

WIPO



SCIT/7/7
ORIGINAL:English
DATE:April26,2002

E

WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION
GENEVA

STANDING COMMITTEE ON INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES

PLENARY Seventh Session Geneva, June 10 to 14, 2002

REQUEST FOR THE REVISION OF WIPO STANDARDS T.8

Document prepared by the Secretariat

1. The ad hoc International Patent Classification (IPC) Reform Working Group (hereinafter referred to as "the Working Group"), at its fifth session, agreed that, in view of the reform of the IPC, WIPO Standard ST.8 and some other relevant standards ("electronic data processing standards") needed revision. The Working Group also agreed that the revision of WIPO Standard ST.8 should be initiated and completed as soon as possible so as to give industrial property offices sufficient time to accommodate their computer systems to the revised Standard before the entering into force of the reformed IPC. In this respect, the Working Group authorized the International Bureau to submit a request to the Standing Committee on Information Technologies (SCIT) for inclusion of the revision of Standard ST.8 (and as necessary, recommendations concerning other relevant standards) in the SCIT work program. In order to provide comprehensive material for ensuring a timely revision process under the SCIT, the Working Group requested the European Patent Office (EPO) to prepare a detailed revision proposal by September 1, 2001, and invited its members to submit comments on the proposal by November 1, 2001. The EPO was invited to submit a final revision proposal to the SCIT by December 1, 2001. (See document IPC/REF/5/3, paragraphs 41 to 43.)

2. On November 16, 2001, the EPO submitted to the Secretariat a request for revision of Standard ST.8, as well as related standards. This request is reproduced as the Annex to this document.

3. *The SCIT Plenary is invited:*

(a) *to consider the proposal to revise WIPO Standard ST.8 as requested in the Annex to this document;*

(b) *to create a task for the revision of Standard ST.8; and to set up a task force to handle such revision and to study its impact on other standards referring to IPC data.*

[Annex follows]

Europäisches
PatentamtEuropean
Patent OfficeOffice européen
des brevets

GD1

DG1

DG1

Principal Directorate Documentation

HP/01.269/hp

REQUEST FOR REVISION OF WIPO STANDARD ST.8

INTRODUCTION

The reform of the IPC is ongoing and it is planned to have the new IPC available from July 2004 onwards for internal use by the Industrial Property Offices and the new symbols should be used on the published documents from January 2005 onwards. The reformed IPC should allow all IPO's to allot the IPC symbols of a chosen level (core or advanced) in the same way.

The Master Classification Database, storing the allotted symbols for all documents, should allow the retrieval of the IPC information as well as its maintenance. Therefore an exchange of information between the IPO's and the Master Classification database is to be carried out.

Most IPO's have high expectations from the reformed IPC and it is agreed that the PCT minimum documentation (full specifications in English, French or German) should always be reclassified according to the last version of the advanced level of this reformed IPC.

REVISION REQUEST

The current WIPO standard ST.8 defines the format of the IPC for computer interpretation and is used in exchange standards. The reformed IPC itself as well as the needs for a smooth and correct retrieval of the information are resulting in fundamental changes of the currently existing indicators as well as the creation of new indicators.

On behalf of the Committee of Experts and its ad hoc IPC Reform Working Group, the EPO requests the SCIT to revise WIPO standard ST.8 as well as the other standards referring to the IPC. Special attention is drawn to the short time period left for the revision taking into account that IPO's should have enough time to adapt their computer programmes for recording and exchanging the new IPC. A treatment of this request by the Working Group on Standards and Documentation in their next session is therefore highly desirable.

SURVEY OF NEEDS FOR IPCC CORE AND ADVANCED LEVEL

REPRESENTATION OF THE IPC SYMBOL

The IPC symbol is currently represented in 18 digits namely 1 for section, 2 for class, 1 for subclass, 3 for main group before the slash and 5 for group level after the slash. Although there is no short term need to extend the digits for the main and group level it is wisest to allow 4 digits before the slash and 6 digits after the slash.

REPRESENTATION OF THE INDICATORS

Eight indicators are to be stored namely type of level, version or validity date, date of allotting the classification symbol, first or other position, invention or other information, original or reclassified data, generating office, intellectual or family propagated data.

Level indicator

Offices are expected to classify only in one level (core or advanced). However both levels are to be complete in the master classification database and a level indicator is needed to allow completed datasets per level. The level indicator should allow to make the difference between core, advanced, subclass and other level. The letters C, A, S and O are proposed for it and a 1 digit field is needed.

Version indicator

The version indicator already exists but is to be replaced by a date indicator and although a month indication with six digits is enough for the expected publication frequency it is proposed to work with 8 digits namely YYYYMMDD with Y for year, M for month and D for day. The frequency of updating the advanced level could no longer term be more than once per month.

Action date

The date of allotting the classification symbol (action date) is represented by 8 symbols namely YYYYMMDD. This date allows to check if a classification needs to be reviewed after revision of the scheme e.g. in case of creating new subdivisions.

Main and further invention information

The position of the first invention information classification symbol needs to be recognised and therefore a 1 digit field is needed. The letters F and L could be used in it for respectively first and later position.

Invention and other information

The difference between invention information and other information is important for the retrieval of the information and can also be made in a 1 digit field with two letters. It is proposed to use the letters I and N for respectively the invention and non-invention information.

Original and reclassified data

Original data is the first data allotted to the document. In case of the core level it is the publishing office which is giving this data. For the advanced level it can be another office. Reclassified data is data changed due to a change in the schemes. An incidental change due to an error is considered as a correction and keeps the status original. The indication of original and reclassified data can again be marked in a 1 digit field with letters. The letters B and R are proposed respectively for the basic or original and the reclassified data.

Generating Office

In the current situation each office is generating its own IPC data. With the reformed IPC it is expected that at least a part of the reclassified data is delivered by other offices than the publishing office. Information on the source of the reclassified data is considered necessary. For the generating office a 2 digit field is needed and the country or office code CC is to be used.

Intellectual and propagated data

Propagation of the data via a patent family system is foreseen. A difference is to be made between the intellectual and propagated data. Especially the propagation on a common priority can lead to errors and this indicator facilitates later correction. The indication, if the data is given by a human person or family - propagated by a machine, can be placed in a 1 digit field and the letters H and M could be used respectively for human and machine classification.

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

The letters proposed above are in first instances selected for more technical reasons but they also allow an easy checking on error cases as all letters are only used once independently of their position.

This proposal covers also well known security measures namely blank fields as separators between blocks of information although it is left to the authority of the SCIT SDWG to judge on its utility in view of modern techniques.

For the sequence of the fields it is proposed to start with the fields which are mandatory for the respective offices followed by the fields which are to be filled by the Master Classification Database. The action date can be filled in by the offices but if not done the date of load in the Master Classification Database is recorded as the action date.

Although in databases in general the slash is not stored in view of its fixed position, it is proposed to put also the slash in the string of information.

It is felt that also digits should be reserved for later use although these separator blanks between the fields could be used if needed. 1 digit is mentioned just to bring the total number of digits on 50.

CONCLUSION

The Standard and Documentation Working Group of the SCIT is requested to review ST8 and the following format is proposed namely to have a field with 50 positions with the following sequence and content:

Position	Content
1	section
2	blank
3,4	class
5	blank
6	subclass
7	blank
8-11	group(rightfilled)
12	slashseparator
13-18	subgroup(leftfilled)
19	blank
20-27	validitydateversion
28	blank
29	classificationlevel
30	blank
31	firstorlaterpositionofsymbol
32	blank
33	classificationvalue(inventiveetc..)
34	blank
35-42	actiondate
43	blank
44	originalorreclassifieddata
45	blank
46	humanorfamilydata
47	blank
48-49	generatingoffice
50	forlateruse

The Standard and Documentation Working Group of the SCIT is also requested to study the impact of the ST8 revision on other standards referring to IPC data e.g. ST30, ST32, ST35 and ST40.

[End of Annex and of document]