

From: Siep de Vries <siep.de.vries@bie.minez.nl>
To: "SCIT" <scit.mail@wipo.int>
Date: Fri, Aug 3, 2001 11:30 AM
Subject: circular SCIT 2539/06

August 3, 2001
WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION
Department Standards and Documentation Service
34, chemin des Colombettes
1211 GENEVA 20
Switzerland

subject:
circular SCIT 2539/06

Dear Sir,

With relation to the circular SCIT 2539/06 of July 6, 2001, issued by mr. K.-P. Wittig, and in its attached Survey dealing with information to be included in the Wipo Handbook on Industrial Property Information and Documentation, the NETHERLANDS INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY OFFICE would like to make some remarks. These remarks are contained in an annex to this letter. The Office is looking forward to see the information concerned in an appropriately amended form included in the useful Handbook just mentioned.

Yours sincerely,

S. de Vries
Head, Chemical Division,
Netherlands Industrial Property Office
Postbox 5820
2280 HV RIJSWIJK
The Netherlands

ANNEX

Remarks by the Netherlands Industrial Property Office
concerning the draft Survey of
the grant and publication of Supplementary Protection Certificates.

question 4, pages 7.2.4 and 7.2.5

In the case of the two entries for NL [question 4(a) and question 4(b)] the proposed text in English is an incomplete translation of the mentioned titles in Dutch. The text in English should read:

question 4(a) Supplementary Protection Certificate for Medicinal Products;

question 4(b) Supplementary Protection Certificate for Plant Protection Products.

question 7, pages 7.2.8 and 7.2.10

In the answer to question 7(a)(vii), concerning the Date of Authorization, NL is missing in the list associated with the answer YES. Compare the replies to the questions 7(b)(vii), 9(a)(vii) and 9(b)(vii).

In the answer to question 7(b)(vi), concerning the Number of the Authorization, NL is missing in the list associated with the answer YES. Compare the replies to the questions 7(a)(vi), 9(a)(vi) and 9(b)(vi).

question 10, pages 7.2.16 and 7.2.17

The remarks made by NL in connection with its reply to the questions 10(b)(i)(c) and 10(b)(ii)(c) have been interchanged. The remark ending with the words "and the granted SPC are laid open to public inspection" obviously belongs to question 10(b)(ii)(c) which deals with "granted SPCs". Compare the corresponding remarks made by NL - and correctly represented in the draft Survey - in connection with the corresponding questions 10(a)(i)(c) and 10(a)(ii)(c).

question 11, pages 7.2.18 and 7.2.19

In the replies by NL to questions 11(a)(i) and 11(b)(i), relating to Names of Databases, the language of NL is correctly reflected as "Dutch". The name of the Office, however, should read: Netherlands Industrial Property Office.

question 12, pages 7.2.20 and 7.2.21

In the reply by NL to question 12(a)(i) one should, on the first line, read 1993 rather than 1943.

In the reply by NL to question 12(b)(i) one should, on the first line, read 1997 rather than 1943.

Summary, item 5 on page 7.2.23

In view of the replies given by NL to questions 12(a)(i) and 12(b)(i), the summary given of the numbering system used by NL clearly is incomplete.

CC: "Dir. Secretariaat" <dirsec@bie.minez.nl>