent on the other.

PANAWELL & PARTNERS LLC

Addr: 1002-1005, 10th Floor, China Life Tower
16 Chao Yang Men Wai Street, Chaoyang District

Beijing 100020, China

Tel: (86 10)85253778

Fax: (86 10)85253671

Code: 100020

E-mail: mail@panawell.com

Website: www.panawell.com



Editor: Jane Wang
Lan Wang
Shute XU
Translator: Jane Wang
Yujing Zhang
Yazhi Zhao
Dan Jin
Layout: Shunshun Dong