

Committee on WIPO Standards (CWS)

Eleventh Session
Geneva, December 4 to 8, 2023

REPORT

adopted by the Committee

INTRODUCTION

1. The Committee on WIPO Standards (herein after referred to as “the Committee”, or “the CWS”) held its Eleventh Session in Geneva from December 4 to 8, 2023.
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; Bhutan; Brazil; Bulgaria; Burundi; Canada; Chile; China; Côte d'Ivoire; Croatia; Cuba; the Czech Republic; Denmark; Finland; France, Gambia; Georgia; Germany; Indonesia; Iran (Islamic Republic of), Italy; Japan; Kazakhstan; Kenya; Lebanon; Lithuania; Morocco; Mexico; Norway; Peru; Portugal; Republic of Korea; Republic of Moldova; Russian Federation; Samoa; Saudi Arabia; Singapore; Slovakia; Spain; Sweden; Switzerland; Thailand; Ukraine; the United Kingdom and the United States of America (47).
3. In their capacity as members of the CWS, the representatives of the following Intergovernmental Organizations took part in the session: African Intellectual Property Organization (OAPI); Eurasian Patent Organization (EAPO); European Patent Organization (EPO); European Union (EU) and 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: Association pour le Devenir des Autochtones et de leur Connaissance Originelle (ADACO); Brand Owners Protection Group (Gulf BPG); Confederacy of Patent Information User Groups (CEPIUG); European Law Students' Association (ELSA International); International Association for the Protection of Intellectual Property (AIPPI); Maloca Internationale; Ordre Suprême des Ancêtres (OSA) and Patent Documentation Group (PDG) (8).

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

Agenda Item 1: Opening of the session

6. The Eleventh Session was opened by the Assistant Director General, Infrastructure and Platforms Sector of WIPO, Mr. Ken-Ichiro Natsume, on behalf of the Director General of WIPO, who welcomed the participants. Mr. Natsume stressed the importance of forums such as the CWS to enhance collaboration between Member States, in an environment where emerging technologies are increasingly playing a larger part in our daily work.

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

7. The CWS unanimously elected, for its next two consecutive sessions, the twelfth and thirteenth sessions, Mr. Michael Cristiano (Australia) as Chair, whose term begins with the closure of the eleventh session.

8. Mr. Young-Woo Yun (WIPO) acted as Secretary to the CWS.

DISCUSSION OF THE AGENDA ITEMS

Agenda Item 3: Adoption of the agenda

9. The CWS unanimously adopted the agenda as proposed in document CWS/11/1 PROV.3 with the editorial amendments. The adopted agenda is published as document [CWS/11/1](#) on the meeting page.

10. The Chair invited delegations to provide any general statements but no statements were made.

PRESENTATIONS

11. The presentations, working documents and any other related documents from this session have been published on the WIPO website at:
https://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/details.jsp?meeting_id=75413.

DISCUSSIONS, CONCLUSIONS, AND DECISIONS

12. 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- to 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: CWS Work Program

Agenda Item 4(a): Work Program and Task List of the CWS

13. Discussions were based on document CWS/11/8.

14. The CWS noted the updated Work Program and Task List of the CWS, which were provided as the Annex to document CWS/11/8. There were 24 Tasks defined in the Task List,

where 19 Tasks were assigned to a specific Task Force and five Tasks were not. Four proposals were made to update the existing Work Program. The CWS also noted an additional three proposals to create new CWS Tasks, which were presented in documents [CWS/11/15](#), [CWS/11/16](#) and [CWS/11/25](#). The Secretariat informed the CWS that 10 new Intellectual Property Offices (IPOs) from developing countries recently nominated their experts to participate in several CWS Task Forces after responding to Circular [C.CWS 175](#), which encouraged IPOs to participate in the CWS Task Forces.

15. With regards to the proposal to consolidate works on necessary revisions to WIPO Standards ST.36, ST.66, ST.86 and ST.96, which are related to eXtensible Markup Language (XML), the CWS noted that the works were conducted under the framework of Task No. 38, Task No. 39, Task No. 42 and Task No. 41 respectively. The CWS was informed that WIPO Standards ST.36, ST.66, ST.86 had not been revised since at least 2012 and the corresponding Task Forces were inactive for a long time. The XML4IP Task Force has updated WIPO Standard ST.96 more than ten times during this period and meets monthly. The CWS noted that the proposal aimed to streamline the discussion by the subject matter experts to make necessary updates to all WIPO XML-related Standards through the XML4IP Task Force.

16. The CWS approved the merging of Task No. 38, Task No. 39 and Task No. 42 into Task No. 41 and revising the description of Task No. 41 which reads:

“Ensure the necessary revisions and updates of WIPO Standards ST.36, ST.66, ST.86 and ST.96; and support the implementation of those Standards”.

17. The CWS also assigned the revised Task No. 41 to the XML4IP Task Force and approved the discontinuation of the ST.36, ST.66 and ST.86 Task Forces.

18. With regards to the proposal for work arrangement regarding WIPO Handbook Part 6 update, the CWS noted that the Digital Transformation Task Force managed any necessary updates to Part 6 of the WIPO Handbook under the framework of Task No. 62. However, this update is also closely related to the work of the Public Access to Patent Information (PAPI) Task Force, conducted under the framework of Task No. 52. Considering the workload of the Digital Transformation Task Force, the Secretariat proposed to transfer the responsibility for updating Part 6 to the PAPI Task Force. The CWS noted that the descriptions of Task No. 52 and Task No. 62 should be revised accordingly once the transfer is approved, with the proposed revisions provided in documents [CWS/11/12](#) and [CWS/11/11](#) respectively.

19. The CWS approved transferring the responsibility of updating Part 6 of WIPO Handbook from the Digital Transformation Task Force to the Public Access to Patent Information Task Force.

20. The CWS noted a proposal for a new Task to encourage IPOs to provide their patent authority file in compliance with WIPO ST.37 to the International Bureau. A detailed proposal for the creation of this new Task was provided in document [CWS/11/15](#). The CWS also noted that 31 Offices have provided their patent authority files to the International Bureau, which are published on the WIPO Authority File portal since the adoption of WIPO Standard ST.37 at the fifth session of the CWS.

21. The CWS noted that more Offices provided 2022 Annual Technical Reports (ATRs) than 2021 ATRs, provided according to Task No. 24. The CWS recalled that it would determine whether or not collection of ATRs will continue, at its twelfth session.

22. Additionally, the Secretariat recalled that the Delegation of the Russian Federation proposed to split INID Code 551 of WIPO Standard ST.60 into two or three different codes for collective, certification, and guarantee marks to enable Offices to more accurately record which mark type was actually requested by applicants and granted in each Office. This issue was discussed at the seventh session of the CWS held in 2019 (see paragraphs 5 to 9 of document [CWS/7/18 Corr.](#) and paragraphs 159 to 162 of document [CWS/7/29](#)). The CWS was informed that during discussions at Madrid Working Group meetings, it was noted that some countries use collective marks while others use certification marks to protect the same goods or services. Because of this difference in practice, splitting INID Code 551 on Madrid application forms could lead to applicants requesting the wrong type of protection in certain countries, necessitating final rejections by the Office. As a result of this discussion, the CWS noted that the Delegations of Germany and Russian Federation withdrew their request to split the INID Code. The CWS also noted that the Delegation of Russian Federation would closely monitor the issue and would present a proposal for necessary amendments to the Madrid Working Group first. If it finds a reasonable solution, it would revert to the CWS with the agreement by the Madrid Working Group in due course. Since the two proponents, the Delegations of Germany and Russian Federation, withdrew their suggestion to split the INID Code 551, and that the Madrid Working Group is still working on a resolution, the Secretariat proposed that Task No. 60 should be held in abeyance until the Madrid Working Group agrees on this issue for collective, certification and guarantee marks.

23. The CWS agreed to hold Task No. 60 in abeyance until such time that the Working Group of the Madrid Union arrives at a decision on the splitting of the INID Code 551.

24. The CWS reviewed the Task List, which was presented in the Annex to document CWS/11/8, taking into consideration the Recommendations of the Report on Evaluation of WIPO Standing Committees, which highlighted the large workload of the Member States and WIPO Secretariat. The CWS noted that all its active Task Forces met quarterly to review and update their objectives in March, June and September 2023, where all CWS Task Force Members and Observers were invited. The CWS noticed that there were some typographical errors in both the Annex to document CWS/11/8 and CWS/11/8 itself and the corrected document CWS/11/8 Corr. was published on the meeting page during the session.

25. The CWS considered its Task List as presented in the Annex to document CWS/11/8. and approved the Secretariat to incorporate the agreements reached at this session in the CWS Work Program and publish them on the WIPO website. The updated Task List is presented as Annex II to this report.

Agenda Item 4(b): Proposal for a new Task on the Implementation of WIPO Standard ST.37

26. Discussions were based on document [CWS/11/15](#).

27. The CWS noted the need for a new Task to support Offices in the production of their WIPO ST.37-compliant authority files, particularly in light of the agreements reached in 2023 by the bodies of the Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT) regarding PCT Minimum Documentation.

28. The Delegation of Brazil indicated its support for the creation of the new Task as it needs specific technical support to finalize the production of their authority file. The Delegation of China supported the proposal but preferred the use of the term “encourage” versus “ensure” at the beginning of the Task description. The Delegation of the Russian Federation explicitly supported the creation of this new Task and indicated that they will be updating their authority file next year to be compliant with the version 2.2 of WIPO Standard ST.37. The Delegation of the United States of America agreed that ideally all patent Offices which contribute data to PATENTSCOPE would ideally also provide an authority file. The same Delegation also proposed that the International Bureau should collaborate with the leaders of the PCT Minimum Documentation Task Force in order to encourage the Task Force Members to provide this authority file as soon as possible.

29. The CWS approved the creation of new Task No. 66, and its addition to the Work Program, with the description:

“Encourage IP offices to provide their patent authority file in compliance with WIPO Standard ST.37 by providing any technical support or training necessary, based on available resources”.

30. The CWS designated the International Bureau as the Task Leader as there were no other nominations.

31. To determine when this Task can be considered complete, the CWS noted that the proposed success factor: that once all of the IPOs who contribute to both the PCT Minimum Documentation inventory and PATENTSCOPE database have provided a WIPO ST.37-compliant authority file to the International Bureau, this Task can be considered complete.

32. In order to be able to commence with the work of the new Task, the CWS requested IPOs to communicate with the International Bureau the type of support that will be required for the production of WIPO Standard ST.37-compliant authority files.

Agenda Item 4(c): Questionnaire on the Prioritization of Tasks of the Committee on WIPO Standards

33. Discussions were based on document [CWS/11/6](#).

34. The CWS considered the draft survey questionnaire provided in the Annex to document CWS/11/6, which was prepared by the Secretariat in consultation with the leaders of the CWS Task Forces for determining the priority of CWS Tasks. The prioritization survey questionnaire was requested by the CWS at its tenth session. The draft survey questionnaire is composed of two parts repeated for each active Task: a general information section regarding metadata for the specific Task and a set of common questions to be responded to. The general information part includes an estimated workload to carry out each Task and its activity level.

35. Many of the delegations indicated the need for prioritization of CWS Tasks to ensure that they were able to continue to effectively contribute. The Representative of the European Union indicated that for the CWS Mandate, “prioritization is key” so they explicitly supported the need for the draft questionnaire. The Delegation of Germany also supported the need for the draft questionnaire but suggested improving the draft considering the following points:

- (a) The priority of certain Tasks changes with time and so a specific timeline should be identified in the survey questionnaire. This timeline should be relatively short, for example three years;
- (b) IPOs will likely have an interest only in specific Task(s) but no interest in others. Therefore it is difficult to provide any response regarding Tasks which are not of interest;
- (c) Ongoing Tasks are difficult to prioritize or allocate resources for;
- (d) Estimation of the amount of effort involved for an individual Task can be difficult. Therefore the addition of a ‘confidence level’ should be considered;
- (e) Individual Tasks may be comprised of a large number of activities and an IPO may only be interested in one or more of these activities. Therefore, priority could be considered at an activity level, rather than at a Task level; and
- (f) It should be clear how the answers by the Offices to the questionnaire will be transformed into a prioritization of tasks.

36. Some delegations also noted that it was not clear over which timeframe this questionnaire was applicable to or what the next steps would be after responses were provided by Offices. Several delegations were interested to know whether the status of a Task would be impacted by their responses in the survey questionnaire.

37. The Delegation of Germany proposed to use a simplified questionnaire, which was composed of a simple prioritized list of an IPO's top five identified activities, which formed part of any CWS Task in the Work Program. The Delegation also proposed that Offices be invited to provide details on the level of resourcing and the type of profile that they could commit to specific activities, so that any skill gaps could be identified. The Delegation of the United States of America shared its concern that the addition of new Tasks to the Work Program could diminish the effectiveness of Task Force Members in providing their contributions.

38. Both the Delegations of Germany and the United States of America suggested that some sort of indication of Office' preference regarding their prioritization of the CWS Tasks should be collected informally and presented at the next session of the CWS.

39. After feedback from several delegations, the Secretariat proposed to withdraw the proposal and prepare an improved draft survey questionnaire for consideration at the next session of the Committee. The Secretariat sought wider participation of CWS Task Force Members in preparing the improved survey questionnaire.

40. The CWS agreed that:

- (a) Members of all CWS Task Forces be asked to collaborate on a simplified and improved version of the questionnaire using the shared CWS Task Force wiki space;
- (b) The new revised draft questionnaire be presented for consideration at the next session of the CWS;
- (c) Informally, information regarding the prioritization of CWS Tasks by Task Force Members should be gathered in parallel on the shared wiki space for all the CWS Task Forces and these results be presented also at the twelfth session of the CWS; and
- (d) Once the survey questionnaire is approved at the twelfth session of the CWS, a survey should be conducted and the survey results received by the International Bureau should be presented at the thirteenth session of the Committee.

Agenda Item 5: Progress Reports by the Task Forces

41. The Secretariat introduced this Agenda Item by indicating that 12 CWS Task Forces would report progress achieved since the last session of the CWS, provide any proposals for consideration by the Committee and their updated work plan. The CWS noted that 10 Task Forces submitted their written report using a common template which consists of summary, background, progress report on each Task with objectives, relevant actions for 2023, progress evaluation, and work plan.

Agenda Item 5(a): Report by the 3D Task Force (Task No. 61)

42. Discussions were based on an oral report delivered by the Delegation of the Russian Federation as the Leader of the 3D Task Force.

43. The CWS noted the content of the oral presentation. The Task Force Leaders provided a summary of the work undertaken since the last session of the CWS which included the drafting of a survey questionnaire investigating the different implementation practices of WIPO ST.91 by

IPOs. The Task Force Leader noted that the draft questionnaire was provided as the Annex to document [CWS/11/26](#) and expected that the survey results would guide the 3D Task Force to determine whether any revisions to WIPO ST.91 would be needed in the future.

Agenda Item 5(b): Report by the API Task Force (Task No. 56 and Task No. 64)

44. Discussions were based on document [CWS/11/14](#) which was presented by both of the Task Force Co-Leaders: the Delegation of Canada and the Representative of the European Union.

45. The CWS noted the progress report on Task No. 56 and Task No. 64 and the work plan of the API Task Force, including commencement of the WIPO API Catalog development project. With regards to this project, the Task Force is seeking feedback from other Offices on any different API endpoints that they may have already been publicly exposed, including the definition of search terms used. The CWS was requested to invite IPOs to provide any relevant information in response to a circular once it is issued by the Secretariat (see paragraph 18 of document CWS/11/14). In relation to Task No. 64, the CWS noted that the Task Force looks forward to IPOs' participation in testing the WIPO ST.97 JSON transformation tool, which is part of Appendix to Annex I of WIPO Standard ST.97, and the establishment of a practice of its use (see paragraph 29 of document CWS/11/14). As Co-Leaders of the Task Force, the Representative of the European Union stressed the importance of providing this information so that this Task Force could understand whether the transformation tool was still considered to be useful.

46. The CWS requested the Secretariat to issue a circular inviting IPOs to provide information relating to different API endpoints exposed by Offices including the definition of terms used in the APIs.

47. The CWS invited its Members to test the WIPO ST.97 JSON transformation tool and to share the results with the API Task Force.

Agenda Item 5(c): Report by the Blockchain Task Force (Task No. 59)

48. Discussions were based on an oral report delivered by the Delegation of the Russian Federation as the Leader of the Blockchain Task Force.

49. The CWS noted the progress made by the Task Force and its work plan, which included the intention of the Task Force to prepare a new WIPO standard defining potential applications of blockchain technology for IP community. Since the last session, the Task Force began preparing a survey of its Member Offices for determining the use of blockchain technologies by Offices. However, this was work halted with priority given to updating the draft standard, which would be published for feedback shortly on the Task Force wiki space. This draft standard is intended to guide IPOs in means of processing and disseminating IP data using blockchain technology.

Agenda Item 5(d): Report by the Report by the Design Representation Task Force (Task No. 57)

50. Discussions were based on document [CWS/11/4](#) which was presented by the Delegation of Australia as a Co-Leader of the Task Force.

51. The CWS noted the content of the document, including that the Task Force presented a proposal for the revision of WIPO Standard ST.88 as document [CWS/11/15](#) for its consideration. The Task Force proposed to discontinue Task No. 57 and the Design Representation Task Force once the proposed revision is approved by the CWS.

52. The CWS approved the discontinuation of Task No. 57 and the Design Representation Task Force.

53. The CWS approved to undertake any further revisions to WIPO Standard ST.88 under the framework of Task No. 33.

Agenda Item 5(e): Report by the Digital Transformation Task Force (Task No. 62, Task No. 63 and Task No. 65)

54. Discussions were based on document [CWS/11/11](#), which was presented by the Digital Transformation Task Force Leader, the Delegation of the United States of America.

55. The CWS noted the progress made by the Task Force regarding Task No. 62, Task No. 63 and Task No.65 since the last session of the Committee.

56. With regards to Task No. 62, the CWS noted that the Task Force commenced work on the development of a common requirements specification for transforming a DOCX document to a corresponding XML document. The CWS also noted that since its last session, the Task Force had conducted a review and performed an analysis of the functionality of DOCX2XML converters in use at the USPTO and at the International Bureau for ePCT. The Task Force encouraged Offices that are currently using DOCX2XML converters to share information on the functionalities of their converter which will enable the Task Force to better understand what converters are available and to then draft a common requirements specification. Due to the changing scope of work captured by Task No. 62, i.e., the transfer of work updating the WIPO Handbook Part 6 to the PAPI Task Force and the work on the development of the common specification for DOCX2XML, the Task Force proposed to update the description of Task No. 62 by removing specific references to WIPO Standards. (See paragraphs 8 to 10 of document CWS/11/11.)

57. The Delegation of Canada indicated that it does not use any DOCX2XML converters and might need to halt their current digital transformation project to incorporate one. The same Delegation noted that the converter used in ePCT could be considered as an alternative solution. The Delegation of China stated its intention to more actively participate in the work of the Digital Transformation Task Force. The Delegation of Germany indicated its support to amend the description of Task No. 62, but found the proposed Task description for Task No. 62 unclear. The Secretariat proposed an alternative Task description, which was supported by delegations.

58. The CWS approved the revised Task description for Task No. 62, which reads:

“Review WIPO Standards developed for paper or image-based communication in view of electronic filing and publication and exchange of IP documentation and propose revisions of those Standards or new recommendations if needed; and prepare a proposal for the recommendation on a common requirements specification for a DOCX to XML (DOCX2XML) converter”.

59. The CWS noted that the Task Force plans to continue the documentation of existing practices of various Offices and the further development of common requirements specification for the converter, which will be helpful to all Offices considering the implementation of a DOCX2XML converter.

60. The CWS encouraged IPOs to provide feedback on their use of DOCX2XML converters and to share information on the functionalities of their converter with the Task Force.

61. With regards to Task No. 63, the CWS noted that there was no progress on it since its last session as the Digital Transformation Task Force had been busy working on Task No. 62 and Task No. 65, and the Task Force did not plan to work on this Task as a priority in near future.

62. Regarding Task No. 65, the CWS noted that the Digital Transformation Task Force worked on the preparation of a proposal for recommendations on the data package format for the electronic exchange of priority documents and certified copies for patents, trademarks and industrial designs. The proposal for the new WIPO standard was presented for consideration by the CWS as a part of document [CWS/11/20](#) and further details regarding progress on this item are provided under Agenda Item 6(a).

63. One delegation noted that it would need significant lead time to implement any new WIPO standards as specifically this would require the necessary testing, both in terms of sending and receiving priority document packages.

Agenda Item 5(f): Report by the ICT Strategy for Standards Task Force (Task No. 58)

64. Discussions were based on document [CWS/11/21](#), which was presented by the ICT Strategy for Standards Task Force Leader, the International Bureau.

65. The CWS noted the progress made by the Task Force on Task No. 58 since the last session of the Committee which included work on improving the Recommendations related to Information Communication Technology (ICT) for IPOs and to prepare a strategic roadmap for the work of the Committee. The Task Force proposed to rename the Task Force to "ICT Strategy Task Force" by removing "for Standards" and to simplify the description of Task No. 58 as follows:

"Prepare a proposal for strategies and a roadmap for the Committee on WIPO Standards (CWS) taking into account the mandate of the CWS".

66. The CWS also noted that the Task Force had been looking for its Co-Leader since its creation and the Delegation of Australia has now volunteered to serve as a Co-Leader, alongside the International Bureau.

67. The Task Force shared that it had several rounds of discussion on the set of 40 Recommendations taking into account information shared at certain regional or international ICT-related meetings. As a result of the discussions, the Task Force prepared a new set of 10 Recommendations which were presented for consideration by the Committee under the Agenda item 8(b), as of the Annex of document [CWS/11/18](#). The Task Force informed the CWS that its Members Offices agreed to share their ICT Strategies to analyze common ICT strategies among IPOs to prepare a proposal for strategic roadmap for the CWS.

68. Several delegations explicitly supported the proposals for the new Task Force name and the updated description of Task No. 58. However, other delegations, indicated that they were unclear regarding the scope of the proposed description for Task No. 58 and the criteria that would be needed to consider the Task completed. Since there was now a reduced set of more general recommendations being proposed at the current session, it was not clear what activities remained outstanding. The International Bureau clarified that the set of 10 draft Recommendations was presented for comments, not for approval by the CWS. The International Bureau stated that the Task Force intends to propose to discontinue its works once the revised ICT Recommendations and a strategic roadmap for the CWS were approved.

69. There were several suggestions from delegations to clarify the scope of the Task Force activities and to improve the proposed Task description, which would make clear the intention of this Task Force. The delegations indicated that it should be clear what the success conditions for this Task were and exactly who was implementing the proposed strategies. Any reference to the term “roadmap” raised concerns with the CWS that the set of recommendations must be implemented by Offices on a particular timeline.

70. The CWS approved the new name of the Task Force as the “ICT Strategy Task Force” and designated the Delegation of Australia as a new Task Force Co-Leader.

71. The CWS approved the improved description for Task No. 58 which now reads as follows:

“Prepare a final proposal for a set of recommendations based on the feedback from the CWS Members on the proposed 10 recommendations on ICT and IP administration”.

Agenda Item 5(g): Report by the Legal Status Task Force (Task No. 47)

72. Discussions were based on document [CWS/11/13](#), which was presented by the Legal Status Task Force Leader, the International Bureau.

73. The CWS noted the progress made by the Task Force regarding Task No. 47 since the last session of the Committee and its updated work plan. The CWS noted that the collaborative efforts of the Task Force and the XML4IP Task Force to develop XML schema components for trademark legal status events. The Members of the two Task Forces were invited to nominate their trademark business or legal experts to review and update supplementary event data which is defined in Annex II of WIPO ST.61. As a result, the Legal Status Task Force presented a proposal to revise Annex II of WIPO ST.61 (see document CWS/11/ 9). The Legal Status Task Force encouraged IPOs to provide their mapping table or update their mapping table which is published in WIPO Handbook at: https://www.wipo.int/standards/en/part_07.html#p7.13 .

74. The Delegation of China shared its intention to implement WIPO Standard ST.27 and is currently undertaking the relevant mapping activities. The Delegation of Canada indicated its intention to implement WIPO Standard ST.61.

Agenda Item 5(h): Report by the Name Standardization Task Force (Task No. 55)

75. Discussions were based on document [CWS/11/22](#), which was presented by the Delegation of the Republic of Korea, as a Co-Leader of the Name Standardization Task Force.

76. The CWS noted the progress made by the Task Force regarding Task No. 55 since the last session of the Committee and its updated work plan. The Task Force reported that it prepared the final proposal for recommendations on the data cleaning of names, based on the working draft presented at the tenth session of the CWS (see document CWS/10/17). The final proposal was submitted for consideration by the Committee as the document [CWS/11/23](#). The Task Force proposed to amend the description of Task No. 55.

77. The Delegation of China expressed their concerns about the amount of work which may result as a result of the cleaning of stakeholder names and is closely following the work of this Task Force.

78. The CWS approved the revised description of Task No. 55 which reads:

“Prepare a proposal for future actions aimed at achieving the standardization of

names in Intellectual Property (IP) documents, with the view to developing a WIPO standard to assist IP offices in providing a better 'quality at source' in relation to names."

Agenda Item 5(i): Report by the Part 7 Task Force (Task No. 50)

79. Discussions were based on document [CWS/11/24](#), which was presented by the Part 7 Task Force Leader, the International Bureau.

80. The CWS noted the progress made by the Task Force regarding Task No. 50 since the last session of the Committee and its updated work plan. The CWS noted the two surveys which were planned to be conducted in 2023, according to its decision made at the last session. The first of which is to update WIPO Handbook Part 7.6 (Bibliographic information in patent Gazettes) and the second to update Part 7.9 (Citation practices). The Task Force reported the outcome of its discussions on these two surveys with some issues identified and suggestions to address them.

81. In relation to the planned survey to determine necessary updates to the WIPO Handbook Part 7.6, the Task Force Leader informed the CWS that the main objective of the survey was to revise Standards ST.11 and ST.19, which have not been revised since 1990. Therefore, the Task Force requested the CWS to decide whether the Standards ST.11 and ST.19 should be revised before conducting the survey. The Delegation of the Russian Federation stated that work on the update of these Standards is not required. The Delegation considered that these survey questionnaires were now outdated and work on the update of these Standards is not required. The Delegation of the United States also indicated that updates to WIPO Standard ST.11 and ST.19 could be postponed as other CWS activities should take priority.

82. The CWS agreed that discussion on revising the two Standards ST.11 and ST.19 should be postponed. Consequently, the CWS decided to postpone the planned survey to update Part 7.6 of the WIPO Handbook.

83. In relation to the survey to determine the necessary updates to the WIPO Handbook Part 7.9, the Task Force noted that the survey questionnaire, which was used in 2008, should be updated before starting a new survey in light of the new types of citation, and new data format and platform for citations, among other reasons. Several delegations stated that as the questionnaire is now outdated, that the benefit of conducting survey questionnaire should be justified beforehand and that conducting the survey is not a priority.

84. The CWS decided to postpone the citation practice survey which would assist in updating Part 7.9 of WIPO Handbook.

85. The International Bureau proposed to replace the word "industrial" with "intellectual" in the description of Task No. 50 as the title of WIPO Handbook was amended to reflect the expanded scope of this resource.

86. The CWS approved the update to the description for Task No. 50 which now reads:

"Ensure the necessary maintenance and update of surveys published in Part 7 of the WIPO Handbook on Intellectual Property Information and Documentation".

87. The CWS noted that the Part 7 Task Force would discuss its work plan in light of the decisions made by the CWS and present a new work plan to the twelfth session of the CWS.

Agenda Item 5(j): Report by the Public Access to Patent Information (PAPI) Task Force (Task No. 52)

88. Discussions were based on document [CWS/11/12](#), which was presented by the Public Access to Patent Information (PAPI) Task Force Leader, the International Bureau.

89. The CWS noted the progress made by the Task Force regarding Task No. 52 since the last session of the Committee and its updated work plan. A letter from Patent Documentation Group (PDG), in support of the update to Part 6 of the WIPO Handbook, was reproduced as the Annex to document CWS/11/12, which included a list of recommendations for this update. The PDG also made a presentation under this Agenda Item which included some background on why this update was important for IP industry stakeholders.

90. The Task Force reported on its activities to prepare recommendations for systems which provide access to publicly available patent information in conducting Task No. 52 and noted that similar recommendations are provided in WIPO Handbook Part 6.1. As a result, the Task Force proposed to take responsibility to update WIPO Handbook Part 6.1, which was previously undertaken by the Digital Transformation Task Force. To account for this change the International Bureau proposed a revised description for Task No. 52.

91. The Delegation of Germany noted that there no longer appears to be a technical element to this work after the proposed update to the description for Task No. 52. If the new Task description is approved, the focus of this Task Force will be to concentrate on the update to Part 6 of the Handbook, which is to primarily to update guidelines relating to the content of IP Office websites. This Delegation believed that instead of updating the guidelines provided in Part 6, that it would be preferable to produce a new WIPO standard with recommendations for patent information search systems. However the Delegation did not oppose the update to the description nor the update to the guidelines being proposed in the updated Task description. The Delegation of the United States of America understood that the new work, as defined by the proposed Task description, is related to what minimum content should be provided on IPO websites and not what public search functionalities would be available. Understanding that this was the proposed intention, this Delegation supported the update to the Task description. The Secretariat, in response to these comments, asked the Committee to rather concentrate on whether it supports the update to the Task description rather than whether a new WIPO standard would be drafted, which had not yet been considered.

92. The CWS approved the update to the description of Task No. 52 which now reads:

“Prepare a proposal for the update of the WIPO Handbook Part 6.1: Recommended minimum contents for intellectual property offices’ websites”.

Agenda Item 5(k): Report by the Sequence Listings Task Force (Task No. 44)

93. Discussions were based on document [CWS/11/7](#) which was presented by the Sequence Listings Task Force Leader, the Representative of the European Patent Office.

94. The CWS noted the progress made by the Task Force regarding Task No. 44 since the last session of the Committee and their updated work plan. The Task Force proposed to amend the description of Task No. 44 as WIPO ST.26 entered into force as planned on July 1, 2022. In addition, the WIPO Sequence Suite went into production on the same day.

95. The Delegation of Germany thanked the International Bureau for its development of the WIPO Sequence Suite as well as the preparation of the revised version of WIPO Standard ST.26. The Delegation noted resource constraints likely experienced by many of the Offices and proposed to add to the proposed Task description, the phrase “based on available resources” after the words “testing new releases”. The Task Force Leader agreed to this proposal.

96. The Delegation of Japan wanted the CWS to note that the removal of the minimum length requirement from WIPO ST.26 would need to be carefully considered in light of the “search result noise” that would be introduced as well as the cost to upgrade IT systems.

97. The Delegation of the United States of America supported the proposed change to the Task description and also indicated that sufficient lead time needs to be provided when new versions of WIPO Sequence Suite are to be tested by IPOs. Otherwise providing good quality test results on time could be challenging. The Delegation also supported the caution expressed by the Delegation of Japan regarding any potential removal of the minimum length requirement.

98. The CWS approved the revised Task description with the additional text proposed by the Delegation of Germany which now reads:

“Support the International Bureau by testing new releases based on available resources and providing user feedback on WIPO Sequence Suite; and prepare necessary revisions of WIPO Standard ST.26.”

Agenda Item 5(l): Report by the XML4IP Task Force (Task No. 41)

99. Discussions were based on document [CWS/11/2](#), which was presented by the XML4IP Task Force Leader, the International Bureau.

100. The CWS noted the progress made by the Task Force regarding Task No. 41 since the last session of the Committee and in particular the release of one major version 7.0 and one minor version 7.1. The CWS noted that version 7.1 included the critical changes to support Hague System operation.

101. The Delegation of China indicated their active participation in the work of this Task Force and provided their intentions to implement WIPO ST.96, in particular for Hague and Madrid communications with the International Bureau.

Agenda Item 6: Development of WIPO Standards

Agenda Item 6(a): Proposal for a new WIPO standard on the data package format for the electronic exchange of priority documents and certified copies

102. Discussions were based on document [CWS/11/20 Rev](#), which was prepared by the Digital Transformation Task Force.

103. The CWS noted the proposal for a new WIPO Standard which defined a data package format for the electronic exchange of priority documents and certified copies. The document also proposed an incremental approach for the implementation of the new WIPO standard with a ‘sunset period’ for the conclusion of this implementation by the end of 2025. This allows each IPO to complete the implementation of the new Standard at its own pace. The Task Force proposed that an IPO only accept and provide priority documents compliant with the Standard from January 1, 2026.

104. The Delegation of Japan did not support the proposed implementation plan. The Delegation noted that different Offices would likely take differing amounts of time to be able to make any necessary changes to the existing priority documents. The Delegation also noted that as the draft standard did not define a complete list of the supplementary files that could be sent by an Office, this might cause issues in processing of these files by the receiving Office. Furthermore, the Delegation pointed out that if a large number of supplementary files are included within the ZIP package, this might result in the ZIP package being too large to transmit via WIPO Digital Access Service (DAS). Additionally, the Delegation considered that the official copy of the priority document should always be provided in PDF format. Finally, the Delegation specified that further discussion would be required to have the opportunity gather more feedback from Offices regarding the current draft. As such, the Delegation of Japan did not support the adoption of the proposed standard.

105. The Delegation of China appreciated the work of the Task Force thus far but considered that the proposed draft standard was too immature for adoption. In particular, the Delegation stated that the Annexes to the draft standard should include examples specific to trademarks and industrial designs since the scope of the standard is no longer restricted to patent priority documents. With regards to the implementation plan of the new standard within WIPO DAS, the Delegation proposed that the suggested January 1, 2026 be a goal instead of a definitive date which must be met. The Delegation also proposed a survey questionnaire in 2025 to determine Office-readiness for implementing the Standard. The Delegation agreed to the revised description of Task No. 65 if the proposed standard is adopted.

106. The Delegation of Germany supported the work already conducted by the Task Force but considered that the draft standard was not ready for adoption. The Delegation pointed out that further clarification regarding the use of the term “certification” should be provided as it has both legal and technical connotations and highlighted that the proposed draft standard did not lend itself well to technical certification of the whole package. The Delegation also noted that transmission of supplementary data, such as classification data, within the data package, could be useful and suggested that a defined list of allowable supplementary data should be provided in the new standard. The Delegation suggested that Offices should be questioned which data would be considered necessary for processing, and that clear rules for formats and storage of those kinds of data should then be provided. Furthermore, the Delegation noted that initial scope of the draft standard was limited to patent priority documents, but its scope was expanded at short notice to include trademark and industrial design priority documents. The Delegation considered that the involvement of trademark and industrial design business experts would be important to prepare a solid and comprehensive proposal. Regarding the name of the draft standard, the Delegation noted that its understanding was the “certified copies” and “priority documents” had the same scope. Finally, the Delegation stressed the importance of being able to identify which of the components of an IP application are those which were originally filed, which was not clear.

107. The Representative of the European Patent Office appreciated the work already achieved by the Task Force, but considered further work on the draft standard was needed before adoption. The Representative suggested that the process for technical certification of the documents, which was not defined in the draft standard, be an important component to be considered. The Representative noted that the draft standard seemed no longer urgently required as a work-around solution was already provided by the International Bureau for IPOs to transmit patent priority documents including a sequence listing in WIPO ST.26 format via WIPO DAS. Some other delegations also confirmed that they had introduced interim measures to send priority documents which contain a WIPO ST.26-compliant sequence listing to requesting Offices and so did not consider that the adoption of the new standard is an urgent issue to address.

108. The Delegation of Canada asked whether the proposed implementation plan is a “big-bang” approach or an incremental approach. The Secretariat responded that it was an incremental approach at the pace determined by each Office within the defined sunset period.

109. The Delegation of United States of America, as the Task Force Leader, noted that there was no consensus on the adoption of the proposed standard. The Delegation noted the two main challenges which the Task Force was facing during development of the draft standard: (1) trying to accommodate all of the individual practices of each Offices; and (2) the lack of engagement from a broad group of Offices, in particular the lack of involvement of trademark and industrial design experts. To improve the draft standard so that it is ready for adoption at the next session, the Delegation indicated that a greater degree of engagement from interested Offices would be critical and recommended that the draft standard be finalized for patent priority documents first.

110. The Secretariat encouraged IPOs to already consider preparation of implementation plans for the new standard and allocate necessary financial resources as they would likely need to upgrade their IT systems and workflow assuming it would be adopted at the twelfth session of the Committee. The Secretariat also proposed that IPOs join the Digital Transformation Task Force and that meetings of this Task Force occur monthly in 2024 prior to the next session of the Committee.

111. The CWS noted that further work would be required on the draft Standard and requested that the Task Force continue its work to prepare a revised proposal.

112. The CWS requested that the Secretariat organize monthly meetings of the Digital Transformation Task Force to make progress on this work as a priority.

113. The Committee requested that the Task Force prepare and present a revised draft for consideration and adoption at its twelfth session.

114. The CWS noted that the Secretariat would send an email to all CWS Task Force Offices and encourage them to nominate their trademark and industrial design experts to join the work of the Digital Transformation Task Force in drafting the new Standard.

115. The CWS encouraged its Members to prepare their implementation plans for the new standard incorporating any necessary upgrades of their IT systems and workflow processes.

Agenda Item 6(b): Proposal for the revision of WIPO Standard ST.26

116. Discussions were based on document [CWS/11/3](#).

117. The CWS considered the proposed revision to WIPO Standard ST.26 resulting in proposed new version 1.7. The proposed revision included two new examples within Annex VI of WIPO ST.26 (the Guidance document), some improvements regarding the consistency of terminology used and some editorial changes. The Delegation of Germany supported the proposed revision and commented that the production of the tracked changes version would support its translation efforts. The Delegation of the United States of America also supported the proposed revision with one caveat: that the simplified Example Index in Annex VI of WIPO ST.26 also include references to the example numbers, which should be corrected. The proposed date for entry into force for this version was indicated as July 1, 2024.

118. The Committee approved the proposed revisions to WIPO Standard ST.26 as detailed in Annexes to document CWS/11/3 with one editorial change: that the Annex VI Example Index should include the reference to the relevant Example numbers.

119. The CWS also approved July 1, 2024 as the date for entry into force of the new version 1.7.

Agenda Item 6(c): Proposal for the revision of WIPO Standard ST.61

120. Discussions were based on document [CWS/11/9](#).

121. The CWS considered the proposed revision to Annex II of WIPO ST.61. The Delegation of Japan enquired whether supplementary data listed in WIPO ST.26 Annex II was mandatory to implement. The Secretariat confirmed that it was not mandatory, but optional when IPOs provide their trademark legal status event data. The Delegation of Germany also noted that the provision of all supplementary data provided in the Standard was optional.

122. The CWS approved the proposed revision of WIPO Standard ST.61 as presented in the Annex to document CWS/11/9.

Agenda Item 6(d): Proposal for the revision of WIPO Standard ST.88

123. Discussions were based on document [CWS/11/5](#).

124. The CWS considered the proposed revision of WIPO Standard ST.88. The several delegations explicitly supported the revision being proposed.

125. The CWS approved the proposed revision to WIPO Standard ST. 88, as presented in the Annex to document CWS/11/5.

Agenda Item 6(e): Proposals for improvement of copyright orphan work metadata in WIPO Standard ST.96

126. Discussions were based on document [CWS/11/19 Rev.](#)

127. The CWS considered the summary of the feedback to Circular C.CWS.171, which requested feedback on the revised proposal from the Members and Observers of the Committee, and a proposal to revisit the two options that had been considered previously by the CWS at its tenth session in 2022.

128. Both the Delegations of Japan and Russian Federation explicitly supported the second option, that is to continue to consult further with copyright orphan work experts on whether the latest proposal presented to the tenth session of the CWS needed further improvements or was needed at all. The Delegation of the United States of America indicated that the latest proposal, referenced in circular C. CWS.171, appeared to be beyond the agreed scope: which was initially agreed upon to facilitate the exchange of copyright orphan work data between IPOs. The Delegation proposed a third option, which was to request that the Secretariat organize a meeting of copyright experts and in particular Offices which have registration systems for copyright orphan works or intend to implement the WIPO ST.96 copyright orphan work schemas. The same Delegation considered that feedback from these Offices would be most valuable as they would likely be able to determine whether WIPO ST.96 should be improved to include the structured components being proposed in the revised proposal.

129. The CWS approved the third option proposed by the Delegation of the United States of America, where a meeting or seminar would be organized so that copyright and technical experts could collaborate on improving the draft presented in the Annex to document [CWS/10/7](#). The CWS requested that the Secretariat organize the meeting to be held in early 2024, inviting Offices which had responded to one of Circulars C.CWS.156 and C.CWS.171, and the Members and Observers of the CWS which have copyright orphan work registration systems or plan to implement the WIPO ST.96 copyright orphan work schemas.

130. The CWS noted that a revised proposal for copyright orphan work would be presented at its twelfth session for consideration.

Agenda Item 6(f): Proposed guidelines for the data cleaning of names

131. Discussions were based on document [CWS/11/23](#).

132. The CWS considered the proposal for “Guidelines for the data cleaning of names” prepared by the Name Standardization Task Force, which is provided as the Annex to this document.

133. The Delegation of China sought further clarification on why these guidelines were needed and indicated that specific objectives should be defined. The same Delegation requested more time to study the proposal. The Delegation of Japan sought clarification on what was the difference between recommendations and guidelines, and whether guidelines should be considered mandatory to implement. The Secretariat clarified that both recommendations and guidelines would be labeled as a WIPO Standard and are not obligatory for an IPO to implement. To avoid different interpretation of the two terms, the Secretariat proposed to use the term ‘recommendations’ rather than ‘guidelines’ for the new WIPO standard title. The Delegation of Canada supported the adoption of the draft guidelines as its contents are just recommendations and not mandatory to implement.

134. Following this feedback, the Delegation of the Republic of Korea, as a Co-Leader of the Name Standardization Task Force, indicated that if the guidelines were not mature enough for adoption then further contributions from Offices would be required to determine what improvements were necessary. The CWS stepped through the proposed guidelines to determine if there was any specific feedback for improvement during the session. The Delegation of the Russian Federation, in reference to paragraph 11 of the proposed guidelines, proposed the collection of transliteration tables from Offices which could be published by the International Bureau on the WIPO website and then be referenced by the draft guidelines. Additionally, the same Delegation recommended the inclusion of the transcription into Cyrillic as part of Figure 1 of Annex I of the draft guidelines. The Delegation of the United States of America indicated that for trademarks, it currently only accepted Latin characters and would transform applicant names to comply with ISO 8859-1 only.

135. The Committee agreed to using the term ‘recommendations’ instead of ‘guidelines’ in the name of proposed new WIPO standard. The CWS noted that the Secretariat proposed “WIPO Standard ST.93” for recommendations on the data cleaning of names.

136. The CWS did not adopt the proposed standard and sent back the proposed new WIPO standard to the Name Standardization Task Force for further discussion and improvement. The CWS requested the Task Force to present an improved draft standard at its twelfth session. The CWS encouraged its Members and Observers to participate more actively in the discussion.

137. The Secretariat agreed to investigate the possibility of publishing a collection of transliteration tables on WIPO website.

Agenda Item 7: Implementation of WIPO Standards by Offices

Agenda Item 7(a): WIPO Standard ST.26

138. The CWS noted presentations made by the Delegations of Australia, the Republic of Korea and the United States of America which were delivered after an introduction by the International Bureau which shared details regarding the survey results for the first year of implementation of WIPO Standard ST.26 by Sequence Listing Task Force Member Offices. The Representative of the European Patent Office also orally shared its experience implementing the Standard.

139. The CWS the challenges in implementing WIPO Standard ST.26 that were commonly indicated in these presentations. The Secretariat thanked all IPOs for their efforts and close collaboration required to implement “big bang” the Standard globally on July 1, 2022.

140. The Delegation of China provided a short update on its implementation of WIPO Standard ST.26. It has already published sequence listings compliant with WIPO ST.26 format in its gazette. The Delegation informed the CWS that it has also organized special examiner training in the pharmaceutical field and was active in supporting the testing of new versions of the WIPO Sequence Suite. However, the Delegation noted that its applicants had some issues generating their sequence listings using WIPO Sequence. The Delegation proposed that the International Bureau provide a support platform for WIPO Sequence where users can report issues while also tracking their progress in being resolved. The Secretariat supported the proposal.

141. The CWS noted that the International Bureau would consider implementing the proposal by the Delegation of China to track in a more transparent manner how reported bugs are being resolved by the WIPO Sequence Suite development team.

Agenda Item 7(b): WIPO Standard ST.37

142. The CWS noted presentations by the Delegation of the Republic of Korea and the Representative of the Eurasian Patent Organization, which were delivered after an introduction by the International Bureau regarding updates made to the Authority File Portal since the last session.

143. The Delegation of Brazil requested feedback from other Offices regarding the definition of exception codes. The Secretariat indicated that under the new Task No. 66, which was approved at this session, it could support such Offices requests.

Agenda Item 7(c): WIPO Standards ST.27, ST.61 and ST.87 concerning legal status events

144. The CWS noted presentations by the Delegation of Japan, the Delegation of the Republic of Korea and the Delegation of Norway, which were delivered after an introduction by the Secretariat on the implementation of legal status relating to WIPO Standards. The Representative of the Eurasian Patent Organization also orally shared its experience implementing the three Standards.

145. The CWS noted that the Secretariat intended to provide training on the content and implementation of these particular WIPO Standards.

146. The CWS was invited to provide specific feedback to the International Bureau, as the Legal Status Task Force, on whether the balance of the number of detailed and key events is appropriate.

Agenda Item 7(d): WIPO Standard ST.90

147. The CWS noted presentation by the Representative of the European Patent Office, which was delivered after an introduction by the Secretariat on the implementation of WIPO Standard ST.90 by IPOs. The Representative of the European Union also orally shared its experience implementing the Standard.

Agenda Item 7(e): WIPO Standard ST.91

148. The CWS noted presentations by the Delegation of the Republic of Korea and the Representative of the Eurasian Patent Organization, which were delivered after an introduction by the Secretariat on the implementation of WIPO ST.91 on 3D models and 3D images by IPOs.

Agenda Item 7(f): WIPO Standard ST.96

149. The CWS noted presentations by the Delegations of the Republic of Korea, Switzerland and Canada after an introduction by the International Bureau on the implementation of different WIPO ST.96 versions by Task Force member Offices. The Representative of the Eurasian Patent Organization also orally shared its experience with this Standard.

150. The Delegation of Switzerland sought support from other Offices which have implemented WIPO ST.96 payment components. The CWS encouraged Offices to participate in the XML4IP Task Force to ensure that the Standard continues to meet their needs.

Agenda Item 7(g): Other WIPO Standards

151. The CWS noted a presentation by the Delegation of the Russian Federation on its implementation of WIPO Standards ST.26, ST.37, ST.27, ST.61, ST.87, ST.90, ST.91, ST.36, ST.66, ST.86 and ST.96.

Agenda Item 8: Policies and activities relating to intellectual property (IP) data, information system and information services

Agenda Item 8(a): IP Offices' strategies and policies on Information Communication Technologies (ICT) and digital transformation

152. Discussions were based on presentations by the Delegation of Australia, the Delegation of the Republic of Korea, the Representative of the European Union, the Representative of the Eurasian Patent Organization and the International Bureau. The CWS noted the contents of these presentations, which were published on the meeting page.

153. In relation to the presentation made by the Delegation of the Republic of Korea, the Delegation of China asked where the reliability rating was derived from. The Korean Delegation responded that these were calculated from examiner satisfaction ratings at the Korean Intellectual Property Office.

Agenda Item 8(b): Recommendations on ICT and IP administration

154. Discussions were based on document [CWS/11/18](#).

155. The CWS recalled that it had noted, at its sixth session, the original 40 Recommendations and considered that many Recommendations were categorized into Group 3 which did not appear relevant to the CWS for the near future (see paragraphs 17 to 27 of document CWS/6/34). The CWS noted that the ICT Strategy for Standards Task Force had considered all original 40 Recommendations, including those Recommendations of Group 3 relevant to the mandate of the CWS that was adopted at the tenth session of the CWS. The CWS also noted the results of the analysis by the Task Force of the 40 Recommendations:

- (a) that the level of detail for some of the Recommendations was different;

- (b) the number of Recommendations was considered too many for IPOs to implement;
- (c) some Recommendations are outdated; and
- (d) four of the Recommendations were considered already completed (see paragraphs 5 and 8 of document CWS/11/18).

Taking this into account, the Task Force proposed a set of 10 new draft Recommendations on ICT and IP administration, with corresponding actions. The proposed new Recommendations are reproduced in the Annex to document CWS/11/18.

156. The CWS considered the proposed set of new draft Recommendations. Improvements to the wordings of these proposed Recommendations were made after interventions by several delegations.

157. The CWS agreed that the draft Recommendations be improved by the inclusion of the following minor changes:

- (a) In Recommendation 4(c), replace the start of the first sentence with 'IP offices should ensure that a policy to leverage API and the Cloud is in place...';
- (b) In Recommendation 7(a), replace 'should' with 'are encouraged to' so that the first sentence reads as follows: 'IP offices are encouraged to actively participate in the cooperative projects that...';
- (c) In Recommendation 10(a)(ii), add the words 'if possible' to the end of the last sentence; and
- (d) In Recommendation 10, replace 'should' with 'are encouraged to' in the first sentence so that it reads as follows: 'IP offices are encouraged to share experience if possible relating to different ICT project delivery models, including...'

158. The CWS requested that the Secretariat issue a circular inviting its Members to comment on the improved draft Recommendations on ICT and IP administration.

159. The CWS also requested the ICT Strategy Task Force to report the results of responses to this circular at its twelfth session.

Agenda Item 8(c): Global Identifier for natural persons and legal entities

160. Discussions were based on document [CWS/11/17](#) and the presentations made by the International Bureau, the Delegations of the Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia and the United States of America, and the Representative of European Union, and of the International Union for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants (UPOV).

161. The CWS noted the progress achieved on the Global Identifier Project since the last session of the CWS including the definition of a global identifier code structure and the provision of the next steps for the project. The International Bureau reported that the Project aims at providing a single global identifier per natural person or legal entity to identify them consistently, accurately and securely across IP systems and jurisdictions globally. The CWS noted that the International Bureau intended to invite a limited number of Offices and other stakeholders to the next phases of the Project on the basis of Global Identifier use case(s) which would be chosen in due course, to better understand their specific needs, and the International Bureau would engage in the development of potential use case(s) for example, the global assignment use case, as needed.

162. The Delegation of Germany supported the initiative in general and pointed out a potential issue regarding data protection rules in Europe. When transmitting data outside of Europe, the user has the right to delete private data, which conflicts with the proposed blockchain implementation of the global identifier. The International Bureau responded that the data protection was one of the challenges that was identified in Phase 1 of the Project and has been looking for a potential resolution. The Delegation of Spain expressed its interest in the initiative and asked whether there could be a conflict with existing digital identity currently used by individuals. The International Bureau also noted that the Global Identifier should be compatible with existing digital identity systems that follow the W3C Decentralized identifiers (DIDs). The Delegation of China noted the foreseeable burden that the proposed implementation would place on the applicants to keep their entry up-to-date. The same Delegation also noted that it would require more time to consider the content of the document and to consult with their stakeholders and customers. The Delegation of Japan considered the concept of Global Identifiers useful, but objected to the mandatory implementation of the Global Identifier due to the costs it would incur, the necessity of legal updates and upgrades to the IT systems that would be required. The International Bureau confirmed that the use of Global Identifier would not be mandatory, but would be encouraged. The Delegation of Samoa supported to the initiative but highlighted challenges such as the interlinking of Global Identifiers with IP registries and interoperability.

163. The CWS noted the presentations made by the five IPOs, which participated in Phase 1 of the Global Identifier Project and their full support for the Project. The Delegation of the Republic of Korea informed the Committee of its consideration of Global Identifiers and its application for the "Applicant Name Standardization Initiative" within IP5 Offices. It shared its plan on the survey to collect input from the IP5 industry regarding on the applicant name standardization, which would include questions on requirements for Global Identifiers and the adoption of Global Identifier for their initiatives such as global assignments. The Delegation of Saudi Arabia considered that the Global Identifier Project met the goals set out by the Delegation in its proposal for establishing an international database to standardize applicant names presented at the tenth session of the Committee (see document CWS/10/10) and it looked forward to continuing its participation in the next phase of the Project. The Delegation of the United States of America highlighted goals and benefits of global identifiers, and several considerations for business and IT to implement the global identifier. The Representative of European Union introduced its approach for digital identity and potential integration of Global Identifier into the approach. The Representative of UPOV presented possible use cases of Global Identifiers for UPOV, which would streamline various business processes by replacing the current different customer identifiers issued by different UPOV Members such as application filing, payment and transfer ownership.

164. In response to those presentations, the Delegation of Canada enquired whether the global identifiers would be applied to PCT applications and what technical changes might be required for Offices to process the Global Identifiers for those applications that enter through the national phase, and potential impact on its customer numbers in place across departments within the Canadian Government. The International Bureau responded that the implementation of Global Identifiers within the PCT systems is planned in Phase 2 of the project and the International Bureau would potentially provide IT infrastructure for the Global Identifiers so that Offices can utilize it to issue and/or process Global Identifiers. The International Bureau also stated that Offices can link their customer numbers to the Global Identifiers if they provide a single and unique customer number per natural person or legal entity. The Delegation of the United States asked UPOV whether there would be metrics in place to measure the efficiency gains and benefits of adopting the global identifier, which might help in developing a business case for other Offices. The Representative of UPOV responded that it would be able to report achieved benefits to Offices who intend to participate in Phase 2 as it already has its users and its partner Offices who expressed willingness to engage the specific use cases.

165. The CWS noted the proposed global identifier code structure and the next steps for the Global Identifier Project, including Phase 2.

Agenda Item 8(d): Proposal for recommendations on data exchange framework

166. Discussions were based on document [CWS/11/16](#) and the presentation made by the Delegation of Japan.

167. The CWS noted the project brief prepared by the Delegation of Japan detailed in document CWS/11/16 for preparing a set of recommendations on implementing a data exchange framework. The project brief referred to open data initiatives which government agencies used to provide data to the public in a machine-readable format for ready use by the private sector. The Delegation proposed to develop a new WIPO standard to support WIPO Member States exchange data with a common recognition of the significance of aligned data exchange processes, under the framework of a new Task with a corresponding Task Force.

168. The Delegation of Spain enquired what is missing from already existing data practices, including the use of open data platforms and WIPO Standards. The Delegation of United States of America stated that the proposal by the Delegation of Japan and the other proposal by the Delegation of Saudi Arabia under Agenda Item 8(e) were closely related. This Delegation proposed that any decision regarding a new Task or Task Force be postponed until after the proposal by the Delegation of Saudi Arabia was heard. The postponement was supported by the Delegations of Republic of Korea and Brazil which recognized that resource allocation should be optimized for CWS Tasks.

169. The Delegation of China generally supported the proposal by the Delegation of Japan as it emphasized the importance of optimizing data exchange. However, the Delegation raised several points of further discussion which were necessary including the status of existing bilateral agreements on data exchange; the potential impact of the recommendations on the Offices which were currently implementing WIPO Standards; and whether consideration had been made regarding data sharing and security national regulations. The Delegation also requested further details on what efficiency savings could be found by implementing the data exchange framework. In response, the Delegation of Japan indicated that its proposal was aimed at making data exchange more efficient instead of adding additional burden for IPOs.

170. The Delegation of the Republic of Korea enquired whether the proposal would have an impact on WIPO Standards. The Delegation of Japan considered that its proposal would not impact existing WIPO Standards as it aims to develop a policy framework for data sharing and exchange rather than a particular data structure or format.

171. As there was no consensus under this Agenda Item and this topic was considered by several delegations as strongly related to Agenda Item 8(e), the CWS agreed that any decision regarding the creation of a new Task or Task Force be postponed until after the proposal made by the Delegation of Saudi Arabia under the Agenda Item 8(e).

Agenda Item 8(e): Proposal for establishing a global platform to facilitate IP information exchange

172. Discussions were based on document [CWS/11/25](#) and the presentation made by the Delegation of Saudi Arabia.

173. The CWS noted the project brief prepared by the Delegation of Saudi Arabia for establishing a global platform to facilitate the exchange of IP information. The Delegation proposed to develop a global platform, under the supervision of WIPO, which aims to harmonize and standardize IP data provided by disparate sources. The Delegation also proposed to create a new CWS Task with a corresponding Task Force for this work.

174. The Delegation of Canada sought clarification on the difference or relationship between the proposal by the Delegation of Japan presented under Agenda Item 8(d) above and the current proposal by the Delegation of Saudi Arabia. The same Delegation considered that the proposed work undertaken in the proposal by the Delegation of Japan should be considered as earlier in the work process than the work proposed by the Delegation by Saudi Arabia. The Delegation of the United States of America complimented the detail provided in the proposal by the Delegation of Saudi Arabia, but noted that it seemed an ambitious plan and would require significant resources. The same Delegation proposed that the two proponents collaborate together on a combined proposal, comprised of small preparatory steps, for consideration before a decision is made whether a new Task is created, preferably at the next session of the CWS. The Delegation of China indicated that further study on the impact of investing in such a data platform seemed to be required including the cost of hosting such a large number of documents and whether bilateral agreements would still be required. The Delegation of Germany sought further clarification from the Delegation of Saudi Arabia regarding what data gap exists or missing functionalities when considering existing WIPO products such as PATENTSCOPE and the Global Brands Database. This gap analysis could serve to improve these existing products and could be one of the small steps proposed by the Delegation of United States of America.

175. The CWS noted that many delegations considered the two proposals were interlinked and suggested that the two proponents work together to prepare a consolidated proposal with more concrete and achievable goals in near future.

176. Taking into account the feedback from the delegations, the Delegations of Japan and Saudi Arabia proposed as an alternative a combined single Task and one Task Force. The two Delegations proposed the following description for the combined Task:

“Analyze practices and challenges of IP offices in exchanging their data; explore technical solutions; and prepare recommendations on IP data exchange”

177. The CWS reviewed the new Task description proposed by the two Delegations. Several delegations explicitly supported the new Task description. The CWS noted that the Delegations of Japan and Saudi Arabia volunteered to co-lead the combined Task Force, with the International Bureau, once it had been created. However there was no consensus on the creation of this Task or Task Force.

178. To reach consensus, the CWS considered four options in relation to the Agenda Item 8(d) and Agenda Item 8(e) as follows:

(a) Option 1: create a new Task and an associated Task Force with the revised Task description provided in the paragraph above. The CWS noted that the Delegations of Japan and Saudi Arabia volunteered to lead the Task Force along with the International Bureau, if it was established;

(b) Option 2: request the Delegations of Japan and Saudi Arabia to draft an improved proposal for consideration at the next session of the Committee in relation to improving data exchange processes. This would postpone the creation of the Task and the associated Task Force until the next session;

(c) Option 3: create a Task Force to collaborate with the Delegations of Japan and Saudi Arabia to prepare an improved proposal for consideration at the next session of the Committee; and

(d) Option 4: request the Secretariat to issue a circular to CWS Members with the purpose of gathering necessary information so that an improved consolidated proposal could be prepared by the Delegations of Japan and Saudi Arabia and presented at the next session of the Committee. On the basis of the consolidated proposal, the CWS will consider the establishment of the new Task and the Task Force at the next session. Any interested CWS Member will be invited to participate in the preparation of the circular.

179. The CWS agreed to 'Option 4' specified in paragraph 178 above. The Secretariat then outlined a tentative schedule for preparation of the circular and the consolidated proposal considering the responses to the circular.

Agenda Item 8(f): Proposal for a draft survey questionnaire on the implementation of WIPO Standard ST.91

180. Discussions were based on document [CWS/11/26](#).

181. The CWS noted the proposal for a survey questionnaire to collect information on how widely WIPO Standard ST.91 is used and implemented by IPOs and to what extent and for which IP rights.

182. The CWS approved the survey questionnaire as presented in the Annex to document CWS/11/26.

183. The CWS requested that the Secretariat issue a circular inviting its Members and Observers to participate in the survey.

184. The CWS also requested that the 3D Task Force report the results of the survey at its twelfth session.

Agenda Item 8(g): Report on 2022 Annual Technical Reports (ATRs)

185. Discussions were based on presentation by the International Bureau.

186. The CWS noted the content of the presentation, in particular the fact that six more Offices participated in 2023 than 2022, and nine more Annual Technical Reports (ATRs) were submitted. The Secretariat considered that the simplified format for ATRs streamlined the provision of ATRs.

Agenda Item 9: Technical collaboration and support

Agenda Item 9(a): 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

187. Discussions were based on document [CWS/11/10](#).

188. The CWS noted the content of the report, in particular the 2022 activities of the International Bureau related to providing technical advice and assistance for capacity building for IPOs in the promotion of IP standards information.

189. The CWS noted the presentations made by the International Bureau on 'WIPO IP Office Suite Common ICT solutions for IP Offices' and on 'WIPO Global Databases'. The CWS was

informed that the 'WIPO IP Office Suite' is a complete set of tools to support all the business operations of an IP office for all industry property types, where WIPO Standards are integrated to implicitly assist Offices to implement WIPO Standards. The Committee noted that the coverage of data and functionality of the Global Databases. The International Bureau invited IPOs to provide their data for completeness of the Global Databases for the benefits of users and Offices. The International Bureau also encouraged IPOs to provide their data following WIPO Standards for efficiency of processing data for the Databases.

190. The CWS noted that this document would serve as the basis of the relevant report to be presented to the WIPO General Assembly to be held in 2024, as requested at its 40th session held in October 2011 (see paragraph 190 of document WO/GA/40/19).

Agenda Item 9(b): Development of common ICT solutions for use by Offices

191. Discussions were based on presentations made by the International Bureau and the Delegation of Saudi Arabia.

192. The CWS noted the content of three presentations on common ICT solutions for use by Offices. The International Bureau presented on its solutions for IPOs regarding 'AI tools for common use' and 'WIPO Sequence Suite'. The Delegation of Saudi Arabia introduced its 'New IP Search Engine', which is publicly accessible.

Agenda Item 9(c): Cooperative technical projects between Offices

193. Discussions were based on a presentation made by the International Bureau and an oral presentation by the Representative of the Eurasian Patent Organization.

194. The CWS noted the cooperative project, between the International Bureau and the API task Force Member Offices, to develop a unified API catalog. The CWS noted that the cooperative project aims to build a catalog which would index APIs provided by IP institutions and the pilot would end in the first half of 2024. The CWS also noted that there is a dedicated wiki space for the project, which could be accessible by any interested Offices, upon request.

195. The CWS was informed of the cooperative technical projects shared by the Representative of the Eurasian Patent Organization, which included the implementation of WIPO Standard ST.91, the development of Eurasian IP register and the establishment of a common patent platform which would utilize various WIPO Standards.

Agenda Item 10: Summary by the Chair

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

Agenda Item 11: Closing of the session

197. The meeting was closed by the Chair on December 8, 2023.

Adoption of the report of the session

198. *This report was adopted by the participants to the eleventh 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, 2.4.3.D - International Information Technology Cooperation, German Patent and Trade Mark Office (DPMA), Munich

ARABIE SAOUDITE/SAUDI ARABIA

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

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

Omar ALQASEM (Mr.), Head, Artificial Intelligence and Data Solutions, Saudi Authority for Intellectual Property (SAIP), Riyadh

Hala ALRAHMH (Ms.), Head, Data Management Office, 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

Michael CRISTIANO (Mr.), General Manager, Chief Information Officer, Innovation and Technology Group, IP Australia, Department of Industry, Science and Resources, Canberra

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

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

Ivanka BARISIC (Ms.), International ICT Cooperation Specialist, Innovation & Technology Group, IP Australia, Department of Industry, Science and Resources Canberra

Zohair HUSSAIN (Mr.), International ICT Delivery Manager, 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

BHOUTAN/BHUTAN

Karma ZANGMO (Ms.), Senior Intellectual Property Officer, Department of Media, Creative Industry and Intellectual property, Ministry of Industry, Commerce and Employment (MoICE), Thimphu

BRÉSIL/BRAZIL

Alexandre CIANCIO (Mr.), General-Coordinator, Patent Technological Information, Directorate of Patents, National Institute of Industrial Property (INPI), Ministry of Development, Industry, Trade and Services (MDIC), Rio de Janeiro

BULGARIE/BULGARIA

Dail DAILOV (Mr.), Junior Expert, Administrative and Legal Activities, Patent Office of the Republic of Bulgaria, Ministry of Economy, Sofia

Radoslava MLADENOVA (Ms.), Patent Examiner, Directorate Examination and Protection of Inventions, Utility Models and Industrial Designs, Patent Office of the Republic of Bulgaria, Ministry of Economy, Sofia

BURUNDI

Joadane NCUTI (Mme), conseillère, Département du commerce extérieur, Ministère du commerce, du transport, de l'industrie et du tourisme, Bujumbura

CANADA

Sudeep ACHARYA (Mr.), Director, Investments and Program Management, Canadian Intellectual Property Office (CIPO), Innovation Science and Economic Development Canada (ISED), Gatineau

Khadar HOSH (Mr.), Data Analyst, Business Improvement Services, Data Dissemination, Canadian Intellectual Property Office (CIPO), Innovation Science and Economic Development Canada (ISED), Gatineau

Derek SPERO (Mr.), Solution Architect, Canadian Intellectual Property Office (CIPO), Innovation Science and Economic Development Canada (ISED), Ottawa

CHILI/CHILE

Octavio Francisco MONTECINOS AMPUERO (Sr.), Subdirector, Tecnologías de la Información y Comunicaciones, Subdirección de Tecnologías de la Información y Comunicaciones., Instituto Nacional de Propiedad Industrial (INAPI), Ministerio de Economía, Santiago

CHINE/CHINA

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

JIN Hanxiao (Ms.), Principal Staff, Automation Department, China National Intellectual Property Administration (CNIPA), Beijing

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

CÔTE D'IVOIRE

Manzan Dominique Chantal BES (Mme), cheffe, Service conseil et formation, Office ivoirien de la propriété intellectuelle (OIPI), Ministère de l'industrie et de la promotion du secteur privé , Abidjan

CROATIE/CROATIA

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

Vesna JEVTIĆ (Ms.), Senior Advisor-Specialist, Digitalization of Business and Development of Information Business Systems, Digital Business and Quality Department, State Intellectual Property Office (SIPO) of the Republic of Croatia, Zagreb

CUBA

Lyan MARSANS CASTELLANOS (Sra.), Jefa, Departamento de Marcas, Oficina Cubana de la Propiedad Industrial (OCPI), Ministerio de Ciencia, Tecnología y Medio Ambiente, La Habana

DANEMARK/DENMARK

Martin Scheil CORNELIUSSEN (Mr.), Head, Information Technology Development and Data, Danish Patent and Trademark Office, Ministry of Industry, Business and Financial Affairs, Taastrup

ESPAGNE/SPAIN

Maria Rosa CARRERAS (Sra.), Jefe de Área, Divulgación de la propiedad intelectual, Madrid

ETATS-UNIS D'AMÉRIQUE/UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

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

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

Li WANG (Ms.), Director, Office of the Chief Information Officer, Enterprise Data Architecture Division, 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

Kathleen KALAFUS (Ms.), Technical Specialist, Scientific and Technical Information Center, United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO), Department of Commerce, Alexandria

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

Tyle AUDUONG (Ms.), Director, Data Quality, United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO), Department of Commerce, Alexandria

Alicia ANTOINE (Ms.), Business Analyst, United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO), Department of Commerce, Alexandria

FÉDÉRATION DE RUSSIE/RUSSIAN FEDERATION

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

Victoria GALKOVSKAYA (Ms.), Deputy Head, Federal Service for Intellectual Property (ROSPATENT), Moscow

Ilya KONONENKO (Mr.), Deputy Head, Office of the Director, Federal Institute of Industrial Property (FIPS), Federal Service for Intellectual Property (ROSPATENT), Moscow

Olga FEDOSEEVA (Ms.), Deputy Head, Division for Information Search System Design, Center for Design, Development and Maintenance of Applied Information Systems, Federal Institute of Industrial Property (FIPS), Federal Service for Intellectual Property (ROSPATENT), Moscow

Valeriya MAKSIMOVA (Ms.), Senior Patent Researcher, Federal Institute of Industrial Property (FIPS), Federal Service for Intellectual Property (ROSPATENT), Moscow

Olga TIURINA (Ms.), Senior Patent Researcher, Federal Institute of Industrial Property (FIPS), Federal Service for Intellectual Property (ROSPATENT), Moscow

FINLANDE/FINLAND

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

FRANCE

Sylvie MERESSE (Mme), chargée de diffusion des données dessins et modèles, et indications géographiques, Direction propriété industrielle et entreprises, Courbevoie

GAMBIE (LA)/GAMBIA (THE)

Aliou JABANG (Mr.), Senior Legal Clerk, IPAS Administrator, Registrar General's Department, Attorney General's Chambers, Ministry of Justice, Banjul

GÉORGIE/GEORGIA

Nino JINTCHARADZE (Ms.), Main Specialist, International Relations and Protocol Division, National Intellectual Property Center (SAKPATENTI), Tbilisi

INDONÉSIE/INDONESIA

Dede Mia YUSANTI (Ms.), Member of Delegation, Directorate General of Intellectual Property (DGIP), Ministry of Law and Human Rights, Jakarta

Novi MIRAWANTY (Ms.), Sub Coordinator, Information Technology Planning and Standardization, Directorate of Information Technology, Directorate General of Intellectual Property (DGIP), Ministry of Law and Human Rights, Jakarta

Aditia RATNA (Ms.), Application Head, Directorate of Information Technology, Directorate General of Intellectual Property (DGIP), Ministry of Law and Human Rights, Jakarta

Ridho DWINANDA (Mr.), Application Systems and Computer Network Analyst, Directorate of Information Technology, Directorate General of Intellectual Property (DGIP), Ministry of Law and Human Rights, Jakarta

Anis ERSITA (Ms.), Member of Delegation, Directorate General of Intellectual Property (DGIP), Ministry of Law and Human Rights, Jakarta

Nugroho Irawan FEBIANTO (Mr.), Application Systems and Computer Network Analyst, Directorate General of Intellectual Property (DGIP), Ministry of Law and Human Rights, Jakarta

Erwin Andriawan Putra GONTI (Mr.), Intellectual Property Analyst, Secretariat, Directorate General of Intellectual Property (DGIP), Ministry of Law and Human Rights, Jakarta

Mohammad IRVAN (Mr.), Intellectual Property Analyst, Information Technology of Intellectual Property, Ministry of Law and Human Rights, Depok

Masnin MASNIN (Ms.), Member of Delegation, Directorate General of Intellectual Property (DGIP), Ministry of Law and Human Rights, Jakarta

Sonya PAU ADU (Ms.), Member of Delegation, Directorate General of Intellectual Property (DGIP), Ministry of Law and Human Rights, Jakarta

Des Maharani PRASETYADEWI (Ms.), Member of Delegation, Directorate General of Intellectual Property (DGIP), Ministry of Law and Human Rights, Jakarta

Setyo PURWANTORO (Mr.), Member of Delegation, Directorate General of Intellectual Property (DGIP), Ministry of Law and Human Rights, Jakarta

Muly Malem Karina Alasen SEMBIRING (Ms.), Member of Delegation, Directorate General of Intellectual Property (DGIP), Ministry of Law and Human Rights, Jakarta

Benedictus Benny SETIAWAN (Mr.), Member of Delegation, Directorate General of Intellectual Property (DGIP), Ministry of Law and Human Rights, Jakarta

Tri WAHYUNI (Ms.), Member of Delegation, Directorate General of Intellectual Property (DGIP), Ministry of Law and Human Rights, Jakarta

IRAN (RÉPUBLIQUE ISLAMIQUE D'IRAN (ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF)

Zakieh TAGHI ZADEH PIRPOSHTEH (Ms.), First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

ITALIE/ITALY

Lino FANELLA (Mr.), Information Technology Expert, Information Technology Department, Directorate General for the Protection of Industrial Property, Italian Patent and Trademark Office (UIBM), Ministry of enterprises and Made in Italy, Rome

JAPON/JAPAN

HARA Kazuhide (Mr.), Deputy Director, Patent Information Policy Planning Office, Japan Patent Office (JPO), Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry (METI), Tokyo

NIBOSHI Yosui (Mr.), Assistant Director, Information Technology Policy Planning Office, Japan Patent Office (JPO), Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry (METI), Tokyo

SAKAGUCHI Takeshi (Mr.), Deputy Director, Patent Information Policy Planning Office, Japan Patent Office (JPO), Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry (METI)Tokyo

IHOSHII Junya (Mr.), Deputy Director, Information Technology Policy Planning Office, Japan Patent Office (JPO), Ministry of Economy, Trade, and Industry (METI), Tokyo

YASUI Takuya (Mr.), First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

KAZAKHSTAN

Saltanat AZHIBEKYZY (Ms.), Chief Specialist, Patent Information and Automation of Examination Stages Division, National Institute of Intellectual Property, Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Astana

KENYA

Sammy Ziro LEWA (Mr.), Patent Examiner, Pharmaceuticals, Patents Division, Ministry of Investments, Trade and Industry, Nairobi

LIBAN/LEBANON

Carla WEHBE (Ms.), Senior Patent Examiner, Office of Intellectual Property, Department of Intellectual Property, Directorate General of Economy and Trade, Ministry of Economy and Trade, Beirut

Hazan Abdel SAMAD, First Secretary, Geneva

LITUANIE/LITHUANIA

Deimante IVINSKIENE (Ms.), Head, Applications Receiving and Document Management Division, State Patent Bureau of the Republic of Lithuania, Vilnius

MAROC/MOROCCO

Imane LEMTIRI CHELIEH (Mme), cheffe, Service Datalab, Plateformes digitales et data, Office marocain de la propriété industrielle et commerciale (OMPIC), Casablanca

MEXIQUE/MEXICO

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

María del Pilar ESCOBAR BAUTISTA (Sra.), Consejera, Misión Permanente, Ginebra

Itzel FERNÁNDEZ PANDO (Sra.), Asesor, Misión Permanente, Ginebra

NORVÈGE/NORWAY

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

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

PÉROU/PERU

Lourdes LÓPEZ RENGIFO (Sra.), Especialista, División de Patentes, Instituto Nacional de Defensa de la Competencia y de la Protección de la Propiedad Intelectual (INDECOPI), Presidencia del Consejo de Ministros (PCM), Lima

PORTUGAL

Luís ENGISSA (Mr.), Member of the Board, Directive Council, Portuguese Institute of Industrial Property (INPI), Ministry of Justice, Lisbon

RÉPUBLIQUE DE CORÉE/REPUBLIC OF KOREA

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

KIM Hui (Mr.), Researcher, Deliberation and Industry Research Team, Korea Copyright
Commission, Republic of Korea, Jinju

CHOI Sangwon (Mr.), Deputy Director, Industrial Property Information Policy Division,
Korean Intellectual Property Office (KIPO), Daejeon

HYUN Seung Woo (Mr.), Deputy Director, Industrial Property Information System Division,
Korean Intellectual Property Office (KIPO), Daejeon

KIM Seonghun (Mr.), Assistant Director, Industrial Property Data Management Division,
Korean Intellectual Property Office (KIPO), Daejeon

KIM Soojin (Ms.) Deputy Director, Cultural Trade and Cooperation Division, Copyright
Bureau, Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism, Republic of Korea, Sejong

LEE Jintae (Mr.), Director, Deliberation and Industry Research Team, Korea Copyright
Commission, Republic of Korea, Jinju

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

LEE Jinyong (Mr.), Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva

RÉPUBLIQUE DE MOLDOVA/REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA

Nicolae DIMOV (Mr.), Lead Specialist, Information Technologies Division, State Agency on
Intellectual Property (AGEPI), Chişinău

Olga CICINOVA (Ms.), Head, Workflow Division, Patents Department, State Agency on
Intellectual Property (AGEPI), Chişinău

RÉPUBLIQUE TCHÈQUE/CZECH REPUBLIC

Jakub JUZL (Mr.), System Analyst, Patent Information Department, Industrial Property Office
of the Czech Republic, Prague

ROYAUME-UNI/UNITED KINGDOM

Peter SLATER (Mr.), Chief Data Officer, Digital Data and Technology (DDaT), Intellectual
Property Office (IPO), Newport

Lauren JOHNSON (Miss), Data Steward, Digital Data and Technology (DDaT), Intellectual
Property Office (IPO), Newport

SAMOA

Holton FAASAU (Mr.), Deputy Registrar, Registry of Companies and Intellectual Properties
(RCIP), Ministry of Commerce, Industry and Labour (MCIL), Apia

SINGAPOUR/SINGAPORE

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

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

Ying Jie NG (Mr.), Trade Mark Examiner, Registry of Trade Marks, Intellectual Property Office of Singapore (IPOS), Singapore

Sreeja S (Ms.), Assistant Director, Registries of Patent, Designs and Plant Varieties,, Intellectual Property Office of Singapore (IPOS), Singapore

SLOVAQUIE/SLOVAKIA

Katarina DOVALOVA (Ms.), Patent Information Expert, Information Technology Operations, Industrial Property Office of the Slovak Republic, Banská Bystrica

SUÈDE/SWEDEN

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

Anders SVENSSON (Mr.), Process Owner, Design and Trademark Department, Swedish Intellectual Property Office (PRV), Söderhamn

SUISSE/SWITZERLAND

Mirko GALLI (M.), chef, Développement des services et innovation, Services de technologie et d'infrastructure, Institut fédéral de la propriété intellectuelle (IPI), Berne

Kilian AELLEN (M.), ingénieur senior, Exigences, Technologies de l'information et de la communication (TIC) Services de technologie et d'infrastructure, Institut fédéral de la propriété intellectuelle (IPI), Berne

THAÏLANDE/THAILAND

Peerathai PISANTHAMMANONT (Ms.), Computer Technical Officer, Professional Level, Department of Intellectual Property (DIP), Ministry of Commerce, Nonthaburi

UKRAINE

Davyd BLBULIAN (Mr.), Intellectual Property Professional, Patent Information, Documentation and Standardization Unit, National Intellectual Property Authority, Ukrainian National Office for Intellectual Property and Innovations (UANIPIO), Ministry of Economy of Ukraine, Kyiv

Halyna DOBRYNINA (Ms.), Deputy Head, Patent Information, Documentation and Standardization Unit, National Intellectual Property Authority, Ukrainian National Office for Intellectual Property and Innovations (UANIPIO), Ministry of Economy of Ukraine, Kyiv

Nadiia KOLOMIETS (Ms.), First Category Intellectual Property Professional, Patent Information, Documentation and Standardization Unit, National Intellectual Property Authority, Ukrainian National Office for Intellectual Property and Innovations (UANIPIO), Ministry of Economy of Ukraine, Kyiv

Andrii ZOZULIUK (Mr.), Head, International Cooperation Department, National Intellectual Property Authority, Ukrainian National Office for Intellectual Property and Innovations (UANIPIO), Ministry of Economy of Ukraine, Kyiv

II. ORGANISATIONS INTERGOUVERNEMENTALES/INTERGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

ORGANISATION AFRICAINE DE LA PROPRIÉTÉ INTELLECTUELLE (OAPI)/AFRICAN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION (OAPI)

Ayouba IDI (M.), examinateur, Brevets, Direction des brevets et autres créations techniques, Yaoundé

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

Andrey AGEENKO (Mr.), Head, Cyber Security Division, Moscow

Andrey SEKRETOV (Mr.), Head, Division of Integration Solutions, Department of Information Technologies, Moscow

Denis ZASTAVNYI (Mr.), Head, Department of Information Technologies, Moscow

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

Clara BOIANGIU (Ms.), Patent Examiner, Biotechnology, The Hague

Theodor PALEOLOG, Head, Tools, Back Office Department, Rijswijk

Fernando FERREIRA (Mr.), Administrator, Business Information Technology, Back Office, Rijswijk

Roland NELSON (Mr.), Head, Engineering and Architecture Department, The Hague

Monika NEUMANN (Ms.), Legal Expert, Directorate Patent Law and Processes, Munich

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

Vesna VAJSBAHER (Ms.), Patent Data Specialist, Data Services in Patent Intelligence, Vienna

UNION EUROPÉENNE (UE)/EUROPEAN UNION (EU)

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

Lorenzino VACCARI (Mr.), Digital Transformation Department, Alicante

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

Carlos LUNA (Mr.), Information Technology Specialist, Digital Transformation Department,
Alicante

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

Miguel OLIVARES SEMPERE (Mr.), Information Technology Cooperation Specialist, Tools,
Institutional and Cooperation Department (ICD), Alicante

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

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

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

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

Amelia Rose PATRICK (Ms.), Head of Delegation, Brussels
Tarik ÇIMEN (Mr.), Delegate, Brussels
Tamrin DARBAKOV (Mr.), Delegate, Brussels

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

Catherine BONNER (Ms.), Patent Attorney, Chair, Standing Committee on Patent
Cooperation Treaty (PCT), Southampton
Milton Lucido LEA BARCELLOS, Member, Porto Allegre

Confederacy of Patent Information User Groups (CEPIUG)

Guido MORADEI (Mr.), Delegate, Intellectual Property Office (IPO) Relations, Varese
Domenico GOLZIO (Mr.), Delegate, Italian Section (AIDB), Wassenaar

Groupe de documentation sur les brevets (PDG)/Patent Documentation Group (PDG)

Nicholas COLE (Mr.), Senior Information Scientist, Legal Department, Hounslow
Arndt MECKE (Mr.), Patent Information Professional, WG IMPACT, Munich
Cinda HARROLD (Ms.), Manager, Scientific Information, CAS, Content Operations,
Columbus
Benjamin LANSBURY (Mr.), Senior Product Manager, Content Management Department,
London
Maike HOUTROUW (Ms.), Intellectual Property Analyst, Eindhoven

MALOCA Internationale

Leonardo RODRÍGUEZ PEREZ (Mr.), Indigenous Affairs, Geneva

Ordre Suprême des Ancêtres (OSA)

Raphaella AYINA (Mme), représentante suppléante auprès l'ONUG, Secrétariat général,
Montréal

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)**

Ken-Ichiro NATSUME (M./Mr.), sous-directeur général, Secteur de de l'infrastructure et des
plateformes/Assistant Director General, Infrastructure and Platforms Sector

Kunihiko FUSHIMI (M./Mr.), directeur, 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

Yongwoong KIM (M./Mr.), administrateur principal de programme, Bureau du sous-directeur
général (SIP), Secteur de l'infrastructure et des plateformes/Senior Program Officer,
Office of the Assistant Director General (IPS), 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

Caroline SCHLESSINGER (Mme/Ms.), secrétaire II, Division des classifications
internationales et des normes, Secteur de de l'infrastructure et des plateformes/Secretary II,
International Classifications and Standards Division, Infrastructure and Platforms Sector

[L'annexe II suit/Annex II follows]

TASK LIST

(a) Tasks discontinued at this session:

- | | |
|--------------|--|
| 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. 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. |

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

- | | |
|--------------|--|
| Task No. 66: | Encourage IP offices to provide their patent authority file in compliance with WIPO Standard ST.37 by providing any technical support or training necessary, based on available resources. |
|--------------|--|

(c) Tasks revised at this session:

- | | |
|--------------|---|
| Task No. 41: | Ensure the necessary revisions and updates of WIPO Standards ST.36, ST.66, ST.86 and ST.96; and support the implementation of those Standards. |
| Task No. 44: | Support the International Bureau by testing new releases based on available resources and providing user feedback on the WIPO Sequence Suite; and prepare necessary revisions of WIPO Standard ST.26. |
| Task No. 50: | Ensure the necessary maintenance and update of surveys published in Part 7 of the WIPO Handbook on Intellectual Property Information and Documentation. |
| Task No. 52: | Prepare a proposal for the update of the WIPO Handbook Part 6.1 "Recommended minimum contents for intellectual property offices' websites". |
| Task No. 55: | Prepare a proposal for future actions aimed at achieving the standardization of names in Intellectual Property (IP) documents, with the view to developing a WIPO standard to assist IP offices in providing a better "quality at source" in relation to names. |

Task No. 58: Prepare a final proposal for a set of recommendations based on the feedback from the CWS Members on the proposed 10 recommendations on ICT and IP administration.

Task No. 62: Review WIPO Standards developed for paper or image-based communication in view of electronic filing and publication and exchange of IP documentation and propose revisions of those Standards or new recommendations if needed; and prepare a proposal for the recommendation on a common requirements specification for a DOCX to XML (DOCX2XML) converter.

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

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. 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. 59: Explore the possibility of using blockchain technology in the processes of providing IP rights protection, processing information about IP objects and their use; 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; 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 Prepare a proposal for a new WIPO standard supporting the potential application of blockchain technology within the IP ecosystem.

Task No. 63: Develop visual representation(s) of XML data, based on WIPO XML Standards, for electronic publication.

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.

(e) Tasks to ensure continuous maintenance of WIPO Standards:

- 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. 64: Ensure the necessary revisions and updates of WIPO Standard ST.97.

(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. 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. 33: Ongoing revision of WIPO Standards.
- Task No. 33/3: Ongoing revision of WIPO Standard ST.3.

(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.
- 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.

[End of Annex II and of document]