

WIPO



IPC/WG/11/2 Suppl.2
ORIGINAL: English only
DATE: June 14, 2004

E

WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION
GENEVA

SPECIAL UNION FOR THE INTERNATIONAL PATENT CLASSIFICATION
(IPC UNION)

IPC REVISION WORKING GROUP

Eleventh Session
Geneva, June 14 to 24, 2004

REQUESTS FOR REVISION OF THE INTERNATIONAL
PATENT CLASSIFICATION (IPC)

Document prepared by the Secretariat

1. Annexes I to III this document contain comments submitted by Japan, Sweden and the European Patent Office (EPO), respectively, on the revision requests contained in document IPC/WG/11/2 and its Supplement 1.

2. *The Working Group is invited to consider the comments contained in Annexes I to III to this document.*

[Annexes follow]

ANNEX I

Japan Patent Office

June 8 , 2004

 IPC Revision request

We make preliminary comments on IPC revision requests .

▪ B60L7/00 and H02K49/00

Electrodynamic brake (B60L7/) encompasses both reversing-phase braking and reversing-rotation braking while dynamo-electric brakes (H02K49) does not encompass either reversing-phase braking or reversing-rotation braking.

Since the scopes of H02K49/ and B60L7/ are different each other, both wordings should be kept as they are.

▪ E01D

We support GB proposal.

▪ G01G9/00,19/00

1. JP thinks it is reasonable to keep G01G19/52, 19/62, 19/64 under G01G19/00 as they are now.
2. G01G1/ - 7/ are subdivided based on the means of measurement of weight and G01G11/ - 17 are subdivided based on the purposes of measurement of weight. We believe the boundary between G01G9/ and G01G19/ is clear considering the fact that G01G9/ works as a residual group for G01G1/ - 7/ and G01G19/ works as a residual group for G01G11/ - 17/ .
3. JP Modified Proposal
We think that the GB remarks are correct. In light of them, we propose the followings in order to make the boundary clearer.

Existing wording:

G01G9/00 Methods of, or apparatus for, the determination of weight not otherwise provided for

JP proposal:

G01G9/00 Methods of, or apparatus for, the determination of weight not provided for in groups 1/00 to 7/00

Existing wording:

G01G19/00 Weighing apparatus or methods adapted for special purposes not provided for in the preceding groups

JP proposal:

G01G19/00 Weighing apparatus or methods adapted for special purposes not provided for in groups 11/00 to 17/00

▪ B21K21/00

We support GB proposal.

▪ A62D3/00

We support EP proposal.

▪ B31B

a) We adopt all unprinted subgroups in 3/-41/ as FI and classify documents into them. Therefore, we think deletion of Note(3) and incorporation of all unprinted subgroups can solve the problem. The above solution may be better than partial incorporation of unprinted subgroups considering the fact that 3/-41/ should be subdivided based on the same philosophy as 1/ because of the similarity of subject matters.

b) We think X/14 in each main group should be referred in the corresponding XX/25.

▪ C11D17/00

GB proposal is acceptable for us.

▪ A01F

SE proposal is acceptable for us.

▪ D21H

SE proposal is acceptable for us.

[Annex II follows]

ANNEX II

Swedish Patent and Registration Office

Requests for revision of the IPC

June 3rd, 2004

Comments

(in response to document IPC/WG/11/2, Annexes I and III)

B21K 21/00

We support adopting this as a project. We think the reference to “subgroups” is definitely incorrect. It is not clear whether 21/00 is intended to be a combination place or not, but we think combinations are perhaps unlikely in the area. We think this should also be investigated..

E01D 18/00

This should be treated as a minor error, a project is not necessary.

B60L 7/00, H02K 49/00

We would accept adopting this as a project, even though we think there is a clear difference in scope between these two places. H02K is the general place providing for the brakes themselves, while B60L is an application place for brake systems specially adapted to vehicles. However, the situation might not be completely clear to the user, so titles and/or references might be modified.

C11D 17/00

We support adopting this as a project. C11D uses quite a lot of guidance headings and horizontal lines separating parts covered by different guidance headings, or not covered by guidance headings. We think the particular problem is caused by a missing horizontal line above 17/00. Soap is a detergent material, so if there were a horizontal line above 17/00 there would be no problem. The use of guidance headings in the whole subclass should be investigated - perhaps some could be removed and replaced by more exact main group titles.

E01D - dismantling of bridges

We support adopting this as a project, since at the moment it is not clear where dismantling of bridges should be classified. We do not have any stronger feelings, but E01D might be more suitable than E04G, and in that case a separate main group appears better than adding a part to some existing title. In any case the reference situation must be clarified.

G01G 9/00, 19/00

We support adopting this as a project, since the difference in scope between these two groups must be clarified. We think the intention is that 19/00 should only be residual to the application-oriented groups 11/00 - 17/00. 9/00 should either be a residual group for the function-oriented groups 1/00 - 7/00, or a residual group for the entire subclass. In any case 19/00 cannot be residual to 9/00, so something needs to be done.

A62D 3/00

We support adopting this as a project, since the current title is not very satisfactory. However, the existing title says “means” and “processes” - is it really correct to only mention “processes” in the new title? A quick search in EPODOC shows that 2900 of the documents in the ECLA main group A62D3/00 mention “process+” or “method+”, but 600 mention “apparatus” or “means”, and many of these documents do indeed claim apparatus. Apparatus should of course also go to 3/00 if not provided for elsewhere, but wouldn't it be better not to have to rely on classifiers' knowledge of implicit scope - we think the words “Processes for” should be removed from the title. We think the subclass title should be modified in harmony with the main group title, and at the same time it should be modified to cover the matter of main groups 5/00 and 7/00. These groups are clearly not covered by the current subclass title.

Anders Bruun

[Annex III follows]

ANNEX III

Europäisches
PatentamtEuropean
Patent OfficeOffice européen
des brevets

Principal Directorate Tools / Documentation

Comments	Project: revision requests	Subclass:	14 June 2004
-----------------	----------------------------	-----------	--------------

Ref. : IPC/WG/11/2 + suppl.

E01D 18/00 (GB, dated March 12, 2004)

We agree with GB that the spelling of “aquaducts” in the main group title should be changed to “aqueduct”.

C11D (GB, dated March 12, 2004)

We agree with GB to add “or soaps” to the title of group C11D17/00. To EP, the reference to group 13/14, groups 13/20 and 17/06, as well as group 17/08 seem to indicate soaps are included in the scope of group 17/00. For the reason indicated by SE (guidance headings / horizontal line) starting a revision project might be advisable.

E01D (GB, dated March 12, 2004)

We agree with GB that dismantling of bridges should be in this subclass. We think that creating a new main group specifically for this invention information would be a better solution than adding a second part to the title of main group E01D 22/00, because this group is provided for erecting, assembling or repairing of bridges, the complete opposite of dismantling. Even if the number of documents is small, it would be a lost of intellectual effort, if we put this clear defined subject matter in a new created residual group.

A01F (SE, dated March 12, 2004)

We believe that the proposed title could be shortened by combining the “bundling and baling” and leave out the second part starting with “Stationary apparatus or hand tool for bundling of hay, straw or the like”. The new title will be easier to read without a substantial change in scope:

N Threshing; Bundling or baling of hay, straw or the like; Cutting of hay, straw or the like; Devices for storing agricultural or horticultural produce

D21H (SE, dated March 12, 2004 / US comments May 17, 2004)

We agree with SE proposal for the reasons indicated in that proposal.
The notes are correctly represented in the proposal, as they were approved in the corresponding H-project.

H. Mende
P.Daeleman

[End of Annex III and of document]