
Special Union for the International Patent Classification (IPC Union) IPC Revision Working Group

**Twenty-Ninth Session
Geneva, May 13 to 17, 2013**

REPORT

adopted by the Working Group

INTRODUCTION

1. The IPC Revision Working Group (hereinafter referred to as “the Working Group”) held its twenty-ninth session in Geneva from May 13 to 17, 2013. The following members of the Working Group were represented at the session: Brazil, Canada, China, Egypt, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Japan, Mexico, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States of America, African Regional Intellectual Property Organization (ARIPO) and the European Patent Office (EPO) (22). The list of participants appears as Annex I to this report.
2. The session was opened by Mr. A. Farassopoulos, Director, International Classifications and Standards Division.

OFFICERS

3. The Working Group unanimously elected Mr. R. Iasevoli (EPO) as Chair and Mr. P. Zenteno Márquez (Mexico) as Vice-Chair for 2013.
4. Mrs. N. Xu (WIPO) acted as Secretary of the session.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

5. The Working Group unanimously adopted the agenda, which appears as Annex II to this report.

DISCUSSIONS, CONCLUSIONS AND DECISIONS

6. As decided by the Governing Bodies of WIPO at their tenth series of meetings held from September 24 to October 2, 1979 (see document AB/X/32, paragraphs 51 and 52), the report of this session reflects only the conclusions of the Working Group (decisions, recommendations, opinions, etc.) and does not, in particular, reflect the statements made by any participant, except where a reservation in relation to any specific conclusion of the Working Group was expressed or repeated after the conclusion was reached.

REPORT ON THE FORTY-FIFTH SESSION OF THE IPC COMMITTEE OF EXPERTS

7. The Secretariat presented an oral report on the forty-fifth session of the IPC Committee of Experts (hereinafter referred to as “the Committee”) (see Annex IV to document IPC/CE/45/2).

8. It was noted in particular that the Committee had adopted the IPC Revision Roadmap under which those areas should be preferably revised where there was a large amount and significant growth rate of patent applications from emerging countries, not covered by the CPC or FI, and where the number of subgroups in the IPC was not sufficient for an effective search. These areas were identified in a list that would be updated twice a year by the International Bureau. Revision requests to revise those areas might be submitted twice a year by any member of the IPC Union following a procedure that was detailed under project [CE 456](#). Revision requests might also be submitted following the same procedure by the EPO/The United States of America or Japan, in areas where major reorganization of CPC or FI, respectively, would be planned, in order to avoid discrepancy with the IPC.

9. It was further noted that in the framework of revision projects, definitions would be considered only for those places where there was a need for further explanation of the scheme or its use. New subclass definitions would be considered only in those subclasses where there was evidence that the scheme or the relation of the subclass with other places was not clear enough. Only the relevant sections of the definitions would then be drafted. The definitions should be as focused as possible. For example, if the scope of a subclass was clear but its relationship with other subclasses was not, only the corresponding section of the definitions would be developed.

10. It was particularly noted that the Committee had decided to delegate its authority to adopt approved schemes to the Working Group and had approved a new revision and publication procedure (see paragraph 14, below).

11. The Committee had further adopted amendments to the *Guide to the IPC (Guide)* and the Guidelines for Revision of the IPC, in particular a new categorization and definition of different types of references. Finally, the Committee had considered several issues related to reclassification.

REPORT ON THE EIGHTH SESSION OF THE IP5 WG1-WORKING GROUP ON CLASSIFICATION

12. The Working Group noted a short oral report by the USPTO on behalf of the Five IP Offices on the eighth session of the IP5 WG1–Working Group on Classification (WG1).

13. The eighth session of the WG1 took place at the USPTO in Washington DC from March 18 to 22, 2013. The WG1 decided to close the Common Hybrid Classification (CHC) project which would be replaced by a new Classification Initiative. The mandate and the Concept of Operations of this initiative were agreed upon and would be presented for approval to the Deputy Heads and Heads of the Five IP Offices in June 2013. All pending CHC project proposals would be considered under the new WG1 mandate after its approval.

IPC REVISION AND PUBLICATION PROCEDURES

14. In the framework of the new revision and publication procedure adopted by the Committee (see paragraph 10, above), the Working Group would be responsible for all technical or formal consideration of revision projects including the final adoption of schemes. In order to accelerate the entry into force of approved schemes, the summer session of the Working Group was advanced to early May. The compilation of all amendments to enter into force in the following version of the IPC would be available in the two authentic languages in the beginning of June for final checking. An early publication of the scheme, RCL and compilation would be available simultaneously, for checking purposes, as well as the corresponding Master Files and the Validity File.

15. In order to further improve the checking work, an editorial board (second pair of eyes) was appointed by the Working Group composed of the following volunteering offices: Brazil, Canada, France, Germany, Ireland, Japan, Russian Federation, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom and the EPO. The International Bureau would distribute the parts of the scheme to be checked from editorial and formal point of view to its members. The International Bureau would in particular explicitly check the correspondence between the RCL and the transfer notes and version indicators in the scheme. Some offices using the Master Files would be invited to check their correctness. This checking would last for two weeks. The International Bureau would then introduce the corrections in order to prepare the final early publication for July 1, as per usual.

16. Following an invitation by the Committee, and in line with the concept of having a "second pair of eyes" on the projects, the Working Group appointed for each new revision project a co-Rapporteur next to the Rapporteur (see the corresponding project file). His/her role would be to check the proposals submitted by the Rapporteur, at various stages of a project, from a formal point of view, as well as their integration into the scheme. The co-Rapporteur could propose if a "light" maintenance of the scheme in the revised area is needed, e.g., in order to improve consistency in terminology.

IPC REVISION PROGRAM

17. The Working Group discussed 18 revision projects, namely: [A 052](#), [A 056](#), [A 057](#), [A 058](#), [A 059](#), [C 459](#), [C 460](#), [C 461](#), [C 462](#), [C 463](#), [C 464](#), [C 465](#), [C 466](#), [F 004](#), [F 007](#), [F 008](#), [F 013](#) and [F 015](#). The status of those projects and the list of future actions and deadlines are indicated in the corresponding projects on the e-forum. All decisions, observations and technical annexes are available in the "Working Group Decision" annexes of the corresponding projects on the e-forum.

18. Rapporteurs of revision projects were reminded to review, as far as possible, the references in the revised area of the revision projects and provide proposals for removal of non-limiting references from the scheme if any, as well as to provide definitions where needed.

IPC DEFINITIONS PROGRAM

19. The Working Group discussed 43 definition projects, namely: [D 152](#), [D 221](#), [D 228](#), [D 233](#), [D 235](#), [D 252](#), [D 253](#), [D 255](#), [D 256](#), [D 257](#), [D 258](#), [D 261](#), [D 263](#), [D 270](#), [D 271](#), [D 272](#), [D 273](#), [D 274](#), [D 275](#), [D 276](#), [D 277](#), [D 278](#), [D 279](#), [D 280](#), [D 281](#), [D 282](#), [D 283](#), [D 284](#), [D 285](#), [D 287](#), [D 288](#), [D 289](#), [D 290](#), [D 291](#), [D 292](#), [D 293](#), [D 294](#), [D 295](#), [D 296](#), [D 298](#), [D 299](#), [D 303](#) and [D 304](#). The status of those projects and the list of future actions and deadlines are indicated in the corresponding projects on the e-forum. All decisions, observations and technical annexes are available in the "Working Group Decision" annexes of the corresponding projects on the e-forum. The Working Group completed nine definition projects.

20. The Working Group noted the decision by the Committee concerning new subclass definitions. New subclass definitions would be considered only in those subclasses where there was evidence that the scheme or the relation of the subclass with other places was not clear enough (see paragraph 9, above).

IPC MAINTENANCE

21. The Working Group discussed nine maintenance projects, namely: [M 011](#), [M 013](#), [M 014](#), [M 742](#), [M 743](#), [M 744](#), [M 745](#), [M 746](#) and [M 747](#). The status of those projects and the list of future actions and deadlines are indicated in the corresponding projects on the e-forum. All decisions, observations and technical annexes are available in the "Working Group Decision" annexes of the corresponding projects on the e-forum.

22. The Working Group agreed to create new maintenance projects as follows:

Mechanical: [M 750](#) (Section B, SE); and

Chemical: [M 748](#) (Section C, IE), [M 749](#) (H01M, EPO).

UPDATES ON IPC-RELATED IT ISSUES

23. The Working Group noted a short [presentation](#) by the International Bureau on the status of various IT systems and projects supporting the IPC.

24. It was noted that the backlog of IPC reclassification included 1.2 million families and since the forty-fifth session of the Committee of Experts, offices had focused their efforts on the transmission of reclassification data for IPC revisions 2009.01 to 2012.01. Offices were invited to ensure that their reclassification data submissions were acceptable for IPCRECLASS through checking of their publication under <http://www.wipo.int/ipcreclassification/>.

25. The new version 3.0 of the IPC Internet publication platform was in production and the installation procedure for the corresponding software package had been simplified. The IPCCAT retraining with DOCDB XML documents, taking IPC 2012.01 reclassification into account, was completed and a feasibility study on text categorization in the IPC at group-level was in progress.

26. IPC e-forum functional evolutions related to automatic PDF conversion of annexes posted in other formats would be deployed in the coming weeks. Finally, it was announced that the IPC Revision Management (IPCRM) project had just been kicked off. The project would be entirely outsourced and had as target date for first production use the early publication of IPC 2016.01.

NEXT SESSION OF THE WORKING GROUP

27. The Working Group, having assessed the workload expected for its next session, agreed to devote the first two and a half days to the electrical field, the half day in the afternoon and the following half day in the morning to the chemical field and the last one and a half days to the mechanical field.

28. The Working Group noted the following dates for its thirtieth session:

November 4 to 8, 2013

*29. This report was
unanimously adopted by the
Working Group by electronic
means on June 11, 2013.*

[Annexes follow]