

# WIPO



IPC/CE/39/2

ORIGINAL: English

DATE: January 22, 2007

# E

**WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION**  
GENEVA

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

**COMMITTEE OF EXPERTS**

**Thirty-Ninth Session  
Geneva, February 26 to March 1, 2007**

COORDINATION OF IPC REVISION AND RECLASSIFICATION OF PATENT FILES

*Document prepared by the Secretariat*

## Updating of Documents

1. At its thirty-eighth session, held in October 2006, the Committee of Experts approved an instruction to the IPC Revision Working Group to take into account the availability of resources for reclassification when carrying out revision of the core level. The Committee further requested the International Bureau to prepare update proposals for updating the following documents: "Revision Policy and Revision Procedure for the Reformed IPC" and "Working Procedure of the IPC Revision Working Group", in order to include the said instruction (see document IPC/CE/38/10, paragraphs 17 and 18).

2. It is proposed to amend the said documents in the following way (the amendments are indicated in italics):

Revision Policy and Revision Procedure for the Reformed IPC (Annex IV to document IPC/CE/33/12)

19. The IPC Revision Working Group should evaluate all requests to ensure that they comply with the revision policy and the revision criteria laid down by the Committee and described in this document, determine the need for them and their priority. *When considering revision requests which require reclassification of patent files for inclusion in the core level revision program, the Working Group should take into account the availability of resources for reclassification which will be needed as a result of revision. If such resources are not currently available, the Working Group should postpone consideration of the revision request until a solution for reclassification of patent files can be found.*

20. Revision requests approved by the Working Group should be included in the IPC core level revision program. For each approved request, a project file should be created. The Working Group should establish time frames for individual actions on the project (comments, rapporteur report) and should appoint an office-rapporteur.

21. The offices-rapporteurs should be responsible

Working Procedure of the IPC Revision Working Group (Annex VI to document IPC/CE/36/11)

13. The IPC/WG should evaluate all requests to ensure that they comply with the revision policy and the revision criteria of the IPC/CE, determine the need for them, and their priority. *When considering revision requests which require reclassification of patent files for inclusion in the core level revision program, the IPC/WG should take into account the availability of resources for reclassification which will be needed as a result of revision. If such resources are not currently available, the IPC/WG should postpone consideration of the revision request until a solution for reclassification of patent files can be found.*

14. Revision requests approved by the IPC/WG should be included in the IPC core level revision program. For each approved request, a project file should be created on the IPC e-forum. The IPC/WG should establish time frames for individual actions on the project (comments, Rapporteur report).

15. The Rapporteurs are responsible

### Partial Reclassification of Patent Files

3. The IPC Revision Working Group, at its sixteenth session held in November 2006, when considering revision project C 436 “pointed out that the area of main groups C12N 5/00 and C12P 21/00 needed revision in view of their file size largely exceeding 100,000 documents each, several of their subgroups containing tens of thousands of documents each. It was also pointed out that, in view of the inefficiency of the scheme, even major offices were not using the IPC as a tool for classification or search in this area”.

4. Furthermore “the Working Group was informed that the Trilateral Offices were not in the position to undertake a major reclassification in that area in view of the large amount of documents to be reclassified. However, it was noted that delaying of any revision would further increase the problem in the years to come, since the documentation in this area was increasing at a high rate”.

5. Finally the Working Group invited the Committee to “examine how to proceed when a need for revision is evident in an area with a rapid rate of growth, while there is a lack of resources for reclassification in one office of the ALS. For example, if an incomplete reclassification of the backfile could be tolerated in such cases, thus allowing the new scheme to be used for the classification of the front file” (see paragraph 30 of document IPC/WG/16/3).

6. The Committee is invited to consider the following options that could be followed in such a case:

(a) the Working Group should base the revision of such area on an existing “local” classification scheme (e.g., ECLA or FI), or a combination of such schemes, aiming to minimize the effort for intellectual reclassification, i.e., the majority of the PCT minimum documentation should be reclassified without intellectual effort in the new revised scheme;

(b) the front file should be classified using exclusively the new revised scheme. However the “old” scheme could be used, for a certain time period, for searching those documents that will not be reclassified. The revised scheme should have an indication that there is a need of using the “old” scheme for complete search and hyperlinks to this “old” scheme. Once the reclassification of the backfile completed, these indications-links should be removed from the IPC.

7. This would not be a return to the pre-reform IPC, since it would be rather an exception limited in time and a substantial amount of the relevant documents would be reclassified in the new scheme. However it should be very carefully considered, since it would be a completely new practice in the IPC. If the Committee agrees to consider such an option, the International Bureau should examine all practical consequences (amendment of CONOPS, changes in IT systems, in particular RIPCIS and Reclassification, in the MCD and even in some attributes of ST.8) and prepare a proposal that should be discussed in the frame of a CE project.

8. *The Committee is invited:*

(a) *to adopt the proposed amendments to the “Revision Policy and Revision Procedure for the Reformed IPC” and to the “Working Procedure of the IPC Revision Working Group”;*

(b) *to consider the possibility for partial reclassification in some revision projects and decide on relevant appropriate actions.*

[End of document]