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## BACKGROUND

At its sixth session in October 2019, the Committee on WIPO Standards (CWS) noted the 40 Recommendations prepared by the Meeting on ICT Strategy and Artificial Intelligence, which the International Bureau convened for the exchange of views and experiences in ICT and business management for effective Intellectual Property Office (IPO) administration. The CWS considered the analysis of 40 Recommendations by the Secretariat and their relevancy to the activities of the CWS categorized into three Groups indicated in the [Annex of document CWS/6/3](https://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=415579). (See paragraphs 18 to 19 of document CWS/6/34.)

At its sixth session, the CWS created the new Task No. 58 and established the ICT Strategy for Standards Task Force (hereinafter referred to as “ICT Strategy Task Force” or “Task Force”) to work on Task No. 58 and designated the International Bureau as the Task Force leader. The CWS requested the International Bureau to issue a circular inviting IPOs to nominate business managers or ICT policy makers for the new Task Force and for volunteers to serve as co-leader with the International Bureau. (See paragraphs 17 to 24 of document CWS/6/34.)

At its eighth session, the CWS noted the progress report of the ICT Strategy Task Force, which contains the priority of 40 Recommendations proposed by the Task Force, and the reallocation of the following Recommendations: R20, R33 and R35 to Group 1 from Group 2, with the following recommendations still falling into Group 3 (Recommendations seem to be not relevant to the CWS activity now and in the near future): R03, R07, R08, R24, R25, R29, R30, R31, R34 and 40. (See paragraph 4 of document CWS/8/13.)

With regard to the priority of the 40 Recommendations, taking into account the results of the survey conducted within the Task Force, the International Bureau, as the Task Force leader, reported the following recommendations, which belong to Group 1 (Recommendations related to the CWS Tasks), as a priority:

* Sharing information and possible collaboration on emerging technologies for IP administration such as search, classifications and languages (R09);
* Common conversion software tool to XML, e.g. DOCX convertor (R18 and R4);
* Re-engineering and digital transformation (R06);
* Providing IPOs’ authority file data or information to the International Bureau (R23);
* Online services via APIs enabling interoperability of systems, including systems developed by third party solution providers (R39);
* Developing a prototype for a distributed IP registry, exploring potential use cases of blockchain technology, including IP registry and priority data, and investigating legal and technical possibilities for identifying patent families (R12 and R15); and
* Exploring improved methods and creating a prototype of centralized service, with open and standard APIs, for data dissemination and data exchange between IPOs and regional/international IP systems (R38).

(See paragraph 6 of document CWS/8/13.)

The CWS also noted that the Task Force survey only had responses from seven Task Force members. In order to gather opinions from a wider audience, the CWS requested that the International Bureau invite all IPOs to take a survey on priority of the 40 Recommendations and report the results at its ninth session. (See paragraphs 83 to 84 of document CWS/8/24).

## SURVEY RESULTS

In June 2021, the Secretariat issued circular C.CWS.151 inviting IPOs to participate in a survey on priority of 40 ICT Strategy Recommendations, and 27 IPOs responded to the survey. Responses were received from 22 IPOs of the following Member States: Australia, Bahrain, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Chile, Czech Republic, Ecuador, Estonia, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Mexico, New Zealand (NZ), Norway, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom, United States of America (US), Uruguay, and Uzbekistan; and the four following regional Offices: African Regional Intellectual Property Organization (ARIPO), European Patent Office (EPO), European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO), Patent Office of the Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf (GCC); and the International Bureau (PCT). Full survey responses are available as Annex I to the present document.

The following table shows the number of votes each recommendation received, sorted by Borda score and split into categories as described below (Recommendations highlighted in orange are categorized in Group 3 mentioned in paragraph 3 above and ones highlighted in green are prioritized by the Task Force as indicated paragraph 4 above):

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Recommendation Number** | **High Votes** | **Medium Votes** | **Low Votes** | **Borda Score** | **Category** |
| R04 | 18 | 6 | 1 | 67 | A |
| R07 | 19 | 4 | 1 | 66 |
| R23 | 17 | 7 | 1 | 66 |
| R05 | 13 | 10 | 3 | 62 | B |
| R06 | 14 | 7 | 5 | 61 |
| R16 | 13 | 9 | 4 | 61 |
| R02 | 11 | 13 | 2 | 61 |
| R27 | 14 | 6 | 6 | 60 |
| R01 | 13 | 9 | 3 | 60 |
| R20 | 13 | 7 | 5 | 58 |
| R28 | 12 | 9 | 4 | 58 |
| R40 | 12 | 9 | 4 | 58 |
| R19 | 11 | 11 | 3 | 58 |
| R21 | 12 | 7 | 7 | 57 |
| R31 | 11 | 10 | 4 | 57 |
| R14 | 9 | 11 | 6 | 55 | C |
| R32 | 11 | 6 | 9 | 54 |
| R11 | 9 | 9 | 7 | 52 |
| R29 | 8 | 11 | 6 | 52 |
| R09 | 8 | 10 | 8 | 52 |
| R30 | 6 | 15 | 4 | 52 |
| R39 | 9 | 7 | 10 | 51 |
| R34 | 10 | 5 | 10 | 50 |
| R37 | 9 | 7 | 8 | 49 |
| R10 | 9 | 6 | 10 | 49 |
| R22 | 4 | 15 | 7 | 49 |
| R08 | 6 | 11 | 8 | 48 | D |
| R03 | 8 | 7 | 9 | 47 |
| R25 | 7 | 9 | 8 | 47 |
| R12 | 6 | 10 | 9 | 47 |
| R13 | 7 | 6 | 13 | 46 |
| R35 | 5 | 10 | 10 | 45 |
| R18 | 5 | 9 | 12 | 45 |
| R26 | 5 | 11 | 7 | 44 |
| R15 | 4 | 11 | 10 | 44 |
| R17 | 3 | 12 | 11 | 44 |
| R36 | 4 | 11 | 9 | 43 |
| R24 | 6 | 8 | 8 | 42 |
| R33 | 2 | 5 | 16 | 32 | E |
| R38 | 1 | 7 | 15 | 32 |

To compare the preferences for each recommendation, a score was calculated using a Borda count, which is a standard mathematical method for comparing preference selections. The Borda count used here assigns 3 points for High votes, 2 point for Medium votes, and 1 point for Low votes. Given that ICT Strategy for Standards Task Force has limited resources available and a large number of recommendations, it makes sense to start by focusing on recommendations with stronger support.

The table above sorts recommendations by their Borda score. The recommendations were then split into categories based on score. Category A has recommendations with the highest level of support, characterized by many High votes and almost no Low votes. Category B recommendations have moderate high support, with double digit High votes and a small number of Low votes. Category C recommendations have moderate support, with slightly more or equal High votes to Low votes. Category D recommendations have mixed support, with large numbers of Medium votes but generally more Low votes than High votes. Category E recommendations have limited support, with very few High or Medium votes. The full text of the recommendations in each category are shown in Annex II to the present document.

Categories A and E have well defined boundaries, with noticeable gaps in scoring. The boundary between C and D is less well defined, and a case could be made for adjusting the boundary higher or lower, combining the two categories, or other approaches. In any case, the differences between C and D may be less important than simply noting that many items in both categories have broad support for Medium or High priority.

It is noted that the participating Offices had different interpretations of the survey questionnaire and rated recommendations by different criteria. Some Offices gave a low priority vote to a recommendation because they already implemented it, while some others gave a high priority because the recommendation is still important for Offices. Furthermore, depending on the digitalization status at Offices, the given priority is different. For example, R03 (Back-file capturing of IP data by OCR conversion of image data) was indicated as a priority by some Offices which are in the early stages of digitalization.

Priority ratings to certain Recommendations vary depending on the business coverage of the participating Offices, e.g., some Recommendations related to patent business, which are not relevant to trademark Offices such as EUIPO. Some responses had no priority rank but instead a comment to clarify or indicate ‘not applicable’; e.g., see US response to R14 and EPO and NZ responses to R32, respectively.

In addition to the rating, valuable comments which explain their rating or other relevant information, were provided by participating Offices. Some outstanding comments are:

* Some Offices partially rank the priority of a Recommendation, e.g., EPO’s response to R04 - High for first part of Recommendation, but Low for common tools.
* Readiness in terms of resources and timelessness, e.g., R03 requires resource and time to achieve it.)
* Readiness of common or relevant tools - R05 and others: Recommendations are quite helpful, however, some Offices do not have the technological tools to do so or there may be limitations, including IPO constraints and applicant constraints/limitations.

It is noted that the results of this survey are quite different from the survey results of the Task Force explained in paragraph 4 above. For example, R38 was a prioritized recommendation from the Task Force survey, but it belongs to the least priority category of this survey of all IPOs.

It is proposed that the ICT Strategy for Standards Task Force should be asked to prepare a strategic roadmap for consideration by the CWS (see paragraphs 19 to 20 of document CWS/7/29) taking into account the results of the survey and should consider the survey results when it updates its work plan for 2022.

*The CWS is invited to:*

*(a) note the content of this document and the responses to the survey as reproduced in Annex I of this document and indicated in paragraph 6 above; and*

*(b) request the ICT Strategy Task Force to take into account the results when it prepare the strategic roadmap and its work plan as indicated in paragraph 15 above.*

[[Annex I](https://www.wipo.int/edocs/mdocs/cws/en/cws_9/cws_9_2-annex1.zip) follows]