

Meeting of International Authorities under the Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT)

Thirty-Third Session
Geneva, October 28 and 29, 2026

PERMANENT TASK FORCE ON PCT MINIMUM DOCUMENTATION: STATUS REPORT

Document prepared by the United States Patent and Trademark Office

SUMMARY

1. On January 1, 2026, the Permanent Task Force on PCT Minimum Documentation under the Meeting of International Authorities (MIA) (“the Permanent Task Force”) came into operation, after the entry into force of the amended Regulations and new provisions of the Administrative Instructions relating to the PCT minimum documentation. Led by the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO), the Permanent Task Force assumed the work to implement the PCT minimum documentation requirements for patent and non-patent literature from the ad hoc PCT Minimum Documentation Task Force (“the Task Force”). This document gives the background to the Permanent Task Force and summarizes its work this year, including the first comprehensive review of the non-patent literature (NPL) items of the PCT minimum documentation. The Meeting is invited to approve the NPL journals that the Permanent Task Force has recommended for addition to and deletion from the list of NPL items referred to in Rule 34.1(b)(ii) that constitute a part of the PCT minimum documentation.

BACKGROUND

2. In 2016, the MIA reactivated the PCT Minimum Documentation Task Force to undertake a comprehensive review of the PCT minimum documentation under the lead of the European Patent Office (EPO) and the USPTO. The mandate that was given to the Task Force in 2016, and endorsed by the MIA in early 2017 (see paragraphs 3 and 4 of document [PCT/WG/17/16](#)), can be summarized as follows:

- (a) Create an up-to-date inventory of the patent literature and non-patent literature parts of the current PCT minimum documentation.

- (b) Recommend objective criteria and up-to-date standards for the inclusion in the PCT minimum documentation of both patent documentation and non-patent literature, including traditional knowledge-based prior art.
3. At its twenty-ninth session (June 20 to 22, 2022), the MIA agreed to add the following three objectives to the Task Force's mandate (see paragraph 22 of document [PCT/MIA/29/4](#) and paragraph 51(c) of document [PCT/MIA/29/10](#)):
- (a) Guide and support Offices in being technically ready by the date of entry into force of the amended definition of the PCT minimum documentation to make available, in accordance with the technical and accessibility requirements, all patent documents, and where applicable utility model documents, published on or after the said date of entry into force.
- (b) Agree on a roadmap over the 10 years following the date of entry into force of the amended definition of the PCT minimum documentation to support Offices in meeting the technical requirements to make available all patent documents, and where applicable utility model documents, published on or after the cutoff date up until the said date of entry into force.
- (c) Ensure that the implementation of the agreed roadmap is included in the mandate of the (future) standing Task Force on PCT minimum documentation under the PCT MIA that will start operating after the entry into force of the amended Regulations and new provisions of the Administrative Instructions relating to the PCT minimum documentation.
4. At its fifty-fifth (24th ordinary) session (July 6 to 14, 2023), the PCT Assembly adopted amendments to Rules [34](#), [36](#) and [63](#), and an Understanding regarding the interpretation of Rules 36 and 63 (document [PCT/A/55/2](#) and paragraph 32 of document [PCT/A/55/4](#)), to enter into force on January 1, 2026. This update of the legal framework was the culmination of intensive work in the Task Force as well as discussions at various sessions of the MIA and PCT Working Group.
5. Modifications to the Administrative Instructions under the PCT including a new [Annex H](#), setting out the technical and accessibility requirements and procedure for inclusion of patent and utility model documents and non-patent literature in the minimum documentation, were promulgated on June 19, 2024, through Circular [C. PCT 1672](#). They entered into force on January 1, 2026, together with the Rule amendments.
6. With the adoption of the PCT Rule amendments in July 2023 and the promulgation of the modifications to the PCT Administrative Instructions in June 2024, the Task Force completed the objectives of its initial mandate of 2016. Hence, since June 2024, the work of the Task Force work has been dedicated to the three objectives that were added to its mandate in 2022 (see paragraph 3, above).
7. The Task Force held its eighth session from May 19 to 22, 2025. It was the final session before entry into force, on January 1, 2026, of the revised provisions relating to the PCT minimum documentation, and before the submission by International Authorities of their applications for extension of appointment as an International Searching and Preliminary Examining Authority. As part of these applications, which had to be submitted by December 1, 2025, International Authorities were required to demonstrate compliance with the new PCT minimum documentation requirements. This session focused thus on the final preparations required for the timely implementation of the revised PCT minimum documentation provisions.
8. At this session, the Task Force endorsed a certification process to confirm that an Office had met the requirement that it has made its patent collection available to other International Searching Authorities (ISAs) ensuring that the compliance with the new PCT minimum

documentation requirements be assessed in the same and objective way for all Authorities and Offices. The said certification process consisted of the following stages:

- (a) Stage 1 - Documentation: This stage corresponds to the filling out of the checklists to report on the status of the preparations to reach compliance.
- (b) Stage 2 - Verification: This stage corresponds to the testing phase during which the following verifications need to be performed:
 - (i) Compliance of the Authority File with both Annex H of the PCT Administrative Instructions (text-searchable indicators) and [version 2.2](#) of WIPO Standard ST.37 to be checked by the International Bureau.
 - (ii) Availability of full text in an allowable format on a repository to be checked by at least one International Authority.
 - (iii) Confirmation that full text can be downloaded in bulk from the repository to be checked by the same International Authority.
- (c) Stage 3 - Certification: An Office is considered as certified compliant by the Task Force if the test results are positive and no other International Authority raises objections within one month from the completion of the first test (in case of tests by several Authorities) and posting the testing results. The certification is documented by the testing results published in dedicated tables on the wiki.

9. Further at its eighth session, the Task Force endorsed parallel timelines for timely certification, one for International Authorities and one for Offices not appointed as International Authorities. It was noted that all Offices should strive to conclude the verification (testing) phase by September 1, 2025, and that another common key milestone was October 1, 2025, which was the cutoff date for meeting certification requirements and the deadline for the notification to the International Bureau under new Rule 34.1(d)(i).

10. The non-patent literature (NPL) minimum documentation was also addressed at the eighth session. The Task Force validated the detailed time plan proposed by the USPTO, volunteer coordinator for the first Comprehensive Review of the NPL minimum documentation, regarding the work of the future permanent Task Force. In addition, a draft NPL submission form aiming at capturing all the information an ISA might need to evaluate a proposal to add or remove a NPL item was agreed upon. For further details on that session, see document PCT/MD/8/6, attached as an Appendix to document [PCT/MIA/32/5](#).

11. On September 9, 2025, to support Offices in their final preparations, the International Bureau issued Circular [C. PCT 1690](#) containing a template for the notification to the International Bureau under new Rule 34.1(d)(i) that an Office is making its patent documents and, where applicable, its utility model documents available in compliance with the technical and accessibility requirements specified in Annex H to the Administrative Instructions.

PROGRESS REPORT

12. The provisions of Annex H of the PCT Administrative Instructions that entered into force on January 1, 2026, set up a permanent Task Force under the MIA comprising representatives of ISAs. The said provisions entrust that Task Force with tasks related to the review of the list of items of NPL referred to in Rule 34.1(b)(ii) with a view to verify that items continue to meet the criteria for inclusion in the PCT minimum documentation and to consider resources for addition to the list. The future permanent Task Force on PCT Minimum Documentation under the MIA was also mandated by the MIA at its twenty-ninth session (June 20 to 22, 2022) with implementing the agreed 10-year patent documentation roadmap (see paragraph 6(b) of

document PCT/MIA/32/5) to support Offices in meeting the technical requirements to make available all patent documents, and where applicable, utility model documents, published on or after the cut-off date up until the said date of entry into force.

13. At its thirty-second session (October 29 to 31, 2025), the MIA approved the mandate for the new permanent Task Force on PCT Minimum Documentation proposed by the ad hoc Task Force (paragraph 19 of PCT/MIA/32/5), as follows:

(a) For non-patent literature matters, namely:

(i) Conducting a comprehensive review every five years to verify that the items on the non-patent literature list continue to meet the criteria for inclusion and to consider the inclusion of new resources, in accordance with the adopted comprehensive review cycle.

(ii) Establishing a schedule of volunteer International Searching Authorities to conduct an annual review of the non-patent literature list on a rotational basis for obsolete and discontinued resources, as well as metadata updates.

(iii) Performing any further tasks that might be required by the provisions of Part II of new Annex H of the PCT Administrative Instructions.

(b) For patent documentation matters, namely:

(i) Monitoring and conducting activities to support the handling of patent documents published from January 1, 2026, in accordance with the new requirements.

(ii) Monitoring and conducting activities until the end of 2035 to support the transition for back file publications published from January 1, 1991.

(iii) Performing any further tasks that might be required by the provisions of Part I of new Annex H of the PCT Administrative Instructions.

14. Further at this thirty-second session, the MIA noted the invitation to all Authorities from the USPTO, in its role as the Authority responsible for convening and organizing the meeting that would undertake the first comprehensive review of the list of items of NPL in the minimum documentation, to begin consideration of the existing and potential new items for the list, which should be submitted by the end of January 2026. New pages on the PCT Minimum Documentation Task Force electronic forum (hereinafter, "the wiki") were in the final stages of preparation for this purpose.

15. The work of the first session of the new Permanent Task Force (June 9 to 11, 2026 and September 29 to 30, 2026) commenced with discussion of ISA compliance with Part I of Annex H. The EPO reported that compliance forms had been submitted by only 20 Offices as of January 1, 2026. The Task Force agreed that receipt of compliance forms from the remaining 14 Offices was an urgent action item and set a deadline of 1 July 2026 for submission of the outstanding Forms. A second area of concern was that backfile digitization was complete for only 10 Offices. The importance of digitization in a valid XML format in compliance with Annex H was raised, because structured XML can be ingested into search systems whereas text-based PDF data cannot. The International Bureau introduced the question of the ability of ISAs to ingest or import the patent collections and requested feedback from the Authorities on their experiences.

16. The EPO proposed that the patent collection validation procedure agreed upon and applied in the context of the entry into force of the new PCT minimum documentation

requirements also apply to validation of new patent collections becoming part of the PCT Minimum Documentation. The Task Force endorsed this proposal. The International Bureau recommended that Annex H be updated to memorialize the validation process as it presently stands, as several steps are absent from the outline in paragraphs 22 and 23 of Annex H. The Task Force agreed to add this proposal as an action item. The International Bureau will consult initially through the wiki and eventually issue a PCT Circular to this end.

17. With further regard to Part I of Annex H, the International Bureau presented a paper reviewing procedures related to providing and accessing patent data that would benefit from having greater detail, to assist national Offices in digitizing and publishing collections in a manner that maximizes their value. The International Bureau recommended that the Task Force develop a "best practices" document that would assist future Offices to efficiently become compliant with Annex H. The Task Force was invited to comment on the Annex H procedures, including issues set out in the paper, and on their experiences providing and accessing patent data. The EPO suggested a soft deadline of July 15, 2026, for submission of feedback by Offices on the paper. As an action item, the International Bureau would create a page on the wiki for this purpose.

18. The focus of the first session of the new Permanent Task Force next turned to the NPL portion of the PCT minimum documentation. The EPO reported on NPL citation data that they collect and analyze from international search reports generated by all Authorities, and kindly shared on the wiki a spreadsheet comprising 44 years of citation data for 133 NPL journals.

19. The mandated annual review of the current NPL resource list to identify discontinued or obsolete resources was led by the USPTO, as adjunct to their role as coordinator of the five-year Comprehensive Review. Seven titles on the NPL list were identified as discontinued; the Task Force found consensus to remove these titles, as shown below, from the minimum documentation list.

NPL 62: IBM Journal of Research and Development

NPL 91: Kobunshi Ronbunshi (Japanese Journal of Polymer Science and Engineering)

NPL 150: Solid-State Technology

NPL 219: Popular Science

NPL 229: Derwent Biotechnology Abstracts

NPL 231: Bell Labs Technical Journal

NPL 247: Medicinal and Aromatic Plants Abstracts

20. The five-year Comprehensive Review of the NPL portion of the PCT Minimum Documentation comprised:

- (a) verifying that all current resources were still in compliance with the Criteria for Inclusion (paragraphs 25 to 29 of Annex H); and
- (b) considering both current resources and additional resources recommended by International Authorities for inclusion, using the criteria set forth in paragraph 34 of Annex H.

21. The USPTO explained that five titles no longer met the criteria for inclusion; there was consensus in the Task Force to remove these titles, listed below, from the minimum documentation list.

NPL 132: Plastverarbeiter

NPL 147: SMPTE Motion Imaging Journal

NPL 156: Stahl und Eisen

NPL 181: RFE-Elektrohaendler: Fachmagazin fuer die CE – und Hausgerate-Branche

NPL 228: Elektor / Elektor

22. Thirty-two current NPL titles identified by one or more International Authorities were considered for removal by the Task Force as potentially not meeting the criteria of paragraphs 34 (b) and/or 34(c) of Annex H, which relate to usage. Deliberations relied heavily but not exclusively on the citation data collected by the EPO (see paragraph 18, above). Consensus was reached to remove the 18 titles listed below, with the other 14 titles remaining on the NPL list.

NPL 017: ATZ. Automobiltechnische Zeitschrift

NPL 020: Aviation Week and Space Technology

NPL 038: Chemistry & Industry

NPL 045: Control Engineering

NPL 110: Kunststoffe International: magazine for plastics (renamed Plastics Insights)

NPL 112: Machine Design

NPL 135: Power

NPL 145: Scientific American

NPL 164: VDI-Z

NPL 168: Electronics World

NPL 171: REE. Revue de l'Électricité et de l'Électronique

NPL 204: Elektronik

NPL 220: Popular Mechanics

NPL 224: TR Transfer

NPL 225: MPA - Messen, Prüfen, Automatisieren

NPL 226: VDI-Nachrichten

NPL 227: Konstruktion

NPL 237: Journal of Chinese Medicine

23. Eighty-five new NPL resources were proposed for consideration for addition to the PCT minimum documentation by one or more International Authorities. The Indian Patent Office (IPO) gave two presentations on the NPL additions that their Office recommended, which included how the titles were identified, electronic availability, and various citation metrics, and responded to questions from Offices. The USPTO noted the large number of proposed

additions, acknowledged the supporting data, especially that addressing paragraph 34(c) of Annex H, and asked for suggestions on how to consider the proposed additions. Comments from the Offices included that more time was needed for in-depth evaluation of each proposed resource, that a “report” for each resource comprising evidence relevant to paragraph 34 of Annex H would be useful, and that the NPL list is a minimum documentation list, not maximum. The EPO suggested that the Task Force propose a time period for evaluation, and the USPTO concurred with the need for more time, including the need to consider costs and relevant usage metrics and thresholds. The Task Force agreed to keep the current comprehensive review cycle open, in order for the Task Force to complete deliberations prior to the Meeting of the International Authorities (MIA), with the proviso of no new proposals for NPL additions. The USPTO proposed that consideration of the proposed additions be extended until August 15, 2026, to allow for supplementation of existing proposals with supporting information, with discussion to take place on the Task Force wiki, and that the Task Force reconvene in September to finalize recommendations. The five titles proposed for deletion just prior to commencement of this session, but too late to be considered, would also be included in the consideration period. Consensus among Offices was reached. The EPO voiced its intent to generate and then share international search report citation data for the proposed additions but expressed that thresholds should only be part of the ultimate decision.

24. At the reconvening of the first session of the new Permanent Task Force, Offices shared potential methods for evaluating the titles proposed as additions to the current PCT minimum documentation NPL list. A collaborative discourse among Task Force members followed that ultimately achieved consensus to add the seven titles listed below. These titles shared the attributes of a very high citation number in international search reports, inclusion in each of the candidate lists generated by Offices using its proposed evaluation method, and partial or complete free access to the full text of the title. In particular, the discussion reflected a sensitivity to the financial burden that adopting partially open access titles could impose on small and medium-sized Offices. There was no consensus to add a new title to the NPL list with the limitation that inclusion only pertained to the subset of content that was currently freely available. Authorities that did not have full access to the four partially open access titles voiced agreement to obtain full access within two years of their addition to the revised NPL list (as per paragraph 42 of Annex H). If the list is approved and it published in January 2027, these Authorities would therefore need full access by January 2029.

MDP-017 (MDP-031): Journal of Medicinal Chemistry

MDP-019: Bioorganic and Medicinal Chemistry Letters

MDP-023: Scientific Reports

MDP-038: Food Chemistry

MDP-027: Nature Communications

MDP-057: Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology

MDP-018 (MDP-032): ACS Applied Materials & Interfaces

25. Offices agreed that work by the Permanent Task Force on PCT Minimum Documentation to establish detailed objective criteria for the inclusion of new titles to the PCT minimum documentation NPL list, including discussion about whether any new criteria should also apply to existing titles, should continue following the closing of the first session. Items proposed for future discussion included the question of whether document delivery might sometimes be an alternative to full subscriptions to “maintain full text access” as per paragraph 42 of Annex H, a proposal for a more structured format for future addition requests, which includes whether a title is open access, and which existing PCT minimum documentation titles are already covered by

the same subscription as the proposed title, and the scope of a “recommended resource list”. There was broad support among Offices to hold a mid-2027 meeting for this purpose, which would also facilitate the annual review of NPL titles.

26. The International Bureau offered to create a wiki page for the purpose of facilitating discussion among librarians and other NPL experts about useful resources and noted that the conversation about a “recommended resource list” could continue on said page.

27. With regard to compliance with Part I of Annex H, the EPO proposed regular, perhaps annual, meetings to share updates on digitization, exchange test data etc. in order to keep the momentum going. The Chair noted that an annual, virtual meeting would support both Part I compliance and developing objective criteria for the NPL list.

28. The EPO asked about feedback to the International Bureau paper related to Annex H procedures and digitization guidance (PCT/MDPTF/2026/1/4). The International Bureau acknowledged contributions from the EPO and IPO, invited further contributions on the wiki page established for that purpose, and suggested continuing the discussion at the proposed 2027 meeting.

29. The International Bureau responded to Office interest in the continuation of support sessions and offered to facilitate future clinics. Offices were asked to inform the International Bureau of specific questions that they would like to be discussed since support from librarians and documentation experts in other International Authorities might be required to provide appropriate advice.

30. The Task Force discussed the role of the volunteer ISA for annual review of the NPL list to identify any obsolete or discontinued resources and determine if a meeting of the Task Force would be needed, and agreed to the USPTO proposal for a one-year volunteer ISA term, to begin each year following the annual Meeting of the International Authorities (MIA). The Canadian Intellectual Property Office (CIPO) volunteered to serve as the next one-year volunteer ISA.

31. The permanent PCT Minimum Documentation Task Force will report on a regular basis to the MIA and, where relevant, to the PCT Working Group. The second session of this permanent Task Force is tentatively scheduled for May 2027. The Canadian Intellectual Property Office (CIPO) is the volunteer ISA leading the 2027 annual review.

32. *The Meeting is invited to*

(i) take note of the contents of the present document; and

(ii) approve the recommendations of the Permanent Task Force on PCT Minimum Documentation to remove the journals listed in paragraphs 19, 21 and 22, above, from the list of items of non-patent literature in the minimum documentation referred to in Rule 34.1(b)(ii), and to add the journals listed in paragraph 24, above, to that list.

[Appendices follow]

PCT/MDPTF/1/10
Date: 10 July 2026

Permanent Task Force on PCT Minimum Documentation

First session
By videoconference, 9-11 June 2026

Summary of discussions

Adopted by the Task Force

1. The Permanent Task Force on PCT Minimum Documentation (“the Task Force”) held its first session by videoconference from 9 to 11 June 2026.
2. The list of participants is available on the Task Force wiki as document PCT/MDPTF/2026/INF/1.

Item 1: Opening of the session (Day 1)

3. Mr. Michael Richardson, Director, PCT Business Development Division, International Bureau (IB) welcomed participants on behalf of the Director General, Mr. Daren Tang. He gave the historical context of the PCT Minimum Documentation Task Force and offered a comment on the agenda item “Review of Procedures related to Annex H”. With regard to participation in the meetings of this Task Force (as per paragraph 30 of Annex H), the IB felt it valuable to extend an invitation to any designated Office interested in the work of the Task Force, although Annex H does not specifically provide for it. The IB suggested that the Task Force accept this participation, and invited future discussion about procedures related to Annex H.
4. Mr. Michael Neas, Acting Director of the International Patent Legal Administration, United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) welcomed participants to the first meeting of the Permanent Task Force on PCT Minimum Documentation, as Chair of the session. He noted that 24 International Authorities were in attendance, as well as the IB, a delegation from the Mexican Institute of Industrial Property (IMPI), whose appointment as an International Authority will soon be taken up by the PCT Assembly in July 2026, and observers from the Norwegian, French, German, Swiss and United Kingdom Offices.
5. The Task Force adopted the agenda as set out in document PCT/MDPTF/2026/1/1.

Item 2: Summary of Annex H Compliance Forms (EPO)

6. Mr. Antony Fonderson (EPO) gave a presentation summarizing ISA compliance with Part I of Annex H as of 1 January 2026, derived from the Compliance Forms submitted by 20 Offices (PCT/MDPTF/2026/1/2). He noted the substantial progress that has been made, in general, but that backfile digitization was an area of concern in that it was complete for only 10 Offices. The importance of digitization in a valid XML format in compliance with Annex H was noted. An urgent action item for the Task Force is to receive Compliance Forms from the remaining 14 Offices; 1 July 2026 was proposed and agreed as a deadline for submission of the outstanding Forms.
7. The Chair thanked the EPO for the presentation, and suggested that a second action item be to work collectively to bring all Offices into full compliance with Annex H.
8. Mr. Michael Richardson (IB) raised the question of the ability of ISAs to ingest or import the patent collections and requested feedback from the Authorities on their experiences. He added that Offices have informed the IB that they are unsure as to their obligations with respect to providing their collections, in view of a lack of clarity about the requirements of Annex H, such as text-based versus XML-based data.
9. Mr. Antony Fonderson explained that it was important that digitized files be in XML format because structured XML can be ingested into search systems whereas text-based PDF data cannot.

Item 3: Procedure to validate patent collections prior to inclusion in the PCT Minimum Documentation (EPO)

10. Mr. Antony Fonderson (EPO) gave a presentation on the Procedure to Validate Patent Collections Prior to Inclusion in the Minimum Documentation (PCT/MDPTF/2026/1/3), including a review of the requirements and obligations of an Authority, technical requirements and the review/validation process. Regarding the procedure for validation of new patent collections becoming part of the PCT Minimum Documentation, he proposed to follow the same procedure than the one agreed and applied last year in the context of the entry into force of the new PCT minimum documentation requirements. The Task Force endorsed this proposal. Moreover, he suggested that it would be valuable to have a progress table on the Task Force wiki that would display the validation and certification status of incoming collections.
11. Mr. Michael Richardson (IB) recommended that Annex H be updated to memorialize the validation process as it presently stands, as several steps are absent from the outline in paragraphs 22 and 23 of Annex H. The Task Force agreed to add this proposal as an action item. The IB will consult initially through the wiki and eventually issue a PCT Circular to this end.

Item 4: Review of procedures related to Annex H, Part 1 (IB)

12. Mr. Thomas Marlow (IB) presented a paper (PCT/MDPTF/2026/1/4) reviewing the procedures set forth in Annex H relating to providing patent data, with the aim of providing additional, needed clarity and stimulating discussion within the Task Force. It was recommended that the Task Force develop a 'best practices' document that would assist future Offices to efficiently become compliant with Annex H.
13. The challenge of automating optical character recognition (OCR) was raised in the context of the benefit of sharing experiences between Offices. CIPO proposed a wiki space for sharing OCR/automation best practices and tool testing results to avoid duplicate work. The IB mentioned that they are working on a new OCR tool and that, if successful, the technology

would be shared with Offices. Additionally, the IB noted related work on this topic in the Standards area, including the posting of a "[Digitization Guidelines Survey](#)", which has a response date of 15 June 2026.

14. Mr. Michael Richardson (IB) proposed consideration of modifications to Annex H, such as explicitly welcoming observing Offices to all Task Force meetings. The IB offered that paragraph 38, as written, was not what was intended in that designated Offices (not the public) should be able to recommend to the Task Force non-patent literature (NPL) titles for addition to the resource list.
15. The EPO suggested a soft deadline of 15 July 2026 for submission of feedback by Offices on the paper. As an action item, the IB will create a meeting follow-up wiki page for this purpose.

Item 5: International Search Report NPL citation data (EPO)

16. Mr. Antony Fonderson (EPO) gave a presentation (PCT/MDPTF/2026/1/7) about the NPL citation data that the EPO collects and analyzes from International Search Reports generated by all Authorities. A spreadsheet kindly shared on the wiki before the meeting (PCT/MDPTF/2026/1/6) comprises 44 years of citation data for 133 NPL journals. It was noted that a small number of journals account for most citations, and that citation trends (e.g. growth) should be considered in addition to averages.

Item 6: Review of current non-patent literature resource list – Annual review (USPTO)

17. The Chair opened the discussion of the NPL portion of the PCT Minimum Documentation by reminding participants that the NPL list represents the minimum NPL resources for international search and examination, and other NPL resources could be consulted in addition to this minimum. The Chair also highlighted a comment on the wiki from the National Institute of the Industrial Property Office of Chile (INAPI) about considering the subscription costs when considering expanding the list.
18. Mr. Bobby Vinyard (USPTO) gave a presentation about proposed updates to the current NPL resource list (PCT/MDPTF/2026/1/5), which incorporated ISR citation data collected by the EPO (2020-present). The presentation contained proposals that were active at the start of the session (withdrawn proposals were excluded), except for a few proposals for deletion that had been received after the presentation had been prepared.
19. The results of the annual review to identify discontinued and obsolete resources was discussed first. Consensus was reached to remove seven discontinued titles from the list as shown on slide 5 of the presentation and listed immediately below.

NPL 62: IBM Journal of Research and Development

NPL 91: Kobunshi Ronbunshi (Japanese Journal of Polymer Science and Engineering)

NPL 150: Solid-State Technology

NPL 219: Popular Science

NPL 229: Derwent Biotechnology Abstracts

NPL 231: Bell Labs Technical Journal

NPL 247: Medicinal and Aromatic Plants Abstracts

Item 6: Review of current non-patent literature resource list – Comprehensive review (Day 2)

20. Discussion of five journals (as shown in blue on slide 8 of the presentation and listed immediately below) that were found to no longer meet the inclusion criteria of paragraphs 25-29 of Annex H resulted in consensus to remove them from the NPL resource list.

NPL 132: Plastverarbeiter
NPL 147: SMPTE Motion Imaging Journal
NPL 156: Stahl und Eisen
NPL 181: RFE-Elektrohaendler: Fachmagazin fuer die CE – und Hausgerate-Branche
NPL 228: Elektor / Elektor

Discussions were then directed to proposed removals as shown in slides 10-13 of the presentation. Consensus was reached by the Task Force to remove the following titles from PCT Minimum Documentation NPL list:

NPL 017: ATZ. Automobiltechnische Zeitschrift
NPL 020: Aviation Week and Space Technology
NPL 038: Chemistry & Industry
NPL 045: Control Engineering
NPL 110: Kunststoffe International: magazine for plastics (renamed Plastics Insights)
NPL 132: Plastverarbeiter
NPL 135: Power
NPL 147: SMPTE Motion Imaging Journal
NPL 156: Stahl und Eisen
NPL 164: VDI-Z
NPL 171: REE. Revue de l'Électricité et de l'Électronique
NPL 181: RFE-Elektrohaendler: Fachmagazin fuer die CE -und Hausgeraete-Branche
NPL 204: Elektronik
NPL 220: Popular Mechanics
NPL 224: TR Transfer
NPL 225: MPA - Messen, Prüfen, Automatisieren
NPL 226: VDI-Nachrichten
NPL 227: Konstruktion
NPL 228: Elektor / Elektor
NPL 237: Journal of Chinese Medicine

Consensus was not reached to remove the following titles which will therefore remain on the PCT Minimum Documentation NPL list:

NPL 085a: IEICE Transactions on Communications
NPL 085b: IEICE Transactions on Electronics
NPL 085c: IEICE Transactions on Fundamentals of Electronics, Communications and Computer Sciences
NPL 085d: IEICE Transactions on Information and Systems
NPL 095: Russian Journal of Applied Chemistry (Zhurnal prikladnoi khimii)
NPL 100: Russian Journal of General Chemistry (Zhurnal obshchei khimii)
NPL 127: Optics and Spectroscopy (Optika i spektroskopiya)
NPL 134a: Polymer Science – Series A Polymer Physics
NPL 134b: Polymer Science – Series B Polymer Chemistry
NPL 178: Russian Journal of Organic Chemistry / Zurnal organiceskoj himii
NPL 183: Semiconductors
NPL 185: Technical Physics Letters

NPL 235: Acta Pharmaceutica
NPL 248: Korean Journal of Traditional Knowledge

Regarding NPL 246 (MDP-16): Indian Journal of Traditional Knowledge, the USPTO had originally identified the journal on the wiki as not meeting the criteria. However, the proposal was subsequently withdrawn, and the journal is being retained. It was agreed to review the proposals for deletion that were received after the presentation had been prepared alongside the discussions on the wiki on the proposed additions before taking a decision on the proposed deletions.

Item 7: Proposals for additions of journals (IPO)

21. Ms. Vishakha Gupta (Indian Patent Office - IPO) gave two presentations on proposed additions to the PCT Min Doc NPL list, which were also shared on the TF wiki. The first presentation (PCT/MDPTF/2026/1/8) on recommended additions to the NPL list comprised 80 of the 83 journal titles that IPO has proposed. It was noted that 46 are open-access journals and 34 are subscription-based journals. Ms. Gupta provided details on the methodology, including citation analysis, accessibility, and examiner surveys. The second presentation (PCT/MDPTF/2026/1/9) by IPO focused on citation metrics derived from international reports issued by the IPO within the past 3 years, highlighted top journals cited and those with fewer citations but still valuable. Additional citation evidence for the Indian Journal of Traditional Knowledge (IJTK) was noted, and IPO emphasized the importance of niche domains in achieving balanced subject matter representation.
22. The Chair thanked IPO for the presentations and invited questions for the IPO about the presentation. The IPO responded to questions from Offices about some of the metrics that were presented.
23. The Chair noted the large number of proposed additions, acknowledged the supporting data, especially that addressing paragraph 34(c) of Annex H, and asked for suggestions on how to consider the proposed additions.
24. Comments from the Offices included that more time was needed for in-depth evaluation of each proposed resource, that a "report" for each resource would be useful and perhaps that the IB could develop an evaluation form, and that the NPL list is a minimum doc list, not maximum. The EPO suggested that the Task Force propose a time period for evaluation.
25. USPTO concurred with the need for more time, including the need to consider costs and investigate a correlation between Impact Factor and CiteScore, which indicators are citation metrics valued in academia, and usage during prior art search.
26. The Chair concluded that multiple offices are not in position to evaluate these proposals yet. Rather than postpone a decision on these journals for five years, the Chair offered the EPO's suggestion to keep the current comprehensive review cycle open, for a time to be determined, in order for the Task Force to complete deliberations prior to the Meeting of the International Authorities (MIA) in the fall. If we conclude there is no consensus to add, then they don't get reviewed for five years. He suggested that we consider a way for Offices that have proposed additions to provide more information, potentially on the wiki, and/or have a brief Task Force meeting, and asked for feedback.
27. The IB stated they would be happy to facilitate discussion on the wiki but suggested that a form may not be the best way to facilitate the discussion. The IB is open to having another meeting before the MIA.

28. Discussion returned to metrics and the need to consistently apply them. The question of what constitutes high citations and high usage was raised, and that usage/citation data by multiple ISAs was necessary to make the data meaningful. The EPO stated that they intend to derive ISR citation data for the proposed new journals using ISSN numbers and will share this data when it is available. A question for thought was offered as to whether one citation in three years was sufficient to merit inclusion of a resource. For perspective, it was noted that close to 300,000 International Search Reports per year have been issued recently. The Chair suggested to continue this discussion of metrics and thresholds when the meeting reconvened the next day.

Item 8: Conclusions of discussions, report, closing remarks (Day 3)

29. The Chair thanked IPO for providing data in Excel form and mentioned the post from the Ministry of Intellectual Property of the Republic of Korea (MOIP) on the Task Force wiki about accessing the Korean Journal of Traditional Knowledge (KJTK)
30. MOIP clarified that some articles in KJTK are in English. For those that are not in English, abstracts, keywords, analytical information, and published information are available in English. MOIP also clarified the login requirements, explaining that users can browse KJTK without logging in but need to log in or access KJTK through IP Authentication to view full text.
31. The Chair opened discussion of the role of the volunteer ISA for annual review of the NPL list and discussed potential volunteer ISA term options of one year vs five years. The responsibility of the volunteer ISA is to look at the list each year to identify any obsolete or discontinued resources and determine if a meeting of the Task Force is needed. The Task Force agreed to the USPTO proposal for a one-year volunteer ISA term, to begin each year following the annual Meeting of the International Authorities (MIA).
32. The Chair opened the floor for volunteer ISA nominations. The Canadian Intellectual Property Office (CIPO) volunteered to serve as the next one-year volunteer ISA.
33. The Chair thanked CIPO, who would be the volunteer ISA for October 2026-October 2027.
34. Discussion returned to the proposed additions to the NPL list. The USPTO proposed that consideration of the proposed additions be extended until 15 August 2026, with discussion to take place on the TF wiki via chat. CIPO requested confirmation that the consideration period is for supplementation only, and no new proposals will be allowed.
35. The Chair clarified the USPTO proposal with the proviso of no new additions. The consideration period would allow for supplementation of existing proposals with supporting information and comments but be frozen to new additions. The USPTO would work with the IB to update the wiki to facilitate consideration. The Chair proposed that the TF be reconvened in early September to finalize the recommendations to the MIA.
36. The IB supported the clarified approach and suggested treating the September meeting as a continuation; this TF meeting being “suspended” rather than “closed”. Consensus among Offices was reached. The USPTO also clarified that there was a late proposal from CNIPA to remove five resources, and those deletions should be included in the supplementation/consideration period. The Chair accepted the USPTO clarification, and no objections were voiced.
37. The IPO raised the topic of metrics/thresholds, whether they should be included now and written into the decisions at this time and questioned if thresholds are needed.

38. The Chair responded that proposing offices should submit whatever evidence/metrics they deem relevant and that TF members would weigh that evidence, attributing value to the data as they see fit. The Chair acknowledged interest in further defining metrics/thresholds and suggested wiki postings on this topic ahead of the September meeting.
39. The IB confirmed that September will cover unresolved items, additions, thresholds; emphasized that very early (prior to August 15) postings of comments/materials would enable general policy thinking, and that thresholds would likely take the form of indicative numbers, not absolute cutoffs.
40. The EPO voiced its intent to post its position about thresholds on the wiki but cautioned that thresholds should not be the sole determinant. The EPO also reminded the group about the recommended resources list as an alternative for the proposed resources that are ultimately not added to the NPL Minimum Documentation list.
41. The Chair thanked the EPO and asked participants to post their proposals, ideas, or informal thoughts concerning metrics and thresholds on the wiki in the coming weeks. He noted that the USPTO and IB will provide wiki space for these submissions so the group can review and discuss them ahead of the September continuation and reminded proposing offices to supplement their existing NPL proposals with relevant evidence.
42. CIPO noted that they will be counting on the EPO report for ISR citation data on their proposed additions.
43. The Chair proposed producing and circulating a draft summary of the meeting, then posting a final version on the wiki; confirmed the meeting would be suspended and reconvened in early September and asked for closing remarks.
44. The IB thanked the Chair, the USPTO and all who contributed to this successful meeting and the progress made, noting that it was a learning experience as the first comprehensive review of the list of NPL items in the PCT minimum documentation.
45. The Chair thanked the IB and EPO for their help preparing for this meeting, USPTO support/IT staff for excellent assistance, and all Task Force members for their constructive engagement. He confirmed that the USPTO will circulate the draft summary and work with the IB on wiki updates, and formally suspended the meeting until early September.

[Appendix II follows]

Permanent Task Force on PCT Minimum Documentation

Continuation of the First Session By videoconference, 29-30 September 2026

Summary of Discussions

Adopted by the Task Force

1. The Permanent Task Force on PCT Minimum Documentation ("the Task Force") continued its first session by videoconference from 29 to 30 September 2026.

Item 9: Reconvening of the session

2. Mr. Michael Neas (United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO)) opened the continued Task-Force session, as Chair, and explained that its primary goal was to prepare recommendations for the Meeting of the International Authorities (MIA) on additions to and deletions from the non-patent literature (NPL) portion of the PCT minimum documentation list. He noted that roughly 85 proposed additions were under consideration, and thanked Offices for their posts on the wiki about methods for evaluating these titles. The Chair invited Offices to discuss their evaluation methods, in the order of presentation on the wiki.

Item 10: Continuation of review of proposals for additions of journals

3. USPTO acknowledged the miscalculation in its initial proposed method, and offered that other proposals might be better. The USPTO clarified that the USPTO would need objective metrics to support additions, especially if they brought subscription costs.
4. The China National Intellectual Property Administration (CNIPA) conducted the evaluation of each item from five dimensions. (a) Compliance with the inclusion criteria specified in Annex H of the PCT Administrative Instructions; (b) Control of resource subscription costs; (c) The resource's substantial influence, including being indexed in mainstream databases such as SCI; (d) High search and citation value, reflected by high cumulative citation volume and steady citation trends; (e) Ease of access to the resource. Following this assessment, CNIPA identified 39 journals satisfying the foregoing requirements. CNIPA also stressed that national offices should still conduct holistic consideration of multiple factors including costs before determining whether these journals may be added to the MinDoc List.
5. The Japan Patent Office (JPO) proposed a threshold based on three-year ISR citation totals. The proposal compared citation counts for the candidate titles with the average citation count for the top 25% of titles on the existing list. Ten proposed titles met the threshold.

6. The Indian Patent Office (IPO) asked whether Annex H's criteria could be changed and whether any new criteria should also apply to existing titles and emphasized the importance of a consistent evaluation criteria. IPO also raised the importance of considering citations to titles outside the current list and balancing subject-matter coverage and invited attention of the Task Force to the outcome of preliminary exercise by the IPO on classifying the existing titles as per the IPC which had been posted on the wiki..
7. The Chair said the Task Force could decide whether to develop objective criteria and whether to apply them to existing titles but doubted that detailed criteria could be agreed upon during this meeting. He suggested that this session focus on seeking agreement on any additions that were relatively straightforward, and invited other Offices to offer their opinion.
8. The European Patent Office (EPO) emphasized that additions could have budgetary implications and that the group needed an objective basis for decisions. The EPO saw merit in the JPO proposal, further noting that work on defining criteria should continue. The EPO identified seven titles common to all Offices' candidate lists for which a consensus of support might be achievable before the MIA.
9. The Canadian Patent Office (CIPO) said usage data could help identify the most-used titles and that open-access titles would be easier to support.
10. The Austrian Patent Office (APO) supported considering freely accessible titles, while warning that subscription costs could be especially burdensome for small and medium-sized offices.
11. The Ministry of Intellectual Property of the Republic of Korea (MOIP) supported using citation data as a practical starting point, while noting that the criteria to be developed should also consider subject-matter balance. The MOIP supported consideration of the seven titles identified by the EPO.
12. CNIPA agreed that a practical outcome for this meeting would be to only add the seven titles common to the proposed lists.
13. EPO posted the seven candidate titles in the meeting chat, to facilitate consideration by the Task Force.
14. The International Bureau (IB) gave background on the NPL list's origins, explaining that it dates to 1978 and that access to publications has changed since then. The IB also noted that Rule 34 gives the International Searching Authorities a role in determining the list.
15. IPO supported addition of the seven titles, noting that more time is needed to establish detailed criteria. With regard to improving the review process, the IPO stressed that some existing NPL titles are costly and underutilized, and that subject matter balance is important for the NPL list.
16. USPTO raised a concern that at least one of the seven titles might be only partly open access and asked whether any inclusion could be limited to the freely available content.
17. EPO confirmed that some titles may have only part of their content openly available, and proposed that smaller Offices check their current access level before the Task Force decides whether to add the titles or set conditions.
18. The Chair proposed postponing the decision on the seven titles until the next day so Offices could check their access, allowing for an educated determination of whether the seven could

be added with or without stipulations. He then turned the discussion to the remaining 78 titles, observing that there was not yet consensus.

19. CIPO raised concerns about cost, and asked, as food for thought, whether document delivery might sometimes be an alternative to full subscriptions to “maintain full text access” as per paragraph 42 of Annex H.
20. The IB asked if Offices with full access to the seven titles might be able to share access and cost information with those who don’t, and what it means in practice to search a title without a subscription.
21. USPTO explained that costs can be difficult to discern because subscriptions may cover bundles of publications, and added that procurement rules may restrict what information that Offices can share.
22. The Chair asked whether the Task Force supported further work on establishing objective criteria, particularly in relation to paragraph 34 of Annex H.
23. IPO asked whether citation information could be gathered for titles cited by Authorities but not included in the current minimum documentation list noting that such information could provide visibility into newly cited NPLs and that such data would be of value for search purposes.
24. MOIP proposed a more structured format for future addition requests, which includes whether a title is open access, and which existing PCT minimum documentation titles are already covered by the same subscription as the proposed title.
25. In response to the question from IPO, the EPO stated that all International Search Report citation data is available through DOCDB for bulk download, but noted that identifying every cited title outside the minimum documentation list would be computationally difficult. The EPO suggested evaluating specific candidate titles instead.

Item 11: Continuation of review of proposals for removal of journals from the NPL List

26. The Chair turned the discussion to the five titles proposed to be deleted: Chemical Engineering, Machine Design, Scientific American, Electronics World, and Research Disclosure. He noted the USPTO post on the wiki supporting deleting only three of them (Machine Design, Scientific American, Electronics World).
27. Many Offices indicated support for deleting Machine Design, Scientific American, and Electronics World.
28. CNIPA raised the question of what subscription means were available for the two titles that the USPTO wanted retained on the NPL list, Chemical Engineering and Research Disclosure, and the USPTO responded that institutional package subscriptions from EBSCO and Questel, respectively, were examples.
29. The Chair confirmed agreement of the Task Force to remove the following titles from PCT Minimum Documentation NPL list:

NPL 112: Machine Design
NPL 145: Scientific American
NPL 168: Electronics World

Consensus was not reached to remove the following titles which will therefore remain on the PCT Minimum Documentation NPL list:

NPL 029: Chemical Engineering
NPL 234: Research Disclosure

30. In response to an inquiry from the Chair, the EPO voiced its preference to discuss the patent-documentation requirements the following day. The IB supported that schedule in view of the concurrent DOCX to XML Conversion meeting.
31. The IB returned the discussion to the 78 proposed additions that will not be added to the NPL list at this time and the recommended list referred to in paragraph 37 of Annex H, and suggested continuing resource-sharing discussions through the wiki, potentially with a formal group of librarians. The USPTO and EPO both voiced support for a space to track useful resources outside the minimum documentation list, with the EPO noting that information on proposed additions that were not approved should not be lost.
32. CIPO, APO and the IB discussed creation of a wiki page for librarian names with a voluntary option to add contact details, in addition to a space to share resources and continue discussions.
33. The Chair suspended the session for the day. He summarized the plan to revisit the seven proposed additions the next day, then discuss patent documentation, and explore future work on more objective evaluation criteria.

Item 12: Conclusion of discussion on proposed additions to the NPL minimum documentation list

34. The Chair thanked the JPO for posting their findings about access to the seven proposed journal titles on the wiki, and invited the JPO to comment.
35. JPO reported that three titles were fully open access and four were only partially open access, and noted that a subscription to one journal in a bundle might enable institutional access to other titles. Therefore, the JPO suggested checking outside office networks to determine if a title is open access.
36. The Eurasian Patent Organization (EAPO) reported similar findings and noted that Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology became fully open access in 2024; earlier articles are not open access.
37. IPO found two titles fully open access and likewise noted the 2024 change for Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology.
38. MOIP said three titles were open access and the remaining four were available to MOIP and likely most other Offices through existing American Chemical Society (ACS) or ScienceDirect subscriptions that may already be used to access resources in the current PCT minimum documentation collection. MOIP supported adding all seven, citing their use in search reports and no expected additional subscription cost.
39. The Chair opened the floor for further comments.
40. CIPO supported adding all seven titles and did not support an “open access contingency” for the seven hybrid access titles because it would be too complicated. Although CIPO does not currently have access to all seven, they agreed to subscribe to those remaining.
41. EPO asked if other Authorities already had access through subscription packages.

42. The Chair reiterated that some partially open access titles are part of packages and queried all Offices if adding “full title access” would be a financial burden to any Office. Authorities responded in the meeting chat.
43. Offices confirming full access to all seven titles were: IPO, USPTO, IP Australia, CNIPA. CIPO intended to obtain full access.
44. Offices indicating only partial access to the seven titles were: Egyptian Intellectual Property Authority (EGIPA), National Institute of Industrial Property of Brazil (INPI), Intellectual Property Office of the Philippines (IPOPHL).
45. INPI indicated that it would take some time for them to obtain full access to all seven titles.
46. The IB clarified that paragraph 42 of Annex H allows two years after the list takes effect to obtain full access, i.e. January 2029, and the implications of the five-year access requirement for a title that became open access in 2024.
47. In view of the responses, the Chair asked again whether anyone objected to adding all seven titles without qualification.
48. EGIPA said the titles were important and used by their examiners, and that EGIPA would discuss arrangements to obtain full access.
49. The Finnish Patent and Registration Office (PRH) and the JPO confirmed that they would add missing subscriptions.
50. The Chair confirmed agreement of the Task Force to add the following titles to the NPL minimum documentation list:

MDP-017 (MDP-031): Journal of Medicinal Chemistry
MDP-019: Bioorganic and Medicinal Chemistry Letters
MDP-023: Scientific Reports
MDP-038: Food Chemistry
MDP-027: Nature communications
MDP-057: Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology
MDP-018 (MDP-032): ACS Applied Materials & Interfaces

Item 13: Update on compliance with Annex H Part I

51. EPO presented an update of the status of compliance reports (PCT/MDPTF/2026/1/2/REV). In brief, 31 of 34 Offices had submitted forms and 14 were fully compliant. The EPO reviewed front-file availability, repositories, authority files, and backfile digitization.
52. IPO asked what the service level agreement (SLA) question in the compliance form referred to.
53. EPO clarified that the SLA question came from the IB, and the IB offered that the SLA was not an obligation, but information about good practice.
54. APO said they migrated their collections to a new SFTP server, which led to a shortening of the approval process for the creation of external users for access, and offered to update their compliance form.

55. EPO proposed regular, perhaps annual, meetings to share updates on digitization, exchange test data etc. in order to keep the momentum going. The USPTO voiced support for an annual virtual meeting.
56. The Chair said an annual, virtual meeting regarding compliance could also support developing objective criteria for the NPL list under Annex H, which is work agreed to by the Task Force, and facilitate the annual review of NPL titles. The Chair added that CIPO was the volunteer ISA for the October 2026 – September 2027 evaluation of the NPL list.
57. The Chair opened the floor for discussion about having a mid-year meeting. EGIPA, CIPO, JPO, the Spanish Trademark and Patent Office (SPTO), EAPO, INPI, IPO, CNIPA, APO, MOIP, PRH, the Norwegian Industrial Property Office (NIPO), Danish Patent and Trademark Office (DKPTO), the Turkish Patent and Trademark Office (Turkpatent) and IPOPHL expressed support for meeting the following year. The Chair treated the response as broad support.

Item 14: Conclusions of discussions, report and closing remarks

58. The Chair summarized the meeting's outcomes, including the agreed title additions and deletions, and invited final comments.
59. EGIPA asked about organizing a clinic similar to earlier support sessions on patent documentation requirements.
60. The IB described prior clinics and offered to facilitate future clinics, but these may require support from librarians and documentation experts in other International Authorities to provide appropriate advice. The IB requested that EGIPA and other Offices inform them of specific questions that they would like discussed in order to arrange for suitable experts.
61. The Chair outlined next steps: The USPTO will prepare a continuation meeting summary and, with the EPO, a paper for the MIA. CIPO will take over as volunteer ISA for the annual review for obsolete and discontinued titles. He opened the floor for final comments.
62. IPO valued the collaborative review and appreciated that Authorities had found some of the same useful titles.
63. MOIP stated that they do not have a strong objection to having a recommended resource list but expressed concern that automatically placing every NPL resource that was considered but not included on a separate list could make that list too broad to be useful.
64. The Chair acknowledged MOIP's concern, and added that we are unlikely to arrive at a decision today. He suggested that the conversation continue on the wiki page that the IB will establish.
65. The IB stated that their priority was enabling discussion among NPL experts about useful resources; a list could be one possible outcome but was not itself the objective.
66. The Chair said the resource list was a talking point at the meeting but that there was no vote to create this list at this point in time.
67. EPO asked about feedback to the IB's paper related to Annex H procedures and digitization guidance (PCT/MDPTF/2026/1/4).

68. The IB said the comments from the EPO and the IPO had been reviewed, welcomed further contributions on the wiki, and suggested continuing the discussion at the proposed 2027 meeting.
69. The IB thanked the USPTO for chairing and organizing the meeting, the EPO for updates on the patent side and other Offices for their contributions to a successful meeting. The IB offered support to prepare for the MIA.
70. The Chair confirmed that discussion of the Annex H procedures paper would continue on the wiki and be revisited at the next Task Force meeting. He thanked everyone and closed the meeting.

[Annex follows]

ANNEX

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

TASK FORCE MEMBERS

AUSTRIAN PATENT OFFICE

AUSTRALIAN PATENT OFFICE

BRAZILIAN NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY

CANADIAN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OFFICE

CHINA NATIONAL INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION

EGYPTIAN PATENT OFFICE

EURASIAN PATENT OFFICE

EUROPEAN PATENT OFFICE

FEDERAL SERVICE FOR INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OF THE RUSSIAN
FEDERATION

FINNISH PATENT AND REGISTRATION OFFICE

INDIAN PATENT OFFICE

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OFFICE OF THE PHILIPPINES

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OFFICE OF SINGAPORE

ISRAEL PATENT OFFICE

JAPAN PATENT OFFICE

MINISTRY OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OF THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA (MOIP)

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY OF CHILE

NORDIC PATENT INSTITUTE

SAUDI AUTHORITY FOR INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

SPANISH PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

SWEDISH INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OFFICE

TURKISH PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UKRAINIAN NATIONAL OFFICE FOR INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AND
INNOVATIONS

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

VISEGRAD PATENT INSTITUTE

WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION

OBSERVERS

GERMAN PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OFFICE (UNITED KINGDOM)

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY (FRANCE)

SWISS FEDERAL INSTITUTE OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

[End of Appendix II and of document]