

13/488

WIPO



PCT/TCO/SS/III / 23
ENGLISH ONLY
DATE: October 9, 1972

WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION
UNITED INTERNATIONAL BUREAUX FOR THE PROTECTION OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
GENEVA

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

INTERIM COMMITTEE FOR TECHNICAL COOPERATION STANDING SUBCOMMITTEE

Third Session, Geneva, October 2 to 9, 1972

REPORT

prepared by the International Bureau

Introduction

1. The Standing Subcommittee of the PCT Interim Committee for Technical Cooperation (hereinafter referred to as the Standing Subcommittee) held its third session in Geneva from October 2 to 9, 1972.
2. The members of the Standing Subcommittee are the countries whose national industrial property Offices are prospective International Searching or International Preliminary Examining Authorities under the PCT, that is, Austria, Germany (Federal Republic), Japan, the Netherlands, the Soviet Union, Sweden, the United Kingdom and the United States of America. The International Patent Institute (IIB) is also a member of the Standing Subcommittee. Brazil is an observer member of the Standing Subcommittee. All members were represented at this session.

Opening of the Session

3. The session was opened by the Director General of WIPO.

Election of Officers

4. The Standing Subcommittee unanimously elected Mr. R.A. Wahl (United States of America) as Chairman and Mr. K. Otani (Japan) and Mr. J. Dekker (Netherlands) as Vice-Chairmen.
5. Mr. Klaus Pfanner, Senior Counsellor, Head of the Industrial Property Division, WIPO, acted as Secretary of the Standing Subcommittee.

Agenda

6. The Standing Subcommittee adopted its agenda as contained in document PCT/TCO/SS/III/1.Rev.Rev. with the proviso that Item 8(iii) (Citation of non-patent literature) should be considered before and in connection with Item 6(i) (Minimum documentation: Non-patent literature).

Draft Forms and Explanatory Memorandum including Flow Charts

7. Discussions were based upon document PCT/TCO/SS/III/2 (Draft Forms) and PCT/TCO/SS/III/3 (Explanatory Memorandum on the Utilization of the Forms).

8. Several Delegations made detailed comments on the forms and the flow charts presented in the documents referred to above. All of these comments were noted by the Secretariat. They are, however, not recorded in the Report. Some of the Delegations presented written comments on the said documents to the Secretariat.

9. It was decided to invite all members of the Standing Subcommittee to communicate written comments or additional written comments and suggestions, if any, to the International Bureau not later than by December 15, 1972.

10. The Standing Subcommittee invited the International Bureau to prepare thereafter a revised new edition of the documents containing the forms and the flow charts on the basis of the comments already received and to be received.

11. On the basis of the observations made in the meeting, the Secretariat said that it already planned the following improvements in the said new edition:

(i) there will be more frequent reference to the applicable Articles and Rules of the PCT;

(ii) the most important forms will be printed so that the actual spacing of the entries could be examined;

(iii) any form addressed to the applicant and requiring a reply by him will, where appropriate, be accompanied by a form which the applicant may use for replying;

(iv) to the extent possible, forms emanating from different authorities will be on paper of different color in order to allow easy identification of their source.

12. The Secretariat added that, once all comments were received and analyzed, the convening of a small group of consultants might appear to be useful in order to assist the International Bureau in the preparation of the revised edition of the documents under consideration.

13. The Standing Subcommittee noted the suggestions contained in paragraphs 11 and 12 with approval.

MINIMUM DOCUMENTATION: NATIONAL PATENT DOCUMENTS

14. Discussions were based on documents PCT/TCO/SS/III/4 and Corr.

15. In reply to a question of the Delegation of the Soviet Union concerning the possible volume of the patent documents in the English, French and German languages which, under PCT Rule 34.1(c) (vi), may be expected to be placed at the disposal of each International Searching Authority, the Secretariat stated that no further information had been received since the report contained in document PCT/TCO/SS/I/2 was established. It was therefore not possible at present to indicate the volume of patent documents to be included in the minimum documentation under the said provision or to examine further questions in this context, such as the conditions under which the International Searching Authorities could receive such documents. It was, however, the intention of the International Bureau to continue its efforts to obtain more information from the countries, other than the seven minimum documentation countries, which publish patent documents in English, French and German, and to prepare also for that part of the minimum documentation an inventory similar to the one presented in respect of the patent documents of the seven minimum documentation countries.

16. The Delegation of the Netherlands suggested that, in case it should be difficult to give precise indications as to the patent documents to be included in the PCT minimum documentation under Rule 34.1(c) (vi), the International Bureau should attempt to present at least an estimate of the number of patent documents to be considered under the said Rule.

17. After several Delegations had expressed their satisfaction with the inventory of patent documents of the seven minimum documentation countries as contained in documents PCT/TCO/SS/I/2 and PCT/TCO/SS/III/4, the Standing Subcommittee:

(i) noted the information contained in document PCT/TCO/SS/III/4;

(ii) agreed that the inventory of patent documents to be included in the minimum documentation under PCT Rule 34.1(c) (i) to (v), in its present form, may now be used for checking and, where necessary, for the completing of the files of the prospective International Searching and International Preliminary Examining Authorities;

(iii) agreed that, for the time being, the cut-off date of the said inventory would remain July 1, 1971, and that a general revision and updating of the inventory should take place only shortly before the expected entry into force of the Patent Cooperation Treaty;

(iv) asked the International Bureau to continue its work with respect to the patent documents referred to in Rule 34.1(c) (vi) with a view to preparing at an early date an inventory of the patent documents to be included in the PCT minimum documentation under the said Rule.

MINIMUM DOCUMENTATION: NON-PATENT LITERATURE

Citations of Non-Patent Literature

18. Discussions were based on documents PCT/TCO/SS/III/9, 16 and 19.

19. The Delegation of the Netherlands drew the attention of the Standing Subcommittee to the fact that, while the proportion of non-patent literature in the search files of the Netherlands Patent Office had considerably increased, the citation frequency of non-patent literature was decreasing. This was due to the fact that non-patent literature was of importance for search and examination only with respect to the latest publications not yet contained in patent documents. The interest in non-patent literature was steadily decreasing in view of the introduction, by more and more legislations, of a system of publication of patent applications after 18 months. For these reasons, the share of non-patent literature in the PCT minimum documentation should be kept as small as possible.

20. The Delegations of Germany (Federal Republic), the United Kingdom, the IIB, Sweden, the United States of America and Austria agreed with the statement made by the Delegation of the Netherlands. The Delegations of the United Kingdom, Austria and the IIB added that the citation rate of non-patent literature in searches seemed to be relatively low in the mechanical arts. On the other hand, a higher proportion of citations was to be found in the electrical, physics and chemical fields. This factor should be taken into account when considering the inclusion of non-patent literature items in the PCT minimum documentation.

21. The Delegation of the Soviet Union said that the statistical evaluation of the frequency of citations of non-patent literature should continue. A list of minimum requirements for the evaluation of non-patent literature should be drawn up and should include a minimum number of references, a percentage ratio of citations of non-patent literature in comparison with patent literature, the relevance of such literature in view of its date of publication, and its importance with respect to the different arts, identified by using the symbols of the International Patent Classification (IPC).

Minimum List of Periodicals

22. Discussions were based on documents PCT/TCO/SS/III/7 and 8.

23. The Standing Subcommittee discussed the results of the survey made by the International Bureau as reflected in the documents referred to above, in the light of the conclusions reached under the preceding item of the agenda with respect to the relatively limited importance of non-patent literature for search and examination.

24. Taking these considerations into account, the Standing Subcommittee expressed the opinion that the non-patent literature minimum documentation should, at least at the beginning, not comprise more than approximately 100 periodicals and that in establishing the list of these periodicals two considerations should be paramount : that the periodicals included should be those which, according to the experience of the examiners, were the most useful in the sense that they are the most likely to contain disclosures not available in the patent literature, and that periodicals should not be excluded from the list only because of the fact that they are in languages used in only one or in only very few of the prospective Searching Authorities.

25. The Standing Subcommittee decided that with the aim of gradually developing such a restricted list of periodicals the International Bureau should address, by the middle of November 1972, two requests for information to the members of the Standing Subcommittee.

26. One of the requests would be along the lines that each member should indicate 42 periodicals in the chemical field, 36 periodicals in the electrical and physics fields, and 22 periodicals in the mechanical field which, on the basis of the experience of its examiners, were the most useful in the sense stated above. The numbers in question represent the same proportion in which the various kinds of periodicals stand to each other in the two lists of periodicals referred to in document PCT/TCO/SS/I/3(ANNEX) and the sixth column of paragraph 12 of document PCT/TCO/SS/III/8.

27. The second request would consist of an invitation addressed to each member of the Standing Subcommittee to indicate in each of the three groups, in the order in which they are considered to be useful in the sense indicated above, the most outstandingly important periodicals published in the language of its own country.

28. In the invitation addressed to the IIB, the latter would be asked to comply with this request in respect of periodicals in any language, with particular emphasis on the French language.

29. The replies to both requests should reach the International Bureau by the end of February 1973.

30. The Standing Subcommittee noted in this connection, and also when the INSPEC/PAL project was discussed, that the coverage of PAL had nothing to do with the restricted list of periodicals for the purposes of minimum documentation: whereas the coverage of the former should extend to several thousand periodicals, the latter would aim at listing approximately one hundred only.

31. The Standing Subcommittee also noted that International Searching Authorities would, naturally, not limit their searches to periodicals listed among the same one hundred. They would continue to take into consideration, with or without the assistance of PAL, all the non-patent literature which they consider now, and the significance of the list of the approximately one hundred periodicals would be merely that it would constitute the minimum documentation under Rule 34.1(b)(iii) and thus would have to be considered by all International Searching Authorities.

32. Thus, in the establishment of such lists, each prospective Authority should

primarily be led by the aim of including periodicals which it wishes to see the other prospective Authorities use, so that there should be a core of periodicals that all of them cover--rather than by the aim of including the periodicals it uses itself, since the latter will, by that Authority, be continued to be covered, as a practical matter, whether they appear in the list or not.

"PAL" Project

33. Discussion on the "PAL" (Patent Associated Literature) project of INSPEC, an information service operated by the Institution of Electrical Engineers, London, was based on documents PCT/TCO/SS/III/10, 11 and 20 and a document entitled "The 'PAL' System," prepared by INSPEC and transmitted to the members of the Standing Subcommittee on August 3, 1972, with WIPO Circular 1492.

34. Two representatives of INSPEC, Messrs. Barlow and Cox, participated in the discussion.

35. Mr. Barlow recalled the steps accomplished since the December 1971 Session of the Standing Subcommittee. INSPEC first sent to the members of the Standing Subcommittee a sample of its current service furnished to the US Patent Office. The sample consisted of the full text of some 300 scientific articles published mainly in journals in the electrical and electronics field. Full symbols according to the International Patent Classification (IPC) had been allocated by INSPEC to these articles. The sample represented one week's output of the said service. At the same time, INSPEC prepared, and sent to the said members, sample abstracts in the format (A4) and having the contents and the layout which was envisaged for the PAL Service. Thereafter, representatives of INSPEC and the International Bureau visited, with the exception of the United Kingdom Patent Office, each Office member of the Standing Subcommittee in order to discuss the details of the proposed service and the results of the tests and evaluations which had been made in the meantime in the various Offices on the basis of the samples of INSPEC (see the "agreed notes" drawn up at the end of each visit, reproduced in document PCT/TCO/SS/III/10). Parallel to these steps, INSPEC started negotiations with publishers of scientific journals in order to explore with them the possibilities of solving the copyright problems connected with furnishing, when so desired by the customer, copies of the full texts of, and/or the drawings appearing in, the articles of which abstracts were to be included in the PAL Service. INSPEC presented a report on these negotiations which indicated that there were excellent prospects for resolving the said copyright problems.

36. After an exchange of views among members of the Standing Subcommittee and representatives of INSPEC and of the International Bureau, Mr. Barlow described the essential parts of the PAL Service as now proposed. The PAL Service would consist of abstracts of scientific articles. In a first period--the only one to which the present plan and offer related--the fields to be covered would be "physics, electrical and electronics engineering, computers and control." (Later, the Service could be extended to the fields of mechanical engineering, as well as chemical and other fields, but no offer was made in respect of these fields at the present time.) In order to select the articles to be abstracted for the purposes of the PAL Service, INSPEC would scan several thousand scientific journals. These included, among others, all the journals in the field of physics, electrical and electronic engineering, computers and control, which appeared in the first list of 594 periodicals drawn up by WIPO and listed in document PCT/TCO/SS/I/3 ANNEX. The articles selected would be those likely to be of interest to patent examiners looking for new disclosures. The abstracts would be in English. Each abstract would be on a separate sheet of paper of A4 size. In addition to bibliographic data, each abstract would contain one or more classification symbols according to the IPC; if any abstract contained more than one such symbol, as many copies of the same abstract would be furnished as there were symbols. Furthermore, when the article contained drawings, the abstract would include at least one of them if it facilitated the understanding of the abstract. The classification according to the IPC--always to its finest subdivision-- would be effected by INSPEC. (For a surcharge, classification also according to the US Patent Classification would be available). The total number of abstracts per year was expected to be in the neighborhood of 10,000. They would be delivered at monthly, or on special request, at shorter intervals. The time between the publication of the article and its abstracting would be generally from 30 to 40 days. The subscription fee for one year would be between

US\$39,000 per subscription if there were three subscribers and gradually less if there were more than three subscribers, the minimum being, in the case of seven or more subscribers, US\$21,500. Copies of the full text of each article abstracted would be available for US\$2 per article.

37. Mr. Barlow (INSPEC) emphasized that the PAL Service could be started only, but that it would be started, if at least three subscriptions were made for at least one year. If such subscriptions were made within the next few weeks, the Service would start with the periodicals published as from January 1, 1973.

38. The Representative of the IIB said that he would recommend to his management that the IIB subscribe to the PAL Service; he could, however, not predict whether his recommendation would be followed.

39. The Delegation of the United States said that since it found the existing services of INSPEC satisfactory and the proposed PAL Service useful, it would recommend to the US Patent Office to subscribe to the proposed PAL Service.

40. The Delegation of Brazil stated that the National Institute of Industrial Property of Brazil was seeking authorization for subscribing to the PAL Service.

41. The Delegation of Sweden said that the Royal Patent Office of Sweden was very interested in the PAL Service.

42. The Delegation of Germany (Federal Republic) said that the German Patent Office was prepared to give favorable consideration to the question of subscribing to the PAL Service.

43. The Delegation of Japan stated that the Japanese Patent Office was very much interested in the PAL Service.

44. The Delegation of the Soviet Union said that the Committee for Inventions and Discoveries would prefer to enter into an exchange agreement with INSPEC under which the said Committee would furnish abstracts in the English language of articles in the Russian and other languages of the Soviet Union and INSPEC would furnish, in exchange, the PAL Service.

45. The Delegation of the United Kingdom stated that since it was not a prospective International Searching Authority it had no direct interest in the PAL Service.

46. The Delegation of Austria said that its position was the same as reflected in the Agreed Note (see document PCT/TCO/SS/III/10, Annex G).

47. Officials of the Canadian and Mexican national Offices, who were present during the discussion, expressed general interest in the PAL Service.

48. Mr. Barlow (INSPEC) noted with appreciation the interest expressed by several Delegations and said that INSPEC would contact each of them in the very near future in order to negotiate a subscription agreement with them. As far as the remarks of the Soviet Delegation were concerned, Mr. Barlow said that before taking any position on it, INSPEC awaited detailed written proposals of the Soviet Committee as contemplated during the discussions which took place in Moscow earlier in 1972 (see PCT/TCO/SS/III/10, Annex D, paragraphs 32 and 33).

49. The Representative of the International Bureau said that that Bureau continued to be at the disposal of all those interested in order to coordinate the wishes they may have vis-à-vis INSPEC and to facilitate the putting into effect of the PAL Service.

50. The Standing Subcommittee decided to maintain on its agenda, as a high priority item, the INSPEC/PAL project and asked the International Bureau to continue its efforts to bring about the realization of that project.

Cooperation with the International Atomic Energy Agency

51. Discussions were based on document PCT/TCO/SS/III/14.
52. The Standing Subcommittee noted the report submitted by the International Bureau on the International Nuclear Information System (INIS), a system operated by the International Atomic Energy Agency. It expressed the view that the INIS system, at least in its present form and at the present time, is of little if any use for Patent Offices. Further evaluation of the system should be suspended. This position could, however, be reviewed in due course in the light of new developments.

ABSTRACTING AND TRANSLATING SERVICES

53. The Standing Subcommittee noted the work accomplished by the International Bureau, as reported in documents PCT/TCO/SS/III/5 and 6. It decided that, in view of the very substantial and detailed information already assembled, there was no need for further action for the time being. The matter should, however, be reviewed in due course in the light of further developments.

Uniformity in Documentation and Working Methods: Isolated Searches and Search Techniques

54. Discussion was based on documents PCT/TCO/SS/III/12 and 15.
55. The Standing Subcommittee noted with appreciation the reports on isolated searches presented by the German Patent Office and the IIB.
56. With respect to the question raised in paragraph 7 of document PCT/TCO/SS/III/12, the Delegation of the Netherlands, supported by the Delegation of the United Kingdom, suggested that the ICIREPAT questionnaire, reproduced in Annex II of the said document, should be revised in view of the PCT requirements. They suggested that the revised questionnaire should be circulated to the various Offices with a view to soliciting information not only on the present searching standards and practices in each Office but also with a view to soliciting the views of each Office on prospective standards and practices for PCT searches.
57. The Delegation of the IIB announced that the IIB intended to amplify the report on isolated searches prepared by the IIB and annexed to document PCT/TCO/SS/III/15. The revised report of the IIB would be submitted in early 1973. It suggested that this report, together with the report of the German Patent Office, could be most useful in the revision of the ICIREPAT questionnaire.
58. The Standing Subcommittee decided that once the revised IIB report was available, the International Bureau should draw up a new questionnaire along the lines of the questionnaire contained in Annex II of document PCT/TCO/SS/III/12 but with particular relevance to PCT requirements. The new questionnaire should be drafted in such a way as to obtain information not only on current searching practices but also on standards which are expected for PCT searches.
59. The Delegation of Germany (Federal Republic), referring to the organization of search files according to the International Patent Classification (IPC), asked whether meetings to be held on this subject could not be organized in time combination with PCT Interim Committee sessions.
60. The Secretariat informed the Standing Subcommittee about the mandate given to the International Bureau by the Executive Committee of the Paris Union to continue the study of this matter as indicated in document P/EC/VIII/10 with the help of an ad hoc Working Group to be convened by the Director General of WIPO. That Working Group would have to be convened in Spring 1973, as the International Bureau had to present a progress report to the 1973 session of the Executive Committee of the Paris Union. For this and other reasons, a time combination with the 1973 sessions of the PCT Interim Committees planned for autumn 1973 was difficult to establish. Possibilities of holding such meeting in time combination with any other relevant WIPO meeting would however be explored.

Uniformity in Documentation and Working Methods:
Bilateral Examiner Exchanges

61. Discussions were based on documents PCT/TCO/SS/13 and 17.
62. The Delegation of the United Kingdom referred to the benefits to be obtained from examiner exchanges particularly if the examiners involved presented, on the basis of their experience gained abroad, concrete suggestions to the management of their own Office.
63. The Delegation of Japan said that exchange of examiners would be useful particularly after the establishment of uniform international search methods.
64. The Delegation of Germany (Federal Republic) stressed the benefits of examiner exchanges. In the German Patent Office, organizational and procedural changes had been influenced by the experience gained in the course of such exchanges.

INPADOC

65. The discussion was based on document PCT/TCO/SS/III/18.
66. Dr. Auracher and Mr. Werner, Director General and Technical Director, respectively, of the International Patent Documentation Center (INPADOC) participated in the discussion.
67. Dr. Auracher recalled the Agreement concluded between the Republic of Austria and WIPO concerning the creation of INPADOC, the details of the setting up of INPADOC and its activities since its creation. In addition to the information contained in document PCT/TCO/SS/III/18, Dr. Auracher informed the Standing Subcommittee of two very recent events: the increase of INPADOC's capital (Stammkapital) from one million Austrian Schillings to 20 million Austrian Schillings, and the submission of the Agreement between Austria and WIPO to the Austrian Parliament for ratification.
68. Dr. Auracher said that one of the most urgent tasks of INPADOC was the conclusion of exchange agreements between each of the major national Offices and the IIB on the one hand and INPADOC on the other hand. These agreements should secure, and regulate the details of, the exchange, in machine-readable form, of bibliographic data of patent documents. He said that representatives of INPADOC, accompanied in most if not all cases by representatives of Siemens (the firm with which INPADOC concluded a contract for the computer operations of INPADOC), would visit, in the course of the next weeks, the said Offices and the IIB in order to seek and give information on the technical details of the machine-readable data carriers that would be involved in the exchange, and to negotiate an agreement of cooperation with each. He handed over to the representatives of the said Offices and the IIB, the text of a draft model agreement, the description of the computer tape which would be offered by INPADOC, and a questionnaire asking for various information mainly concerned with the machine-readable data carrier which would be offered in exchange for the said tape.
69. Dr. Auracher informed the Standing Subcommittee that INPADOC has acquired from Siemens computer tapes carrying the bibliographic data of some 600,000 patent documents published in the last three years and relating mainly to electrical, electronic and mechanical inventions. These data would be included in the INPADOC data base.
70. He said that INPADOC expected to start the exchange early in 1973--provided the agreements of cooperation are concluded and become operative in the meantime-- and that INPADOC planned to include in its services by the end of 1973, all published patent documents of all countries provided they contain the priority data (where applicable) and/or the IPC symbols required for the patent family service and the identification by classification service, respectively.
71. Subject to the conclusion of an agreement of cooperation with INPADOC, the following declarations were made:

- (i) the Delegation of the Netherlands offered the data base of the patent family system operated by the Netherlands Patent Office;
- (ii) the Delegations of Brazil and Mexico expressed their interest in collaborating with INPADOC;
- (iii) the Delegation of Canada offered to exchange its bibliographic data in punched paper tape form;
- (iv) the Delegation of Australia offered to exchange bibliographic data in punched card form;
- (v) the Delegation of the Soviet Union stated that the Soviet Office could provide machine-readable data covering the patent documents of the Soviet Union and expressed the hope that the other socialist countries would participate in INPADOC through the Soviet Office;
- (vi) the Delegation of the United States stated that at the present time bibliographic data in machine-readable form of only 77% of its documents could be provided. It was hoped, however, that the remaining 23% could also be provided very soon.
- (vii) the Delegation of the United Kingdom stated that the UK Office would prefer to deliver the tapes covering UK documents through the IIB. This would not result in a delay for INPADOC since it was expected that the bibliographic data would be transmitted to the IIB about one month before the documents were published. However, discussion could of course take place regarding the possibility of the data being delivered directly to INPADOC;
- (viii) the Delegation of Sweden stated that its Office would try to speed up its switch-over to fully mechanized administrative procedures in order to have machine-readable data available which would enable it to conclude an agreement of cooperation with INPADOC;
- (ix) the Delegation of France stated that, any former declarations notwithstanding, the French National Institute of Industrial Property would be ready to deliver machine-readable data to INPADOC at the beginning of 1973. Its Government had, however, wished that Austria should declare that it no longer wished to become an International Searching Authority under the PCT. The cooperation of France was motivated by a desire to serve the interests of French inventors and industry rather than those of the French Office which did not perform searches;
- (x) the Delegation of Germany (Federal Republic) reiterated its willingness to exchange bibliographic data on magnetic tape with INPADOC;
- (xi) the Representative of the IIB stated that bibliographic data of the Netherlands and Luxembourg and probably the United Kingdom could be delivered by the IIB to INPADOC. With regard to bibliographic data pertaining to Belgian and Italian documents, he said that he was not in a position to make any commitment;
- (xii) the Delegation of Japan reiterated the willingness of the Japanese Patent Office to cooperate with INPADOC through the Japan Patent Information Center (JAPATIC).
72. The Representative of the International Bureau stated that, in accordance with the Agreement concluded between Austria and WIPO, the International Bureau would continue to do its best to make INPADOC operational. Staff members of the International Bureau would assist in the negotiations of the agreements of cooperation, without which INPADOC might not be viable. The International Bureau would continue to encourage close cooperation between INPADOC and Derwent Publications, Ltd., London, mainly in the field of marketing INPADOC services to industry.

73. The Standing Subcommittee noted these declarations.

Future Program

74. The Standing Subcommittee expressed the opinion that the International Bureau should give the highest priority to the matters relating to INPADOC and PAL/INSPEC and to the establishment of forms to be included in the PCT Administrative Instructions.

75. Furthermore, the Standing Subcommittee expressed the wish that priority be given to further work on the list of periodicals constituting the minimum non-patent literature under the PCT, on the inventory of patent documents under PCT Rule 34.1(c)(vi) and on the questionnaire on search techniques.

76. The Standing Subcommittee noted that, time permitting, work should continue also on items of the program of the PCT Interim Committee on Technical Cooperation other than the highest priority items and the priority items referred to in the preceding two paragraphs.

77. The Standing Subcommittee agreed to have its next session from Wednesday, April 25 to Monday, April 30, 1973, at the headquarters of WIPO in Geneva.

78. This Report was unanimously adopted by the Standing Subcommittee in its closing meeting on October 9, 1972.

Annex follows

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

I. MEMBERS OF THE STANDING SUBCOMMITTEE

AUSTRIA

Mr. G. GALL
Oberkommissär
Austrian Patent Office
Vienna

GERMANY (FEDERAL REPUBLIC)

Mr. K.H. HOFMANN
Abteilungspräsident
German Patent Office (Berlin Branch)
Berlin

Mrs. R. VON SCHLEUSSNER
Regierungsdirektorin
German Patent Office
Munich

Mr. W. MASSALSKI
Regierungsrat
German Patent Office (Berlin Branch)
Berlin

JAPAN

Mr. K. OTANI
Director General
Second Examination Department
Japanese Patent Office
Tokyo

Mr. K. TAKAMI
Trial Examiner
Department of Appeals
Japanese Patent Office
Tokyo

NETHERLANDS

Mr. J. DEKKER
Vice-President
Netherlands Patent Office
The Hague

SWEDEN

Mr. S. PERSSON
Head of Division
Royal Patent and Registration Office
Stockholm

Mr. M. JACOBSSON
Legal Advisor
Ministry of Justice
Stockholm

Mr. B. HANSSON
Primary Examiner
Royal Patent and Registration Office
Stockholm

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Mr. E. ARTEMIEV
Deputy Chairman
Committee for Inventions and Discoveries
attached to the Council of Ministers of the USSR
Moscow

Mr. L. KOMAROV
Director
All Union Scientific Research Institute of
State Patent Examination
Moscow

Mr. V. EVGENIEV
Head of Section
Committee for Inventions and Discoveries
attached to the Council of Ministers of the USSR
Moscow

UNITED KINGDOM

Mr. D.G. GAY
Superintending Examiner
Patent Office
London

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Mr. R.A. WAHL
Assistant Commissioner of Patents
U.S. Patent Office
Washington, D.C.

Mr. M.K. KIRK
Director
Office of Legislation and International Affairs
U.S. Patent Office
Washington, D.C.

Mr. H.D. HOINKES
Legislative and International Patent Specialist
U.S. Patent Office
Washington, D.C.

INTERNATIONAL PATENT INSTITUTE

Mr. L.F.W. KNIGHT
Conseiller à l'Informatique
IIB
The Hague

Mr. A. VANDECASTEELE
Conseiller au Service Technique
IIB
The Hague

II. OBSERVER MEMBER

BRAZIL

Mr. G.R. COARACY
Assistant to the President
National Institute of Industrial Property
Brazil

Mr. R.I. CANTIELLO
Assistant to the President
National Institute of Industrial Property
Brazil

Mr. F.M. PERRI
Secretary
Permanent Mission of Brazil
Geneva

III. OFFICERS OF THE STANDING SUBCOMMITTEE

CHAIRMAN : Mr. R.A. WAHL (United States of America)
VICE-CHAIRMEN: Mr. K. OTANI (Japan), Mr. J. DEKKER (Netherlands)
SECRETARY: Mr. K. PFANNER (WIPO)

IV. WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION (WIPO)

Professor G.H.C. BODENHAUSEN, Director General
Dr. A. BOGSCH First Deputy Director General
Mr. K. PFANNER, Senior Counsellor, Head of the Industrial Property Division
Mr. P. CLAUS, Technical Counsellor, Head of the ICIREPAT Section, Industrial
Property Division
Mr. Y. GROMOV, PCT Section, Industrial Property Division

/End of document/