

WIPO



IPC/CE/36/6

ORIGINAL: English

DATE: January 28, 2005

E

WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION
GENEVA

**SPECIAL UNION FOR THE INTERNATIONAL PATENT CLASSIFICATION
(IPC UNION)**

COMMITTEE OF EXPERTS

**Thirty-Sixth Session
Geneva, February 14 to 18, 2005**

IMPLEMENTATION IN THE IPC OF THE REFORM RESULTS

Document prepared by the Secretariat

1. At its thirty-fifth session, held in October 2004, the Committee of Experts approved the decision of the IPC Revision Working Group that residual main groups should not be created automatically in all subclasses, but a careful approach be applied. At its twelfth session, held in November-October 2004, the IPC Revision Working Group considered a selected number of proposals for the creation of new residual main groups where broad consensus had been reached prior to its session, and approved the majority of them. These amendments are contained in the Annex to document CE/36/3. Annex I to the present document contains a relevant excerpt of the report of the twelfth session of the IPC Revision Working Group which relates to this task.

2. At its thirty-fourth session, held in February 2004, the Committee of Experts considered the project relating to references in the advanced level of the IPC, pointing to places outside their hierarchical branch. The Committee adopted notes for warning classifiers and searchers about potential problems concerned with such references and agreed that those notes should be considered as a preliminary solution only, which was necessary in view of the large

number of possibly affected references and the high degree of intellectual work that a comprehensive solution would entail. The Committee also agreed that a comprehensive and consistent solution would be highly desirable and requested the IPC Revision Working Group to investigate if further steps towards the comprehensive solution could be taken before the entering into force of the next edition of the IPC (see document IPC/CE/34/10, paragraphs 28 to 31). At its twelfth session, the IPC Revision Working Group reconsidered said preliminary solution and decided that the inclusion of said warning notes could be abandoned and a comprehensive and consistent solution be implemented. Annex II to this document contains a relevant excerpt of the report of the twelfth session of the IPC Revision Working Group which relates to this task.

3. With respect to the ongoing Task “Updating of IPC Training Examples”, the IPC Revision Working Group approved the Guidelines and the corresponding template at its twelfth session. In total, 29 training example projects were examined by the Task Force and seven of them were completed. Annex III to this document contains a relevant excerpt of the report of the twelfth session of the IPC Revision Working Group which relates to this task.

4. With respect to the ongoing Task “Elaboration of Classification Definitions”, the IPC Revision Working Group approved further definition projects at its twelfth session. In total, 38 definition projects were approved in English and 18 completed both in English and French.

5. The Committee of Experts is invited to take note of the contents of the Annexes to this document and to make decisions as necessary.

[Annexes follow]

ANNEX I

EXCERPT FROM DOCUMENT IPC/WG/12/4

INTRODUCTION OF RESIDUAL MAIN GROUPS IN IPC SUBCLASSES

15. Discussions were based on a compilation of Projects R 701 to R 706, on project file WG 111 and on an additional working document, prepared by the Secretariat, listing all proposals for new residual main groups in subclasses where consensus to create them had been reached. The Working Group approved the majority of those groups and also approved some amendments to existing groups. A list of the approved new groups and amendments is given in Annex K to this report.
16. It was agreed that the new residual main groups should also be indicated in subclass indexes, where such indexes exist, and that horizontal lines should be included to separate them from other groups, where needed. The Secretariat informed the Working Group that all these amendments would be prepared in the form of technical annexes for adoption at the next session of the Committee of Experts.
17. The Working Group reconfirmed its decision taken at its eleventh session to use the symbol 99/00 for new main groups residual to the whole subclass (see document IPC/WG/11/7, paragraph 24). In order to avoid confusion, it was decided that symbol 99/00 should be used exclusively for residual groups, and therefore existing group A43D 99/00 was renumbered to A43D 98/00.
18. The Secretariat informed the Working Group that an updated list, based on Annex G of document IPC/WG/11/7 would be posted to Project WG 111, indicating where new residual main groups were introduced, where consensus was reached not to create any residual group, where residual main groups already existed, including their numbering, and where no agreement could be reached.
19. The Working Group invited comments to be submitted to Project WG 111 by March 30, 2005, on how to proceed with the remaining subclasses where there was disagreement between the recommendations given in the residual projects, the recommendation of the rapporteurs and the opinions by commenting offices. Comments were also invited on whether the numbering of existing residual main groups, being residual to the whole subclass, should be changed to 99/00 or 999/00. The Secretariat was asked to act as rapporteur and to prepare a report by April 30, 2005.

[Annex II follows]

ANNEX II

EXCERPT FROM DOCUMENT IPC/WG/12/4

CONSIDERATION OF REFERENCES IN THE ADVANCED LEVEL OF THE IPC

25. The Working Group noted an oral report by the Secretariat on the progress of Project WG 091. As agreed at the eleventh session of the Working Group held in June 2004 (see document IPC/WG/11/7, paragraphs 35 to 41), the International Bureau had made available lists including a total of approximately 5,100 references in the advanced level of the IPC, pointing to places outside their hierarchical branch. The volunteering reviewing offices have considered those references and have determined which groups in the core level could bear an asterisk, indicating that the core level user should consult the references in the advanced level subgroups in order to determine the exact scope of the core level group. The results of this extensive work are detailed in Annexes 14 to 24 to the project file.

26. It was noted that roughly one out of four considered references could lead to the inclusion of an asterisk in a core level group. The experience of the reviewing offices has shown that the consultation of the advanced level by a core level user, in order to determine the scope of a core level group, would be a complicated exercise. On the other hand, the RIPCIS system is able to display core level groups with different titles (or references) when consulting the core level than when consulting the advanced level. Therefore, core level groups could include a reference (to another core level group) instead of an asterisk when consulting the core level, whereas they would remain unchanged when consulting the advanced level.

27. It was therefore decided to abandon the inclusion of any asterisk in the core level. Instead, the reviewing offices were requested to propose references in those core level groups where the inclusion of an asterisk had been proposed. The titles of these references should be simple enough for core level users and their usefulness, in the context of the core level, should be carefully considered. The reviewing offices should consider abandoning inclusion of references that could not fulfil the above requirements.

28. Each reviewing office was invited to submit such references in those sections that it had already considered, by the end of February 2005, in order to allow their introduction in the eighth edition of the IPC.

[Annex III follows]

ANNEX III

EXCERPT FROM DOCUMENT IPC/WG/12/4

UPDATING OF IPC TRAINING EXAMPLES

10. Discussions were based on Annexes 26 and 27 to project file WG 093, containing, respectively, the “Guidelines on Drafting Training Material” and the corresponding “Template for Training Examples”, which had been approved by the Task Force on IPC Training Examples on a temporary basis, and on Annexes 29 and 30 to the project file, containing relevant comments submitted by the United States of America and the European Patent Office.

11. The Working Group approved, with some amendments, the Guidelines and the corresponding Template, which appear, respectively, as Annexes G and H to this report.

12. It was noted that, during this session, the Task Force held separate meetings in the three technical fields, where 29 training example projects were discussed. A summary of these discussions appears as Annex I to this report.

13. Bearing in mind the aim of considering all training examples by the end of 2005, the Task Force distributed among its members 35 additional examples for consideration. The decisions of the Task Force with respect to the training example projects and the deadlines for the next round of actions are summarized in Annex J to this report.

14. The Working Group accepted, with gratitude, an invitation made by the Delegation of Ireland, to host a meeting of the Task Force on IPC Training Examples at the Irish Patents Office, Kilkenny, in late April - early May 2005. It was noted that at this meeting the Task Force could finalize several training examples before their formal approval at the thirteenth session of the Working Group. The International Bureau and the Irish Patents Office would arrange the exact dates in January 2005 and inform the other Task Force members accordingly.

[End of Annex III and of document]