

## ANNEX III

## SUMMARY OF REPLIES RECEIVED IN RESPONSE TO WIPO CIRCULAR No. IPC 145

1. The International Bureau received a total of 55 replies in response to WIPO Circular No. IPC 145, including 39 from States being members of the IPC Union (55 members), 13 from States not being members of the IPC Union and three from intergovernmental organizations.
2. Replies were received from the following Offices or Organizations: African Regional Intellectual Property Organization (ARIPO) (AP), Algeria (DZ), Armenia (AM), Australia (AU), Austria (AT), Azerbaijan (AZ), Belize (BZ), Brazil (BR), Bulgaria (BG), Canada (CA), Chile (CL), China (CN), Croatia (HR), Cuba (CU), Czech Republic (CZ), Denmark (DK), Estonia (EE), Eurasian Patent Office (EAPO) (EA), European Patent Office (EPO) (EP), Finland (FI), France (FR), Germany (DE), Greece (GR), Guatemala (GT), Hungary (HU), Indonesia (ID), Ireland (IE), Israel (IL), Japan (JP), Kenya (KE), Kyrgyzstan (KG), Lithuania (LT), Madagascar (MG), Mexico (MX), Mongolia (MN), Netherlands (NL), Norway (NO), Portugal (PT), Republic of Korea (KR), Republic of Moldova (MD), Romania (RO), Russian Federation (RU), San Marino (SM), Slovakia (SK), Slovenia (SI), Spain (ES), Sweden (SE), Switzerland (CH), Thailand (TH), The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (MK), Turkey (TR), Ukraine (UA), United Kingdom (GB), United Republic of Tanzania (TZ), United States of America (US).
3. The replies received are summarized in the table reproduced below. In order to provide an overview as comprehensive as possible, this table has been supplemented by earlier replies of offices or organizations that have not replied to Circular No. IPC 145 but have replied to Circulars Nos. IPC 107 and 123, issued on June 30, 2003, and August 4, 2004, respectively, requesting similar information on the use of the reformed IPC. In total, 72 offices or organizations have replied to at least one of these three Circulars.
4. The answers to the six questions included in the questionnaire of Circular No. IPC 145 can be summarized as follows:

Classifying according to the eighth edition of the IPC

Question 1: “Will your Office start publication of patent documents classified according to the eighth edition of the IPC from January 1, 2006?”

Forty-seven out of 55 offices replied “Yes” and only eight offices replied that they could not meet this deadline.

Question 2: “If the response to Question 1 is “No”, from which date does your Office plan to start publication of patent documents classified according to the eighth edition?”

Four of the above eight offices provided provisional dates (see the table below).

Use of the core level or the advanced level of the eighth edition of the IPC

Question 3: “Will your Office use the core level or the advanced level of the eighth edition of the IPC for classifying your published patent documents?”

Thirty-nine offices replied that they would use the advanced level. Taking into account replies to question 2 of Circular No. IPC 107, a total of 48 offices have indicated that they would use the advanced level.

Ten offices replied they would use the core level only. Taking into account replies to question 2 of Circular No. IPC 107, a total of 15 offices indicated that they would use the core level only.

Three offices replied that they would use both levels. In its reply to Circular No. IPC 107, Monaco indicated that it would classify at subclass level only.

Question 4: “If the response to Question 3 is both “Core level” and “Advanced level”, please list technical fields (indicated by IPC symbols) in which the advanced level will be used.”

See the table below.

Reclassification of retrospective patent collections for loading the reclassification data in the Master Classification Database (MCD)

Question 5: “Is your Office carrying out or is planning to carry out reclassification according to the eighth edition of the IPC of your patent documents published before January 1, 2006?”

Twenty-seven offices replied “Yes” and 22 offices replied “No”. Taking into account replies to question 7 of Circular No. IPC 123, a total of 29 offices indicated that they would carry out such reclassification while a total of 24 offices indicated that they would not carry out such reclassification

Question 6: “If the response to Question 5 is “Yes”, when does your office plan to make the results of reclassification available for loading in the MCD?”

For the different dates indicated in the replies, see the table below.

Table: Summary of Replies to Questions 1 to 6 of Circular No. IPC 145  
("Use of the Eighth Edition of the IPC")

<p>A: Advanced level C: Core level S: Subclass level Y: Yes N: No * The office/organization has not yet replied to Circular No. IPC 145; the answers indicated in the table were derived from the replies received to similar questions in Circulars Nos. IPC 107 or IPC 123 (see paragraph 3, above). # The office has regular data exchange with the front office of the EPO according to IPC-8 requirements.</p>
---

Country or Organization	Code	Questions 1 and 2	Questions 3 and 4	Question 5	Question 6
Algeria	DZ	Y	C	N	
ARIPO	AP	Y	A		
Armenia	AM	Y	C	Y	01.12.2006
Australia	AU	Y <sup>#</sup>	A	N	
Austria	AT	Y	A	N	
Azerbaijan	AZ	Y	C	N	
Belarus <sup>*</sup>	BY		C		
Belgium <sup>*</sup>	BE		C		
Belize	BZ	Y	A	N	
Brazil	BR	N by 07.2007	A	N	
Bulgaria	BG	Y	A	Y	2008
Canada	CA	Y <sup>#</sup>	A	N	
Chile	CL	Y	A	N	
China	CN	Y <sup>#</sup>	A	Y	open
Colombia <sup>*</sup>	CO		C		
Croatia	HR	Y	A	Y	open
Cuba	CU	Y	A	Y	open
Czech Republic	CZ	Y	A	Y	09.2006
Denmark	DK	Y <sup>#</sup>	A	N	
EAPO	EA	Y	A		
Egypt <sup>*</sup>	EG		A		
EPO	EP	Y <sup>#</sup>	A		
Estonia	EE	Y	A	N	
Finland	FI	Y	A	Y	open
France	FR	Y <sup>#</sup>	A		
Germany	DE	Y <sup>#</sup>	A		
Greece	GR	Y	A	Y	open
Guatemala	GT	Y	A	Y	after 2006

IPC/CE/37/9  
Annex III, page 4

Country or Organization	Code	Questions 1 and 2	Questions 3 and 4	Question 5	Question 6
Hungary	HU	Y	A	Y	31.12.2006
Iceland*	IS		C		
Indonesia	ID	N 01.07.2007	A	N	
Ireland	IE	Y	C	Y	01.01.2006
Israel	IL	N 01.03.2006	A	N	
Italy*	IT		A		
Japan	JP	Y <sup>#</sup>	A	Y	03.2006
Kenya	KE	N	C/A <sup>1</sup>	N	
Kyrgyzstan	KG	N 01.07.2006	A	N	
Lithuania	LT	Y	C	Y	01.01.2007
Madagascar	MG	Y	C	Y	Q4/2006
Mexico	MX	N	A	Y	06.2006
Monaco*	MC		S		
Mongolia	MN	Y	C	N	
Netherlands	NL	Y	A	N	
New Zealand*	NZ		C		
Nicaragua*	NI			Y	
Norway	NO	Y	A	Y	2006-2007
OAPI*	OA		A	Y	
Poland*	PL		A		
Portugal	PT	Y	A	Y	Q1/2006
Republic of Korea	KR	Y	A	Y	06.2006
Republic of Moldova	MD	Y <sup>#</sup>	A	Y	06.2006
Romania	RO	Y <sup>#</sup>	A	Y	Q1/2006
Russian Federation	RU	Y	A	Y	04.2006
San Marino	SM	N			
Serbia and Montenegro*	YU		A	N	
Slovakia	SK	Y <sup>#</sup>	C	Y	12.2006
Slovenia	SI	Y <sup>#</sup>	C	Y	01.2006
Spain	ES	Y <sup>#</sup>	A	Y	07.2006
Sweden	SE	Y <sup>#</sup>	A	Y	2006-2009
Switzerland	CH	Y <sup>#</sup>	A	N	
Thailand	TH	Y	C/A <sup>2</sup>	N	
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	MK	Y	C	Y	
Turkey	TR	Y	A	N	
Ukraine	UA	Y	C/A <sup>3</sup>	Y	Q3-Q4/2006
United Kingdom	GB	Y <sup>#</sup>	A	N	
United Republic of Tanzania	TZ	N		N	

<sup>1</sup> Advanced level in biological areas.

<sup>2</sup> Core level for unexamined applications, advanced level for examined applications.

<sup>3</sup> Ukraine has provided an extensive list which cannot be reproduced here.

Country or Organization	Code	Questions 1 and 2	Questions 3 and 4	Question 5	Question 6
United States of America	US	Y <sup>#</sup>	A	N	
Uruguay <sup>*</sup>	UY		A		
Uzbekistan <sup>*</sup>	UZ		A		
Viet Nam <sup>*</sup>	VN		A	N	

[Annex IV follows]