



2000-09-29

Management
Ms. Helen Frary,
Head, IT Business
Section,
WIPO

PROPOSAL FOR THE RESTRUCTURING OF THE SCIT

Comments by the Swedish Patent Office

It should be pointed out right away, that we support the proposal to dissolve the SCIT and replace it with two new bodies: the **Advisory Group on IT** and the **SC on Technical Standards & Documentation**, respectively.

However, the argumentation in the first sections of document SCIT/RES/1 Rev. requires some comment.

In par 6, the existing mandate is recalled and in par 7 the mandate is characterized as "quite limited in scope". We do not share that view. It should be remembered that the existing mandate wisely defines *WHAT* the SCIT should do, e.g. *guide on the WIPO global information network and on the provision of IP information services*.

It is true that the mandate does not say much concerning the matter which is the subject of par 1 of the document, but that paragraph is focusing on *HOW* the SCIT should work. Although the **means** are important enough, we do believe that the **goals** are even more important. In other words, *WHAT* is more important than *HOW*.

Further, par 3 of the document relates solely to the improvement of the IT competence and resources of the International Bureau. Although this is very relevant for the possibility of the combined efforts of WIPO and its Member States to achieve the necessary modernization, it is only indirectly related to the organizational questions, e.g. the SCIT as such.

Nevertheless, we agree that a certain lack of clarity in respect of the SCIT mandate and agenda has led to a confusion of WHAT items and HOW items. The proposals in par 10 – 20 are therefore welcome.

In our opinion, the first sentence of par 12 is too limiting. Although the name of the Committee includes *Documentation*, the sentence only states *Standards*. The mandate should therefore be elaborated to clearly cover also such items as policies, recommendations, statements of principles etc (cfr the WIPO Handbook on Industrial Property Information and documentation).

To illustrate this, one could consider the IPC. When the PCPI was created in 1978, it was finally possible – after many years – to combine under one organizational structure patent classification (the IPC) and the computerization of search methods (ICIREPAT). This proved very efficient, and it was probably one of the reasons that the IPC/CE in 1998 voiced concern that a possible separation from the new body (the SCIT) might leave the classification work without enough resources and separated from the professional environment¹.

We would be pleased to be given the opportunity to discuss more of the details once the general direction is established.

Yours sincerely,

¹ It is an established fact that still to-day, automated search is considerably enhanced by discretionary classification symbols

Lars Björklund
Deputy Director General