

# OMPI



IPC/CE/28/2  
ORIGINAL : anglais  
DATE : 8 février 1999

F

ORGANISATION MONDIALE DE LA PROPRIÉTÉ INTELLECTUELLE  
GENÈVE

UNION PARTICULIÈRE POUR LA CLASSIFICATION INTERNATIONALE DES BREVETS  
(UNION DE L'IPC)

## COMITÉ D'EXPERTS

Vingt-huitième session  
Genève, 1<sup>er</sup> - 5 mars 1999

RECOMMANDATIONS DU SÉMINAIRE DE HAUT NIVEAU SUR LA CIB  
ET DU GROUPE SPÉCIAL

*Document établi par le Bureau international*

1. Les annexes 1 à 8 du présent document contiennent les propositions concernant la mise en œuvre des recommandations du Séminaire de haut niveau sur la CIB présentées par les membres ci-après du groupe spécial créé par le séminaire : Allemagne, Espagne, États -Unis d'Amérique, Fédération de Russie, Japon, Portugal, Royaume -Uni et Suède.

2. L'annexe 9 du présent document contient un plan d'action pour la mise en œuvre des recommandations du séminaire établi par le Bureau international sur la base de ces propositions.

3. *Le comité d'experts est invité à adopter le plan d'action proposé à l'annexe 9.*

[Les annexes suivent]

## ANNEX 1/ANNEXE 1

<b>DEUTSCHES PATENT- UND MARKENAMT</b> German Patent and Trademark Office	<b>IPC Taskforce</b> Date : 18.01.1999
<b>DE - Contribution</b> <b>Comments and Proposals</b>	

**Re: Document IPC/SEM/98/11 (Report), paras. 24 to 27 and 34**

### **Introduction**

If the IPC should survive in the new millennium, i.e. in the electronic age, it is necessary to undertake some modifications in the revision policy and revision procedure. Along that the IPC Advanced Seminar has put down a list of recommendations which had to be further elaborated.

The comments and proposals are made on the basis of the paras. 24 to 27 of the report, document IPC/SEM/98/11.

### **IPC general structure and principles**

#### ***As to par. 24 a)***

It seems to be necessary having a transitional revision period to prepare the IPC, its policy and revision, for the next millennium, i.e. for the electronic age.

#### ***As to par. 24 b)***

Indeed, the IPC revision policy has to be adapted to the new electronic circumstances. Since fundamental changes are concerned the modification of the IPC Revision Policy as proposed by Netherlands Industrial Property Office should be considered and elaborated by a working group (WG).

#### ***As to par. 24 c)***

We appreciate very much illustrating the IPC entries by examples. The IPC will then become more user-friendly.

Par. 26 d) "Introduce in IPC entries more technical terms illustrating the contents of the entry". seems to be in close relation with this paragraph, One could imagine adding the technical term by "e.g.". We think this subparagraph should be better placed under paragraph 24.

Both actions will increase the consistency in the application of the IPC (see also par. 24 g).

#### ***As to par. 24 d)***

We feel it necessary creating such a Working Group, therefore the IPC/Committee could do it at its next meeting.

**As to par. 24 e)**

The last place rule and the precedence references were introduced in the IPC to limit the paper search file. Because of the increase and unlimitedness of electronic search files these restrictions are no longer needed. But such a decision cannot be taken ad hoc it has to be investigated by a WG.

**As to par. 24 f)**

In view of the increasing use of databases and the change from paper search files to electronic search files we feel it necessary that indexing codes should become obligatory. Moreover, the introduction of indexing schemes which can also be universally used should be considered.

**As to par. 24 g)**

In relation with this paragraph we see also the revision of the Guide in the light of clear wording and instructions in order to apply the IPC correctly.

## **Revision period and implementation of the results of the revision**

**As to par. 25 a)**

Because of the rapidly increasing development, the present situation, i.e. the five years period, does not fulfil the needs neither of the searcher nor of the classifier.

A three years period would pay regard to the technological development, i.e. finished projects covering new technology would then earlier be available.

It should be considered whether intermediate issuing of adopted entries (approved by IPC/CE), e.g. every year, would improve the use of the IPC as search tool. Of course, these entries can only be semi-official.

**As to par. 25 b)**

At present there is no co-operation at all between the IPC/Committee and the SCIT. Both bodies should get at least information from each other about planning and results. This could be reflected in the agenda of the meeting of each body.

**As to par. 25 c), d)**

Both items can only be elaborated by a WG

## **Revision procedure**

**As to par. 26 b)**

To accelerate revision work the rapporteur's mandate should be enhanced, e.g. the rapporteur should be authorised to ask for further comments. It should be the task of the rapporteur to say when a project is ready to be discussed in a meeting. We think only those projects should be put on the agenda of a meeting which "*are almost ready for adoption*". This would improve the effectiveness of the meeting.

***As to par. 26 c)***

Besides that, the Working Group for IPC Revision should also be given the competence for

- extending the scope of running projects
- determining the number of projects to be dealt with in one session.

***As to par. 26 e)***

This recommendation has to be elaborated by a WG.

Introduction of entries for novel technology should have priority over further subdivision of existing groups. The latter should be handled with care when revising.

In relation with this recommendation we think "the Criteria for the Selection of IPC Revision Projects" should be reconsidered since for an electronic search file it is not urgent to revise an entry if it contains more than 300 documents.

***As to par. 27 a)***

This item has to be seen in particular with respect to not satisfactorily classified PCT documents.

***As to par. 27 b)***

Improved IPC training should not be limited to developing countries but should also include the "established" Patent Offices.

**General Outlook**

Finally we like to suggest that the session work should be supported by modern means, e.g. by computer and projector for displaying the screen on the wall. Proposals could then be displayed at once, results easier be obtained, e.g. by comparison with the existing wording and approved of. By this it would be easier to focus on the core of the problems We believe that such means would improve the work during the session.

[Annex 2 follows/  
L'annexe 2 suit]

## ANNEX 2/ANNEXE 2

January 13, 1999  
 Shin Ueno  
 Director, R&D Office  
 for Patent Information  
 Japanese Patent Office

## JP Proposal

### Introduction

1. In the IPC advanced seminar held in Newport last December, many Offices pointed out that the existing IPC system had some difficulties as search tool in the electronic age. And all Offices had recognized the existing IPC system did not cope with the electronic documents and electronic search tool. After all, all Offices agreed that a classification system which did not depend on the language, would have an advantage to the word search system and should be developed for the electronic age.
2. First of all, let's check the situation what kind of search tool could use for the patent documents published by each office at present. And after that, look for the solutions to the difficulties in the electronic age that almost all documents were digitized. Through this process, the way to get the solution for the existing IPC system i.e. revision period, indexing system e.t.c. will automatically appear.

### Number of Patent documents in 1996 and Non-IPC search tool for them

3. Fig.1 is the list of top 10s for the number of A-publication which was made from the WIPO statistics for the patent application in 1996. (US : grant, JP: almost all had published as PAJ)

#### IP/STAT/1996/A & PCT statistics(1996)

Offices	applications	grants	A-publication		non-IPC search tool
				percent	
<Total>	3613 925	809 414	3501 997		
Japan	401 251	215 100	401251	11.5%	FI, J-term
Germany	155 095	55 444	155095	4.4%	ECLA
United Kingdom	129 353	44 335	129353	3.7%	ECLA
Republic of Korea	113 994	16 516	113994	3.3%	
United States of America	223 419	109 646	109646	3.1%	USC, ECLA
France	98 508	49 245	98508	2.8%	ECLA
European Patent Office	86 614	40 069	86614	2.5%	ECLA
Spain	83 983	19 817	83983	2.4%	
Sweden	83 441	18 983	83441	2.4%	
Italy	80 852	37 935	80852	2.3%	

Fig. 1

4. Fig.1 shows that the office publishing a great volume of patent documents (JPO) and the office using its own classification system (USPTO) have non-IPC search tools (FI and USC), and many kind of documents are covered by ECLA.

Considering the fact that FI which has about 185,000 classification symbols and ECLA which has about 120,000 classification symbols are developing on the IPC, and both have the experiences and open to the public use ( Search for Japanese patent documents using FI will open to the public free of charge this March in the Internet ) , it will be the most realistic solution that these classifications should be taken account for the development of IPC system.

Difficulties and possible solutions proposed

5. In the last IPC advanced seminar, many Offices pointed out the difficulties and proposed possible solutions as shown in the Table.

(1) Growth of the Documentaion (SE)	Global Indexing (SE) Obligatory Indexing (GB)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Consider the indexing system for a rapid revision procedure</li> <li>- Consider two step revision process for a stability of the IPC system</li> <li>- Support the proposals</li> <li>- Consider the development of the electronic concordance system</li> <li>- Support the proposal</li> <li>- Support the proposal</li> </ul>
(2) High cost of Indexing (US)	Automated classification (US)	
(3) Slow reaction to advancing technology (GB)	Shorten revision period (US e.t.c.)	
(4) Long revision period (US)		
(5) Classifications containing too many or too few documents (US)		
(6) Difficulty of reclassification (RU e.t.c.)	Automated classification (US)	
(7) Instability of classification system (EP,JP)	Frozen IPC system (EP) Extend revision period (JP)	
(8) Inconsistent placement of patent documents (US)	Provide rules of placement e.t.c. (US) Investigate automated tools (US)	
(9) Not apply latest complete IPC (GB)		
(10) No use of patent family information (US)		
(11) Not reclassify the backfile of patent documents (US)	Automated classification (US)	
(12) Slow and cumbersome revision process (SE)	Give the rapporteur a more active role (SE)	
(13) No interface between SCIT and the IPC (US)	Establish a close cooperation (US)	

Table

The themes of these solutions can roughly summarize as follows;

- Indexing [(1),(2)],
- Revision period [(3) – (5)]
- Consistency of IPC [(7) – (10)]
- Reclassification [(6),(10)]
- Revision procedure e.t.c. [(12),(13)]

6. These themes should not be dealt with separately because each theme relates to others as pointed out in the Seminar. Then, it is necessary at first to consider the new IPC structure to solve the central problem that the existing IPC is insufficient as a search tool.
7. The simple and obvious solution to the central problem is a creation of appropriate classification entries in case of need. But this solution has some practical difficulties as follows;
  - (a) the difficulty in establishing non-overlapping relations among many other classification entries and in clarifying the definition of the new entries
  - (b) the difficulty for rapid creation of new classification entries in present circumstances like long revision period and slow revision procedure
  - (c) the difficulty for the reclassification in small Offices and for the change of search system in large Offices
8. A possible solution to overcome the difficulty-(a) proposed is the adoption of global indexing system or/and multi-classification system which adopted only in the electronic age. This proposal should be considered for the future IPC system.
9. The difficulty-(b) would be the most basic difficulty which relates to other difficulties, especially has close relation with (c), then should be considered altogether.

The revision period should be short in order to follow the progress of technology, though it needs enough time to examine the relations between new classification entries and the existing IPC, and it is hard to proceed revision process in the existing revision procedure.

On the other hand, some small Offices stated that it was hard to reclassify the search file, and large Offices wanted the stability of IPC system.

In case the revision period is shorter, the needs for the reclassification would be indispensable, and the search system based on the IPC should also be reconstructed frequently.

These show that the contradictory needs exist for the IPC.

## [ **Proposal**]

### **Proposals considering above-mentioned difficulties**

10. After considering those, it is easy to reach the idea for the future indexing schemes and the revision period.

JPO would like to make the proposals corresponding to the conclusion of the Seminar as follows;

#### **<IPC general structure and principles>**

Extend the function of the indexing schemes or reconstruct the indexing schemes including the following detail functions

- Multi-classification schemes
- First entries for the creation of classification entries
- Non-obligatory in general but obligatory for the specific offices, for example, proposing office, rapporteur office in order to accumulate the experience results
- After accumulating sufficient experience, we should consider adopting them for the classification entries

#### **<revision period>**

Considering the double structure of the revision period answering the contradictory demands

- Annual revision for new technology as the indexing entries
- Long revision period (over 5 years) for the classification entries

#### **<revision procedure>**

Considering a procedure to work the revision project efficiently

- Give a rapporteur more active role as a project leader
- Use the electronic tools for substantial discussions of the project , i.e. e-mail, video conference

[Annex 3 follows/  
L'annexe 3 suit]



ANNEX 3/ANNEXE 3

---

**INPI-INSTITUTO NACIONAL DA PROPRIEDADE INDUSTRIAL  
PORTUGUESE INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY OFFICE**

---

**PROPOSALS IN THE FRAME OF THE TASK FORCE WORKING ON THE  
BASIS OF RECOMMENDATIONS FROM IPC ADVANCED SEMINAR**

**1. Introduction:**

This paper offers our view on certain questions referred to paragraphs 24, 25 and 26 of the report contained in doc.IPC/SEM/98/11. In the Seminar we already gave some opinions, but we are giving now further elaboration. Obviously our views are based in our own experience, as illustrated on the paper titled “The utilisation of IPC in INPI” presented on the Seminar.

**2. Duration of Revision Cycles:**

In our view, the present cycle duration of five years is too long. We wait too much time for introduction of new improvements. We prefer a revision cycle of three years.

**3. System of priorities for new revision proposals:**

We defend that the decision of adoption (or not) of revision proposals should lay down on the Committee of Experts and not in any Working Group.

The criteria of adoption should be more qualitative than quantitative: many of good projects in the past didn't fulfil all the quantitative criteria.

Priorities on adopting new IPC revision proposals could be in our opinion:

- 1-Creation of classification places covering new technologies;
- 2-Solving overlapping problems (improve search efficiency);
- 3-Subdivision of existing entries where search is particularly difficult.
- 4-Improve wordings, examples, references.

#### **4. Multiple Classification:**

Multiple classification is already in practise in certain Offices. In our opinion it is necessary to regulate and harmonise this procedure, otherwise the file size can increase too much and search efficiency will decrease. What are the areas where this procedure will be implemented is something to be decided. In connection with this item, perhaps we can envisage to revise the IPC Guide on the Chapter “Classification of Technical Subjects of Inventions”.

#### **5. Hybrid Systems:**

They are more and more important in IPC. Indexing codes are not obligatory and for the time being we believe this is a good solution. Nevertheless in certain areas of IPC, the user should be aware of the necessity of using indexing codes to achieve fine results.

How to expand and encourage the utilisation of indexing codes is something that should be thought in combination with a more friendly presentation.

#### **6. Ad hoc working group:**

Questions as focused in points 4 and 5 should be dealt by this Ad hoc working group. The idea of producing a pamphlet with a questionnaire to be presented to users of IPC seems a very good idea. This will permit to the Committee of Experts find the best policy and procedure for the long term.

Any way this policy cannot forget in our view that IPC is the only classification used world-wide, and for that reason, its revision and improvement is a crucial matter for a largest majority of Offices.

\*\*\*

Lisboa,1999-01-15

**José Silva Carvalho**

[Annex 4 follow/  
L'annexe 4 suit]

ANNEX 4/ANNEXE 4

RU PROPOSAL

Having studied all the materials of the Seminar and its recommendations we agree with the main directions of actions proposed in these recommendations (IPC/SEM/98/11). We would like to pay attention to the following items.

**24 (a)** We consider expedient the introduction of a 3-year transitional revision period (1999-2002). We suppose it to be enough for the solution of the problems of further application of the IPC as a universal global patent classification for enabling efficient searches.

**24(b)** As to the IPC revision policy statements we support the proposals of the Netherlands Industrial Property Office.

**24(c)** We think useful the introduction of examples of patent documents (as it done in C 01B 39/14, 39/20, 39/28 etc.), detailed notes or classification definitions for new proposed entries in the IPC electronic version where it is necessary.

**25(a)** In our opinion the duration of revision cycles can be determined to the end of 3-year transitional revision period taking into account the accumulated experience.

**25(c)** We are interested in studying automated classification tools and we are ready to participate in pilot project on their use.

**25(d)** We consider expedient the cooperation between offices in reclassification of backlog patent files and we are ready to exchange reclassification lists.

**26, 27** We maintain the recommendations relating to revision procedure and to training in the use of the IPC.

We confirm our intention to take part in the Task Force. And we are pleased to inform you that our representative is Mr. Gennady Nenakhov, the Head of the IPC division.

[Annex 5 follows/  
L'annexe 5 suit]

**Oficina Española de Patentes y Marcas**

**Spanish Patent and Trademark Office**

**IPC Task Force**

---

## **Introduction**

This document includes the ES proposal in relation to the recommendations of the IPC Advanced Seminar (IPC/SEM/98/11).

## **IPC general structure and principles**

- 24.d)** We find necessary such a working group to be established in the next meeting of the CE, having in mind that it will be responsible of the study of the IPC revision policy and revision procedure modifications.
- 24.a)** A transitional period of three years (1999-2002) seems to be appropriate in order to elaborate the above mentioned modifications in the IPC revision procedure and policy.
- 24.c)** The introduction of electronic data as well as more technical terms illustrating the contents of IPC entries (**26.d**), will really make the IPC more user-friendly.  
It will be very useful, for ex., to illustrate some definitions of subgroups, especially in the mechanical field, with figures.

In the implementation of this task it should be taken into account , when possible, the work already done by the different Offices.

**24.e)**

**24.f)**

**24.g)**

These are points linked by the fact that the consistency in the application of the IPC must be increased.

In this sense, the IPC guide should be revised and make the instructions and principles to be applied when classifying more clear.

The items of multiple classification, indexing systems, last place rule or principles such as function versus application should be studied all together in deep and detail, taking in account the different situations that we can find in different places or fields (Chemistry, for ex., is very much affected for the last place rule and the use of indexing systems).

As it was commented in **24.d)** above, the study of this modifications should be trusted to the ad hoc working group.

### **Revision period and implementation of the results of the revision**

**25.a)**

The actual duration of the revision cycles seems to be unadequate in order to have an up to date IPC and to fulfil the needs of an always changing technology.

It could be studied the possibility of a revision cycle of three years.

Any case, this point has to be studied in relation to the reclassification of the backlog patent files.

**25.c)**

Any progress that could be done in this point will make easier the fact of shortening the revision cycles and the reclassification of the documents affected for the different editions of the IPC.

For the implementation of this item, it would be required that WIPO could contribute with different resources to the working group.

## **Revision procedure**

**26.e)** The priorities for revision proposals should be established by the CE.

Nevertheless, priority for the revisions proposals could be as follows:

- 1- X- notations, creation of places for new technologies.
- 2- Subdivision of existing places
- 3- Number of documents involved in relation to the need of text searching in the field
- 4- Clarification of wordings.

## **Training in the use of IPC**

**27.a)**

**27.b)** Both are necessary for making a more consistent use of the IPC. We think WIPO must play a relevant role in this point, providing as far as it is possible, modern training techniques and tools.

[Annex 6 follows/  
L'annexe 6 suit]

# Swedish Patent and Registration Office

IPC Policy and Procedure  
Task Force  
January 18th, 1999

## COMMENTS on document IPC/SEM/98/11

**We are a bit disappointed with the results of the seminar. Many of the recommendations are only of a cosmetic nature, or only deal with details. The seminar hardly touched on the three fundamental issues of long-term goals, resources and management. Before considering the recommendations of the seminar, we would like to make some general statements:**

***Development of the IPC must continue, and cannot be allowed to slow down.***

Some delegations at the seminar were of the opinion that the IPC could be more or less "frozen", for example through a moratorium or by stopping pure subdivision of existing groups. This would quickly erode the usefulness of the system. For documents that are not part of the PCT minimum documentation, and even for some parts of the minimum documentation, there are no available additional or alternative classification tools. For documents that are not published in English, possibilities of text searching do not exist or are severely restricted, and in any case limited to the publishing language.

The general opinion is that patent information and intellectual property is of growing global importance. Patent systems are being developed and encouraged in competitive and quickly growing economies, for example in the Far East. Intellectual property is seen as a key to economic growth in developing countries. In view of this, a language-independent tool for access to patent information is very important.

A short term refocusing of resources is perhaps reasonable under the circumstances, but nobody would gain from a long-term slowing down of the development of the IPC. It would cause irreparable damage to let the only international system for retrieval of patent information degrade.

***A substantial revision of the IPC will require considerable additional long-term resources, committed by patent offices or the WIPO.***

The question of resources is crucial to any work. The IPC work is suffering from a serious shortage of manpower. Apart from the International Bureau, IPC development work has relied on resources committed by patent offices. There are probably no more than 30 - 40 people in the world with a knowledge of the IPC that is deep enough to enable them to participate in developing a high-quality classification system in a consistent way. Almost all of these people only work part time with IPC matters.

A substantial reengineering of the system will require additional resources. Just as an arithmetic example, it would take almost seven man-years to spend ten minutes on each of the 70000 IPC entries!

The IPC work is difficult to motivate in financial terms, such as quick pay-back of invested money. Patent offices are, with few exceptions, fund-starved government agencies. Changing priorities inside offices have immediate effect on the IPC work. It has to be asked whether the fickle resources of patent offices can, or should, be relied on for the long-term maintenance of the IPC. If patent offices cannot commit sufficient resources to IPC revision work, it must be considered whether resources can be organised from other sources, for example through WIPO.

***Any substantial revision of the IPC will require active management.***

The present situation is caused by lack of management and lack of response to "customer needs". There is no body within the existing IPC organisation structure that is capable of managing the process of overhauling the complete system. The Committee of Experts has no possibility to take that responsibility - such a process can not be managed by a committee which meets once or twice a year, and is formed by members who first look at what is good for their respective offices and only then at what is good for the IPC. If any major work is to be undertaken, some kind of "permanent" IPC revision staff has to be created.

### **Comments on the recommendations of the Advanced Seminar**

#### **24. Recommendations relating to the IPC general structure and principles:**

We have no major objections against the recommendations put forward in points 24a - 24g.

However, it has to be observed that these recommendations will in themselves not solve any of the fundamental problems. We do not want to see a situation where we at the end of the next revision period have wasted three years on meetings and discussions about details without finding any new ideas or resources. The crucial questions of long-term goals, management and resources have to be resolved.

#### **25. Recommendations relating to the revision period and implementation of the results of the revision:**

##### **a) Determine the most appropriate duration of revision cycles.**

This question cannot be seen in isolation. Although in itself desirable, a shortening of the revision cycle also creates considerable problems. The complications caused by a multiplicity of editions of the IPC must be compensated by improved tools for dealing with those problems, such as an electronic version of the IPC with linking between different editions.

##### **b) Establish a close co-operation between the Committee and the SCIT.**

The lack of active management of the IPC is a major problem. The management of the development work, and the necessary assignment of WIPO resources to it, could be natural links between the Committee and the SCIT. Future developments of the IPC will make more and more use of information technology, and the IPC is a natural integral part of future IT tools for accessing patent information, for example via Internet.

##### **c) Study automated classification tools and conduct pilot projects on their use, in particular for the reclassification of backlog patent files.**

We have no objections to such a study, although we are not very optimistic about the possibilities of automatic classification of patent documents using text analysis. Not even true artificial intelligence, if it is achievable, will be able to deal with the most fundamental difficulty: The fact that the texts, especially the claims, are not produced in order to provide information.



**d) Study the possibility of co-operation between offices in the reclassification of backlog patent files, including its outsourcing to external contractors.**

This should of course also be studied, but again we have questions about the practicality: Can the reclassification information be used? Only a few patent offices have their own search databases. For other offices, including all small and medium size offices, the reclassification data will be useless unless it is introduced into the major readily available patent databases.

**26. Recommendations relating to the revision procedure:**

We support recommendations 26a - 26e.

**27. Recommendations relating to training in the use of the IPC:**

We have no objections, but we wonder who will do the work?

**Conclusion:**

**We are very worried about the future of the IPC as a working international standard. We fear that continuous degradation will lead to irreparable damage to the IPC. Nobody would gain from letting it degrade to a point where it is of no use as a search tool, especially not the small and medium-sized offices and the developing countries.**

**The seminar made some interesting and necessary recommendations regarding details of procedure and policy, but hardly touched the most crucial points. If we want the IPC to survive as a working international standard, we must do something about the fundamental causes behind the degradation of the IPC: The lack of long-term goals, the shortage of resources and the lack of management.**

**Anders Bruun**

[Annex 7 follows/  
L'annexe 7 suit]

# **GB Contribution to IPC Taskforce**

## **Introduction**

Our contribution to this task force is primarily based upon the recommendations of the IPC Advanced Seminar. We believe that there were certain clear results from that seminar and that the IPC should move forward into the millennium with rapid but considered actions based upon the clear consensus which the seminar provided. We apologise if this involves some repetition of the seminar report but we think this is necessary. We have structured our submission on the basis of a problem and solution approach.

## **Problem**

The IPC structure is not very user friendly and is not particularly suitable for searching electronic databases

## **Solution**

All future and current revision projects should include linked explanatory text, including example patents if necessary, of most, if not all, classification and/or indexing codes.

Rules should be set up for structured multiple classification.

All hybrid schemes in IPC should be reviewed as regards ease of use and cost-effectiveness, and assessed with a view to conversion to multiple classification.

IPC Class should be thoroughly re-engineered and modernised to provide easy access to IPC for expert and non-expert users alike and consideration given to how the software could link to internet patent databases.

## **Problem**

The IPC cannot react quickly enough to changes in technology.

## **Solution**

The change to a three-year revision period should be established as soon as practicable.

The costs and benefits of a yearly electronic IPC revision should be considered.

The costs and benefits of translation into French at every stage of the revision procedure should be examined.

All existing and future revision projects should be scrutinised, as regards their position in a new revision priority list which would be structured primarily in terms of the importance of the project.

Rapporteurs should have more control over revision projects particularly as regards how and when discussions are carried out.

Subject matter working groups should be established by the Committee of Experts. These groups would have more freedom over where, when and how they would meet, i.e. they would not necessarily be tied to a twice-yearly meeting regime.

Revision requests should be submitted directly to subject matter working groups via WIPO. The subject matter working groups should be empowered to adopt revision projects without reference to Committee of Experts except in exceptional circumstances.

## **Problem**

There appears to be no connection between SCIT and IPC Revision such that those Committees will work independently to the detriment of the work they are tasked with.

## **Solution**

A mechanism for co-operation between the Committee of Experts and SCIT should be established immediately. Ideally this would involve attendance of Committee of Experts representatives at SCIT to establish a presence independent of national delegates and also vice versa.

## **Problem**

Inconsistent application of IPC

WIPO should take a more proactive role in training, particularly developing countries, in the use of the IPC. Computer-based tools should be developed to enhance this role.

## **Problem**

The difficulty of tracing back an IPC search using different editions.

## **Solution**

Consideration be given to using data available from various patent offices' databases to provide effective backlog reclassification for revision projects and other suitable areas of IPC. Although the US idea of subcontracting backlog reclassification is attractive, we think it may not be practical. However, it certainly merits a rigorous analysis of its feasibility and cost-effectiveness.

***Recommendations***

- ***IPC revision should be temporarily suspended for all but the most important projects to allow Offices to concentrate resources on some of the above measures.***
- ***A priority list for outstanding projects should be established by Committee of Experts***
- ***A New Millennium Working Group (NWMG) should be set up by the Committee of Experts with the power to set up sub-groups for work to be carried out, for example corresponding in the broad category areas given in paras. 24 to 27 of IPC/SEM/98/11.***
- ***The change to a three-year revision period should be established by the Committee of Experts at the March 1999 meeting.***

[Annex 8 follows/  
L'annexe 8 suit]

ANNEX 8/ANNEXE 8

**USPTO PROPOSAL**

**For**

**Implementation of the Recommendations of  
The Advanced Seminar on the International Patent Classification**

**Held at Newport, United Kingdom, December 7 to 11, 1998**

**BACKGROUND**

The Advanced Seminar on the International Patent Classification (IPC) was convened by WIPO under the authorization of the IPC Committee of Experts (CE). The purpose of the Seminar was to consider the use and structure of the IPC, and its revision policy and procedure. Representatives of 28 national industrial property offices (IPO's), intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations attended the Seminar.

Numerous lectures were given and presentations made by attending representatives. The focus was on the IPC's strengths and weaknesses, and its role in the rapidly changing technology of patent information storage and retrieval. A consensus agreed that, while the IPC continues to be relevant and important, it is beset by many problems and that action to address those problems is necessary. To that end, Seminar attendees agreed to a set of conclusions and recommendations to be presented to the CE for their consideration.

It was further agreed that advantage would be taken of the CE's previous authorization for the forming of a Task Force to elaborate on the Seminar's work by developing recommendation details, including a plan of action for their implementation. Eleven national IPO's, including the USPTO, and two intergovernmental organizations volunteered to participate in the work of the Task Force. WIPO invited Task Force members to submit proposals concerning actions to be taken with respect to each recommendation of the Seminar. This document is the USPTO proposal submitted in response to the WIPO invitation.

**SEMINAR RECOMMENDATIONS**

The recommendations of the Seminar are set forth in the "Summary of Proceedings" adopted by the Seminar at its final session (see document IPC/SEM/98/11). These recommendations have been extracted and are presented in original order, in table form, at *Attachment A*.

The Seminar divided the recommendations in four groupings: Structure and Principles; Revision Period and Revision Results Implementation; Revision Procedure; and Training. The recommendations were further characterized by their potential for realization within either: the short term, i.e., capable of being implemented for the new revision period; or, the medium term, i.e., capable of being implemented after the completion of the “transitional period.” (The “transitional period” is defined by the Seminar in its first recommendation - see below - as 1999-2002.)

For convenience and as an aid to better understanding, this document will address separately the short term and medium term recommendations. A re-ordering of the recommendations on that basis can be found, in table form, at *Attachment B*.

## SHORT TERM RECOMMENDATIONS

### Structure & Principles

*Ref. 24-a<sup>1</sup> Introduce a transitional revision period (1999 – 2002) during which modifications to the IPC revision policy and revision procedure and to the implementation of results of the revision should be elaborated.*

The transitional period should be viewed as defining the beginning and end points of a multi-dimensional IPC modernization project -- a project to which well established project management techniques would be applied. For example, a timetable with, as needed, intermediate milestones should be developed for each recommendation. Timetable/milestones would be established to ensure the implementation of all short term recommendations by the end of the transitional period. Medium term recommendation timetables/milestones would ensure that their full elaboration and planning for their implementation were completed by 2002. Overall project management should also include coordination between related recommendation implementation tasks, as well as resource requirement identification and resource acquisition planning.

Certain of the short term recommendations seem capable of easy implementation and inappropriate for the application of project management techniques (see 24-b, below). However, their effective implementation requires subsequent actions be taken for which planning is required (for example, as noted in the discussion of 24-b, below). Other short term recommendations (see 24-c, below) clearly imply the need for implementation planning, resource commitment and coordination. Without the application of project management techniques, it is unlikely that such recommendations will yield satisfactory result within the transitional period.

---

<sup>1</sup> This and similar references to follow refer to the identified paragraph in WIPO Document IPC/SEM/11/98 - Summary of Proceedings of the Advanced IPC Seminar.

In adopting this transitional period recommendation, the CE should:

- establish it as a time-framework for encompassing the implementation of all short term recommendations and the planning for all medium term recommendations;
- direct that, within this period, a project management approach will be taken in the implementation and elaboration of all recommendations;
- constitute the recommended ad hoc working group (see below) as a project team; and
- request augmented International Bureau support for the team, to include skilled project management consultant support and automated project management tools.

The establishment of an ad hoc working group was characterized by the Seminar as a medium term recommendation (Ref. 24-d). However, the working group's charter is quite broad, encompassing modifications to IPC revision policy and procedure; and, in effect, it is the product of their work that is envisioned as medium term rather than the establishment of the working group, *per se*. The USPTO believes, therefore, that it is not inconsistent with Seminar recommendations to urge that the CE establish the ad hoc working group as a matter of priority. Further, ascribing a broad interpretation to "IPC revision policy and procedure", the CE should task the working group to assume overall project coordination responsibility - under CE supervision and with WIPO support - for short term recommendation implementation and medium term recommendation planning.

*Ref. 24-b Modify IPC revision policy statements as proposed in the lecture by The Netherlands Industrial Property Office.*

In their lecture, the Netherlands Industrial Property Office proposed the following revisions to IPC revision policy statements:

- Policy statements 1 and 7 be replaced by a new statement 1, as follows-
  1. Revision of the IPC, in conformity with the Strasbourg Agreement Concerning the International Patent Classification, is needed when, in order to enable efficient searches to be carried out through combination of IPC with other generally available search methods, such revision would significantly improve the selection of data in accordance with the relevance of those data to the question asked.
- Policy statement 2 be replaced with the following-
  2. Each revision request should be selected on the basis of the criteria currently agreed upon by the IPC Committee of Experts.
- Policy statements 3, 4, and 6 remain unchanged
- Policy statement 5 be deleted.

It would appear that the CE can easily implement this recommendation -- they need only agree and direct that the policy statements be revised as proposed. But revision of the policy statements is meaningless without implementation of the changed policy that the revisions suggest. This is not so easy.

Revised policy statement 2., leaves it to the CE to articulate criteria by which to measure proposed IPC revisions against the principle set forth in new policy statement 1. Past experience suggests that the development of acceptable and useful criteria will be a time consuming, interactive, multi-step process. In order for that to be accomplished expeditiously, the CE should - in addition to authorising revision of the policy statements - direct that implementing criteria be developed and assign that task to the ad hoc working group.

*Ref. 24-c Introduce electronic data illustrating the contents of IPC entries: examples of patent documents, detailed notes and classification definitions.*

Full implementation of this recommendation will require a large effort. The CE should seek, from among IPOs and intergovernmental IPC users, volunteers to:

- define and structure the task;
- establish necessary standards, e.g., textual and electronic;
- identify and allocate portions of the task among participants;
- finalize the initial electronic data product; and,
- develop procedures for product maintenance and improvement (see 26-d, below).

This task and its participants (a “task group”) may be separate from the ad hoc working group; but the activity should be included in the working group’s overall project coordination responsibility. Obviously, significant amounts of WIPO support and expert contractor assistance will also be necessary for the task group to successfully complete several stages of the above task.

## **Revision Procedures**

*Ref. 26-a During the transitional period continue the revision of the IPC on the basis of the revision projects deferred from the previous revision period and new revision proposals that may be submitted for the creation of classification places covering new technologies.*

In considering new IPC revision proposals, even those characterized as involving new technologies, the CE should be mindful of the recommended changes to the IPC revision policy statements. If approved, and even in the absence of adopted implementing criteria, the changed policy intent should be used as a subjective filter in evaluating project proposals. During the transitional period, in anticipation of



major changes to the structure and principles of the IPC, the CE should err on the side of caution in its review of revision proposals.

Should the CE implement recommendation 26-c (see below), then its revision groups would be required to perform this initial filtering function. In that process the revision groups should exercise an equal or even greater degree of caution, referring for decision to the CE any revision requests/proposals where there is doubt about their appropriateness in light of adopted revision policy.

*Ref. 26-b Augment the role of rapporteurs for revision projects by giving them a mandate to initiate further discussion of the projects.*

Theoretically, the role of IPC revision project rapporteurs is a passive one; although, in practice, they often serve - in addition - as project expeditors and, sometimes, advocates for a particular approach. The essential thrust of this recommendation is to recognize the need for and usefulness of identified leadership for each IPC revision project, both to make the revision process more efficient and to achieve a greater consistency and coherence in the final product. The recommendation would sanction a leadership responsibility for the rapporteur function. The USPTO feels that the intent of this recommendation could be made clearer and its purpose more likely realized if the rapporteur title were changed to "Project Leader."

*Ref. 26-c Streamline the revision procedure by allowing the revision requests to be submitted directly to revision groups via the International Bureau.*

Revision groups would be expected to be mindful of current IPC revision policy and exercise caution in accepting a directly submitted revision request for further work. Any doubt should be resolved by prompt referral for CE decision. (See discussion under 26-a, above.)

It is understood that no IPC revision will be actually implemented without the approval of the CE as required by the Strasbourg Agreement.

*Ref. 26-d Introduce in IPC entries, where appropriate, more technical terms illustrating their contents.*

This recommendation is seen as closely related to 24-c, above, and both address aspects of the larger goal of making the IPC more useful and useable. The examples, notes and definitions envisioned in 24-c and the additional technical terms called for here are prescribed as remedies for a serious IPC system problem -- users often have great difficulty in identifying the specific IPC classifications wherein a given technology of interest can be found. The CE should consider this and the 24-c recommendations in that larger context - how to make the IPC more useful and useable.

The Advanced Seminar has suggested that the enrichment of the IPC by addition of more examples, notes, definitions and technical terms represents an effective approach. The Seminar recognizes that this would constitute a substantial amount of additional material and counsel its incorporation in the IPC by electronic means. The discussion under 24-c, above, elaborates a mechanism to accomplish this enrichment for existing IPC classifications, but also envisions the need for maintenance procedures. In effect, this means changing IPC revision procedures; for the most efficient time to introduce enrichment material is at the time of revision. Thus changes in IPC structure and principles require changes in IPC revision procedures.

Therefore, the CE should take a systematic approach, assigning to the task group foreseen in the discussion under 24-c, above, responsibility for elaboration and implementation of this recommendation (26-d).

### **Training**

*Ref. 27-a Enhance WIPO role and support in the application of the IPC.*

*Ref. 27-b Improve IPC training by providing modern training techniques, for example, computer based and Internet training tools. This should involve, in particular, enhanced support for developing countries in use of IPC.*

In many IPOs, examiners have difficulty using the IPC effectively due, in part, to inadequate knowledge of the IPC system. Further, the IPC has had a long-standing problem as regards document placement consistency -- that is, the degree to which there is consistency among different IPOs in the selection of an IPC classification for assignment to a given technological disclosure. This results in a dispersal of a technology to many different classifications with detriment to the IPC's usefulness for global patent information retrieval

In the view of the Advanced Seminar, these problems stem, in major part, from a dearth of IPC training in many IPOs and, for such training as may be done, the absence of uniform training tools, techniques and materials<sup>2</sup>. These recommendations are intended to address IPC training deficiencies. Recommendation 27-b, articulates the need for better IPC training tools and techniques. Importantly, it recognizes that it is essential to use modern mechanisms, such as computer-based training (CBT) and the Internet, in order to make the developed training resources widely available in a cost-effective manner.

The Advanced Seminar was well aware that the development of sophisticated training tools, as recommended, requires expertise not readily available within the community of CE members. The latter can and must be relied upon for subject matter input, but

---

<sup>2</sup> An example of classification system training materials for examiner use - "Examiner Handbook on the Use of the U. S. Classification System" -- can be found at:  
<http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/pac/dapp/sir/co/examhbk/index.htm>

CBT and Internet-based training tool development is another matter. Thus, in recommendation 27-a, the Advanced Seminar calls for an enhanced WIPO role and support. That support should be directed not only to making training available for IPO use, especially developing country IPOs, but also to assisting the CE in training tool development.

Like most of the recommendations heretofore discussed, implementation of these training recommendations is seen as a multi-step process involving CE member participation, WIPO participation and, probably, consultant/contractor participation, as well. Once again, project management techniques seem called for and assignment of responsibility for these recommendations to the ad hoc working group appears appropriate.

## MEDIUM TERM RECOMMENDATIONS

Reviews & materials elaboration recommendations: Many of the recommendations characterized as medium term deal with reviews and the elaboration of materials - generally intended to serve as a basis for subsequent action aimed at IPC system improvement. These recommendations are:

### Structure & Principles

*Ref. 24-e Consider the elaboration of rules for multiple classification in the IPC, for example, in areas covered by the last place rule, in function-orientated versus application areas, and investigate possible bearing of such rules on general principles of classifying disclosed in the Guide to the IPC.*

*Ref. 24-f Review the hybrid systems in the IPC.*

*Ref. 24-g Elaborate measures for increasing the consistency in the application of the IPC.*

### Revision Period & Revision Results Implementation

*Ref. 25-a Determine the most appropriate duration of revision cycles.*

### Revision Procedure

*Ref. 26-e Elaborate a system of priorities for revision proposals.*

These activities should take place during the transitional period so that the product of each may be available for use in planning for IPC system changes after the transitional period -- or sooner if possible. The scheduling of these activities is a matter of resource availability and CE priorities. For reasons noted, the USPTO suggests a priority:

1. The actual placement of patent documents in the IPC system is very important. Each year, hundreds of thousands of documents are classified into the system by examiners worldwide. The rules that are followed and the consistency of that classification are a major factor in the effectiveness of the IPC as a document retrieval tool. Therefore, highest priority should be given to:

*Ref. 24-e Consider the elaboration of rules for multiple classification in the IPC, for example, in areas covered by the last place rule, in function-orientated versus application areas, and investigate possible bearing of such rules on general principles of classifying disclosed in the Guide to the IPC.*

*Ref. 24-g Elaborate measures for increasing the consistency in the application of the IPC.*

2. Clearly, there is wide spread concern about the promptness with which truly needed revision to the IPC is undertaken, completed and made available to users. Consequently, priority should also be accorded to:

*Ref. 25-a Determine the most appropriate duration of revision cycles.*

*Ref. 26-e Elaborate a system of priorities for revision proposals.*

3. The primary focus of IPC improvement efforts stemming from the Seminar's recommendations should be the basic structure of the IPC, itself. Hybrid additions, which are essentially indexing system overlays to the IPC, give rise to significant investment of additional examiner time and should be viewed with caution. Consequently, a lower priority should be accorded to:

*Ref. 24-f Review the hybrid systems in the IPC.*

Obviously, if resources permit, more than one or all of these priority levels could be undertaken in parallel.

Once the CE establishes priority, responsibility for undertaking and overseeing these activities should be assigned to the ad hoc working group.

Objective critical recommendations: The four remaining medium term recommendations are seen as, in effect, critical to the ultimate realization of a modern, revitalized IPC system. Two of these deal with reclassification of backlog patent documents (i.e., the backfile):

### **Revision Period and Revision Results Implementation**

*Ref. 25-c Study automated classification tools and conduct pilot projects on their use, in particular for the reclassification of backlog patent files.*

*Ref. 25-d Study the possibility of cooperation between offices in the reclassification of backlog patent files, including its outsourcing to external contractors.*

Both of these recommendations should be included under a comprehensive backfile reclassification initiative and assigned for project management oversight by the ad hoc working group. It should be recognized, however, that the bulk of documents requiring reclassification, as well as the resources and expertise in the development and use of automated classification tools, are centered in a few large IPOs. Consequently, the CE should seek the establishment of a cooperative consortium of these IPOs, with WIPO participation, to actually carry out this initiative. IPOs invited to participate should include the EPO, JPO and USPTO.

It should be noted that reported cooperation between the EPO and JPO aimed at merging their IPC-based classification systems might have a substantial beneficial impact on the goal of backfile reclassification. If successful, the resulting “merged” system might serve as a base for an evolving “new IPC” - one which, inherently, would reflect a reclassified backfile. This potential should be a factor to be considered in the CE’s comprehensive backfile reclassification initiative.

A third recommendation addresses a critical organizational deficiency:

*Ref. 25-b Establish a close cooperation between the Committee and the SCIT.*

The purview of the CE is the IPC. That of the SCIT is information technology. Yet the IPC will be a key component of the patent information systems that are a primary focus of the SCIT, and information technology must necessarily be a key component of the solutions the CE seeks to many IPC problems. The need for close cooperation between the CE and SCIT is manifest and the CE should move promptly to initiate such cooperation. Observer status at each other’s sessions and/or an open invitation by each to the other to seek consultation and assistance as needed, might constitute a constructive beginning. In anticipation of CE acceptance of this recommendation, the International Bureau should be prepared to offer for CE consideration a draft communication from the CE to the SCIT, which document could serve to initiate CE/SCIT cooperation.

The final medium term recommendation goes to the essence of this USPTO proposal:

### **Structure & Principles**

*Ref. 24-d Establish an ad hoc working group to consider modifications to the IPC revision policy and revision procedure and develop a general question and answer pamphlet on the application of the IPC.*

As initially discussed under recommendation 24-c, above, and alluded to in connection with several other recommendation discussions in this paper, an ad hoc

working group performing overall project coordination is proposed as the primary mechanism by which the CE can achieve the goals envisioned by the Advanced Seminar. The USPTO believes that such a mechanism is necessary if there is to be any realistic expectation that the many, complex and interactive initiatives required to accomplish IPC modernization can be successfully carried out. Thus, as a matter of high priority, the CE should with realism address the issue of how those Advanced Seminar recommendations it chooses to adopt can be pursued in an effective manner. We urge the ad hoc working group - project coordination approach.

#### USPTO INVITATION

Should the CE adopt the proposed USPTO approach, or some similar one, there will be a need to “get organized” in order to launch effectively and expeditiously the IPC modernization effort. Consequently, those volunteers (e.g., an ad hoc working group) and WIPO staff who will be charged with the responsibility to carry out the adopted Advanced Seminar recommendations should informally meet to discuss, crystallize and structure the project effort.

The USPTO feels that such a meeting could beneficially be held subsequent to the CE’s March 1999 session, allowing sufficient time to disseminate the CE decisions taken, identify participant (e.g., ad hoc working group) volunteers and develop a meeting agenda. Given these requirements, it would seem that a 3 to 5 day meeting in April or early May would be appropriate, and would allow sufficient time for circulation of meeting results to CE members for consideration at their September session.

The USPTO would be willing to host such a meeting at its Washington facility, and extends that invitation to the CE and the International Bureau for their consideration.

#### CONCLUSION

The USPTO sees the consensus for IPC modernization represented by the recommendations of the Advanced Seminar as virtually a “one time” opportunity. The CE should seize and move aggressively to capitalize on that opportunity. If that process is to be successful, CE members must be prepared to think and take action outside the traditional operating mode and the International Bureau must be prepared to support them as they move into new territory. The stakes are high and the effort may fail, but it should not be allowed to fail because of a hesitancy to innovate.

			<b>ATTACHMENT - A</b>
<b>ADVANCED IPC SEMINAR RECOMMENDATIONS</b>			
(Original Order)			
<b>GROUPING</b>	<b>REF. PARA. (IPC/SEM/11/98)</b>	<b>TERM</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATION</b>
<b>Structure &amp; Principles</b>	24-a	Short	Introduce a transitional revision period (1999 – 2002) during which modifications to the IPC revision policy and revision procedure and to the implementation of results of the revision should be elaborated.
<b>Structure &amp; Principles</b>	24-b	Short	Modify IPC revision policy statements as proposed in the lecture by The Netherlands Industrial Property Office.
<b>Structure &amp; Principles</b>	24-c	Short	Introduce electronic data illustrating the contents of IPC entries: examples of patent documents, detailed notes and classification definitions.
<b>Structure &amp; Principles</b>	24-d	Medium	Establish an ad hoc working group to consider modifications to the IPC revision policy and revision procedure and develop a general question and answer pamphlet on the application of the IPC.
<b>Structure &amp; Principles</b>	24-e	Medium	Consider the elaboration of rules for multiple classification in the IPC, for example, in areas covered by the last place rule, in function-orientated versus application areas, and investigate
<b>Structure &amp; Principles</b>	24-f	Medium	Review the hybrid systems in the IPC.
<b>Structure &amp; Principles</b>	24-g	Medium	Elaborate measures for increasing the consistency in the application of the IPC.
<b>Revision Period &amp; Revision</b>	25-a	Medium	Determine the most appropriate duration of revision cycles.
<b>Revision Period &amp; Revision</b>	25-b	Medium	Establish a close cooperation between the Committee and the SCIT.
<b>Results Implementation</b>	25-c	Medium	Study automated classification tools and conduct pilot projects on their use, in particular for the reclassification of backlog patent files.
<b>Revision Period &amp; Revision</b>	25-d	Medium	Study the possibility of cooperation between offices in the reclassification of backlog patent files, including its outsourcing to external contractors.
<b>Revision Procedure</b>	26-a	Short	During the transitional period continue the revision of the IPC on the basis of the revision
<b>Revision Procedure</b>	26-b	Short	Augment the role of rapporteurs for revision projects by giving them a mandate to initiate further discussion of the projects.
<b>Revision Procedure</b>	26-c	Short	Streamline the revision procedure by allowing the revision requests to be submitted directly to revision groups via the International Bureau.
<b>Revision Procedure</b>	26-d	Short	Introduce in IPC entries, where appropriate, more technical terms illustrating their contents.
<b>Revision Procedure</b>	26-e	Medium	Elaborate a system of priorities for revision proposals.
<b>Training</b>	27-a	Short	Enhance WIPO role and support in the application of the IPC.
<b>Training</b>	27-b	Short	Improve IPC training by providing modern training techniques, for example, computer based

<b>ATTACHMENT - B</b>			
<b>ADVANCED IPC SEMINAR RECOMMENDATIONS</b>			
<b>(Sorted by Term)</b>			
<b>GROUPING</b>	<b>REF. PARA. (IPC/SEM/11/98)</b>	<b>TERM</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATION</b>
<b>Structure &amp; Principles</b>	24-a	Short	Introduce a transitional revision period (1999 – 2002) during which modifications to the IPC revision policy and revision procedure and to the implementation of results of the revision should be elaborated.
<b>Structure &amp; Principles</b>	24-b	Short	Modify IPC revision policy statements as proposed in the lecture by The Netherlands Industrial Property Office.
<b>Structure &amp; Principles</b>	24-c	Short	Introduce electronic data illustrating the contents of IPC entries: examples of patent documents, detailed notes and classification definitions.
<b>Revision Procedure</b>	26-a	Short	During the transitional period continue the revision of the IPC on the basis of the revision projects deferred from the previous revision period and new revision proposals that may be submitted for the creation of classification places covering new technologies.
<b>Revision Procedure</b>	26-b	Short	Augment the role of rapporteurs for revision projects by giving them a mandate to initiate further discussion of the projects.
<b>Revision Procedure</b>	26-c	Short	Streamline the revision procedure by allowing the revision requests to be submitted directly to revision groups via the International Bureau.
<b>Revision Procedure</b>	26-d	Short	Introduce in IPC entries, where appropriate, more technical terms illustrating their contents.
<b>Training</b>	27-a	Short	Enhance WIPO role and support in the application of the IPC.
<b>Training</b>	27-b	Short	Improve IPC training by providing modern training techniques, for example, computer based and Internet training tools. This should involve, in particular, enhanced support for developing
<b>Structure &amp; Principles</b>	24-d	Medium	Establish an ad hoc working group to consider modifications to the IPC revision policy and revision procedure and develop a general question and answer pamphlet on the application of
<b>Structure &amp; Principles</b>	24-e	Medium	Consider the elaboration of rules for multiple classification in the IPC, for example, in areas covered by the last place rule, in function-orientated versus application areas, and investigate
<b>Structure &amp; Principles</b>	24-f	Medium	Review the hybrid systems in the IPC.
<b>Structure &amp; Principles</b>	24-g	Medium	Elaborate measures for increasing the consistency in the application of the IPC.
<b>Revision Period &amp; Revision Results Implementation</b>	25-a	Medium	Determine the most appropriate duration of revision cycles.
<b>Revision Period &amp; Revision Results Implementation</b>	25-b	Medium	Establish a close cooperation between the Committee and the SCIT.
<b>Revision Period &amp; Revision Results Implementation</b>	25-c	Medium	Study automated classification tools and conduct pilot projects on their use, in particular for the reclassification of backlog patent files.
<b>Revision Period &amp; Revision Results Implementation</b>	25-d	Medium	Study the possibility of cooperation between offices in the reclassification of backlog patent files, including its outsourcing to external contractors.
<b>Revision Procedure</b>	26-e	Medium	Elaborate a system of priorities for revision proposals.

[Annex 9 follows/  
L'annexe 9 suit]



ANNEXE 9

PLAN D'ACTION POUR LA MISE EN ŒUVRE DES RECOMMANDATIONS  
DU SÉMINAIRE DE HAUT NIVEAU SUR LA CIB

*établi par le Bureau international*

INTRODUCTION

1. Le Séminaire de haut niveau sur la CIB, qui s'est tenu en décembre 1998, avait été chargé d'étudier l'utilisation et la structure de la CIB, ainsi que les principes et la procédure de révision de la classification, et d'élaborer des recommandations destinées au Comité d'experts de l'Union de l'IPC et visant à adapter le fonctionnement de la classification à l'environnement électronique. Après avoir convenu que la CIB, qui constitue la seule classification de brevets utilisée partout dans le monde, reste un outil de recherche d'une importance considérable, le séminaire a dressé le tableau des principaux problèmes auxquels elle est confrontée et a indiqué que tant la classification elle-même que les méthodes de révision et d'application de la classification devaient subir des modifications pour permettre une utilisation efficace de la classification dans l'environnement électronique.
2. Les discussions qui ont eu lieu au sein du séminaire ont abouti à plusieurs catégories de recommandations adressées au comité :
  - a) recommandations relatives à la structure et à la conception générales de la CIB;
  - b) recommandations relatives à la période de révision et à la mise en œuvre des résultats de la révision;
  - c) recommandations relatives à la procédure de révision;
  - d) recommandations relatives à la formation à l'utilisation de la CIB.
3. Le séminaire a convenu qu'une partie des recommandations susmentionnées ne nécessitent pas un examen approfondi et peuvent être mises en œuvre par le comité à court terme, c'est-à-dire dès la nouvelle période de révision, alors qu'une autre partie de ces recommandations doivent être examinées en détail dans le cadre d'un groupe de travail ad hoc et pourraient être mises en œuvre à moyen terme, soit à l'expiration de la période de transition (1999-2001).
4. Afin de mieux préciser les recommandations et de mettre au point un plan d'action pour leur mise en œuvre, le séminaire a créé un groupe spécial et a invité ses membres à présenter au Bureau international des propositions concernant les actions à mettre en œuvre pour chacune des recommandations. De telles propositions ont été présentées par les membres ci-après du groupe spécial : Allemagne, Espagne, États-Unis d'Amérique, Fédération de Russie, Japon, Portugal, Royaume-Uni et Suède. Ces propositions figurent dans les annexes 1 à 8 du présent document.

5. Sur la base des propositions présentées, le Bureau international a établi un projet de plan d'action pour la mise en œuvre des recommandations du séminaire, qui est décrit ci -après.

#### PERSPECTIVE GÉNÉRALE

6. La mise en œuvre des modifications de la structure, du contenu, de la révision et de l'application de la CIB repose essentiellement sur les recommandations des paragraphes 24.a) et d) qui figurent dans le résumé des débats du séminaire et qui visent à instaurer une période de révision de transition au cours de laquelle lesdites modifications devraient être mises au point et à créer un groupe de travail ad hoc chargé d'examiner ces modifications. Selon toute vraisemblance, une réforme de la CIB pourra être menée à bien au cours de la période de transition, alors même que la révision de la CIB se poursuivra, de façon limitée cependant.

7. La gestion et l'organisation de la réforme du CIB seront assurées par le Bureau international, essentiellement par l'intermédiaire du groupe de travail ad hoc proposé, des organes qui lui succéderont le cas échéant et de groupes spéciaux. On trouvera ci -après l'examen détaillé du plan d'action proposé en ce qui concerne chacune des recommandations du séminaire avec une indication, le cas échéant, du calendrier applicable, des ressources nécessaires et des mesures à mettre en œuvre sur le plan logistique. À la suite du plan d'action, certains autres éléments abordés par les membres du groupe spécial parallèlement aux recommandations du séminaire sont analysés.

#### RECOMMANDATIONS RELATIVES À LA STRUCTURE ET À LA CONCEPTION GÉNÉRALES DE LA CIB

Instaurer une période de révision de transition (1999 -2002) au cours de laquelle il conviendrait de mettre au point les modifications des principes et de la procédure de révision de la CIB, ainsi que de la procédure de mise en œuvre des résultats de la révision  
(recommandation à court -terme)

8. L'intention du séminaire était de faire en sorte que le comité d'experts puisse décider d'instaurer une période de révision de transition à sa vingt -huitième session, définissant ainsi un cadre permettant de poursuivre la révision de la CIB tout en procédant à la réforme de la classification. Si une décision était prise en ce sens, la huitième édition de la CIB devrait être publiée à la mi-2001 et devrait entrer en vigueur le 1<sup>er</sup> janvier 2002.

9. Au cours de la période de transition, toutes les recommandations à court terme du séminaire, si elles sont adoptées par le comité, devraient être mises en œuvre et toutes les recommandations à moyen terme devraient être finalisées en vue de leur mise en œuvre à partir de 2002.

Modifier les grands principes de révision de la CIB conformément aux propositions formulées dans l'exposé de l'Office néerlandais de la propriété industrielle (recommandation à court-terme)

10. Le texte de la proposition de l'Office néerlandais de la propriété industrielle concernant l'orientation du travail de révision de la CIB pour la septième période de révision figure dans l'appendice de la présente annexe. Les modifications qu'il est proposé d'apporter à l'orientation adoptée pour la sixième période de révision portent essentiellement sur l'utilisation de la CIB dans le cadre de la recherche électronique de données classique parallèlement à l'utilisation d'autres moyens électroniques de recherche et sur la nécessité de tenir compte des opportunités qu'offrent ces moyens dans le cadre du processus de révision (voir le grand principe 1).

11. Compte tenu du fait que de nouvelles discussions sont prévues au sein d'un groupe de travail ad hoc chargé d'examiner les modifications des principes et de la procédure de révision de la CIB, la formulation proposée pour l'orientation du travail de révision de la CIB est susceptible d'être précisée davantage. Compte tenu de cette possibilité, le comité souhaitera peut-être adopter la proposition en question à titre provisoire, de façon à donner des instructions pour le travail de révision en cours, étant entendu que l'orientation pourrait être définie avec plus de précision au cours de la période de transition.

12. L'instauration de nouveaux principes de révision aura des conséquences directes sur les travaux d'un groupe chargé d'examiner la révision de la CIB et pourrait aboutir au réexamen des critères de sélection des projets de révision de la CIB, définis dans le cadre du PCIPI. Même si la révision des critères de sélection ne figure pas explicitement dans les recommandations du séminaire, elle est de toute évidence liée à la modification des principes de révision et pourrait être examinée par le groupe de travail ad hoc qu'il est proposé de créer parallèlement à un éventuel système de priorités applicable aux propositions de révision (recommandation 26.e)).

Insérer des données électroniques destinées à illustrer le contenu des entrées de la CIB : exemples de documents de brevet, notes détaillées et définitions (recommandation à court-terme)

13. La présente recommandation vise à rendre la CIB plus facile à utiliser et son application plus cohérente. Bien que le séminaire en ait fait une recommandation à court terme, elle ne pourrait en fait être mise œuvre à court terme que partiellement.

14. On pourrait envisager, aux fins d'une mise en œuvre immédiate, dès la huitième édition de la CIB, de proposer des liens électroniques vers des documents de brevet cités en exemples pour les groupes de la CIB récemment créés et vers un ensemble de notes pertinentes à différents niveaux de la hiérarchie, en fonction du contenu des entrées, pour tous les groupes de la CIB. Le matériel nécessaire à la mise en œuvre de la première de ces tâches est disponible, compte tenu du fait que la procédure actuelle de révision de la CIB oblige à citer des exemples de documents de brevet pour tous les nouveaux groupes proposés. Ce matériel devrait être rassemblé et inséré dans les versions électroniques de la CIB. En revanche, des travaux de programmation importants seront nécessaires pour la mise en œuvre de la deuxième des tâches citées.

15. Cela étant, revoir toute la classification en vue de mettre au point des notes additionnelles et des définitions, même dans les seuls domaines techniques les plus délicats, ou d'insérer des exemples de documents de brevet ou des dessins pour illustrer certains groupes existants de la CIB nécessitera des ressources importantes en plus du travail normal de révision. Pour mener à bien ces travaux, un groupe spécial, composé d'experts de la CIB hautement qualifiés venant des offices de brevet qui participent activement aux travaux de révision de la CIB, devrait être créé. Un tel groupe spécial aurait pour mandat d'établir, au cours de la période provisoire, du matériel explicatif supplémentaire destiné à être inséré dans la CIB et ferait directement rapport au comité d'experts.

Créer un groupe de travail ad hoc chargé d'examiner les modifications des principes et de la procédure de révision de la CIB et de mettre au point une brochure d'information générale du type questions-réponses sur l'application de la CIB (recommandation à moyen terme)

16. La création d'un groupe de travail ad hoc sera nécessaire pour la mise au point des modifications de la CIB elle-même, de sa procédure de révision et de son application. Si cette recommandation est adoptée par le comité, il est proposé de tenir, en 1999, deux sessions du groupe de travail ("Groupe de travail ad hoc sur la réforme de la CIB"), en mai et en novembre, de façon à ce que le groupe puisse présenter un rapport sur les décisions qu'il aura prises à la prochaine session du comité, qu'il est prévu de convoquer au début de 2000. En fonction des résultats obtenus, le comité pourrait inviter le groupe de travail à poursuivre ses travaux en 2000 ou le dissoudre et créer le groupe de travail ad hoc pour la révision du Guide d'utilisation de la CIB, dont le mandat porterait notamment sur la modification du guide en question à la lumière des travaux préparatoires relatifs à la réforme de la CIB tels qu'ils auraient été approuvés.

17. La mise au point d'une brochure d'information générale du type questions-réponses sur l'application de la CIB, qui vise à répondre aux besoins des utilisateurs non familiarisés avec la classification, est plus particulièrement liée aux recommandations relatives à la formation à l'utilisation de la CIB et pourrait être envisagée parallèlement à d'autres actions visant à améliorer la formation à la CIB.

Examiner la possibilité de définir des règles applicables au classement multiple dans la CIB, par exemple dans des endroits régis par la règle de la dernière place, dans des endroits axés sur la fonction et dans des endroits axés sur l'application, ainsi que d'aligner ces règles sur les règles de classement générales qui figurent dans le Guide d'utilisation de la CIB (recommandation à moyen terme)

18. La présente recommandation constituerait l'une des principales tâches du Groupe de travail ad hoc sur la réforme de la CIB et nécessiterait, le cas échéant, un réexamen complet de certaines caractéristiques de la structure de la CIB. Il est indispensable de définir des principes applicables au classement multiple dans la CIB afin d'accroître son efficacité en tant qu'outil de recherche dans l'environnement électronique. Le Bureau international établira un document de travail aux fins de l'examen de la présente recommandation par le groupe de travail.

Revoir les systèmes hybrides dans la CIB (recommandation à moyen terme)

19. La révision des systèmes hybrides dans la CIB devrait revêtir divers aspects, tels que la possibilité de convertir certains schémas d'indexation en schémas de classement, l'introduction de schémas d'indexation universels, l'analyse coût-efficacité des systèmes hybrides, la simplification de la présentation des codes d'indexation. Le problème de fond que pose l'indexation facultative pourrait être laissée en suspens jusqu'à l'examen des objectifs à long terme du développement de la CIB. Le Bureau international présentera un document d'information concernant les systèmes hybrides au groupe de travail ad hoc.

Définir des mesures visant à accroître la cohérence dans l'application de la CIB  
(recommandation à moyen terme)

20. Il est très difficile d'assurer une véritable cohérence dans l'application d'une classification aussi utilisée dans le monde que la CIB compte tenu de la diversité relative des approches adoptées en matière de classement dans les différents offices et des différences réelles constatées dans les revendications au sein d'une même famille de brevets. Une enquête menée par le PCIPI au milieu des années 80 a mis au jour un ensemble de classes de la CIB, toutes liées à des subdivisions axées sur la fonction, dans laquelle on a observé un grand nombre de cas d'incohérence dans l'utilisation de la CIB. À la suite de cette enquête, une tâche spéciale a été attribuée au Groupe de travail du PCIPI sur l'information en matière de recherche, sur l'introduction, dans les classes axées sur la fonction de la CIB, de renvois aux classes axées sur l'application pertinentes. Au cours des nombreuses années qu'a duré l'examen de cette tâche, de tels renvois ont été introduits dans certaines classes de la CIB, en particulier dans les classes F 16 et G 05. Ces renvois visaient à accroître la cohérence dans l'application de la CIB.

21. Il semble établi que l'introduction dans la CIB des informations supplémentaires évoqués au paragraphe 15, aux fins d'explication, permettra une utilisation plus cohérente de la classification. En conséquence, un groupe spécial, dont la création est proposée dans ledit paragraphe, pourrait également se voir confier la définition de mesures visant à accroître la cohérence dans l'application de la CIB.

**RECOMMANDATIONS RELATIVES À LA PÉRIODE DE RÉVISION ET À LA MISE EN ŒUVRE DES RÉSULTATS DE LA RÉVISION**

Déterminer la durée la plus indiquée pour les cycles de révision (recommandation à court terme)

22. Le cycle de révision actuellement appliqué, qui est de cinq ans, est le résultat d'un compromis entre des offices favorables à la stabilité de la CIB et à une période de révision plus longue et des offices souhaitant disposer d'une CIB plus dynamique et favorables à une période de révision plus courte. À l'heure actuelle, et alors que le monde entier est témoin de la rapidité des progrès techniques, la durée de cinq ans fixée pour le cycle de révision, qui conduit à un retard considérable entre la présentation d'une demande de révision et la mise en œuvre des résultats de cette révision dans la CIB, ne semble plus appropriée. De nombreux offices seraient partisans de passer à une période de révision de trois ans qui permettrait d'accélérer l'examen des propositions de révision de la CIB. Déterminer la durée la plus

indiquée pour les cycles de révision constituerait l'une des tâches du Groupe de travail ad hoc sur la réforme de la CIB. Si elle est adoptée par le comité, la période de révision de transition – fixée à trois ans – permettrait de se faire une idée des possibilités qu'offrent les cycles de trois ans en ce qui concerne la traduction dans les langues nationales, le classement très poussé des documents publiés et le perfectionnement des classificateurs.

23. Parallèlement à l'examen de la durée la plus indiquée pour les cycles de révision, il conviendrait également d'examiner la possibilité de publier chaque année les modifications de la CIB adoptées, ainsi que des informations sur leur utilisation en tant que classification non officielle par des offices volontaires. Cela permettrait aussi, comme le proposent certains offices, une introduction rapide des entrées non officielles dans la classification et leur expérimentation au cours de la période de révision, en vue de leur adoption définitive à la fin de ladite période.

Établir une collaboration étroite entre le comité et le SCIT (recommandation à moyen terme)

24. Comme cela a été indiqué au cours du séminaire, les nouvelles techniques de l'information jouent un rôle primordial dans l'adaptation de la CIB à l'ère électronique : une coopération étroite devrait en conséquence être mise en place entre le comité d'experts et le Comité permanent de l'OMPI des techniques de l'information (SCIT). Cette collaboration pourrait avoir pour objet les nouveaux outils de recherche qui utilisent la CIB. En réalité, le SCIT est déjà impliqué dans le projet d'extension du système d'interrogation de la CIB en langage naturel aux langues autres que le français. Le comité d'experts pourrait collaborer à ce projet en donnant l'avis de ses experts en classification.

25. Pour entamer ladite collaboration, un document d'information adressé au SCIT pourrait être établi par le Bureau international, à la suite de la vingt-huitième session du comité d'experts, afin de donner un aperçu des projets du comité dans le domaine des techniques de l'information et de demander, le cas échéant, l'assistance technique du SCIT.

Étudier les outils automatiques de classement et lancer des projets pilotes sur leur utilisation, en particulier pour le reclassement des fichiers rétrospectifs relatifs aux brevets (recommandation à moyen terme)

26. La présente recommandation vise à supprimer le problème découlant de l'utilisation de plusieurs éditions de la CIB au cours de la recherche. Le Bureau international a l'intention de mener un projet pilote sur l'utilisation d'outils automatiques de classement pour le reclassement des dossiers de brevets. Après s'être penché sur l'expérience accumulée par certains offices dans le domaine des outils automatiques de classement, le Bureau international a l'intention de publier un appel d'offres invitant certaines entreprises commerciales à mettre au point un logiciel pour le reclassement, fonctionnant sur la base des informations sur le transfert de matières fournies dans la CIB elle-même et dans la table de concordance. Le rapport sur l'état d'avancement des travaux concernant le projet pourrait être présenté à la prochaine session du comité, en 2000, en vue de finaliser le projet au cours de l'exercice biennal 2000-2001, et notamment de faire expérimenter le produit final par les offices intéressés. Si sa mise au point est satisfaisante, le logiciel pourrait être mis à la disposition des offices souhaitant reclasser leurs fichiers rétrospectifs relatifs aux brevets.

Étudier les possibilités de collaboration entre offices dans le domaine du reclassement des fichiers rétrospectifs relatifs aux brevets, y compris le recours à des sous-traitants extérieurs (recommandation à moyen terme)

27. La présente recommandation devrait constituer l'une des tâches du Groupe de travail ad hoc sur la réforme de la CIB. Compte tenu du fait qu'un certain nombre d'offices reclassent régulièrement leurs dossiers de recherche lorsqu'une nouvelle édition de la CIB est publiée, il semble possible de mettre en place une collaboration entre les offices dans le domaine du reclassement des dossiers de recherche. Le Bureau international dispose d'informations émanant d'offices qui ont reclassé – complètement ou en partie – leurs dossiers de brevets en fonction de la sixième édition de la CIB et qui se sont portés volontaires pour mettre leurs données relatives à ce reclassement à la disposition des autres offices. Un document d'information portant sur cette question sera présenté au groupe de travail ad hoc.

#### RECOMMANDATIONS RELATIVES À LA PROCÉDURE DE RÉVISION

28. Les recommandations appartenant à cette catégorie portent sur un ensemble de mesures destinées à améliorer et à accélérer la procédure de révision de la CIB. Elles semblent plus évidentes et plus faciles à mettre en œuvre que les recommandations de la catégorie précédente. La réalisation de la plus grande partie d'entre elles nécessite une décision du comité d'experts suivie de leur mise en œuvre dans la pratique de révision par le Bureau international.

Au cours de la période de transition, poursuivre la révision de la CIB sur la base des projets de révision reportés de la période de révision précédente et des nouvelles propositions de révision susceptibles d'avoir été présentées en vue de la création d'endroits dans la classification destinés à couvrir de nouvelles techniques (recommandation à court terme)

29. La présente recommandation est étroitement liée aux recommandations relatives à l'instauration de la période de transition et à la création du Groupe de travail ad hoc sur la réforme de la CIB. La nécessité de poursuivre la révision de la CIB, tout en mettant au point des modifications importantes de la CIB elle-même et de son application, doit être examinée compte tenu des ressources limitées des offices qui jouent un rôle actif dans le domaine de la CIB. En conséquence, la recommandation propose de limiter les travaux de révision au minimum nécessaire pour que la classification tienne compte des progrès techniques, sur la base des projets de révision reportés de la période de révision précédente et des nouvelles propositions de révision relatives à la création d'endroits dans la classification destinés à couvrir de nouvelles techniques. De toute évidence, les propositions appartenant à cette dernière catégorie sont les plus urgentes à mettre en œuvre dans la prochaine édition de la CIB. Si la présente recommandation est adoptée par le comité, le Bureau international pourra se voir invité à publier une circulaire invitant à présenter chaque année les demandes de révision ne concernant que ce type de révision.

Accroître le rôle des rapporteurs des projets de révision grâce à un mandat qui leur permettrait d'engager de nouvelles discussions sur les projets (recommandation à court terme)

30. Accroître le rôle des rapporteurs des projets de révision leur donnerait pratiquement le statut de chef de projet ainsi que la responsabilité de décider du moment auquel le projet est prêt à être débattu en session du groupe de travail. Pour que les rapporteurs puissent assumer cette responsabilité, il est nécessaire qu'ils aient la possibilité de reprendre l'examen des questions en suspens ou de susciter une nouvelle série de commentaires. Si la recommandation est adoptée, les modifications pertinentes de la procédure actuelle de révision devraient être proposées par le Bureau international et approuvées par le groupe de travail concerné et par le comité.

Rationaliser la procédure de révision et autoriser la présentation directe des demandes de révision au groupe de révision par l'intermédiaire du Bureau international (recommandation à court terme)

31. L'idée maîtresse de la présente recommandation est d'accélérer l'introduction des propositions de révision dans le programme de révision en permettant de les adresser au groupe de travail qui se réunirait plus souvent que le comité d'experts. L'examen par le groupe de travail des demandes de révision présentées serait basé sur les critères de sélection des projets de révision de la CIB actuels ou sur des critères modifiés si le comité décidait de procéder à une telle modification. Le groupe de travail devrait faire preuve de circonspection dans ses décisions d'accepter ou non un projet de révision dans le programme et, en cas de doute, la demande de révision devrait être transmise au comité pour une décision définitive.

Insérer, au besoin, un plus grand nombre de termes techniques dans les entrées de la CIB afin d'illustrer leur contenu (recommandation à court terme)

32. La présente recommandation vise à faciliter l'interrogation de la CIB grâce à l'insertion dans le texte des entrées de la CIB d'un plus grand nombre d'exemples comportant des termes techniques auxquels sont accoutumés les utilisateurs de la littérature technique et de la documentation en matière de brevets. On se souviendra que les exemples qui figurent dans la CIB ne limitent pas le sens de la phrase qui les précède mais sont simplement destinés à apporter une explication. Cela permettrait d'introduire des termes plus techniques, même s'ils ne sont pas systématiquement utilisés dans la documentation publiée, tout en conservant des règles précises pour la formulation des définitions qui figurent dans les entrées elles-mêmes. Si elle est adoptée, la présente recommandation nécessitera la modification des instructions particulières pour la révision de la CIB.

Élaborer un système de priorités pour les propositions de révision (recommandation à moyen terme)

33. La présente recommandation constitue une tâche devant faire l'objet de discussions au sein du Groupe de travail ad hoc sur la réforme de la CIB. Comme indiqué plus haut, elle devrait être examinée parallèlement aux critères de sélection des projets de révision de la CIB en vigueur.



## RECOMMANDATIONS RELATIVES À LA FORMATION À L'UTILISATION DE LA CIB

34. Un ensemble de recommandations relatives à la formation, qui devrait également porter sur la mise au point d'une brochure d'information générale de type questions -réponses sur l'application de la CIB (questions fréquentes), vise à améliorer la compréhension de la CIB et à promouvoir une plus large utilisation, à la fois par les personnels des offices de brevets et par le public en général. Le Bureau international envisage, tout en poursuivant ses programmes de perfectionnement professionnel, en particulier dans les pays en développement – dont, par exemple un atelier régional sur la CIB, au cours de l'exercice biennal 2000-2001 – de mettre l'accent, comme le recommande le séminaire, sur l'élaboration de techniques de formation moderne, faisant appel, par exemple, à des méthodes d'apprentissage à distance basées sur l'informatique et sur l'utilisation de l'Internet.

35. En se fondant sur le matériel de formation déjà disponible et que l'on peut trouver, par exemple, dans le Manuel d'introduction à la CIB, composé de deux séries d'exemples destinés à la formation mis au point par le Groupe de travail du PCIPI sur l'information en matière de recherche, le Bureau international a l'intention de confier la mise au point d'outils de formation interactifs basés sur l'utilisation de l'informatique et de l'Internet à des sous-traitants extérieurs. Pour ce projet, l'expérience acquise par l'Académie mondiale de l'OMPI dans le domaine des techniques d'enseignement à distance sera mise à profit.

36. La mise au point de nouveaux matériels de formation, comprenant une brochure d'information générale de type questions -réponses sur l'application de la CIB, pourrait être demandée au Groupe de travail ad hoc sur la réforme de la CIB.

## RÉPARTITION DES TÂCHES DÉCOULANT DES RECOMMANDATIONS DU SÉMINAIRE DE HAUT NIVEAU SUR LA CIB

37. En résumé du plan d'action décrit ci-dessus, il est proposé d'approuver la répartition ci-après des tâches découlant de recommandations du séminaire (la numérotation des recommandations est la même que celle qui figure dans le résumé des débats du séminaire (voir le document IPC/SEM/98/11)) :

- Groupe de travail ad hoc sur la réforme de la CIB :  
recommandations 24.b), 24.e), 24.f), 25.a), 25.d), 26.e), 27.b);
- Groupe spécial composé de certains experts :  
recommandations 24.c), 24.g);
- Comité d'experts de l'Union de l'IPC et Bureau international :  
recommandations 24.a), 24.b), 24.d), 25.b), 25.c), 26.a), 26.b), 26.c), 26.d), 27.a).

## OBJECTIFS À LONG TERME, RESSOURCES ET GESTION

38. Certains membres du groupe spécial ont soulevé la question des objectifs à long terme du développement de la CIB, de la disponibilité des ressources nécessaires à sa révision et à sa réforme et de la gestion globale de la CIB.

39. Il apparaît clairement qu'il serait difficile de définir les objectifs à long terme du développement de la CIB, alors que la mise en œuvre des actions à court et à moyen terme en vue de la réforme de la CIB va seulement commencer et qu'il n'est pas possible de préjuger des résultats auxquels vont aboutir les diverses tâches liées à la réforme. La recommandation du séminaire selon laquelle, à la fin de la période de transition, une stratégie à long terme en vue de la création d'un nouveau système international de classification des brevets pour le prochain millénaire devrait être définie (voir le paragraphe 31 du document IPC/SEM/98/11), semble constituer une approche judicieuse à l'heure actuelle.

40. En ce qui concerne la disponibilité des ressources nécessaires à la révision et à la réforme de la CIB, on se souviendra que la révision de la CIB est réalisée avant tout dans l'intérêt des offices de brevet et l'on peut supposer que les offices continueront à allouer les mêmes ressources à la CIB qu'à l'heure actuelle. Cependant, ces ressources sont inévitablement limitées et ne sont pas suffisantes pour la révision et une réforme simultanée de la CIB. L'affectation de ressources au programme de mesures nécessaires à l'adaptation de la classification à l'environnement électronique relève de la compétence de l'Assemblée des États membres de l'OMPI. Il est proposé en conséquence que le comité d'experts établisse une recommandation en la matière destinée à l'Assemblée de l'Union de l'IPC, qui se réunira en septembre 1999.

41. En ce qui concerne la gestion globale de la CIB, plusieurs membres du groupe spécial ont demandé que le rôle et le soutien de l'OMPI dans le domaine de la CIB soient accrus, ce qui nécessite inévitablement une augmentation des ressources humaines et financières affectées au sein du Bureau international à ce secteur. L'affectation de ressources en quantité suffisante est une condition préalable à la gestion efficace et à la mise en œuvre réussie de la réforme de la CIB. Il est proposé que le comité d'experts de l'Union de l'IPC accorde toute l'attention voulue à cette question lors des discussions relatives au programme et budget de l'OMPI pour l'exercice biennal 2000-2001.

[L'appendice suit]

APPENDICE

ORIENTATION DU TRAVAIL DE RÉVISION DE LA CIB POUR  
LA SEPTIÈME PÉRIODE DE RÉVISION

Les cinq grands principes suivants devront servir de base pour le travail de révision de la CIB au cours de la septième période de révision :

1. La révision de la CIB, conformément à l'Arrangement de Strasbourg concernant la classification internationale des brevets, est nécessaire lorsque, pour permettre des recherches efficaces dans le cadre de l'association de la CIB et d'autres méthodes de recherche disponibles, elle est susceptible d'améliorer considérablement la sélection de données en fonction de leur pertinence par rapport à la question posée.
2. Toutes les demandes de révision devraient être sélectionnées en fonction des critères en vigueur convenus par le Comité d'experts de l'Union de l'IPC.
3. Lors de la révision d'un secteur donné de la CIB, toute solution permettant d'améliorer ce secteur en tant qu'outil de recherche devrait être examinée compte tenu des besoins particuliers de recherche de ce secteur.
4. Il faudrait veiller à ne pas créer des concepts de classement qui se chevauchent.
5. Une révision de la CIB qui en modifierait la structure fondamentale ne devrait pas être entreprise sans bonne raison, par exemple la prise en compte de nouvelles techniques, la suppression de chevauchements, etc.

[Fin de l'annexe 9 et du document]