

WIPO



SCIT/SDWG/5/4

ORIGINAL: English

DATE: September 17, 2004

WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION

GENEVA

STANDING COMMITTEE ON INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES

STANDARDS AND DOCUMENTATION WORKING GROUP

Fifth Session

Geneva, November 8 to 11, 2004

REVISION OF WIPO STANDARD ST.10/C

Document prepared by the Secretariat

1. At its fourth session, held from January 26 to 30, 2004, the Standards and Documentation Working Group (SDWG) adopted a revision of WIPO Standard ST.10/C in order to improve the quality of patent family data and to avoid confusion in the presentation of priority application numbers. The said revision, as well as the revision of the same Standard that was adopted by the SDWG at its third session, in May 2003, also intended to bring the Standard into line with the reform of the International Patent Classification (IPC) (SCIT/SDWG/4/14, paragraphs 20 to 30, and SCIT/SDWG/3/9, paragraphs 20, 21, and 27 to 30).

2. The IPC Committee of Experts, at its 34th session, from February 23 to 27, 2004, decided to postpone the entering into force of the reformed IPC until January 1, 2006 (IPC/CE/34/10, paragraphs 36 to 47). As a consequence of this postponement, a further revision of WIPO Standards ST.8 and ST.10/C became necessary. In order to propose consistent revisions of these two Standards for the consideration by the SDWG, the ST.8 and ST.10/C Task Forces exchanged views on this matter. Document SCIT/SDWG/5/3 addresses the question concerning the impact of the said postponement on WIPO Standard ST.8.

3. On July 13, 2004, the Japan Patent Office (JPO), as Leader of the ST.10/C Task Force, submitted a report of the Task Force on its progress, conclusions, proposals and remaining work to be completed, for consideration by the SDWG. This report is reproduced as an Annex to this document with Appendices 1 to 3 thereto. An oral report on the status of the revision of WIPO Standard ST.10/C will also be presented at the fifth session of the SDWG.

4. Appendix 1 of the Annex to this document reproduces the Minutes of the meeting held by the ST.10/C Task Force on January 28, 2004. At that meeting, the Task Force discussed the second phase of the process to carry out Task No. 30, since the first phase of this process had already been considered completed by the SDWG (SCIT/SDWG/4/14, paragraph 30).

5. Appendix 2 of the Annex to this document is a proposal for a revised version of the description of Task No. 30 which reflects the inclusion of the revision of WIPO Standard ST.13 within the scope of Task No. 30. This revised version was prepared by the ST.10/C Task Force for consideration and approval by the SDWG. The new description of Task No. 30, if approved by the SDWG, would also be reflected in the corresponding pages of Annex 1 to document SCIT/SDWG/5/10 (Task List of the SDWG).

6. Subsequent to the above-mentioned postponement of the entering into force of the reformed IPC, the International Bureau (IB), having consulted and agreed thereon with the ST.10/C Task Force, published the revised Editorial Note to WIPO Standard ST.10/C which is now available on WIPO's website (<http://www.wipo.int/scit/en/standards/standards.htm>). In addition, the ST.10/C Task Force noticed that a further revision of paragraph 3 of WIPO Standard ST.10/C was necessary due to the said postponement; the proposed revision of this paragraph is reproduced in Appendix 3 to the Annex to this document.

7. *The SDWG is invited:*

(a) *to note the report of the ST.10/C Task Force and the oral report referred to in paragraph 3, above;*

(b) *to consider and approve the revised description of Task No. 30, in particular the inclusion of the revision of WIPO Standard ST.13 within the scope of this Task, as proposed in Appendix 2 to the Annex to this document; and*

(c) *to consider and adopt the proposal concerning the revision of WIPO Standard ST.10/C as reproduced in Appendix 3 to the Annex to this document.*

[Annex follows]

ANNEX

REPORT OF THE WIPO STANDARD ST.10/C TASK FORCE
(July 20, 2004)

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 ST.10/C Task Force would present a proposal on a unified format for priority application numbers.
6. The ST.10/C Task Force started its discussions and tasks related to the first phase after the end of the second session of the SCIT/SDWG (SCIT/SDWG/2).
7. As for the revision and update of the Appendix, the ST.10/C Task Force prepared two different questionnaires and letters entitled "Maintenance of the tables in the Appendix to WIPO Standard ST.10/C (SDWG Task No. 30)". 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 issued Circulars C. SCIT 2580 and 2581, dated April 4, 2003, which invited IPOs to provide information on the maintenance of the Appendix to WIPO Standard ST.10/C.
8. The circular C. 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 C. 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 members of the Paris Convention.

9. The IB requested them to submit their answers by May 30, 2003. The IB received 36 responses until the fourth session of SCIT/SDWG (SCIT/SDWG/4). The complete list of countries and their responses are available on the WIPO/SCIT Web Page at <http://www.wipo.int/scit/en/mailbox/circ03.htm> under “Administrations/Circulars”. The updated Appendix was published in the 2003 WIPO *Handbook on Industrial Property Information and Documentation* CD-ROM and in the SCIT area of WIPO’s website.

10. With regard to revision of the recommendation set out in the Standard, the ST.10/C Task Force eagerly exchanged views and opinions in order to find a pragmatic but effective solution. Thanks to the great efforts made by every member, the ST.10/C Task Force successfully completed its discussions at the first phase before the SCIT/SDWG/4. The ST.10/C Task Force prepared and submitted to the IB its proposal to revise the texts of paragraphs 3, 5 and 11 of the Standard (Appendix 2 to document SCIT/SDWG/4/3).

11. In addition to the revision of the Standard, the ST.10/C Task Force proposed that a cover page be provided for WIPO Standard ST.10/C containing an “Editorial Note” by the IB (Appendix 3 to document SCIT/SDWG/4/3). Moreover, the ST.10/C Task Force proposed that the Annex containing the previous version of the Standard be provided. The Editorial Note and Annex would help the IPOs know that the new version of paragraphs 2 and 3 would be implemented for all patent documents with a publication date from January 1, 2005, while the previous version would be valid until December 31, 2004.

12. As for the cover page, the Task Force also suggested that the cover page to WIPO Standard ST.10/C be added to the WIPO website and be provided in the 2003 WIPO Handbook CD. In addition, the Task Force proposed that the cover page text and related Annex be removed from the Standard by the IB at a suitable time subsequent to January 1, 2005.

13. At the SCIT/SDWG/4 meeting, the Task Force invited 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.

14. The SDWG approved the text of WIPO Standard ST.10/C, as reproduced in Annex 4 to document SCIT/SDWG/4/14 (Report), as well as the proposal for the cover page. The Task Force thus completed the first phase. The SDWG, on the other hand, requested that the ST.10/C Task Force review paragraph-numbering issues proposed by the KIPO at the second phase.

Task Force Activities

- (a) Revise the description of Task No. 30 for the second phase

15. In order to seek the ST.10/C Task Force’s future direction, in particular the goal of the second phase, the ST.10/C Task Force held its Task Force meeting on January 28, 2004, during the SCIT/SDWG/4 meeting. The Minutes of the meeting are presented as Appendix 1 to this report. The participants expressed many opinions and questions about the following issues:

- Implementation date of a unified format to be decided at the second phase
- Necessity and/or feasibility of the second phase
- Harmonization with recommended application numbers under WIPO Standard ST.13
- KIPO's proposal (reviewing paragraph-numbering issues).

16. As a result, the participants recognized that it would be necessary to explore a unified format for application numbers at the second phase, but that it would be difficult to arrive at unified format for priority application numbers without examining an ideal format for application numbers. Then, it was agreed that these two issues should be discussed simultaneously to avoid inconsistency between the two formats. Finally, they concluded that, if other ST.10/C Task Force members supported the idea, the ST.10/C Task Force should propose to the SDWG the inclusion of the task relating to the revision of WIPO Standard ST.13 in the scope of Task No. 30, taking into consideration the similarities between WIPO Standards ST.10/C and ST.13. It was also agreed to discuss revision of the description of Task No. 30 of the SDWG Task List in order to express the new relevance/scope of Task No. 30 at the second phase.

17. These proposals were fully supported by every member in the ST.10/C Task Force's e-forum. Then, the ST.10/C Task Force started preparing the new Task No. 30 description that would be submitted to the IB for consideration by the SDWG members at the fifth session of the SDWG, to be held in November 2004.

(b) Revise the Standard along with the postponement of IPC Reform

18. The IPC Committee of Experts, at its 34th session (February 23 to 27, 2004), decided to postpone the entering into force of the reformed IPC until January 1, 2006 (paragraphs 36 to 47 of document IPC/CE/34/10).

19. It was recognized that as a consequence of this postponement the Editorial Note to WIPO Standard ST.10/C should be revised. The ST.10/C Task Force examined the revision of the Editorial Note proposed by the IB and confirmed its accuracy. The new version reflecting the postponement is now available on the WIPO website (<http://www.wipo.int/scit/en/standards/standards.htm>).

20. The new Editorial Note states that the new version of paragraphs 2 and 3 will come into force on January 1, 2006, and not on January 1, 2005, while the previous versions of these paragraphs will be valid until December 31, 2005.

21. Furthermore, the ST.10/C Task Force noticed that paragraph 3, that refers to sample representation of IPC classifications and indications, should also be revised for the same reason. In addition to that, it turned out that "B28B 5/02" indicated as Core Level Classification is not a Core Level Classification anymore and should be replaced by "B28B 5/00".

22. In the framework of its mandate the ST.10/C Task Force discussed this issue and decided to present its proposal for the said revision of paragraph 3 of WIPO Standard ST.10/C for consideration by the SDWG at the SCIT/SDWG/5 meeting. For the appropriate revision, the ST.10/C Task Force exchanged views and opinions on the revision with the ST.8 Task Force that is responsible for any IPC Reform-related issues and that also needed to revise its own Standard.

Current Results and Further Work

- (a) Revise the description of Task No. 30 for the second phase

23. The ST.10/C Task Force has completed preparing its proposal for the new description of Task No. 30 of the SDWG Task List and presents it as Appendix 2 to this report. The new task “Revise the recommendation set out in Standard ST.13” has been added to the second chapter “Relevance/Scope of Task” in the revised Task No. 30 description along with the following wording:

“In order to establish an ideal unified format for priority application numbers, during the second phase, that will be in harmony with recommended application numbers set out in Standard ST.13, the Task Force also considers the need to:

- (c) Revise the recommendation set out in Standard ST.13

The following two revisions should be considered:

(i) a revision to facilitate industrial property offices’ compliance with the Standard, taking into account requirements of industrial property offices such as amendment of the total number of alphanumeric characters;

(ii) a revision to assure more standardized presentation of application numbers.”

24. It should be noted that this task has the same purpose as the revision of Standard ST.10/C, namely for the purposes of improving the quality of patent family data and avoiding confusion in the presentation of priority application numbers. Therefore, the inclusion of the WIPO Standard ST.13 revision in the scope of the Task should be regarded as rational.

25. In addition, Chapters I and III have been updated, following the recent progress of the ST.10/C Task Force.

26. The ST.10/C Task Force will invite the SDWG to consider and approve the above-mentioned proposal concerning revision of the description of Task No. 30. The ST.10/C Task Force will work on the task presented in the new Task No. 30 description if it is approved by the SDWG at the SCIT/SDWG/5 meeting.

- (b) Revise the Standard along with the postponement of IPC Reform

27. The ST.10/C Task Force has completed preparing its proposal for the revision of paragraph 3 of WIPO Standard ST.10/C along with the postponement of the entering into force of the reformed IPC. The Task Force presents the proposal as Appendix 3 to this report.

28. First, “Int. Cl. (2005)” in the second line was changed to “Int. Cl. (2006)” since the version year 2005 of the Core Level Classification will not exist anymore.

29. Second, “B28B 5/02” in the third and sixth lines was replaced by “B28B 5/00” due to the change in Core Level Classifications.

30. Third, version dates of Advanced Level Classifications were changed to (2007.03) and (2008.06), respectively, in order to be in harmony with the proposed revision of paragraph 8 of WIPO Standard ST.8.

31. Lastly, the last sentence was replaced by the following text:

“This presentation is effective beginning with the January 1, 2006, edition of the IPC.”

32. The ST.10/C Task Force will invite the SDWG, at the SCIT/SDWG/5 meeting, to consider and approve the above-mentioned proposal concerning the revision of paragraph 3 of WIPO Standard ST.10/C.

[Appendices follow]

APPENDIX 1

MINUTES OF ST.10/C TASK FORCE MEETING ON JANUARY 28, 2004

Introduction

1. The ST.10/C Task Force Meeting was held during the SCIT/SDWG/4 meeting, on January 28, 2004, to discuss the Task Force's future direction. Since the Task Force's proposal for revision of WIPO Standard ST.10/C was accepted and the Task Force completed the first phase, it was the time to consider and clarify its project brief relating to the second phase.
2. The Task Force Leader invited participants to frankly express their opinions on the topic, raising several issues to be discussed.

Discussion

3. The participants expressed many opinions and questions during the discussion. They are summarized as follows:
 - (a) Implementation date of a unified format to be decided at the second phase
 - We will need a certain interval between the implementation date of the second phase and that of the first phase.
 - As an alternative, such as in WIPO Standards ST.6 and ST.13, we could encourage IPOs to follow the recommendation when they change their present numbering systems or introduce numbering systems.
 - If we give IPOs some moratorium or don't set any implementation date, however, the unified format will not be meaningful. It is predicted that there may be many offices that will continue to use their current format.
 - We could put pressure on the IPOs continuing to use their current format to follow the unified format by some means (e.g., sending them a Questionnaire). Also, we could encourage them to implement the unified format by using, in the text of the Standard, "as soon as possible" instead of a certain date.
 - It should be noted that we had a clear reason when we set an implementation date of revised ST.8 of January 1, 2005. On the other hand, we feel it difficult to find a clear reason for an implementation date of a new priority application number.
 - Asking IPOs to use the new format in a short time (e.g. two years) is not a realistic approach.

(b) Necessity and/or feasibility of the second phase

- WIPO Standards are merely recommendations. We can't expect too much even though we create an ideal format.
- We have just completed the first phase and IPOs are about to follow the new recommendation. Is it really necessary to explore a new format right now?
- It might be unrealistic to find an ideal unified format and to force IPOs to use it.
- We have succeeded in finding a moderate and pragmatic solution at the first phase. However, the solution of the first phase is not perfect.
- We should at least explore an ideal solution to improve the quality of patent family data and to avoid confusion in the preparation of priority application numbers.
- We have recognized the importance of creating a unified format to achieve our goal.
- In order to improve the quality of patent family data it was also stated that a unified format to indicate and to exchange the complete set of priority data (e.g., priority country, priority application number and priority date) should also be explored in conjunction with a unified format to indicate the priority application number.

(c) Harmonization of the unified format for priority application numbers with recommended application numbers under WIPO Standard ST.13

- If we have an ideal unified format for application numbers, we may be able to solve our problems.
- If a unified format for priority application numbers is not in accordance with the one for application numbers, on the other hand, IPOs and applicants will be confused.
- Unfortunately, there are quite a few offices that don't follow the recommended format of the current WIPO Standard ST.13 because it has several defects.
- We suspect that we can't decide on a unified format without thinking about the recommendation of application numbers under WIPO Standard ST.13.
- Feedback from our Task Force will be useful for revision of WIPO Standard ST.13. We should decide on a unified format for priority application numbers first, and then we can revise the recommendation of application numbers under WIPO Standard ST.13 to be in harmony with the unified format for priority application numbers.
- These two issues should be discussed simultaneously to avoid inconsistency between the two formats.
- If a new Task Force for revision of WIPO Standard ST.13 is created, the members will probably be the same as for the ST.10/C Task Force. These two topics are very similar.
- We should include the task relating to revision of WIPO Standard ST.13 in our scope of Task if the same members are supposed to discuss a very similar issue.
- We should hear other members' opinions on the above-mentioned proposal. If everyone agrees on it, we should discuss revision of Task No. 30 description first and submit to the IB our proposal for the revised Task to be considered at the SCIT/SDWG/5 meeting in November.
- The would-be Task Force will have to discuss much heavier issues than the JPO originally proposed. Therefore, we may assign another member to lead the new Task Force after the SCIT/SDWG/5 meeting, if necessary.

(d) KIPO's proposal

- The KIPO proposed changes in a reorganization of the presentation of bibliographic data components during discussions of agenda item 6 at the SCIT/SDWG/4 meeting.
- It was agreed by the SDWG that these changes should be reviewed at the second phase.
- We should keep this agreement in mind.

Conclusions

4. Finally, the participants of the Task Force meeting reached the following conclusions and agreed to hear other Task Force members' opinions on them before taking further actions:

- It is necessary to explore a unified format for priority application numbers at the second phase to achieve our ultimate goal.
- Without examining an ideal format for application numbers, however, it is difficult to arrive at a unified format for priority application numbers. These two issues should be discussed simultaneously to avoid inconsistency between the two formats.
- Taking into account the similarity between WIPO Standards ST.10/C and ST.13 (e.g., members and topics), we should propose to include the task relating to revision of WIPO Standard ST.13 in the scope of Task No. 30.
- We will invite other Task Force members to consider our proposal after the SCIT/SDWG/4 meeting. If everyone agrees on it, we should discuss revision of Task No. 30 description first and submit to the IB our proposal for the revised Task to be considered at the SCIT/SDWG/5 meeting, in November.
- We may assign another member to lead the new Task Force after the SCIT/SDWG/5 meeting, if necessary.

– Adopted by the ST.10/C Task Force on February 27, 2004 –

[Appendix 2 follows]

APPENDIX 2

REVISED DESCRIPTION OF TASK No. 30 OF THE SDWG TASK LIST

Proposal prepared by the ST.10/C Task Force

Task No. 30 Revision of WIPO Standard ST.10/C

I. BACKGROUND AND STATUS OF WORK

- The necessity of revising WIPO Standard ST.10/C was proposed by the Japan Patent Office (JPO) at the Trilateral Working Group Meeting held in Washington, DC, in April 2001. This proposal was supported by both the EPO and the USPTO.
- The proposal was made and supported at the first SDWG meeting in May 2001. (See paragraphs 34 and 35 of document SCIT/SDWG/1/9.)
- The JPO submitted a project brief titled “Project Brief of the Revision of ST.10/C” to the Secretariat on July 2, 2001. (See Annex to document SCIT/7/5.)
- Task was created by the SCIT Plenary at its seventh session in June 2002. It was also agreed that a Task Force would be set up to discuss this issue. (See paragraphs 25 to 27 of document SCIT/7/17.)
- The Task Force was established on July 12, 2002.
- At the second session of the SDWG in December 2002, it was agreed that the Task Force would implement 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. (See paragraphs 35 to 38 of document SCIT/SDWG/2/14.)
- The International Bureau issued Circulars SCIT 2580 and 2581, dated April 4, 2003, which invited industrial property offices to provide information on the maintenance of the Appendix to WIPO Standard ST.10/C. The circulars were based on the letter and questionnaires prepared by the Task Force. The updated Appendix and the revised version of the Standard that was adopted by the SDWG on May 8, 2003 (see Task No. 31), were published in the 2003 WIPO *Handbook on Industrial Property Information and Documentation* CD-ROM and in the SCIT area of WIPO’s website.
- The Task Force presented a report on the work carried out at the third session of the SDWG in May 2003. (See paragraphs 16 to 19 of document SCIT/SDWG/3/9, and document SCIT/SDWG/3/2.)
- On October 10, 2003, the Japan Patent Office, as Task Leader, submitted a proposal for the revision of WIPO Standard ST.10/C.
- The proposal was accepted by the SDWG, and the Task Force completed the first phase at the fourth session of the SDWG, in January 2004. (See paragraphs 20 to 30 of document SCIT/SDWG/4/14, and document SCIT/SDWG/4/3.)

- At the fourth session of the SDWG, it was suggested that the Task Force consider the impact of the revision of WIPO Standard ST.10/C on WIPO Standard ST.13 during the second phase in order to avoid inconsistent recommendations between these Standards.
- At the Task Force meeting held during the fourth session of the SDWG, it was proposed to examine an appropriate numbering system for applications along with the second phase of the WIPO Standard ST.10/C revision and to include the revision of WIPO Standard ST.13 in the scope of Task No. 30. (See conclusion part of “Minutes of ST.10/C Task Force Meeting on January 28, 2004”.)
- In March 2004, the Task Force reached an agreement to support these proposals and decided to submit to the IB a revised Task No. 30 description for the SDWG members’ consideration at the fifth session of the SDWG, to be held in November 2004.

II. RELEVANCE/SCOPE OF TASK

In order to improve the quality of patent family data and to avoid confusion in the presentation of priority application numbers, the Task Force considers in particular the need to:

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

The following revisions and updates of the Appendix to WIPO Standard ST.10/C should be considered:

- (i) a revision and update to cover all the member States of the Paris Convention;
- (ii) a revision and update to include the presentation of application numbers of both patents and utility models in the examples;
- (iii) a revision and update to include, in the examples, the presentation of application numbers assigned by receiving regional offices of a particular country in those cases where there is no uniform system established for assigning application numbers among the different receiving regional offices.

- (b) Revise the recommendation set out in WIPO Standard ST.10/C.

The following two recommendations should be considered for adding to the said Standard:

- (i) a recommendation to industrial property offices to comply with the Standard when presenting the application numbers of a patent document in the notification of the first filing and in the certificate of priority;
- (ii) a recommendation to industrial property offices to encourage and facilitate the compliance, by applicants, of the Standard when providing the priority application number in subsequent filings.

In order to establish an ideal unified format for priority application numbers, during the second phase, that would be in harmony with recommended application numbers set out in WIPO Standard ST.13, the Task Force also considers the need to:

- (c) Revise the recommendation set out in WIPO Standard ST.13

The following two revisions should be considered:

- (i) a revision to facilitate industrial property offices' compliance with the Standard, taking into account requirements of industrial property offices such as amendment of the total number of alphanumeric characters;

- (ii) a revision to assure a more standardized presentation of application numbers.

III. PROPOSED ACTION WITH TIME FRAME

The SDWG, at its second session, in December 2002, agreed on a two-phase process for this Task. During the first phase, the Appendix to WIPO Standard ST.10/C was revised and updated in October 2003, and a proposal concerning the recommendations set out in this Standard was approved at the fourth session of the SCIT/SDWG, in January 2004. Thus, the first phase was completed. The Task Force will present, in the second phase, a proposal on a unified format for priority application numbers for consideration by the SDWG. (See paragraphs 31 to 38 of document SCIT/SDWG/1/14, and document SCIT/SDWG/2/6.) In addition, the Task Force intends to present a proposal on an appropriate format for application numbers that will be used as part of priority application numbers for consideration by the SDWG.

Task Leader

The Japan Patent Office (JPO) is designated as the Task Leader.

– *Adopted by the ST.10/C Task Force on May 25, 2004* –

[Appendix 3 follows]

APPENDIX 3

PROPOSAL FOR REVISION OF PARAGRAPH 3 OF WIPO STANDARD ST.10/C

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

Int. Cl. (2006)

B28B 5/00

B28B 1/29 (2007.03)

H05B 3/18 (2008.06)

Where: **B28B 5/00** 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, 2006, edition of the IPC. *

* See "[Editorial Note](#) by the International Bureau" on the cover page.

[End of Appendix 3 and of document]