Results of CWS Survey on IPO Use of Identifiers
General

- Approved by CWS/6 in Oct 2018
- Issued in Dec 2018; results through Mar 2019
- 23 IP Offices responded
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Perceived advantages of using Applicant Identifiers in your Office?

- Effective management of applicant information
- Easy to change applicant's information in all relevant records simultaneously
- Control over the length of names, in particular, ensuring that they fit in database fields or screen forms
- Effective management of foreign applicant names
- Avoiding corrupted diacritic and other specific characters
- Avoiding "similar or same looking" characters with different codes, (e.g. UTF-8 hex code 0620 for Cyrillic "P"

Other - Please specify:
Perceived advantages for Applicants and Patent Information Users?

- No need to repeatedly input the same information: 70%
- Accurate statistics on patent applicants and owners: 60%
- Eliminating confusion and inconsistency by unifying multiple versions of an applicant name into a single, standardized name: 80%
- Availability of information regarding the parent company of the entity filing for the patent (disclosed corporate structure): 25%
- Avoiding mistakes, such as where the inventor’s name incorrectly appears as the patentee name: 30%
- Improving accuracy for re-assignments: 20%
- Other: Please specify: 10%
Do you consider global identifiers a desirable solution?

- 63.2% Yes
- 31.6% Not sure
- 5.3% No
Which options would you consider for investigation in your Office?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>L: Low</th>
<th>M: Medium</th>
<th>H: High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of identifiers</td>
<td>2 (9.5%)</td>
<td>3 (14.3%)</td>
<td>16 (76.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normalized* names</td>
<td>9 (45.0%)</td>
<td>6 (30.0%)</td>
<td>5 (25.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of “dictionaries” of patentee names by patent information</td>
<td>9 (56.3%)</td>
<td>7 (43.8%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of standardized** names designated by applicants</td>
<td>10 (52.6%)</td>
<td>5 (26.3%)</td>
<td>4 (21.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Which approach to assigning identifiers does your Office (plan to) use?

- **Normative (code assigned by a national authority)**: 60%
- **Procedural (code assigned by an international authority, e.g. WIPO, based on the applicant’s IP portfolio in an agreed international database)**: 20%
- **Other. Please specify**: 20%
What info do you request to determine identifiers for national applicants?

- Tax number: 25%
- Social security number: 5%
- Passport number: 10%
- Copy from the register of legal entities: 45%
- E-mail address: 20%
- Other: 5%

*Percentages based on survey results.*
Do you (plan to) use a computer algorithm to normalize or standardize applicant names?

- 31.8% Not sure
- 31.8% Yes
- 36.4% No
Plan to include identifiers in data exchanged with other IPOs?

- 63.2% No
- 15.8% Yes
- 21.1% Not sure
Thank you for your attention!