



Brief and important information for our users

Newsflash 2005/25

26-09-2005 Chinese application numbers (continued)

In an earlier Newsflash (2005/05), we informed our users about the changes in the Chinese application format. Following the publication of this announcement, Helpdesk received a number of queries on this topic.

Unfortunately, in addition to the already rather complex subject matter, we encountered erroneous formatting in the IFD version of the bibliographic exchange product IFD for divisional application numbers, i.e. in cases where the year in the application date did not match the year in the application number. The bug has now been removed and should not recur in the future.

This is a follow up Newsflash to elaborate on the above issues.

Before filing date 1.10.2003 the CN application number had 10 digits, consisting of four digits for the year and 6 digits for the sequence number. Therefore the format was 4 + 6 (i.e. **yyyynnnnnn**). After the changes introduced by the Chinese Patent Office in October 2003, the sequence number format was increased to 8 digits, so the 12 digits (i.e. **4+8 (yyyynnnnnnnn)**) exceeded the application number length allowed for the IFD format. So it was decided to skip the year in the number part of the IFD format for CN application numbers.

Example:

"2003 12345678 "

instead of

"2003 200312345678"

Here below a table with some fictitious examples to illustrate the differences in the formatting before and after 1.10.2003:

DOCDB format	filing date	IFD format
CN 200312345678 F	20031001	CN 2003 12345678 D 0
CN 200312345678 T	20031001	CN 2003 12345678 A 0
CN 03123456 A	20030930	CN 2003 2003123456 A 0
CN 03123456 U	20030930	CN 2003 2003123456 U 0
CN 03123456 F	20030930	CN 2003 2003123456 D 0

And here an example of the bug mentioned above (taken from document CN 1616258 A):

010, 020, 030 are the IFD tags for identifying data elements

```
CN      1616258A ..... 010.... $CN\  
CN      1616258A ..... 020.... $A \  
CN      1616258A ..... 030.... $ 1616258\  
CN      1616258A ..... 040.... $2004 10096568\  
CN      1616258A ..... 050.... $20020822\  
CN      1616258A ..... 060.... $20050518\  
CN      1616258A ..... 170.... $A \  
CN      1616258A ..... 070.... $ 7B 60B 19/14 A$ 7B 25J 9/18 B\  
CN      1616258A ..... 080.... $CN\  
CN      1616258A ..... 090.... $2002 0410096568\  
CN      1616258A ..... 100.... $20020822\  
CN      1616258A ..... 180.... $A \
```

The correct formatting of the divisional application number both in tag 040 (application number) and 090 (priority application number) is:

```
CN      1616258A ..... 090.... $2004 10096568\  
CN      1616258A ..... 040.... $2004 10096568
```

The bug has now been corrected.