

ANNEX VI

SUMMARY OF THE REPLIES RECEIVED ON CIRCULAR No. IPC 107

1. By the end of the thirty-third session of the IPC Committee of Experts, a total of 49 replies were received including 35 from member States of the IPC Union (54 members), 11 from States not members of the IPC Union and three from intergovernmental organizations.

2. Replies were received from following Offices and Organizations:

African Regional Industrial Property Organization (AP)	Lithuania (LT)
Algeria (DZ)	The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (MK)
Armenia (AM)	Madagascar (MG)
Austria (AT)	Mexico (MX)
Azerbaijan (AZ)	Netherlands (NL)
Belarus (BY)	New Zealand (NZ)
Belgium (BE)	Norway (NO)
Bulgaria (BG)	Portugal (PT)
Canada (CA)	Republic of Korea (KR)
China (CN)	Romania (RO)
Colombia (CO)	Russian Federation (RU)
Croatia (HR)	Serbia and Montenegro (CS)
Czech Republic (CZ)	Slovakia (SK)
European Patent Office (EP)	Slovenia (SI)
Estonia (EE)	Spain (ES)
Eurasian Patent Office (EA)	Sweden (SE)
Finland (FI)	Switzerland (CH)
France (FR)	Togo (TG)
Germany (DE)	Turkey (TR)
Hungary (HU)	Ukraine (UA)
Iceland (IS)	United Kingdom (GB)
Ireland (IE)	United States of America (US)
Israel (IL)	Uruguay (UY)
Japan (JP)	Uzbekistan (UZ)
Kyrgyzstan (KG)	

3. The answers to the five questions included in the questionnaire can be summarized as follows:

Question 1

“Does your Office use at present subclass symbols or complete symbols of the IPC for classification of your published documents?”

Forty-eight offices replied that they use complete symbols, including one office using subclass symbols for published applications and complete symbols for published patents.

Question 2

“Does your Office intend to use the subclass level, the core level or the advanced level of the reformed IPC after its entry into force (January 1, 2005) for classification of your published patent documents?”

- Seventeen offices replied they would use the core level;
- Twenty-seven offices replied they would use the advanced level;
- Four offices replied they would apply the core level and advanced level in parallel, depending on the relevance of the technical field for their country.

Question 3

“Does your Office intend to carry out reclassification of your published patent documents following revision changes made to the core level or to the advanced level of the reformed IPC?”

- Twenty-four offices replied they would carry out such reclassification;
- Twenty-two offices replied they would not carry out such reclassification;
- Two offices indicated that no decision was taken yet.

Question 4

“Would your Office like to request that reclassification of your published patent documents having patent family members in the PCT Minimum Documents be made by automatic propagation of the reclassification data from the PCT Minimum Documentation?”

- Twenty-eight offices replied they would request such propagation;
- Seven offices replied they would not request such propagation;
- One office has not yet decided on this matter.

The EPO and the USPTO indicated that this question did not apply to their offices.

Question 5

“If the response to Question 3 is “Yes,” would your Office be prepared to carry out reclassification according to the reformed IPC (next edition of the IPC) of the complete collection of your published patent documents, or its part not covered by the option indicated in Question 4?”

Eighteen of the 23 offices that replied to question 3 with “Yes” would be prepared to carry out such reclassification.

4. Some offices that replied “Yes” to question 3 explained that they would reclassify only such documents of their national collection that have no family members in the PCT Minimum Documentation and for which, therefore, no automatic propagation according to question 4 is possible.
5. One remark requested provision of a definition of the family mentioned in question 4.
6. One patent office explained with regard to question 4 that it would request automatic propagation only for documents having a foreign priority. Another office also requested the facility to request automatic propagation for selected categories of documents only.
7. With respect to question 5, some offices replied that they may reclassify only a limited part of their collection, e.g. documents published after a specific date.
8. One office requested technical assistance by WIPO for application and reclassification according to the reformed IPC.

[Annex VII follows]