

## **Committee on WIPO Standards (CWS)**

**Tenth Session**  
**Geneva, November 21 to 25, 2022**

### **REPORT**

*adopted by the Committee*

#### **INTRODUCTION**

1. The Committee on WIPO Standards (referred to as “the Committee”, or “the CWS”) held its Tenth Session in Geneva from November 21 to 25, 2022.
2. The following Member States of WIPO and/or members of the Paris Union and Bern Union were represented at the session: Armenia; Australia; Austria; Bahrain; Brazil; Canada; China; Croatia; the Czech Republic; Finland; France; Germany; Ghana; Hungary; India; Indonesia; Iraq; Israel; Italy; Japan; Kenya; Kuwait; Lithuania; Madagascar; Malta; Mexico; Morocco; Nicaragua; Norway; Pakistan; Paraguay; Peru; the Philippines; the Republic of Korea; the Republic of Moldova; Romania; the Russian Federation; Saudi Arabia; Singapore; Spain; Sri Lanka; the Sudan; Sweden; Thailand; Türkiye; Uganda; the United Kingdom; the United States of America; Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) (49).
3. In their capacity as members of the CWS, the representatives of the following Intergovernmental Organizations took part in the session: African Regional Intellectual Property Organization (ARIPO); Eurasian Patent Organization (EAPO); European Patent Organisation (EPO); European Union (EU); International Union For The Protection of New Varieties of Plants (UPOV) (5).

4. Representatives of the following Intergovernmental Organizations and Non-Governmental Organizations took part in the session in an observer capacity: China Council for the Promotion of International Trade (CCPIT); Confederacy of Patent Information User Groups (CEPIUG); European Federation of Joint Management Societies of Producers for Private Audiovisual Copying (EUROCOPYA); European Law Students' Association (ELSA International); International Association for the Protection of Intellectual Property (AIPPI); International Trademark Association (INTA); Ordre Suprême Des Ancêtres (OSA) (7).

5. The list of participants appears as Annex I to this report.

#### Agenda Item 1: Opening of the session

6. The tenth session was opened by the Director of International Classifications and Standards Division, Mr. Kunihiro Fushimi, on behalf of the Director General of WIPO.

#### Agenda Item 2: Election of the Chair and two Vice-Chairs

7. Taking into account the discussion on the electoral cycle of the officers (Chair and two Vice-Chairs) under the WIPO General Rules of Procedure adopted by the WIPO Assemblies in July 2022 and a transition to this new practice, the Secretariat proposed to elect a Chair and Vice-Chairs for the tenth and eleventh sessions.

8. The CWS agreed to elect a Chair and Vice-Chairs for the tenth session whose term of office would extend through the eleventh session and be terminated by the closure of the eleventh session. At the eleventh session, the CWS will elect new officers for the twelfth and thirteen sessions in accordance with the new practice.

9. The CWS unanimously elected Ms. Åsa Viken (Sweden) as Chair and Ms. Nourah Alamari (Saudi Arabia) as Vice-Chair for its tenth and eleventh sessions.

10. Mr. Young-Woo YUN (WIPO) acted as Secretary to the CWS.

#### DISCUSSION OF AGENDA ITEMS

##### Agenda Item 3: Adoption of the agenda

11. Discussions were based on document CWS/10/1 Prov. 3.

12. The CWS unanimously adopted the agenda as shown in Annex II of this report.

13. The Chair invited delegations to provide general statements. The Delegation of Saudi Arabia thanked the Secretariat for organizing the meeting and hoped for a successful session.

#### PRESENTATIONS

14. The presentations, written statements given and working documents from this session are available on the WIPO website at:

[https://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/details.jsp?meeting\\_id=69689](https://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/details.jsp?meeting_id=69689).

#### DISCUSSIONS, CONCLUSIONS, AND DECISIONS

15. As decided by the Governing Bodies of WIPO at their tenth series of meetings held from September 24 to October 2, 1979 (see document AB/X/32, paragraphs 51 and 52), the report of this session reflects only the conclusions of the CWS (decisions, recommendations, opinions, etc.) and does not, in particular, reflect the statements made by any participant, except where a reservation in relation to any specific conclusion of the CWS was expressed or repeated after the conclusion was reached.

##### Agenda Item 4: Organizational matters and special rules of procedures

16. Discussions were based on document CWS/10/2.

17. The CWS noted the content of the document, in particular the recommendations from the [Report on Evaluation of WIPO Standing Committees](#) prepared by WIPO's Internal Oversight Division. The Report recommended to compile Standing Committee procedures as a way to clarify roles and processes. However no clear documentation on the organizational matters and procedures of the CWS is available for Member States and Observers. The Secretariat presented a proposal for organizational matters and special rules of procedure in document CWS/10/2.

18. One delegation suggested that the CWS working methods could be improved in relation to task forces by increasing the clarity and transparency of how decisions are reached. A number of edits to the proposal were proposed by a delegation, including an explanation of the fast track procedure for revisions of certain WIPO Standards. Several delegations supported the changes and proposed a few clarifications.

19. The CWS adopted its organizational matters and special rules of procedure with amendments agreed during the session as shown in Annex 3 of this report.

#### Agenda Item 5: Consideration of the Work Program and Tasks List of the CWS

20. Discussions were based on document CWS/10/3.

21. The CWS noted the content of the document, in particular the recommendations of the [Report on Evaluation of WIPO Standing Committees](#) to review workload and agree on priorities for the following year.

22. The Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT) Working Group, at its fifteenth session, recommended the CWS to develop a new standard to enable the transmission of sequence listings in WIPO Standard ST.26 format as part of priority documents and certified copies. A new CWS task was proposed for this purpose.

23. The CWS agreed to create new Task No. 65 with the description: "To prepare a proposal for recommendations on the data package format for the electronic exchange of priority documents and certified copies for patents, marks and industrial designs".

24. The Delegation of the United States of America as the Digital Transformation Task Force Leader, suggested that the new Task No. 65 would be suitable for the Digital Transformation Task Force to work on. One delegation pointed out that Offices might have different requirements with regards to priority documents, as some were not participating in WIPO-DAS or issuing priority documents on paper. The delegation suggested that these requirements should be taken into account as much as possible when working on the Task. The Delegation of the Republic of Korea informed the Committee that it had made a proposal for priority document exchange format in XML, which could refer to images or PDF documents, for discussion by the XML4IP Task Force. The Delegation suggested starting with XML structure when considering its proposal, which refers to attachments in PDF or image format such as sequence listings now and handling entire priority documents in different document formats in the future.

25. The CWS assigned this Task to the Digital Transformation Task Force. The CWS requested the Digital Transformation Task Force to prioritize work on Task No. 65 and to present a proposal for a new WIPO standard at the next session of the CWS. The CWS also requested the Secretariat to issue a circular inviting Intellectual Property Offices (IPOs) to nominate relevant experts to join the Digital Transformation Task Force.

26. For prioritization of tasks, the Secretariat found it unclear how to prepare a proposal, since different IPOs may have different priorities and a different sense of urgency, depending on their business requirements or their own projects with differing timelines. The Secretariat suggested some relevant considerations for IPOs to review when deciding the priority of tasks by the CWS. The Secretariat also proposed conducting a survey of IPOs to determine priorities for the Committee's work with two sets of questions: one set is for the Office to express their own priorities based on their own projects and concerns, while the other is for Offices to express the priorities they see for the IP community including stakeholders.

27. Several delegations supported the survey. One delegation proposed that the International Bureau include an estimate of the workload for each task in the survey such as complex, medium and simple, to help Offices assess the required resources. Several delegations supported this proposal. The International Bureau agreed to provide this information. One delegation suggested freezing low priority tasks and another delegation proposed not to neglect lower priority tasks.

28. The CWS requested IPOs to provide comments on how the CWS should determine the priority of tasks as presented in paragraphs 11 to 14 of document CWS/10/3. The CWS requested the Secretariat to work with the Leaders of its Task Forces to prepare a survey questionnaire for presentation at the next session of the CWS for determining the preferences of IPOs in prioritizing Tasks.

29. One delegation commented that it would be useful for each Task Force to identify objectives and actions for the year and measure progress with quarterly update meetings. Another delegation suggested that the Secretariat work with Member States to create a template for Task Force reporting.

30. The CWS agreed that each Task Force identify objectives and relevant actions for the year and measure progress against those objectives at its annual meeting. The CWS requested the Secretariat to provide a common template for Task Force reporting. The CWS also agreed that quarterly meetings of its Task Forces be held to review and update those objectives of Task Forces and requested the Secretariat to organize quarterly meetings. The Secretariat agreed to work with the Task Force Leaders to prepare the common template and organize the quarterly Task Force update meetings.

31. During the review of tasks, one delegation asked whether Tasks No. 38 and No. 39 for updating ST.36 and ST.66 could be closed since Task No. 33 already covers revisions of existing Standards. The Secretariat noted the issue and suggested that each Task Force review the list of tasks and recommend necessary changes to the work program at the next session of the CWS.

32. The CWS approved the Secretariat to incorporate the agreements reached at this session in the CWS Work Program and CWS Work Program Overview and publish them on the WIPO website. The updated work program is shown in Annex 4 of this report.

33. The Delegation of the United Kingdom remarked that they would no longer be able to co-lead the API Task Force. The Representative of the European Union offered to co-lead the Task Force with the Delegation of Canada.

34. The CWS agreed to have the European Union co-lead the API Task Force with the Canadian Intellectual Property Office.

#### Agenda Item 6: Revision of WIPO Standard ST.3

35. Discussions were based on document CWS/10/4.

36. The CWS noted the content of the document, in particular the proposed revision to ST.3. Following the decision by the CWS at its ninth session to change “industrial property” to “intellectual property” in the WIPO Handbook, the Secretariat prepared a proposed revision to ST.3 reflecting the decision. In addition to changing “industrial” to “intellectual”, the update adds two-letter codes for two IPOs that practice intellectual property but not industrial property (i.e., copyright) within the scope of coverage of ST.3: the Marshall Islands (code “MH”) and Niue (code “NU”). Furthermore, based on input from the Hague and Madrid Systems, the text of footnote 4 on use of codes “IB” and “WO” was updated to clarify their intended usage within those Systems.

37. The CWS approved the revisions to WIPO Standard ST.3 as reproduced in the Annex to document CWS/10/4.

#### Agenda Item 7: IP Data Management using XML or JSON

##### Agenda Item 7 (a): Report by the XML4IP Task Force (Task No.41, Task No. 47 and Task No.64)

38. Discussions were based on document CWS/10/5.

39. The CWS noted the content of the document, in particular the release of ST.96 version 6.0 and the work plan of the XML4IP Task Force. Among other changes, version 6.0 includes a series of new alloy composition XML schemas to capture Patent and Non-Patent Literature (NPL) alloy composition data, as well as revised existing XML schema components in relation to Madrid and Hague communications. A first draft of both trademark legal status and design legal status XML schemas was published on the Task Force wiki and was discussed by the XML4IP Task Force there. The XML4IP Task Force will collaborate with the Legal Status Task Force to complete the development of XML schemas related to supplementary data in a series of joint Task Force meetings. For its 2023 workplan, the XML4IP Task Force will work on the development of XML components to capture trademark and design legal status data, improve copyright orphan work components, and finalize development of patent record and patent transaction XML schemas.

40. One delegation suggested increasing collaboration with the Legal Status Task Force to develop legal status components, including developing the new legal status schemas in collaboration during joint meetings. Other delegations supported the proposal. The International Bureau, as the leader of both Task Forces, agreed to this proposal.

##### Agenda Item 7 (b): Proposal for a new WIPO standard on JSON

41. Discussions were based on document CWS/10/6 Rev.

42. The CWS noted the content of the document, in particular the final draft JSON standard presented in the Annex to document CWS/10/6 Rev. The final draft includes a series of design rules as well as a set of JSON schemas, which are based on the XML schemas of WIPO Standard ST.96, version 5.0 and the draft JSON schema specification 2020-12, and examples of JSON instances. The XML4IP Task Force developed the draft JSON standard taking into account the need for data consistency and compatibility between XML and JSON formats, to facilitate data exchange among IPOs and data dissemination by IPOs in these two formats.

43. The CWS adopted new WIPO Standard ST.97 with the name “Recommendation for processing of intellectual property data using JSON”, as reproduced in the Annex to document CWS/10/6 Rev.

44. The CWS approved the revision of Task No. 64 with the description: “Ensure the necessary revisions and updates of WIPO Standard ST.97”. The CWS designated the API Task Force to carry out revised Task No. 64.

45. The International Bureau proposes to assign the API Task Force the revised Task No. 64, as it also manages WIPO Standard ST.90 on Web APIs. As the new Standard on JSON is expected to be continuously revised alongside the revisions of WIPO ST.96 and the evolution of [JSON schema specification](#), it was proposed to make use of the established “fast track” procedure for the consideration and/or adoption of the revisions of the new JSON standard.

46. The CWS approved the fast track procedure to revise WIPO Standard ST.97 as proposed.

47. The International Bureau noted several editorial amendments that are required to WIPO Standard ST.90 for consistency with ST.97, such as referencing ST.97 where appropriate.

48. The CWS approved editorial amendments to WIPO Standard ST.90 to refer to the adopted Standard ST.97 and requested the Secretariat to introduce other necessary editorial amendments to ST.90 as needed. The revised ST.90 will be published on the WIPO website after the tenth session.

#### Agenda Item 8: Orphan Works

##### Agenda Item 8 (a): Proposals for improvement of copyright orphan work metadata in WIPO Standard ST.96

49. Discussions were based on document CWS/10/7.

50. The CWS noted the content of the document, in particular the revised working draft for copyright orphan work metadata. Following the ninth session of the CWS, Member States and Observers of WIPO were invited to provide their comments on the improved proposals through circular C.CWS 156. Nine responses were received from six Member States and three Observers. The working draft was revised according to the feedback received.

51. The CWS invited members to comment on the revised working draft for copyright orphan work metadata presented in the Annex to document CWS/10/7.

##### Agenda Item 8 (b): Proposals for the next step in relation to copyright orphan works metadata

52. Discussions were based on document CWS/10/8.

53. The CWS noted the content of the document. The scope of the working draft focuses on orphan works while considering standards and metadata used in the creative industries that are relevant for identifying and exchanging information about orphan works. This aims to ensure that ST.96 will be interoperable with other data standards around the world, developed or used by creative industries, including collective management organizations and libraries.

54. The International Bureau proposed two options for possible next steps. *Option 1* would be to create a new Task and a Task Force, i.e., Copyright Orphan Works Metadata Task Force, to prepare final proposals for metadata recommendation on right holders' role and categories of creative works, to be referenced to as XML components in WIPO Standard ST.96 for copyright orphan works. *Option 2* would conduct another round of consultation on the revised working draft presented in the Annex to document CWS/10/7 via a CWS circular inviting copyright experts to comment.

55. One delegation remarked that they do not support work in the larger copyright ecosystem beyond metadata for orphan works. They did not support creation of a new Task in *Option 1*. The delegation could support *Option 2* only if the work returned to its original scope. Another delegation agreed. One delegation supported *Option 1*, but finally they agreed on *Option 2*.

56. The CWS agreed to perform another round of consultation to solicit input from copyright Offices and industry (*Option 2*). The CWS requested the Secretariat to issue a circular inviting its Members and Observers, with explicit reference to Copyright Offices, and institutions as well as international Non-Governmental Organizations representing creative industry stakeholders, to review the revised working draft included in document CWS/10/7 and submit their comments.

57. The CWS requested the Secretariat to present, at its next session, a final proposal reflecting the results of the consultation for consideration and approval by the CWS, or a proposal for next steps, depending on the comments received during the consultation.

#### Agenda Item 9: Blockchain for IP ecosystem

##### Agenda Item 9 (a): Report by the Blockchain Task Force (Task No. 59)

58. Discussions were based on document CWS/10/9.

59. The CWS noted the content of the document, in particular the white paper published by the International Bureau on blockchain for IP ecosystems. This white paper explored potential applications and opportunities presented by blockchain technologies to IP ecosystems. It also identified the challenges and issues that should be addressed to determine the feasibility and cost-effectiveness of utilizing such technologies for the benefit of IP stakeholders. It is expected that the white paper should help IPOs and other interested parties with their strategic policy and decision making on the adoption of blockchain technologies in their businesses, as well as providing information for further discussions and collaborations among interested parties.

60. The CWS noted that the Blockchain Task Force agreed on the following four workstreams: Regulatory Interoperability, Governance Interoperability, Technical Standards and Use cases, and the first two workstreams are led by the International Bureau. The CWS noted that the International Bureau has been working on the revised draft document of Analysis of UNICITRAL Model Law on electronic transferable records for Blockchain uses in IP ecosystems in relation to the Regulatory workstream and drafting a document on Governance. The CWS also noted that the International Bureau will provide the two documents for consideration by the Blockchain Task Force. The International Bureau stated that the last workstream, i.e. Use cases, could be considered completed as 13 use cases were defined in the white paper, and the Task Force should focus on the first three workstreams. The Delegation of the Russian Federation agreed on focusing on the remaining three workstreams.

61. The Delegation of Australia noted that they would be unable to continue as a co-leader of the Task Force. No other delegations volunteered to serve as co-leader.

62. The CWS noted that the Delegation of the Russian Federation became the sole leader of the Blockchain Task Force.

##### Agenda Item 9 (b): Blockchain related activities by Offices

63. Discussions were based on presentations by the Delegations of the Russian Federation, the European Union Intellectual Property Office, the International Union for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants (UPOV), the International Trademark Association (INTA) and the International Bureau. The CWS noted that the International Bureau has recently launched a blockchain pilot for a global (digital) identifier, which is composed of two Phases.

64. The CWS noted the content of the presentations. The presentations are available on the meeting page as documents [CWS/10/ITEM 9B EUIPO](#), [CWS/10/ITEM 9B IB](#), [CWS/10/ITEM 9B INTA](#), [CWS/10/ITEM 9B ROSPATENT](#), and [CWS/10/ITEM 9B UPOV](#).

#### Agenda Item 10: Proposal for establishing an international database to standardize applicant names

65. Discussions were based on document CWS/10/10 and a presentation by the Delegation of Saudi Arabia. The presentation is available on the meeting page as document [CWS/10/ITEM 10 SAIP](#).

66. The CWS noted the content of the document and the presentation. Several delegations expressed interest in the proposal, while pointing out possible overlap with other CWS work areas including name standardization and blockchain use cases, as well as work in other forums such as the Five IP Offices (IP5). Some delegations noted that the proposal involved more than just technical issues, with legal and policy issues also implicated, as well as stakeholder interests and concerns. Because of the large potential impact on applicants and other stakeholders, those groups should also be involved in the process of developing a solution. Some delegations suggested that a feasibility study would be needed before they can decide whether to support the proposal.

67. One delegation noted the overlap with the CWS survey on the use of identifiers conducted in year 2018-19, and that global identifiers have growing interest among Offices but also limitations. Another delegation remarked that a new database would require significant changes to Office's IT systems which would have to be weighed against the costs. Another delegation wished to distinguish between natural and legal persons. The Delegation of Saudi Arabia expressed interest in working with all delegations to address their concerns.

68. One delegation considered that the proposal falls well within the CWS remit and has strong relations to the Name Standardization Task Force and believed that a global database at WIPO was a very sensible idea. Taking into account several challenges on name standardization across jurisdictions, the delegation proposed a feasibility study to provide more information before deciding whether to proceed with the international database proposal. Two other delegations agreed on the proposal.

69. The International Bureau suggested using the global (digital) identifier pilot, which was presented under the Agenda Item 9(b), as a proof of concept to assess feasibility and document potential issues with adopting global identifiers. The Delegation of Saudi Arabia agreed on the suggestion by the International Bureau and expressed its interest in the pilot.

70. The CWS requested the International Bureau to collaborate with some interested Offices on the global (digital) identifier pilot and report the results at the next session of the CWS.

#### Agenda Item 11: Legal Status Data

##### Agenda Item 11 (a): Report by the Legal Status Task Force (Task No. 47)

71. Discussions were based on document CWS/10/11.

72. The CWS noted the content of the document, in particular the progress of the Task Force on Task No. 47 and the International Bureau's plans to develop training materials in collaboration with the Task Force.

73. The CWS noted the proposed revisions to ST.87, Annex II on supplementary data, presented in the Annex of document CWS/10/11. This revision is intended to align ST.87 with ST.27 and ST.61. Two delegations explicitly supported the proposal.

74. The CWS approved the revisions to ST.87 in the Annex of document CWS/10/11.

75. In light of the CWS and the Task Force not finding a way to proceed with work on a potential merger of the three legal status Standards, the Task Force suggested discontinuing the merger work and revising the description of Task No. 47 appropriately.

76. The CWS approved the revision of Task No. 47 which now reads: "Ensure the necessary revisions and updates of WIPO Standards ST.27, ST.87, and ST.61; prepare supporting materials to assist the use of those Standards in the IP community; and support the XML4IP Task Force to develop XML components for legal status event data."

#### Agenda Item 11 (b): Implementation of WIPO Standards ST.27, ST.61 and ST.87 by Offices

77. Discussions were based on presentations by Delegations of Australia, Germany, and the United Kingdom.

78. The CWS noted the content of the presentations. The presentations are available on the meeting page as documents [CWS/10/ITEM 11B IP AUSTRALIA](#), [CWS/10/ITEM 11B DPMA](#), and [CWS/10/ITEM 11B UK IPO](#).

79. The CWS noted that some Offices implemented ST.27 or ST.87 and the implementation of ST.61 is under consideration. For the implementations, corresponding XML schemas are required. The Delegation of the United Kingdom stated that the Standards are very helpful for modernization of their legal status data as well as harmonization of data across the three IP types.

#### Agenda Item 12: Sequence Listings

##### Agenda Item 12 (a): Report by the Sequence Listings Task Force (Task No. 44)

80. Discussions were based on document CWS/10/12.

81. The CWS noted the content of the document, in particular the work plan of the Sequence Listings Task Force (SEQL Task Force). In 2023, the Task Force plans to continue participating in the development and testing of the WIPO Sequence Suite and to support the development of any further revisions of WIPO Standard ST.26, if required. Nine delegations shared their experiences of implementation of ST.26 and use of WIPO Sequence Suite, and appreciated the International Bureau's support. One delegation stated that due to lack of resources, they cannot provide the first level support for WIPO Sequence users in their country. The International Bureau confirmed that it could provide the first level support as needed, if resources are available.

82. The CWS requested IPOs to continue supporting use of the WIPO Sequence Suite for preparing sequence listings compliant with WIPO Standard ST.26.

##### Agenda Item 12 (b): Proposal for the revision of WIPO Standard ST.26

83. Discussions were based on documents CWS/10/13, CWS/10/13 Rev., CWS/10/13 Rev. 2, ST.26-tracked-changes-draft1 and ST.26-tracked-changes-draft2.

84. The CWS noted the content of the document, in particular the proposed revision to WIPO Standard ST.26. The SEQL Task Force proposed to correct certain editorial mistakes noted by the Task Force or to provide additional clarification in sections of the Main Body and Annexes and finally to include three new examples in Annex VI of ST.26.

85. Several delegations suggested additional changes to the proposed revision captured in document CWS/10/13 after reviewing of a tracked changes version of ST.26 which implemented the described changes. A side meeting was arranged during this session for interested participants to prepare an updated revision of CWS/10/13 which described a common set of proposed changes. The CWS continued discussions on the revised working document which was prepared at the side meeting.

86. One delegation requested that in the future the Secretariat produce a tracked changes version of WIPO Standard ST.26, rather than describing the proposed improvements within the working document. WIPO Standard ST.26 is implemented globally and there may be legal implications if one of the amendments is misunderstood. This Standard is also translated into several languages other than English, French and Spanish and the tracked changes version will assist in the accuracy of this translation process. The CWS agreed that for this session, they would consider for approval the list of proposed improvements as described in document CWS/10/13 REV.2, as long as it was comprehensive. The Secretariat confirmed that in the future a proposal for the revision of ST.26 would be always presented as the complete ST.26 with tracked changes.

87. The CWS approved the revision to WIPO Standard ST.26 with agreed amendments described in document CWS/10/13 Rev. 2.

88. The CWS noted that the Secretariat would implement the changes proposed in CWS/10/13 REV.2, a provisional draft of ST.26 version 1.6 with tracked changes, and share it with the SEQL Task Force for its review and confirmation that it accurately implements the agreed content of the working document. Once the Task Force has confirmed the contents of this Standard, the Secretariat will officially publish it.

89. The Secretariat proposed July 1, 2023 as the date that the new version of WIPO ST.26, version 1.6, would enter into force. While the CWS agreed to this date, several delegations proposed to fix the entry into force date only for version 1.6 at this stage. While ST.26 version 1.6 includes only editorial changes, it is unknown whether future versions may require additional lead-time for delegations to implement, after the revised version of ST.26 is approved at the relevant sessions of the CWS. The Secretariat agreed that the date of entry into force for ST.26 would be discussed at the relevant session of the CWS.

90. One delegation asked why ST.26 revisions required a delay before coming into force. Other delegations remarked that they needed time to translate the Standard, revise their regulations, update IT systems, or make other preparations.

91. The CWS decided to set July 1, 2023 as the entry into force date of version 1.6 of WIPO Standard ST.26.

92. The Secretariat informed the CWS that two versions of WIPO Standard ST.26, 1.5 and 1.6, would be made available on WIPO website until July 1, 2023. After this time, only version 1.6 would be available.

93. The Secretariat informed the CWS that translations of ST.26 into German, Japanese and Korean are available on the WIPO website as the relevant Offices translated the Standard and made them available to the Secretariat. The Secretariat invited other Offices to provide translations of ST.26 in the other languages of the WIPO Sequence Suite in addition to the three official publication languages of WIPO Standards: English, French and Spanish and the three indicated at the start of this paragraph. The translations should be kept up-to-date when new versions of WIPO Standard ST.26 are approved at the relevant session of CWS.

Agenda Item 12 (c): WIPO Sequence Suite development and support

94. Discussions were based on document CWS/10/14.

95. The CWS noted the content of the document. Development of the WIPO Sequence Suite aimed to achieve a "Minimum Viable Product", which went live in production on the WIPO ST.26 implementation date of July 1, 2022. Basic training was hosted by the International Bureau on WIPO Sequence in all ten PCT publication languages with the support of Offices and on the WIPO Sequence Validator in two PCT publication languages, based on Offices' requests. Updates to the WIPO Sequence Suite are now made under a maintenance contract and support is provided to users under a three-tier support model described in paragraph 13 of document CWS/10/14.

96. The CWS requested IPOs to encourage applicants to subscribe to the WIPO Sequence mailing list and refer to the WIPO Sequence and ST.26 knowledge base. The CWS also encouraged IPOs to report any new bugs or proposals for improvement through the three-tier support model.

#### Agenda Item 12 (d): Implementation of WIPO Standard ST.26 by Offices

97. Discussions were based on presentations by Delegations of Germany, the Republic of Korea, the United States of America, and the European Patent Organization.

98. The CWS noted the content of the presentations. The presentations are available on the meeting page as documents [CWS/10/ITEM 12D DPMA](#), [CWS/10/ITEM 12D EPO](#), [CWS/10/ITEM 12D KIPO](#), and [CWS/10/ITEM 12D USPTO](#).

#### Agenda Item 13: Patent Authority File

##### Agenda Item 13 (a): Updates of the WIPO Authority File Portal

99. Discussions were based on a presentation by the International Bureau.

100. The CWS noted the content of the presentation, in particular the inclusion of patent publication data provided in ST.37 format from 29 IPOs in the WIPO Authority File portal. Three updates to the portal were published in 2022: in April, July, and October with new entries from Croatia, Estonia, Israel, and Lithuania. The majority of Offices still provide their authority file data in TXT format but five Offices provide in XML format. The CWS noted that patent documents from 76 Offices are available in PATENTSCOPE. It would be desirable to make patent authority files of those 76 Offices available via the Authority File portal.

##### Agenda Item 13 (b): Implementation of WIPO Standard ST.37 by Offices

101. Discussions were based on presentations by Delegations of the United Kingdom, the European Patent Organization, and the International Bureau.

102. The CWS noted the content of the presentations. The presentations are available on the meeting page as documents [CWS/10/ITEM 13B EPO](#), [CWS/10/ITEM 13B IB](#), and [CWS/10/ITEM 13B UK IPO](#).

103. The CWS noted that the patent authority file is an important tool to ensure completeness, quality of data and consistency for patent document collections. The International Bureau emphasized the importance of authority file definition for ensuring data quality and encouraged Offices who have not yet done so to consider authoring their own authority file. The CWS noted that the EPO also provides its authority file in JSON format as well as XML and CVS formats.

#### Agenda Item 14: Digital Transformation

##### Agenda Item 14 (a): Report by the Digital Transformation Task Force (Task No. 62)

104. Discussions were based on a presentation by the Digital Transformation Task Force.

105. The CWS noted the content of the presentation, in particular the progress made by the Task Force. After review of the digital transformation survey results, the Task Force Leader recommended developing a plan for the Task Force to work on bringing uniformity to two areas of the patent application process: intake and export. For intake, most Offices require similar information for items such as bibliographic data, claims, specification, abstract, and drawings. The Task Force should explore DOCX to XML conversion as an option for Offices. For export, most Offices offer publications in one or more formats. The Task Force can work towards encouraging all Offices to provide their publications in a common ST.96 format along with other existing formats. This will help users of patent information to have at least one common format they can rely on for their use of the data. The presentation is available on the meeting page as document [CWS/10/ITEM 14A USPTO](#).

106. The CWS approved the work items for the Task Force presented in paragraphs 10 to 12 of document CWS/10/15.

Agenda Item 14 (b): Analysis of survey results on Office practices for Digital Transformation

107. Discussions were based on document CWS/10/15.

108. The CWS noted the content of the document, in particular the results of the Digital Transformation survey. In March 2022, the Secretariat issued circular C.CWS 155 inviting IPOs to participate in the survey on digital transformation. Responses were received from 40 Members State and regional IPOs. Most respondents accept submissions as PDF or paper, while almost half accept free-form Microsoft Word DOCX. More than half of respondents indicate that they provide initial content-based validations to applicants prior to the submission. A large majority of Offices stated that the originally-submitted application documents are considered the authoritative copy of the submission.

109. The CWS approved the survey analysis in paragraphs 3 to 9 of document CWS/10/15 for publication in the *WIPO Handbook on Intellectual Property Information and Documentation*.

Agenda Item 15: Report by the Part 7 Task Force (Task No. 50)

110. Discussions were based on document CWS/10/16.

111. The CWS noted the content of the document, in particular the revised work plan in paragraph 5 of document CWS/10/16. The Task Force discussed scheduling an update for citation practices in Part 7.9 of the WIPO Handbook as requested at the previous session of the CWS. Normally, only one update to Part 7 is scheduled per calendar year to avoid burdening IPOs with too many surveys, considering that other Task Forces also conduct surveys of IPOs. However, no other Task Forces proposed surveys for 2023 at the tenth session of the CWS. Therefore the Task Force recommended updating both 7.9 on citation practices and the already scheduled part 7.6 on bibliographic information in patent gazettes in 2023.

112. The CWS approved the revised work plan, including surveys in 2023 to update Parts 7.6 and 7.9 of the *WIPO Handbook*.

Agenda Item 16: Report by the Name Standardization Task Force (Task No. 55)

113. Discussions were based on document CWS/10/17.

114. The CWS noted the content of the document, in particular the progress made on draft recommendations for clean data in support of name standardization. The recommendations cover general considerations for intake, processing, cleanup, and publication of clean name data. The draft recommendations are at a very early stage and do not reflect agreement or consensus by the Task Force yet. They are presented to the CWS for information purposes and comments.

115. One delegation noted that their system does not allow customers to directly change data such as addresses, and that mechanisms are used to validate ownership. The International Bureau, as a co-leader of the Task Force, commented that the draft recommendations were intended to be compatible with such features and the Task Force would discuss modifying the language to clarify if needed.

116. The CWS invited IPOs to comment on the draft recommendations on name standardization in the Annex of document CWS/10/17.

#### Agenda Item 17: ICT Strategy for Standards Task Force (Task No. 58)

117. Discussions were based on a presentation by the International Bureau as the Task Force leader.

118. The CWS noted the content of the presentation, in particular the progress made by the Task Force.

119. The Delegation of the United States of America, as Digital Transformation Task Force leader, proposed assigning work on DOCX converters to the Digital Transformation Task Force. The Leader suggest work on comparison of existing DOCX converters for consistency and differences, and to develop a technical specification to meet the goals of IPOs and applicants.

120. The CWS requested the Digital Transformation Task Force to propose a revision to Task No. 62 regarding DOCX converters at the eleventh session of the CWS.

#### Agenda Item 18: Report by the 3D Task Force (Task No. 61)

121. Discussions were based on a presentation by the Delegation of the Russian Federation as the Task Force leader.

122. The CWS noted the content of the presentation, in particular the progress made by the Task Force. As a follow-up of the discussions held at the ninth session of the CWS, the 3D Task Force leader has been working on a proposal for a potential editorial update to reflect the comments from the Member States. The updated version will be initially discussed with the Task Force Members. The Task Force plans to develop and discuss search and comparison methods for 3D visual representations. The CWS noted that the Task Force needs more time to work on 3D search methods, given the ongoing investigations and studies, as well as limited experience many Task Force members currently have with the subject matter.

123. The Task Force leader asked whether the fast track could be authorized to the 3D Task Force to revise WIPO Standard ST.91 for editorial changes. The Secretariat responded that the fask track would not be appropriate to revise Stanard ST.91 as it is not expected to have continuous revisions such as WIPO Standards ST.96 and ST.97.

#### Agenda Item 19: Analysis of survey results on calendar dates

124. Discussions were based on document CWS/10/18.

125. The CWS noted the content of the document, in particular the results of the calendar dates survey. Responses were received from 37 Member States and regional IPOs. Three quarters of respondents still use day-first date formats in some published documents, despite the recommendation by ST.2 to use year-first date formats. About half of respondents reported that they still spell out month names (either full or abbreviated) in some published documents rather than using purely numeric date formats. Three quarters of respondents never omit leading zeroes in published dates, which complies with the recommendations of ST.2.

126. One delegation suggested that the Part 7 Task Force discuss the reasons for variations across Offices and how to increase compliance with ST.2.

127. The Delegation of the Russian Federation informed the CWS that it recently responded to the survey. The CWS noted that the Secretariat would include the new entry from the delegation into the published survey and agreed on reflecting the response to the survey analysis.

128. The CWS approved the survey analysis in paragraphs 3 to 11 of document CWS/10/18 with the amendments by the Secretariat as needed for publication in the *WIPO Handbook*. The CWS requested the Secretariat to adapt the survey, as needed, with regard to the new entry, for the publication.

#### Agenda Item 20: Report on 2021 Annual Technical Reports (ATRs)

129. Discussions were based on document CWS/10/19.

130. The CWS noted the content of the document, in particular the responses by IPOs to circulars C.CWS.158-160 requesting submission of ATR information for 2021. Responses were received from 17 IPOs, which represents a slight decline from last year.

131. Seven of the 17 responding IPOs used the simplified ATR format approved at the ninth session of the CWS to provide links to information on their websites. Even among those participants, a substantial amount of text was still provided for instructional purposes or for information not available on their website.

#### Agenda Item 21: Update of the WIPO Handbook on Industrial Property Information and Documentation

132. Discussions were based on a presentation by the International Bureau. The presentation is available on the meeting page as document [CWS/10/ITEM 21 IB](#).

133. The CWS noted the content of the presentation, in particular the updates made to the *WIPO Handbook* in 2022 and plans for further revisions in 2023, in particular Part 6: recommendations on minimum contents for IPO websites and Part 8: Terms and Abbreviations. The CWS noted that the International Bureau plans to present proposals for updating Parts 6 and 8 for consideration at its eleventh session.

#### Agenda Item 22: Report by the International Bureau on the provision of technical advice and assistance for capacity building to industrial property offices in connection with the mandate of the CWS

134. Discussions were based on document CWS/10/20.

135. The CWS noted the content of the document, in particular the 2021 activities of the International Bureau related to providing technical advice and assistance for capacity building to IPOs regarding dissemination of IP standards information. The Secretariat received a series of requests for technical assistance and training in 2021, regarding support for implementing both WIPO Standards ST.26 and ST.96. To support IPOs and applicants to implement WIPO Standard ST.26, the International Bureau developed WIPO Sequence Suite software, in close collaboration with IPOs and end user groups. With regard to the request for training for WIPO Standard ST.96, the International Bureau, in collaboration with the XML4IP Task Force, proposed creating a 'Getting started with ST.96' guide. The Secretariat continues to be committed to providing technical assistance and training regarding WIPO Standards on demand, depending on the availability of resources.

136. The CWS also noted that at the end of 2021, 90 IPOs from developing countries in all regions were actively using WIPO's IP Office Business Solutions for the administration of their IP rights, in which WIPO Standards are integrated. Fifty-one Offices were participating in one of the online exchange platforms offered by WIPO (the Centralized Access to Search and Examination and the Digital Access Service). A key focus is to upgrade the service level of IPOs by assisting them to move to online services for filing and for IP information dissemination.

137. Following requests, the International Bureau provided two training seminars via an online platform on the International Patent Classification (IPC) for officials and examiners in 2021. The International Bureau also provided seven online training courses and seminars in 2021 on the use of International Classifications for trademarks and industrial designs for officials and examiners of IPOs. The training programs included how to use the relevant WIPO Standards.

138. The CWS noted that the International Bureau has been working together with many IPOs, particularly in certain groups of developing countries, to promote the exchange of IP data with a view to providing users in those countries with greater access to IP information originating from those IPOs. The exchange of IP data was organized in accordance with relevant WIPO Standards. The trademark collections of the following countries have been included in Global Brand Database during the year 2021 in chronological order: Cuba, Kyrgyzstan, Vanuatu and Zambia; the patent collections of the following countries have been included in PATENTSCOPE during the year 2021: Finland, Kazakhstan, New Zealand, and Poland. The industrial design collections of Cuba, Indonesia, Peru, Singapore and Viet Nam have also been added in WIPO's Global Design Database in 2021.

139. The CWS took note of the 2021 activities of the International Bureau, related to providing technical advice and assistance for capacity building to IPOs, regarding dissemination of IP standards information. This document will serve as a basis of the relevant report to be presented to the WIPO General Assembly to be held in 2023, as requested at its 40th session held in October 2011 (see paragraph 190 of document WO/GA/40/19).

#### Agenda Item 23: Exchange of information on digitalization activities

140. Discussions were based on presentations by Delegations of Australia, Norway, Spain and the Russian Federation.

141. The CWS noted the content of the presentations. The presentations are available on the meeting page as documents [CWS/10/ITEM 23 IP AUSTRALIA](#), [CWS/10/ITEM 23 NIPO](#), [CWS/10/ITEM 23 OEPM](#), and [CWS/10/ITEM 23 ROSPATENT](#). The Delegation of Spain informed the CWS of the summary of discussions which took place in the tenth session of ICT Roadmap meeting as the host of the session.

#### Agenda Item 24: Summary by the Chair

142. The Summary by the Chair was prepared and distributed for information purposes. The CWS noted the Summary by the Chair.

#### Meetings of the CWS Task Forces

143. During this session, the following CWS Task Forces held informal meetings: Name Standardization, ICT Strategy for Standards, API and Sequence Listings Task Forces, and the joint meeting of XML4IP and Legal Status Task Forces. The CWS was informed of the progress made regarding their respective tasks in the said meetings.

Agenda Item 25: Closing of the session

144. The meeting was closed by the Chair on November 25, 2022.

Adoption of the report of the session

*145. This report was adopted by the participants to the tenth session of the CWS via an e-forum.*

[Annex I follows]

LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS/  
LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

**I. ÉTATS MEMBRES/MEMBER STATES**

(dans l'ordre alphabétique des noms français des États)  
(in alphabetical order of the names in French)

ALLEMAGNE/GERMANY

Thomas PLARRE (Mr.), Examiner, German Patent and Trademark Office (DPMA), Munich

Katja BRABEC (Ms.), Senior Advisor, International Information Technology Cooperation,  
2.4.3.D - International Information Technology Cooperation, German Patent and Trade Mark  
Office (DPMA), Munich

ARABIE SAOUDITE/SAUDI ARABIA

Ali ALHARBI (Mr.), Head, IP Information Center, Deputy Head, Delegation, Saudi Authority  
for Intellectual Property (SAIP), Riyadh

Hebah ALOMARI (Ms.), Operations Services Supervisor, IP Services, Saudi Authority for  
Intellectual Property (SAIP), Riyadh

Nourah ALAMARI (Ms.), IP Enablement Executive Director, IP Enablement, Saudi Authority  
for Intellectual Property (SAIP), Riyadh

ARMÉNIE/ARMENIA

Vardan AVETYAN (Mr.), Chief Specialist, Intellectual Property Office, Ministry of Economy of  
the Republic of Armenia, Yerevan

AUSTRALIE/AUSTRALIA

Yohan RAMASUNDARA (Mr.), Senior Director, Innovation and Digital Services, Innovation  
and Technology Group, IP Australia, Department of Industry, Science and Resources,  
Canberra

Ivanka BARISIC (Ms.), Assistant Director, International ICT Cooperation, Innovation and  
Digital Services, Innovation and Technology Group, IP Australia, Department of Industry,  
Science and Resources, Canberra

Zohair HUSSAIN (Mr.), Assistant Director, International ICT Cooperation, Innovation and  
Digital Services, Innovation and Technology Group, IP Australia, Department of Industry,  
Science and Resources, Canberra

Julia PRICE (Ms.), Assistant Director, International ICT Cooperation, Innovation and Digital  
Services, Innovation and Technology Group, IP Australia, Department of Industry, Science  
and Resources, Canberra

Mladen MITIC (Mr.), Director, International ICT Cooperation, Innovation and Digital Services,  
Innovation and Technology Group, IP Australia, Department of Industry, Science and  
Resources, Canberra

AUTRICHE/AUSTRIA

Gloria MIRESCU (Ms.), Patent Examiner, Austrian Patent Office, Federal Ministry of Climate Action, Environment, Energy, Mobility, Innovation and Technology, Vienna

#### BAHREÏN/BAHRAIN

Rashid ALSAYOOF (Mr.), Head, Designs and Patent Registration, Ministry of Industry and Commerce, Manama

#### BRÉSIL/BRAZIL

Alexandre CIANCIO (Mr.), General-Coordinator of Technological Information, National Institute of Industrial Property (INPI), Ministry of Economy, Rio de Janeiro

#### CANADA

Jean-Charles DAOUST (Mr.), Director General, Programs Branch, Canadian Intellectual Property Office (CIPO), Gatineau

#### CHINE/CHINA

WANG Xiaofeng (Ms.), Level II Consultant, Information Technology Department, China National Intellectual Property Administration (CNIPA), Beijing

GUO Botao (Mr.), Deputy Divisional Director, Patent Documentation Department, China National Intellectual Property Administration (CNIPA), Beijing

HUANG Yuxiang (Mr.), Deputy Divisional Director, Intellectual Property Publishing House, China National Intellectual Property Administration (CNIPA), Beijing

MA Xiaolei (Ms.), Staff Member, Intellectual Property Publishing House, China National Intellectual Property Administration (CNIPA), Beijing

WANG Cheng (Ms.), Level I Principal Staff Member, Patent Documentation Department, China National Intellectual Property Administration (CNIPA), Beijing

#### CROATIE/CROATIA

Saša PIGAC (Mr.), Head, Digital Business and Quality Department, State Intellectual Property Office (SIPO), Zagreb

Vesna JEVTIĆ (Ms.), IT Specialist, Digital Business and Quality Department, State Intellectual Property Office (SIPO), Zagreb

## ESPAGNE/SPAIN

María Rosa CARRERAS DURBÁN (Sra.), Jefa de Área de Divulgación de la Propiedad Industrial, División de Tecnologías de la Información, Oficina Española de Patentes y Marcas (OEPM), Ministerio de Industria, Comercio y Turismo, Madrid

Rosa ORIENT QUILIS (Sra.), Oficial, Misión Permanente, Ginebra

## ÉTATS-UNIS D'AMÉRIQUE/UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Arti SHAH (Ms.), International Program Manager, Office of International Patent Cooperation, United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO), Department of Commerce, Alexandria

Nelson YANG (Mr.), Senior Advisor and Director, International Patent Business Solutions, Office of International Patent Cooperation, United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO), Department of Commerce, Alexandria

Virginia HO (Ms.), Information Technology Specialist, Office of Chief Information Officer, United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO), Department of Commerce, Alexandria

Narith TITH (Mr.), Information Technology Specialist, Office of Chief Information Officer, United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO), Department of Commerce, Alexandria

Yasmine FULENA (Ms.), IP Advisor, Permanent Mission, Geneva

## FÉDÉRATION DE RUSSIE/RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Vladislav MAMONTOV (Mr.), Head, Multilateral Cooperation Division, International Cooperation Department, Federal Service for Intellectual Property (ROSPATENT), Moscow

Sergey BIRYUKOV (Mr.), Head, Center for Design, Development and Maintenance of Applied Information Systems, Federal Institute of Industrial Property (FIPS), Moscow

Olga FEDOSEEVA (Ms.), Deputy Head, Division for Information Search System Design, Federal Institute of Industrial Property (FIPS), Moscow

Alexander GORBUNOV (Mr.), Director Adviser, Office of the Director, Federal Institute of Industrial Property (FIPS), Moscow

Yury ZONTOV (Mr.), Senior Researcher, Division for Software Application Development, Federal Institute of Industrial Property (FIPS), Moscow

## FINLANDE/FINLAND

Jouko BERNDTSON (Mr.), Senior Patent Examiner, Finnish Patent and Registration Office (PRH), Ministry of Economic Affairs and Employment of Finland, Helsinki

## FRANCE

Jean-Baptiste DARGAUD (M.), ingénieur brevet, Département de la propriété industrielle et des entreprises, Institut national de la propriété industrielle (INPI), Courbevoie

Sabine DARRIGADE (Mme), cheffe, Division dissémination données, Département IP, Institut national de la propriété industrielle (INPI), Courbevoie

## GHANA

Mark ADJABENG (Mr.), Trade Mark Examiner, Trade Marks Office, Registrar General's Department, Ghana Industrial Property Office, Accra

Teddy EDU-YAW (Mr.), Patent Examiner, Patent Section, Registrar General's Department, Ghana Industrial Property Office, Accra

## HONGRIE/HUNGARY

János ERDŐSSY (Mr.), Head, Chemistry and Biotechnology Section, Hungarian Intellectual Property Office (HIPO), Budapest

## INDE/INDIA

Mohit MOHIT (Mr.), Senior Examiner, Trade Marks and Geographical Indications, Copyright Office, Office of the Controller General of Patents, Designs and Trade Marks, Department for Promotion of Industry and Internal Trade, Intellectual Property India, Government of India, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, New Delhi

## INDONÉSIE/INDONESIA

Anis ERSITA (Ms.), Head of Administration, Directorate of Information Technology, Directorate General of Intellectual Property (DGIP), Ministry of Law and Human Rights of the Republic of Indonesia, Jakarta

Abdul HALIM (Mr.), Staff, Directorate of Information Technology, Directorate General of Intellectual Property (DGIP), Ministry of Law and Human Rights of the Republic of Indonesia, Jakarta

Rudi SETIAWAN (Mr.), Staff, Directorate of Information Technology, Directorate General of Intellectual Property (DGIP), Ministry of Law and Human Rights of the Republic of Indonesia, Jakarta

## IRAQ

Maitham ZUBAIDY (Mr.), Chief Engineer, Intellectual Property Department, Ministry of Industry and Minerals, Baghdad

## ISRAËL/ISRAEL

Naomi GEHLER (Ms.), System Manager, Information Technology, Israel Patent Office, Ministry of Justice, Jerusalem

Miriam HARRIS (Ms.), Project Manager, Information Technology, Israel Patent Office, Ministry of Justice, Jerusalem

ITALIE/ITALY

Lino FANELLA (Mr.), Information Technology Division, Italian Patent and Trademark Office, Ministry of Economic Development, Rome

JAPON/JAPAN

IHOSHI Junya (Mr.), Deputy Director, Information Technology Policy Planning Office, Japan Patent Office (JPO), Tokyo

KANEKO Hidehiko (Mr.), Deputy Director, Patent Information Policy Planning Office, Japan Patent Office (JPO), Tokyo

NIBOSHI Yosui (Mr.), Assistant Director, Information Technology Policy Planning Office, Japan Patent Office (JPO), Tokyo

KENYA

Sammy LEWA (Mr.), Patent Examiner Pharmaceuticals, Technical Services, Patent Division, Kenya Industrial Property Institute (KIPI), Ministry of Industrialization, Trade and Enterprise Development, Nairobi

KOWEÏT/KUWAIT

Abdulaziz TAQI (Mr.), Commercial Attaché, Permanent Mission, Geneva

LITUANIE/LITHUANIA

Liūnė STOROŽENKAITĖ (Ms.), Specialist, Industrial Property Information Division, State Patent Bureau of the Republic of Lithuania, Vilnius

MADAGASCAR

Naharisoa Oby RAFANOTSIMIVA (Mme), coordinateur juridique, Coordination juridique, Office malgache de la propriété industrielle (OMAPI), Ministère de l'industrialisation, du commerce et de la consommation (MICC), Antananarivo

Mathilde Manitra Soa RAHARINONY (Mme), chef, Service de l'enregistrement international des marques, service de l'enregistrement international des marques, Office malgache de la propriété industrielle (OMAPI), Ministère de l'industrialisation, du commerce et de la consommation (MICC), Antananarivo

MALTE/MALTA

Nicoleta CROITORU-BANTEA (Ms.), Political Officer, Permanent Mission, Geneva

## MAROC/MOROCCO

Sara EL ALAMI (Mme), cheffe, Service des affaires juridiques et du contentieux, Département des affaires juridiques, Bureau marocain du droit d'auteur (BMDA), Département des affaires juridiques, Ministère de la culture, de la jeunesse et des sports, Rabat

## MEXIQUE/MEXICO

Felix ALAVEDRA CAVA (Sr.), Especialista en Propiedad Industrial, Dirección Divisional De Sistemas y Tecnologías de la Información, Instituto Mexicano de la Propiedad Industrial (IMPI), Ciudad de México

Omar Santiago GALVEZ CASTILLO (Sr.), Coordinador Departamental de Examen de Forma, Dirección Divisional de Patentes, Instituto Mexicano de la Propiedad Industrial (IMPI), Ciudad de México

Mario Iran PARRA HERNÁNDEZ (Sr.), Coordinador Departamental de Documentación Electrónica, Dirección Divisional de Sistemas y Tecnologías de la Información, Instituto Mexicano de la Propiedad Industrial (IMPI), Ciudad de México

Jessica SÁNCHEZ VAZQUEZ (Sra.), Coordinadora Departamental de Desarrollo de Sistemas de Patentes, Dirección Divisional de Sistemas y Tecnologías de la Información, Instituto Mexicano de la Propiedad Industrial (IMPI), Ciudad de México

## NICARAGUA

Claudia Mercedes PÉREZ LÓPEZ (Sra.), Ministro Consejero, Misión Permanente, Ginebra

## NORVÈGE/NORWAY

Jens Petter SOLLIE (Mr.), Business Architect, Digital Services, Norwegian Industrial Property Office (NIPO), Oslo

Magne LANGSAETER (Mr.), IPR System Product Owner, Digital Services, Norwegian Industrial Property Office (NIPO), Oslo

Pål Vidar NYDAHL (Mr.), Senior Adviser, Digital Services, Norwegian Industrial Property Office (NIPO), Oslo

## OUGANDA/UGANDA

Arthur KWESIGA (Mr.), Director, ICT and Innovation, Uganda Registration Services Bureau Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs (URSB), Kampala

## PAKISTAN

Ali RASUL (Mr.), Deputy Director, Information Technology, Intellectual Property Organization of Pakistan (IPO-Pakistan), Ministry of Commerce, Islamabad

PARAGUAY

Joel Emiliano TALAVERA ZARATE (Sr.), Director Nacional, Dirección Nacional de Propiedad Intelectual (DINAPI), Dirección Nacional de Propiedad Intelectual, Asunción

PÉROU/PERU

Lourdes LOPEZ RENGIFO (Sra.), Especialista 2, Dirección de Invenciones y Nuevas Tecnologías, Instituto Nacional de Defensa de la Competencia y de la Protección de la Propiedad Intelectual, Presidencia del Consejo de Ministros (PCM), Lima

Zenia PANDURO R. (Sra.), Ejecutivo, Cooperación Técnica y Relaciones Institucionales, Instituto Nacional de Defensa de la Competencia y de la Protección de la Propiedad Intelectual (INDECOPI), Lima

PHILIPPINES

Lizzie CABRERA (Ms.), Director, Information Technology Management Service, Intellectual Property Office of the Philippines (IPOPHL), Manila

Darlene BARRACAS (Ms.), Information Technology Officer, Information Technology Management Service, Intellectual Property Office of the Philippines (IPOPHL), Taguig City

Rizalino GALACIO (Mr.), Information Technology Officer, Information Technology Management Service, Intellectual Property Office of the Philippines (IPOPHL), Taguig City

RÉPUBLIQUE DE CORÉE/REPUBLIC OF KOREA

LEE Jintae (Mr.), Director, Copyright Trade and Industry Team, Korea Copyright Commission, The Copyright Bureau of the Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism of the Republic of Korea, Seoul

PAK Yunseok (Mr.), Senior Researcher, Copyright Trade, The Copyright Bureau of the Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism of the Republic of Korea, Jinju

CHOI Sunghyeok (Mr.), Assistant Director, Information System Division, Korean Intellectual Property Office (KIPO), Daejeon

KIM SungSoo (Mr.), Investigator, Korea Trade Commission, Sejong

LEE Jumi (Ms.), Deputy Director, Information and Customer Policy Division, Korean Intellectual Property Office (KIPO), Daejeon

NAM Euiho (Mr.), Investigator, Korea Trade Commission, Sejong

CHOI Hyeyoon (Ms.), Deputy Director, Cultural Trade and Cooperation Division, The Copyright Bureau, Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism of the Republic of Korea, Sejong

KIM Sojeong (Ms.), Policy Specialist, Cultural Trade and Cooperation Division, The Copyright Bureau, Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism of the Republic of Korea, Sejong

LEE Jinyong (Mr.), IP Attaché, Permanent Mission, Geneva

SONG Sangyong (Mr.), Deputy Director, Information Management Division, Korean Intellectual Property Office (KIPO), Daejeon

RÉPUBLIQUE DE MOLDOVA/REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA

Nicolae DIMOV (Mr.), Principal Specialist, Institutional Management Direction, State Agency on Intellectual Property (AGEPI), Chişinău

Vadim URSU (Mr.), Head, Institutional Management Direction, State Agency on Intellectual Property (AGEPI), Chişinău

RÉPUBLIQUE TCHÈQUE/CZECH REPUBLIC

Michal VERNER (Mr.), Deputy Director, Patent Information Department, Industrial Property Office of the Czech Republic, Prague

ROUMANIE/ROMANIA

Monica SOARE-RADA (Ms.), Head, European Patents and International Applications Bureau, State Office for Inventions and Trademarks (OSIM), Bucharest

Letitia STOIAN (Ms.), Director, Patent Directorate, State Office for Inventions and Trademarks (OSIM), Bucharest

ROYAUME-UNI/UNITED KINGDOM

Julie DALTREY (Ms.), Head, Metadata Management, Data, Intellectual Property Office United Kingdom (UK IPO), Newport

Lauren JOHNSON (Ms.), Designs Manager, UKIPO Designs, Intellectual Property Office United Kingdom (UK IPO), Newport

SINGAPOUR/SINGAPORE

Andrew AU (Mr.), Senior Trade Mark Examiner, Registry of Trade Marks, Intellectual Property Office of Singapore (IPOS), Singapore

Bernard ONG (Mr.), Group Director, Policy and Engagement, Intellectual Property Office of Singapore (IPOS), Singapore

Rouxin LAI (Ms.), Business Analyst, Intellectual Property Office of Singapore (IPOS), Singapore

Lee LILY (Ms.), Principal Assistant Director, Registries of Patents, Designs and Plant Varieties, Intellectual Property Office of Singapore (IPOS), Singapore

SOUDAN/SUDAN

Nadia MUDAWI (Ms.), Senior Legal Counsel, Registrar General of Intellectual Property Administration, Ministry of Justice, Khartoum

SRI LANKA

Buthgama MUDIYANSE SUMANA BANDARA (Ms.), Additional Secretary, Agency Coordination, Ministry of Trade, Commerce and Food Security, Colombo

SUÈDE/SWEDEN

Åsa VIKEN (Ms.), Process Owner, Patents, Patent Department, Swedish Intellectual Property Office (PRV), Stockholm

THAÏLANDE/THAILAND

Tawansongsang KARNKAWINPONG (Mr.), Senior Patent Examiner, Department of Intellectual Property (DIP), Ministry of Commerce, Nonthaburi

Peerathai PISANTHAMMANONT (Mr.), Developer, IT, Department of Intellectual Property (DIP), Ministry of Commerce, Nonthaburi

TÜRKIYE

Duygu MERT (Ms.), City Planner, International Relations and Education Department, Directorate General for Copyright, Ministry of Culture and Tourism, Altındağ

VENEZUELA (RÉPUBLIQUE BOLIVARIENNE DU)//VENEZUELA (BOLIVARIAN REPUBLIC OF)

Milethny MALDONADO (Sra.), Coordinadora de Área de Multilaterales, Servicio Autónomo de la Propiedad Intelectual (SAPI), Ministerio del Poder Popular de Comercio Nacional, Caracas

Catherine VIELMA (Sra.), Analista de Asuntos Internacionales, Servicio Autónomo de la Propiedad Intelectual (SAPI), Ministerio del Poder Popular de Comercio Nacional, Caracas

**II. ORGANISATIONS  
INTERGOUVERNEMENTALES/ INTERGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS**

ORGANISATION EURASIENNE DES BREVETS (OEAB)/EURASIAN PATENT ORGANIZATION (EAPO)

Aurelia CEBAN (Mr.), Deputy Director, Examination Department, Moscow

Andrey KONDRAT (Mr.), Director, Patent Application Docflow Operation and Control Division, Examination Department, Moscow

Andrey SEKRETOV (Mr.), Director, International Relations Department, Moscow

ORGANISATION EUROPÉENNE DES BREVETS (OEB)/EUROPEAN PATENT ORGANISATION (EPO)

Fernando FERREIRA (Mr.), IT Administrator, WIPO Sequence Listings TF Leader CWS Task No. 44, Business Information Technology (BIT), Rijswijk

Leslie RIPAUD (Ms.), Patent Examiner - SEQL expert, DG1 Biotechnology, Munich

Vesna VAJSBAHER (Ms.), OPS and Bulk Data Specialist, EPO Patent Knowledge, Vienna

Angel ALEDO LOPEZ (Mr.), CTO, Business Information Technology (BIT), Munich

Domenico GOLZIO (Mr.), Director, CTO Office, Wassenaar

David HORAT (Mr.), Head, Department in Prior Art Data Management, Business Information Technology (BIT), Rijswijk

ORGANISATION RÉGIONALE AFRICAINE DE LA PROPRIÉTÉ INTELLECTUELLE (ARIPO)/AFRICAN REGIONAL INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION (ARIPO)

John Fredrick Omiti ONUNGA (Mr.), Patent Examiner, IP Operations/Substantive Examination, Harare

UNION EUROPÉENNE (UE)/EUROPEAN UNION (EU)

Thom CLARK (Mr.), Legal Specialist, Legal Department, Alicante

Pamela LOPEZ VEIGA (Ms.), Information Technology Solutions Architect, Digital Transformation Department, Alicante

Erjola MURATAJ (Ms.), Seconded National Expert, Project Manager on Tools, Institutional and Cooperation Department (ICD), Alicante

Adam STUBBINGS (Mr.), Digital Transformation Department, Alicante

Lorenzino VACCARI (Mr.), Information Technology Expert, Digital Transformation Department, Alicante

Raymond KLAASSEN (Mr.), Head, Architecture and Development, Digital Transformation Department, Alicante

Panagiotis SPAGOPOULOS (Mr.), Information Technology Architecture Lead, Digital Transformation Department, Alicante

UNION INTERNATIONALE POUR LA PROTECTION DES OBTENTIONS VÉGÉTALES (UPOV)/INTERNATIONAL UNION FOR THE PROTECTION OF NEW VARIETIES OF PLANTS (UPOV)

Hend MADHOUR (Ms.), Information Technology Officer, Geneva

**III. ORGANISATIONS NON GOUVERNEMENTALES/NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS**

Association européenne des étudiants en droit (ELSA International)/European Law Students' Association (ELSA International)

Leyli AHMADOVA (Ms.), Head of Delegation, ELSA, Brussels

Association internationale pour la protection de la propriété intellectuelle (AIPPI)/International Association for the Protection of Intellectual Property (AIPPI)

Joginder SINGH (Mr.), Member, IP Office and Practice and Procedures Committee, Zurich

China Council for the Promotion of International Trade (CCPIT)

HUANG Yuan (Mr.), Expert, Beijing

WANG Chongya (Mr.), Expert, Beijing

YAO Xin (Mr.), Expert, Expert, Beijing

Confederacy of Patent Information User Groups (CEPIUG)

Guido MORADEI (Mr.), Delegate, Relations with IPOs, Varese

Fédération européenne des sociétés de gestion collective de producteurs pour la copie privée audiovisuelle (EUROCOPYA)/European Federation of Joint Management Societies of Producers for Private Audiovisual Copying (EUROCOPYA)

Juliette PRISSARD (Ms.), Director, Procirep, Eurocinema, Brussels

Idzard VAN DER PUYL (Mr.), Procirep, Eurocinema Brussels

International Trademark Association (INTA)

Thomas BARRETT (Mr.), Chair, Blockchain Subcommittee, Woburn

Olha VOLOTKEVYCH (Ms.), Intern, Cork

Moish PELTZ (Mr.), Partner, Emerging Issues Committee, New York

Ordre Suprême des Ancêtres (OSA)

Raphaella AYINA (Ms.), Observatrice auprès du CWS, Secrétariat Général, Ottawa

**IV. BUREAU/OFFICERS**

Présidente/Chair Åsa VIKEN (Mme/Ms.) (Suède/Sweden)

Vice-présidents/Vice-Chairs: Nourah ALAMARI (Mme/Ms.) (Arabie Saoudite/Saudi Arabia)

Secrétaire/Secretary: Young-Woo YUN (M./Mr.) (OMPI/WIPO)

**V. BUREAU INTERNATIONAL DE L'ORGANISATION MONDIALE DE LA PROPRIÉTÉ INTELLECTUELLE (OMPI)/INTERNATIONAL BUREAU OF THE WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION (WIPO)**

Kunihiko FUSHIMI (M./Mr.), directeur de la Division des classifications internationales et des normes, Secteur de de l'infrastructure et des plateformes /Director, International Classifications and Standards Division, Infrastructure and Platforms Sector

Young-Woo YUN (M./Mr.), chef, Section des normes, Division des classifications internationales et des normes, Secteur de de l'infrastructure et des plateformes /Head, Standards Section, International Classifications and Standards Division, Infrastructure and Platforms Sector

Edward ELLIOTT (M./Mr.), administrateur chargé de l'information en matière de propriété intellectuelle de la Section des normes, Division des classifications internationales et des normes, Secteur de de l'infrastructure et des plateformes / Intellectual Property Information Officer, Standards Section, International Classifications and Standards Division, Infrastructure and Platforms Sector

Emma FRANCIS (Mme/Ms.), spécialiste des données de propriété intellectuelle de la Section des normes, Division des classifications internationales et des normes, Secteur de de l'infrastructure et des plateformes / Intellectual Property Data Expert, Standards Section, International Classifications and Standards Division, Infrastructure and Platforms Sector

[L'annexe II suit/  
Annex II follows]

## AGENDA

1. Opening of the Tenth Session
2. Election of the Chair and two Vice-Chairs
3. Adoption of the agenda
4. Organizational matters and special rules of procedures  
See document CWS/10/2.
5. Consideration of the Work Program and Tasks List of the CWS  
See document CWS/10/3.
6. Revision of WIPO Standard ST.3  
See document CWS/10/4.
7. IP Data Management using XML or JSON
  - (a) Report by the XML4IP Task Force (Task No.41, Task No. 47 and Task No.64)  
See document CWS/10/5.
  - (b) Proposal for a new WIPO standard on JSON  
See document CWS/10/6.
8. Orphan Works
  - (a) Proposals for improvement of copyright metadata in WIPO Standard ST.96  
See document CWS/10/7.
  - (b) Proposal for the next step in relation to copyright orphan works metadata  
See document CWS/10/8.
9. Blockchain for IP ecosystem
  - (a) Report by the Blockchain Task Force (Task No. 59)  
See document CWS/10/9.
  - (b) Blockchain related activities by Offices
10. Proposal for establishing an international database to standardize applicant names  
See document CWS/10/10.
11. Legal Status Data
  - (a) Report by the Legal Status Task Force (Task No. 47)  
See document CWS/10/11.
  - (b) Implementation of WIPO Standards ST.27, ST.61 and ST.87 by Offices
12. Sequence Listings
  - (a) Report by the Sequence Listings Task Force (Task No. 44)  
See document CWS/10/12.
  - (b) Proposal for the revision of WIPO Standard ST.26  
See document CWS/10/13.
  - (c) WIPO Sequence Suite development and support  
See document CWS/10/14.
  - (d) Implementation of WIPO Standard ST.26 by Offices

13. Patent Authority File
  - (a) Updates of the WIPO Authority File Portal
  - (b) Implementation of WIPO Standard ST.37 by Offices
14. Digital Transformation
  - (a) Report by the Digital Transformation Task Force (Task No. 62)
  - (b) Analysis of survey results on Office practices for Digital Transformation  
See document CWS/10/15.
15. Report by the Part 7 Task Force (Task No. 50)  
See document CWS/10/16.
16. Report by the Name Standardization Task Force (Task No. 55)  
See document CWS/10/17.
17. Report by the ICT Strategy for Standards Task Force (Task No. 58)
18. Report by the 3D Task Force (Task No. 61)
19. Analysis of survey results on calendar dates  
See document CWS/10/18.
20. Report on 2021 Annual Technical Reports (ATRs)  
See document CWS/10/19.
21. Update of the WIPO Handbook on Intellectual Property Information and Documentation
22. Report by the International Bureau on the provision of technical advice and assistance for capacity building to industrial property offices in connection with the mandate of the CWS  
See document CWS/10/20.
23. Exchange of information on Offices' digitalization activities
24. Summary by the Chair
25. Closing of the session

[Annex III follows]

## **ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS AND SPECIAL RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE COMMITTEE ON WIPO STANDARDS (CWS)**

*Adopted at the tenth session of the Committee on  
WIPO Standards (CWS), November 25, 2022*

1. Subject to the following Organizational Matters and Special Rules of Procedure, the General Rules of Procedure of WIPO shall apply to the Committee on WIPO Standards (CWS).
2. The CWS shall report to the General Assembly of WIPO at least once every two years.
3. Recommendations and proposals from the CWS may be passed either to the WIPO General Assembly, to the Program and Budget Committee, or directly to the Director General, as needed.
4. The CWS shall establish its work program, priorities and working methods.
5. The decisions adopted by the CWS are considered as recommendations directed to Member States, in particular to their national or regional intellectual property offices, to the International Bureau of WIPO, to international organizations, and to any other national or international institutions interested in intellectual property matters.
6. The CWS may establish or dissolve task forces. Task forces will deal with specific tasks as required and be subject to the rules provided in paragraphs 23 to 29, below.

### **MEMBERSHIP**

7. All WIPO Member States as well as Members of the Paris Union or Berne Union that are not Member States of WIPO shall be members of the CWS. In addition, the African Intellectual Property Organization (OAPI), the African Regional Intellectual Property Organization (ARIPO), the Benelux Office for Intellectual Property (BOIP), the Eurasian Patent Organization (EAPO), the European Patent Organization (EPO), the International Union for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants (UPOV), the Nordic Patent Institute (NPI), the Patent Office of the Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf (GCC), Visegrad Patent Institute (VPI) and the European Union shall be members of the CWS, provided that they shall not have the right to vote.
8. Observer status is extended to Member States of the United Nations that are not Member States of WIPO, the Paris Union or Berne Union. The CWS determines which intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations shall be admitted to its meetings as observers. The Director General of WIPO shall invite, as observers, to the meetings of the CWS such entities that were admitted as observers by the CWS. Additionally, observers that were admitted by the Assemblies of the Member States of WIPO, shall be invited by the Director General of WIPO, if the subject matter of the CWS meetings seems to be of direct interest to these observers.

### **MANDATE**

9. The mandate of the CWS will be to provide a forum to adopt new or revised WIPO standards, policies, recommendations and statements of principle relating to intellectual property data, global information system related matters, information services on the global system, data dissemination and documentation, which may be promulgated or referred to the WIPO General Assembly for consideration or approval.

10. The Secretariat will endeavor to provide technical advice and assistance for capacity building to IP Offices by undertaking projects regarding dissemination of IP standards information. The Secretariat will provide regular written reports to the CWS on the details of such activities, as well as any other technical assistance and capacity-building activities that it undertakes in connection with the mandate, and provide the same to the General Assembly. The Secretariat will provide funding assistance for the participation of LDCs and developing countries, within existing budgetary resources, in order to encourage and facilitate the participation of technical experts from developing countries and LDCs in CWS meetings.

#### SESSIONS

11. The CWS will meet once a year and will receive annual progress reports from its subsidiary bodies.

#### OFFICERS

12. The CWS shall have a Chair and two Vice-Chairs and shall elect them for a term of two consecutive sessions. Any outgoing Chair or Vice-Chair may be immediately re-elected to office for one more consecutive term only.

#### MEETING DOCUMENTATION

13. Meeting documentation shall be published on the website of WIPO. The letter of invitation and the draft agenda will be distributed by electronic means and published on the website of WIPO.

#### PROJECT TASK INITIATION

14. Tasks shall be created by the CWS.

15. Consideration of a new proposal, subject or activity, including requests for the revision of existing WIPO Standards or the preparation of new standards, may be initiated by any member, observer, task force or by the International Bureau by submission of a written project brief to the Secretariat. The project brief should include a clear description of the problem or specific need to be addressed, and indicate how it was determined. The project brief should also provide the objectives of the task, options for solution and the expected benefits.

16. The Secretariat shall present the requests and project briefs received to the first available session of the CWS for consideration with some additional information such as cost estimates, resource requirements, risks, success factors and the implications of the task on the existing CWS tasks. The CWS shall determine whether each specific request falls within its mandate and how to proceed with that request. The CWS shall also decide the appropriate subsequent action, including whether there is a need for creating a task and a task force to handle the task.

17. On each request adopted as a task for inclusion in its work program, the CWS shall determine the corresponding task description and the priority to be given to the task, including, as far as possible, the proposed action(s) and time frame(s).

18. The CWS shall designate a leader or co-leaders of the task force. If the task should not be assigned to a specific task force, the CWS shall assign a leader for the task. If the incumbent task force leaders inform the Secretariat of their resignation, the Secretariat shall report it to the first available session of the CWS.

#### WORKING METHODS

19. The CWS and, in particular, its task forces shall base their working methods on the intensive use of electronic means set up by the Secretariat. This ensures the flexibility required to allow a maximum number of interested members and observers worldwide to take part in the discussions and consider issues within a short period of time.

20. The authority for approving the creation of new WIPO Standards or for the revision of existing WIPO Standards shall belong to the CWS. The CWS may, however, establish a mechanism for reaching an agreement by electronic means, which may be delegated to its task forces as required. The CWS may also consider exceptionally to provide the authority to a designated task force to make use of the “fast track” procedure for the approval of the revisions of specific WIPO Standards, which require continuous revisions and updates. The “fast track” procedure is defined as follows:

- (a) any proposal to revise the relevant WIPO Standard shall be presented directly or through the Secretariat to the designated Task Force for consideration and approval;
- (b) the designated Task Force is temporarily authorized to approve revisions of the relevant WIPO Standard;
- (c) if there is no consensus reached on the revisions by the designated Task Force, then it shall be presented to the CWS for its consideration; and
- (d) the designated Task Force Leader will inform the CWS of any revision of the relevant WIPO Standard approved by the Task Force at the next session of the CWS.

21. A Chair’s summary shall be distributed to participants at the end of each session of the CWS. It will only refer to the decisions made by the CWS and the status of tasks. A detailed report of the session of the CWS shall be posted on the WIPO website for comments after closing the session. The adoption of the detailed report may take place through electronic means. If it should not be possible to reach an agreement on the detailed report via the electronic means, then the adoption of the said report shall be included in the agenda of the next session of the CWS.

22. The detailed report of a CWS session will reflect only the conclusions of the CWS (decisions, recommendations, opinions, etc.) and will not, in particular, reflect statements attributed to any participant, except where a reservation in relation to any specific conclusion of the CWS is expressed or repeated after the conclusion is reached.

#### TASK FORCES

23. To allow for consideration of a specific issue, a task force shall be constituted on the following basis:

- (a) a request for the creation of a task force may be initiated either by a member, by observers or by the International Bureau;
- (b) a clear mandate for the task force must be agreed by the CWS in advance of the task force’s first discussions; such a document shall include:
  - the task(s) to be handled by the task force;
  - the designation of a task force leader;
  - an indication of the professional/technical competencies needed by delegates participating in the task force discussions; and
- (c) task forces shall report to the CWS.

24. The Secretariat shall set up and maintain an e-forum for each task force, and provide the task force leader with assistance to carry out the work of the task force.

25. The Secretariat shall invite members and observers of the CWS to nominate their representatives to participate in the work of the task force, and shall particularly indicate the professional/technical competencies required. Members and observers should inform the Secretariat of the status of their representatives as soon as their representatives to the task force have been changed so that the membership of the task force is up to date.

26. The status of observer in a task force e-forum may be granted to external contractors of an intellectual property office if the request comes directly from a member.

27. Task forces should carry out their work in a dynamic and flexible environment and transparent manner. Electronic working via e-forums shall be their normal framework, but they may also hold meetings in person or remotely as needed. The information discussed and the work done by a task force at a meeting shall be posted on the e-forum in order to allow task force members and observers who could not attend the meeting to express their views. Substantive discussions and decisions relevant for the work of the task force shall be conducted within the task force.

28. The task force leader shall be responsible for initiating and conducting the task force discussions, making sure the views of all task force members are heard and duly discussed, reporting to the CWS on the agreements reached by the task force and presenting, through the Secretariat, the corresponding proposals for consideration by the CWS. If required, in consultation with the task force leader, the Secretariat may conduct discussion of the task force and/or report the task force's activities to the CWS on behalf of the task force leader.

29. The CWS shall consider, revise, and take appropriate decisions on the recommendations of a task force, or refer the recommendation back to the task force for further consideration.

[Annex IV follows]

**TASK LIST****(a) Tasks discontinued at this session:**

No tasks were discontinued at this session.

**(b) Tasks created at this session and on which work has not started:**

Task No. 65: To prepare a proposal for recommendations on the data package format for the electronic exchange of priority documents and certified copies for patents, marks and industrial designs.

**(c) Tasks revised at this session:**

Task No. 47: Ensure the necessary revisions and updates of WIPO Standards ST.27, ST.87, and ST.61; prepare supporting materials to assist the use of those Standards in the IP community; and support the XML4IP Task Force to develop XML components for legal status event data.

Task No. 64: Ensure the necessary revisions and updates of WIPO Standard ST.97.

**(d) Tasks on which work remains to be done:**

Task No. 24: Collect and publish Annual Technical Reports (ATRs) on Patent, Trademark and Industrial Design Information Activities of the CWS Members (ATR/PI, ATR/TM, ATR/ID).

Task No. 44: Support the International Bureau by providing users' requirements and feedback on the ST.26 authoring and validation software tool; support the International Bureau in the consequential revision of the PCT Administrative Instructions; and prepare necessary revisions of WIPO Standard ST.26.

Task No. 52: Prepare recommendations for systems for providing access to publicly-available patent information of industrial property offices.

Task No. 55: Envisage developing a WIPO standard assisting Industrial Property Offices (IPOs) in providing better "quality at source" in relation to applicant names, prepare a proposal for future actions aimed at the standardization of applicant names in IP documents and present it for consideration by the CWS.

Task No. 56: Ensure the necessary revisions and updates of WIPO Standard ST.90; support the International Bureau in developing a unified catalog of APIs that are made available by Offices; and support the International Bureau in promoting and implementing WIPO Standard ST.90.

Task No. 58: Prepare a proposal for a roadmap of future development and enhancement of WIPO standards, including policy recommendations, with a view to more effective production, sharing, and utilization of data by IP offices and other interested parties, taking the following activities:

- i. to review the Recommendations in Group 1 indicated in the Annex of document CWS/6/3, in collaboration with other relevant CWS Task Forces;
  - ii. to review the Recommendations in Group 2 and Group 3 indicated in the Annex of document CWS/6/3;
  - iii. to prioritize Recommendations and suggest a timeline; and
  - iv. to explore the impact of disruptive technologies on IP administration and IP data in view of harmonization and collaboration.
- Task No. 59: Explore the possibility of using blockchain technology in the processes of providing IP rights protection, processing information about IP objects and their use:
- i. Collect information about IPO developments in use of and experience with blockchain, assess current Industry Standards on blockchain and consider merit and applicability to IPOs;
  - ii. Develop reference models of using blockchain technology in the IP field, including guiding principles, common practice and use of terminology as a framework supporting collaboration, joint projects and proofs of concept; and
  - iii. Prepare a proposal for a new WIPO standard supporting the potential application of blockchain technology within the IP ecosystem.
- Task No. 60: Prepare a proposal for the numbering of INID codes regarding word marks and figurative marks, on splitting INID code (551), and a potential INID code for combined marks.
- Task No. 61: Ensure the necessary revisions and updates of WIPO Standard ST.91, including methods of search for 3D models and 3D images.
- Task No. 62: Review WIPO Standards: ST.6, ST.8, ST.10, ST.11, ST.15, ST.17, ST.18, ST.63 and ST.81, and WIPO Handbook Part 6, in view of electronic publication of IP documentation; and propose revisions of those Standards and materials if needed.
- Task No. 63: Develop visual representation(s) of XML data, based on WIPO XML Standards, for electronic publication.
- (e) Tasks to ensure continuous maintenance of WIPO Standards:
- Task No. 38: Ensure continuous revision and updating of WIPO Standard ST.36.
  - Task No. 39: Ensure the necessary revisions and updates of WIPO Standard ST.66.
  - Task No. 41: Ensure the necessary revisions and updates of WIPO Standard ST.96.
  - Task No. 42: Ensure the necessary revisions and updates of WIPO Standard ST.86.
  - Task No. 57: Ensure the necessary revisions and updates of WIPO Standard ST.88.

(f) Tasks of continuing activity and/or information nature:

- Task No. 18: Identify areas for standardization relevant to the exchange of machine-readable data on the basis of projects envisaged by such bodies as the Five IP Offices (IP5), the Five Trademark Offices (TM5), the Industrial Design 5 Forum (ID5), ISO, IEC and other well-known industry standard-setting bodies.
- Task No. 33: Ongoing revision of WIPO Standards.
- Task No. 33/3: Ongoing revision of WIPO Standard ST.3.
- Task No. 50: Ensure the necessary maintenance and update of surveys published in Part 7 of the WIPO Handbook on Industrial Property Information and Documentation.

(g) Tasks on which work has been held in abeyance:

- Task No. 43: Prepare guidelines, for implementation by industrial property offices, regarding paragraph numbering, long paragraphs, and consistent rendering of patent documents.

[End of Annex IV and of document]