

ANNEX V

SUMMARY OF TASK FORCE DISCUSSIONS ON  
“UPDATING OF IPC TRAINING EXAMPLES”  
(NOVEMBER 22, 23 AND 25, 2005)

General Discussions

1. The Task Force on Training Examples had before it, in particular, the compilations of the relevant TE project files.
2. The Task Force discussed 24 existing IPC Training Example (TE) projects. The decisions of the Task Force with respect to those TE projects, including the new deadlines for the next round of actions are summarized in Annex VI. Further information with respect to some of those decisions is given in paragraph 3, below.
3. The Task Force made the following observations, in addition to the decisions set forth in Annex IV, with respect to the IPC/TE projects. Approved examples during this meeting would be distributed among members of the Editorial Board for editorial checking. All references to annexes in this paragraph refer to annexes of the corresponding project file, unless otherwise stated.

IPC Training Example Projects

Project TE 119 (chemical) – The Task Force approved the last Rapporteur proposal contained in Annex 8.

Project TE 122 (chemical) – The Task Force conditionally approved the Rapporteur proposal contained in Annex 14. The Rapporteur was invited to submit a new proposal taking into account all the comments made during the discussions, e.g. that the reference in C01F and C01G referring “compound containing silicon C01B 33/00” should be mentioned in the “Analysis” section, to include an explanation of the order of symbols in both the core and the advanced levels, and to add in the first table “ALUMINIUM” in the query and “C01F” in the IPC place and to redraft the “Analysis” section accordingly.

Project TE 123 (chemical) – The Task Force conditionally approved the Rapporteur proposal contained in Annex 14. The Rapporteur was invited to submit a new proposal taking into account the comments made on the order of the symbols and some editorial issues, and investigating whether classification should be made in B32B 29/06, instead of B32B 29/00, in the advanced level.

Project TE 124 (chemical) – The Task Force approved the Rapporteur proposal contained in Annex 10, with some amendments, to appear as Annex 11.

Project TE 131 (chemical) – Discussions were based on the last Rapporteur proposal contained in Annex 10. Comments were invited on whether the current invention information I4 really represents invention information or additional information. The Rapporteur was invited to submit a new proposal taking into account comments to be submitted.

Project TE 204 (mechanical) – The Task Force approved the Rapporteur proposal contained in Annex 21.

Project TE 209 (mechanical) – The Task Force agreed to withdraw this training example, because no agreement could be reached among Task Force members on the final classification.

Project TE 216 (mechanical) – Discussions were based on the last Rapporteur proposal contained in Annex 9. It was agreed that the current classification appearing on the said proposal was acceptable. The Rapporteur was invited to submit a new proposal, explaining that C22B 1/20 is not appropriate because of the reference in main group, which refers “sintering apparatus” to F27, adding F26B 15/16 as a classification symbol for additional information with explanation, and investigating whether classification in F27B 9/00 for invention information is appropriate.

Project TE 217 (mechanical) – The Task Force approved the Rapporteur proposal contained in Annex 12, with amendments, to appear as Annex 13.

Project TE 218 (mechanical) – Discussions were based on the last Rapporteur proposal contained in Annex 3. The Task Force agreed on classifying in all three groups B60Q 1/26, B60Q 1/34 and B60Q 1/44 as invention information. The Rapporteur was invited to submit a new proposal taking into account the comments submitted.

Project TE 219 (mechanical) – Discussions were based on the last Rapporteur proposal contained in Annex 14. Comments were invited on whether invention information I1 and I2 are two aspects of the same inventive thing in which case I1 should be classified as invention information and I2 as additional information, in view of the reference in group E02B 17/00, or whether I1 and I2 are two different inventive things and, therefore, should be both classified as invention information. The Rapporteur was invited to submit a new proposal taking into account the comments to be submitted.

Project TE 221 (mechanical) – The Task Force conditionally approved the Rapporteur proposal contained in Annex 7. The Rapporteur was invited to submit a new proposal precisely indicating the IPCCAT query in the first table, including the second table which was missing from the said proposal and providing explanation on the order of the symbols.

Project TE 222 (mechanical) – Comments were invited on the last Rapporteur proposal contained in Annex 7. The Rapporteur was invited to submit a new proposal taking into account the comments to be submitted and providing the second table that is currently missing in the said Annex.

Project TE 224 (mechanical) – The Task Force approved the Rapporteur proposal contained in Annex 18.

Project TE 225 (mechanical) – Discussions were based on the last Rapporteur proposal contained in Annex 8. It was noted that invention information I3 should be removed, whereas I4 should be retained. The Rapporteur was invited to submit a proposal taking into account the above remarks.

Project TE 227 (mechanical) – The Task Force approved the Rapporteur proposal contained in Annex 9.

Project TE 229 (mechanical) – The Task Force approved the Rapporteur proposal contained in Annex 9, with the addition of the following paragraphs at the end of “Analysis and Selection of Classification Symbols” section, to appear as Annex 12:

CL: The group titles in F16F do not accurately reflect the nature of the claimed device. Therefore, its use of balancing of a gate or door is considered to represent the invention most adequately. Thus, E05F 1/00 is listed first.

AL: The group titles in F16F do not accurately reflect the nature of the claimed device. Therefore, its use of balancing of a gate or door is considered to represent the invention most adequately. Thus, E05F 1/08 is listed first.

Project TE 230 (mechanical) – The Task Force approved the Rapporteur proposal contained in Annex 9.

Project TE 231 (mechanical) – The Task Force approved the Rapporteur proposal contained in Annex 13.

Project TE 316 (electrical) – The Task Force approved the Rapporteur proposal contained in Annex 8, with minor editorial amendments, to appear as Annex 9.

Project TE 326 (electrical) – The Task Force approved the Rapporteur proposal contained in Annex 16, with the addition of the reason why F02D 43/00 is listed first and minor editorial amendments, to appear as Annex 17.

Project TE 330 (electrical) – The Task Force approved the Rapporteur proposal contained in Annex 12, with minor editorial amendments, to appear as Annex 13.

Project TE 334 (electrical) – Discussions were based on the last Rapporteur proposal contained in Annex 2. The Task Force agreed that this is a good example for training and an artificial example should be created based on the patent document, in view of the lack of an identical family member in French. Comments were invited on the said Rapporteur proposal in Annex 2. The Rapporteur was invited to submit a new proposal taking into account the comments to be submitted.

Project TE 336 (electrical) – Discussions were based on the last Rapporteur proposal contained in Annex 8. The Rapporteur was invited to submit a new proposal, including, in particular, a redrafted table under the “Identification of Potential Subclasses” section. It was noted that the query for I2 produced A63D 15/00 as a second answer, and it was judged necessary to show why this answer was irrelevant to this example.