

Committee on WIPO Standards (CWS)

Sixth Session
Geneva, October 15 to 19, 2018

REPORT ON THE SURVEY ON THE USE OF WIPO STANDARDS

Document prepared by the Secretariat

BACKGROUND

1. At its fifth session held in 2017, the Committee on WIPO Standards (CWS) noted the report on results of the survey on the use of WIPO Standards, including the summary of responses from 31 Industrial property offices (IPOs). The CWS requested the International Bureau to continue and intensify its efforts in providing technical assistance to the Member States and to follow-up on the cases referred to in paragraph 8 (c) of document CWS/5/2, as well as other cases in the future which would require awareness building and technical assistance. (See paragraphs 13, 14 and 19 of document CWS/5/22.)
2. As a follow-up to the decisions of the CWS at its fifth session, the Secretariat issued Circular C. CWS 89 through *Note Verbale*, dated November 29, 2017, inviting IPOs to submit or amend their responses to the survey on the use of WIPO Standards. In addition, the result of the survey on the use of WIPO Standards reported at the fifth session of the CWS was published as Part 7.12 of the *WIPO Handbook on Industrial Property Information and Documentation* (WIPO Handbook). Furthermore, WIPO Standards ST.7 to ST.7/F and ST.30 were moved to the Archive, which is also available on WIPO website. Consequently, IPOs' responses to the archived Standards were also archived. (See paragraphs 15 to 18 of document CWS/5/22.)

PROGRESS REPORT

3. In replying to Circular C. CWS 89, the two IPOs (CA and MD) amended their previous responses and the following nine IPOs newly submitted their input: AR, CH, EC, EM, EP, GB, GE, IL and TH.

4. The following 49 IP Offices took part in the survey at the time of preparing this document:

AR	Argentina	JP	Japan
AU	Australia	KG	Kyrgyzstan
BA	Bosnia and Herzegovina	KR	Republic of Korea
BD	Bangladesh	LT	Lithuania
CA	Canada	MD	Republic of Moldova
CH	Switzerland	MX	Mexico
CN	China	OM	Oman
CO	Colombia	RU	Russian Federation
CZ	Czechia	SA	Saudi Arabia
DE	Germany	SE	Sweden
EC	Ecuador	SK	Slovakia
EM	EUIPO	SV	El Salvador
EP	European Patent Office	TH	Thailand
GB	Great Britain	TN	Tunisia
GE	Georgia	TT	Trinidad and Tobago
HN	Honduras	UA	Ukraine
HR	Croatia	UG	Uganda
HU	Hungary	US	United States of America
IL	Israel	ZA	South Africa
IT	Italy		

5. The 49 responses to the survey are publically available in “CWS Survey on the Use of WIPO Standards” Wiki at <https://www3.wipo.int/confluence/x/OADDB>; the survey results can be browsed by Standard and by IP Office. The overview of the implementation status is available in a table form on the page “WIPO Standards Implementation Overview” at <https://www3.wipo.int/confluence/x/OALDB>.

6. The main obstacles for the implementation of WIPO Standards in IPOs’ practices and reasons for their non-implementation indicated in the new responses from the 11 IPOs were similar to the obstacles and reasons that had been reported to the fifth session of the CWS, and could be summarized as follows:

- (a) Recommended technologies were outdated, for example, mixed-mode format (ST.35);
- (b) Recommendations were relevant to the paper publication and were no longer applicable to the electronic publication, for example, recommendations related to indexes of patent documents (ST.19), name indexes (ST.20) and reduction of volume of priority documents (ST.21);
- (c) More time was needed to implement recently adopted WIPO Standards (ST.26, ST.27, ST.37 and ST.68) in IP Offices’ practices;
- (d) Some IPOs did not have a business case for the implementation of some WIPO Standards;

(e) National legislation did not contain provisions necessary for the implementation of certain WIPO Standards, for example, protection of sound marks (ST.68); and

(f) Already existing national (regional) practices did not follow (completely or partially) the recommendations of a given WIPO Standard.

7. It was reported that in some cases the implementation of WIPO Standards was achieved via WIPO software solutions for IPOs such as WIPO IPAS Office Suite and WIPO Scan. In addition, no IPOs have requested a technical advice and assistance for their implementation of WIPO Standards since the last session of the Committee. Taking into account responses, the International Bureau will continue to support the implementation of WIPO Standards through WIPO software solutions, and will provide technical advice and assistance for IPOs' implementation of WIPO Standards upon request.

8. The survey was useful to ascertain the status of implementation of WIPO Standards in IP offices; to identify problems with the implementation of WIPO Standards and reasons for them; identify needs of IP offices for future development of standardization on IP information in this field. The survey also shows that, despite the existing differences in the implementation by IP offices, WIPO Standards remain a powerful tool of the international exchange of IP information and documentation.

9. The responses submitted by IP offices – especially the information whether WIPO Standards were implemented in their practices or not – could help IP information users analyze IP documents; for other IP offices they constituted a valuable source of learning existing practices in the field of IP information and documentation. Therefore, it is proposed that the CWS encourages IPOs, which have not submitted their responses to the survey, to do so.

10. *The CWS is invited to:*

(a) note the content of the present document; and

(b) request the Secretariat to issue a Circular, inviting IPOs to submit their responses to the Survey on the use of WIPO Standards, referred to paragraph 9, above.

[End of document]