

**E**

SCIT/P 5/99 Rev.1

ORIGINAL: English

DATE: April 20, 2001

**WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION  
ORGANISATION MONDIALE DE LA PROPRIÉTÉ INTELLECTUELLE  
GENEVA / GENÈVE**

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES**

**COMITÉ PERMANENT DES TECHNIQUES DE L'INFORMATION**

**SCIT PROGRAM PROJECT FILE  
DOSSIER DE PROJET DE PROGRAMME SCIT**

<b>SUBJECT / SUJET</b>	<b>UNIQUE IDENTIFICATION OF A PATENT DOCUMENT/ IDENTIFICATION UNIVOQUE D'UN DOCUMENT DE BREVET</b>		<b>PROPOSED BY / SDWG PROPOSÉ PAR</b>		
<b>ANNEX / ANNEXE</b>	<b>CONTENT / CONTENU</b>		<b>SEE / VOIR P 5/99</b>	<b>ORIGIN / ORIGINE</b>	<b>DATE</b>
1	Circular SCIT 2460 and Questionnaire	Circulaire SCIT 2460 et questionnaire		WO	19.08.99
2	Comments	Commentaires		VA	06.09.99
3	Comments	Commentaires		BE	08.09.99
4	Comments	Commentaires		UA	24.09.99
5	Comments	Commentaires		CZ	27.09.99
6	Comments	Commentaires		KG	01.10.99
7	Comments	Commentaires		AT	21.10.99
8	Comments	Commentaires		GE	26.10.99
9	Comments	Commentaires		LT	26.10.99
10	Comments	Commentaires		ES	27.10.99
11	Comments	Commentaires		PL	27.10.99
12	Comments	Commentaires		US	27.10.99
13	Comments	Commentaires		CN	29.10.99
14	Comments	Commentaires		DE	29.10.99
15	Comments	Commentaires		KZ	29.10.99
16	Comments	Commentaires		RU	29.10.99

**NEXT ACTION:** Consideration by SCIT/SDWG/1**BY:** May 2001**REF.** SCIT/WG/2/12, paras. 29–33;  
Task No. 22**PROCHAINE ACTION :** Examen par le SCIT/SDWG/1**POUR :** mai 2001

ANNEX / ANNEXE	CONTENT / CONTENU		SEE / VOIR P 5/99	ORIGIN / ORIGINE	DATE
17	Comments	Commentaires		SK	29.10.99
18	Comments	Commentaires		HU	01.11.99
19	Comments	Commentaires		MK	01.11.99
20	Comments	Commentaires		MD	02.11.99
21	Comments	Commentaires		BG	03.11.99
22	Comments	Commentaires		AM	05.11.99
23	Summary of replies and conclusions	Résumé des réponses et conclusions		WO	22.11.99
24	Circular SCIT 2524	Circulaire SCIT 2524	Rev.1	WO	22.12.00
25	Comments	Commentaires	Rev.1	KZ	06.02.01
26	Comments	Commentaires	Rev.1	RU	13.02.01
27	Comments	Commentaires	Rev.1	UA	15.02.01
28	Comments	Commentaires	Rev.1	US	15.02.01
29	Comments	Commentaires	Rev.1	JP	21.02.01
30	Comments	Commentaires	Rev.1	NL	21.02.01
31	Comments	Commentaires	Rev.1	PL	21.02.01
32	Comments	Commentaires	Rev.1	MU	07.03.01



C. SCIT 2524  
03

December 22, 2000

RE: Results reached by the Patent Document Identification (PDI) Task Force of the Standing Committee on Information Technologies (SCIT)

---

Madam,  
Sir,

At its second session, which was held in December 1999, the SCIT Standards and Documentation Working Group (SDWG) agreed to set up a task force to determine the extent of the problem of uniquely identifying patent documents and the steps necessary to remedy that problem. The SDWG requested the task force to consider in particular in its analysis:

- the best way to cite and retrieve patent documents;
- the potential impact with relation to publication, storage and retrieval of patent documents; and
- the WIPO standards, if any, which need to be amended or created.

(See document SCIT/WG/2/12, paragraphs 29 to 33.)

In accordance with the above-mentioned decision by the SDWG, the International Bureau, by Circular SCIT 2484 of March 3, 2000, invited those offices wishing to actively participate in the discussions to nominate a representative to participate in the work of the PDI Task Force.

/...

C. SCIT 2524  
03

2.

./.

The attached Annex summarizes the work carried out by the PDI Task Force, including issues discussed, conclusions and proposals. Your Office is invited to consider the Annex and to provide the International Bureau with any comments thereon, in particular with regard to the conclusions and proposals of the Task Force (see paragraphs 12 to 15). Your comments should reach the International Bureau by February 20, 2001, at the latest, preferably by e-mail to “scit.mail@wipo.int”, indicating the number of this Circular.

The International Bureau intends to present the conclusions of the PDI Task Force, along with the comments received, to the SDWG for consideration in the year 2001.

Sincerely yours,



Klaus-Peter Wittig  
Deputy Director  
Standards and Documentation Service

## UNIQUE IDENTIFICATION OF PATENT DOCUMENTS

*Results reached by the SCIT Patent Document Identification Task Force  
(November 2000)*

### INTRODUCTION

1. Formerly, before WIPO Standard ST.50 started to undergo revision with regard to corrected documents, it was thought that a patent document could be uniquely identified by the ST.3 country/organization code, the ST.6 publication number and the ST.16 kind-of-patent document code, e.g., US 1234567 A. However, it was found that some Offices/Organizations (e.g., DK, WO) used the same “unique” identifier also when they issued corrected documents. Although the publication dates used on the original document and on the corrected document usually differ, this compromises the concept of “unique” identifier. The latest revision to WIPO Standard ST.50 will limit offices to no more than two ST.16 codes (e.g., A8, A9) regardless of how many corrections are made. The above-mentioned problem is resolved through the use of supplementary correction codes provided in WIPO Standard ST.50, although not all offices use those codes (e.g., US with PGPubs).

2. As a result, and in the framework of the discussions of the old Task No. 7(b) (Inclusion of supplementary correction codes in WIPO Standard ST.14), of the 1998–99 SCIT Work Program, the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) suggested that the SCIT Standards and Documentation Working Group (SDWG) study how a patent document could be uniquely identified. As proposed by the SDWG during its first meeting, the SCIT Plenary agreed to create the current Task No. 22 of the SCIT Work Program for the 2000–2001 biennium, with the following wording:

Investigate, in the light of the revised Standard ST.14, whether any other WIPO Standard, such as ST.6, ST.10/B, ST.11, ST.12, ST.16, ST.19, ST.30, ST.32, ST.35 and ST.40, requires revision in order to clarify how a patent document should be uniquely identified.

The SCIT Plenary agreed to assign this task to the SDWG.

(See paragraph 28 of document SCIT/WG/1/12 and paragraph 14 of document SCIT/2/8).

3. Subsequently, at its second session, which was held in December 1999, the SDWG agreed to set up a task force to determine the extent of the problem of uniquely identifying patent documents and the steps necessary to remedy that problem. The SDWG requested the task force to consider in particular in its analysis:

- the best way to cite and retrieve patent documents;
- the potential impact with relation to publication, storage and retrieval of patent documents;  
and
- the WIPO standards, if any, which need to be amended or created.

(See document SCIT/WG/2/12, paragraphs 29 to 33.)

4. In accordance with the above-mentioned decision by the SDWG, the International Bureau, by Circular SCIT 2484 of March 3, 2000, invited those offices wishing to actively participate in the discussions to nominate a representative to serve as a member of the Patent Document Identification (PDI) Task Force. The list of PDI Task Force members is attached (Appendix 2).

#### ISSUES CONSIDERED BY THE PDI TASK FORCE

5. The basic issue discussed by the PDI Task Force was how to uniquely identify a patent document.

6. It was felt that while the correction codes provided by WIPO Standard ST.50 could also be used for uniquely identifying some recent patent documents, they do not provide a solution for all documents. Such codes have been available only since the May 1998 revision of WIPO Standard ST.50. Some industrial property offices have only recently begun to use the supplementary correction codes, and they are not yet widely in use nor will they apply retroactively to older documents.

7. For obvious reasons, the relevant publication date of the patent document should be presented on the first page in a prominent way to facilitate the manual identification of the document when looking at paper, microfiche, etc., copies of the document, as well as computer displays thereof. With this purpose, the PDI Task Force suggested that WIPO Standard ST.10/B be amended by adding "the date of publication of the document" to the data components listed in paragraph 5 thereof (see paragraph 15, below). This would present the existing information in a more user-friendly way and should be done for all patent documents regardless of whether there are corrections or not. It should then be obvious to all users that the date is the publication date for that patent document.

Annex to C. SCIT 2524, page 3  
03

8. Some patent documents may have more than one date tagged with INID codes (40) through (48) of WIPO Standard ST.9, but only the latest one would be the publication date of the document being considered.

9. The identification of patent documents by computers for locating the correct document or information related to it would present no problem since, for example, they could be programmed to automatically check the four data elements listed in paragraph 12, below, and to use the latest publication date regardless of where it was stored.

10. WIPO Standard ST.32 has a tag B140, identified as the “Document date, usually date of publication,” which was intended for the purpose of uniquely identifying a document. There is no corresponding ST.9 code, but the PDI Task Force considered that, at present, a new INID code should not be created for fear of causing confusion among users. The existing publication date codes provided for in category code (40) of WIPO Standard ST.9 are sufficient.

#### Identifying related family members

11. The computer search systems must notify the user about other family members, including corrections, alterations, republications, etc. As long as the patent documents which are published later contain priority information (ST.9 codes (30), etc.) and related publication information (ST.9 codes (60), etc.), the computer systems should be able to alert the user to other international and domestic family members.

### CONCLUSIONS AND PROPOSALS BY THE PDI TASK FORCE

#### Citation of patent documents

12. The PDI Task Force agreed that the minimum data elements that must be indicated to uniquely identify all kinds of patent documents either manually or by computers are the following:

- (a) the ST.3 code of the industrial property office or organization publishing the document;
- (b) the publication number according to WIPO Standard ST.6;

(c) the kind-of-document code according to WIPO Standard ST.16; and

(d) the date of publication of the document as provided by ST.9 INID codes (41) through (48), as appropriate. The presentation of calendar dates identified by any of the INID codes concerned should be in the sequence and format recommended in WIPO Standard ST.2.

#### Publication, storage and retrieval of patent documents

13. The identification of patent documents using the four data elements given in paragraph 12, above, assumes that no industrial property office will publish two corrections to the same document on the same date. Therefore, it is extremely important that no document be corrected more than once on the same day and that industrial property offices or organizations provide a new publication date (preferably under INID code (48) of WIPO Standard ST.9) for corrected patent documents.

14. It may happen that some industrial property offices or organizations do not follow the recommended procedure established in this document (see paragraphs 12 and 13, above) and continue to use the same four identification elements listed in paragraph 12, above, including the same date of publication, for the original document and the corrected document. Under such circumstances, all industrial property offices or organizations maintaining collections of the data may need to store the paper or electronic copies of both the original document and the corrected document together so that users would retrieve both documents when requesting a copy of either one. The same would have to be done for all older corrected documents that do not make a distinction between the said four identification data elements, including the publication date, for the original document and for the corrected document.

#### WIPO Standards to be amended

15. The PDI Task Force agreed that the WIPO Standards requiring revision are Standards ST.6, ST.10/B and ST.33. The text of the proposed revision of each Standard is set out in Appendix 1 to this Annex.

[Appendixes follow]

## APPENDIX 1

### Proposals concerning amendments to WIPO Standards

The PDI Task Force agreed to propose the following wording for the parts of WIPO Standards which should be revised (the parts to be amended are indicated in bold):

#### 1. Standard ST.10/B

(a) Standard ST.10/B, paragraph 5, should be amended to read as follows (ref.: paragraph 7 of Annex to Circular C. SCIT 2524):

5. Those bibliographic data components considered by the issuing office to be of importance compared with the remaining data components, e.g., essential document identification data, should be printed, in the upper part of the first page, in a manner to give them more emphasis (for example, in bold) in relation to data components considered to be of lesser importance and should at least include the following data components:

- (a) the number of the document (INID code (11)), presented on the top right-hand side of the page;
- (b) the identification of the issuing office or organization (INID code (19));
- (c) the identification of the kind of document (INID code(s) (12) and/or (13));
- (d) **the date of publication of the document (INID codes (40) through (48), as appropriate);**
- (e) the symbols of the International Patent Classification (INID code (51)).

(b) Standard ST.10/B, paragraphs 8 and 9, should read:

8. For the purpose of using patent documents in libraries and in search or other files, it is recognized that the repetition of the document number and associated ST.3 and ST.16 codes, **as well as the publication date of the document (INID codes (40) through (48), as appropriate)**, in one or more of the margins of the first page of the patent document is useful.

9. So as to provide a unique page identification of published patent documents, particularly when individual pages of published patent documents are displayed on a video display screen, it is recommended that the two-letter code of the issuing office or organization according to WIPO Standard ST.3, the publication number of the patent document, the code identifying the kind of patent document according to WIPO Standard ST.16 and **the publication date of the document (INID codes (40) through (48), as appropriate)** be given in that order in one or more of the margins of the first page and on each of the following pages. It is further recommended that the data be printed on one line, e.g.:

AT	406799	B	2000.09.25
DE	19854173	C2	2000.11.23
FR	2732249	A1	1996.10.04
NL	7412658	A	1975.04.29

Appendix 1, page 2

2. Standard ST.6, paragraph 14, should read:

14. It should be noted that the two-letter code according to WIPO Standard ST.3 and the kind of document code according to WIPO Standard ST.16 do not form part of the publication number. However, both codes, **along with the publication date of the document (INID codes (40) through (48), as appropriate)**, have to be associated with the publication number for the complete identification of the patent document. In such cases, the rules set out in WIPO Standard ST.10/B should be followed.

3. Standard ST.33

(a) paragraph 15 should read:

15. The relation between patent documents and logical records is determined by the content of each physical record:

- The record prefix contains the full identification of each patent document containing elements as defined in accordance with ST.3, ST.10/B, ST.16 **and the publication date**;
- Additional revisory documents with the same identification may exist in the same file. In general the transition between documents (in particular with the same identifier) is given by the physical record for which:
  - the current record sequence number is equal to the "Total records" number, and
  - the current frame number is equal to the "End of frame number", and
  - the current page number is equal to the "Total pages" number.

(b) in Appendix II, the entry of the first column (the header of which is "M/D") that corresponds to the publication date (Item No. 20.2) should be amended to read "M" instead of "D," i.e., the publication date prefix should become mandatory instead of desirable.

The PDI Task Force recommended that the suggestions with regard to the revision of WIPO Standard ST.33 should be forwarded to the SCIT Standards Task Force, which is coordinating the modification of all of the so-called electronic Standards (i.e., WIPO Standards ST.30, ST.31, ST.32, ST.33, ST.35 and ST.40).

[Appendix 2 follows]

APPENDIX 2

MEMBERS OF THE SCIT PATENT DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION TASK  
FORCE

<b>NAME</b>	<b>TITLE</b>	<b>OFFICE/ ORGANIZATION</b>
Mr. HATTORI, Kazuo	Deputy Director Patent Information Policy Division	Japanese Patent Office
Mrs. GRONAU, Elvira	Head of Technical Section XI	Austrian Patent Office
Mr. KRIER, Marc	Director Applied R&D Documentation	European Patent Office
Mr. REKOLA, Juha	Head of Development Division	National Board of Patents and Registration of Finland
Mr. RISHELL, Edmond	International Exchanges and Standards Specialist	United States Patent and Trademark Office
Mr. ROTHE, Hubert	Head, Industrial Property Information Section	German Patent and Trade Mark Office
Mr. STOLT, Leif	Principal Examiner	Swedish Patent and Registration Office

The International Bureau was represented by Mr. Angel LÓPEZ SOLANAS, Senior Industrial Property Officer, Standards and Documentation Service.

[End of Appendix and of Annex]

[Annex 25 follows]



**REPUBLIC OF KAZAKSTAN  
NATIONAL PATENT OFFICE**

---

6, Abdullins St., building 1, 480002, Almaty, Republic of Kazakstan  
Tel.: (327) 30-09-73 E-mail: kazpat@online.ru Fax: (327) 30-  
13-76

---

№

Date

From: Mrs. R.T. Alchimbaeva, Vice-Chairman  
To: WIPO, Geneva  
Attn.: Mr. Klaus-Peter Wittig, Deputy Director, Standard and  
Documentation Service  
Your Ref. C. SCIT 2524  
03

Date: 05.02.2001

Re: Results reached by the Patent Document Identification (PDI) Task  
Force of the Standing Committee on Information Technologies (SCIT)

Dear Mr. Wittig,

In response to Your Ref. C. SCIT 2524/03 of December 22, 2000, we'd like  
to inform you that Kazpatent consider as very actual problems of publishing  
amended patent documents in accordance with requirements of WIPO  
standards.

The "Kazpatent" follow recommendations and requirements of WIPO  
standards, especially of the codes (15) and (48) as well as of the ST.50.  
when amended patent documents are published.

The "Kazpatent" confirm their consent with proposed amendments and new  
versions of WIPO standards ST.6, ST.10/B and ST.33.

Sincerely yours,  
Mrs. R.T. Alchimbaeva,  
Vice-Chairman

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'R. Alchimbaeva'.

[Annex 26 follows/L'annexe 26 suit]

РОССИЙСКОЕ  
АГЕНТСТВО ПО ПАТЕНТАМ  
И ТОВАРНЫМ ЗНАКАМ  
(РОСПАТЕНТ)



RUSSIAN  
AGENCY FOR PATENTS  
AND TRADEMARKS  
(ROSPATENT)

123995, Москва, Березжковская наб., 30, корп. 1  
Телефон 240-60-15. Телекс 114818 ПДЧ. Факс 243-33-37

30-1, Berezhkovskaya nab., 123995, Moscow, Russia  
Phone: (095) 240-6462, 240-6179 Fax: (095) 243-3337

Mr. KLAUS-PETER WITTIG

Deputy Director  
Standards and Documentation  
Service  
WIPO

Your ref.

Our ref. 45-1/6

Date

Date 12.02.2001

SCIT
21 FEV. 2001
03

Dear Mr. WITTIG,

Referring to the circular letter C.SCIT 2524 of December 22, 2000 concerning the results reached by the PDI Task Force of the Standing Committee on Information Technologies we would like to inform you as follows:

This Office highly appreciates the considerable work carried out by the PDI Task Force aiming to solve the problem of uniquely identifying patent documents. We quite agree with the conclusions made thereon and support the proposal concerning the citation of patent documents (paragraph 12 of the Annex to the circular in question).

We consider that the wording of the proposed amendments to WIPO Standards ST.10/B, ST.6 and ST.33 fully satisfy the purpose of the revision. Nevertheless we would like to know the reason of leaving paragraphs 17, 18 and 19 of the Standard ST.10/B without the same amendments as in paragraphs 5, 8 and 9 (namely by adding the publication date of the document to the data elements of identification both in the text of each paragraph and the examples thereto).

M.V.KRYUKOVA

Deputy Director  
International Relations Dpt

[Annex 27 follows/L'annexe 27 suit]

ANNEX 27/ANNEXE 27

15/02 01 THU 10:39 FAX +380444580611

Fax

001

Ministry for Education and Science of Ukraine  
State Department of Intellectual Property  
**UKRAINIAN INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY INSTITUTE**  
(UKRPATENT)

15, Simyi Khokhlovykh Street, Kyiv-119, 04119, Ukraine. Tel./Fax: (380-44) 458-06-11  
8, Lvivska Ploscha, Kyiv-53, 04655, Ukraine. Tel.: (380-44) 212 50-82 Fax: (380-44) 212 34-49

*Big 15.02.01 № 92/01*

SCIT
16 FEB. 2001
03

Mr. William Guy  
Senior Counsellor  
Standards and Documentation Service  
World Intellectual Property Organization  
34, chemin des Colombettes,  
1211 Geneva 20  
Switzerland  
Fax: (41-22) 733 5428

February 12, 2001

Re: Results reached by the Patent Document Identification (PDI) Task Force  
of the Standing Committee on Information Technologies (SCIT)

Dear Mr. Guy,

Referring to Circular C.SCIT 2524/03 of 22 December, 2000, I am pleased to  
inform you that the Ukrainian Industrial Property Institute supports the  
conclusions and proposals of the PDI Task Force concerning the means for  
uniquely identifying all kinds of patent documents.

We have no further comments on the contents of the proposals of the PDI  
Task Force .

Sincerely yours,

*Alla Krasovska*

Alla Krasovska  
Director

[Annex 28 follows/L'annexe 28 suit]



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

COMMISSIONER FOR  
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK  
WASHINGTON, DC  
WWW

February 15, 2001

Mr. Klaus-Peter Wittig  
Deputy Director  
Inter-Office Information Services Department  
World Intellectual Property Organization  
34, chemin des Colombettes  
1211 Geneva 20  
SWITZERLAND

Re: WIPO SCIT Circular 2524 – Results reached by the Patent Document Identification (PDI) Task Force of the Standing Committee on Information Technologies (SCIT)

---

Dear Mr. Wittig:

The United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) supports the conclusions and proposed changes to the WIPO standards recommended by the Patent Document Identification Task Force.

A great deal of time and effort by the members of the Standards and Documentation Working Group has been expended in determining the best way to uniquely identify a patent document. Uniquely identifying documents is the foundation on which many other standards, surveys, and statistics depend. Uniquely identifying patent documents is critical to many of the operations of Intellectual Property Offices, commercial entities and members of the public. It would be a shame to have gone through all this effort to only have the results listed in an annex of a SCIT Standards and Documentation Working Group report. Such results would not become widely known nor easily found in the future.

Therefore, in addition to the above changes to the existing WIPO Standards, we strongly recommend that a new WIPO Standard be created setting forth the contents of paragraphs 12-14 of the Annex to SCIT Circular 2524. This would give all users the essential elements needed to uniquely identify patent documents and give intellectual property offices and others guidance in publication, storage and retrieval of patent documents.

There is currently no single location in the WIPO Handbook on Industrial Property Information and Documentation giving this information, even with the changes to the WIPO Standards recommended in Appendix 1 of the Annex to SCIT Circular 2524. Users should not have to

guess what is needed to uniquely identify a patent document nor should they have to search through all the paragraphs of a number of WIPO Standards to find this vital information.

If the Working Group agrees, we would suggest such an important standard upon which many of the other standards depend be given the number Standard ST.1. While Standard ST.1 was used for other subject matter previously, this fact can be mentioned in a footnote to the new Standard ST.1, if the Working Group believes it necessary to do so.

Sincerely,

**/Robert W. Saifer/**

Robert W. Saifer, Director  
International Liaison Staff

[Annex 29 follows/L'annexe 29 suit]

**From:** <PA0630@jpo.go.jp>  
**To:** <scit.mail@wipo.int>  
**Date:** Wed, Feb 21, 2001 12:30 PM  
**Subject:** coment on c2524(Annex)

Dear Mr.Klaus-Peter Wittig,

I apologize for delay of my response.  
I approve to IB proposal dated December 22, 2000.

Best Regards,

Kazuo Hattori  
JPO

**CC:** <hattori-kazuo@jpo.go.jp>, <kawakami-rie@jpo.go.jp>,  
<kamiyama-shigeki@jpo.go.jp>, <minami-koichi@jpo.go.jp>

[Annex 30 follows/L'annexe 30 suit]

**From:** Siep de Vries <siep.de.vries@bie.minez.nl>  
**To:** "SCIT" <scit.mail@wipo.int>  
**Date:** Wed, Feb 21, 2001 4:01 PM  
**Subject:** circular SCIT 2524

February 21, 2001  
Netherlands Industrial Property Office  
Postbox 5820  
2280 HV RIJSWIJK  
The Netherlands

subject:  
Circular SCIT 2524/03

Mr. Klaus-Peter Wittig  
Deputy Director  
Standards and Documentation Service  
World Intellectual Property Organization  
34, chemin des Colombettes  
1211 GENEVA 20  
Switzerland

Dear Sir,

With relation to your Circular SCIT 2524/03 of December 22, 2000, concerning the work carried out by the PDI Task Force, the Netherlands Industrial Property Office herewith would like to inform you that it is very pleased with the results obtained by the PDI Task Force. The Office can accept the conclusions and proposals by the PDI Task Force as reflected in paragraphs 12 - 15 and Appendix 1 of the Annex to the Circular.

Yours sincerely,

S. de Vries  
Head Chemical Division  
Netherlands Industrial Property Office

**CC:** Coby Belder <coby.belder@bie.minez.nl>, "Dir. Secretariaat" <dirsec@bie.minez.nl>, Koen Korving <koen.korving@bie.minez.nl>

[Annex 31 follows/L'annexe 31 suit]

**From:** "Jacek Zawadzki" <jzawadzki@uprp.pl>  
**To:** <scit.mail@wipo.int>  
**Date:** Wed, Feb 21, 2001 8:55 AM  
**Subject:** SCIT 2524 / 03

Dear Sirs,

Thank you for your letter of 22 December 2000 and the relevant papers reporting efforts of the SCIT Standards and Documentation Working Group.

Our response to the questions raised coupled with the above identified circular is that the Polish Patent Office, in order to satisfy users of patent information, has already applied - as recommended by the WIPO -- the minimum elements on its paper documentation.

We recognize your efforts on expand ways of dissemination, storage and retrieval of patent documents very worthy to be pushed. We believe that nevertheless a preparation the retroactive works in this context appear to be the problematical task for majority of patent offices, the current jobs should immediately be put into action by the industrial property offices.

Yours faithfully,

for Maria Jurczakowska, Director Informatics Department, Polish Patent Office

Jacek Zawadzki

[Annex 32 follows/L'annexe 32 suit]

**From:** "Mauritius Mission" <mission.mauritius@ties.itu.ch>  
**To:** <scit.mail@wipo.int>  
**Date:** Wed, Mar 7, 2001 4:25 PM  
**Subject:** Results reached by the Patent Document Identification (PDI)/ Task Force of the SCIT

Our Ref: MMG/INT/8/B

7 March 2001

Mr Klaus-Peter Wittig  
Deputy Director  
Standards and Documentation Service  
World Intellectual Property Organisation  
34, chemin des Colombettes  
1211 Geneva 20  
email : scit.mail@wipo.int

Sir,  
Results reached by the Patent Document Identification (PDI)  
Task Force of the Standing Committee on Information Technologies (SCIT)

I have the honour to refer to your letter C.SCIT 2524 03 dated 22 December 2000 and to inform you that under the Mauritius Patents Act, there is no provision for the publication of the patent documents and therefore the Mauritius authorities have not used the Patent Document Identification under the WIPO Standards. Consequently, the Mauritius authorities regret to inform that they are not in a position to offer comments to the annex of your letter dated 22 December 2000.

Please accept, Sir, the assurances of my highest consideration.

(R. Sawmy)  
for Head of Mission

[End of Annex 32 and of document/  
Fin de l'annexe 32 et du document]