

WIPO



IPC/CE/33/6 Suppl.2
ORIGINAL: English
DATE: September 30, 2003

E

WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION
GENEVA

**SPECIAL UNION FOR THE INTERNATIONAL PATENT CLASSIFICATION
(IPC UNION)**

COMMITTEE OF EXPERTS

Thirty-Third Session
Geneva, October 2 to 10, 2003

CONCEPT OF OPERATIONS FOR THE REFORMED IPC

Document prepared by the Secretariat

1. Annexes I and II to this document contain comments submitted by the European Patent Office (EPO) and the Patent and Trade Mark Office of Germany, relating to the Concept of Operations for the Reformed IPC.

2. *The Committee of Experts is invited to take note of the comments submitted.*

[Annexes follow]

ANNEX I/ANNEXE I



**Europäisches
Patentamt**

GD1

**European
Patent Office**

DG1

**Office européen
des brevets**

DG1

Principal Directorate Tools-Documentation

HP/03.136/hp

CONOPS*Questions and Precisions***INTRODUCTION**

Detailed discussions on the CONOPS procedure resulted in the fact that questions came up, which never were mentioned in the past but still need to be discussed and decisions are to be taken. For some cases more precision is needed in CONOPS and it is felt better to treat now these points in a separate document to avoid the introduction of a new version of CONOPS on a very late moment.

VERSION INDICATOR IN THE IPC SCHEMES*CORE LEVEL*

It is our understanding that the core level has one version indicator for the complete core level. This indicator is changing with the new version e.g. in 2008. For the management of the core level in the MCD some measures are needed, because the version indicator is stored with every classification symbol assigned to a document.

It is proposed that the I.B. creates lists of all the group symbols which are unchanged in the new version of the core level. With the list of unchanged symbols the MCD administrator can change the version indicator for these symbols in the MCD from 2005 to 2008.

The second list of changed and new symbols can be used by the administrator to produce the working lists for each Office in the core level as well as for the maintenance.

ADVANCED LEVEL

It is clear that in the advanced level each classification symbol has his own version indicator. However there is still an open question on the part of the advanced level, which corresponds with the core level. What happens with this part when in 2008 the core level is becoming version 2008? Should the version indicators of these advanced level symbols also be updated e.g. to 2008.01?

In principle we can introduce the new core level date in the corresponding part of the advanced level. It can give strange impressions as finer subdivisions have an older date than the groups on a higher level (less dots).

The EPO has the feeling that we should separate completely core and advanced level for their version indicators and only change in the advanced level when a real change occurs.

ALLOTING AND RECORDING OF NOT YET VALID SYMBOLS

RECORDING

In CONOPS it is several times mentioned that when reclassifications are ongoing the valid data can be delivered together with the future not yet valid data by delivering the valid data with indicator B, the not yet valid data with indicator R and a delete message being the valid data with indicator D.

From the beginning it was already clear that delete messages are to be kept outside the MCD and to be stored in a separate file for later usage when the corresponding scheme becomes valid. The initial thought was to store the not yet valid data in the MCD. However by doing it we store this information on document level although in principle reclassification data is stored on family level. This internal rule of the MCD is based on the family propagation. Therefore it is proposed to keep the not yet valid symbols outside the MCD until the new scheme is valid. At that moment the symbols with respective R and D indicators are loaded and propagated.

ALLOTING

The principle of allotting not yet valid symbols is sound as it avoids later reclassification effort. However we should bear in mind that reclassification is to be limited to one document per family. Therefore it is proposed that Offices, which intend to allot these not yet valid symbols, check at first if the document is a potential working document for reclassification. It can be done by checking the priority country.

This means that not yet valid symbols (for future versions) should be delivered by an office only for documents which would appear on their working list according to the rules in 2.6.2

CLASSIFICATION CHANGES OUTSIDE REVISION PROJECTS

In section 2.10 of CONOPS the procedure is explained for classification changes outside revision projects. It became clear that two different cases can appear. We can use this procedure for an incidental correction of given classification symbols but we can also use this procedure for addition of a classification when an omission occurred during the initial classification.

It is felt that in the first case the new symbol together with a delete is to be sent to the MCD as a separate action but still similar to normal reclassifications.

For the second case there is only a new symbol, which is to be added and therefore this symbol should appear on the (weekly) publication file together with the new published documents.

DELIVERY OF THE BACK FILE DATA BY OFFICES

Offices, which announced to deliver their own IPC 2005 data for the back file of their documents to the MCD, are requested to deliver the data by June 2004 in view of the general planning for preparing the 2005 data in the MCD.

[Annex II follows/
L'annexe II suit]

ANNEX II/ANNEXE II

DEUTSCHES PATENT- UND MARKENAMT German Patent and Trade Mark Office	Class/Subcl.: MCD
	Date : 25.09.2003
DE - Comment	

Re: Guide Taskforce / IPC/WG/10 → Item 11 (Conops → MCD)

DE- Request for fixed frontpage classification symbol

In our opinion it is necessary to maintain the originally assigned classification symbol on the frontpage of a patent document.

When changing the classification symbol during a reclassification the original and the updated symbol should be stored in separate entries – if there is a second reclassification the latest updated symbol can be deleted (by overwriting) – the original symbol always has to be kept.

Using this procedure it is secured that the document can be retrieved with the original classification symbol. DE thinks that the original classification symbol is part of the original bibliographic data. For normal work (e.g. search) only the updated dataset will be used.

The practical procedure could involve the use of one of the “blank-position” from the ST 8 (o= riginal classification, r= reclassified classification symbol).

A. Okelmann

D:\9482\New Guide IPC\orig-symbol-mcd.doc

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