

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

**Seventh Session**  
**Geneva, July 1 to 5, 2019**

### **REPORT**

*adopted by the Committee*

#### **INTRODUCTION**

1. The Committee on WIPO Standards (hereinafter referred to as “the Committee”, or “the CWS”) held its Seventh Session in Geneva from July 1 to 5, 2019.
2. The following Member States of WIPO and/or members of the Paris Union and Bern Union were represented at the session: Algeria; Australia; Austria; Azerbaijan; Belarus; Belgium; Bolivia (Plurinational State Of); Brazil; Canada; Chile; China; Congo; Côte D’ivoire; Croatia; Czechia; Ecuador; Egypt; El Salvador; Finland; Germany; Ghana; Guatemala; Honduras; Hungary; India; Israel; Italy; Jamaica; Japan; Kazakhstan; Lebanon; Mauritania; Nepal; Nigeria; Norway; Oman; Paraguay; Republic Of Korea; Romania; Russian Federation; Saudi Arabia; Singapore; Spain; Sweden; Thailand; Ukraine; United Kingdom; United States Of America (48).
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); African Regional Intellectual Property Organization (ARIPO); Eurasian Patent Organization (EAPO); European Patent Office (EPO); European Union (EU); Patent Office Of The Cooperation Council For The Arab States Of The Gulf (GCC Patent Office) (6).
4. Representatives of the following non-governmental organizations took part in the Session in an observer capacity: Association Des Spécialistes De La Propriété Intellectuelle De Côte D’ivoire (ASPICI); International Association For The Protection Of Intellectual Property (AIPPI); Confederacy Of European Patent Information User Groups (CEPIUG); Patent Information Users Group (PIUG) (4).

5. The participation of seven Delegations or Representatives from Least Developed Countries (LDCs) or developing countries was financed by WIPO in accordance with the decision taken by the General Assembly in 2011.

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

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

7. The seventh session was opened by Director Mr. Kunihiko Fushimi on behalf of the Director General of WIPO, Mr. Francis Gurry, who welcomed the participants.

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

8. The CWS unanimously elected Mr. Jean-Charles Daoust (Canada) as Chair, and Mr. Sergey Biryukov (Russian Federation) as Vice-Chair.

9. Young-Woo YUN, Head, Standards Section, acted as Secretary of the Session.

### DISCUSSION OF AGENDA ITEMS

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

10. The CWS unanimously adopted the agenda as proposed in document CWS/7/1 PROV.2, which appears as Annex II to this report.

### PRESENTATIONS

11. The presentations given at this Session of the CWS and working documents are available on the WIPO website at: [https://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/details.jsp?meeting\\_id=50414](https://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/details.jsp?meeting_id=50414).

### 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 and 52), the report of this Session reflects only the conclusions of the CWS (decisions, recommendations, opinions, etc.) and does not, in particular, reflect the statements made by any participant, except where a reservation in relation to any specific conclusion of the CWS was expressed or repeated after the conclusion was reached.

#### Agenda Item 4: Revision of WIPO Standard ST.3

13. Discussions were based on documents CWS/7/2 REV. and CWS/7/2 ADD.

14. The CWS noted the content of the documents. The CWS considered the proposals described in document CWS/7/2 REV. and the Annex to document CWS/7/2 REV. in particular, the proposal regarding the new sources of the short form of names for states and territories. The International Bureau proposed to shift from the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) 3166 to the UN Terminology Database (UNTERM) as a source for the short form of state names in WIPO Standard ST.3. With regard to territory names or where a deviation from state names in UNTERM is required, established WIPO practice shall prevail, reflecting official requests by the states concerned.

15. The CWS also considered the proposal for replacing the streamlined procedure for the revision of ST.3, which was established at the eleventh session of the former Standing Committee on Information Technologies - Standards and Documentation Working Group (SCIT/SDWG) in 2009 with the new procedure which should be incorporated into the Standard.

16. As the outcome of consultation through the circular C.CWS 109, the CWS noted that there was no objection to include a new code “EU” for the European Union in the Standard, but two Intellectual Property Offices (IPOs) requested to provide a footnote to clarify the purpose and appropriate use of the new code “EU” considering the following existing codes in WIPO ST.3: EM, EP and QZ. The CWS considered the proposal for the footnote described in document CWS/7/2 ADD.

17. The CWS approved the proposal for the new streamlined procedure for the revision of WIPO Standard ST.3, which will be included as a new Annex III to the Standard.

18. The CWS approved the revised WIPO Standard ST.3 as presented in the Annex to document CWS/7/2 REV. The CWS also approved the inclusion of new footnote 14 regarding the two-letter codes “EM”, “EP”, “EU” and “QZ” in WIPO Standard ST.3 as proposed in document CWS/7/2 ADD.

#### Agenda Item 5: Report on Task No. 58 by the ICT Strategy for Standards Task Force

19. Discussions were based on the presentation of the progress report delivered by the International Bureau as the Task Force Leader.

20. The CWS noted the content of the report, including 16 IPOs volunteered to join the Task Force and the Task Force members have started prioritizing recommendations considering their Office’s preferences. The CWS also noted that several Task Force members suggested developing new standards on authority files for trademarks and industrial designs such as WIPO Standard ST.37 for patent authority file as well as the Task Force prioritized the topic on developing a common DocX conversion tool supported by several Task Force members. The CWS was informed that the Task Force would prepare a strategic roadmap for consideration at the next session of the CWS.

21. The CWS encouraged IPOs to volunteer to serve as a co-leader of the Task Force with the International Bureau.

#### Agenda Item 6 (a): Report on Task No.41, No.53, No.56 and No.63

22. Discussions were based on document CWS/7/3 REV.

23. The CWS noted the content of the document and its Annexes, including progress on the Tasks No. 41, No. 53, No. 56 and No. 63. The CWS noted the plans of ST.96 implementations for Hague System and WIPO IP Admiration System (IPAS). The International Bureau indicated that Hague System was on track to transition to a single format, ST.96, by December 31, 2020. The International Bureau also indicated that by June 2020, ST.96 would be used for online publication and for data exchange with third parties in WIPO IPAS.

24. The CWS encouraged IPOs to participate in the testing of XML schemas for copyright orphan works, geographical indications and patent legal status.

25. After consideration of the draft patent legal status XML, the Delegation of Germany proposed that the legal status code component in XML be implemented as a complex type rather than as a string variable. The International Bureau, as the XML4IP Task Force Leader, noted the proposal.

26. The Delegation of the Russian Federation delivered a presentation on the progress of Task No. 53 which focused on the development of the new XML components to capture geographical indication information. The CWS noted that the XML4IP Task Force planned to include the new XML components in the next release of ST.96 in October.

27. The CWS also noted the issues on interoperable implementation of ST.96 and the centralized repository for ST.96 implementation schema. Several delegations indicated support for the proposal in CWS/7/3 Annex I for a centralized repository, with the delegations indicating that a compatible implementation is preferable. The International Bureau indicated that the XML4IP Task Force would continue discussion on the issue of ST.96 interoperable implementation considering conformant and compatible implementation options.

28. One delegation proposed that the XML4IP Task Force audit which ST.96 elements should be mandatory, in light of the mandatory elements defined in corresponding XML components of the older XML standards: ST.36, ST.66 and ST.86. Two delegations supported the idea of this audit. The International Bureau explained that the XML4IP Task Force had reviewed those three XML Standards when ST.96 was developed, including occurrences of XML elements. The International Bureau suggested that the Task Force should revisit the occurrence issue case-by-case according to the input from the Task Force members.

29. The CWS supported the International Bureau collecting Office-specific implementations of ST.96 to be hosted on the proposed centralized repository.

30. The CWS requested the XML4IP Task Force to review ST.96 components by comparing them with the corresponding XML components of the older XML Standards: ST.36, ST.66 and ST.86, in order to determine which ST.96 elements should be mandatory.

31. With regard to the management of XML components in ST.96 or other WIPO XML Standards referring to ST.96, the International Bureau proposed that the XML4IP Task Force be allowed to decide for the CWS on the proposal to incorporate other XML schemas, as discussed in paragraphs 36 to 38 of document CWS/7/3 REV.

32. The CWS agreed that it would leave the decision to the XML4IP Task Force on whether XML schema components for a particular Standard referring to ST.96 should reside in ST.96 or the indicated Standard, such as ST.37. The CWS requested that the XML4IP Task Force report its decisions and the changes in ST.96 and other WIPO Standards using XML to the next session of the CWS.

33. The CWS noted the new audience of developers for WIPO Standards and commented on the provision of a new forum for this audience, as a supplement to the Task Force online forums for IPOs. One delegation indicated that seeking input from developers may be difficult considering this would not be one of their directed tasks during development. Another delegation indicated that the forum should be monitored through the Task Force.

34. The CWS agreed to create a new developers' forum so that developers working with IPOs can provide direct feedback on relevant WIPO Standards.

35. The CWS noted the proposal for monthly meetings to discuss potential revisions of WIPO ST.96. Several delegations committed to participate in the meetings. The International Bureau reiterated that there would be only a maximum of two revisions to ST.96 per year except emergency releases, as agreed at the sixth session of the CWS.

36. The CWS supported the idea of monthly meetings of the XML4IP Task Force. The CWS noted that the International Bureau would suggest a regular day and time for the meetings.

37. The CWS noted the need to extend the scope of ST.96 from 'Industrial Property' to 'Intellectual Property' due to the inclusion of XML schema components for copyright orphan works.

38. The CWS noted the XML4IP Task Force work plan, including the next release of ST.96 on October 1, 2019.

39. The XML4IP Task Force requested that the Digital Transformation Task Force be assigned Task No. 63, because the XML4IP Task Force handles the content of XML, while presentation of XML is better suited for the Digital Transformation Task Force.

40. The CWS reassigned Task No. 63 to the Digital Transformation Task Force.

Agenda Item 6 (b): Proposal for WIPO standard on Web API

41. Discussions were based on document CWS/7/4 and its Annexes I and II.

42. The CWS noted the content of the document and its Annexes, in particular the progress described in paragraphs 7 and 9 of document CWS/7/4. A number of delegations indicated their support for this new standard and noted its usefulness.

43. In particular the CWS noted that the latest revision of the draft standard included the first example model Application Programming Interface (API) specification, DocList, as the Appendix to Annex IV of the draft Web API standard. This example model was inspired by one of the current One Portal Dossier (OPD) webservices. The International Bureau notified that the XML4IP Task Force had agreed that the DocList would be the only example of OPD-inspired webservice within the new standard and the Task Force agreed to focus on another pilot, patent legal status API.

44. The Delegation of Australia presented their progress on providing the second model example for the draft Web API standard: patent legal status API. They indicated that the example model would be provided in both Open API Specification (OAS) and RESTful API Markup Language (RAML) and would have an ST.96 XML response or a JSON payload.

45. The International Bureau indicated that WIPO products and services would implement the draft WIPO Web API standard in the future. For example, the WIPO Sequence Validator has been implemented according to this draft standard. The International Bureau also informed the CWS that the revised draft standard would be used for developing the WIPO Centralized Access to Search and Examination (CASE) APIs by starting development for DocList and DocContent in 2019.

46. The CWS noted the International Bureau's plans to implement the new Web API standard in its products and services and encouraged IPOs to participate in testing the new WIPO CASE APIs once they are implemented.

47. The International Bureau stated that inputs from experts in the area of the webservices are indispensable to finalize the draft standard.

48. The CWS encouraged IPOs to comment on the amended draft standard and its new Annexes.

49. Knowing that Task No. 56 is managed by the XML4IP Task Force, the International Bureau proposed that a new Task Force be created to manage this task to allow the involvement of experts from IPOs and the development community with a specific knowledge of the development of Web APIs. The XML4IP Task Force proposed to revise Task No. 56 considering the Task reassignment.

50. The CWS agreed on the revised description of Task No. 56, which now reads as follows:

“Prepare recommendations for data exchange supporting machine to machine communications focusing on: (i) facilitation of the development of web services which access IP resources; (ii) provision of business vocabulary and appropriate data structures; (iii) naming conventions for Uniform Resource Identifier (URI) of resources; and (iv) provision of business cases for implementing web services.”

51. The CWS also agreed on the creation of a new Task Force named “API Task Force” and on the assignment of Task No. 56 to the API Task Force.

52. The CWS requested that the Secretariat issue a circular inviting IPOs to nominate their experts on Web API development to participate in the new API Task Force and for volunteers to serve as the Task Force leader. Several delegations indicated their interest in participating in the Task Force.

53. The CWS requested the API Task Force to present a final proposal for the new draft standard at the eighth session of the CWS.

54. The CWS agreed on the creation of an online forum to allow broader collaborative efforts between the new API Task Force and developers in developing APIs for accessing IP resources.

#### Agenda Item 6 (c): Proposal for JSON specification

55. Discussions were based on document CWS/7/5.

56. The CWS noted the content of the document. In particular, more and more IPOs have started using JavaScript Object Notation (JSON) for data dissemination and the International Bureau had observed the needs for recommendations to support IPO communication in this format. Taking into account the new needs, the XML4IP Task Force started discussion on drafting a new standard on JSON. In order to provide a framework to continue this work by the Task Force, the International Bureau proposed a new Task.

57. The International Bureau indicated that the new draft WIPO JSON standard would handle more than just patents, trademarks and industrial designs, such as copyright orphan works. As such, the acronym ‘IP’ will indicate ‘Intellectual Property’ rather than ‘Industrial Property’ in the proposed standard.

58. The CWS created a new Task the description of which reads as follows:

“Prepare a proposal for recommendations for JavaScript Object Notation (JSON) resources compatible with WIPO Standard ST.96 to be used for filing, processing, publication and/or exchange intellectual property information.”

59. The CWS assigned the new Task to the XML4IP Task Force. The CWS encouraged IPOs to comment on the working draft of the JSON Specification. The CWS also encouraged IPOs to participate in the discussion on the JSON Specification, to test JSON schema, and to provide feedback to the XML4IP Task Force.

60. The CWS requested the XML4IP Task Force to present a final proposal for a new WIPO standard on JSON for consideration at its eighth session.

#### Agenda Item 7 (a): Report on Task No. 59

61. Discussions were based on document CWS/7/6 and the presentation by Task Force co-leaders, Australia and the Russian Federation.

62. The CWS noted the content of the document and presentation and encouraged IPOs to participate in the discussions by the Blockchain Task Force.
63. The CWS noted that in November 2018, the Secretariat had issued Circular C.CWS.108 inviting IPOs to nominate their representatives to the Blockchain Task Force. Thirteen IPOs responded to the Circular.
64. In January 2019, the Task Force co-leaders and the International Bureau developed a Task Force member's survey to "Collect information about Task Force members' developments in use of and experience with Blockchain." The Task Force members were invited to complete this survey throughout February 2019. Based on the survey results, the Task Force drafted a Standard scope statement and identified areas for further work. Taking into account the outcomes as described in paragraph 8 of document CWS/7/6, the Blockchain Task Force proposed to revise the description of Task No. 59.
65. The CWS noted that further work had been discussed at the face-to-face Task Force meeting on May 1, 2019, with several modifications to the earlier documents. The Task Force agreed to refine the draft standard Table of Contents, liaison with ISO TC/307 on Blockchain and distributed ledger technologies, refine use cases for Blockchain, and explore a collaborative environment to interact with Blockchain experts in the private sector.
66. One delegation remarked that most Blockchain innovation occurs in the private sector and that IPOs should be careful not to hinder private sector developments. IPOs should continue to monitor potential use cases for Blockchain and discuss with those developing Blockchain platforms.
67. The CWS approved the proposal for a revision of description of Task No. 59 and standard scope statement as presented by the co-leaders. The new Task description and scope statement read as follows:

Amended description of 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."

Scope Statement:

"This Standard aims to guide the Intellectual Property Offices (IPOs) and other Organizations that need to manage, store, process, exchange and disseminate IP data using Blockchain. It is intended that by using this Standard, the implementation of Blockchain can be simplified and accelerated in an interoperable manner within the IP ecosystem."

Agenda Item 7 (b): Report on the Blockchain Workshop

68. Discussions were based on an oral report presented by the International Bureau.

69. The CWS noted that on April 29 – 30, 2019, the International Bureau hosted a workshop on Blockchain and IP, as agreed the sixth session of the CWS. The workshop was intended to explore appropriate roles for the public and private sectors in potential uses of Blockchain for the IP ecosystem, and discuss areas for potential standardization of IP data for Blockchain. Day one covered general features and use of Blockchain, while day two addressed uses of Blockchain with IP. Over 150 participants attended the workshop, including Blockchain experts and IP experts from the private sector, as well as interested parties from IPOs, industry, academia, and intergovernmental organizations.

70. The CWS noted the recommendations from the workshop, including:

- focus on standardizing the IP data to be stored on a Blockchain, rather than trying to standardize technology stacks;
- work with other standardization bodies, such as ISO and International Telecommunication Union (ITU);
- collaborate with existing Blockchain technical communities to ensure that the standards WIPO develops are useful and compatible with Blockchain implementations;
- engage with the broader Blockchain community of experts through platforms the community already uses, such as GitHub;
- understand that identity management is a difficult problem that goes far beyond the world of IP. Many Blockchain applications, such as supply chain management, smart contracts, and property registers, rely on some form of identity management;
- work with the broader community addressing identity management issues, rather than creating a separate identity solution that only works for the IP ecosystem;
- ensure interoperability between blockchain-enabled systems; and
- pay attention to governance issues, especially regarding identity and interoperability.

71. Several delegations noted that the workshop had provided valuable information about Blockchain for IP and was very useful for the Blockchain Task Force to carry out Task No. 59.

Agenda Item 8 (a): Report on Task No. 55

72. Discussions were based on document CWS/7/7.

73. The CWS noted the content of the document, including the information regarding the survey and the workshop.

74. The CWS noted that the Secretariat had circulated a survey on use of identifiers for applicants by IPOs in November 2018, as agreed at the sixth session of the CWS. Twenty-three IPOs responded to the survey, as summarized in document CWS/7/8. A report on the survey results was discussed under Agenda Item 8 (b).

75. The CWS noted that the International Bureau hosted a workshop on name standardization on May 2 and 3, 2019, at WIPO headquarters in Geneva. Thirty participants attended the workshop, including IPO representatives, users of IP information, private sector IP data providers, and academic researchers. A report on the Workshop was discussed under Agenda Item 8 (c).

76. Immediately following each day of the workshop, the Name Standardization Task Force held meetings to discuss the findings. The results of the Task Force meetings are reported under Agenda Item 8 (c) of the present document.

77. Since the survey on use of identifiers was completed, the Task Force proposed to revise the description of Task No. 55 by removing the language on conducting a survey.



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

“Envisaging developing a WIPO standard assisting Industrial Property Offices (IPOs) in providing better ‘quality at source’ in relation to applicant name, prepare a proposal for future actions aimed at the standardization of applicant names in IP documents and present it for consideration by the CWS.”

79. The CWS requested the Name Standardization Task Force to present a proposal for future actions for consideration at its eighth session.

Agenda Item 8 (b): Results of the survey on the use of identifiers for applicants by intellectual property offices

80. Discussions were based on document CWS/7/8.

81. The CWS noted the content of the document with the survey results and analysis by the International Bureau. Twenty three Offices submitted responses to the survey. The CWS noted that sharing identifiers between IPOs might be difficult as two thirds do not intend to publish or exchange their identifiers, for reasons such as privacy rules or use of identifiers that were not intended to be made public (e.g., passport numbers). Some IPOs responded that they would have difficulties implementing identifiers due to legal restrictions or IT requirements. Eighty percent of respondents indicated that exploring use of identifiers is a high or medium priority for them. No other option (normalized names, standardized names, dictionaries) received more than 50% support.

82. The International Bureau informed the CWS that the individual and collective responses were published with document CWS/7/8 for consideration. The International Bureau indicated that the survey results and collective responses would be updated for enhancing readability of the documents by adding diagrams and introducing minor editorial changes for final publication.

83. One delegation requested that applicants should be involved in any activities on name standardization, and that many issues would be better addressed at the applicant level.

84. The CWS requested that the International Bureau publish the survey results along with the individual and collective responses on the WIPO website once the updates described above have been completed.

Agenda Item 8 (c): Report on the Name Standardization Workshop

85. Discussions were based on an oral report presented by the International Bureau.

86. The CWS noted the results of the Name Standardization Workshop held on May 1-2, 2019. In particular, the report indicated that IPOs face many challenges with changes to their handling of official legal records of applicant data. Legal requirements, IT investments, funding, and other issues limit the ability of many IPOs to standardize applicant names or use identifiers. Another complication is that different uses of applicant data can require different approaches to name standardization or identifiers, and the technology is evolving very rapidly.

87. The CWS also noted other outcomes from the workshop:

- there are at least two different groups with different needs for name standardization: data collection staff at IPOs, who must collect and maintain legal records of applicant data, and downstream users (including data providers and analysts);
- collecting and maintaining high quality data at IPOs is critical for any downstream solution to work. It benefits everyone working with IP data, but requires significant resource commitments from IPOs. Several IPOs are currently undertaking data cleaning projects to improve the quality of their data;

- there are no "perfect" solutions to name harmonization or identifiers that address the needs of different types of analysis;
- IPOs may benefit from discussing strategies to address data issues with each other;
- the use of identifiers for IP applicants and owners has several potential advantages, namely, being language independent and easier for machines to process. However, participants also noted that identifiers raise many challenges for IPOs; and
- developing and maintaining a system of identifiers is very complex and expensive, not just in IT expenditures but also for governance and procedures to maintain clean data. Also, some Offices lack the legal authority or IT capabilities needed to implement identifiers.

88. The CWS was informed that after the workshop, the Task Force further discussed the issues to identify next steps. The Task Force agreed that significant changes to IPO data collection systems are not feasible due to technical and legal limitations. Improving quality of collected data emerged as a common goal among members. However, due to different needs and environments at IPOs, the Task Force considers that it does not make sense to develop common software tools or algorithms at this time. Developing global identifiers remains an area of interest, but it appears to be difficult and costly with uncertain benefits. The Task Force agreed to continue exploring possible work on identifiers.

89. The CWS noted that the Task Force agreed to develop a forum for IPOs to share high level strategies for cleaning name data, develop materials to raise awareness of data quality issues, and develop guidance for IPOs and applicants on data practices.

#### Agenda Item 9: 3D Task Force Report on Task No. 61

90. Discussions were based on document CWS/7/9.

91. The CWS noted the content of the document and the work plan of the 3D Task Force, reported by the Russian Federation as the Task Force Leader, and encouraged IPOs to participate in the Task Force discussions. The CWS reviewed the proposed questionnaire for IPOs on 3D models and images.

92. One delegation proposed changing "patent laws" to "laws" in question 3.1 so Offices can consider all types of IP in their response.

93. One delegation proposed changing the answer choice "inventions" to "patents" throughout the survey, since the other answer choices were types of IP.

94. One delegation proposed combining utility models and patents into a single answer choice, since Office's answers would likely be the same for both.

95. One delegation proposed adding patents for chemical and biological molecules as an answer choice separate from other types of patents, since those technologies may need different requirements for 3D models provided by applicants.

96. Several delegations noted that "3D models and images" may be confusing, since images are normally two dimensional. The delegations expressed their concern that IPOs taking the survey might answer on the basis of 2D images that represent 3D objects, rather than images which are themselves 3D. The delegations therefore proposed adding "3D" in front of the word image throughout the questionnaire, and adding the following definition to the questionnaire glossary: "3D Images – Images that represent objects displayed in three dimensions (length, depth, height), e.g., 3D photos, stereoscopy, etc."

97. The CWS approved the questionnaire for IPOs on use of 3D models and 3D images in the Annex to document CWS/7/9 with the modifications described above as follows:

- changing “patent laws” to “laws” in question 3.1 so Offices can consider all types of IP in their response;
- changing the answer choice “inventions” to “patents” throughout the survey questionnaire, since the other answer choices were types of IP;
- combining utility models and patents into a single answer choice, since Office’s answers would likely be the same for both;
- adding two new questions to the survey as follows;
  - “Which specific advantages and/or specific drawbacks do you expect from 3D models regarding search, for instance prior art search?”
  - “Do you expect that applicants will comply to provide 3D models which fulfill the defined standards?”
- adding patents for chemical and biological molecules as an answer choice separate from other types of patents, since those technologies may need different requirements for 3D models provided by applicants. The CWS agreed to split the answer choice for “patents” throughout the questionnaire into two choices, one for chemical and biological patents and one for all other types; and
- changing the term “images” to “3D images” throughout the questionnaire and updating the glossary with the proposed definition.

98. The Task Force presented a second questionnaire for industry and users, as referred to in paragraph 7 of document CWS/7/9. Several delegations stated that it is important to collect industry and users’ opinion on this matter. Some delegations proposed having the International Bureau conduct the survey of applicants. One industry representative indicated their desire to participate in the survey. One delegation proposed changing the title of the document from “Guidance Document for IPOs” to “Model Survey” to reflect this intended use.

99. The Secretariat explained the CWS practice that the Committee invites IPOs to participate in surveys, and if needed, IPOs collect information from their users and incorporate the results in their responses. One of the reasons is that IPOs have closer contacts with their users, and can verify and filter the information appropriately. The International Bureau proposed sending the industry questionnaire to IPOs as a model questionnaire, and letting IPOs collect the information from their users.

100. Taking into account the need for user input and its survey practices, the CWS agreed to provide the document to IPOs as a model questionnaire to conduct their own outreach and to change the document title correspondingly. The CWS noted that the model questionnaire could be changed by Offices before use to collect data from their applicants and users. The CWS agreed to allow interested Observers to join the 3D Task Force and provide their responses to the applicant survey.

101. The CWS agreed on the amended IPO survey questionnaire which is reproduced as Annex III to the document with the model questionnaire for industry as the Appendix to Annex III. The CWS requested the International Bureau to issue a circular inviting IPOs to respond to the amended questionnaire of IPOs, and to attach the model questionnaire as an annex to the circular for IPOs to consider. The CWS encouraged IPOs to collect the data indicated in the model survey questionnaire from their applicants for consideration by the 3D Task Force.

Agenda Item 10: Digital Transformation Task Force Report on Task No. 62

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

103. The CWS noted the content of the document and the work plan of the Digital Transformation Task Force as presented by the United States of America as the Task Force Leader. The Delegation of United States of America, as the Task Force Leader, indicated that the Task Force intends to discuss existing practices and challenges with digital publication, agree on a definition and criteria for reviewing the WIPO Standards in the Task description, prioritize Standards for review, and begin reviewing Standards to develop proposed revisions.

104. The CWS noted the Task Force's work plan and encouraged IPOs to participate in the Task Force discussions.

Agenda Item 11 (a): Report on Task No. 47

105. Discussions were based on document CWS/7/11.

106. The CWS noted the content of the document and the activities of the Legal Status Task Force reported by the International Bureau as the Task Force Leader. The Task Force held six online meetings since the sixth session of the CWS to discuss revisions to ST.27 events and a new guidance document with common scenarios, resulting in the proposals to revise ST.27 presented at the seventh session. The Task Force intends to continue revising ST.27 and ST.87 as needed based on input from Offices implementing the Standards, but does not expect any major revisions will be necessary.

107. The CWS noted the Task Force's activities and work plan and encouraged IPOs to participate in the Task Force discussions.

108. The CWS noted that in February 2019, the Secretariat had issued Circular C.CWS 113 inviting IPOs to provide the results of (a) the assessment of their business practices and IT systems, including their tentative schedule for the implementation of WIPO Standard ST.87; and (b) the review of the provisional detailed events in accordance with their respective laws and practices. IPOs were requested to provide mapping tables with their submissions. Fourteen IPOs responded to the Circular.

109. The International Bureau reported that they planned to publish the consolidated ST.87 mapping tables submitted by IPOs in Part 7.13 of the WIPO Handbook with approval from CWS. Two delegations requested to provide updated mapping tables before publication, due to changed circumstances that make their previously submitted tables outdated.

110. The CWS approved the publication of the received ST.87 mapping tables in Part 7.13 of the WIPO Handbook once the two requesting delegations have provided updated versions. The CWS encouraged IPOs to provide or update their mapping tables for WIPO ST.27 and ST.87.

111. The International Bureau proposed that the Task Force begin work on a proposed standard for trademark legal status data. Task Force members indicated their interest in working on trademark legal status data at this time, and prioritized it over working on the guidance document for ST.87 on industrial design legal status data. Delegations also preferred to see how Offices use the ST.27 guidance documents in implementing ST.27 before proceeding with the ST.87 guidance document.

112. The CWS agreed that the Legal Status Task Force begin work with priority on a standard for trademark legal status data.

113. The Task Force proposed to revise the description of Task No. 47 to account for the completed and remaining work on WIPO Standards ST.27, ST.87, and trademark legal status data.

114. The CWS approved the proposal to revise the description of Task No. 47. The new Task description reads as follows: “prepare proposals for revisions to WIPO Standards ST.27 and ST.87 as needed; prepare a proposed guidance document for industrial design legal status data; prepare a recommendation for the exchange of legal status data on trademarks by industrial property offices; and support the XML4IP Task Force to develop XML components regarding legal status event data”.

Agenda Item 11 (b): Revision of WIPO Standard ST.27

115. Discussions were based on document CWS/7/12.

116. The Task Force prepared a new guidance document for ST.27 with sets of examples to assist IPOs and others with understanding how to use ST.27. The new examples were prepared around a set of five common scenarios identified by the Task Force, with examples for each scenario provided by four to six Offices. The examples are intended to better show how to map national events to ST.27 events, and how to transform those mappings into an ST.27 data file for exchange with others.

117. The CWS noted the report by the International Bureau as the Task Force Leader on the proposed revisions to ST.27 agreed on by the Task Force. The proposals include:

- changes to the category descriptions to more explicitly reflect the types of IP rights and applications covered, as indicated in paragraph 4 of document CWS/7/12;
- changing the word “issued” to “completed” in events D14 and D15 to better reflect the practice of Offices which may not issue the report to the applicant at the time it is completed, as indicated in paragraph 6 of document CWS/7/12;
- clarifying the language in R12, R13, and R14 to better reflect their intended uses: R13 for name corrections, R14 for changes of ownership, and R12 for IPOs that do not distinguish the two situations, as indicated in paragraph 7 of document CWS/7/12;
- a new event “IP Right entered into force” for rights such as SPCs that enter into force at a later date than when the grant occurs, as indicated in paragraph 8 of document CWS/7/12; and
- a new Common Scenarios Guidance Document with examples to assist IPOs and users with understanding how to use ST.27, as described in paragraphs 10 to 12 and reproduced in Annex I of document CWS/7/12.

118. The CWS approved the proposed revisions to the Main Body of WIPO Standard ST.27 described above. The CWS also approved the proposed revision of Annex I, with corresponding updates to Annex II, of WIPO Standard ST.27, as described above.

119. The CWS approved adding the proposed new Common Scenarios Guidance Document as Annex V of WIPO Standard ST.27 and moving the current Annex V to Annex VI with the title Category Based Guidance Document.

120. The CWS noted the proposal by the International Bureau to add three reserved characters to the encoding of ST.27 legal status events. These characters will be fixed with three reserved positions as ‘xxx’ for future use in the revised version of ST.27. This will allow IPOs to proceed with implementing ST.27 with assurances that the encoding format will not change. The Task Force proposes exploring possible uses for the reserved characters and preparing a proposal for the eighth session of the CWS.

121. The CWS noted the presentation of one possible use of reserved characters called procedure tags, as described in paragraphs 13 to 21 of document CWS/7/12. The CWS noted an invitation from the Task Force to comment on possible uses of the reserved field or the 15 procedure tags proposed by the International Bureau in Annex II of document CWS/7/12.

122. The CWS approved the International Bureau's proposal to add three reserved characters to the event code, which are fixed as "xxx" and reserved for possible future use, as described in paragraphs 22 to 24 of document CWS/7/12. The CWS noted that this revision allows IPOs to proceed with implementation of ST.27 with a stabilized event coding format. The CWS also approved a proposal to update paragraph 47 of ST.27 to reflect the position of the reserved characters.

Agenda Item 11 (c): Report on the implementation plans of WIPO Standard ST.87

123. Discussions were based on an oral report presented by the International Bureau as the Task Force Leader.

124. The CWS noted the content of the presentation, including the revised number of responses compared to paragraph 14 of document CWS/7/11. Fourteen IPOs responded to the circular, with nine providing mapping tables. Three IPOs have a planned start date to begin implementation, while four IPOs are waiting on IT upgrades or funding to before planning implementation. Four IPOs do not plan to implement ST.87 at this time. One respondent reported that ST.87 planning was useful for preparing to open their IPO and begin practice on industrial designs in the near future.

Agenda Item 12 (a): Report on Task No. 44

125. Discussions were based on document CWS/7/13.

126. The CWS noted the content of the document.

127. The translation of free text qualifiers, which form part of the ST.26 sequence listing, remains one of the outstanding issues for ST.26, and will affect the necessary amendments to the PCT legal framework. The Delegation of China indicated its preference for both English and other languages to be used for these types of qualifiers, although they would continue with their implementation plan supplied at the sixth session, based on the version 1.2 of the Standard. The Delegation of Canada also indicated its preference for bilingual support (French & English) considering its constitutional obligations, but indicated that they would not oppose the use of only Unicode Basic Latin characters for the free text qualifiers.

128. The Delegation of the United States of America provided, in collaboration with the Sequence Task Force Leader, EPO, a presentation on the ST.26 sequence annotation regarding free text qualifiers. The Delegation recalled the agreed goals of WIPO Standard ST.26, which are reproduced as follows:

- allow applicants to draw up a single sequence listing acceptable for the purposes of both international and national or regional procedures;
- enhance the accuracy and quality of presentations of sequences for easier dissemination, benefiting applicants, the public, and examiners;
- facilitate searching of the sequence data; and
- allow sequence data to be exchanged in electronic form and introduced into computerized databases.

129. Taking into account the goals mentioned above, WIPO Standard ST.26 allows only basic latin characters in sequence data. As the “free text” is part of the sequence data, it is limited to to Unicode Basic Latin. The CWS recalled that ST.26 is based on the standard of the International Nucleotide Sequence Database Collaboration (INSDC) that is a collaboration of different gene database providers and receives sequence data from IPOs and from the research community. The INSDC provides free search of sequence data to the public and requires Unicode Basic Latin for sequence data to allow content to be understandable to the broadest audience possible as the scientific community overwhelmingly uses English for annotation and description of sequences. The Delegation highlighted the importance of compatibility of ST.26 with the INSDC format, to achieve the ST.26 goals, particularly the first goal mentioned above.

130. The CWS noted the proposal by the Sequence Listing Task Force to classify the 51 free text qualifiers in Annex I of ST.26 as either ‘language-independent’ or ‘language-dependent’. The CWS also noted that a first draft of the new Annex I will be provided by the Task Force in the third quarter of 2019 and a final draft of the revised Annex I for consideration at the eighth session of the CWS.

#### Agenda Item 12 (b): Revision of WIPO Standard ST.26

131. Discussions were based on document CWS/7/14.

132. The CWS noted the content of the document. A few substantive revisions to ST.26 were proposed, mostly limited to Annex I and Annex VII of ST.26. These include updates necessary due to corresponding updates to the INSDC, addition of optional qualifiers to ST.26 Annex I and corrections to terms used within ST.26 Annex VII.

133. The CWS approved the proposed revision of WIPO Standard ST.26. The CWS also approved that Annex III and Appendix to Annex VI of ST.26, which are XML instances, will be published as separate downloadable files linked within the Standard, instead of publishing the XML instances in text format as part of the Standard.

#### Agenda Item 12 (c): WIPO Sequence Tool

134. Discussions were based on document CWS/7/15 and a demonstration of the WIPO Sequence Tool by the International Bureau.

135. The CWS noted the content of the document, including the official name of the ST.26 common tool, ‘WIPO Sequence’. The CWS encouraged IPOs and users to trial the official release of the tool when it is provided in the second half of 2019 and provide feedback to the International Bureau.

136. The International Bureau strongly encouraged IPOs to start considering their implementation plans for transitioning to ST.26, as there may be changes to national law required as well as upgrades to IT systems. During the presentation, a model roadmap for this transition was presented.

137. The Delegation of Australia indicated their progress on their implementation plan, including that no change to their Patent Act was required. They sought some clarification in regards to errors versus warnings and the behavior of the tool when resolving validation errors, which the International Bureau addressed.

138. The CWS requested the Secretariat to issue a circular inviting IPOs to provide their implementation plans for transitioning to WIPO Standard ST.26 to the International Bureau in 2019.

139. One delegation thanked the International Bureau for their work producing the WIPO Sequence tool and encouraged other IPOs to participate in its testing. Another delegation hoped that issues with the tool would be resolved soon so it could encourage applicants to use WIPO Sequence.

140. The CWS supported testing of the WIPO Sequence tool during development.

Agenda Item 13 (a): Report on Task No. 51

141. Discussions were based on document CWS/7/16.

142. The CWS encouraged IPOs to participate in the Authority File project by providing their own authority file data sets to the International Bureau.

143. One delegation indicated support for the Authority File project and encouraged other Offices to provide this information. One representative indicated that the commercial sector is using the published authority files to validate their own data sets, which was one of the aims of this project.

144. The CWS noted that the International Bureau would produce the PCT authority file in both the ST.37 TXT format in addition to the existing XML format, until the end of 2019, in order to support the transition of customers to the new ST.37 format. The CWS also noted that the International Bureau would produce the authority file of PCT publications only in ST.37 format from January 1, 2020.

Agenda Item 13 (b): Revision of WIPO Standard ST.37

145. Discussions were based on document CWS/7/17 and an alternative proposal presented by the International Bureau.

146. The CWS approved the amendment in paragraph 9(c) of WIPO Standard ST.37 by removing “vii. kind of document code” in reference to the application identification of the corresponding publication as proposed in document CWS/7/17.

147. With regard to the proposed modifications to Annex III of ST.37 (XSD), the CWS considered proposals reproduced in document CWS/7/17 Annex I and ‘Alternative Proposal CWS/7/17 Annex I’ posted in the WIPO website at: [https://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/doc\\_details.jsp?doc\\_id=440553](https://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=440553). The proposed modifications were to:

- improve descriptions of XML components;
- rename following components: `PriorityClaimType` and `PriorityClaimBagType` to `PriorityApplicationIdentificationType` and `PriorityApplicationIdentificationBagType` respectively; `backupCategory` component as `updateAFCategory`; and
- replace `AdditionalComment` with `com:CommentText`; and `contentCategory` with `groupedAFIndicator`.

148. The CWS considered the proposals regarding Annex IV of ST.37 (DTD) which was for alignment with the modifications to the Annex III (XSD).

149. The International Bureau noted that there would be minor adjustment in Annex III of ST.37 in relation to the namespace of XML components depending on the decision of the XML4IP Task Force regarding where XML components should be stored in ST.96 or ST.37.



150. The CWS approved the proposed revisions to Annexes III (XSD) and IV (DTD) of WIPO Standard ST.37 as reproduced in Annex IV of this report. The CWS noted there would be minor adaptation of Annex III with regard to the namespace of XML components in the publication of revised ST.37 according to the decision of the XML4IP Task Force.

151. The CWS also approved the suggestion to provide the content of Appendixes to Annexes III and IV of WIPO Standard ST.37 as two downloadable files, with links provided in the Standard.

152. One delegation indicated the need for the International Bureau to communicate with the PCT Working Group to update them of the changes to WIPO ST.37. This is because ST.37 authority file information is part of the PCT Minimum Documentation.

153. One representative reiterated that providing authority files in text format is also still an option and encouraged IPOs to provide authority file in any format it could, regardless of file size, due to the valuable nature of this project. The Task Force Leader EPO and the International Bureau also indicated that the only reason text format had not been discussed was because no revisions to the text format had been proposed at this time.

#### Agenda Item 13 (c): Publication of Authority File Web Portal

154. Discussions were based on the oral report and demonstration of the WIPO authority file portal by the International Bureau.

155. The CWS was informed that authority files from 20 IPOs and Organizations are currently available on the WIPO Authority File portal and a further eight have indicated their intention to supply their authority file information to the International Bureau in the near future. The International Bureau will publish authority file information for PCT applications compliant with ST.37 from the second half of 2019.

156. The International Bureau reminded authority file participants that even if they host their own authority file information, it is necessary to provide the International Bureau with an update to the file coverage and potentially remarks column on the Authority File portal page when they update their authority file information.

157. The CWS noted that it would not be necessary at this time for the Secretariat to issue a circular inviting IPOs to once again provide their authority file data sets.

158. The CWS encouraged its Members to participate in WIPO's Authority File portal project by providing their authority file data sets to the International Bureau.

#### Agenda Item 14 (a): Report on Task No.60

159. Discussions were based on document CWS/7/18 CORR.

160. The CWS noted the content of the document and considered the recommendations made by the Trademark Standardization Task Force. The Task Force considered input from other relevant groups in the International Bureau, including the Madrid System group.

161. On the subject of splitting 551 to distinguish collective marks, certification marks, and guarantee marks, the CWS noted a statement from the International Bureau indicating that the Madrid System previously used separate checkboxes to distinguish the items in INID Code 551. This caused problems because different jurisdictions have different scopes of protection for these marks. Given the lack of harmonized meaning, applicants may receive e.g., a collective mark in one jurisdiction and a certification mark in another for the same intended use. Thus the Madrid system preferred the “constructive ambiguity” of keeping these items together in INID code 551. IPOs generally require additional information from the applicant to register these mark types anyway, so a provisional refusal from the IPO would be expected even if the mark types were distinguished.

162. The CWS considered whether Task No.60 should be discontinued and decided to continue the Task so that the Task Force could work on the unresolved issues described under Agenda Item 14 (b).

163. The CWS considered whether the Task Force should resume work on Task No. 49, “prepare a recommendation for the electronic management of motion or multimedia marks for adoption as a WIPO standard.” Work on Task No. 49 was suspended at the fifth session of the CWS pending implementation of the directive by several Member States. The CWS noted that now many EU countries are already in the process of implementing EU Directive 2008/95/EC for new types of trademarks, including multimedia marks, making this a good time to resume the work. Several delegations reported that they are ready to resume the work.

164. The CWS agreed to resume work on Task No. 49.

#### Agenda Item 14 (b): Proposal for the revision of WIPO Standard ST. 60

165. Discussions were based on document CWS/7/19.

166. The CWS noted the content of the document. The Trademark Standardization Task Force provided recommendations on the items in Task No. 60, namely: the numbering of INID codes for word marks and figurative marks, splitting INID code (551), and a potential INID code for combined marks.

167. On numbering of INID codes for word marks and figurative marks, the Task Force proposed using 592 for Word Mark and 593 for Figurative Mark, because the other ten-digit ranges between 530 and 600 were either already full or contained information unrelated to mark type.

168. The CWS approved the proposed revision to ST.60 for assigning INID code 592 to Word Mark and code 593 to Figurative Mark.

169. Two delegations proposed adopting a new INID code 594 for Combined Word and Figurative Mark. This proposal was more specific than the general Combined Mark envisioned in the Task Description.

170. The CWS approved creating a new INID code 594 for ‘Combined Word and Figurative Mark’.

171. Two delegations requested splitting INID code 551 into separate codes for the three mark types. The CWS could not reach agreement on the Task Force proposal not to split INID code 551 to distinguish collective marks, certification marks, and guarantee marks.

172. The CWS agreed to refer the matter to the Task Force for further discussion.

#### Agenda Item 15 (a): Report on Task No. 57

173. Discussions were based on document CWS/7/20.

174. The CWS noted the content of the document and the work plan of the Design Representation Task Force as presented by Australia as the Task Force Co-leader. In particular, the Task Force updated the Standard scope statement and Table of Contents. The Task Force work plan through 2020 was presented.

175. The CWS noted that in November 2018, the Secretariat had issued Circular C.CWS.110 inviting IPOs to respond to the survey on Electronic Representations of Industrial Designs approved at the sixth session of the CWS. Twenty-five Offices responded to the survey. The results and analysis of the survey are discussed under Agenda Item 15 (b). The Task Force will consider the results of the survey and develop the draft Standard for consideration by the CWS. The CWS encouraged IPOs to participate in the Task Force discussions.

Agenda Item 15 (b): Results of the survey on electronic visual representation on industrial designs

176. Discussions were based on document CWS/7/21 and a presentation by the Task Force Co-leader.

177. The CWS noted the content of the document and the presentation. Twenty-five IPOs submitted responses to the survey. Most respondents reported the majority of filings were electronic and published designs are available online. Most IPOs in the survey have similar types of requirements for design submissions, though the details of format, size, and resolution accepted vary from Office to Office. Support for 3D, hologram, and multimedia files is very low, with five or fewer IPOs accepting each type.

178. The CWS requested the International Bureau to publish a report on survey results as well as individual and collective responses on the WIPO website with readability improvements.

Agenda Item 16 (a): Report on Task No. 50

179. Discussions were based on document CWS/7/22.

180. The CWS noted the content of the document. The Part 7 Task Force presented their plan to continue updating items in Part 7 of the WIPO Handbook, according to the priorities established at previous sessions of the CWS.

181. The CWS noted that in December 2018, the International Bureau had published updates to part 7.2.4 of the WIPO Handbook on the presentation of priority application numbers. Part 7.2.4 contains responses from 48 IPOs, with updated information provided by 12 IPOs in response to the latest survey.

182. The Part 7 Task Force carried out the survey on grant and publication of SPCs and PTEs, as requested by the sixth session of the CWS. The results of the survey were discussed under Agenda Item 16 (b).

183. The CWS noted the potential for overlap between the work of the Digital Transformation Task Force reviewing WIPO Standard ST.18 on patent gazettes and the survey in Part 7.6 of the WIPO Handbook on bibliographic information in patent gazettes. Several delegations requested delaying the update to Part 7.6 and other parts of the WIPO Handbook until the Digital Transformation Task Force was able to review ST.18.

184. The CWS agreed to hold in abeyance the proposal to prepare a questionnaire for updating Part 7.6 of the WIPO Handbook pending the progress report of the Digital Transformation Task Force at the next session of the CWS.

185. The CWS approved the revised work plan and schedule for the Part 7 Task Force, with the modification to updating Part 7.6 noted above.

186. The CWS requested the Secretariat to issue a circular inviting IPOs to update their information in Part 7.3 of the WIPO Handbook.

187. The CWS requested the Part 7 Task Force to prepare a questionnaire to update Part 7.1 of the WIPO Handbook, for presentation at its eighth session.

Agenda Item 16 (b): Results of the survey on the grant and publication of SPCs and PTEs

188. Discussions were based on document CWS/7/23 and a presentation by the International Bureau.

189. The CWS noted that in November 2018, the Secretariat had issued circular C.CWS.110 requesting IPOs to participate in the survey to update Part 7.7 of the WIPO Handbook on grant and publication of Supplementary Protection Certificates and Patent Term Extensions. Twenty-six Offices submitted responses to the survey. Among responding offices, 92% provide SPCs or PTEs for medicinal products, 75% for plant products, and 20% for other types of products. Two thirds of respondents publish or plan to publish major events for SPCs or PTEs, such as grants and filings. Publication is typically done via online databases (85%) and/or an Official Gazette (70%).

190. The CWS noted the content of the document and requested the International Bureau to prepare and publish a report on the survey results as well as individual and collective responses in Part 7.7 of the WIPO Handbook with readability improvements.

191. One representative inquired whether information on Patent Term Adjustment (PTA) should be surveyed. The International Bureau explained that the Task Force has previously considered adding PTA to the survey and decided that PTA should be handled in a separate survey. The CWS noted that requests to survey information on PTA should be directed to the Part 7 Task Force for its consideration.

Agenda Item 16 (c): Questionnaire on numbering of published documents and registered rights

192. Discussions were based on document CWS/7/24.

193. The CWS noted the content of the document containing a final draft questionnaire to update Part 7.2.2. of the WIPO Handbook for consideration by the CWS. Because the items in Part 7.2.2 on application numbering have been superseded by Parts 7.2.6 and 7.2.7, the only remaining information to be updated concerns publication and registration numbers from IPOs. The questionnaire can be found in the Annex to document CWS/7/24.

194. The CWS approved the draft questionnaire to update Part 7.2.2 of the WIPO Handbook on numbering systems for published documents and registered rights.

195. The CWS requested the Secretariat to issue a circular inviting IPOs to participate in the survey and requested the International Bureau to present the results of the survey for consideration at its eighth session.

Agenda Item 17: PAPI Task Force proposal for a questionnaire on providing access to publicly available patent information

196. Discussions were based on document CWS/7/25.

197. The CWS noted the content of the document and the proposed questionnaire on access to publicly available patent information in the Annex to the working document.

198. Several delegations proposed revisions to clarify the text in Part 1 of the questionnaire.

- remove the definition of “basic patent information” from the glossary;

- remove the word “basic” and the words “published applications or granted patents” from question 1;
- remove questions 4 and 5 on authority file data from the questionnaire, since the International Bureau now publishes authority file data provided by IPOs in Part 7.14 of the WIPO Handbook;
- modify question 7 to read “Are the online systems for patent information indicated above available in English for the user interface and search? Any other languages?”;
- change the answer choices for question 9 from “Yes / No / Partial” to “Yes, for all years / Yes, for some years / No”;
- provide minor clarifications to the list of answer choices on questions 6, 8, and 10; and
- move question 6 of the questionnaire to the second question and renumber other questions accordingly.

199. Several delegations suggested revisions to Part 2 of the questionnaire to collect additional information or clarify the questions. No concrete proposals were made due to the limited time available.

200. The CWS approved Part 1 of the draft questionnaire with the modifications described above and referred Part 2 back to the PAPI Task Force to prepare a proposal for the next session of the CWS. The approved Part 1 of the questionnaire is reproduced in Annex V of the present document.

201. The CWS requested the Secretariat to issue a circular inviting IPOs to participate in Part 1 of the survey.

#### Agenda Item 18: Report on the survey on the use of WIPO Standards

202. Discussions were based on an oral report presented by the International Bureau.

203. The CWS noted the content of the report. In particular, since the sixth session of the CWS, 20 IPOs have reported implementing ST.37 on Authority Files, and four IPOs reported implementing ST.27 on patent legal status data completely or partially. A new question was added to the survey for ST.87 on industrial design legal status data.

204. The CWS encouraged Offices to review their responses to the survey and if necessary update their information when they implement a WIPO Standard, when a new version of a WIPO Standard is released, or when they make significant changes to their IT systems that could impact their implementation of WIPO Standards.

#### Agenda Item 19: Report on Annual Technical Reports (ATRs)

205. Discussions were based on an oral report presented by the International Bureau.

206. The CWS noted declining participation rates by Offices in the ATRs and requested input on ways to improve ATRs, considering the complexity of the questionnaires, the duplication of other WIPO questionnaires, and the availability of this information on IPO websites.

207. Several delegations remarked that the information requested in ATRs is already available in their Office’s Annual Report. Other delegations noted that the survey questions were unclear on what information was being requested and for what purpose.

208. The CWS requested that the International Bureau prepare a proposal to improve the ATRs at the next session of the CWS, and use the ATR channel to gather input from Offices. The input should start by reviewing the objectives of the ATRs and then proceed to the modifications to the questionnaire in alignment with the updated objectives.

Agenda Item 20: 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

209. Discussions were based on document CWS/7/26.

210. The CWS noted the content of the document and of the 2018 activities of the International Bureau, related to providing technical advice and assistance for capacity building to IPOs, regarding dissemination of IP standards information.

211. The CWS noted that two Representatives of ARIPO and OAPI requested assistance from the International Bureau in support of capacity building and staff training on the use of WIPO Standards for their Offices and member states.

212. The CWS noted the 2018 activities of the International Bureau, related to providing technical advice and assistance for capacity building to IPOs, regarding dissemination of IP standards information. The CWS also noted that this document would serve as a basis of the relevant report to be presented to the WIPO General Assembly to be held in 2019, as requested at its 40th session held in October 2011 (see paragraph 190 of document WO/GA/40/19).

Agenda Item 21: Consideration of the Work Program and Tasks List of the CWS

213. Discussions were based on document CWS/7/27.

214. One representative suggested providing hyperlink to the referenced Standards in the Task List. The Secretariat noted the need of improvement in the Task List document for improving readability.

215. The CWS noted the content of the document and considered the Task List and CWS Work Program in the Annex to document CWS/7/27 in order to establish the Work Program of the CWS.

216. The CWS approved the List of Tasks, as presented in the Annex to document CWS/7/27 and agreed that the CWS Work Program be updated by incorporating the List of Tasks and reflecting the agreements reached at the seventh session of the CWS.

217. After updating the List of Tasks with the agreements reached at this Session, the status of Tasks is as follows:

(a) Tasks revised at this session:

Task No. 47: Prepare proposals for revisions to WIPO Standards ST.27 and ST.87 as needed; prepare a proposed guidance document for industrial design legal status data; prepare a recommendation for the exchange of legal status data on trademarks by industrial property offices; and support the XML4IP Task Force to develop XML components regarding legal status event data.

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

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

- Task No. 44: Support the International Bureau by providing users’ requirements and feedback on the ST.26 authoring and validation software tool; support the International Bureau in the consequential revision of the PCT Administrative Instructions; and prepare necessary revisions of WIPO Standard ST.26.
- Task No. 49: Prepare a recommendation for the electronic management of motion or multimedia marks for adoption as a WIPO standard.
- Task No. 52: Survey on content and functionalities of systems for providing access to publicly available patent information of industrial property offices, as well as future plans with respect to their publication practices; prepare recommendations for systems for providing access to publicly available patent information of industrial property offices.
- Task No. 53: Develop XML schema components for geographical indications.
- Task No. 56: Prepare recommendations for data exchange supporting machine to machine communications focusing on:
- i. message format, data structure and data dictionary in JSON and/or XML; and
  - ii. naming conventions for Uniform Resource Identifier (URI) of resources.
- Task No. 57: Collect information about the requirements from IP offices and customers; and prepare recommendations for electronic visual representations of designs.
- Task No. 58: Prepare a proposal for a roadmap of future development and enhancement of WIPO standards, including policy recommendations, in view of more effective production, sharing, and utilization of data by IP offices and other interested parties, taking the following activities:

- i. to review the Recommendations in Group 1 indicated in the Annex of document CWS/6/3, in collaboration with other relevant CWS Task Forces;
- ii. to review the Recommendations in Group 2 and Group 3 indicated in the Annex of document CWS/6/3;
- iii. to prioritize Recommendations and suggest a timeline; and
- iv. to explore the impact of disruptive technologies on IP administration and IP data in view of harmonization and collaboration. Collect information about the requirements from IP offices and customers; and prepare recommendations for electronic visual representations of designs.

- Task No. 60: Prepare a proposal for the numbering of INID codes regarding word marks and figurative marks, on splitting INID code (551), and a potential INID code for combined marks.
- Task No. 61: Prepare a proposal for recommendations on three-dimensional (3D) models and images.
- Task No. 62: Review WIPO Standards: ST.6, ST.8, ST.10, ST.11, ST.15, ST.17, ST.18, ST.63 and ST.81 in view of electronic publication of IP documentation; and propose revisions of those Standards if needed.
- Task No. 63: Develop visual representation(s) of XML data, based on WIPO XML Standards, for electronic publication.

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

- Task No. 38: Ensure continuous revision and updating of WIPO Standard ST.36.
- Task No. 39: Ensure the necessary revisions and updates of WIPO Standard ST.66.
- Task No. 41: Ensure the necessary revisions and updates of WIPO Standard ST.96.
- Task No. 42: Ensure the necessary revisions and updates of WIPO Standard ST.86.
- Task No. 51: Ensure the necessary revisions and updates of WIPO Standard ST.37.

(d) 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. 23: Monitor the inclusion, in databases, of information about the entry, and, where applicable, the non-entry into the national (regional) phase of published PCT international applications.
- 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.

Task No. 50: Ensure the necessary maintenance and update of surveys published in Part 7 of the WIPO Handbook on Industrial Property Information and Documentation.

(e) Tasks created at the Seventh Session and on which work has not started:

Task No. 64: Prepare a proposal for recommendations for JavaScript Object Notation (JSON) resources compatible with WIPO Standard ST.96 to be used for filing, processing, publication and/or exchange intellectual property information.

(f) 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.

#### MEETINGS OF THE CWS TASK FORCES

218. During this session, the following CWS Task Forces held informal meetings: 3D, Design Representation, Digital Transformation, ICT Strategy for Standards, Legal Status, Name Standardization, Sequence Listing and Trademark Standardization Task Forces.

[Annexes follow]

## LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS/LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

### I. ÉTATS MEMBRES/MEMBER STATES

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

#### ALGÉRIE/ALGERIA

Hicham BOUTABBA (M.), directeur, Innovation, Institut national algérien de la propriété industrielle (INAPI), Ministère de l'industrie et des mines, Alger

#### ALLEMAGNE/GERMANY

Sara BÜHRER (Ms.), Trademark Examiner, Deputy Head of Unit, Trademark Department, German Patent and Trade Mark Office, Munich

Katja BRABEC (Ms.), Information Technology Strategic Planning and International Coordination, German Patent and Trade Mark Office (DPMA), Munich

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

Jan POEPEL (Mr.), Counsellor, Intellectual Property and WIPO Matters, Permanent Mission, Geneva

#### ARABIE SAOUDITE/SAUDI ARABIA

Saad ALHUDIBI (Mr.), Head, Patent Information Unit, Saudi Patent Office, King Abdullaziz City for Science and Technology (KACST), Riyadh

Khalid ALIBRAHIM (Mr.), Delegate, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Geneva

#### AUSTRALIE/AUSTRALIA

Michael BURN (Mr.), Assistant Director, International ICT Cooperation, IP Australia, Canberra

#### AUTRICHE/AUSTRIA

Katharina FASTENBAUER (Ms.), Head, Patent Support and PCT, Deputy Vice President, Technical Affairs, Austrian Patent Office, Ministry of Transport, Innovation and Technology, Vienna

#### AZERBAÏDJAN/AZERBAIJAN

Emil HASANOV (Mr.), Counsellor, Deputy Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission, Geneva

Elnur MUSLUMOV (Mr.), Head, Information Technologies and Publishing Department, Intellectual Property Agency of the Republic of Azerbaijan, Baku

BÉLARUS/BELARUS

Katsiaryna BAIKACHOVA (Ms.), Assistant Director General, National Center of Intellectual Property (NCIP), Minsk

BELGIQUE/BELGIUM

Jonathan SAKÉ (Mr.), Intern, Permanent Mission, Geneva

BOLIVIE (ÉTAT PLURINATIONAL DE)/BOLIVIA (PLURINATIONAL STATE OF)

Mijael SORIA GALVARRO (Sr.), Pasante, Misión Permanente, Ginebra

BRÉSIL/BRAZIL

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

Marcus VIEIRA (Mr.), Information Technology Systems Coordinator, National Institute of Industrial Property, Ministry of Economy (INPI), Rio de Janeiro

CANADA

Jean-Charles DAOUST (Mr.), Director, Investments and Program Management, Canadian Intellectual Property Office (CIPO), Programs Branch, Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada, Gatineau

CHILI/CHILE

María Catalina OLIVOS (Sra.), Abogada, Departamento Internacional y Políticas Públicas, Instituto Nacional de Propiedad Industrial (INAPI), Ministerio de Economía, Santiago

CHINE/CHINA

LUO Cheng (Mr.), Deputy Director, Automation Department, China National Intellectual Property Administration (CNIPA), Beijing

WANG Cheng (Ms.), Official, Patent Literature Department, China National Intellectual Property Administration (CNIPA), Beijing

ZHANG Chunhua (Ms.), Official, China Intellectual Property Publishing House, Beijing

### CONGO

Ludovic Guy LOBOKO (M.), conseiller en charge des questions de l'OMPI, Mission permanente, Genève

### CÔTE D'IVOIRE

Kumou MANKONGA (M.), premier secrétaire, Mission permanente, Genève

### CROATIE/CROATIA

Vesna JEVTIĆ (Ms.), Information Technology Specialist, Information Technology, State Intellectual Property Office (SIPO), Zagreb

### ÉGYPTE/EGYPT

Heba OSAMA (Ms.), Senior Information Specialist, Egyptian Patent Office, Cairo

### EL SALVADOR

Diana HASBUN (Sra.), Ministra Consejera, Misión Permanente de El Salvador ante la Organización Mundial del Comercio (OMC) y la Organización Mundial de la Propiedad Intelectual (OMPI), Ginebra

### ÉQUATEUR/ECUADOR

Heidi VÁSCONES (Sra.), Tercer Secretario, Misión de Ecuador ante la Organización Mundial del Comercio (OMC), Ginebra

### ESPAGNE/SPAIN

María Rosa CARRERAS DURBÁN (Sra.), Coordinadora, Área Proyectos Tecnológicos Internacionales, División de Tecnologías de la Información, Madrid

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

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

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

Tyle AUDUONG (Ms.), Supervisory for Trademark Business Operation Specialist, United States Department of Commerce, United States Patent and Trademark Office, Alexandria

Susan WOLSKI (Ms.), PCT Special Programs Examiner, International Patent Legal Administration, Office of International Patent Cooperation, United States Department of Commerce, United States Patent and Trademark Office, Alexandria

Yasmine FULENA (Ms.), Intellectual Property Advisor, Permanent Mission, Geneva

Kristine SCHLEGELMILCH (Ms.), Intellectual Property Attaché, Permanent Mission, Geneva

#### FÉDÉRATION DE RUSSIE/RUSSIAN FEDERATION

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

Vladislav MAMONTOV (Mr.), Principal Specialist, International Cooperation Department, Federal Service for Intellectual Property (ROSPATENT), Moscow

Olga TIURINA (Ms.), Senior Researcher, Division for the Development of Information Resources, Classification Systems and Standards in the Field of Intellectual Property, Federal Institute of Industrial Property (FIPS), Moscow

Yury ZONTOV (Mr.), Senior Researcher, Software Division, Department for Design and Development of Applied Information Systems, Federal Institute of Industrial Property (FIPS), Moscow

#### FINLANDE/FINLAND

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

#### GHANA

Cynthia ATTUQUAYEFIO (Ms.), Minister Counsellor, Geneva

#### GUATEMALA

Flor DE María GARCIA DIAZ (Sra.), Consejero, Misión Permanente de Guatemala ante la Organización Mundial del Comercio (OMC), la Organización Mundial de la Propiedad Intelectual (OMPI), UNCTAD, CCI, Ginebra

#### HONDURAS

Mariel LEZAMA PAVÓN (Sra.), Consejera, Misión Permanente, Ginebra

#### HONGRIE/HUNGARY

Gyongyi SZILVITZKY (Ms.), Head, Receiving and Official Publication Section, Hungarian Intellectual Property Office (HIPO), Budapest

Janos ERDOSSY (Mr.), Patent Examiner, Patent Department, Hungarian Intellectual Property Office (HIPO), Budapest

INDE/INDIA

Devan RAJAGOPALAN (Mr.), Joint Controller, Patent Office, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, Chennai

ISRAËL/ISRAEL

Dror BEN YEHUDA (Mr.), Information Technology Manager, Digital Technologies and Information (IT), Israel Patent Office, Ministry of Justice, Jerusalem

ITALIE/ITALY

Cristiano DI CARLO (Mr.), Information Technology Coordinator, Italian Patent and Trademark Office (UIBM), Ministry of Economic Development, Rome

Fabrizio FORNARI (Mr.) Information Technology Department, Italian Patent and Trademark Office (UIBM), Ministry of Economic Development, Rome

JAMAÏQUE/JAMAICA

Sheldon BARNES (Mr.), First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

JAPON/JAPAN

Hiroyuki NISHIBORI (Mr.), Deputy Director, Information Technology and Patent Information Management Office, Japan Patent Office (JPO), Tokyo

Hiroshi OKAZAWA (Mr.), Deputy Director, Information Technology and Patent Information Management Office, Japan Patent Office (JPO), Tokyo

Hiroki UEJIMA (Mr.), First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

KAZAKHSTAN

Gulnara BELGOZHINA (Ms.), Head, Department of State Registries, Publications and Examination of Agreements, National Institute of Intellectual Property, Ministry of Justice, Nur-Sultan

LIBAN/LEBANON

Lubna KODEIH (Ms.), Senior Trademark Examiner, Intellectual Property Unit, Ministry of Economy and Trade, Beirut

MAURITANIE/MAURITANIA

Diamilatou DIA (Mme), conseillère, Mission permanente, Genève

NÉPAL/NEPAL

Bimal Prasad BARAL (Mr.), Under Secretary, Foreign Investment and Intellectual Property Section, Ministry of Industry, Commerce and Supplies, Kathmandu

NIGÉRIA/NIGERIA

Amina SMAILA (Ms.), Minister, Permanent Mission, Geneva

NORVÈGE/NORWAY

Jens Petter SOLLIE (Mr.), Intellectual Property Rights System Manager, Digital Services, Norwegian Industrial Property Office (NIPO), Oslo

Magne LANGSAETER (Mr.), Intellectual Property Rights System Assistant Manager, Digital Services, Norwegian industrial Property Office (NIPO), Oslo

OMAN

Fatma AL-BULUSHI (Ms.), Patent Examiner, Intellectual Property Department, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, Muscat

PARAGUAY

María Cristina ACOSTA COLMAN (Sra.), Asesora, Dirección General de Propiedad Industrial, Dirección Nacional de Propiedad Intelectual, Asunción

RÉPUBLIQUE DE CORÉE/REPUBLIC OF KOREA

LEE Jumi (Ms.), Deputy Director, Korean Intellectual Property Office (KIPO), Daejeon

PARK Siyoung (Mr.), Intellectual Property Attaché and Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva

RÉPUBLIQUE TCHÈQUE/CZECH REPUBLIC

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

ROUMANIE/ROMANIA

Eugenia NICOLAE (Ms.), Director, Databases and Information Systems Division, State Office for Inventions and Trademarks (OSIM), Bucharest

Mariana PANDELE (Ms.), Expert, Databases and Information Systems Division, State Office for Inventions and Trademarks (OSIM), Bucharest

Florin TUDORIE (Mr.), Minister, Permanent Mission, Geneva

#### ROYAUME-UNI/UNITED KINGDOM

Julie DALTRY (Ms.), Data Architect, Innovation Directorate, Newport

#### SINGAPOUR/SINGAPORE

Wei Hao TAN (Mr.), First Secretary, Intellectual Property, Singapore

#### SUÈDE/SWEDEN

Åsa VIKEN (Ms.), Process Owner, Patent Department, Swedish Patent and Registration Office (PRV), Stockholm

#### THAÏLANDE/THAILAND

Sasanon NISACHOLS (Ms.), Head, Information and Communication Technology Center, Department of Intellectual Property, Ministry of Commerce, Nonthaburi

#### UKRAINE

Nadia KOLOMIETS (Ms.), Expert, Patent, Documentation and Standardization Division, Ministry of Economic Development and Trade of Ukraine, State Enterprise "Ukrainian Intellectual Property Institute" (Ukrpatent), Kyiv

## **II. ORGANISATIONS INTERNATIONALES INTERGOUVERNEMENTALES/INTERNATIONAL INTERGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS**

#### UNION EUROPÉENNE (UE)/EUROPEAN UNION (EU)

Justyna PETSCH (Ms.), Blockathon Project Lead, European Observatory on Infringements of Intellectual Property Rights, Alicante

Panagiotis SPAGOPOULOS (Mr.), Architecture Service, Digital Transformation Department, Alicante

#### OFFICE DES BREVETS DU CONSEIL DE COOPÉRATION DES ÉTATS ARABES DU GOLFE (CCG)/PATENT OFFICE OF THE COOPERATION COUNCIL FOR THE ARAB STATES OF THE GULF (GCC PATENT OFFICE)

Arwa ALHAMMAD (Ms.), Database Specialist, Patent Office of Gulf Co-operation Council (GCC-PO), The Secretariat General of The Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf, Riyadh



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

Hamidou KONE (M.), directeur, Direction des systèmes d'information et de la publication (DSIP), Yaoundé

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

Evgenii TIURIN (Mr.), Head, Paperless Information Technology Development Division, Patent Information and Automation Department, Moscow

OFFICE EUROPÉEN DES BREVETS (OEB)/EUROPEAN PATENT OFFICE (EPO)

Fernando FERREIRA (Mr.), Data Standards Coordinator, Architecture and Data Standards, Rijswijk

Jeff STEWART (Mr.), Project Manager, Information Technology Cooperation, Rijswijk

Christian SOLTMANN (Mr.), Product Manager, Patent Data Services, Directorate 5.4.1 Publication, Vienna

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

Flora KOKWIHYUKYA MPANJU (Ms.), Head, Search and Substantive Examination, Intellectual Property Rights, Ministry of Justice, Harare

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

ASSOCIATION DES SPÉCIALISTES DE LA PROPRIÉTÉ INTELLECTUELLE DE CÔTE D'IVOIRE (ASPICI)

Sandrine KOUAME (Ms.), vice-presidente, Abidjan

ASSOCIATION INTERNATIONALE POUR LA PROTECTION DE LA PROPRIÉTÉ INTELLECTUELLE (AIPPI)/INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROTECTION OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY (AIPPI)

Jonathan OSHA (Mr.), Reporter General, Zurich

CONFEDERACY OF EUROPEAN PATENT INFORMATION USER GROUPS (CEPIUG)

Guido MORADEI (Mr.), Delegate, Varese

PATENT INFORMATION USERS GROUP (PIUG)

Stephen ADAMS (Mr.), Delegate, Roche

**IV. BUREAU/OFFICERS**

Président/Chair: Jean-Charles DAOUST (M./Mr.) (CANADA)

Vice-président/Vice-Chair: Sergey BIRIUKOV (M./Mr.) (FÉDÉRATION DE  
RUSSIE/RUSSIAN FEDERATION)

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

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

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

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

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

[Annex II follows]

## AGENDA

*Document prepared by the Secretariat*

1. Opening of the Seventh Session
2. Election of the Chair and two Vice-Chairs
3. Adoption of the agenda  
See present document.
4. Revision of WIPO Standard ST.3  
See documents CWS/7/2 REV. and CWS/7/2 ADD.
5. Report on Task No. 58 by the ICT Strategy for Standards Task Force
6. XML4IP Task Force
  - (a) Report on Task No.41, No.53, No.56 and No.63  
See document CWS/7/3 REV.
  - (b) Proposal for WIPO standard on Web API  
See document CWS/7/4.
  - (c) Proposal for JSON specification  
See document CWS/7/5.
7. Blockchain Task Force
  - (a) Report on Task No. 59  
See document CWS/7/6.
  - (b) Report on the Blockchain Workshop
8. Name Standardization Task Force
  - (a) Report on Task No. 55  
See document CWS/7/7.
  - (b) Results of the survey on the use of identifiers for applicants by intellectual property offices  
See document CWS/7/8.
  - (c) Report on the Name Standardization Workshop
9. 3D Task Force Report on Task No. 61  
See document CWS/7/9.
10. Digital Transformation Task Force Report on Task No. 62  
See document CWS/7/10.
11. Legal Status Task Force
  - (a) Report on Task No. 47  
See document CWS/7/11.
  - (b) Revision of WIPO Standard ST.27  
See document CWS/7/12.
  - (c) Report on the implementation plans of WIPO Standard ST.87

12. Sequence Listing Task Force
  - (a) Report on Task No. 44  
See document CWS/7/13.
  - (b) Revision of WIPO Standard ST.26  
See document CWS/7/14.
  - (c) WIPO Sequence Tool  
See document CWS/7/15.
13. Authority File Task Force
  - (a) Report on Task No. 51  
See document CWS/7/16.
  - (b) Revision of WIPO Standard ST.37  
See document CWS/7/17.
  - (c) Publication of Authority File Web Portal
14. Trademark Standardization Task Force
  - (a) Report on Task No.60  
See document CWS/7/18 CORR.
  - (b) Proposal for the revision of WIPO Standard ST. 60  
See document CWS/7/19.
15. Design Representation Task Force
  - (a) Report on Task No. 57  
See document CWS/7/20.
  - (b) Results of the survey on electronic visual representation on industrial designs  
See document CWS/7/21.
16. Part 7 Task Force
  - (a) Report on Task No. 50  
See document CWS/7/22.
  - (b) Results of the survey on the grant and publication of SPCs and PTEs  
See document CWS/7/23.
  - (c) Questionnaire on numbering of published documents and registered rights  
See document CWS/7/24.
17. PAPI Task Force proposal for a questionnaire on providing access to publicly available patent information  
See document CWS/7/25.
18. Report on the survey on the use of WIPO Standards
19. Report on Annual Technical Reports (ATRs)
20. Report by the International Bureau on the provision of technical advice and assistance for capacity building to industrial property offices in connection with the mandate of the CWS  
See document CWS/7/26.
21. Consideration of the Work Program and Tasks List of the CWS  
See document CWS/7/27.
22. Summary by the Chair

23. Closing of the session

[Annex III follows]

## DRAFT QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE USE OF 3D MODELS AND 3D IMAGES IN IP DATA AND DOCUMENTATION

### Glossary

3D model – An electronic file that is created by specialized software, for mathematically representing the surface of an object in three dimensions

3D Images – Images that represent objects displayed in three dimensions (length, depth, height), e.g. 3D photos, stereoscopy, etc.

3DS – A file format used by the Autodesk 3ds Max 3D modeling, animation and rendering software

DWF – Design Web Format

DWG – A file format widely used for CAD drawings

IGES – Initial Graphics Exchange Specification

OBJ – An open geometry vertex file format used for CAD and 3D printing

Raster image – An image that is composed of a map of points (pixels), referred to as a bitmap. Typical file formats for raster images include JPEG, TIFF, PNG and BMP

STL – Standard Tessellation Language - a file format native to the stereolithography CAD software created by 3D Systems

STEP – Standard for the Exchange of Product model data –an open ISO Standard which can represent 3D objects in Computer-aided design (CAD) and related information

Vector graphics – An image file that is composed of shapes formed of mathematical formulas and coordinates on a 2D plane. As opposed to raster images, vector graphics have the property of scaling infinitely without any degradation of quality

X3D – Successor of VRML, an Open ISO Standard XML format

---

### Q1. IP objects and stages of their lifecycle

Q1.1. Does your office currently use 3D models or 3D images for IP objects within the office? If so, for which IP objects:

Trademarks

Industrial designs

Patents (e.g. inventions and/or utility models) including

patents in chemistry as a field of technology (e.g. chemical structures, biological structures)

patents in other fields of technology (e.g. Electrical engineering, Mechanical engineering, etc.)

Integrated circuit topology

Other (please specify: \_\_\_\_\_)

Q1.2. Does your office consider using 3D models or 3D images for IP objects in the future? If so, for which IP objects:

Trademarks

Industrial designs

Patents (e.g. inventions and/or utility models) including

patents in chemistry as a field of technology (e.g. chemical structures, biological structures)

patents in other fields of technology (e.g. Electrical engineering, Mechanical engineering, etc.)

Integrated circuit topology

Not sure

Other (please specify: \_\_\_\_\_)

Q1.3. On which stages of IP objects` lifecycle does your office currently accept/implement 3D models?

a) Trademarks

Filing of the application

Examination

Storage

Search

Publication

Data exchange

Other (please specify: \_\_\_\_\_)

b) Industrial designs

Filing of the application

Examination

Storage

Search

Publication

Data exchange

Other (please specify: \_\_\_\_\_)

c) Patents in chemistry as a field of technology (e.g. chemical structures, biological structures)

Filing of the application

Examination

Storage

Search

Publication

Data exchange

Other (please specify: \_\_\_\_\_)

d) Patents (e.g. inventions and/or utility models) in other fields of technology except chemistry

- Filing of the application
- Examination
- Storage
- Search
- Publication
- Data exchange
- Other (please specify: \_\_\_\_\_)

e) Integrated circuit topology

- Filing of the application
- Examination
- Storage
- Search
- Publication
- Data exchange
- Other (please specify: \_\_\_\_\_)

f) Other (please specify: \_\_\_\_\_)

- Filing of the application
- Examination
- Storage
- Search
- Publication
- Data exchange
- Other (please specify: \_\_\_\_\_)

Q1.4. Does your Office carry out any image transformations? If so, for which objects and on which stages?

a) Trademarks

- Filing of the application
- Examination
- Storage
- Search
- Publication
- Data exchange
- Other (please specify: \_\_\_\_\_)



b) Industrial designs

- Filing of the application
- Examination
- Storage
- Search
- Publication
- Data exchange
- Other (please specify: \_\_\_\_\_)

c) Patents in chemistry as a field of technology (e.g. chemical structures, biological structures)

- Filing of the application
- Examination
- Storage
- Search
- Publication
- Data exchange
- Other (please specify: \_\_\_\_\_)

d) Patents (e.g. inventions and/or utility models) in other fields of technology except chemistry

- Filing of the application
- Examination
- Storage
- Search
- Publication
- Data exchange
- Other (please specify: \_\_\_\_\_)

e) Integrated circuit topology

- Filing of the application
- Examination
- Storage
- Search
- Publication
- Data exchange
- Other (please specify: \_\_\_\_\_)

f) Other (please specify: \_\_\_\_\_)

Filing of the application

Examination

Storage

Search

Publication

Data exchange

Other (please specify: \_\_\_\_\_)

Q1.5. On which stages of IP objects` lifecycle does your office consider accepting/implementing 3D models in the future?

a) Trademarks

Filing of the application

Examination

Storage

Search

Publication

Data exchange

Not sure

Other (please specify: \_\_\_\_\_)

b) Industrial designs

Filing of the application

Examination

Storage

Search

Publication

Data exchange

Not sure

Other (please specify: \_\_\_\_\_)

c) Patents in chemistry as a field of technology (e.g. chemical structures, biological structures)

Filing of the application

Examination

Storage

Search

Publication

Data exchange

Not sure

Other (please specify: \_\_\_\_\_)

d) Patents (e.g. inventions and/or utility models) in other fields of technology except chemistry

- Filing of the application
- Examination
- Storage
- Search
- Publication
- Data exchange
- Not sure
- Other (please specify: \_\_\_\_\_).

e) Integrated circuit topology

- Filing of the application
- Examination
- Storage
- Search
- Publication
- Data exchange
- Not sure
- Other (please specify: \_\_\_\_\_)

f) Other (please specify: \_\_\_\_\_)

- Filing of the application
- Examination
- Storage
- Search
- Publication
- Data exchange
- Not sure
- Other (please specify: \_\_\_\_\_)

Q2. Existing practices and future plans

Q2.1. Please describe existing practices/future plans for using 3D models and 3D images within your office.

---

---

---

### Q3. Regulations

Q3.1. What laws and regulations concerning 3D models and 3D images are implemented within your jurisdiction?

---

---

---

### Q4. Formats and technical tools

Q4.1. Which formats of 3D models or 3D images does your office use at the moment? Does your office use the same or different formats for different stages of lifecycle: filling, examination, publication etc.?

---

---

---

Q4.2. Which formats of 3D models or 3D images does your office consider using in the future? Does your office consider using the same or different formats for different stages of lifecycle: filling, examination, publication etc.?

---

---

---

Q4.3. Please provide us with your suggestions and proposals on formats and reasons why you suppose them to be important (a list of formats to consider) except mentioned in items 6.1, 6.2

---

---

---

Q4.4. Which technical tools does your office currently use to work with 3D models (i.e. viewers, converters, etc.)? Are these standard tools commercially available, or do you consider using any special tool developed for your Office or by your Office?

---

---

---

Q4.5. Which technical tools does your office consider using in future work with 3D models (i.e. viewers, converters, etc.)? Are these standard tools commercially available, or do you consider using any special tool developed for your Office or by your Office?

---

---

---

Q4.6. Please provide us with your suggestions and proposals on tools and reasons why do you suppose them to be important (a list of tools to consider)

---

---

---

Q5. Specific requirements and limitations

Q5.1. Please provide us with preferable specific file requirements? Should they be the same or different for different objects and stages (i.e. limitations and restrictions for 3D files, size (Mb) and format of 3D model for storing, processing, and sharing, etc.)

---

---

---

Q5.2. In your opinion, what would be the main requirements when choosing 3D file formats (open source, wide spread adoption, etc.)

---

---

---

Q5.3. In your opinion, what would be the main requirements when choosing tools for working with 3D files?

---

---

---

Q6. Expectations concerning the use of 3D

Q6.1. Which specific advantages and/or drawbacks do you expect from 3D models and 3D images regarding search, for instance prior art search?

---

---

---

Q6.2. Do you expect that applicants will comply to provide 3D models which fulfill the defined standards?

---

---

---

Q7. Any other comments

---

---

---

## APPENDIX

### A MODEL QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INDUSTRY ON THE DESIGN OF OBJECTS FOR IP RIGHTS PROTECTION USING 3D MODELS AND IMAGES

#### Glossary

3D model – An electronic file that is created by specialized software, for mathematically representing the surface of an object in three dimensions

3DS – A file format used by the Autodesk 3ds Max 3D modeling, animation and rendering software

DWF – Design Web Format

DWG – A file format widely used for CAD drawings

IGES – Initial Graphics Exchange Specification

OBJ – An open geometry vertex file format used for CAD and 3D printing

Raster image – An image that is composed of a map of points (pixels), referred to as a bitmap. Typical file formats for raster images include JPEG, TIFF, PNG and BMP

STL – Standard Tessellation Language - a file format native to the stereolithography CAD software created by 3D Systems

STEP – Standard for the Exchange of Product model data –an open ISO Standard which can represent 3D objects in Computer-aided design (CAD) and related information

Vector graphics – An image file that is composed of shapes formed of mathematical formulas and coordinates on a 2D plane. As opposed to raster images, vector graphics have the property of scaling infinitely without any degradation of quality

X3D – Successor of VRML, an Open ISO Standard XML format

---

Q1. Is your Organization interested in filing to an Intellectual Property Office three-dimensional models as a part of application for visual representation of your objects for IP Rights protection? This may be in addition to or in place of any two-dimensional images (drawings, photos, etc.) in your application.

Yes  No  Not sure

Other (please specify: \_\_\_\_\_)

Q2.1. Does your Organization currently create/design objects for IP Rights protection or their visual representations in 3D formats?

Yes  No

Other comments (please specify: \_\_\_\_\_)

Q2.2. Which objects for IP Rights protection does your Organization create/design using 3D formats for their representation?

- Trademarks
- Industrial designs
- Inventions
- Utility models
- Integrated circuit topology
- Other (please specify: \_\_\_\_\_)

Q2.3. If your Organization does create/design objects for IP Rights protection using 3D formats for their visual representation, please, specify file formats for:

a) Trademarks (list of formats)

---

---

---

b) Industrial designs (list of formats)

---

---

---

c) Inventions (list of formats)

---

---

---

d) Utility models (list of formats)

---

---

---

e) Integrated circuit topology (list of formats)

---

---

---

f) Other (please specify: \_\_\_\_\_)

---

---

Q2.4. If your Organization does create/design objects for IP Rights protection using 3D formats for their visual representation, please, specify software tools (i.e. CAD systems, design editors, viewer tools etc.) for:

a) Trademarks (list of tools)

---

---

---

b) Industrial designs (list of tools)

---

---

---

c) Inventions (list of tools)

---

---

---

d) Utility models (list of tools)

---

---

---

e) Integrated circuit topology (list of tools)

---

---

---

f) Other (please specify: \_\_\_\_\_)

---

---

Q3.1. Does your Organization consider creating/designing objects for IP Rights protection or their visual representations in 3D formats in the future? If your Organization does not consider using 3D models and images for representation of its objects for IPR protection in the future, what is the reason and what are your concerns?

Yes  No  Not sure

Other comments (please specify: \_\_\_\_\_)

Q3.2. Which types of IP Rights does your Organization consider creating/designing objects for in 3D formats?

Trademarks

Industrial designs

Inventions

Utility models

Integrated circuit topology

Not sure

Other (please specify: \_\_\_\_\_)

Q3.3. If your Organization consider creating/designing objects for IP Rights protection or their visual representations in 3D formats in the future, please, specify file formats for:

a) Trademarks (list of formats)

---

---

---



b) Industrial designs (list of formats)

---

---

---

c) Inventions (list of formats)

---

---

---

d) Utility models (list of formats)

---

---

---

e) Integrated circuit topology (list of formats)

---

---

---

f) Other (please specify: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_)

Q3.4. If your Organization considers creating/designing objects for IP Rights protection or their visual representations in 3D formats, please, specify tools that could be used for that purpose for:

a) Trademarks (list of tools)

---

---

---

b) Industrial designs (list of tools)

---

---

---

c) Inventions (list of tools)

---

---

---

d) Utility models (list of tools)

---

---

---

e) Integrated circuit topology (list of tools)

---

---

---

f) Other (please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

---

---

---

Q4. Please, specify 3D formats that, in your opinion, also could be used for filing 3D models and images as visual representations of objects for IP Rights protection (except those that used to create objects for IP Rights protection):

a) Trademarks (list of formats)

---

---

---

b) Industrial designs (list of formats)

---

---

---

c) Inventions (list of formats)

---

---

---

d) Utility models (list of formats)

---

---

---

e) Integrated circuit topology (list of formats)

---

---

---

f) Other (please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

---

---

---

Q5. Other comments and suggestions

---

---

---

## ST.37 ANNEX III –XSD

```
<?xml version="1.0" encoding="UTF-8"?>
<xsd:schema xmlns:xsd="http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema"
xmlns:com="http://www.wipo.int/standards/XMLSchema/ST96/Common"
xmlns:pat="http://www.wipo.int/standards/XMLSchema/ST96/Patent"
targetNamespace="http://www.wipo.int/standards/XMLSchema/ST96/Patent"
elementFormDefault="qualified" attributeFormDefault="qualified">
  <xsd:import namespace="http://www.wipo.int/standards/XMLSchema/ST96/Common"
schemaLocation="Common_V3_1_Custom.xsd"/>
  <xsd:annotation>
    <xsd:documentation>As defined in WIPO ST.37 Authority File for patent documents,
which include patents for inventions, plant patents, design patents, inventors certificates,
utility certificates, utility models, patents of addition, inventors certificates of addition,
utility certificates of addition, and published applications therefor.</xsd:documentation>
  </xsd:annotation>
  <xsd:element name="AFLatestDocumentDate" type="com:DateType">
    <xsd:annotation>
      <xsd:documentation>Date of the most recently published document listed in this
authority file.</xsd:documentation>
    </xsd:annotation>
  </xsd:element>
  <xsd:element name="ApplicationFilingCategory" type="pat:ApplicationFilingCategoryType">
    <xsd:annotation>
      <xsd:documentation>Describes the filing type of application i.e. PCT, Regional
or National.</xsd:documentation>
    </xsd:annotation>
  </xsd:element>
  <xsd:simpleType name="ApplicationFilingCategoryType">
    <xsd:restriction base="xsd:token">
      <xsd:enumeration value="PCT">
        <xsd:annotation>
          <xsd:documentation>PCT</xsd:documentation>
        </xsd:annotation>
      </xsd:enumeration>
      <xsd:enumeration value="Regional">
        <xsd:annotation>
          <xsd:documentation>Regional</xsd:documentation>
        </xsd:annotation>
      </xsd:enumeration>
      <xsd:enumeration value="National">
        <xsd:annotation>
          <xsd:documentation>National</xsd:documentation>
        </xsd:annotation>
      </xsd:enumeration>
    </xsd:restriction>
  </xsd:simpleType>
  <xsd:element name="ApplicationIdentification" type="pat:ApplicationIdentificationType">
    <xsd:annotation>
      <xsd:documentation>Provides the information necessary to identify a particular
patent application. Refers to ST.9 INID Code 20.</xsd:documentation>
    </xsd:annotation>
  </xsd:element>
  <xsd:complexType name="ApplicationIdentificationType">
    <xsd:sequence>
      <xsd:element ref="com:IPOfficeCode"/>
      <xsd:element ref="com:ApplicationNumber"/>
      <xsd:element ref="com:ApplicantFileReference" minOccurs="0"/>
      <xsd:element ref="com:FilingLanguageCode" minOccurs="0"/>
      <xsd:element ref="pat:ApplicationFilingCategory" minOccurs="0"/>
      <xsd:element ref="pat:InventionSubjectMatterCategory" minOccurs="0"/>
      <xsd:element ref="pat:FilingDate" minOccurs="0"/>
    </xsd:sequence>
    <xsd:attribute ref="com:id"/>
  </xsd:complexType>
  <xsd:element name="AttachedPriorityDocumentIndicator" type="xsd:boolean" fixed="true">
```

```

        <xsd:annotation>
            <xsd:documentation>A Boolean which indicates whether the priority document is
attached to the application.</xsd:documentation>
        </xsd:annotation>
    </xsd:element>
    <xsd:element name="AuthorityFile" type="pat:AuthorityFileType">
        <xsd:annotation>
            <xsd:documentation>Root element for the authority file</xsd:documentation>
        </xsd:annotation>
    </xsd:element>
    <xsd:element name="AuthorityFileDataCoverage" type="pat:AuthorityFileDataCoverageType">
        <xsd:annotation>
            <xsd:documentation>List of patent documents published by industrial property
offices grouped according to their ST.16 kind-of-document codes for a given date
range.</xsd:documentation>
        </xsd:annotation>
    </xsd:element>
    <xsd:complexType name="AuthorityFileDataCoverageType">
        <xsd:sequence>
            <xsd:element ref="pat:PublicationDateRange"/>
            <xsd:element ref="pat:PublicationNumberRange" minOccurs="0"/>
            <xsd:element ref="pat:KindCodeCoverage" minOccurs="0"/>
            <xsd:element ref="pat:ExceptionCodeCoverage" minOccurs="0"/>
            <xsd:element ref="pat:DataCoverageURI" minOccurs="0"/>
        </xsd:sequence>
    </xsd:complexType>
    <xsd:element name="AuthorityFileDefinition" type="pat:AuthorityFileDefinitionType">
        <xsd:annotation>
            <xsd:documentation>Provide definition file information relating to this
associated authority file, including file coverage.</xsd:documentation>
        </xsd:annotation>
    </xsd:element>
    <xsd:complexType name="AuthorityFileDefinitionType">
        <xsd:choice maxOccurs="unbounded">
            <xsd:element ref="pat:ExceptionCodeList"/>
            <xsd:element ref="pat:PatentDocumentKindCodeList"/>
            <xsd:element ref="pat:MostRecentDocument"/>
            <xsd:element ref="pat:AuthorityFileDataCoverage"/>
            <xsd:element ref="com:CommentText"/>
            <xsd:element ref="com:DocumentLocationURI"/>
        </xsd:choice>
        <xsd:attribute ref="com:id"/>
        <xsd:attribute ref="pat:groupedAFIndicator" use="required"/>
        <xsd:attribute ref="pat:groupAFCategory"/>
        <xsd:attribute ref="pat:updateAFCategory" use="required"/>
    </xsd:complexType>
    <xsd:element name="AuthorityFileEntry" type="pat:AuthorityFileEntryType">
        <xsd:annotation>
            <xsd:documentation>An authority file entry consists of data required to
uniquely identify a patent publication according to WIPO ST.37.</xsd:documentation>
        </xsd:annotation>
    </xsd:element>
    <xsd:complexType name="AuthorityFileEntryType">
        <xsd:sequence>
            <xsd:element ref="pat:PatentPublicationIdentification"/>
            <xsd:element ref="pat:ExceptionCode" minOccurs="0"/>
            <xsd:element ref="pat:ApplicationIdentification" minOccurs="0"/>
            <xsd:element ref="pat:PriorityApplicationIdentificationBag" minOccurs="0"/>
        </xsd:sequence>
        <xsd:attribute ref="com:id"/>
    </xsd:complexType>
    <xsd:complexType name="AuthorityFileType">
        <xsd:sequence>
            <xsd:element ref="pat:AuthorityFileDefinition" minOccurs="0"/>
            <xsd:element ref="pat:AuthorityFileEntry" maxOccurs="unbounded"/>
        </xsd:sequence>
        <xsd:attribute ref="com:officeCode" use="required"/>
        <xsd:attribute ref="com:creationDate"/>
    </xsd:complexType>

```

```

</xsd:complexType>
<xsd:attribute name="updateAFCategory" type="pat:UpdateCategoryType">
  <xsd:annotation>
    <xsd:documentation>Determines how updates to the authority file will be
performed e.g., incremental versus full.</xsd:documentation>
  </xsd:annotation>
</xsd:attribute>
<xsd:simpleType name="UpdateCategoryType">
  <xsd:restriction base="xsd:token">
    <xsd:enumeration value="full">
      <xsd:annotation>
        <xsd:documentation>A complete new authority file is provided at
each update period.</xsd:documentation>
      </xsd:annotation>
    </xsd:enumeration>
    <xsd:enumeration value="incremental">
      <xsd:annotation>
        <xsd:documentation>Only the new authority file entries published
since the last update period are provided.</xsd:documentation>
      </xsd:annotation>
    </xsd:enumeration>
    <xsd:enumeration value="differential">
      <xsd:annotation>
        <xsd:documentation>Only the records which have changed or are
required to be updated since the last update period are provided.</xsd:documentation>
      </xsd:annotation>
    </xsd:enumeration>
  </xsd:restriction>
</xsd:simpleType>
<xsd:element name="BeginRangeNumber" type="xsd:string">
  <xsd:annotation>
    <xsd:documentation>First number in the range. </xsd:documentation>
  </xsd:annotation>
</xsd:element>
<xsd:attribute name="groupedAFIndicator" type="xsd:boolean">
  <xsd:annotation>
    <xsd:documentation>Indicates that the authority file has been grouped, or not,
according to one of the defined categories.</xsd:documentation>
  </xsd:annotation>
</xsd:attribute>
<xsd:element name="DataCoverageURI" type="xsd:anyURI">
  <xsd:annotation>
    <xsd:documentation>URI where a detailed description of the data coverage of
the authority file is available. </xsd:documentation>
  </xsd:annotation>
</xsd:element>
<xsd:element name="DocumentTotalQuantity" type="xsd:nonNegativeInteger">
  <xsd:annotation>
    <xsd:documentation>Total number of documents according to a particular kind
code. </xsd:documentation>
  </xsd:annotation>
</xsd:element>
<xsd:element name="EndRangeNumber" type="xsd:string">
  <xsd:annotation>
    <xsd:documentation>Last number in the range. </xsd:documentation>
  </xsd:annotation>
</xsd:element>
<xsd:element name="ExceptionCode" type="pat:ExceptionCodeType">
  <xsd:annotation>
    <xsd:documentation>Exception code as indicated in WIPO
ST.37</xsd:documentation>
  </xsd:annotation>
</xsd:element>
<xsd:element name="ExceptionCodeCoverage" type="pat:ExceptionCodeCoverageType">
  <xsd:annotation>
    <xsd:documentation>Data coverage summary by exception code including total
quantity of documents.</xsd:documentation>
  </xsd:annotation>
</xsd:element>

```

```

</xsd:element>
<xsd:complexType name="ExceptionCodeCoverageType">
  <xsd:sequence maxOccurs="unbounded">
    <xsd:element ref="pat:ExceptionCode"/>
    <xsd:element ref="pat:DocumentTotalQuantity"/>
  </xsd:sequence>
</xsd:complexType>
<xsd:element name="ExceptionCodeDefinition" type="pat:ExceptionCodeDefinitionType">
  <xsd:annotation>
    <xsd:documentation>A set of Exception codes, particularly the codes N, W and
X, and their descriptions as defined by the IP Office, which are different from definitions in
WIPO ST.37.</xsd:documentation>
  </xsd:annotation>
</xsd:element>
<xsd:complexType name="ExceptionCodeDefinitionType">
  <xsd:sequence>
    <xsd:element ref="pat:ExceptionCode"/>
    <xsd:element ref="pat:ExceptionCodeDescriptionText"/>
  </xsd:sequence>
</xsd:complexType>
<xsd:element name="ExceptionCodeDescriptionText" type="xsd:string">
  <xsd:annotation>
    <xsd:documentation>A different or specific description of an exception code,
which an IP Office uses in their authority file.</xsd:documentation>
  </xsd:annotation>
</xsd:element>
<xsd:element name="ExceptionCodeList" type="pat:ExceptionCodeListType">
  <xsd:annotation>
    <xsd:documentation>List of exception codes that have a different or specific
definition in use by the IP Office rather than the definitions of exception codes defined in
WIPO ST.37.</xsd:documentation>
  </xsd:annotation>
</xsd:element>
<xsd:complexType name="ExceptionCodeListType">
  <xsd:sequence maxOccurs="unbounded">
    <xsd:element ref="pat:ExceptionCodeDefinition"/>
  </xsd:sequence>
</xsd:complexType>
<xsd:simpleType name="ExceptionCodeType">
  <xsd:restriction base="xsd:token">
    <xsd:enumeration value="C">
      <xsd:annotation>
        <xsd:documentation>Defective publication documents
</xsd:documentation>
      </xsd:annotation>
    </xsd:enumeration>
    <xsd:enumeration value="D">
      <xsd:annotation>
        <xsd:documentation>The document was deleted after the
publication</xsd:documentation>
      </xsd:annotation>
    </xsd:enumeration>
    <xsd:enumeration value="E">
      <xsd:annotation>
        <xsd:documentation>Publication number allocated by the IPO
representing a PCT national/regional phase entry (for example Euro-PCT). No corresponding
document published. A Euro-PCT application is an international (PCT) patent application that
entered the European regional phase.
</xsd:documentation>
      </xsd:annotation>
    </xsd:enumeration>
    <xsd:enumeration value="M">
      <xsd:annotation>
        <xsd:documentation>Published document is
missing</xsd:documentation>
      </xsd:annotation>
    </xsd:enumeration>
    <xsd:enumeration value="N">

```

```

        <xsd:annotation>
          <xsd:documentation>The use of code 'N' must be described in the IP
Office's Authority Definition File.</xsd:documentation>
        </xsd:annotation>
      </xsd:enumeration>
      <xsd:enumeration value="P">
        <xsd:annotation>
          <xsd:documentation>Document available only on
paper</xsd:documentation>
        </xsd:annotation>
      </xsd:enumeration>
      <xsd:enumeration value="R">
        <xsd:annotation>
          <xsd:documentation>Reissued publication</xsd:documentation>
        </xsd:annotation>
      </xsd:enumeration>
      <xsd:enumeration value="U">
        <xsd:annotation>
          <xsd:documentation>Unknown publication number, for example, when
during compilation of the authority file one or a list of publication number(s) has been found
in the database, but the corresponding document(s) is(are) missing without known cause.
Typically this code can indicate could be a database error that requires further
analysis.</xsd:documentation>
        </xsd:annotation>
      </xsd:enumeration>
      <xsd:enumeration value="W">
        <xsd:annotation>
          <xsd:documentation>The use of code 'W' must be described in the IP
Office's Authority Definition File.</xsd:documentation>
        </xsd:annotation>
      </xsd:enumeration>
      <xsd:enumeration value="X">
        <xsd:annotation>
          <xsd:documentation>The use of code 'X' must be described in the IP
Office's Authority Definition File." </xsd:documentation>
        </xsd:annotation>
      </xsd:enumeration>
    </xsd:restriction>
  </xsd:simpleType>
  <xsd:element name="FilingDate" type="com:DateType">
    <xsd:annotation>
      <xsd:documentation>The date assigned by the Patent Office that identifies when
an application meets certain criteria to qualify as having been filed. Refers to ST.9 INID Code
22.</xsd:documentation>
    </xsd:annotation>
  </xsd:element>
  <xsd:attribute name="groupAFCategory" type="pat:GroupCategoryType">
    <xsd:annotation>
      <xsd:documentation>Identifies how the authority files has been grouped i.e.,
by date, publication-level or document-kind code.</xsd:documentation>
    </xsd:annotation>
  </xsd:attribute>
  <xsd:simpleType name="GroupCategoryType">
    <xsd:restriction base="xsd:token">
      <xsd:enumeration value="date">
        <xsd:annotation>
          <xsd:documentation>Date</xsd:documentation>
        </xsd:annotation>
      </xsd:enumeration>
      <xsd:enumeration value="publication-level">
        <xsd:annotation>
          <xsd:documentation>Publication level</xsd:documentation>
        </xsd:annotation>
      </xsd:enumeration>
      <xsd:enumeration value="document-kind">
        <xsd:annotation>
          <xsd:documentation>Document kind</xsd:documentation>
        </xsd:annotation>
      </xsd:enumeration>
    </xsd:restriction>
  </xsd:simpleType>

```

```

        </xsd:enumeration>
    </xsd:restriction>
</xsd:simpleType>
<xsd:element name="IncorporationByReferenceIndicator" type="xsd:boolean" fixed="true">
    <xsd:annotation>
        <xsd:documentation>A Boolean which indicates whether an element or part is
incorporated by reference in the (international) application</xsd:documentation>
    </xsd:annotation>
</xsd:element>
<xsd:element name="IndicatedIPOfficeCode" type="com:ExtendedWIPOST3CodeType">
    <xsd:annotation>
        <xsd:documentation>Where the earlier application is a regional or
international application, an ST.3 code identifying a country party to the Paris Convention or a
member of the WTO for which the regional or international application was made and which is
indicated in the priority claim. Refers to ST.9 INID Code 34.</xsd:documentation>
    </xsd:annotation>
</xsd:element>
<xsd:element name="InventionSubjectMatterCategory"
type="pat:InventionSubjectMatterCategoryType">
    <xsd:annotation>
        <xsd:documentation>Describes the type of invention captured by the published
patent i.e. Design, Utility or Plant</xsd:documentation>
    </xsd:annotation>
</xsd:element>
<xsd:simpleType name="InventionSubjectMatterCategoryType">
    <xsd:restriction base="xsd:token">
        <xsd:enumeration value="Design">
            <xsd:annotation>
                <xsd:documentation>Design</xsd:documentation>
            </xsd:annotation>
        </xsd:enumeration>
        <xsd:enumeration value="Utility">
            <xsd:annotation>
                <xsd:documentation>Utility</xsd:documentation>
            </xsd:annotation>
        </xsd:enumeration>
        <xsd:enumeration value="Plant">
            <xsd:annotation>
                <xsd:documentation>Plant</xsd:documentation>
            </xsd:annotation>
        </xsd:enumeration>
    </xsd:restriction>
</xsd:simpleType>
<xsd:element name="KindCodeCoverage" type="pat:KindCodeCoverageType">
    <xsd:annotation>
        <xsd:documentation>Data coverage summary by kind code including document total
quantity.</xsd:documentation>
    </xsd:annotation>
</xsd:element>
<xsd:complexType name="KindCodeCoverageType">
    <xsd:sequence maxOccurs="unbounded">
        <xsd:element ref="com:PatentDocumentKindCode"/>
        <xsd:element ref="pat:DocumentTotalQuantity"/>
    </xsd:sequence>
</xsd:complexType>
<xsd:attribute name="libraryIdentifier" type="xsd:token">
    <xsd:annotation>
        <xsd:documentation>The library-identifier attribute is intended as an
identifying code for the library containing priority documents - to be used where offices
support the access of the documents from many such libraries. The recommended format of library-
identifier should be composed of a WIPO Standard ST.3 code of the operating Office of service or
digital library, together with service (or digital library) name (optional) separated by a
hyphen to allow for the fact that some Office may operate more than one library. For example,
"IB-DAS" for Digital Access Service for Priority Documents run by WIPO.</xsd:documentation>
    </xsd:annotation>
</xsd:attribute>
<xsd:element name="MostRecentDocument" type="pat:MostRecentDocumentType">
    <xsd:annotation>

```



```

        <xsd:documentation>Provide the publication number and associated date for the
latest patent document included within the authority file.</xsd:documentation>
    </xsd:annotation>
</xsd:element>
<xsd:complexType name="MostRecentDocumentType">
    <xsd:sequence>
        <xsd:element ref="pat:PublicationNumber"/>
        <xsd:element ref="com:PublicationDate"/>
    </xsd:sequence>
    <xsd:attribute ref="com:id"/>
</xsd:complexType>
<xsd:element name="OnlineAvailablePriorityDocumentIndicator"
type="pat:OnlineAvailablePriorityDocumentIndicatorType">
    <xsd:annotation>
        <xsd:documentation>Where the priority document is made available to the
corresponding IPO (e.g., RO or the IB) from a digital library, this indicator provides a
reference to obtain the priority document from such digital library</xsd:documentation>
    </xsd:annotation>
</xsd:element>
<xsd:complexType name="OnlineAvailablePriorityDocumentIndicatorType">
    <xsd:simpleContent>
        <xsd:extension base="pat:TrueType">
            <xsd:attribute ref="pat:libraryIdentifier"/>
            <xsd:attribute ref="com:officeCode"/>
        </xsd:extension>
    </xsd:simpleContent>
</xsd:complexType>
<xsd:element name="PatentDocumentKindCodeDefinition"
type="pat:PatentDocumentKindCodeDefinitionType">
    <xsd:annotation>
        <xsd:documentation>An element within the PatentDocumentKindCodeList. Includes
both the document kind code and associated definition.</xsd:documentation>
    </xsd:annotation>
</xsd:element>
<xsd:complexType name="PatentDocumentKindCodeDefinitionType">
    <xsd:sequence>
        <xsd:element ref="com:PatentDocumentKindCode"/>
        <xsd:element ref="pat:PatentDocumentKindCodeDescriptionText"/>
    </xsd:sequence>
</xsd:complexType>
<xsd:element name="PatentDocumentKindCodeDescriptionText" type="xsd:string">
    <xsd:annotation>
        <xsd:documentation>A description of the patent document kind code used by a
particular IPO.</xsd:documentation>
    </xsd:annotation>
</xsd:element>
<xsd:element name="PatentDocumentKindCodeList" type="pat:PatentDocumentKindCodeListType">
    <xsd:annotation>
        <xsd:documentation>A list of specific document kind codes used by an IPO. Use
of WIPO ST.16 is recommended.</xsd:documentation>
    </xsd:annotation>
</xsd:element>
<xsd:complexType name="PatentDocumentKindCodeListType">
    <xsd:sequence maxOccurs="unbounded">
        <xsd:element ref="pat:PatentDocumentKindCodeDefinition"/>
    </xsd:sequence>
</xsd:complexType>
<xsd:element name="PatentPublicationIdentification"
type="pat:PatentPublicationIdentificationType">
    <xsd:annotation>
        <xsd:documentation>Details identifying a particular published patent document,
as part of an authority file entry. Refers to ST.9 INID Code 10.</xsd:documentation>
    </xsd:annotation>
</xsd:element>
<xsd:complexType name="PatentPublicationIdentificationType">
    <xsd:sequence>
        <xsd:element ref="com:IPOfficeCode"/>
        <xsd:element ref="pat:PublicationNumber"/>
    </xsd:sequence>

```

```

        <xsd:element ref="com:PublicationLanguageCode" minOccurs="0"/>
        <xsd:element ref="com:PatentDocumentKindCode" minOccurs="0"/>
        <xsd:element ref="com:PublicationDate" minOccurs="0"/>
    </xsd:sequence>
    <xsd:attribute ref="com:id"/>
</xsd:complexType>
<xsd:element name="PriorityApplicationIdentification"
type="pat:PriorityApplicationIdentificationType">
    <xsd:annotation>
        <xsd:documentation>Details of the priority application which is associated
with the particular authority file entry.</xsd:documentation>
    </xsd:annotation>
</xsd:element>
<xsd:element name="PriorityApplicationIdentificationBag"
type="pat:PriorityApplicationIdentificationBagType">
    <xsd:annotation>
        <xsd:documentation>A list of priority applications which are used to claim
priority. Refers to ST.9 INID Code 30.</xsd:documentation>
    </xsd:annotation>
</xsd:element>
<xsd:complexType name="PriorityApplicationIdentificationBagType">
    <xsd:sequence>
        <xsd:element ref="pat:PriorityApplicationIdentification"
maxOccurs="unbounded"/>
        <xsd:element ref="pat:IncorporationByReferenceIndicator" minOccurs="0"/>
    </xsd:sequence>
    <xsd:attribute ref="com:id"/>
</xsd:complexType>
<xsd:complexType name="PriorityApplicationIdentificationType">
    <xsd:sequence>
        <xsd:element ref="com:IPOfficeCode"/>
        <xsd:element ref="com:ApplicationNumber" minOccurs="0"/>
        <xsd:element ref="com:PatentDocumentKindCode" minOccurs="0"/>
        <xsd:element ref="pat:FilingDate"/>
        <xsd:element ref="pat:IndicatedIPOfficeCode" minOccurs="0"
maxOccurs="unbounded"/>
        <xsd:element ref="pat:ApplicationFilingCategory" minOccurs="0"/>
        <xsd:choice minOccurs="0">
            <xsd:element ref="pat:RequestedPriorityDocumentIndicator"/>
            <xsd:element ref="pat:AttachedPriorityDocumentIndicator"/>
            <xsd:element ref="pat:OnlineAvailablePriorityDocumentIndicator"/>
            <xsd:element ref="com:DASAccessCode"/>
        </xsd:choice>
    </xsd:sequence>
    <xsd:attribute ref="com:id"/>
    <xsd:attribute ref="com:sequenceNumber" use="required"/>
</xsd:complexType>
<xsd:element name="PublicationDateRange" type="pat:PublicationDateRangeType">
    <xsd:annotation>
        <xsd:documentation>Publication date range over which the authority file is
valid. </xsd:documentation>
    </xsd:annotation>
</xsd:element>
<xsd:complexType name="PublicationDateRangeType">
    <xsd:sequence>
        <xsd:element ref="com:StartDate"/>
        <xsd:element ref="com:EndDate"/>
    </xsd:sequence>
</xsd:complexType>
<xsd:element name="PublicationNumber" type="xsd:string">
    <xsd:annotation>
        <xsd:documentation>Publication Number. </xsd:documentation>
    </xsd:annotation>
</xsd:element>
<xsd:element name="PublicationNumberRange" type="pat:PublicationNumberRangeType">
    <xsd:annotation>
        <xsd:documentation>A range of patent publication numbers which are included
within this authority file.</xsd:documentation>

```

```
        </xsd:annotation>
    </xsd:element>
    <xsd:complexType name="PublicationNumberRangeType">
        <xsd:sequence>
            <xsd:element ref="pat:BeginRangeNumber"/>
            <xsd:element ref="pat:EndRangeNumber"/>
        </xsd:sequence>
    </xsd:complexType>
    <xsd:element name="RequestedPriorityDocumentIndicator" type="xsd:boolean" fixed="true">
        <xsd:annotation>
            <xsd:documentation>The receiving office is requested to prepare and transmit
to the IB a certified copy of the earlier application.</xsd:documentation>
        </xsd:annotation>
    </xsd:element>
    <xsd:simpleType name="TrueType">
        <xsd:restriction base="xsd:boolean">
            <xsd:pattern value="true"/>
        </xsd:restriction>
    </xsd:simpleType>
</xsd:schema>
```

## ST.37 ANNEX IV - DTD

```
<?xml version='1.0' encoding='UTF-8' ?>

<!--Annex IV of WIPO Standard ST.37, XML Data Type Definition (DTD) for Authority Files

This entity may be identified by the PUBLIC identifier:
*****
PUBLIC "-//WIPO//XSD AUTHORITY FILE 1.2//EN" "AuthorityFile_V1_2.dtd"
*****
*****
* Date draft created: 2018-09-19

* Annex IV was adopted by the Committee on WIPO Standards (CWS) at its sixth session on October
19, 2018.
*****
* 2019-07-05: Revision approved at the seventh session of the CWS 2019-07-05:
* (i) group-category renamed grouped-af-indicator and is now a list of Boolean values 'yes' and
'no'
* (ii) backup-category renamed update-af-category
* (iii) additional-comment renamed comment-text
*
*****
* PUBLIC DTD URL

* http://www.wipo.int/standards/DTD/AuthorityFile_V1_2.dtd

*****

*****
* CONTACTS: xml.standards@wipo.int

*****

-->
<!ELEMENT authority-file (authority-file-definition? , authority-file-entry+)>

<!ATTLIST authority-file country CDATA #REQUIRED
                        date-produced CDATA #REQUIRED >
<!ELEMENT authority-file-definition (exception-code-list | document-kind-code-list | most-
recent-document | data-coverage | comment-text | document-location-uri)+>

<!-- 1/07/2019 - Add CWS/7/17 for alignment with XSD <!ATTLIST authority-file-definition
content-category (complete | grouped ) #REQUIRED
                group-category (date |
                                publication-level |
                                document-kind ) #IMPLIED
                backup-category (full |
                                incremental |
                                differential ) #REQUIRED >-->

<!ATTLIST authority-file-definition grouped-af-indicator (yes | no ) #REQUIRED
                group-af-category (date |
                                publication-level |
                                document-kind ) #IMPLIED
                update-af-category (full |
                                incremental |
                                differential ) #REQUIRED >

<!ELEMENT document-location-uri (#PCDATA)>

<!ELEMENT exception-code-list (exception-code-definition)+>
```

```

<!ELEMENT exception-code-definition (exception-code, exception-code-description)>
<!ELEMENT exception-code-description (#PCDATA)>
<!ELEMENT exception-code (#PCDATA)>
<!--
<!ATTLIST exception-code ( C |
                           D |
                           E |
                           M |
                           N |
                           P |
                           R |
                           U |
                           W |
                           X ) #IMPLIED >
--><!ELEMENT document-kind-code-list (document-kind-code-definition)+>
<!ELEMENT document-kind-code-definition (kind, document-kind-code-description)+>
<!ELEMENT document-kind-code-description (#PCDATA)>
<!ELEMENT most-recent-document EMPTY>
<!ATTLIST most-recent-document publication-number CDATA #REQUIRED
                               publication-date CDATA #REQUIRED >
<!ELEMENT data-coverage (publication-date-range? , publication-number-range? , kind-code-
coverage? , exception-code-coverage? , data-coverage-uri?)>
<!ELEMENT publication-date-range EMPTY>
<!ATTLIST publication-date-range start-date CDATA #REQUIRED
                               end-date CDATA #REQUIRED >
<!ELEMENT publication-number-range EMPTY>
<!ATTLIST publication-number-range begin-range-number CDATA #REQUIRED
                               end-range-number CDATA #REQUIRED >
<!ELEMENT kind-code-coverage (kind, document-total-quantity)*>
<!ELEMENT document-total-quantity (#PCDATA)>
<!ELEMENT exception-code-coverage (exception-code, document-total-quantity)*>
<!ELEMENT data-coverage-uri (#PCDATA)>
<!ELEMENT authority-file-entry (publication-reference , exception-code? , application-reference?
, priority-claims?)>
<!ELEMENT publication-reference (document-id)>
<!-- document-id tag as defined in ST.36 -->
<!ELEMENT document-id (country , doc-number , kind? , date?)>
<!--Two-letter alphabetic codes which represent the names of states, other entities
and intergovernmental organizations the legislation of which provides for the protection of
IP rights or which organizations are acting in the framework of a treaty in the field of IP.
e.g. "XX".
Always in upper case.-->
<!ELEMENT country (#PCDATA)>
<!--Doc-number: The number of the referenced patent (or application) document-->
<!ELEMENT doc-number (#PCDATA)>
<!--Document kind code; e.g., A1 (WIPO ST.16)-->
<!ELEMENT kind (#PCDATA)>
<!--Date: components of a date. Format: YYYYMMDD (WIPO ST.2)-->

```

```
<!ELEMENT date (#PCDATA)>

<!--Publication exception code; single-alphabetic letter code to indicate the reason why the
complete published document, for which the corresponding number is assigned, is not available:
  C=Defective documents;
  D= Documents deleted after the publication;
  E=Publication number allocated by the IPO representing a PCT national/regional phase entry
(for example Euro-PCT). No corresponding document published. A Euro-PCT application is an
international (PCT) patent application that entered the European regional phase;
  M=Missing published documents;
  N=Not used publication number: e.g. publication numbers have been issued, but finally have
not been allocated to any publication;
  P=Document available on paper only;
  R=Reissued publications;
  U=Unknown publication numbers: e.g. when during compilation of the authority file certain
publication number(s) has been found in the database, but the corresponding document(s) is(are)
missing without known cause. Typically this code can indicate a database error that requires
further analysis;
  W=Applications (or patents) which were withdrawn before the publication;
    this can include lapsed or ceased patents and might depend on national patent law
regulations;
  X=Code available for individual or provisional use by an IPO;
-->

<!--Application reference information: application number, country.
In case of a filing reference, the kind code is empty and the date refers to the filing date.
-->
<!ELEMENT application-reference (country , doc-number , filing-date?)>

<!--Filing Date: components of a date. Format: YYYYMMDD (WIPO ST.2)-->
<!ELEMENT filing-date (#PCDATA)>

<!--Priority application identification (priority-claim)-->
<!ELEMENT priority-claims (priority-claim+)>

<!ELEMENT priority-claim (country , doc-number , kind , date)>

<ATTLIST priority-claim sequence          CDATA #REQUIRED
                    priority-claim-kind (national | regional | international )
#REQUIRED >

<!-- 1/07/2019 - Add CWS/7/17 for alignment with XSD <!ELEMENT additional-comment (#PCDATA)-->
<!ELEMENT comment-text (#PCDATA)>
```

[Annex V follows]

## DRAFT QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE CONTENT AND FUNCTIONALITIES OF SYSTEMS FOR PROVIDING ACCESS TO PUBLICLY AVAILABLE PATENT INFORMATION

### GLOSSARY

Publication – In line with [Part 8 of the WIPO Handbook](#), the terms “publication” and “published” are used in the sense of making available:

- a patent document to the public for inspection or supplying a copy on request;
- multiple copies of a patent document produced on, or by, any medium (e.g., paper, film, magnetic tape or disc, optical disc, online database, computer network, etc.).

Legal status information – information about events that may affect the grant, scope, term, ownership, or other legal aspects of a patent or patent application.

### PART 1

This part of the survey covers basic availability and coverage of online data systems.

#### Core Information

Q1. Does your Office provide access to patent information online?

YES  NO

Q2. What types of patent information from your Office are available online? Please select all that apply:

- Unpublished applications (limited info made available before publication)
- Published applications
- Granted patent publications
- Legal status information
- Correction documents
- Priority data
- Patent Term Extensions or Supplementary Protection Certificates data
- Patent family information
- File inspection
- Court decision data
- Reassignments
- Licensing information
- Official Gazette
- Other: (Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_)

Please provide URLs where the available types of information can be accessed online:

---

Q3. How can users access patent information online? Mark all that apply:

- Online queries with no login required
- Online queries with free login (no payment required)
- Online queries with paid subscription or contract required
- Online queries only in designated locations, such as a public search facility
- No online queries, only bulk data downloads are available

Q4. Who can access this information online?

- Information is only available to patent attorneys admitted to practice before the Office
- Information is only available to residents of the Office's country or region
- Information is available to anyone
- Other: (Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_ )

Q5. Are the online systems for patent information indicated above available in English for the user interface and search?

Any other languages? [dropdown choices]

Q6. What time periods does the available online data cover for the following types of patent information? If the data has gaps or is incomplete, please note so under Remarks.

| Type of Information   | From (date) | To (date) | Not available | Remarks |
|---|-------------|-----------|---------------|---------|
| Unpublished applications (limited info made available before publication) |             |           |               |         |
| Published applications  |             |           |               |         |
| Granted patent publications   |             |           |               |         |
| Legal status information  |             |           |               |         |
| Correction documents  |             |           |               |         |
| Priority data   |             |           |               |         |
| Patent Term Extensions or Supplementary Protection Certificates data      |             |           |               |         |
| Patent family information   |             |           |               |         |
| File inspection   |             |           |               |         |
| Court decision data   |             |           |               |         |
| Reassignments   |             |           |               |         |
| Licensing information   |             |           |               |         |
| Official Gazette  |             |           |               |         |

Q7. Is the following legal status information available in online systems:

Answer choices for each: YES for all years / YES for some years / NO



- Whether the patent is granted
- Whether the patent is currently in force
- PCT national phase entry date
- PCT national phase non-entry date
- Fee payments
- Change of ownership
- Pre- and post-grant events following court decisions.
- Other information

Comments:

---

Q8. How often is each type of patent information updated online?

| Type of Information   | Update frequency (multiple choice: realtime, daily, weekly, biweekly, monthly, quarterly, other) |
|---|--|
| Unpublished applications (limited info made available before publication) |  |
| Published applications  |  |
| Granted patent publications   |  |
| Legal status information  |  |
| Correction documents  |  |
| Priority data   |  |
| Patent Term Extensions or Supplementary Protection Certificates data      |  |
| Patent family information   |  |
| File inspection   |  |
| Court decision data   |  |
| Reassignments   |  |
| Licensing information   |  |
| Official Gazette  |  |

[End of Annex V and of document]