

# WIPO



IPC/CE/37/7

ORIGINAL: English

DATE: January 27, 2006

**WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION**  
GENEVA

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

**COMMITTEE OF EXPERTS**

**Thirty-Seventh Session  
Geneva, February 14 to 17, 2006**

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RESULTS OF THE REFORM OF THE IPC

*Document prepared by the Secretariat*

1. At its thirty-sixth session, held in February 2005, the IPC Committee of Experts considered the task "Introduction of residual main groups in IPC subclasses" and noted that a large number of new residual main groups had been approved by the IPC Revision Working Group. The Committee agreed to consider this task as completed for the IPC reform basic period and gave the task to the Working Group to continue in the next revision period (see document IPC/CE/36/11, paragraph 21).
2. At its fourteenth session, held in November 2005, the IPC Revision Working Group considered this task in detail and arrived at certain conclusions concerning continuation of the work on the task. The Working Group also approved particular instructions for creating new residual main groups and agreed on further actions to be undertaken with regard to this matter. Annex I to this document contains a relevant excerpt of the report of the fourteenth session of the Working Group which relates to this task.
3. At its thirty-sixth session, the Committee also considered the ongoing task "Elaboration of classification definitions" and noted that 38 definition projects had been approved in English and 18 completed both in English and French. Bearing in mind that the IPC Revision Working Group would consider those projects which were close to completion during its next

session, the Committee realized that the target figure of 50 definitions for subclasses of the eighth edition of the IPC would be reached and agreed to consider this task as completed for the IPC reform basic period and gave this task to the Working Group to continue in the next revision period (see document IPC/CE/36/11, paragraph 24).

4. At its thirteenth session, held in June 2005, the IPC Revision Working Group discussed this task and made a significant progress in consideration of definition projects. Nine definition projects were approved in English and 21 definition projects were completed in both English and French. The Working Group also appointed an editorial board for classification definitions.

5. Consideration of definition projects was continued at the fourteenth session of the IPC Revision Working Group held in November 2005. At that session, nine definition projects were approved in English and nine definition projects were completed in both English and French.

6. Annex II to this document contains relevant excerpts of the reports of the thirteenth and fourteenth sessions of the Working Group which relate to this task.

*7. The Committee of Experts is invited to take note of the contents of the Annexes to this document and to make decisions as necessary.*

[Annexes follow]

ANNEX I

EXCERPT FROM DOCUMENT IPC/WG/14/3, PARAGRAPHS 6 TO 9

“INTRODUCTION OF RESIDUAL MAIN GROUPS IN IPC SUBCLASSES

“6. Discussions were based on a compilation of the latest submissions to the project file WG 111. The Working Group agreed that subclasses where consensus had been reached in the course of residual projects that a new residual main group was not needed, should not be reviewed again, and that no residual main groups should be created therein. The recently introduced new residual main groups (see Annex IV to document IPC/CE/36/11) should not be reviewed again.

“7. It was further decided that the review of all 184 subclasses where no consensus had been reached (see Annex III to this report) should be continued and this task should be completed during the current revision period, if possible. In order to assure the timely completion of this task, the Working Group agreed on the following actions:

“(a) Rapporteurs of existing definition projects whose respective subclass is among the subclasses without consensus should review the need for a residual main group in that subclass, taking into account the different opinions submitted in the course of projects R 701 to R 706, and submit their recommendations by March 31, 2006, to the corresponding R 701 to R 706 projects.

“(b) For all remaining subclasses (i.e., where there is no consensus and no definition project), Rapporteurs of projects R 701 to R 706 should review the latest comments and submit their recommendations regarding the introduction of a new residual main group or the initiation of a definition project, in difficult cases, by March 31, 2006.

“(c) Offices were invited to submit comments on Rapporteurs’ recommendations by May 5, 2006, in order to allow Rapporteurs to review these comments before the next session of the Working Group.

“(d) The Working Group agreed to consider the recommendations, any comments and replies of Rapporteurs to those comments at its next session.

“Particular Instructions for Creating New Residual Main Groups

“8. The Working Group approved the following particular instructions for creating new residual main groups:

“(a) The sole reason for introduction of a new residual main group in a subclass should be the fact that the scope of that subclass is not exhausted by the existing main groups.

“(b) For new residual main groups the standard title “Subject matter not provided for in other groups of this subclass” should be used unless a new residual main group would be clearly residual to only a part of the subclass, e.g., in case of subclasses with multi-part titles or of existing residual main groups with specific titles.

“(c) No references should be included in any residual groups and there should be no subgroups under them.

“(d) Residual main groups being residual to the whole subclass should in general carry the number 99/00; they should carry the number 999/00 only in exceptional cases when the numbering of existing classification groups goes beyond 100/00.

“(e) The numbering of new residual groups with specific titles, i.e., of groups being residual to only a part of the subclass, should be different from 99/00 or 999/00 and should be chosen such, if possible, that the residual group is positioned after all the groups of similar subject matter to which it is residual.

“(f) No guidelines for creating residual main groups would be needed because the above decisions would be fully sufficient as instructions to rapporteurs.

#### “Further Actions

“9. The following further actions were approved:

“(a) A regular review of residual groups having standard titles should be instituted in order to identify subject matter or new technology that may require creation of new ordinary classification groups; the Secretariat was asked to prepare a proposal for a procedure for such regular reviews to be considered at the next session of the Working Group.

“(b) No immediate amendments to paragraphs 55 to 57, 162 to 164 and 183 of the Guide would be necessary. The proposed amendments could be examined in the framework of Task 10 as proposed in the IPC development program.

“(c) Existing residual groups being residual to their whole subclass should be renumbered to 99/00 or 999/00, and their titles should be replaced by the standard title, in the framework of the systematic maintenance of the IPC.

“(d) Existing residual main groups with subgroups should be reviewed with the intention to convert these subgroups to conventional classification groups.”

[Annex II follows]

ANNEX II

EXCERPTS FROM DOCUMENTS IPC/WG/13/5, PARAGRAPHS 30 TO 40,  
AND IPC/WG/14/3, PARAGRAPHS 33 AND 34

Excerpt from Document IPC/WG/13/5

“APPOINTMENT OF AN EDITORIAL BOARD FOR IPC DEFINITIONS

“30. Discussions were based on document IPC/WG/13/2 containing a proposal of the International Bureau relating to the appointment of an Editorial Board for classification definitions.

“31. It was recalled that at its meeting, in May 2002, the Task Force on Classification Definitions “noted an important difference in the style of the wording of definitions. It was noted that the harmonization in wording could be solved in the future by an ‘editorial board’... In the meantime... the Secretariat was authorized to introduce editorial amendments that would not change the technical aspects of the projects... in agreement with the respective Rapporteur”.

“32. The experience since then, in preparing and discussing definitions, has shown that the absence of an editorial board has slowed down the process of approval of IPC definitions. Numerous comments on the IPC e-forum, or during the sessions of the Working Group, were focused on editorial problems (e.g., conformity with the template or with IPC terminology), creating delays in approving proposals which were otherwise ready.

“33. It was therefore decided to create an Editorial Board to review proposals of definition projects. The same Board could be used to review proposals of other types of projects as well (e.g., Training Examples), if needed.

“34. The Working Group agreed that the Board should not be a formal body with regular meetings, but rather a group of delegates with good experience in drafting using IPC terminology. At least one member should be appointed for each technical field. The Secretariat should coordinate the work of the Board, accomplish some of its formal tasks and appoint a member of the Board to review a particular proposal, when needed.

“35. An initial draft proposal should first be submitted to the Secretariat before posting to the IPC e-forum. The Secretariat should check the conformity of the initial draft with the template and make the necessary corrections. If additional editorial changes were needed, a member of the Board would be appointed by the Secretariat to review that initial draft. The member of the Board would amend the proposal, in agreement with the Rapporteur. The final draft should be posted by the Secretariat to the IPC e-forum within, approximately, two months of submission of the initial draft.

“36. The Working Group may refer a project to the Board, at any stage, giving specific instructions, for example, in order to bring the text of a proposal in conformity with IPC terminology. Electronically approved projects should also be checked by the Board, in agreement with the Rapporteur, and the final version should be posted to the IPC e-forum within, approximately, two months of approval.

“37. Once a project is completed in one language, a similar procedure should be used in the preparation of the proposal in the other language.

“38. The following offices volunteered to participate in the Editorial Board with technical experts in the three technical fields: EPO, France, United Kingdom, Sweden and United States of America. Ireland volunteered to participate with an expert in the chemical field.

#### “IPC DEFINITIONS PROGRAM

“39. The Working Group had before it, in particular, document IPC/WG/12/4 and compilations of the relevant definition project files. The decisions of the Working Group with respect to those projects, in particular new deadlines and appointment of offices for the preparation of French versions, are listed in Annex V to this report. Further information with respect to some of those decisions is given in paragraph 40, below. It was further agreed to create several new definition projects D 073 to D 114 and appoint rapporteurs (for details, see said Annex V). Rapporteurs were invited to send their initial proposals to the International Bureau, acting as Coordinator of the Editorial Board (see paragraph 35, above).

“40. The Working Group made the following observations, in addition to the decisions set forth in Annex V to this report, with respect to the cited IPC definition projects. All references to annexes in this paragraph refer to annexes of the corresponding project file, unless otherwise stated.

#### “IPC Definition Projects

“Project D 006 (electrical) – The Working Group approved the English version of Annex 45, subject to removal of the limiting references to sections C and H.

“Project D 008 (electrical) – The Working Group approved the French version of Annex 29.

“Project D 009 (electrical) – The Working Group approved the English version of Annex 30.

“Project D 010 (electrical) – The Working Group approved the French version of Annex 30.

“Project D 011 (electrical) – The Working Group approved the French version of Annex 29.

“Project D 012 (mechanical) – The Working Group approved, with some clerical corrections, the French version of Annex 29.

“Project D 013 (mechanical) – The Working Group approved the French version of Annex 17.

“Project D 014 (mechanical) – The Working Group conditionally approved the English version of Annex 23, subject to addition of “e.g. iontophoresis” at the end of the first bullet of the definition statement, the removal of “as this terminology is commonly defined in English”, and the removal of quotation marks in all occurrences of the term “therapy”.

“Project D 016 (mechanical) – The Working Group invited comments on the placement of references, in particular of the reference to class H04.

“Project D 017 (mechanical) – The Working Group conditionally approved the French version of Annex 26, subject to removing the entry for “cage” in the French Glossary and to replacing the present explanation for “câble” by “élément allongé flexible, flasque qui ne peut transmettre qu’une force de traction (p.ex. cordage, filin, chaîne)”.

“Project D 018 (mechanical) – The Working Group approved the English version of Annex 27.

“Project D 019 (mechanical) – The Working Group approved the French version of Annex 31.

“Project D 020 (mechanical) – The Working Group approved the French version of Annex 26.

“Project D 021 (chemical) – The Working Group approved the English version of Annex 39 and the French version of Annex 41.

“Project D 027 (electrical) – The Working Group approved the French version of Annex 37.

“Project D 028 (electrical) – The Working Group approved the French version of Annex 18.

“Project D 029 (mechanical) – The Working Group approved the French version of Annex 18.

“Project D 031 (mechanical) – The Working Group invited comments on whether the first bullet in the definition statement should be amended in order to include “lift bridges which comprise only one support”.

“Project D 032 (mechanical) – The Working Group approved the French version of Annex 23.

“Project D 036 (chemical) – The Working Group accepted the offer of the Rapporteur to review the counter proposal of Annex 42, recently submitted by the Japanese Patent Office, and invited comments on the Rapporteur Report to be submitted.

“Project D 038 (chemical) – The Working Group approved the French version of Annex 24.

“Project D 039 (chemical) – The Working Group approved with some amendments the French version of Annex 38.

“Project D 040 (chemical) – The Working Group approved, with some amendments, the French version of Annex 30.

“Project D 041 (mechanical) – The Working Group approved the French version of Annex 12.

“Project D 042 (mechanical) – The Working Group approved the French version of Annex 12.

“Project D 046 (electrical) – The Working Group decided that the term “contact lenses” should be added at the end of the title of subclass G02C (see also paragraph 10 above). Comments were invited on how the borderline between subject matter of subclass G02C and group H05B 3/84 could be clarified and if the latter should be removed from the list of limiting references.

“Project D 050 (electrical) – The Working Group approved the French version of Annex 20 and asked the Editorial Board to amend the already approved English version according to the remarks of the Russian Federation of March 28, 2005.

“Project D 051 (electrical) – The Working Group decided that in the already approved English version of Annex 8 “photogrammetry” should be replaced by “photogrammetry or videogrammetry” in the title and in the definition statement, and “measuring of” should be replaced by “combined measuring devices for measuring of” in the definition statement. The Working Group also approved the French version of Annex 12, subject to corresponding amendments.

“Project D 052 (electrical) – The Working Group approved the French version of Annex 9.

“Project D 053 (electrical) – It was decided that the references in the title of main group H02P 29/00 should be removed. The Working Group invited comments as to whether additional explanations regarding the relevance of other subclasses, for example those given as examples in the definition statement, should be included.

“Project D 061 (chemical) – The Working Group approved the English version of Annex 9.

“Project D 062 (chemical) – The Working Group approved the English version of Annex 6, subject to some editorial changes.

“Project D 063 (chemical) – The Working Group approved the English version of Annex 6, subject to some editorial changes.

“Project D 066 (chemical) – The Working Group approved, with some clerical corrections, the English version of Annex 9.”

Excerpt from Document IPC/WG/14/3

“IPC DEFINITIONS PROGRAM

“33. The Working Group had before it, in particular, document IPC/WG/13/5 and compilations of the relevant definition project files. The decisions of the Working Group with respect to those projects, in particular new deadlines and appointment of offices for the preparation of French versions, are listed in Annex VII to this report. It was further agreed to create new definition projects D115 to D123 (for details see said Annex VII). Further information with respect to some of those decisions is given in paragraph 34, below.

“34. The Working Group made the following observations, in addition to the decisions set forth in Annex VII to this report, with respect to the cited IPC definition projects. All references to annexes in this paragraph refer to annexes of the corresponding project file, unless otherwise stated.

“IPC Definition Projects

“Project D 006 (electrical) – The Working Group approved the French version of Annex 48, subject to some editorial changes.

“Project D 009 (electrical) – The Working Group approved the French version of Annex 34, subject to some editorial changes.

“Project D 014 (mechanical) – The Working Group approved the French version of Annex 27.

“Project D 016 (mechanical) – The Working Group approved the English version of Annex 20.

“Project D 018 (mechanical) – The Working Group approved the French version of Annex 30.

“Project D 031 (mechanical) – The Working Group approved the English version of Annex 39.

“Project D 034 (mechanical) – The Working Group approved the English version of Annex 22, subject to some editorial amendments.

“Project D 035 (mechanical) – The Working Group approved the English version of Annex 15.

“Project D 036 (chemical) – The Working Group approved the English version of Annex 52.

“Project D 043 (electrical) – The Working Group approved the English version of Annex 16, subject to some editorial amendments.

“Project D 046 (electrical) – The Working Group approved the English version of Annex 15, subject to some editorial amendments, e.g., the reference to group A61F 9/00 should be placed in the Informative References section.

“Project D 048 (electrical) – The Working Group approved the English version of Annex 27 and the French version of Annex 28.

“Project D 049 (electrical) – After some discussion, the Working Group agreed that definitions for main groups should not be combined (see definitions for main groups H04L 13/00 to 17/00 and H04L 19/00 to 23/00 in Annex 21). The Rapporteur was therefore invited to split these combined definitions into definitions for individual main groups, to apply the new template and, if necessary, to sort the references according to subsections in the section “References Relevant to Classification”. The translating Office was asked to amend the French version accordingly after the submission of the new English version.

“Project D 053 (electrical) – The Working Group approved the English version of Annex 11 and asked the translating Office to amend the French version accordingly.

“Project D 054 (electrical) – The Rapporteur informed the Working Group that the Trilateral Offices were currently achieving considerable progress in establishing the advanced level for the new subclass G06Q. Since this work has an impact on the subclass definitions, and in particular on definitions of main groups, the latest proposal should be revised. In view of the importance of definitions for classifying the complex subject matter of this new subclass, the Working Group felt that the elaboration of the subclass definition should not be delayed, and asked the Rapporteur to submit a revised proposal during the first half of 2006. Priority should be given to the elaboration of the subclass definition, while the elaboration of main group definitions could be postponed.

“Project D 055 (mechanical) – The Working Group recalled its decision regarding the creation of this definition project (see paragraph 14 of document IPC/WG/9/8), agreed that definitions for classes were not desirable and that in this project, individual definitions for each subclass of class F21 should be established.

“Project D 058 (mechanical) – The Working Group agreed that, according to the experience that the German Patent and Trade Mark Office had gained in the course of test classification, definitions for the new subclass B60W were urgently needed and invited a new Rapporteur report and proposal by December 31, 2005, taking into account the latest submitted comments (see Annexes 9 to 12), removing

the part in the definition statement “this subclass does not cover” to the relationship or the references section and applying the new template in respect of “references relevant for classification”. Comments were invited on the proposal to be submitted.

“Project D 059 (electrical) – The Working Group invited the Rapporteur to prepare a new proposal taking into account the latest comments by Japan (see Annex 4).

“Project D 060 (mechanical) – The Working Group invited the Rapporteur to prepare a new report, after reviewing the references relevant to classification and taking into account the latest comments submitted to the project file. It was also agreed that the term “motor” should be replaced by “machine” in the first entry of the Glossary.

“Project D 061 (chemical) – The Working Group approved the French version of Annex 15 and corresponding amendments to the English version of Annex 13.

“Project D 062 (chemical) – The Working Group approved the French version of Annex 11 and corresponding proposed amendments to the English version of Annex 12 (see remarks at the end of Annex 11).

“Project D 063 (chemical) – The Working Group approved the French version of Annex 11 and agreed to delete the expression “overlaps with” in the informative reference of the English version of Annex 7.

“Project D 066 (chemical) – The Working Group approved the French version of Annex 9.

“Project D 070 (mechanical) –The Working Group invited a new Rapporteur’s proposal taking into account the latest comments submitted to the project file. The Working Group agreed that the subject matter of each subclass to which A23L is residual, listed in the definition statement, should be indicated as in the section “Relationship Between Large Subject Matter Areas”. It was also agreed that in the section “Relationship Between Large Subject Matter Areas”, the wording “matter of function or application” was not sufficiently clear and that a reference to paragraphs 85 to 87 of the Guide should be included.

“Project D 072 (electrical) – After some discussion of the two recently submitted comments, regarding the classification of specially adapted equipment using Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) technology in this subclass (see Annexes 10 and 11), the Working Group invited further comments on this issue and on how the relation to RFID technology *per se* should be taken into account in this definition. The Rapporteur was invited to prepare a new proposal based on the comments to be submitted. The Rapporteur was also requested to review whether the reference to subclass G07D should be considered as a limiting reference.”