

WIPO



SCIT/SDWG/4/3

ORIGINAL: English

DATE: November 25, 2003

E

WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION
GENEVA

STANDING COMMITTEE ON INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES STANDARDS AND DOCUMENTATION WORKING GROUP

Fourth Session
Geneva, January 26 to 30, 2004

REVISION OF WIPO STANDARD ST.10/C (TASK No. 30)

Document prepared by the Secretariat

Introduction

1. At the third session of the Standards and Documentation Working Group (SDWG) of the Standing Committee on Information Technologies (SCIT), held from May 5 to 8, 2003, the Japan Patent Office (JPO), as the Leader of the WIPO Standard ST.10/C Task Force (ST.10/C Task Force), gave an oral report of the work carried out by the Task Force. The Task Force Leader reported that two questionnaires on the revision and update of the Appendix to WIPO Standard ST.10/C had been completed and forwarded to the International Bureau (IB) for distribution to industrial property offices (IPOs). The questionnaires were distributed by the IB on April 4, 2003, along with Circulars SCIT 2580 and 2581, and Offices were asked to send their responses by May 30, 2003. The IB received responses to the questionnaires from 36 Offices, (AR, AU, AZ, BE, BG, BY, CA, CH, DE, EC, EE, ES, FI, HR, HU, ID, IE, JP, KG, KP, KR, LS, LT, MC, MD, MG, MT, MX, NL, NZ, PH, SE, SI, SK, TR, US), 10 of which from countries that were not previously represented in the Appendix to the Standard. These countries were: AZ, BY, HR, ID, KG, KP, LS, MG, MT, TR. The replies to the said circulars are available in the SCIT area of WIPO's website at [http://www.wipo.int/scit: Administration/Circulars](http://www.wipo.int/scit:Administration/Circulars).

2. The updated Appendix to WIPO Standard ST.10/C and the revised version of the Standard that was adopted by the SDWG on May 8, 2003, were published in the 2003 WIPO *Handbook on Industrial Property Information and Documentation* CD-ROM and the SCIT area of WIPO's website (<http://www.wipo.int/scit>: WIPO Standards and Other Documentation/List of WIPO Standards).

3. The ST.10/C Task Force met on May 7, 2003, to revise the recommendation set in the standard and in particular, to examine the contents of Appendix 3 to document SCIT/SDWG/2/6, concerning the revision of paragraphs 11 and 12 of the Standard. Following this meeting, the Task Force carried on further exchanges via the electronic forum. On October 10, 2003, the JPO, as the Leader of the Task Force, submitted the report of the Task Force on the work carried out, the issues addressed and the agreements reached, for the consideration by the SDWG. The report of the ST.10/C Task Force is reproduced as an Annex to this document with three Appendices attached.

4. An oral progress report of the work carried out by the Task Force since submitting the report referred to in paragraph 3, above, will be presented at the current session of the SDWG in order to inform the Working Group on the status of the revision of WIPO Standard ST.10/C.

5. *The SDWG is invited:*

(a) *to note the contents of the Report prepared by the ST.10/C Task Force as given in the Annex to this document and the three attached Appendices;*

(b) *to note the oral progress report by the ST.10/C Task Force;*

(c) *to consider and agree to the proposals concerning the amendments to WIPO Standard ST.10/C reproduced in Appendix 2 to the Annex to this document.*

[Annex follows]

ANNEX

REPORT OF THE WIPO STANDARD ST.10/C TASK FORCE
(October 1, 2003)

Introduction

1. In order to improve the quality of patent family data and to avoid confusion in the presentation of priority application numbers, after finalizing the specific description of the Task Force, the WIPO Standard ST.10/C Task Force (ST.10/C Task Force) began discussions regarding WIPO Standard ST.10/C in July 2002.

2. At the second session of the SCIT/SDWG held in December 2002 (SCIT/SDWG/2), in accordance with the proposal made by the ST.10/C Task Force, the SDWG agreed on a two-phase process:

- (i) the first phase consisting of a moderate and pragmatic solution; and
- (ii) a second phase with a standardized format solution.

3. During the first phase, the ST.10/C Task Force would prepare a questionnaire on the revision and update of the Appendix to WIPO Standard ST.10/C that would be forwarded to the Secretariat for its distribution to the industrial property offices (IPOs) for its completion.

4. The Task Force would also complete a proposal concerning the recommendations set out in this standard along the lines suggested in Appendix 3 to document SCIT/SDWG/2/6.

5. In a second phase, the Task Force would present a proposal on a unified format for priority application numbers.

6. Significant progress was made after the second session of the SCIT/SDWG and was reported at the third session of the SCIT/SDWG held in May 2002 (SCIT/SDWG/3).

7. Two different questionnaires and letters entitled “Maintenance of the tables in the Appendix to WIPO Standard ST.10/C (SDWG Task No. 30)” were prepared by the Task Force. On January 29, 2003, the JPO, as Task Force Leader, submitted to the Secretariat the two questionnaires concerning the revision and update of the Appendix to ST.10/C for distribution to and completion by IPOs. The IB prepared two circulars based on the questionnaires and letters.

8. The introduction to the questionnaire contained a list of the problems that it was intended to resolve and it was decided that two versions of the questionnaire would be produced to serve the different needs of the two distinct groups of targeted IPOs, i.e., those that were already listed in the tables of the WIPO Standard ST.10/C Appendix and those that were members of the Paris

Convention but were not listed in the Appendix to the standard. In the case of the former, the purpose of the questionnaire was to ask IPOs to verify the accuracy of the information contained in the Appendix tables. In both cases, the aim of the document had been to emphasize with IPOs the importance of WIPO Standard ST.10/C and to encourage them to complete and update the Appendix tables as appropriate.

9. As for the revision of the recommendation set out in the Standard, the Delegation of the Republic of Korea, in recalling the objective of the Task Force to provide a unified format for priority application numbers, cautioned the meeting that consideration would need to be given to the differing types of industrial property rights and the needs of regional receiving offices, before an agreement on a unified format can be reached.

10. The Representative of the European Patent Office (EPO) agreed that there was a need to consider the question of industrial property rights and a method for ensuring their unique identification. The Task Force Leader stated that this issue would be firstly discussed at the forthcoming Task Force meeting and would be included in ongoing Task Force discussions.

Task Force Activities

(a) Revise and update the Appendix to WIPO Standard ST.10/C

11. On April 4, 2003, the Circulars SCIT 2580 and 2581 were distributed to IPOs and were posted on the WIPO website. The Circular SCIT 2580 was prepared for the IPOs whose application numbers were provided in the Tables of the Appendix to WIPO Standard ST.10/C to check the accuracy of the information contained in the Tables. The Circular SCIT 2581, on the other hand, was prepared for the IPOs whose application numbers were not listed in the Tables of the Appendix to WIPO Standard ST.10/C although they are a member of the Paris Convention. The IB requested them to submit their answers by May 30, 2003. The IB has so far received 36 responses.

(b) Revise the recommendation set out in the Standard

12. The Task Force continued to examine appropriate revision of the recommendations set out in the WIPO Standard ST.10/C along the lines suggested in Appendix 3 to document SCIT/SDWG/2/6. The Task Force meeting was held on May 7, 2003, to examine the suggested lines of paragraphs 11 and 12. Also, the participants discussed the issue raised by the Korean Industrial Property Office (KIPO) at the SCIT/SDWG/3.

13. At the meeting, the participants paid particular attention to the following issues and reached some consensus:

(a) Revision of paragraph 7

The KIPO proposed that consideration be given to revising the text of paragraph 7 to add “types of industrial property rights” to the recommended priority application number. Taking into account the purpose of the first phase and any possible confusion caused by the revision, however, they agreed not to consider any change in the standard at the first stage. Instead they agreed to consider the necessary change at the second phase.

(b) Replacement of the title [ST.10/C]

With regard to the title of a specified line or column for “Recommended Presentation in Abbreviated Form As a Priority Number” that was tentatively expressed as [ST.10/C], some participants pointed out that [ST.10/C] is not familiar to applicants and proposed three new candidates. Namely, there are the following four options including the original proposal:

- Option 1: [ST.10/C]
- Option 2: [INID(30)]
- Option 3: [(30)PAN]
- Option 4: [The number of your priority application, to be used for filing abroad under the Paris Convention, is]

They agreed to examine appropriate text with the Task Force members.

(c) Removal of space between [ST.10/C] and [JP2000-001234]

In order to appropriately read or process the data by machine, they agreed to remove the space between [ST.10/C] and [JP2000-001234]. However, they decided to consider other Task Force members’ opinions.

(d) Removal of underline of [JP2000-001234]

In order to avoid confusion of the description, it was suggested removing the underline of [JP2000-001234] and to seek any possible way of emphasizing the number. They agreed to examine the issue with the Task Force members.

(e) Decision on implementation date in paragraph 12

They decided to examine desirable implementation date with the Task Force members.

14. The detailed discussions and results of the Task Force meeting were recorded on “Minutes of ST.10/C Revision Task Force on 7 May 2003” (see Appendix 1 to this document) and were reported to all the Task Force members for their consideration. Then, the Task Force exchanged views and opinions on the above-mentioned issues.

15. As for the issue (a) of paragraph 13, above, the KIPO again suggested amending

paragraph 7(e). The KIPO proposed that the second sentence of paragraph 7(e) be changed to “The letter “U” should be inserted after the application number, separated by two blank spaces.” by deleting “The letter or set of characters should be removed and” in the sentence. It pointed out that since the application number of KIPO consists of identifier (type of rights) and number, it is desirable that the identifier would be kept in the priority application number. It was agreed, however, that the Task Force would leave out the discussion at the first phase and examine it at the second phase as decided at the Task Force meeting. It was also recognized that, if this proposal were accepted, the offices that now remove the letter or set of characters following the guidance would be confused by the change. It was noted, on the other hand, that the SDWG agreed to change the word “demand” to “encourage” in paragraph 11(b) at the SCIT/SDWG/2 so that they could allow some exception with any rational reason.

16. With regard to the issue (b) of paragraph 13, above, it was agreed to adopt the options 4 (“[The number of your priority application, to be used for filing abroad under the Paris Convention, is]” as the title). It was pointed out that the title of the option 4 would best meet the purpose of the revision (obtaining consistently accurate priority application number on subsequent applications) since it clearly spelled out the meaning and intended use of the number.

17. Concerning the issues (c) and (d) of paragraph 13, above, the Task Force agreed to accept the proposals of the Task Force meeting. In relation to the issue (d), “Removal of underline of [JP2000-001234],” it was recognized that it would not be necessary to use any alternative method to emphasize the way of describing priority application numbers because the guideline written in the last sentence of the paragraph 11(a) seemed clear enough.

18. Along with these issues, it was newly proposed and agreed that the square brackets “[]” before and after the description and the priority number (the text of paragraph 11(a) and example) should be removed because some applicants might be confused by them. It was pointed out that they could be misunderstood as part of the priority application number or could be misread as another symbol, letter or number. In conclusion, the Task Force decided that the example should be “The number of your priority application, to be used for filing abroad under the Paris Convention, is JP2000-001234.” It was also noted that a period (.) should not be put at the end of the sentence not to make applicants misunderstand it as part of the priority application number. Along with that, it was also agreed that the square brackets should be removed from the text of paragraph 11(a).

19. In relation to the issue (e) of paragraph 13, above, the Task Force Leader first proposed that the implementation date of paragraph 12 be “at the latest as of January 1, 2005” to be in accordance with the statement of the new WIPO Standard ST.10/C adopted by the SDWG on May 8, 2003. The Task Force Leader also stated that we should not change the date if possible in order to avoid any confusion and misunderstanding.

20. The United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO), however, commented on the proposal and made a counterproposal as follows:

- New paragraph 12 should be deleted since it raises some concerns.
- It is not desirable to give a specific implementation date (January 1, 2005, at the latest)

- while the rest of the standard was to be implemented by January 1, 2000, with the exception of the recently added text related to the International Patent Classifications (IPC). After the given date, the standard might appear to be out-of-date.
- Also, we would not want offices who go past the January 1, 2005, date to give up trying to comply if they did not meet the date. Many WIPO standards do not even give a desired implementation date.
 - The bottom line is that due to the wide variety of bibliographic elements covered by Standard ST.10/C, no single date can be given for the entire standard.
 - A new introductory paragraph “11(aa)” should be inserted instead of paragraph 12. Due to the importance of this section, we should include text specific to this section indicating the critical need to implement the provisions of this section as soon as possible and why this section of WIPO Standard ST.10/C is so important. Also, we will need to provide a new heading for this section since “Recommendation” will not be in keeping with the rest of this standard.
 - We should change the heading to “PRESENTATION OF PRIORITY APPLICATION NUMBERS FOR USE IN SUBSEQUENT APPLICATIONS.” In addition, we should insert the following text after the heading:

“11(aa) Priority application numbers are provided to applicants by industrial property offices in the notifications of the first filing and in the certificates of priority under the Paris Convention. Priority application numbers are then cited by applicants when filing a subsequent application for the same or related subject matter before a subsequent industrial property office in accordance with the Paris Convention. The priority application number can then be used by industrial property offices to link all related patent document “families” together in databases and computerized search systems. This ability to create patent families is tremendously valuable to industrial property offices for examination purposes, for example, when a better date of filing is needed during the prosecution of a later unrelated application. Patent families also permit patent examiners to review previously published patent documents in a preferred language, if available. Patent families can help offices save significant classification resources (financial, staffing, etc.) by allowing industrial property offices to use the classifications of one patent family member for all members of the patent family.

These and other uses of patent families make the accurate recording of the priority application number by applicants a critical concern of all industrial property offices. Even small deviations from the correct priority application number format can cause patent documents to not be collected into a patent family. The correction of errors in priority data causes huge expenses for industrial property offices. Therefore, it is critical that the provisions of this section of the standard be implemented by industrial property offices as soon as possible.”

- Moreover, a new paragraph 11(a) should begin with the sentence “In order to improve the quality of patent family data and to avoid confusion in the presentation of priority application numbers, the following recommendations are made.”
- In case that proposed paragraph 12 is deleted, the newly revised paragraphs 2 and 3 of WIPO Standard ST.10/C related to presentation of IPC reform classification should refer to the fact that the new presentation of classification symbols related to IPC reform

should be provided on all documents published from January 1, 2005, forward. This implementation date is critical. Since the IPC Reform Task Force (ST.8 Task Force) was created to consider all WIPO Standards impacted by the IPC Reform, we should have this issue considered by them.

21. The Task Force members exchanged views and opinions on these proposals. As for the USPTO proposals, it was pointed out by the EPO that a text like the one proposed by the USPTO may be more appropriate in another place than in the Standard (e.g. in a more general handbook) although the idea itself was fine. In the end, however, the Task Force members agreed to support these USPTO proposals. The German Patent and Trademark Office (GPTO) proposed, on the other hand, that the second part of the first sentence of paragraph 5 should be deleted since the proposed text of paragraph 11(aa) was redundant to the beginning of the existing paragraph 5. The Task Force members agreed on the proposal.

22. With regard to amendment of paragraphs 2 and 3, the IPC Reform Task Force agreed to consider the issue and finally proposed to insert the following text after the last sentence of paragraph 3:

“This presentation is effective beginning with the January 1, 2005, edition of the IPC.”

23. The IPC Reform Task Force also proposed that a cover page be provided for WIPO Standard ST.10/C containing a “Editorial Note” by the IB and that an Annex containing the previous version of the Standard be provided. It was noted that with this approach we could easily inform that the new version of paragraphs 2 and 3 will be implemented for all patent documents with a publication date from January 1, 2005, while the previous version will be valid until December 31, 2004. As the “Editorial Note,” the following text was suggested:

“Editorial Note by the International Bureau

In accordance with the decision taken by the Standards and Documentation Working Group (SDWG) of the Standing Committee on Information Technologies (SCIT) at its third session on May 8, 2003, the new revisions of paragraphs 2 and 3 of Standard ST.10/C have been adopted and will come into force on January 1, 2005. These revisions incorporate changes made necessary by the IPC reform initiative. Industrial property offices are asked to implement the new versions of paragraphs 2 and 3 of the Standard for all patent documents with a publication date from January 1, 2005, onwards. For patent documents published prior to that date, the previous text of paragraphs 2 and 3 of the standard should continue to be used.

The previous versions of paragraphs 2 and 3 of Standard ST.10/C, valid until December 31, 2004, are reproduced as an Annex to the new Standard ST.10/C.”

24. It was noted that since the “Editorial Note” would not be part of the Standard, it could be immediately inserted and later removed without approval by the SDWG. Then, it was proposed that the cover page to WIPO Standard ST.10/C be added to the WIPO website at <http://www.wipo.int/scit/en/standards/pdf/03-10-c.pdf> and be provided in the 2003 WIPO Handbook CD-ROM. It was also proposed to put the asterisk as reference to the footnote “See

Editorial Note on the cover page” at the end of the proposed sentence of paragraph 3. It was proposed, on the other hand, that the cover page text and related Annex be removed from the cover page by the IB at a suitable time subsequent to January 1, 2005.

25. In addition, it was suggested that the following note be provided on the cover page to WIPO Standard ST.10/C in the 2003 WIPO Handbook CD-ROM:

“This Standard is currently under revision. Any updates will be posted to the WIPO Internet website after the January 2004 Standards and Documentation Working Group (SDWG) meeting.”

26. The ST.10/C Task Force agreed to accept the above-mentioned proposals and suggestions made by the IPC Reform Task Force.

Current Result and Further Work

(a) Revise and update the Appendix to WIPO Standard ST.10/C

27. The complete list of countries and their responses are available in the SCIT area of WIPO’s website at <http://www.wipo.int/scit: Administrations/Circulars>.

28. Out of the 36 offices, 10 responded to the circular C. SCIT 2581. It means that we have succeeded in increasing the number of participants in the Tables of the Appendix to WIPO Standard ST.10/C. As for the circulars C. SCIT 2581, 16 offices requested to revise or update their Tables while the others reported that no change is necessary.

29. The IB is now preparing a new Appendix to WIPO Standard ST.10/C based on the result.

(b) Revise the recommendation set out in the Standard

30. Thanks to the great efforts made by every member, the ST.10/C Task Force successfully completed its discussions about the revision of the recommendation set out in the Standard at the first phase. The Task Force proposes to revise the texts of paragraphs 3, 5 and 11 of the Standard. (See Appendix 2 to the document.)

31. In addition to the revision of the Standard, the Task Force proposes that a cover page be provided for WIPO Standard ST.10/C containing an “Editorial Note” by the IB (see Appendix 3 to the document) and that the Annex containing the previous version of the Standard be provided. With this approach, we can easily inform that the new version of paragraphs 2 and 3 will be implemented for all patent documents with a publication date from January 1, 2005, while the previous version will be valid until December 31, 2004.

32. As for the cover page, the Task Force suggests that the cover page to WIPO Standard ST.10/C be added to the WIPO website at <http://www.wipo.int/scit/en/standards/pdf/3-10-c.pdf> and be provided in the 2003 WIPO Handbook CD-ROM. In addition, the Task Force proposes that the

cover page text and related Annex be removed from the cover page by the IB at a suitable time subsequent to January 1, 2005.

33. Moreover, the Task Force proposes that the following editorial note by the IB be provided on the cover page to WIPO Standard ST.10/C in the 2003 WIPO Handbook CD-ROM:

“This Standard is currently under revision. Any updates will be posted to the WIPO Internet website after the January 2004 Standards and Documentation Working Group (SDWG) meeting.”

34. The Task Force will invite the SDWG to consider and approve the above-mentioned proposals concerning revision of the recommendation set out in the Standard at the first phase and insertion of the cover page.

35. Due to the October/November 2003 publishing deadline, the editorial note will need to be inserted by the IB in the 2003 WIPO Handbook CD-ROM before the SDWG meeting in January 2004. This is necessary because this will be the last opportunity to give sufficient warning to users of possible upcoming changes to the Standard. The 2004 WIPO Handbook CD-ROM will be published late in 2004, thus not giving IPOs and others enough time to prepare for the upcoming changes.

(c) The second phase with a standardized format solution

36. After completing the first phase, the Task Force will proceed to the second phase. The Task Force will start examining a unified format for priority application numbers at this stage.

[Appendices follow]

APPENDIX 1

MINUTES OF ST.10/C REVISION TASK FORCE MEETING ON 7 MAY 2003

1. During the SCIT/SDWG/3, the Task Force meeting was held on May 7, 2003, to examine the proposal for the recommendation set out in the WIPO Standard ST.10/C.
2. First, the Task Force Leader explained to the participants the discussions and agreements of the Task Force in this regard, referring to the “Discussion and Agreements on the Standard ST.10/C Revision” distributed on April 8, 2003. The Task Force Leader also introduced to them comments from the USPTO and the KIPO on this paper with its own opinions on these comments.
3. There was no opposition to the proposal of the USPTO for adding the text “along with the title “[ST.10/C]” “ to the last sentence of paragraph 11 (a).
4. As for the KIPO’s proposal for adding “types of IPR” code to the recommended priority application number, the Task Force Leader commented that “Recommended abbreviated Form as a Priority Application Number” has a function of identifying types of IPR, and suggested avoiding duplication. In response to the suggestion, the KIPO newly proposed that the paragraph 7(e) be amended to add “types of IPR code to the recommended priority application number because the current “Recommended abbreviated Form as a Priority Application Number” could not cover various types of IPR. However, the participants expressed the following concerns about this suggestion:
 - This type of issue was already raised by the USPTO at the beginning, but we decided to take a moderate and pragmatic approach at the first phase (and we are now at the first phase).
 - Namely, it was agreed that we would not change the current format of the Appendix in principle while requesting for more IPO entries there and for updated information.
 - The Questionnaires that the Task Force prepared were about to be circulated. If this suggested amendment were allowed, the answers would be inconsistent with the guideline set out in the amended paragraph.
 - This issue should be discussed at the second phase if necessary.
5. After exchanging opinions among the participants, it was agreed that we would not amend the paragraph 7 at the first phase and would consider the necessary change at the second phase.
6. In addition to the above-mentioned important debate, the following issues were newly raised and discussed:

(a) Replacement of the title “[ST.10/C]”

7. It was pointed out that [ST.10/C] seems inappropriate as title of a specified line or column for priority application number because it is not familiar to applicants. Several offices proposed replacing “[ST.10/C]” in the last sentence of paragraph 11(a) and the example with any of the following:

Proposal (1) [INID (30)]

Reason: INID code is more familiar to applicants than WIPO Standard. Then, INID code (30) represents “Data relating to priority under the Paris Convention” according to the WIPO Standard ST.9. Therefore, the applicants would easily recognize the number as priority number with the title [INID (30)].

(Proposed by Rospatent and several offices).

Proposal (2) [(30) PAN]

Reason: PAN stands for Priority Application Number. With INID code number and the abbreviation “PAN” applicants would easily recognize the number as priority number.

(Proposed by the KIPO).

Proposal (3) [The number of your priority application, to be used for filing abroad under the Paris Convention, is]

Reason: Under proposals (1) or (2), some explanation about the abbreviation might be needed even though each of them is familiar to applicants. However, the text of the proposal (3) would enable applicants to easily recognize the number as priority number.

(Proposed by the EPO).

8. The participants decided to invite other Task Force members to consider the proposals and to find an appropriate title.

(b) Removal of space between [ST.10/C] and [JP2000-001234]

9. It was pointed out by the GPTO that the data could not be appropriately read or processed by machine because of the existence of the space between [ST.10/C] and [JP2000-001234]. It was proposed that the space should be omitted to avoid such a problem. The participants agreed on the proposal but decided to consider other Task Force members’ opinions.

(c) Removal of underline of [JP2000-001234]

10. Currently, “[JP2000-001234]” in the example is underlined just to emphasize the way of describing priority application number under the recommendation. In order to avoid confusion of the description, however, it was proposed and agreed that this underline be removed and that other method such as different color or font be used instead. The participants agreed that the Task Force Leader would make a proposal for the other method and invite other Task Force members to consider the proposal.

11. It was recognized that these three issues might be the very last ones to be discussed by the Task Force before submitting the final proposal for the recommendation set out in WIPO Standard ST.10/C. Finally, the Task Force Leader suggested that he would write the minutes of the Task Force meeting after the SCIT/SDWG/3 and would invite the Task Force members to discuss these issues based on the minutes. Every participant accepted this suggestion and then the meeting was closed.

12. After the Task Force meeting, however, it was also suggested by the Spanish Patent and Trademark Office (OEPM) that the following discussion would be needed:

(d) Decision on implementation date in paragraph 12

13. The desirable implementation date remains undecided. In paragraph 12, we should clearly state the date when this Standard should be implemented.

14. The Task Force Leader promised that he would include it in the issues to be discussed by the Task Force.

- *Adopted by the Task Force on June 20, 2003* -

[Appendix 2 follows]

APPENDIX 2

PROPOSED REVISION OF ST.10/C, PARAGRAPHS 3, 5 AND 11

[Paragraph3]

3. One sample representation of IPC classification symbols and indicators is:

Int. Cl. (2005)

B28B 5/02

B28B 1/29 (2006.03)

H05B 3/18 (2007.06)

Where: **B28B 5/02** is core level classification (regular font style) and invention information (bold font style);

B28B 1/29 is advanced level classification (italics font style) and invention information (bold font style); and

H05B 3/18 is advanced level classification (italics font style) and non-invention information (regular font style).

IPC symbols are defined in Part 5 of the WIPO Handbook on Industrial Property Information and Documentation and in the latest version of the Guide to the IPC.

This presentation is effective beginning with the January 1, 2005, edition of the IPC.*

[Footnote]

* See “Editorial Note by the International Bureau” on the cover page.

[Paragraph5]

5. Experience has shown the need for application numbers to be presented in a clear, unambiguous manner. The considerations given below apply equally to all presentations of application numbers of patent documents whether to the application number accorded to the application filed in the issuing industrial property office or that filed in the priority country or with an organization.

[Paragraph 11]

PRESENTATION OF PRIORITY APPLICATION NUMBERS FOR USE IN SUBSEQUENT APPLICATIONS

11. (aa) Priority application numbers are provided to applicants by industrial property offices in the notifications of the first filing and in the certificates of priority under the Paris Convention.

Priority application numbers are then cited by applicants when filing a subsequent application for the same or related subject matter before a subsequent industrial property office in accordance with the Paris Convention. The priority application number can then be used by industrial property offices to link all related patent document “families” together in databases and computerized search systems. This ability to create patent families is tremendously valuable to industrial property offices for examination purposes, for example, when a better date of filing is needed during the prosecution of a later unrelated application. Patent families also permit patent examiners to review previously published patent documents in a preferred language, if available. Patent families can help offices save significant classification resources (financial, staffing, etc.) by allowing industrial property offices to use the classifications of one patent family member for all members of the patent family.

These and other uses of patent families make the accurate recording of the priority application number by applicants a critical concern of all industrial property offices. Even small deviations from the correct priority application number format can cause patent documents to not be collected into a patent family. Correction of errors in priority data cause huge expense for industrial property offices. Therefore, it is critical that the provisions of this section of the standard be implemented by industrial property offices as soon as possible.

11. (a) In order to improve the quality of patent family data and to avoid confusion in the presentation of priority application numbers, the following recommendations are made:

Industrial property offices (IPOs) should always provide priority application number complying with “Recommended Presentation in Abbreviated Form as a Priority Application Number” given in the Appendix to the Standard ST.10/C (in addition to the application number or the minimum significant part of the number) when presenting the application number of a patent document in the notification of the first filing and in the certificate of priority. The “Recommended Presentation in Abbreviated Form as a Priority Application Number” should be presented with the Standard ST.3 code (preferably in a specified line or column along with the title “The number of your priority application, to be used for filing abroad under the Paris Convention, is”) to be easily recognized as priority number by other IPOs and applicants.

Example of presentation of “Recommended Presentation in Abbreviated Form as a Priority Application Number”:

The number of your priority application, to be used for filing abroad under the Paris Convention, is JP2000-001234

(b) Industrial property offices should encourage and facilitate the compliance by applicants of paragraph 11(a) of the Standard 10/C when providing the priority application number in subsequent filings.

[Appendix 3 follows]

APPENDIX 3

PROPOSED TEXT OF “EDITORIAL NOTE BY THE INTERNATIONAL BUREAU”

Editorial Note by the International Bureau

In accordance with the decision taken by the Standards and Documentation Working Group (SDWG) of the Standing Committee on Information Technologies (SCIT) at its third session on May 8, 2003, the new revisions of paragraphs 2 and 3 of Standard ST.10/C have been adopted and will come into force on January 1, 2005. These revisions incorporate changes made necessary by the IPC reform initiative. Industrial property offices are asked to implement the new versions of paragraphs 2 and 3 of the Standard for all patent documents with a publication date from January 1, 2005, onwards. For patent documents published prior to that date, the previous text of paragraphs 2 and 3 of the standard should continue to be used.

The previous versions of paragraphs 2 and 3 of Standard ST.10/C, valid until December 31, 2004, are reproduced as an Annex to the new Standard ST.10/C.

[End of Appendix 3 and of document]