

# WIPO



SCIT/7/17  
ORIGINAL:English  
DATE:June14,2002

# E

WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION  
GENEVA

## STANDING COMMITTEE ON INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES

### PLENARY Seventh Session Geneva, June 10 to 14, 2002

#### REPORT

*adopted by the SCIT Plenary*

#### INTRODUCTION

1. The Standing Committee on Information Technologies (SCIT) held its seventh Plenary ("SCIT Plenary") session in Geneva from June 10 to 14, 2002.
2. The following Member States of WIPO and/or the Paris Union were represented at the session: Albania, Algeria, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Belarus, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, China, Costa Rica, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Germany, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Latvia, Lithuania, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Norway, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, United Kingdom, United States of America, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia (56).
3. Representatives of the United Nations, the International Labour Office (ILO), the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), African Intellectual Property Organization (OAPI), the African Regional Industrial Property Organization (ARIPO), the Benelux Trademark Office (BBM), the European Patent Office (EPO), the Eurasian Patent Organization (EAPO), the World Trade Organization (WTO), (8) took part in the session in a member capacity.

4. Representatives of the following organizations took part in the session in an observer capacity: International Confederation of Music Publishers (ICMP), International Federation of Industrial Property Attorneys (FICPI), International Organization for Standardization (ISO), and Patent Documentation Group (PDG) (4).

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

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

6. The session was opened by Mr. A. Roach, Chief Information Officer (CIO) and Director, IT Projects Division and welcomed the delegates on behalf of Director General.

7. The Secretariat recalled that this session of the SCIT was originally planned to take place in December 2001, and had been postponed. Therefore, the Secretariat proposed that, for reasons of efficiency and expediency, the Chairman be retained for this meeting. This was agreed by the SCIT Plenary.

#### Agenda Item 2: Adoption of the Agenda

8. The Delegation of the United Kingdom suggested that, considering that Agenda items 3(b) to 3(g) would defect the SDWG Work Plan, it would be better to discuss the SDWG Work Plan (as item 3(a)) after having gone through items 3(b) to 3(g). This proposal was accepted by the SCIT Plenary, and thus this Agenda Item was discussed after completing items 3(b) to 3(g).

9. The agenda was adopted with the alteration mentioned above and appears as Annex II to this report.

#### Agenda Item 3: Matters arising from the Standards and Documentation Working Group (SDWG):

(a) SDWG Work Plan (Document SCIT/7/2)

10. Following a proposal by the Delegation of Sweden, the SCIT Plenary decided to discuss Annex I to SCIT/7/2 task by task.

11. Before starting the discussion on each of the tasks, the Secretariat proposed a procedure to be followed in respect of the new tasks that had been established by the SCIT Plenary as a result of the previous discussions concerning Agenda items 3(d), 3(f), and 3(g). Since the SCIT Plenary had established these new tasks on the basis of the project brief attached to the request for their creation without concluding a precise textual description, the result was that the first action of the corresponding task forces would be to reach an agreement on the specific wording of their tasks. Afterwards, the Secretariat would include the descriptions agreed on by the Task Force in the revised task list to be presented at the next session of the Standard and Documentation Working Group (SDWG).

12. In response to a question raised by a number of delegations during the discussion of this item, concerning the outdated time frames of some tasks, the SCIT Plenary requested the Secretariat to review and update the time frame wherever pertinent in the revised task list to be considered by the SDWG at its next session.

13. The Delegation of Sweden requested further information on the action taken with regard to Task No. 7. In response, the Secretariat informed that the Standard and Documentation Working Group, when considering this task, agreed to the elaboration of a project brief in order to initiate a new task to establish the inventory that had been discussed under item 3(g).

14. The Delegation of the United States of America referred to the fact that the description of Task No. 7 focused on monitoring, with no reference to reporting. Consequently, the SCIT Plenary, following a proposal by this Delegation, agreed to insert the words "and report on" after the word "Monitor" in the description of the Task, as well as to add the following text at the end of sub-item III - 1 of page 3 of Annex I to document SCIT/7/2: "The inventories provided in task ## (the new task created under item 3(g)), the Annual Technical Reports of each Intellectual Property Office (IPO) and other available sources of information should be monitored by the International Bureau (and any task force created to support this task). Trends that are observed and potential needs that are identified for change in or creating of WIPO standards should be reported to the Standard and Documentation Working Group, as necessary, but at least annually."

15. The Delegation of Austria asked if the Intellectual Property Digital Library (IPDL) Electronic Task Force referred to in item III of the information provided for Task No. 11 was already established. The Delegation of the Russian Federation asked about how to establish the priorities amongst the various tasks, such as Task No. 10 and No. 11. The Delegation of the European Patent Office (EPO) referred to the importance of the contents of the IPDL for the SCIT Plenary.

16. In response to the above, the Secretariat informed that the IPDL Electronic Task Force was created by the SCIT Plenary at its fifth session, and that it is planned to set up the corresponding electronic forum in the coming weeks, and invite IPO's to nominate their representatives. In its initial phase, which should be completed before the next session of the SDWG, discussions should focus on IPDL standards development. A second phase of the discussions could start in the first half of the year 2003, and at that moment the task force should prepare an initial outline of the contents of the IPDL to be submitted to the SCIT Plenary.

17. The Delegation of Sweden asked if there was anything left from Task No. 13 or if it could be considered completed. The Secretariat responded that it considered that the E-PCT Standard for e-filing as being mature enough to start moving it across to become a WIPO Standard. The Secretariat therefore would suggest that this task remains, and that the Secretariat take the necessary steps to move it towards a WIPO Standard.

18. With regard to Task No. 22, the Secretariat informed that this Task was considered completed by the SDWG at its first session after the approval of the new WIPO Standard ST.1.

## (b) Revision of WIPO Standard ST.6 (Document SCIT/7/3)

19. Following the introduction of document SCIT/7/3 by the Secretariat, the Delegation of the United States of America, as leader of the Task Force (ST.6 Task Force), gave an oral progress report on the work carried out. The Plenary was informed of good progress in the discussions, with helpful input from all its members. However, the Task Force has not yet reached a consensus. The Task Force leader expressed the view that the Task Force would make further progress during their meeting this week.

20. *The SCIT Plenary agreed to establish Task No. 29 which includes the following :*

1. *Revise WIPO Standard ST.6, considering in particular:*

(a) *the total maximum number of digits that should be allowed for the publication number of patent documents;*

(b) *the implications of having a code for each kind of industrial property right mentioned in this Standard included in the format of the publication numbers; and*

(c) *better guidance for defining publication numbers in view of electronic data processing and use by the public.*

2. *To review the impact of the revision of WIPO Standard ST.6 on other WIPO Standards, as well as an appropriate delay for the implementation of the revisions agreed upon.*

21. The Delegation of the European Patent Office (EPO) suggested that the SCIT Plenary give target dates for reaching an agreement within the Task Force, considering the importance of the revised version of this Standard for different systems which are presently under revision in different offices. In response, and given the fact that the Task Force was meeting this week, the Chairman asked the Task Force to consider a reasonable target date and to report back to the SCIT Plenary. Consequently, the Task Force leader reported that the Task Force expected to complete its work by September 15, 2002, and that hopefully, the revision of WIPO Standard ST.6 could very well be approved by the SCIT Standards and Documentation Working Group at its next session.

## (c) Establishment of electronic data processing standards (Document SCIT/7/4)

22. The Secretariat introduced the document SCIT/7/4. After the Chairman invited comments, the Delegation of the Republic of Korea proposed that trademark-related standards be included for review by the task force proposed in paragraph 4(c) of document SCIT/7/4. The Secretariat indicated that if a new task was created concerning trademark standards, its activities could be assigned to this task force.

23. *Having then reviewed SCIT/7/4, the SCIT Plenary approved the recommendation included in paragraph 5 of document SCIT/7/4.*

24. This task force will be called the “Electronic data processing and exchange standards” Task Force. The SCIT Plenary welcomed the offer of the International Bureau to be leader of the Task Force. Future tasks falling under this category shall be assigned to this Task Force.

(d) Revision of WIPO Standard ST.10/C (Document SCIT/7/5)

25. The Secretariat introduced the document SCIT/7/5. The Delegation of the European Patent Office (EPO) stressed the importance that they attached to this project and mentioned that they were extremely satisfied with the proposal of the Japan Patent Office (JPO) and supported it wholeheartedly, whilst expressing their hope that the Task Force would agree on the final version as quickly as possible. The Delegation of Austria also supported the said proposal and further proposed that a recommended format for indicating priority application numbers might be included in the Standard.

26. The Delegation of the United States of America recalled that the table that is provided in Standard ST.10/C gives the format for each country and that there is no single ST.10/C format for priority application numbers.

27. *The SCIT Plenary agreed:*

*(a) to create a task force for the revision of Standard ST.10/C; and*

*(b) to create a Task Force to handle such revision.*

28. The SCIT Plenary welcomed the offer made by the Delegation of Japan to be leader of the Task Force. f

(e) IPDL Standards Development (Document SCIT/7/6)

29. Following the introduction of document SCIT/7/6, the Secretariat made a brief presentation concerning the results of the first and second IPDL Standards Workshops. The presentation included a demonstration of the basic prototyping undertaken by the International Bureau to evaluate the recommendations made by the second Workshop as described in document SCIT/7/6. After review by the IPDL Electronic Task Force, the result of this work shall be presented to the SDWG along with the Workshop reports.

30. The European Patent Office (EPO) requested the Secretariat to ensure that a comparison between the proposed Archival Resource Keys (ARK) permanent identifiers scheme and the Digital Object Identifiers (DOI) scheme be undertaken by the task force, with the results to be presented to the SDWG.

(f) Revision of WIPO Standard ST.8 (Document SCIT/7/7)

31. The Secretariat introduced documents SCIT/7/7 and SCIT/7/7 Add.1.

32. *The SCIT Plenary agreed:*

(a) *to create a task for the revision of all WIPO Standards which may require modification in view of the IPC reform;*

(b) *to create a Task Force to handle the revision of all WIPO non-electronic data processing and exchange standards which may require modification in view of the IPC reform;*

(c) *to assign the revision of all WIPO electronic data processing and exchange standards which may require modification in view of the IPC reform to the "Electronic Data Processing and Exchange Standards Task Force."*

33. The SCIT Plenary welcomed the offer of the EPO to be the leader of the Task Force.

(g) Establishment of an inventory of electronic data products produced by intellectual property Offices for the purpose of disseminating their intellectual property information (Document SCIT/7/8)

34. Following the introduction of document SCIT/7/8 by the Secretariat, the Secretariat gave a demonstration concerning a prototype system to submit and publish the Annual Technical Reports (ATRs). The prototype ATR system was demonstrated because it is functionally identical to a system that would be required to support the inventory of electronic data products. Both systems would be implemented within the framework of the WIPO NET system.

35. *The SCIT Plenary agreed:*

(a) *to create a task that would establish an inventory of electronic data products produced by intellectual property offices; and*

(b) *to establish a Task Force to handle such a new task.*

36. The SCIT Plenary welcomed the offer of the Delegation of Romania to be leader of the Task Force.

37. With reference to the demonstration of the prototype ATR system, the Secretariat advised that it intends to test this new system before implementing it and invited those industrial property offices interested in participating in the test to provide the International Bureau with the e-mail address of the appropriate person of their office to be contacted.

Agenda Item 4: Matters arising from the Information Technology Projects Working Group (ITPWG):

(a) ITPWG Work Plan (Document SCIT/7/9)

38. The Secretariat introduced document SCIT/7/9, which requested the SCIT Plenary to consider the recommendations of the Information Technology Projects Working Group (ITPWG) regarding the deletion of a number of tasks from its work plan. The tasks under consideration were broken into two categories: those that could be subsumed under the overall mandate of the ITPWG to monitor WIPO's Information Technology activities and those, namely tasks 2, 5 and part of 14, that fell under the aegis of the IPO Automation Division which reported to the Cooperation for Development Sector.

39. The Delegations of Austria, Bulgaria, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Mexico, Romania, Russian Federation, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom, Venezuela, BBMA and EPO raised concerns over the proposal to remove these tasks from the SCIT's work program and reiterated their need to receive up-to-date and relevant information concerning all Information Technology (IT) activities undertaken by the International Bureau. The SCIT Plenary recalled that this role fell within its approved mandate.

40. With regard to the first group of tasks (numbers 1, 9, 12, 14 (first part), 16 and 27), the SCIT Plenary raised a number of concerns in particular, the fulfilment of the mandate of the SCIT to monitor and give advice on WIPO's IT activities and the ability of the SCIT to discuss the many, very important matters covered in the tasks. After a substantial discussion it was, therefore, decided that these tasks should be retained within the Work Plan of the ITPWG.

41. Concerning tasks 2, 5 and 14 (last part), the SCIT noted that the mandate of the Standing Committee covered all of WIPO's IT activities and, as such, the tasks in question were undoubtedly IT based, the SCIT decided that they should be retained within the ITPWG Work Plan, and that the work of the IPO Automation Division be reported to the SCIT in line with the Standing Committee's current mechanisms for IT Program reporting.

(b) IT Program reporting (Document SCIT/7/10)

42. Following the introduction of the document SCIT/7/10 by the Secretariat, the Chairman invited comments from the Plenary. The Delegations of Sweden, Russian Federation, Germany, Spain, Egypt, Denmark, Romania, Sudan and the Benelux Trademark Offices spoke of the need to gain more experience with the 'Special Rules of Procedure and Structure of the SCIT' before any modifications should be considered. Further, and in relation to the provision of progress reports to the ITPWG, the delegations of Japan and the United Kingdom expressed views for the retention of the current four-monthly progress reporting procedure.

43. The SCIT Plenary, therefore, deferred approval of the recommendations contained in SCIT/7/10 at this time, preferring instead to gain more experience of the existing procedures before considering their modification.

Agenda Item 5: An overview of WIPO's Information and Communication Technology (ICT) Strategic Planning Process (Document SCIT/7/11)

44. The Secretariat in introducing the document gave a detailed explanation about the fact that document SCIT/7/11 would provide the basis for developing an Information and Communication Technology (ICT) strategic plan for WIPO.

45. The Delegation of the United Kingdom spoke in support of the contents of this document and in particular endorsed the IT vision statement and the mission statement as contained in SCIT/7/11. The Delegation stated that this strategic framework provided an ideal way forward in developing the strategic plan. The Delegation drew attention to the fact that the International Bureau is currently developing a large number of projects which would potentially lead to a period of consolidation, of getting those large projects operational, established and perhaps enhanced and invited the International Bureau to comment on this and any next steps.

46. The Secretariat confirmed the understanding of the Delegate of United Kingdom, adding that most of the major projects will be completed within the current biennium and recognized the fact that following such a large development process there will be a process of consolidation.

47. The Secretariat indicated that consideration was being given to the future extension of the AIMS Project, which relates to the automation of the finance and budgets systems, into the International Bureau's human resources area and procurements services. However, at this stage, this is only being proposed and would have to go through the process of a project initiation, including approval from the Program and Budget Committee and the General Assembly. The International Bureau added that there are some important pieces of work now under consideration, particularly in the area of end-to-end electronic business processing within the IP systems.

48. The Delegation of the United States of America supported the approach outlined in the document and emphasized the importance of integrating the business concerns, particularly in the area of the PCT. The Delegation felt that the plan needed to be a little stronger on the integration of legacy systems. The Delegation raised a question concerning the operating plan and how that would fit with the strategic plan.

49. In responding to the points raised, the Secretariat clarified that the operational plan will appear as part of the Program and Budget, which will be submitted for approval next year for the biennium 2004- 2005.

50. The Delegation of Mexico, in giving its support to the document, highlighted the point that the strategic mission of the ICT Program was in line with the strategic vision of the Director General. The Delegation also reiterated the need for assistance and cooperation from the International Bureau so that national Offices could benefit from the aims of the ICT vision in reducing the digital divide between the developed and developing countries.



51. The Delegation of ARIPO congratulated the International Bureau and felt that the ideas could be used on the regional and national levels as well. The Delegation also suggested that the rapid changes in new technologies could also be considered as a threat.

52. The Delegation of Spain sought clarification on what benefits could be expected in the light of the considerable costs involved.

53. The Secretariat drew the attention of delegates to the fact that the Program and Budget highlights the benefits to be expected from investments in the IT program. However, it was noted that the benefits from this expenditure are not just measurable within the context of the International Bureau, they also bring a lot of benefits to Member States. For example, it is difficult to measure benefits, especially in financial terms, of providing developing countries with access to the Internet and WIPO NET. The Secretariat emphasized that the justifications are not always on a cost-benefit basis. Sometimes, they are more intrinsic, in terms of closing the knowledge divide, making information available to the Member States and so on. However, in other areas, for example, the cost of processing paper within a patents system versus the cost of processing it electronically, the financial gains may be more measurable and this was being evaluated by the International Bureau.

54. The Delegation of Norway highlighted the importance of supporting Member States who wish to cooperate in developing e-business solutions and services.

55. The Delegation of Egypt spoke on the same point as the Delegate of Norway and proposed that certain IT models should be developed for use by IPO offices should they wish to do so. The Delegation also highlighted the need to integrate national IT systems with the International Bureau's systems.

#### Agenda Item 6: Information Security Policy (Document SCIT/7/12)

56. The document SCIT/7/12 was introduced by the Secretariat by means of a presentation describing the modalities for developing and implementing an Information Security Policy, as well as providing a statement as to where WIPO stood in respect to the implementation of its Information Security Policy. In noting the contents of the document SCIT/7/12, the SCIT Plenary heard interventions from the Delegations of Canada, United Kingdom, Egypt, USA, ARIPO and Germany, requesting clarification of points raised either in the document SCIT/7/12 or in the presentation.

57. The Secretariat clarified each point as raised above and in particular gave confirmation that a specific WIPO NET Security Policy was in existence and that it could be made available to delegations on request. The Secretariat offered to investigate the possibility of establishing a "model" Information Security Policy that Member States could use as a starting point when embarking on the process of establishing their own Information Security Policies. The Secretariat confirmed that information security guidelines would also be made available to all Member States as part of the WIPO NET Training.

AgendaItem7:StatusreportontheJOPALProject(DocumentSCIT/7/13)

58. The International Bureau introduced the topic by means of a short presentation which highlighted the main items of information provided in document SCIT/7/13 and the decisions to be made by the Committee.

59. The Delegation of the EPO confirmed that the EPO intended to make its bibliographic Non-Patent Literature database (EPONPL) available through Esp@cen in the near future, providing free of charge access to the public. The current target date for launch of this service was September, 2002. The Delegation added that the database, which consisted of over 1.2 million references, most of which were reclassified according to the ECLA classification system, was now also in use in the USPTO and Japan Patent Office (JPO). All three offices contributed articles for update of the database and similar activity was currently being discussed with several members of the European Union. The database was also available to any IPO office for integration into their own systems.

60. With regard to the subject concerning the continued need for the JOPAL service by IPOs and the merits of discussions with the commercial sector with a view to obtaining more preferential terms for access to, and use of, the abstract and/or full text of published articles, the Delegations of Sweden and Spain stated that they made use of the current JOPAL service and, as such, would not be affected if the service was discontinued.

61. The Delegation of Mexico expressed the view that there was still a need for the JOPAL service by Developing Countries. The Delegation of Mexico therefore supported the proposal to continue with the JOPAL service at least until such time that a similar or more complete service was available from other sources.

62. The Delegations of the EPO and Spain both expressed the view that they would welcome any steps that WIPO might take to open discussions with the commercial sector with the view of obtaining better access by IPOs to published articles.

63. The Delegation of the USPTO urged the International Bureau to take into account work being undertaken within the IPC Reform Group which could have a bearing on the future provision of Non-Patent Literature (NPL).

64. In conclusion, the Committee agreed to approve the recommendations as outlined in paragraph 12 of document SCIT/7/13.

AgendaItem8:SCITWorkingMethods:

(a) Consolidated working methods (Document SCIT/7/14)

65. The Secretariat introduced the documents SCIT/7/14 and SCIT/7/15 and recalled that the Special Rules of Procedure and Structure of the Standing Committee on Information Technologies (SCIT) had been approved at the Sixth Session of the SCIT Plenary and were reproduced for ease of reference whilst discussing the proposals contained in SCIT/7/15.

66. The Delegation of Benelux Trademark Offices sought clarification on the time limits of certain tasks in the SCIT's Working Program.

67. The Secretariat, whilst noting the intervention, recalled that some of the monitoring tasks were of ongoing nature but offered to review all the tasks in line with the comments received from the Benelux Trademark Office.

68. The Delegation of the United States of America requested clarification on the task initiation process in respect to the maintenance and further development of existing WIPO Standards.

(b) Outstanding issues (Document SCIT/7/15)

69. During the discussions, a number of delegations expressed concerns with respect to delays in starting the process of revising WIPO standards, and in doing so proposed that in some cases the so-called 'task initiation procedure' should be abbreviated.

*70. The SCIT Plenary decided that (on the assumption that the Standards and Documentation Working Group would meet on two occasions each year)*

*i) a new task should be added to the Standards and Documentation Working Groups Task List entitled "Ongoing Revision of Non -Electronic Standards".*

*ii) to establish a Task Force to address this task, and designate the International Bureau as Task Leader.*

*71. The SCIT Plenary decided, as a means of expediting the standards revision process, that requests for the revision of standards could be passed directly to the Task Leader, or to the Standards and Documentation Working Group. Where a request is passed directly to the Task Leader, and where possible, work would start immediately, otherwise the Task Leader would refer the request to the next session of the Standards and Documentation Working Group.*

*72. The SCIT Plenary approved the recommendations in paragraph 6 of document SCIT/7/15.*

AgendaItem9:Schedule ofActivities(DocumentSCIT/7/16)

73. TheSCITPlenaryagreedonthefollowingtimetableofmeetings.

December2to6,2002	SecondmeetingoftheStandardsandDocumentationWorking Group(SCIT/SDWG/2)
February3to7,2003	Secondmeetingof theInformationTechnologyProjects WorkingGroup(SCIT/ITPWG/2)
June30toJuly4,2003	EighthPlenarySession(SCIT/7/8)

AgendaItem10:InformationExchangeForum

74. AseriesofinformaldiscussionswasheldonThursday,June13,2002,on thefollowing activities:

- (a) WIPONET
- (b) MadridElectronicDataExchange
- (c) E-Patent
- (d) IMPACT

75. Asthisitemwasaninformalexchangeofinformation,thedeliberationsdonotappear inthepresentreport.

AgendaItem11:ClosingoftheSession

*76. Thisreportwasadoptedbythe SCIT Plenaryatitsclosingmeetingon June 14,2002.*

[Annexesfollow]

ANNEXE I/ANNEX I

I. ÉTATSMEMBRES/MEMBERSTATES

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

ALBANIE/ALBANIA

Nikoleta RISTANI (Mrs.), Director, Juridical and Copyright Department, Tirana

ALGÉRIE/ALGERIA

Nor-Eddine BENFREHA, conseiller, Mission permanente, Genève

ALLEMAGNE/GERMANY

Hubert ROTHE, Head, Section on Industrial Property Information for the public, supply of literature, German Patent and Trademark Office, Munich

AUTRICHE/AUSTRIA

Elvira GRONAU (Mrs.), Head, Technical Department XI, Austrian Patent Office, Vienna

AZERBAÏDJAN/AZERBAIJAN

Mir Yagub SEYIDOV, Head, Department of Patent and License, State Committee on Science and Engineering, Baku

BAHREÏN/BAHRAIN

Mohammad RAMAD HANAWADH, E -Commerce Consultant, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, Manama

BÉLARUS/BELARUS

Irina EGOROVA (Mrs.), First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Belarus, Geneva

BRÉSIL/BRAZIL

Marcos MALAGRICI, Adviser of CEDIN, National Institute of Industrial Property, Rio de Janeiro

BULGARIE/BULGARIA

Anna NENOVA (Mrs.), Director, Industrial Property Information and Documentation Directorate, Patent Office, Sofia

CAMBODGE/CAMBODIA

Penn SOVICHEAT, Deputy Director, Intellectual Property Division, Ministry of Commerce, Phnom Penh

CANADA

John ROMBOUTS, Manager, Technical Architecture, Canadian Intellectual Property Office (CIPO), Industry Canada, Ottawa

CHINE/CHINA

ZHANG Xiyi, Deputy Director General, Planning and Development Department, State Intellectual Property Office, Beijing

MO Huiping (Ms.), Computer Specialist, Trademark Office, State Administration for Industry and Commerce, Beijing

ZHAO Xiuling, Deputy Division Director, National Copyright Administration, Beijing

COSTARICA

Alejandro S OLANO, Minister Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Costa Rica, Geneva

CROATIE/CROATIA

Vesna ČERNELČ-MARJANOVIĆ (Mrs.), Head, IT Department, State Intellectual Property Office, Zagreb

Kristina BUBANKO -IGER (Mrs.), Deputy Director General, State Intellectual Property Office, Zagreb

DANEMARK/DENMARK

Hans JAKOBSEN, Deputy Director General, Danish Patent and Trademark Office, Taastrup

ÉGYPTE/EGYPT

Hesham A. ELDEEB, Academy of Scientific Research and Technology, Cairo

ESPAGNE/SPAIN

Rosina VÁZQUEZ DE PARGA (Dña), Jefe de Área de Documentación y Búsquedas, Oficina Española de Patentes y Marcas, Madrid

Jesus LEONGONZALES, Head, Data Processing Center, Oficina Española de Patentes y Marcas, Madrid

ÉTATS-UNIS D'AMÉRIQUE/UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Edward R. KAZENSKE, Deputy Commissioner for Patent Resources and Planning, Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C.

Cheryl E. KAZENSKE (Ms.), Intellectual Property Program Manager, Office of Legislative and International Affairs, Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C.

Edmond R. ISHELL, International Exchanges and Standards Specialist, Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C.

ÉTHIOPIE/ETHIOPIA

Hailu Geletu G/MARIAM, Acting Head & Technology Development Team Leader, Patent Technology Transfer and Development Department, Ethiopian Science & Technology Commission, Addis - Abeba

FÉDÉRATION DE RUSSIE/RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Marina KRYUKOVA (Mrs.), Deputy Director, International Cooperation Department, Rospatent, Moscou

Alexey GVINEPADZE, Deputy Director, Federal Institute of Industrial Property, Rospatent, Moscou

FINLANDE/FINLAND

Juha REKOLA, Head, Development Division, Patent and Innovations Line, Finnish Patent Office, Helsinki

FRANCE

Jean-François LESPRIT, chargé de mission, Institut national de la propriété industrielle (INPI), Paris

Michèle LYON (Mme), chargé de mission, Département des brevets, Institut national de propriété industrielle (INPI), Paris

Michèle WEIL -GUTHMANN (Mme), conseiller juridique, Mission permanente, Genève

Bernard NORMIER, président directeur général, Société Lingway, Paris

GUATEMALA

WYLD Andrés, First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Guatemala, Geneva

HONDURAS

Olmeda RIVERA RAMÍREZ (Sra.), Secretaria General, Secretariade Relaciones Exteriores, Misión Permanente, Ginebra

Karen CIS (Sra.), Segunda Secretaria, Misión Permanente, Ginebra

HONGRIE/HUNGARY

Zsuzsa TÖR ÖCSIK (Ms.), Deputy, Head, Information Technology Department, Budapest

Ágnes VADÁSZ (Ms.), Senior Information Counsellor, Hungarian Patent Office, Budapest

INDE/INDIA

Homai SAHA, Minister, Permanent Mission of India, Geneva



INDONÉSIE/INDONESIA

Dewi M. KUSUMA ASTUTI (Miss), First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

Andi Noorsaman SOMMENG, Director of Information Technology, Directorate General of Intellectual Property, Department of Justice and Human Rights, Tangerang

IRLANDE/IRELAND

Dolores CASSIDY (Ms.), Patent Examiner, Patents Office, Kilkenny

ITALIE/ITALY

Vittorio RAGONESI, Adviser Juridical, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Roma

Fulvio FULVI, Commercial Attaché, Permanent Mission of Italy, Geneva

JAPON/JAPAN

UENO Shin, Director, Patent Information Promotion Policy Office, Patent Information Division, General Affairs Department, Patent Office, Tokyo

SONO Mitsuru, Director, Information Technology Planning Office, Information Systems Affairs Division, Trademark, Design and Administrative Affairs Department, Patent Office, Tokyo

YAMASHITA Takashi, First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Japan, Geneva

KENYA

Julius Marya MAGWAGA, System Analyst, Industrial Property Office, Nairobi

LETTONIE/LATVIA

Guntis RAMANS, Head, Department of Examination of Inventions, Patent Office, Riga

LITUANIE/LITHUANIA

Saulė DAUKUVIENĖ (Ms.), Chief Specialist of the State Patent Bureau, Vilnius

MAROC/MOROCCO

Khalib SE BTI, premier secrétaire, Mission permanente, Genève

MEXIQUE/MEXICO

Santiago REYNA, Coordinateur départemental de développement de système de brevets, Instituto Mexicano de la Propiedad Industrial y por la Tercera, México

Karla ORNELAS LOERA (Mlle), troisième secrétaire, Mission permanente, Genève

NÉPAL/NEPAL

Stalin Man PRADHAN, Directeur, Département des Industries, Kathmandu

NIGÉRIA/NIGERIA

Franca Obaiya ORPIN (Mrs.), Assistant Chief Administrative Officer, Ministry of Commerce, Abuja

Aliyu Muhammed ABUBAKAR, Counsellor, Nigeria Trade Office, Permanent Mission of Nigeria, Geneva

NORVÈGE/NORWAY

Freddy STRØMMEN, Head, Administrative Support Patent, Patent Office, Oslo

PHILIPPINES

Angelina Ma. Sta. Catalina (Mrs.), First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Philippines, Geneva

POLOGNE/POLAND

Jacek ZAWADZKI, Head, Information Department, Patent Office, Warsaw

PORTUGAL

Maria Luisa ARAÚJO (Mme), Chef du département de l'information, Institut national de la propriété industrielle, Ministère de l'économie, Lisbonne

RÉPUBLIQUEDECORÉE/REPUBLICOFKOREA

KIMJin, Director General, Information and Documentation Bureau, Korean Intellectual Property Office, Taejon

AHNJae -Hyun, Intellectual Property Attaché, Permanent Mission, Geneva

PARKSung -Woo, Deputy Director, Information Development Division, Korean Intellectual Property Office, Taejon

KWONJung -Gak, Deputy Director, International Cooperation Division, Korean Intellectual Property Office, Taejon

YUNYoung -Woo, Deputy Director, Information Planning Division, Korean Intellectual Property Office, Taejon

RÉPUBLIQUEDEMOLDOVA/REPUBLICOFMOLDOVA

Nicolae TARAN, Director General, State Agency on Industrial Property Protection, Chişinău

RÉPUBLIQUETCHÈQUE/CZECHREPUBLIC

Hana BAHULOVÁ (Ms), Head of Section, Patent Information Department, Industrial Property Office, Prague

Eva KŘOVÁKOVÁ (Ms), Searcher, Patent Information Department, Industrial Property Office, Prague

ROUMANIE/ROMANIA

Bogdan BORESCHIEVICI, Director, Patent Library, IT and EDP Directorate, State Office for Inventions and Trademarks (OSIM), Bucharest

Adriana AT ǂNǂSOAIE (Ms.), Head, IT Section, State Office for Inventions and Trademarks (OSIM), Bucharest

ROYAUME-UNI/UNITEDKINGDOM

Peter BACK, Deputy Director, PDD/A, The Patent Office, Newport

Geoff BENNETT, Head, Information Technology Services, The Patent Office, Newport

SLOVÉNIE/SLOVENIA

Milan STUPICA, Counsellor at the Government, Slovenian Intellectual Property Office (SIPO), Ljubljana

SRILANKA

Gothami INDIKADAHENA (Mrs.), Counsellor (Economic and Commercial), Permanent Mission, Geneva

Hettiarachchi CHANDRADASA, Additional Secretary, Ministry of Commerce and Consumer Affairs, Colombo

SOUDAN/SUDAN

Muna Eltahir Abdelrahman ELMAGBOUL (Mrs.), Senior Legal Advisor, Ministry of Justice, Khartoum

SUÈDE/SWEDEN

Lars G. BJÖKLUND, Deputy Director General, Patent Office, Stockholm

Kerstin BERGSTRÖM, Head, Patent Information, Patent Office, Stockholm

SUISSE/SWITZERLAND

Roland Jean TSCHUDIN, Head, Training Division, Institut fédéral de la propriété intellectuelle, Bern

THAÏLANDE/THAILAND

Supark PRONGTHURA, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

TCHAD/CHAD

Abdallah Lebine OUMAR, directeur du commerce, ministre du commerce, de l'industrie et de l'artisanat, N'Djamena

VENEZUELA

Omar MONTILLA, Director (E) of the National Institute of Information and Communication Technology, Ministry of Science and Technology, Caracas

VIETNAM

PHANPHUNG Tuan, Director, Registration Division, National Office of Industrial Property (NOIP), Hanoi

YUGOSLAVIE/YUGOSLAVIA

Jelena POPOVIĆ (Mrs.), Assistant Director, Federal Intellectual Property Office, Belgrade

II. ORGANISATIONS INTERGOUVERNEMENTALES/  
INTERGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

BUREAU INTERNATIONAL DU TRAVAIL (BIT)/INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE  
(ILO)

Roberto ZACHMANN, Job Creation and Enterprise Development Department, Geneva

ORGANISATION DE L'AVIATION CIVILE INTERNATIONALE  
(OACI)/INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION (ICAO)

J. NORTH CUT, Senior Advisor, Information Technology, Montreal

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

Eliane POSSO (Mlle), chef, Service de la publication et de la documentation, Yaoundé

ORGANISATION RÉGIONALE AFRICAINE DE LA PROPRIÉTÉ INDUSTRIELLE  
(ARIPO)/AFRICAN REGIONAL INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION (ARIPO)

Gregory SADYALUNDA, System Administrator, Harare

BUREAU BENELUX DES MARQUES (BBM)/BENELUX TRADEMARK OFFICE (BBM)

A. G. W. J. VERSCHURE, directeur adjoint, La Haye

COMMUNAUTÉ EUROPÉENNE(CE)/EUROPEAN COMMUNITY(EC)

Nicolas VIGNERON, Technical Cooperation Division, Office de l'harmonisation dans le marché intérieur (marques, dessin et modèles) (OHMI)/Office for Harmonization in the Internal Market (Trade Marks and Designs) (OHIM), Alicante

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

Gérard GIROUD, Principal Director Documentation, Rijswijk

Marc KRIER, Director Applied Research and Development, Rijswijk

Georg PANTOGLOU, Director, Cooperation Programmes, INPADOC, Vienna

Johannes KIESBAUER, Director, Publications, Vienna

Guillaume MINNOYE, Principal Director, The Hague

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

Khabibullo FAYAZOV, Vice-President, Eurasian Patent Organization, Moscow

Petr DZEGELENIK, Director, Search and Information Systems Department, Eurasian Patent Organization, Moscow

ORGANISATION MONDIALE DU COMMERCE(OMC)/WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION(WTO)

Ghassan KARAM, Director, Informatics Division, Geneva

III. ORGANISATIONS NON-GOUVERNEMENTALES/  
NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

Fédération internationale des conseils en propriété industrielle(FICPI)/International Federation of Industrial Property Attorneys(FICPI) : Claus Michael MAYER (President, Documentation, Organisation, Communication Commission, Florence)

Groupededocumentationsurlesbrevets(PDG)/PatentDocumentationGroup(PDG) : Ralf H. BEHRENS (Secretary General, Weilder Stadt)

IV. BUREAU/OFFICERS

Président/Chair: PeterBACK(Royaume -Uni/UnitedKingdom)  
Vice-présidents/Vice-Chairs: ÁgnesVADÁSZ(Hongrie/Hungary)  
AhmedELFAKIALI(Soudan/Sudan)  
Secrétaire/Secretary: AllanROACH(OMPI/WIPO)

V. BUREAUINTERNATIONALDEL'ORGANISATIONMONDIALE  
DELAPROPRIÉTÉINTELLECTUELLE(OMPI)/  
INTERNATIONALBUREAUOF THE  
WORLDINTELLECTUALPROPERTYORGANIZATION(WIPO)

KamilIDRIS,directeurgénéral/DirectorGeneral

AllanROACH(Directeurdesservicesinformatiquesetdirecteur,Divisiondesprojets  
informatiques/ChiefInformationOfficerandDirector,ITProjectsDivision)

Divisiondesprojetsinformatiques/InformationTechnologyProjectsDivision:  
Colin BUFFAM(chefdeprojetduprojetWIPO NET/ProjectManager,WIPO NETProject);  
Michael HELKE(chefdeprojetduprojetIMPACT/ProjectManagerIMPACTProject).

Divisiondesservicesinformatiques/InformationTechnologyServicesDivision:  
NeilWILSON(Chef/Head);AngelLOPEZSOLANAS(chef,Service desnormesetdela  
documentation/Head,StandardsandDocumentationService);William GUY(chef,Service  
desprojets spéciauxrelatifsà l'information en matière de propriété industrielle, Division de la  
logistique et de la promotion des innovations/Head, Industrial Property Information Special  
Projects Section, Division for Infrastructure Services and Innovation Promotion).

[L'annexe II suit/  
Annex II follows]

## ANNEX II

## AGENDA

	<u>Paragraphs</u>
1. Opening of the session	6 and 7
2. Adoption of the agenda	8 and 9
3. Matters arising from the Standards and Documentation Working Group (SDWG):	
(a) SDWG Work Plan Seedocument SCIT/7/2.	10 to 18
(b) Revision of WIPO Standard ST.6 Seedocument SCIT/7/3.	19 to 21
(c) Establishment of electronic data processing standards Seedocument SCIT/7/4.	22 to 24
(d) Revision of WIPO Standard ST.10/C Seedocument SCIT/7/5.	25 to 28
(e) IPDL Standards Development Seedocument SCIT/7/6.	29 to 30
(f) Revision of WIPO Standard ST.8 Seedocument SCIT/7/7.	31 to 33
(g) Establishment of an inventory of electronic data products produced by intellectual property Offices for the purpose of disseminating their intellectual property information. Seedocument SCIT/7/8.	34 to 37
4. Matters arising from the Information Technology Projects Working Group (ITPWG):	
(a) ITPWG Work Plan Seedocument SCIT/7/9.	38 to 41
(b) IT Program reporting Seedocument SCIT/7/10.	42 and 43
5. An overview of WIPO's Information and Communication Technology (ICT) Strategic Planning Process Seedocument SCIT/7/11.	44 to 55
6. Information Security Policy Seedocument SCIT/7/12.	56 and 57
7. Status report on the JOPAL Project Seedocument SCIT/7/13.	58 to 64



8. SCITWorkingMethods:
  - (a) Consolidatedworkingmethods SeedocumentSCIT/7/14. 65to68
  - (b) Outstandingissues SeedocumentSCIT/7/15. 69to72
9. ScheduleofActivities SeedocumentSCIT/ 6/6. 73
10. InformationExchangeForum(aseriesofinformaldiscussions, Thursday,June13,2002,10a.m.) 74and75
  - (a) WIPONET
  - (b) MadridElectronicDataExchange
  - (c) E-Patent
  - (d) IMPACT
11. Closingofthesession 76

[EndofAnnexIIan dofdocument]