WIPO
OMPI

W O R L D   I N T E L L E C T U A L   P R O P E R T Y   O R G A N I Z A T I O N

O R G A N I S A T I O N   M O N D I A L E   D E   L A   P R O P R I É T É   I N T E L L E C T U E L L E

GENEVA/GENÈVE

**ADMINISTRATIVE INSTRUCTIONS UNDER THE
PATENT COOPERATION TREATY (PCT)**

**STANDARD FOR THE ELECTRONIC FILING AND PROCESSING
OF INTERNATIONAL APPLICATIONS**

**INSTRUCTIONS ADMINISTRATIVES DU
TRAITÉ DE COOPÉRATION EN MATIÈRE DE BREVETS (PCT)**

**NORME CONCERNANT LE DÉPÔT ET LE TRAITEMENT ÉLECTRONIQUES
DES DEMANDES INTERNATIONALES**

PROPOSAL FOR CHANGE FILE

DOSSIER RELATIF À LA PROPOSITION DE MODIFICATION

SUBJECT: **SUJET :**	Changes to Annex F, Appendix I, section 3.6 (Fee-sheet updates) Modifications de la section 3.6 de l'appendice I de l'annexe F (Fee-sheet updates)	**PROPOSED BY:** **PROPOSÉE PAR :**	IB
HANDLING: **TRAITEMENT :** Expedited cycle Cycle accéléré		**PROPOSED DATE OF ENTRY INTO FORCE:** **DATE PROPOSÉE D'ENTRÉE EN VIGUEUR :**	1.4.2010

ANNEX/ ANNEXE	**CONTENT/CONTENU**	**ORIGIN/ ORIGINE**	**DATE**
1	Fee sheet updates	IB	4.11.2009
2	Comments regarding PFR ST.36-2009-006	ST.36 Task force	27.11.2009 – 23.12.2009
3	Comment	SK	16.12.2009
4	Comment	JP	17.12.2009
5	Comment	UZ	18.12.2009
6	Comment	RU	22.12.2009
7	Comment	IB	5.02.2010

[Annex follows/
L'annexe suit]

NEXT ACTION: **PROCHAINE ACTION :**	Entry into force Entrée en vigueur	**BY:** **POUR LE :**	1.4.2010

ANNEX I /ANNEXE I

FEE SHEET UPDATES TO ALLOW A PAYMENT CONTACT EMAIL ADDRESS TO BE SPECIFIED AND ADD CREDIT CARD TO THE LIST OF PAYMENT MODES

1-1)
Fee-sheet
payment-contact
	Change:
	`<!ELEMENT fee-sheet ((file-reference-id? , applicant-name , prescribed-fees , amount-grand-total+ , deposit-account? , dtext*) | doc-page+)>`
	
	`<!ATTLIST fee-sheet  lang          CDATA  #REQUIRED`
	`                     dtd-version   CDATA  #IMPLIED`
	`                     file          CDATA  #IMPLIED`
	`                     produced-by         (applicant |`
	`                              RO |`
	`                              ISA |`
	`                              IPEA |`
	`                              IB |`
	`                              DO |`
	`                              EO |`
	`                              national-office |`
	`                              regional-office )`
	`#REQUIRED`
	`                     date-produced CDATA  #IMPLIED`
	`                     ro            CDATA  #REQUIRED`
	`                     status        CDATA  #IMPLIED >`
	
	To:
	`<!ELEMENT fee-sheet ((file-reference-id? , applicant-name , prescribed-fees , amount-grand-total+ , deposit-account? , dtext`**`, payment-contact?`**`) | doc-page+)>`
	
	`<!ATTLIST fee-sheet  lang          CDATA  #REQUIRED`
	`                     dtd-version   CDATA  #IMPLIED`
	`                     file          CDATA  #IMPLIED`
	`                     produced-by         (applicant |`
	`                              RO |`
	`                              ISA |`
	`                              IPEA |`
	`                              IB |`
	`                              DO |`
	`                              EO |`
	`                              national-office |`
	`                              regional-office )`
	`#REQUIRED`
	`                     date-produced CDATA  #IMPLIED`
	`                     ro            CDATA  #REQUIRED`
	`                     status        CDATA  #IMPLIED >`
	
	`<!—payment-contact element for use as container for an email that can be used as the contact point for payment processing -->`
	`<!ELEMENT payment-contact email >`
	
	`<!--`
	`     Email address`

NEXT ACTION:	Entry into force	**BY:**	1.4.2010
PROCHAINE ACTION :	Entrée en vigueur	**POUR LE :**	

```
          Attribute:
                email-purpose    reason for which email address
is included:
informal    for informal contact only
general     for any type of communication
confirmation any type of communication, but formal messages
followed up
                by conventional mailing (to the extent offered)
main        where applicant desires this address to be used
as primary
                means of contact as a replacement of the use of
conventional
                post (to the extent that an Office offers this)
                the default value depends on e-mail policies of
the relevant Office.
                For PCT purposes as at 1 July 2008, no attribute
being included is
                equivalent to 'informal'

-->
<!ELEMENT email (#PCDATA)>

<!ATTLIST email  email-purpose   (informal | general |
advance | main )  #IMPLIED >
```

Items impacted	ST.36 element fee-sheet fee-sheet.dtd,
Reason	Adding this element will allow applicants to specify a payment contact for cases where the contact point for payment processing is not the main contact point email for the application. This is proposed in order to enable a change in PCT-SAFE in order to ensure that sensitive client information, in particular credit card details, are not captured in PCT-SAFE. Instead, the filer will receive an email with payment instructions; the dedicated e-mail address allows this to be directed, if necessary, to a person responsible for the payment other than the person making the filing. PCT-SAFE will use the main contact point email, when available to populate a default value for this element. NOTE the email element is already defined in the ICE, and the email-purpose attribute list is specified using a different type of quality. Thus the only new element proposed is payment-contact (optional reflecting the business rule).

NEXT ACTION:	Entry into force	**BY:**	
PROCHAINE ACTION :	Entrée en vigueur	**POUR LE :**	1.4.2010

1-2) fee-sheet credit-card	**Change:**

	``
	<!--
	  Mode of payment
	
	-->
	<!ELEMENT payment-mode (charge | postal-order | cash |
	coupons | cheque | bank-draft | stamps | other | later-
	payment)>
	
	<!--
	  Authorization to later payment
	
	-->
	<!ELEMENT later-payment EMPTY>
	
	<!--
	  Other method by which prior art was disclosed to the
	public
	
	-->
	<!ELEMENT other (#PCDATA)>
	
	<!--
	  Revenue stamps used as mode of payment
	
	-->
	<!ELEMENT stamps EMPTY>
	
	<!--
	  Bank draft to be used as mode of payment
	
	-->
	<!ELEMENT bank-draft EMPTY>
	
	<!--
	  Cheque used as payment method
	
	-->
	<!ELEMENT cheque EMPTY>
	
	<!--
	  Coupons used as mode of payment
	
	-->
	<!ELEMENT coupons EMPTY>
	
	<!--
	  Cash used as payment method
	
	-->
	<!ELEMENT cash EMPTY>
	``

NEXT ACTION:	Entry into force	**BY:**	
PROCHAINE ACTION :	Entrée en vigueur	**POUR LE :**	1.4.2010

```
<!--
  Postal money order used as mode of payment

-->
<!ELEMENT postal-order EMPTY>


<!--
  Authorization to charge deposit account

-->
<!ELEMENT charge EMPTY>




To:
<!--
  Mode of payment

-->
<!ELEMENT payment-mode (charge | postal-order | cash |
coupons | cheque | bank-draft | stamps | other | later-
payment | credit-card)>


<!--
  Authorization to later payment

-->
<!ELEMENT later-payment EMPTY>


<!--
  Other method by which prior art was disclosed to the
public

-->
<!ELEMENT other (#PCDATA)>


<!--
  Revenue stamps  used as mode of payment

-->
<!ELEMENT stamps EMPTY>


<!--
  Bank draft to be used as mode of payment

-->
<!ELEMENT bank-draft EMPTY>


<!--
  Cheque used as payment method
```

NEXT ACTION:	Entry into force	BY:	
PROCHAINE ACTION :	Entrée en vigueur	POUR LE :	1.4.2010

```
-->
<!ELEMENT cheque EMPTY>


<!--
  Coupons used as mode of payment

-->
<!ELEMENT coupons EMPTY>


<!--
  Cash used as payment method

-->
<!ELEMENT cash EMPTY>


<!--
  Postal money order used as mode of payment

-->
<!ELEMENT postal-order EMPTY>


<!--
  Authorization to charge deposit account

-->
<!ELEMENT charge EMPTY>

<!--
  Credit-card used as mode of payment

-->
<!ELEMENT credit-card EMPTY>
```

Items impacted	ST.36 element payment-mode, fee-sheet.dtd, fee-sheet-chapter2.dtd
Reason	Correct omission of this credit-card payment mode possibility

[Annex II follows /
L'annexe II suit]

NEXT ACTION:	Entry into force	**BY:**	1.4.2010
PROCHAINE ACTION :	Entrée en vigueur	**POUR LE :**	

ANNEX II /ANNEXE II

WIPO Standard ST.36 Task Force Comments

Nov 30
Raul SUAREZ Y GONZALEZ says:
The purpose of this change is to ensure that sensitive client information, in particular credit card details, is not captured in PCT-SAFE and in case the payment contact is not the main contact to have his contact details.

The EPO believes that a more general structure might be more appropriated, e.g.:

payment-contact (%name_group; , phone? , fax? , email?)
or
payment-contact (%name_group; , (phone | fax | email)+)

Those two structures offer the following advantages:
- flexibility
- having the name to whom your will be communicating with (payment contact)
- having additional possibilities to exchange credit card information other than email that tends to be strongly discouraged by banks

Dec 02
Samantha HOY says:
With regards to the creation of the proposed element payment-contact, IP Australia would like to highlight the disparity between the generic nature of the element name and the limiting nature of its suggested implementation.

In considering the creation of a new ICE element we support the EPO's comments in relation to having a more general structure. Alternatively, if the IB's intent is to limit the contact mechanism to an email address, then this should be reflected in the naming of the element.

Eg
<ELEMENT payment-contact-email email>
Or if we want to include name information
<ELEMENT payment-contact-email (%name_group; , email)>

Dec 09
YoungWoo Yun says:
Dear all,
I agree with Sammy and Raul. In considering XML4IP, I would like to propose the following structure:
payment-contact (%name_group; , contact-detail)

contact-detail (phone* , fax* , email*)

NEXT ACTION:	Entry into force	BY:	
PROCHAINE ACTION :	Entrée en vigueur	POUR LE :	1.4.2010

Please refer to ST.66 element "ContactInformationDetails":

```
<xs:element name="ContactInformationDetails" minOccurs="0">
 <xs:complexType>
  <xs:sequence>
   <xs:element name="Phone" type="PhoneType" minOccurs="0"
maxOccurs="unbounded" />
   <xs:element name="Fax" type="xs:string" minOccurs="0"
maxOccurs="unbounded" />
   <xs:element name="Email" type="xs:string" minOccurs="0"
maxOccurs="unbounded" />
   <xs:element name="URL" type="xs:anyURI" minOccurs="0"
maxOccurs="unbounded" />
   <xs:element name="OtherElectronicAddress" type="xs:string" minOccurs="0"
maxOccurs="unbounded" />
  </xs:sequence>
 </xs:complexType>
</xs:element>
```

Dec 10
Tomohiro Hakamata says:
[Proposal 1 : modification of the fee-sheet element]
 The JPO thinks that the item on FEE-SHEET corresponds to the element "payment-contact" should be clarified.
 The JPO would like to know concretely how to set this element.

[Proposal 2 : modification of the payment-mode element]
 The JPO agrees with adding the new element "credit-card".
 However, the JPO would like to know why the occurrence of the element "credit-card"is defined as plural.

 In addition, the JPO would like to know why the occurrence of the existing element "later-payment" was changed from once to plural.

Dec 10
Peter WARING says:
[Proposal 1 : modification of the fee-sheet element]

With regard to EPO comment regarding security, the intended usage is that the IB will send a URL to the payment contact that the contact will use to access a secure payment site to allow payment (completely separate from the PCT E-filing data captured in PCT-SAFE)

The intention in the PFR is to enable only the addition of an email address in PCT (Annex F). I agree with the comment by AU regarding the need for the name payment-contact-email, if only holding an email. To make a decision, the question that needs to be answered is, are offices prepared to manage the full contact information

NEXT ACTION:	Entry into force	BY:	
PROCHAINE ACTION :	Entrée en vigueur	**POUR LE :**	1.4.2010

for payment purposes in addition to the existing contact information for the application? The IB intends to only capture the email and does not want to have the name information.

[Proposal 2 : modification of the payment-mode element]
With regard to the cardinality of "credit-card" and "later-payment" I would be grateful for JPO to clarify their comment as unless I have misunderstood, the usage defined is singular.

Dec 14
Raul SUAREZ Y GONZALEZ says:
The EPO agrees with the above (and AU) comments, in order to generate a user-friendly email it a appears that a name_group would be appropriate, hence using the following alternative.

payment-contact (%name_group; , email)

With respect to the comparison to ST.66, the structure is not strict at all and enables empty contact details, which doest not seem to be the purpose for the change underlying the present PFR. Although the EPO clearly favours the above proposal, the EPO would like to suggest the following alternative in case the ST.66 approach would be followed:

contact-detail (phone | fax | email)+

This alternative ensures that at least one usable contact means is provided.

Dec 14
YoungWoo Yun says:
Thank Raul for your alternative.

Dear all,
Thanks for your kind comments and proposal above. In order to reflect all comments, I would like to propose the following:
With regard to "Proposal 1: modification of the fee-sheet element":
I agree that email accompanying with name is more user-friendly. If we agree to capture only email information, it should be reflected to the element name. Thus I prefer Sammy's second option, i.e.,:

<!ELEMENT payment-contact-email (%name_group; , email) >.

If we want to use the element name without "email", i.e.,payment-contact, I would like to propose the followings because the payment-contacts means more than just email information:

<!ELEMENT payment-contact (%name_group; , contact-details)>
<!ELEMENT contact-details (phone | fax | email)+ >

NEXT ACTION:	Entry into force	BY:	
PROCHAINE ACTION :	Entrée en vigueur	**POUR LE :**	1.4.2010

Please let me know by December 21, 2009 which option you prefer. If there is no feedback, it would be considered that the ST.36 Task Force agreed on the first option above, i.e., payment-contact-email (%name_group; , email).

In relation to "Proposal 2 : modification of the payment-mode element":
I suppose that the JPO referred to the initial version of the PFR including the following information:

<!ELEMENT payment-mode (charge | postal-order | cash | coupons | cheque | bank-draft | stamps | other | later-payment*| credit-card*)>

The "later-payment*| credit-card*" was my mistake. It should read "| later-payment| credit-card)". I had used Rich Text Editor to easily edit text, but it had not worked properly. I had not realized the mistake before posting. I found the mistake and corrected it. Thus in the current version, you cannot find the mistake. In the case, I am very sorry for the confusion.

Tomohiro, please confirm whether you have further question or not. If you have further question, please let me know by December 21, 2009. If the JPO has no further issue on the Proposal 2, it would be considered that the ST.36 Task Force members approve the proposal 2 as proposed.

Dec 15
Raul SUAREZ Y GONZALEZ says:
The EPO agrees with the structure of the first proposal but would rather keep the name of the tag generic for future extensions, i.e.:

<!ELEMENT payment-contact (%name_group; , email) >

Dec 16
YoungWoo Yun says:
Dear all,
Considering future extension of the payment-contact and the conceptual meaning of the contact-detail, I agree with the EPO's proposal, i.e., <!ELEMENT payment-contact (%name_group; , email) > above. In relation to using the "contact-details", it may conceptually include address and/or name. Thus it is better not to use the contact-detail elements for payment-contact here.

Dec 21
Tomohiro Hakamata says:
[Proposal 1 : modification of the priority-claim element]

 The JPO thinks that there should be box to write email address in the FEE-SHEET (RO 101 Annex) to use the element payment-contact-email, however, we couldn't find any boxes in it. This was what I would like to focus on in my last comment.
 In other words, the JPO is wondering whether the email address would be rendered or not. And in case it would be rendered, the JPO would like to know whether revised PCT form RO 101 Annex will be provided in the near future or not.

NEXT ACTION:	Entry into force	BY:	
PROCHAINE ACTION :	Entrée en vigueur	POUR LE :	1.4.2010

[Proposal 2 : modification of the request element]
 Thanks for Peter and Woody. The JPO understood the situation.

Dec 22
Tomohiro Hakamata says:
I'm so sorry that my last comment was confusing because of referring to the element named "payment-contact-email".
Actually, I had no intention to oppose to the EPO's proposal which including element "payment-contact".
RO-JP is not planning to contact fee payer with email for a while. So, as for element structure itself, the JPO's stance is totally neutral, and, of course the EPO's proposal is acceptable.

Dec 22
Peter WARING says:
[Proposal 1 : modification of the priority-claim element]
With regards to the question from JPO regarding boxes on the pages of the request form or Annex, the IB does not intend to capture the email address for paper filings and similarly does not want to render the email on the fee sheet; thus the IB has not proposed a modification of the paper fee sheet Annex, nor a style-sheet update. The reasoning behind not having the information on a paper (or rendered electronic) sheet is that the email address is to be used for Credit card payments only and the IB prefers to have a clear separation of the confidential payment information to ensure that this information is not stored, in whatever form, in the publically available file.
On a practical note, following the suggestions for revision to the element structure we note that a name element will be required; the IB will not capture a value for the name (and will need to supply an empty element which is not desirable) and thus with the proposal above it is our intention to modify PCT-SAFE to produce the following XML noting that there may be whitespace variations from the text shown below:
...
<payment-contact>
<email email-purpose="informal">a.b@c.d</email>
<payment-contact>
...
The IB can accept the proposed revision to the structure on the basis that the inclusion of an empty name element will be acceptable.

[Proposal 2 : modification of the request element]
Thank you for confirming.

Dec 23
YoungWoo Yun says:
Dear ST.36 T.F. Colleagues,
I have not received any controversial comment on the modified proposal 1 (i.e.,
<!ELEMENT payment-contact (%name_group; , email)>) and proposal 2 in the PFR ST.36/2009/006 by the deadline (December 21, 2009), and received two explicit

NEXT ACTION:	Entry into force	BY:	
PROCHAINE ACTION :	Entrée en vigueur	**POUR LE :**	1.4.2010

supports to the proposals posted above. In order to make it sure what we agreed on "Proposal 1: modification of the fee-sheet element", I summarize our agreement as follows:

Change From:

<!ELEMENT fee-sheet ((file-reference-id? , applicant-name , prescribed-fees , amount-grand-total+ , deposit-account? , dtext*) | doc-page+)>
<!ATTLIST fee-sheet lang   CDATA #REQUIRED
            dtd-version CDATA #IMPLIED
             file   CDATA #IMPLIED
            produced-by   (applicant |RO |ISA |IPEA |IB | DO |EO |national-office |

                 regional-office) #REQUIRED
            date-produced CDATA #IMPLIED
             ro   CDATA #REQUIRED
            status   CDATA #IMPLIED >

To:

<!ELEMENT fee-sheet ((file-reference-id? , applicant-name , prescribed-fees , amount-grand-total+ , deposit-account? , dtext*, payment-contact?) | doc-page+)>
<!ATTLIST fee-sheet lang   CDATA #REQUIRED
            dtd-version CDATA #IMPLIED
             file   CDATA #IMPLIED
            produced-by   (applicant | RO |ISA |IPEA |IB |DO |EO | national-office |

                 regional-office) #REQUIRED
            date-produced CDATA #IMPLIED
             ro   CDATA #REQUIRED
            status   CDATA #IMPLIED >

Add:

<!--payment-contact element for use as container for an email that can be used as the contact point for payment processing
-->
<!ELEMENT payment-contact (%name_group; , email) >

I am glad to announce that the ST.36 Task Force agreed on the PFR ST.36/2009/006 with modification regarding the proposal 1 described above in this comment on December 22, 2009. The changes in the agreed PFR will be incooperated into the next version of Annex A (model DTD) and Annex C (ICEs) to WIPO Standard ST.36. The adopted PFR will be also available on the website of PFR already adopted (http://www.wipo.int/scit/en/taskfrce/st36/pfr-already-adopted.html.
Many thanks for your kind collaboration.

Jan 06
Samantha HOY says:
Dear ST 36 task force colleagues
Please accept my apologies for not responding earlier. Unfortunately, with Peter and Woody's comments coming out so close to our holiday break I did not see these comments until returning to work this week.

NEXT ACTION:	Entry into force	BY:	
PROCHAINE ACTION :	Entrée en vigueur	POUR LE :	1.4.2010

I would like to say that we agree with Peter's statement that it is not desirable to require an empty name element. If name information is not required for the payment email contact and never will be for this transaction then perhaps we should be reconsidering the current proposal.

In my comment on Dec 10 we suggested the inclusion of name_group if name information was required. As this is not the case and the requirement for this element is purely for the provision of an email for payment contact outside of normal contact information collection then our preference would be to name the element accordingly. Ie

<ELEMENT payment-contact-email email>

Jan 08
YoungWoo Yun says:
Dear the ST.36 TF colleagues,
In considering holiday break and the AU' comment given by Sammy above, I would like to ask you to express your views on the followings:
1. whether you agree to reopen our discussion on the PFR ST.36/2009/006 and;
2. whether you agree on the AU's proposal (Sammy's comment, posted on January 6) above.
You are invited to provide your comments by January 15, 2010 (Friday). If anyone does not want to discuss again the agreed PFR or no one explicitly supports the AU's proposal, our agreement will remain as it is. If some office(s) supports the AU's proposal and there is no objection to the said support, it would be considered that the ST.36 Task Force agreed on the AU's proposal.
I look forward to hearing your comment or support.

Jan 08
Peter WARING says:
Dear all,
Mike and I have discussed the merits of both having and not having the name_group (effectively as originally proposed). We see merits to both cases as not having the group avoids the problem of the need to supply an empty name element and having the group provides the possibility, for the IB and other offices who decide to use the payment contact element, of storing the name as well as the email.
We can accept both solutions, but the IB would like to implement a solution based on the outcome of this discussion as soon as is feasible.
Best regards
Peter

Jan 12
Tomohiro Hakamata says:
Dear all,
Reopening the discussion is acceptable, though, as I wrote on the WIKI, JPO's view of the tag structure is neutral.

Jan 12
Raul SUAREZ Y GONZALEZ says:

NEXT ACTION:	Entry into force	BY:	
PROCHAINE ACTION :	Entrée en vigueur	POUR LE :	1.4.2010

The EPO has no objection to reopen the discussion and does not have a strong position on the issues raised by our concerns above.

Jan 18
YoungWoo Yun says:
Dear all,
I would like to thank Sammy for your efforts and contribution to the revision of WIPO Standard ST.36. I also appreciate the comments on my proposal, posted on January 8, 2010, to address the AU's request above.
As you noted, three comments were posted by the PCT/IB, the JPO and the EPO, above. They agreed to re-open discussion on the PFR ST.36/2009/006. However, I do not see any explicit support to the AU's proposal, i.e., <ELEMENT payment-contact-email email>.

In considering no explicit support to the AU's proposal, I would like to announce that the agreement on the PFR stands as the T.F. already reached on December 22, 2009.

[Annex III follows /
L'annexe III suit]

NEXT ACTION:	Entry into force	BY:	1.4.2010
PROCHAINE ACTION :	Entrée en vigueur	POUR LE :	

ANNEX III /ANNEXE III

Comment by the Industrial Property Office of the Slovak Republic

The Industrial Property Office of the Slovak Republic in its capacity as a receiving Office under the Patent Cooperation Treaty has no comments concerning the proposals for change to the Standard for the Electronic Filing and Processing of International Applications under PCT which are mentioned in the Circular C.PCT 1194.

[Annex IV follows /
L'annexe IV suit]

NEXT ACTION:	Entry into force	**BY:**	
PROCHAINE ACTION :	Entrée en vigueur	**POUR LE :**	1.4.2010

ANNEX IV /ANNEXE IV

Comment by the Japan Patent Office

1-1) Fee-sheet, payment-contact

Element "payment-contact" and Attribute "email-purpose"

   We would like the IB to show us how the proposed DTDs on payment contact are going to be used in the PCT-SAFE software. There is no column for an e-mail address which may be "used as the contact point for payment processing" in the proposed Fee Calculation Sheet, Annex to the Request in Circular 1195.
   We learned from the PFC that the element "email" has already been defined in the ICE and that paragraph 12 of WIPO Standard ST.36 provides that "ICEs must be used as defined in this Standard." We suppose that the four "email-purpose" attributes ("informal," "general," "advance" and "main") are prepared in the proposed DTDs in accordance with the Standard. As for the use of the attribute in PCT e-filing software, however, the JPO believes that an e-mail address in the fee-sheet should be used only as an "informal" contact point and should not use the three other attributes ("general," "advance" or "main"), since only communications concerning practical payment (e.g., instruction for credit card payment) should be sent to this e-mail address. All the other *formal* notifications/invitations, even if those are related to payment (e.g. RO/102, IB/377), should be sent to the main contact point (the common agent, common representative or address for correspondence) as provided for by Administrative Instructions Section 108. This is how the JPO understands the explanation in the Reason column in page 2 of PFC 09/007; that is, "…a payment contact for cases where the contact point for payment processing is not the main contact point for the application…the filer will receive an e-mail with payment instruction…".

[Annex V follows /
 L'annexe V suit]

NEXT ACTION:	Entry into force	BY:	
PROCHAINE ACTION :	Entrée en vigueur	POUR LE :	1.4.2010

ANNEX V /ANNEXE V

Comment by the Republic of Uzbekistan State Patent Office

The State patent Office of the Republic of Uzbekistan has no comments or proposals regarding this circular.

[Annex VI follows /
L'annexe VI suit]

NEXT ACTION:	Entry into force	**BY:**	1.4.2010
PROCHAINE ACTION :	Entrée en vigueur	**POUR LE :**	

PCT/EF/PFC 09/007

ANNEX VI /ANNEXE VI

Comment by the Federal Service for Intellectual Property, Patents and Trademarks
(ROSPATENT)

Referring to the Circular letter C.PCT 1194 of November 5, 2009 we would like to
communicate that the specialists of the Federal Service fir Intellectual Property, Patents and
Trademarks 9ROSPATENT) have carefully considered the proposed modifications to Annex
F of the Administrative Instructions under the PCT and have no objections to them.

[Annex VII follows /
L'annexe VII suit]

NEXT ACTION:	Entry into force	**BY:**	1.4.2010
PROCHAINE ACTION :	Entrée en vigueur	**POUR LE :**	

ANNEX VII /ANNEXE VII

<u>Comment by the International Bureau</u>

Clarifications regarding comments posted above are provided below and, following review of the comments received, the International Bureau will modify Annex F of the administrative instructions as described below. Following the consultations the entry into force has been deferred until April 1, 2010.

<u>Clarifications</u>

<u>1-1) Fee-sheet, payment-contact</u>

 For the payment-contact email address specification we have inserted the proposed element in the fee-sheet and not request. This payment contact is to be used as part of the IB's credit-card payment processing and will only be available for use when filing with RO-IB. The XML element is expected to appear as follows as a child of the <fee-sheet> element in either of the two following forms, both having the same meaning, noting that from the processing of the associated PFR the proposal from AU was accepted and the name element must be included in the payment-contact element according to the ST.36 ICE:

'<payment-contact><name/><email email-purpose="informal"> peter@wipo.int</email></payment-contact>'

or

'<payment-contact><name/><email> peter@wipo.int</email></payment-contact>'.

For the General E-mail authorization, in PCT-SAFE the existing advance copies checkbox description will be modified slightly to say 'advance + paper confirmation' and a new alternative checkbox saying 'exclusively in electronic form (no paper notifications will be sent)' will be inserted. The xml will contain (dependent on the selected checkbox):

'<email email-purpose="advance">peter@wipo.int</email>'

or

'<email email-purpose="main">peter@wipo.int</email>'

<u>1-1) credit-card</u>

During implementation it was discovered that credit-card was already defined elsewhere and already has attributes in addition to the proposal. The attributes have been proposed to be adopted in the ST.36 Task force forum and their inclusion here is accepted:

```
<!-- Credit card used as payment method   -->
<!ELEMENT credit-card EMPTY>
<!ATTLIST credit-card number    CDATA  #REQUIRED
          expires    CDATA  #REQUIRED
          name       CDATA  #IMPLIED
          postal-code CDATA  #IMPLIED >
```

[End of Annex and of file/
Fin de l'annexe et du dossier]

NEXT ACTION:	Entry into force	BY:	1.4.2010
PROCHAINE ACTION :	Entrée en vigueur	**POUR LE :**	