

WIPO



IPC/CE/38/10

ORIGINAL: English

DATE: October 13, 2006

WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION
GENEVA

SPECIAL UNION FOR THE INTERNATIONAL PATENT CLASSIFICATION
(IPC UNION)

COMMITTEE OF EXPERTS

Thirty-Eighth Session
Geneva, October 9 to 13, 2006

REPORT

adopted by the Committee of Experts

INTRODUCTION

1. The Committee of Experts of the IPC Union (hereinafter referred to as “the Committee”) held its thirty-eighth session in Geneva from October 9 to 13, 2006. The following members of the Committee were represented at the session: Austria, Brazil, Canada, China, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Japan, Mexico, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States of America (26). Ukraine was represented as observer. The African Intellectual Property Organization (OAPI), the Eurasian Patent Organization (EAPO), and the European Patent Office (EPO) were also represented. The list of participants appears as Annex I to this report.

2. The session was opened by Mr. A. Bruun, Chair of the Committee. Mr. N. Wilson, Chief Information Officer and Director, IT Division, welcomed the participants on behalf of the Director General of WIPO.

OFFICERS

3. Mr. M. Makarov (WIPO) acted as Secretary of the session.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

4. The Committee unanimously adopted the agenda, which appears as Annex II to this report.

DISCUSSIONS, CONCLUSIONS AND DECISIONS

5. As decided by the Governing Bodies of WIPO at their tenth series of meetings held from September 24 to October 2, 1979 (see document AB/X/32, paragraphs 51 and 52), the report of this session reflects only the conclusions of the Committee (decisions, recommendations, opinions, etc.) and does not, in particular, reflect the statements made by any participant, except where a reservation in relation to any specific conclusion of the Committee was expressed or repeated after the conclusion was reached.

REPORT ON THE TWENTY-FOURTH SESSION OF THE ASSEMBLY OF THE IPC UNION

6. The Committee noted an oral report by the Secretariat on the twenty-fourth session of the Assembly of the IPC Union (see documents IPC/A/24/1 and IPC/A/24/2), held from September 25 to October 3, 2006. The Committee was informed that the Assembly had considered the IPC reform status report prepared by the International Bureau.
7. The Secretariat indicated that delegations of Member States which took the floor at the Assembly had expressed their appreciation of the excellent work carried out by the IPC Union and the International Bureau in the framework of IPC reform and pointed out that the basic period of IPC reform which had been successfully completed by WIPO had reached its principal objectives and had resulted in the creation of new search possibilities for all industrial property offices and users of patent information. The Assembly had taken note of the IPC reform status report.

REPORT ON THE SECOND SESSION OF THE IPC ADVANCED LEVEL SUBCOMMITTEE

8. The Committee noted an oral report by the Secretariat on the second session of the IPC Advanced Level Subcommittee (hereinafter referred to as "the ALS") (see document IPC/SC/2/10), in particular, that the ALS had completed revision and reclassification work of Projects A 001 and A 004, and that it had fixed the date of entering into force of this revision as of January 1, 2007. Project A 006 was expected to be completed by December 2006 and its date of entry into force was expected to be April 1, 2007. The Committee also noted that the ALS had included in the revision program of the advanced level two new projects emanating from Harmony projects.

9. The Committee was informed that the ALS had initiated the update of CONOPS, as foreseen in the IPC development program. The initial proposal would be submitted to Project SC 022 and all members of the IPC Union were invited to participate in the discussions. Finally, the Committee noted the decision of the ALS to monitor the reclassification in the areas where new IPC groups had been created in IPC-8 and where reclassification work had not been completed, in order to inform patent information users on the degree of completion of the backfile data stored in the MCD.

10. The Committee approved the actions of the ALS, in particular those related to the adoption of new schemes in the advanced level and the publication of new IPC versions.

COORDINATION OF IPC REVISION AND RECLASSIFICATION OF PATENT FILES

11. Discussions were based on document IPC/CE/38/2 containing a paper, prepared by the International Bureau, relating to the problem of reclassification of patent files in areas impacted by core level revision projects when one or more member offices of the ALS could not provide necessary resources for reclassification.

12. The Committee agreed with the conclusion of the International Bureau (see document IPC/CE/38/2, paragraphs 9 and 10) that the minimum requirements in respect of reclassification for entering into force of amendments to the core level of the IPC should be the same as for the advanced level, that is, reclassification of respective patent files of the PCT minimum documentation, although reclassification of patent collections outside the PCT minimum documentation should also be encouraged.

13. The Committee noted that at the fifteenth session of the Working Group, held in May/June 2006, several offices had volunteered to participate in reclassification of patent files in the framework of the core level revision Project C 432 (see document IPC/CE/38/2, paragraph 6). Following the International Bureau's request, a number of other offices agreed at the current session to join a group of offices participating in that reclassification.

14. The current composition of the group of participating offices was as follows:

- Brazil, China, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation and Sweden would reclassify their entire national documentation in the area covered by Project C 432;
- Finland, Germany, Greece, Israel, Japan, Mexico, the United Kingdom and the United States of America would reclassify patent families having a national priority;
- Norway would reclassify patent families having a priority application filed in Denmark, Iceland or Norway;

– China additionally indicated that they would also participate in the reclassification of the PCT minimum documentation;

– the EPO stated that they were considering the possibility of participating in the reclassification and would report their decision at the forthcoming session of the Working Group.

15. The Committee expressed its thanks to the offices which have agreed to participate in the reclassification of patent files under the important project in question and felt that an enlarged number of participating offices would allow to reclassify search files of the PCT minimum documentation and a number of national collections.

16. The Committee agreed that details of the work distribution should be agreed upon by the Working Group bearing in mind that reclassification under Project C 432 should be completed by the time of the entering into force of the next edition of the core level of the IPC.

17. The Committee agreed with the recommendation of the International Bureau that the Working Group should draw attention to the availability of resources for reclassification when carrying out revision of the core level (see document IPC/CE/38/2, paragraph 14) and decided to issue the following instruction to the Working Group:

“When considering revision requests which require reclassification of patent files for inclusion in the core level revision program, the Working Group should take into account the availability of resources for reclassification which will be needed as a result of revision. If such resources are not currently available, the Working Group should postpone consideration of the revision request until a solution for reclassification of patent files can be found.”

18. The Committee noted that, in view of this instruction, certain documents providing guidance for the Working Group, namely, “Revision Policy and Revision Procedure for the Reformed IPC” and “Working Procedure of the IPC Revision Working Group”, would require updating and requested the International Bureau to prepare update proposals in respect of those two documents with the view of consideration of those proposals at the next session of the Committee.

TREATMENT OF NON-RECLASSIFIED PATENT DOCUMENTS IN THE MASTER CLASSIFICATION DATABASE

19. Discussions were based on project file CE 381 containing a proposal by Sweden concerned with documents which would have outdated classification symbols in the Master Classification Database (MCD) because they have not been reclassified by respective offices following revision of the IPC (see Annex 1 to the project file).

20. According to the proposal, in order to provide such documents with appropriate classification symbols, the concept of the default transfer should be introduced for every group that was deleted, had its scope changed or received new subgroups. The proposal described a number of scenarios showing how that default transfer could be implemented.

21. In the course of discussions, several delegations felt that the proposal was difficult to implement since, in many cases, finding an appropriate place for the default transfer would be questionable and that the implementation of the proposal would introduce additional complexity in the IPC. It was also mentioned that, following the first revision of the advanced level of the IPC, outdated classification symbols would be retained in the MCD, for making the respective documents searchable, and that the document “Concept of Operations for the Reformed IPC (CONOPS)” would be revised to this effect.

22. In the opinion of other delegations, systematic application of the practice of retaining outdated symbols in the MCD for future revised versions of the advanced and core levels of the IPC would lead to a proliferation of various versions of the IPC which would be necessary for use in searching. This approach would create a situation where searching could become even more complex than in the pre-reformed IPC.

23. The Committee noted that the main problem concerned with documents which would have outdated classification symbols would arise when those symbols have been deleted as a result of revision and should be replaced by other appropriate symbols. It was indicated that the said problem appeared to be more important for the core level than for the advanced level because deleted advanced level symbols could be rolled up to their core level predecessors or would already have core level predecessors in the MCD, whereas rolling up of deleted core level symbols would not always be appropriate, for example, when it would lead to classification at subclass level.

24. The Committee finally agreed that treatment of non-reclassified patent documents in the MCD required further investigation and invited its members to submit comments to project file CE 381, on the proposal by Sweden, taking into consideration various opinions expressed during discussions at this session. The Committee agreed to reconsider this matter when sufficient experience with revision and reclassification of the reformed IPC was accumulated and on the basis of the comments received.

AMENDMENTS TO THE IPC

25. Discussions were based on Annexes 1 and 2 of project file CE 382 containing proposals of amendments to the IPC approved by the Working Group.

26. The Committee adopted the proposed amendments, which appear in the Technical Annexes to this report.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RESULTS OF THE REFORM IN THE IPC

27. Discussions were based on document IPC/CE/38/3 and the Annexes to this document relating to the implementation in the IPC of the reform results.

28. The Committee took note of the content of the Annexes, and, in particular, of the decisions taken by the Working Group and expressed its satisfaction with the work carried out. With respect to the continuing task “Elaboration of Classification Definitions”, the Committee noted that a total of 57 definition projects had been successfully completed both in English and in French. With respect to the task “Introduction of Residual Main Groups in IPC subclasses”, the Committee noted that for the majority of subclasses consensus had been reached and that only 100 subclasses require further consideration.

UPDATING OF IPC TRAINING EXAMPLES

29. Discussions were based on document IPC/CE/38/4.

30. The Committee noted, with satisfaction, that the Working Group, at its fifteenth session held in May/June 2006, had discussed the last set of pending training example projects, of which 14 projects have been completed in English and approved by the Working Group. These approved training examples would be made available after consideration by the Editorial Board.

31. The Committee was informed that the last pending project (Project TE 132 illustrating how to classify “Markush-type formulae”) would be considered at the sixteenth session of the Working Group.

32. The Committee also noted that the International Bureau had completed the preparation of the French version of 68 examples, which were now under review by French-speaking offices. The preparation of the French version for the remaining examples would be completed by the end of 2006. The whole collection of the training examples would be expected to be completed and published, in both languages, during the first quarter of 2007.

33. The Committee confirmed its decision taken at its previous session that the approved IPC training examples would be published in the form of Internet-based interactive IPC tutorials, which would also contain two separate sets of training examples – one for the core and one for the advanced level of the IPC.

34. The Committee recalled that the IPC tutorials provided necessary information for classification in an interactive manner by raising questions in several steps, to which the user would be requested to answer in the form of multiple choices. The system would indicate to the user whether his choice was correct and could give the correct answer if the user had difficulty to find it.

35. The Committee agreed with the recommendations made by the International Bureau, based on its experience accumulated during the introduction of 10 examples into the tutorials, that rapporteurs of training example projects should provide the International Bureau with proposals on alternatives of multiple choices for each of the steps currently presented in the tutorials (see document IPC/CE/38/4, paragraph 9), in order to better illustrate, for example, a classification rule.

36. Rapporteurs were requested to take the already introduced 10 tutorials by the International Bureau as prototypes (the prototypes can be found at <http://www.wipo.int/ipc-training/>) regarding how best to present multiple choices and submit their proposals to the corresponding training example projects on the e-forum by February 28, 2007.

37. The International Bureau would then introduce the examples into the tutorials incorporating the proposals to be submitted.

38. Finally, the Committee expressed its thanks to the Working Group for the considerable work done in the preparation of an important collection of updated training examples.

WORKING PROCEDURE OF THE SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE FOR THE SUPERVISION OF THE ADVANCED LEVEL

39. At its thirty-sixth session, held in February 2005, the Committee adopted a working procedure for the ALS (see Annex V to document IPC/CE/36/11). During the preparation of the first ALS regular session and during the session itself, held in March 2006, it was the view of the ALS that for some points the procedure was not explicit enough while in some other respects it could not be applied. Therefore, the ALS decided to initiate a revision of the said working procedure. At its second session, held in September 2006, the ALS adopted a revised procedure (see the Annex to document IPC/CE/38/5), which served as a basis for discussion.

40. The Committee adopted, with some amendments, the revised working procedure of the ALS which appears as Annex III to this report.

ORDER OF PRESENTATION OF CLASSIFICATION SYMBOLS

41. Discussions were based on document IPC/CE/38/6. In particular, the discussion confirmed that intellectual property offices follow different practices regarding the use of a “main classification” and the related use of the indicators “F” and “L” in ST.8 records of classification symbols. Several offices indicated that the classification symbol presented first has special significance for office internal purposes.

42. In view of the request of users of patent information, the Committee agreed to conduct a survey of the practices of intellectual property offices regarding the order of presentation of classification symbols. The International Bureau was asked to make available a draft version of a questionnaire by October 27, 2006. Offices were invited to submit comments by November 3, 2006, and to reply to the final version of the questionnaire by January 1, 2007. The International Bureau was requested to prepare a summary of the replies for discussion at the next session of the Committee.

43. With respect to conducting searches of patent literature for establishing a comprehensive state of the art, the Committee emphasized that such searches should never be limited to classification symbols that have assigned the indicator “F” in their respective ST.8 record. Such searches should always encompass all classification symbols relating to invention information.

44. The Committee agreed to postpone consideration of any further recommendations until the time when the results of the survey have been discussed at its next session.

45. Regarding the treatment of the “F” indicator in the MCD during reclassification of patent documents, the Delegation of the EPO explained the following:

- for cases where the reclassification can be automated because of a straightforward one-to-one relation between an old symbol and a new symbol in the Revision Concordance List, an “F” indicator allotted to an old symbol will also be allotted to the corresponding new symbol;

- for cases requiring intellectual reclassification, the attribution of the “F” indicator will follow the data as provided by the reclassifying office;

- for reclassifications done by the EPO, the reclassification will be based on the existing ECLA classifications of respective documents. Because the EPO does not use the “F” indicator of ECLA classifications, no such indicator will be attributed to documents reclassified in this way.

IMPLEMENTATION OF IPC REFORM

46. Discussions were based on document IPC/CE/38/7 mainly concerned with the Meeting on the Implementation of IPC Reform which was held in WIPO headquarters on July 3 and 4, 2006.

47. The Committee was informed that the purpose of the Meeting was to discuss the status of the technical implementation of the IPC at industrial property offices, to discover outstanding problems and to determine solutions therefor. Several presentations, relating to various aspects of the implementation of IPC reform, were made by the International Bureau, the EPO and national offices. A number of brief reports on the status of the implementation of IPC reform were also submitted by national offices. Those presentations and brief reports were available under the IT meetings/20060703 folder on the IBIS website. A summary of discussions at the Meeting appeared in Annex I to document IPC/CE/38/7.

48. The Committee was also informed that, in order to assist in preparations for the Meeting, a questionnaire had been sent to industrial property offices requesting information on the classification of patent documents according to the eighth edition, use of WIPO Standards ST.8 and ST.10/C, checking the validity of IPC symbols before publication of patent documents and use of the new features introduced by IPC reform in patent databases of industrial property offices. A survey of the implementation of IPC reform at industrial property offices, prepared by the International Bureau on the basis of replies to the above-mentioned questionnaire, was given in Annex II to document IPC/CE/38/7.

49. The Committee agreed that discussions at the Meeting provided ample information about the current state of the implementation of IPC reform in many industrial property offices and allowed to propose solutions to certain outstanding problems of IPC reform. The Committee expressed its gratitude to all offices which had participated in the Meeting.

50. In the course of discussions, several delegations provided additional replies to the above-mentioned questionnaire and some delegations submitted corrected information to the data included in the survey for their respective offices. On the basis of these submissions, the survey would be updated by the International Bureau.

51. The Delegation of Brazil informed the Committee that the Portuguese version of the eighth edition of the IPC had been prepared and published on the website of the National Institute of Industrial Property (INPI), Brazil.

52. At the request of the Meeting, the Committee considered the conclusions of the Meeting relating to the implementation of IPC reform and agreed that those conclusions gave an objective picture of the current state of IPC reform and included important recommendations for continuing the reform at its implementation stage.

53. The Committee adopted, with some changes, the conclusions as given below and agreed that they should serve as guidance for IPC bodies dealing with the IPC reform.

(a) IP offices are committed to IPC reform and most of the offices in industrialized countries have successfully implemented the reform. After the first months of the transitional period and deployment of modified administrative systems, the situation with the use of the reformed IPC has now stabilized and only a small number of classification errors can be detected in the classification data of offices, since the vast majority of offices have implemented the WIPO Standards ST.8 and ST.10/C and the symbol validation procedure. A few offices in industrialized countries that, for various reasons, have not yet fully implemented the reformed IPC plan to do it in the next few months. It should be noted that, in general, preparations of IP offices for the reformed IPC took two years.

(b) On the contrary, only a few IP offices in developing countries have started to use the reformed IPC or plan to do it in the near future. This is explained by various reasons: lack of necessary staff for modifying internal administrative systems and for training the examiners, difficulties in the stable access to the Internet, lack of portable carriers of the reformed IPC. Urgent measures should be taken in order to assist IP offices in developing countries in the implementation of the reformed IPC. Such measures should include production of portable carriers of the reformed IPC, provision of IT tools assisting in translation of the reformed IPC into national languages, organizing of training courses, provision of further informative materials on the reform.

(c) An important task for the near future would be the implementation of the new revision procedure, namely, preparation and publication of new versions of the advanced level of the IPC. The first such version, as planned, will enter into force on January 1, 2007. For this process, all necessary procedures, such as preparation of a new validity file, preparation of the French version of the amendments to the advanced level, reclassification of respective patent collections, should be done on time. Serious preparatory work will be needed to ensure smooth transition to the new version for IP Offices using the advanced level of the IPC.

(d) More attention should be paid to promotion of the reformed IPC to the users of patent information. The advantages of the new IPC for the users should be explained in much more detail and all queries of the users should be duly considered, replied and, if needed, necessary amendments to the procedures of the reformed IPC should be made. More information should be provided for the users both, by WIPO and IP Offices, and published on the Internet, as well as made available and distributed on other media.

RECLASSIFICATION OF PATENT FILES FOR A NEW VERSION OF THE ADVANCED LEVEL OF THE IPC

54. Discussions were based on document IPC/CE/38/8 presenting the results of the meeting between WIPO and the EPO on the reclassification of patent files for a new version of the advanced level.

55. The Committee noted the major steps of the reclassification procedure triggered by the IPC validity file, the Revision Concordance List file and a country table to be made available by the International Bureau for each revision of the advanced level of the IPC.

56. The Committee noted that working lists – the outcome of the automatic procedure performed by the EPO in the MCD – would be made available for downloading by industrial property offices on the WIPO website.

57. The Committee also noted that the International Bureau would receive reclassification results from offices through a central e-mail address. It was agreed that information about WIPO central IPC reclassification resources would be communicated by the International Bureau to IPC listservers.

58. The Committee requested its members to conform to reclassification exchange formats and specifications provided by the EPO and made available under the MCD folder on the WIPO IBIS website.

59. The Committee noted the elaboration of a reclassification schedule providing major milestones in the reclassification process for the IPC version 2007.01. The EPO indicated that a run of reclassification performed on a test version of the MCD confirmed their readiness to produce working lists for 2007.01 reclassification. The Committee also noted that, provisionally, misuse of the ST.8 “F” or “L” indicator would not affect the reclassification process.

60. Concerning the question of a date of availability of the French version of advanced level revision changes, the Secretariat indicated that the translation into French of those changes was progressing and, upon completion, would be submitted for checking by the Special Subcommittee for the Supervision of the French Version of the IPC. The Secretariat also indicated that the final French version could be ready nearly one month before the official publication and reminded of the possibility of publication of a provisional version, in case of difficulties in agreeing on the final translation into French of the adopted English version.

MASTER CLASSIFICATION DATABASE STATUS REPORT

61. Discussions were based on the paper made available by the EPO (to appear as document IPC/CE/38/9) describing IT developments in relation to the MCD.
62. The Delegation of the EPO informed the Committee that a second release of the MCD backfile DVD had been released in August 2006. The number and the quality of classification symbols of the eighth edition of the IPC have greatly increased in that second release of the backfile. The overall coverage of documents provided with symbols of the eighth edition was 90% of over 50,000,000 documents in the MCD backfile.
63. The Committee was also informed that currently 27 offices regularly provided classification data to the MCD frontfile. The overall coverage of documents bearing symbols of the eighth edition was 88% of more than 1,400,000 documents submitted to the MCD frontfile since January 1, 2006.
64. The Delegation of the EPO also reported of the EPO's proposal relating to a procedure for correcting symbols of the eighth edition which were submitted to the MCD. According to the proposal, such corrections should be sent to the MCD in one of the following ways:
- (a) when a correction of an IPC symbol results in an official republication, the data of the new publication should be sent and added to the patent family according to normal frontfile loading procedures;
 - (b) the corrected data could be sent to the MCD in a standard XML format conforming to the ep-ipcr-documents.dtd. This format consists of a publication number, application number and a set of IPC symbols.
65. The Committee thanked the EPO for having provided the MCD status report and expressed its appreciation with the increasing coverage of documents by the classification information of the eighth edition in the MCD. The Committee encouraged industrial property offices which have not yet started delivery of the bibliographic data to the MCD to begin sending this data as soon as possible. The Committee also requested its members to follow the EPO's proposal for correcting symbols of the eighth edition which were submitted to the MCD.

DEVELOPMENTS IN THE IT SUPPORT FOR THE REFORMED IPC

66. The International Bureau gave a presentation about new functionalities provided through various information systems and products made available to users of the reformed IPC since the last meeting of the Committee. The presentation covered production of the PDF version for the advanced level of the IPC, statistics of the reformed IPC, a new service related to IPC definitions, the IPC revision management system (RIPCIS), automation in the Internet publication preparation and a prototype of the Chinese language version of the categorization assistance in the IPC (IPCCAT).

67. The Committee noted a clarification about the IPC validity file, in particular with respect to interpretation of the specification and justification of its content with regard to a specific scenario for future IPC revisions.

68. In view of the number of information systems and products for the IPC requiring IT support by the International Bureau and the industrial property offices, the Committee was requested to consider a stabilization period during which new undertakings would be limited to the minimum possible extent.

69. The Committee expressed its gratitude to the International Bureau for the number of successful achievements in relation to the IT support for the IPC, despite the size of the IT Operations support team and the numerous tasks to be conducted.

NEXT SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE

70. The Committee noted the tentative dates of its next session:

Geneva, February 26 to March 1, 2007.

*71. This report was unanimously adopted
by the Committee at its closing meeting on
October 13, 2006.*

[Annexes follow]

ANNEXE I/ANNEX I

LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS/
LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

I. ÉTATS MEMBRES/MEMBER STATES

(dans l'ordre alphabétique des noms français des États/
in the alphabetical order of the names in French of the States)

ALLEMAGNE/GERMANY

Klaus HÖFKEN, Head of Classification Systems Section, German Patent and Trade Mark Office, Munich

AUTRICHE

Burkhard SCHLECHTER, Expert, Austrian Patent Office, Vienna

BRÉSIL/BRAZIL

Antonio ABRANTES, Patent Examiner, Ministry of Development, Industry and Foreign Trade, National Institute of Industrial Property (INPI), Rio de Janeiro

Cristiano BERBERT, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

CANADA

John DOWDING, examinateur principal en classification de brevets, Office de la propriété intellectuelle du Canada, Gatineau

CHINE/CHINA

LI Jianrong (Ms.), Director General, Patent Documentation Department, State Intellectual Property Office of the People's Republic of China, Beijing

NA Ying, (Mrs.), Deputy Director, Patent Documentation Department, Research Division, State Intellectual Property Office of the People's Republic of China, Beijing

CROATIE/CROATIA

Gordana RICIJAŠ (Mrs.), Patent Examiner for Section C, State Intellectual Property Office of the Republic of Croatia, Zagreb

DANEMARK/DENMARK

Birthe BJERREGAARD OLESEN (Mrs.), Senior Examiner, Danish Patent and Trademark Office, Ministry of Trade and Industry, Taastrup

ÉGYPTE/EGYPT

Nivin EL ASKARY (Mrs.), General Manager, Egyptian Patent Office, Academy of Scientific Research and Technology (ASRT), Cairo

ESPAGNE/SPAIN

Amaya EZCURRA (Sra.), Técnico Superior Examinador de Patentes, Departamento de Patentes e Información Tecnológica, Oficina Española de Patentes y Marcas (OEPM), Ministerio de Industria, Turismo y Comercio, Madrid

ÉTATS-UNIS D'AMÉRIQUE/UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Terrence MACKEY, International Patent Classifier, United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO), Department of Commerce, Alexandria

FÉDÉRATION DE RUSSIE/RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Gennady NENAKHOV, Head of Information Resources Development Department, Federal Service for Intellectual Property, Russian Agency for Patents and Trademarks (ROSPATENT), Moscow

Gennady NEGULYAEV, Chief Researcher of Information Resources Development Department, Federal Service for Intellectual Property, Russian Agency for Patents and Trademarks (ROSPATENT), Moscow

FINLANDE/FINLAND

Ritva AALTO (Mrs.), Senior Examiner, Patents and Innovations Line, National Board of Patents and Registration of Finland, Helsinki

FRANCE

Michèle LYON (Mme), chargée de mission au Département des brevets, Institut national de la propriété industrielle (INPI), Paris

IRLANDE/IRELAND

Michael LYDON, Head, Patent Examination, Patents Office, Kilkenny

JAPON/JAPAN

Yoshihiro FUJI, Director, Patent Examination Policy Planning Office, Administrative Affairs Division, First Patent Examination Department, Japan Patent Office (JPO), Tokyo

Takamasa MARUYAMA, Deputy Director, Patent Classification Policy Planning Section, Administrative Affairs Division, First Patent Examination Department, Japan Patent Office (JPO), Tokyo

MEXIQUE/MEXICO

Mauricio CABALLERO GALVÁN, Especialista en Propiedad Industrial, Biotecnología, Instituto Mexicano de la Propiedad Industrial (IMPI), México

NORVÈGE/NORWAY

Olav A. AASEN, Head of Section, Electricity, Physics and Fixed Constructions, Patent Department, Norwegian Patent Office, Oslo

PAYS-BAS/NETHERLANDS

Robert SCHOUWENAARS, Patent Examiner, Netherlands Patent Office, Rijswijk

PORTUGAL

Sofia RODRIGUES (Ms.), Patent Examiner, Patent and Utility Model Department, National Institute of Industrial Property (INPI), Ministry of Economy, Lisbon

Jorge Alberto RODRIGUES ALVIM, Director, Information, National Institute of Industrial Property (INPI), Ministry of Economy, Lisbon

RÉPUBLIQUE DE CORÉE/REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Sang-Hyun BYUN, Deputy Director, Patent Examination Policy Team, Korean Intellectual Property Office (KIPO), Daejeon

PARK Jooik, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

RÉPUBLIQUE TCHÈQUE/CZECH REPUBLIC

Radomír NAHODIL, Patent Examiner, Industrial Property Office of the Czech Republic, Prague

ROUMANIE/ROMANIA

Ion VASILESCU, Industrial Property Specialist, State Office for Inventions and Trademarks (OSIM), Bucharest

Mariela-Luminița HĂULICĂ (Mrs.), Head, Chemistry Division, State Office for Inventions and Trademarks (OSIM), Bucharest

ROYAUME-UNI/UNITED KINGDOM

Martin PRICE, Senior Examiner, Patents Directorate, The Patent Office, Newport

SUÈDE/SWEDEN

Anders BRUUN, Patent Expert, Swedish Patent and Registration Office, Stockholm

SUISSE/SWITZERLAND

Kaspar AMSLER, chef examen, Division des brevets, Institut fédéral de la propriété intellectuelle, Berne

TURQUIE/TURKEY

Cemil BAŞPINAR, Junior Patent Examiner, Turkish Patent Institute, Ankara

II. ÉTAT OBSERVATEUR/OBSERVER STATE

UKRAINE

Oleksandr BRAGARNYK, Senior Examiner, Examination Division, Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine, State Department of Intellectual Property, Ukrainian Industrial Property Institute (UKRPATENT), Kyiv

Nataliya KOVINYA (Ms.), Senior Examiner, Pharmaceutical Division, Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine, State Department of Intellectual Property, Ukrainian Industrial Property Institute (UKRPATENT), Kyiv

III. ORGANISATIONS INTERGOUVERNEMENTALES/
INTERGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

OFFICE EUROPÉEN DES BREVETS (OEB)/EUROPEAN PATENT OFFICE (EPO)

Heiko WONGEL, Director *ad interim*, Classification, Rijswijk

ORGANISATION AFRICAINE DE LA PROPRIÉTÉ INTELLECTUELLE (OAPI)/
AFRICAN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION (OAPI)

Idrissa CISSOKO, ingénieur examinateur en mécanique, Yaoundé

ORGANISATION EURASIENNE DES BREVETS (OEAB)/EURASIAN PATENT
ORGANIZATION (EAPO)

Dmitriy ROGOZHIN, Director, Formal Examination Department, Moscow

Victor SURIKOV, Specialist, Automation Department, Moscow

IV. BUREAU/OFFICERS

Président/Chair: Anders BRUUN (Suède/Sweden)
Vice-présidente/Vice-Chair: NA Ying (Mme/Mrs.) (Chine/China)
Secrétaire/Secretary: Mikhail MAKAROV (OMPI/WIPO)

V. BUREAU INTERNATIONAL DE L'ORGANISATION MONDIALE DE LA
PROPRIÉTÉ INTELLECTUELLE (OMPI)/INTERNATIONAL BUREAU OF THE
WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION (WIPO)

Neil WILSON (directeur des services informatiques/Chief Information Officer and Director), Division de l'informatique/IT Division; Mikhail MAKAROV (directeur par intérim/Acting Director), Division de l'information en matière de brevets, de la classification et des normes relatives à la propriété industrielle/Patent Information, Classification and IP Standards Division; Antonios FARASSOPOULOS (chef de la Section de la classification internationale des brevets (CIB)/Head, International Patent Classification (IPC) Section); Patrick FIÉVET (chef de la Section des opérations et de l'appui informatiques/Head, IT Operations and Support Section); Lutz MAILÄNDER (administrateur principal de la classification des brevets à la Section de la classification internationale des brevets (CIB)/Senior Patent Classification Officer, International Patent Classification (IPC) Section); XU Ning (Mme/Mrs.) (administratrice de la classification en matière de brevets à la Section de la classification internationale des brevets (CIB)/Patent Classification Officer, International Patent Classification (IPC) Section), Mónica MOLÉS (Mlle/Ms.) (consultante à la Section des opérations et de l'appui informatique/Consultant, IT Operations and Support Section)

[L'annexe II suit/
Annex II follows]

ANNEX II

AGENDA

	<u>Paragraphs</u> (Annexes)
1. Opening of the session	2 (I)
2. Adoption of the agenda	4 (II)
3. Report on the twenty-fourth session of the Assembly of the IPC Union	6, 7
4. Report on the second session of the IPC Advanced Level Subcommittee	8 – 10
5. Coordination of IPC revision and reclassification of patent files See document IPC/CE/38/2.	11 – 18
6. Treatment of non-reclassified patent documents in the Master Classification Database See project CE 381.	19 – 24
7. Amendments to the IPC See project CE 382.	25, 26
8. Implementation of the results of the reform in the IPC See document IPC/CE/38/3.	27, 28
9. Updating of IPC training examples See document IPC/CE/38/4.	29 – 38
10. Working procedure of the Special Subcommittee for the Supervision of the Advanced Level See document IPC/CE/38/5 and its Suppl.1.	39, 40 (III)
11. Order of presentation of classification symbols See document IPC/CE/38/6.	41 – 45
12. Implementation of IPC reform See document IPC/CE/38/7.	46 – 53

	<u>Paragraphs</u> (Annexes)
13. Reclassification of patent files for a new version of the advanced level of the IPC See document IPC/CE/38/8.	54 – 60
14. Master Classification Database Status Report See document IPC/CE/38/9.	61 – 65
15. Developments in the IT support for the reformed IPC Presentation by the International Bureau	66 – 69
16. Next session of the Committee	70
17. Adoption of the report of the session	71
18. Closing of the session	

[Annex III follows]

ANNEX III

REVISED WORKING PROCEDURE OF THE SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE
FOR THE SUPERVISION OF THE ADVANCED LEVEL
(Replaces Annex V to document IPC/CE/36/11)

1. The succeeding statements and procedure supplement the procedure set forth in “Revision Policy and Revision Procedure for the Reformed IPC” (see Annex IV to document IPC/CE/33/12) and in Section 2.5.1 of Concept of Operations for the Reformed IPC (CONOPS).

2. The following procedure for the Special Subcommittee for the Supervision of the Advanced Level (hereinafter referred to as “ALS”) is designed to accomplish the goals of the reformed IPC in the most cost-effective manner possible. It is intended to optimize resources and accelerate creation of definitions by coordinating core and advanced level revision projects. Accordingly, the ALS procedure conforms to the following principles:

(a) taking advantage, to the maximum extent possible, of existing document classification data within ECLA, FI and USPC classification places in reclassification work performed by ALS;

(b) taking advantage, of the work done in harmonizing ECLA, FI and USPC (Harmony projects);

(c) avoiding redundant intellectual work done by the ALS and the IPC Revision Working Group (IPC/WG);

(d) ensuring the quality of the advanced level, i.e., ensure consistency between the scope of classification places and the patent documents classified therein;

(e) responding quickly to emerging technologies to ensure the reformed IPC is an effective search tool;

(f) maximizing the use of equivalent titles or definitions within existing ECLA, FI and USPC classification places when revising the IPC;

(g) prioritizing the reclassification work on IPC revision projects based on the expected availability of resources at the offices performing the reclassification work;

(h) completing the reclassification of documents in approved advanced level areas within the shortest practicable time frame given constraints at each ALS office in order to facilitate prior art searches at all offices and maintain search file integrity.

WORKING PROCEDURE OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE

3. The members of the ALS will communicate in an appropriate way (see paragraph 4, below) to continuously evaluate revision proposals, prioritize reclassification work for IPC revision projects and approve advanced level revision projects. IPC advanced level (A) projects that require reclassification of the backfile can only be approved if all ALS offices agree on the usefulness from a cost/benefit perspective. Newly proposed projects that merely clarify wordings of existing advanced level classification places and with no significant document reclassification work required will be approved whenever a majority of ALS offices deem them useful.

4. The ALS will have two regular sessions per year, combined with the meetings of the Working Group on Classification of the Trilateral Offices. These sessions will be chaired by the hosting Office which will also be responsible for the preparation of the report. At these sessions, the following standard items should be considered:

- (a) evaluation of new revision requests for the advanced level;
- (b) creation of new A revision projects, appointment of Rapporteurs, prioritization of these projects according to available resources;
- (c) creation of new core level (C) revision projects, if an A project has an impact on the core level, i.e., requires reclassification at the core level;
- (d) adoption of A revision projects;
- (e) programming of reclassification for adopted projects and of preparation of new advanced level versions (decisions on the date when the amendments relating to an adopted project will enter into force).

The sessions will be numbered, in order to keep a track of decisions, in particular as to adoption of projects in relation to RIPCIS.

5. Extraordinary sessions can take place, if needed, during sessions of the Committee of Experts (IPC/CE), of the IPC/WG or by electronic communication (e.g., on the listserver, by e-mail or teleconference) in order to consider urgent matters that could not be settled during ordinary sessions. These sessions will be numbered only if needed in relation to RIPCIS. For example, matters like correction of errors, improvements in the IPC or adoption of definitions can be handled during extraordinary sessions.

6. All revision requests for the advanced level will be accompanied by the corresponding form indicating the reasons for the request, statistical data (available in Harmony projects) and the revision proposal and will be posted to the e-forum.

7. At each regular session the ALS will review all pending advanced level revision requests in accordance with the criteria set forth in the document “Revision Policy and Revision Procedure for the Reformed IPC” (see Annex IV to document IPC/CE/33/12). A current list of all active A projects will be available on the IPC e-forum.
8. Advanced level revision proposals should comply with the IPC revision rules disclosed in the “Guidelines for Revision of the IPC” (see Annex V to IPC/CE/37/9) and in the *Guide to the IPC*. For example, standard wordings and correct order of items should be used in notes, informative references should not appear in classification schemes but only in definitions. In C projects, checking for such compliance is performed by commenting offices in the course of a project and during sessions of the IPC/WG. For A projects, the International Bureau (IB) will check for such compliance and inform the Rapporteur of the A project about possible corrections, before the proposal is submitted to the e-forum for discussion.
9. The IPC/WG will not undertake, without prior consultation with the ALS, any revision work in areas of the IPC where A projects are considered by the ALS. In consultation with the IPC/WG, the ALS may assume responsibility for a CL revision project under consideration by the IPC/WG when this revision project has an impact on an A revision project, in order to avoid redundant work by the ALS and the IPC/WG.
10. For the purposes of planning the reclassification work required for any revision project, the ALS will review and prioritize on a half-yearly basis all IPC revision requests approved by either the IPC/WG or the ALS. Priority will be assigned on the basis of the availability of reclassification resources at ALS offices for any revision project requiring reclassification of documents. In recognition that situations regarding reclassification resources can change, the relative priority of the reclassification work may be changed at any time upon agreement of all ALS offices.
11. The following procedure will be used for each revision project for which the ALS has responsibility:
 - (a) The ALS evaluates revision requests for the advanced level on the basis of the revision criteria established by the IPC/CE and on the cost/benefit aspects. On the basis of this outcome the requests are either approved (i.e., included in the advanced level revision program) or kept for later technical review, or rejected. If a revision request is rejected, the ALS should provide an explanation for the rejection.
 - (b) If an advanced level revision request is approved, the IB will create an A project file on the IPC e-forum and will notify the IPC/WG of the advanced level project.

(c) If proposed amendments to the advanced level include substantial modifications, i.e. requiring reclassification, of the core level (for example, creation of a new subclass, reorganization of an existing subclass or creation of new groups in the core level) the core level part of the revision proposal will be sent to the IPC/WG for consideration and a corresponding C project will be created. Relevant definitions (new or amended) will also be submitted at the same time. In order to avoid delays in the revision procedure, the core level part should be submitted to the IPC/WG at an early stage of a Harmony project, when amendments to the provisional scheme can be made before starting of testing of the provisional scheme. The IPC/WG will be requested to assign the highest priority to consideration of the core level part of A projects. After completion of the consideration of the core level part of A projects, the results will be submitted to the IPC/CE for adoption. If a solution approved by the IPC/WG contradicts the philosophy of the project, the ALS may hold an extraordinary session, and ask the IPC/WG to postpone making a decision until a suitable compromise can be achieved. In the meantime, the provisional advanced level scheme and definitions, as initially proposed to the IPC/WG will continue to be used in the advanced level.

(d) If proposed amendments in an A project include only editorial modifications to the core level which do not require reclassification of patent documents at the core level, for example, changing of wordings of core level entries without scope modification at the core level, the core level part of the revision proposal can be considered and adopted by the ALS in the framework of the A project. The ALS will regularly transmit to the IPC/CE, for approval, a list of all such editorial amendments to the core level.

(e) For each new A project the ALS will appoint a Rapporteur. In case of requests emanating from an ALS Office (e.g., emanating from a Harmony project), this Office will be appointed as Rapporteur. The same applies to the C projects referred to in paragraph 11(c), above.

(f) The Rapporteur will communicate the initial proposal to the IB in order to make the necessary editorial corrections mentioned in paragraph 8, above. The corrected initial proposal will be posted by the Rapporteur to the corresponding A (or C if needed) project on the e-forum, for comments.

(g) If new definitions, or amendments of existing definitions, are needed in the framework of the A project, a proposal for definitions will be submitted and discussed simultaneously with the revision proposal. Subclass definitions may also be discussed in the same way if they are needed for the use of the proposed scheme. If subclass definitions are not necessary for the use of the proposed scheme, they may be submitted to the corresponding, existing or to be created, D project. The same applies to the C projects referred to in the paragraph 11(c), above.

(h) The Rapporteur will identify any active IPC/WG projects that may directly or indirectly overlap with the advanced level project and will notify the IB accordingly. These projects include revision projects (e.g., rewording of titles in the core level scheme), maintenance projects, subclass definition projects, or projects creating notes in related subclasses.

(i) After this notification, the IPC/WG will not initiate new core level revision projects and will suspend or redistribute work on any existing project, or part of a project, that could overlap with the advanced level project (except those indicated in paragraph 11(c), above), until work is concluded on the advanced level project. In the situations where work must continue on core level projects that overlap with projects in the advanced level, the IPC/WG and the ALS will agree to distribute work in such a way that work done on one project does not overlap with the work done on the other project. After conclusion of the advanced level project, the IPC/WG will reevaluate and determine if any related projects that were suspended should continue, be modified, or cancelled.

(j) Within the established time period (two months), offices can submit their comments on the proposed scheme and definitions. Taking into account the comments submitted, the Rapporteur will establish within one month a new version of the scheme and definitions. In view of the fixed sessions of the ALS and the fixed dates of publication of new versions of the advanced level, the same deadlines will be established for all active A projects, e.g., deadlines for comments or rapporteur reports, using a similar practice as in C projects. In exceptional cases, additional deadlines for some projects could be fixed directly by the Rapporteurs.

(k) As soon as possible, the ALS offices will divide the list of patent documents to be reclassified. They will test the provisional scheme by placing documents and propose amendments to the scheme based on this testing, if appropriate.

(l) Several rounds of comments followed by a rapporteur report, with possibly a modified proposal, might be required.

(m) When the Rapporteur considers, on the basis of the submitted comments and the testing of the scheme, that the discussion on the project is completed, the Rapporteur will submit the project to the following regular session of the ALS for adoption. This submission should include the final version of the scheme and definitions needed for the use of the scheme (since one of the primary goals of the definitions is to ensure harmonization of future document placement while accurately reflecting the existing backfile), as well as a Revision Concordance List (RCL) containing instructions for reclassification and the list of amended cross-references.

(n) The ALS may adopt, adopt provisionally or return to the Rapporteur the proposed scheme with its associated definitions and the RCL.

(o) In case of adoption the ALS will set the date of entering into force of the new scheme, based on the availability of resources for reclassification.

(p) The ALS will provisionally adopt a project if there are minor, essentially technical, questions that cannot be solved during the regular session in the absence of technical experts, or if further work is needed on definitions and the RCL. These questions should be solved as soon as possible and the final adoption made at an extraordinary session of the ALS. In case of provisional adoption, the date of entering into force should be set as indicated in paragraph 11(o), above, taking also into account the time needed for the preparation of the final amendments and the final adoption at the extraordinary session.

(q) The ALS may consider that a project is not ready for adoption in which case instructions should be given to the Rapporteur on the necessary actions for the continuation of the project.

(r) When a project is completed, the finally adopted scheme and definitions will be forwarded to the Special Subcommittee for the French version and to the IB for the preparation of the corresponding French version.

(s) Remaining documents will normally be reclassified into the final scheme within the period indicated in CONOPS after the official adoption of the scheme.

[Technical Annexes follow]

TECHNICAL ANNEXES

ANNEX 1EF A23B [Project-Rapporteur : M012/IB] <CE38>

adopt M Note
CL 7/06 < Advanced-to-core >
CL

ANNEX 2E C07C [Project-Rapporteur : M012/IB] <CE38>

adopt M Note
CL C07C
only

1. In this subclass ---

- --- one acyclic chain;
- "quinones" are compounds derived from compounds containing a six-membered aromatic ring or a system comprising six-membered aromatic rings (which system may be condensed or not condensed) by replacing two or four >CH groups of the six-membered aromatic rings by >C(=O) groups, and by removing one or two carbon-to-carbon double bonds, respectively, and rearranging the remaining carbon-to-carbon double bonds to give a ring or ring system with alternating double bonds, including the carbon-to-oxygen bonds; this means that acenaphthenequinone or camphorquinone are not considered as quinones. [5]

2. Attention is drawn ---

adopt M Note
AL C07C

1. In this subclass ---

- --- one acyclic chain;
- "quinones" are compounds derived from compounds containing a six-membered aromatic ring or a system comprising six-membered aromatic rings (which system may be condensed or not condensed) by replacing two or four >CH groups of the six-membered aromatic rings by >C(=O) groups, and by removing one or two carbon-to-carbon double bonds, respectively, and rearranging the remaining carbon-to-carbon double bonds to give a ring or ring system with alternating double bonds, including the carbon-to-oxygen bonds; this means that acenaphthenequinone or camphorquinone are not considered as quinones. [5]

2. Attention is drawn ---

ANNEX 3E C09J [Project-Rapporteur : M012/IB] <CE38>

adopt M Note
CL C09J

--- in groups **C09J 123/06** and **C09J 127/06**.

~~← Note 4 Deleted →~~

~~← Note 5 Deleted →~~

adopt N Note
CL 101/00-
201/00

1. In groups **C09J 101/00-C09J 201/00**, any macromolecular constituent of an adhesive composition which is not identified by the classification according to Note (3) after the title of subclass **C09J**, and the use of which is determined to be novel and non-obvious, must also be classified in a group chosen from groups **C09J 101/00-C09J 201/00**. [8]
2. Any macromolecular constituent of an adhesive composition which is not identified by the classification according to Note (3) after the title of subclass **C09J** or Note (1) above, and which is considered to represent information of interest for search, may also be classified in a group chosen from groups **C09J 101/00-C09J 201/00**. This can, for example, be the case when it is considered of interest to enable searching of adhesive compositions using a combination of classification symbols. Such non-obligatory classification should be given as "additional information". [8]

ANNEX 4E C11B [Project-Rapporteur : M012/IB] <CE38>

adopt M Title PRODUCING (~~pressing, extraction~~), e.g. BY PRESSING RAW MATERIALS OR BY
CL EXTRACTION FROM WASTE MATERIALS, REFINING OR PRESERVING FATS, FATTY
SUBSTANCES (~~e.g. lanolin~~), e.g. LANOLIN, FATTY OILS OR WAXES, INCLUDING
EXTRACTION FROM WASTE MATERIALS ; ESSENTIAL OILS ; PERFUMES (drying-
oils C09F)

ANNEX 5E F28F [Project-Rapporteur : M013/IB] <CE38>

adopt M 27/00 Control arrangements or safety devices specially adapted for heat-exchange or heat-
CL transfer apparatus

[End of Technical Annexes and of document]