

# OMPI



ORGANISATION MONDIALE DE LA PROPRIÉTÉ INTELLECTUELLE  
GENÈVE

IPC/CE/33/2 Suppl.1

ORIGINAL : anglais

DATE : 26 septembre 2003

F

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

## COMITÉ D'EXPERTS

Trente-troisième session  
Genève, 2 - 10 octobre 2003

OBSERVATIONS SUR LE DOCUMENT IPC/CE/33/2

*Document établi par le Secrétariat*

1. Les annexes I à IV du présent document contiennent des observations sur les modifications de la CIB proposées par le Groupe de travail sur la révision de la CIB (voir le document IPC/CE/33/2), soumises par la Suède, le Royaume-Uni et l'Office européen des brevets (OEB).

2. *Le comité d'experts est invité à prendre note des observations soumises dans les annexes I à IV du présent document.*

[Les annexes suivent]

---

# Swedish Patent and Registration Office

Amendments to the IPC

September 23rd, 2003

---

## Comments (in response to IPC/CE/33/2)

### Annex 1

There should presumably be a note number - the existing note will be Note (1) and the new will be Note (2)

### Annex 3

The guidance heading "**Ambulance service**" before A61G 1/00 was deleted (see IPC/WG/5/3, Technical Annex 21), since it was considered inaccurate in view of the modifications. This seems to have been lost when the project was referred back to IPC/WG. Some modifications were also done to the subclass indexes, but this does perhaps not need be dealt with at this session.

### Annex 8

We have discussed the presentation of references such as the one in 15/00 to (B01J) 20/281 before, but I don't remember the outcome - should we or should we not include the subclass symbol in examples in the reference?

### Annex 10

I suggest changing the order of notes (1) and (2), since otherwise it might be unclear what "**this subclass**" in note (2) relates to - C02F or C12S.

### Annex 11

Shouldn't the new note go before the existing Note (4) - don't classification notes go before indexing notes? Compare the position of the new notes in C07C (Annex 12) and C12N (Annex 17)!

### Annexes 13, 16

Again, check the note numbering!

### Annex 19

We have previously, at least informally at the IPC Discussion Forum and elsewhere, proposed to introduce a new group numbering system for reformed subclasses. The current system (1/00, 3/00, 5/00... for main groups and /02, /04, /06... for subgroups) gives, at least for main groups, very limited possibilities to add groups at the place in the numerical sequence where they should be according to the standardised sequence. We propose a new rule, where non-residual main groups are more or less equally spaced between 1/00 and 98/00, leaving space both at the beginning and the end, and where subgroups are more or less equally spaced between 01 and 99, also leaving space at both ends. For F23B we propose using main group numbers 10/00, 20/00 ... 90/00

instead of 10/00 - 26/00. For subgroups some other rule has to be found - perhaps using /20, /40, /60, /80 for main groups of 1-4 subgroups, /10, /20, /30 ... /90 for main groups of 5-9 subgroups and /05, /10, /15 ... /95 for main groups of 10-19 subgroup. Previously there were pretty detailed rules for group numbering - perhaps this is not really necessary. We would like the IB's input on this!

**F23B 14/06:** We note the GB comments, but their suggestion is not correct, since it would allow means that are different from the surface. In case a change is desirable it would be better to say "**with fuel-supporting surfaces that are specially adapted for advancing the fuel through the combustion zone**" or something to that effect.

**F23B 16/04, 16/06, 24/02, 24/04:** We accept the GB proposals, although they are not strictly necessary.

#### **Annex 20**

We might consider renumbering the residual main group 11/00, which is in the middle of several non-residual groups, to 99/00, and use the standard wording. I don't remember if this was discussed during the actual project - the original decision was made back at WG/7.

Anders Bruun

[Annex II follows/  
L'annexe II suit]

## ANNEX II/ANNEXE II

---



---

**UK Patent Office**
**Date: 22 September 2003****Comments on Project CE331****(Committee of Experts)**


---



---

Our comments on the proposed amendments to the IPC, in the Technical Annexes of IPC/CE/33/2 and in the above project, are as follows:

**A61G 5/00**

The term “personal conveyances” has been used to replace the expression “multi-track cycles” in this group. We suspect that these terms are not exact equivalents, and therefore there is probably a (small) change of scope. We think there should be a letter C beside the entry.

The subclass title is unaffected since the existing term “transport” covers personal conveyances.

We also wonder why the expression “multi-track cycles” has been removed altogether - unless it is a meaningless or incorrect term this seems a retrograde step. Anyone searching for or attempting to classify these things (whatever they are!) will be confused and won’t easily find where to look. Could it be reinstated as an example, together with wheelchairs?

We tentatively propose:

C      5/00    Chairs or personal conveyances specially adapted for patients or disabled persons, e.g. wheelchairs, multi-track cycles (chairs - - -

**A61G - Funereal/funeral devices**

Please see US’s Rapporteur report of Definition project D029, Annex 16 (including the Annex thereof). US agrees with our assertion that “funereal” should be replaced by “funeral”, and makes an appropriate proposal. Is this a good opportunity to effect these amendments to the IPC, or should we wait for the Revision WG to make the decision first?

**B01D - note after 15/08** *(no action required)*

We are simply noting something here, not asking for action. This Note is not in the standardised form we adopted for use in multiple classification schemes relating to Hybrid projects; however the note is clear and we do not want to see any amendments made to it.

**B01J 20/285 and 20/289**

A minor suggestion for slightly more elegant wording without a change of meaning or scope: perhaps 20/285 could read “based on polymers” and 20/289 could read “bonded via a spacer”?

**F23B 14/06**

Again a minor suggestion for prettier wording, and in this case better clarity: should this entry read “with means for advancing fuel - - -“?

**F23B 16/04 and 16/06**

For similar reasons to the above, should these entries read “the fuel being fed from below - - -“ and “the fuel being fed along - - -“?

**F23B 24/02 and 24/04**

Again, for the same reasons: should these entries start with the words “characterised by means - - -”?

**Electrodynamic/dynamolectric brakes** (*see definition project D015, Annex 17*)

We wonder whether the occasion of this CE meeting is an opportunity for tackling this question - although we suspect it isn't. We flagged up a problem under the above definition project, which is that B60L (subclass title and main group 7/00) refer to electrodynamic brake systems for vehicles, while H02K 49/00 refers to dynamo-electric brakes. These expressions are almost certainly equivalent, and it is unnecessary and confusing to have 2 different expressions to denote the same thing. The matter is important since subclass and main group titles are affected.

Is it possible to make a decision at this CE, or will it have to be raised as a revision or maintenance project later? This matter will need to be tackled at some stage, as far as amendments to the IPC are concerned; the definition in project D015 can be changed afterwards.

Martin Price

[Annex III follows/  
L'annexe III suit]

## ANNEX III/ANNEXE III

Europäisches  
PatentamtEuropean  
Patent OfficeOffice européen  
des brevets

Principal Directorate Tools / Documentation

<b>Comments</b>	Project: CE33	Subclass:	25 September 2003
-----------------	---------------	-----------	-------------------

Subj.: technical annexes for CE33 meeting

Ref.:       - ce331-annex 01 (EV)  
               - ce331-annex 02 (FV)  
               - ce331-annex 03 (GB comments)  
               - ce331-annex 04(SE comments)

These comments only relate to revision project **C413**.

1) English version:

\* The IB compilation is completely according to the decisions of the Revision WG, so no comments from my part except for two minor remarks:

- I presume in the electronic version (at least) the **complete** classification symbols will be used in notes and references
- In T. annex 17, new note (2) after subclass title originates from TA31 of CE30/11 (project C366) and not from project C413.

\* GB comments:

- B01D – note after 15/08 (annex 8): the formulation of this note was the result of discussions during at least three sessions of the Revision WG, and thus indeed should not be touched anymore.
- B01J-groups (annex 9): we can accept the proposed changes in wording (no change in meaning of scope).

\* SE comments:

- Annex 1: ok
- Annex 8 : see comments above about complete classification symbols
- Annexes 10, 11,13 and 16: I leave the discussion on the correct order of notes to the “Experts”.

2) French Version:

Si on accepte le changement proposé par l' Office GB pour l'annexe 9, la version française doit être changée également :

B01J20/285 ... *à base de* polymères

B01J20/289 ... *reliées* par intermédiaire - - -

Paul Daeleman

[Annex IV follows/  
L'annexe IV suit]

ANNEX IV/ANNEXE IV

**Project: C412      Subclass: A61K**

Following a comment from the UK office in definition project D021, we would like to propose to delete Notes (3) and (4) following the title of A61K8/00. It seems that these notes appeared for the first time in Annex 54 in the project file, but were not discussed.

Note (4) is in contradiction with note (5) under class C07, and it would be more logical to have the same classifying rule.

Note (3) is different from note (2) after the title in A61K, which is now also the first bullet under "Special rules of classification" in the proposal of D021. Although these notes are not contradictory, it would be better to have one formulation only.

Anne Glanddier.

[End of Annex IV and of document/  
Fin de l'annexe IV et du document]