

WIPO



SCIT/SDWG/11/14

ORIGINAL: English

DATE: October 30, 2009

WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION
GENEVA

E

STANDING COMMITTEE ON INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES

STANDARDS AND DOCUMENTATION WORKING GROUP

Eleventh Session
Geneva, October 26 to 30, 2009

REPORT

prepared by the Secretariat

INTRODUCTION

1. The Standards and Documentation Working Group (SDWG) of the Standing Committee on Information Technologies (SCIT) held its eleventh session from October 26 to 30, 2009.
2. The following Member States of WIPO and/or the Paris Union were represented at the session: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belarus, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Finland, France, Germany, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Lithuania, Malaysia, Mexico, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Senegal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States of America, Yemen, and Zambia (40).
3. In their capacity as members of the SCIT, the representatives of the following organizations took part in the session: the Benelux Office for Intellectual Property (BOIP), the European Patent Office (EPO), the Eurasian Patent Organization (EAPO), the Office for Harmonization in the Internal Market (Trade Marks and Designs) (OHIM), and the South Centre (5).

4. The Representative of the European Commercial Patent Services Group (PatCom) took part in the session in an observer capacity.
5. The list of participants appears as Annex I to this report.
6. It was noted that the General Assembly of WIPO had approved the replacement of the SDWG by the Committee on WIPO Standards (CWS), as of the beginning of the next biennium 2010-11. The mandate of the CWS would be to continue the work of the SDWG on the revision and development of WIPO standards relating to industrial property information under a different name. The CWS would be convened in principle once a year and, where appropriate, would prepare proposals and/or activity reports for the consideration of the WIPO General Assembly or relevant assemblies.

Agenda Item 1: Opening of the session

7. The session was opened by Mr. Yo Takagi, Executive Director, Global Industrial Property Infrastructure Department, who welcomed the participants on behalf of the Director General.

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

8. The SDWG unanimously elected Ms. Samantha Hoy (Australia) as Chair and Mr. Konrad Hoffmann (Germany) and Mr. Andrey Sekretov (EAPO) as Vice-Chairs.
9. Mr. Angel López Solanas, Head, WIPO Standards Section, acted as Secretary of the session.

Agenda Item 3: Adoption of the agenda

10. The Secretariat proposed the addition of a new agenda item No. 5(d) that would read:

“Presentation, by the European Patent Office, on Uniform Resource Identifiers (URIs)”.
11. The Secretariat informed that, since no document had been produced with regard to agenda item 18 (Schedule of activities), the reference to working document SCIT/SDWG/11/12 would be removed from the agenda. The item itself would remain in the agenda.
12. The revised agenda was unanimously adopted by the SDWG and appears as Annex II to this report.

DISCUSSIONS, CONCLUSIONS, AND DECISIONS

13. As decided by the Governing Bodies of WIPO at their tenth series of meetings held from September 24 to October 2, 1979 (see document AB/X/32, paragraphs 51 and 52), the report of this session reflects only the conclusions of the SDWG (decisions, recommendations, opinions, etc.) and does not, in particular, reflect the statements made by any participant, except where a reservation in relation to any specific conclusion of the SDWG was expressed or repeated after the conclusion was reached.

PRESENTATIONS

14. The presentations given at this session of the SDWG and working documents are available on the WIPO website at:

http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/details.jsp?meeting_id=17456.

Agenda Item 4: Report of the forty-seventh series of the Assemblies of WIPO Member States concerning the Standing Committee on Information Technologies (SCIT)

15. Discussions were based on documents WO/GA/38/10 and SCIT/SDWG/11/13.

16. Delegations had discussions regarding the request addressed to the SDWG by the General Assembly of WIPO based on document SCIT/SDWG/11/13, concerning the proposed creation of a Committee on Global IP Infrastructure (CGI), which resulted in a number of delegations suggesting possible tasks to be undertaken by such a Committee, and other delegations expressing the need for further information to enable an informed recommendation.

17. Pursuant to the evolution of the discussions and at the request of the SDWG, the Secretariat prepared a working paper, which is attached as Annex III to this report, containing a draft proposal for a possible mandate of the proposed committee, including tasks identified by a number of delegations as possible tasks for consideration, and working procedures. These tasks were suggested by these delegations as tasks that they considered would not fall within the approved mandate of the CWS but that could possibly be considered by the proposed CGI.

18. Concerns regarding the rationale for a new committee, budgetary and development implications, as well as possible duplication of, and overlapping with, other committees' work were also raised during the discussions.

19. Two different views were expressed regarding the provision of a recommendation to the General Assembly on whether this committee should be created. One view was fully ready to recommend the creation of the CGI to the General Assembly. According to this view the SDWG, as a technical body, recognized the need for a forum to discuss/address tasks such as those identified by different delegations and the Secretariat during this 11th session. The other view, although not excluding the creation of the CGI, considered that, due to the lack of sufficient information, more information and further consultations with national authorities would be necessary to provide such a recommendation.

20. In concluding the discussions there was no consensus regarding the recommendation to be provided to the General Assembly.

Agenda Item 5: ST.10/C Task Force (Task No. 30)

21. Discussions were based on document SCIT/SDWG/11/2 concerning the proposal by the ST.10/C Task Force on the revision of WIPO Standard ST.10/C, which provides recommendations on the presentation of bibliographic data components in published patent documents. The document also presented a proposal by the ST.10/C Task Force on the remaining work to be completed with regard to Task No. 30, including the issues to be addressed in a questionnaire to survey industrial property offices (IPOs) regarding application and priority application numbers used. The SDWG noted the report presented by the ST.10/C Task Force in the Annex to document SCIT/SDWG/11/2, and the oral progress report by the Task Force Leader.

22. After considering the proposal by the Task Force, the SDWG adopted the revision of WIPO Standard ST.10/C as reproduced in Appendix 1 of the Annex to document SCIT/SDWG/11/2, with the following change: the word “an” should be inserted in each of the two sentences preceding the examples given in subparagraph 12(b) to read: “Examples of preambles recommended to IPOs for when an applicant is filing abroad under the Paris Convention” and “Examples of presentation of ‘a Priority Application Number’ when an applicant is filing abroad under the Paris Convention”, respectively.

23. Following the discussions, the SDWG approved the proposal by the Task Force on the issues to be addressed in the questionnaire to survey IPOs regarding application and priority application numbers used, as reproduced in paragraph 3 of Appendix 2 of the Annex to document SCIT/SDWG/11/2.

24. The Task Force requested the SDWG to comment and provide guidance on issues that needed further consideration before preparing the questionnaire, as referred to in paragraph 4 of Appendix 2 of the Annex to document SCIT/SDWG/11/2.

25. With regard to how to address the possible complexity and structure of the above-mentioned survey, the SDWG agreed to focus the survey only on application and priority application numbers used at present by IPOs for all industrial property rights. The Task Force was also requested to prepare specific draft questionnaires for each of the three industrial property modalities (i.e., patents, trademarks and industrial designs). In due course, once the questionnaires were approved by the SDWG, the Secretariat should invite IPOs to complete each of the questionnaires by issuing one single circular for the three modalities. Finally, once this first survey was completed, a new survey would be conducted, in a second stage, to survey application and priority application numbers used by IPOs in the past.

26. Following the proposal by the ST.10/C Task Force on further actions regarding Task No. 30, the SDWG approved that, as a follow-up to the discussions by the SDWG at its eleventh session, the Task Force would work on the preparation of a draft questionnaire to survey application and priority application numbering systems used by

IPOs on the basis of the guidance provided by the SDWG in paragraphs 23 and 25, above.

27. As a follow-up to the decision by the SDWG, at its previous session in November 2008, to discuss further Uniform Resource Identifiers (URIs) at its session in 2009, a Representative of the EPO gave a presentation about the potential use of URIs for industrial property documents. The Representative of the EPO focused on the definitions, technical aspects and use in the industrial property domain of URIs, including Uniform Resource Names (URNs) and Uniform Resource Locators (URLs), and Digital Object Identifiers (DOIs). To facilitate discussions on URIs by the SDWG, the International Bureau (IB) had prepared background information that was reflected in a non-paper (Uniform Resource Identifiers for Industrial Property Resources) that was made available on the WIPO website, along with the presentations given at this session of the SDWG.

28. The discussion that followed the presentation reflected that, despite the interest raised by the possible use of a scheme that would provide perennial access to industrial property resources, in particular the use of DOIs or industrial property identifiers (IPIs), the benefits that this practice would bring to IPOs were not yet clear. The participants also expressed their concerns regarding the cost, resources and time that the development and implementation, by IPOs, of the new identifiers would require.

29. Following the discussions, the SDWG agreed that the use of identifiers, for example, DOIs or IPIs, in the industrial property domain was an issue that should be left open to further consideration. The SDWG considered that the decision regarding the introduction of new identifiers was a policy matter that needed careful attention and investigation. The SDWG decided that it would be useful to have more information about costs and benefits to IPOs that would result from the use of the said identifiers for industrial property resources, as well as the type of industrial property resources to which these identifiers would be applied.

30. In order to provide IPOs and other stakeholders with material that could be used for subsequent discussions on the use of the above-mentioned identifiers in the future, the SDWG welcomed the offer by the IB to prepare a new paper providing information about costs and benefits to IPOs, as well as the feasibility of implementing URIs, including IPIs or DOIs, for the industrial property world.

Agenda Item 6: Proposal on the revision of WIPO Standard ST.25 (Task No. 33)

31. Discussions were based on document SCIT/SDWG/11/3, containing a proposal to revise the footnote to WIPO Standard ST.25 (“Standard for the Presentation of Nucleotide and Amino Acid Sequence Listings in Patent Applications”), consequential to modifications to paragraph 3 of the “Standard for the Presentation of Nucleotide and Amino Acid Sequence Listings in International Applications Under the Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT)” as set out in Annex C to the Administrative Instructions under the PCT.

32. The SDWG adopted the revision of the footnote to WIPO Standard ST.25 as set out in paragraph 9 of document SCIT/SDWG/11/3.

Agenda Item 7: Proposal on the revision of WIPO Standard ST.3 (Task No. 33)

33. Discussions were based on document SCIT/SDWG/11/4, concerning a proposal to revise WIPO Standard ST.3, in relation to the names of Bolivia and Venezuela, and a proposal for a new procedure for the revision of WIPO Standard ST.3.

34. The SDWG adopted the following changes to WIPO Standard ST.3:

(a) The current entry for Venezuela (English, French and Spanish) would be changed to:

- Venezuela, Bolivarian Republic of (English);
- Venezuela, République bolivarienne du (French); and
- Venezuela, República Bolivariana de (Spanish).

The two-letter code “VE” would remain unchanged.

(b) The current entry for Bolivia (English and Spanish) and Bolivie (French) would be changed to:

- Bolivia, Plurinational State of (English);
- Bolivie, État plurinational de (French); and
- Bolivia, Estado Plurinacional de (Spanish).

The two-letter code “BO” would remain unchanged.

35. In order to further streamline the procedure for the revision of WIPO Standard ST.3 and since the decisions of the SDWG have not essentially deviated in the past from the United Nations practice or the proposals concerning the names and two-letter codes of intergovernmental organizations, the SDWG adopted the following new procedure:

(a) The IB would revise country names and names of intergovernmental organizations in WIPO Standard ST.3 and notify CWS members of the revision as follows:

(i) The IB would revise WIPO Standard ST.3 by incorporating changes regarding country names as adopted by the Maintenance Agency for International Standard ISO 3166 (ISO 3166/MA). Other proposals for the revision of WIPO Standard ST.3 concerning changes regarding names of intergovernmental organizations identified or received by the IB, would also be directly incorporated in the Standard.

(ii) The IB would then publish the revised WIPO Standard ST.3 on WIPO’s website, as usual, followed by issuing an e-mail informing CWS members of the publication of a revised version of WIPO Standard ST.3.

(b) The IB would revise two-letter codes in WIPO Standard ST.3 and notify CWS members of the revision as follows:

(i) The IB would prepare a proposal for the revision of WIPO Standard ST.3 by incorporating changes regarding two-letter country codes as adopted by ISO 3166/MA. Other proposals for the revision of WIPO Standard ST.3 concerning changes regarding two-letter codes of intergovernmental organizations identified or received by the IB, would also be directly incorporated in the proposed Standard.

(ii) The IB would inform CWS members of the amendments to the Standard by issuing an e-mail. Within two months from the e-mail notification, CWS members would be able to submit remarks concerning the proposed two-letter codes.

(iii) If consensus was reached within the two-month period, then the IB would publish the revised WIPO Standard ST.3 as indicated in paragraph 35(a)(ii), above.

(iv) If consensus was not reached, the IB proposal, together with the remarks submitted, would be forwarded to the following CWS session for consideration and final decision.

Agenda Item 8: Correction procedures in patent offices (Task No. 35)

36. Discussions were based on document SCIT/SDWG/11/5, concerning issues associated with a new survey on correction procedures in patent offices, including the summary and results of the survey, the activities of the Correction Procedures Task Force and the proposal for the revision of WIPO Standard ST.50. The SDWG noted the oral report by the Task Force Leader, who referred to the progress made with regard to Task No. 35.

37. The SDWG considered and approved the replacement, in Part 7.4 of the WIPO *Handbook on Industrial Property Information and Documentation* (WIPO Handbook), of the current “Survey Concerning Correction Procedures by Patent Offices” with the contents reproduced from the new survey as contained in Annex I to document SCIT/SDWG/11/5.

38. The SDWG also considered and approved the replacement, in Part 7.4 of the WIPO Handbook, of the existing “Examples Concerning Corrections, Alterations, and Supplements Relating to Patent Information” with the new examples provided by patent offices, as referred to in paragraphs 7 to 9 of the main part of document SCIT/SDWG/11/5.

39. The SDWG considered the revised proposals made by the Correction Procedures Task Force on the revision of WIPO Standard ST.50.

40. Following the discussions, the SDWG adopted the revision of WIPO Standard ST.50 as reproduced in Annex III to this report.

Agenda Item 9: Progress Report by the Task Leader of the ST.36 Task Force (Task No. 38)

41. Discussions were based on document SCIT/SDWG/11/6, which contained a progress report by the ST.36 Task Force Leader on the revision of WIPO Standard ST.36, and other activities carried out by the Task Force, including an Annex to SCIT/SDWG/11/6 regarding a review of recommendations by the Citation Practices Task Force.

42. The SDWG noted that the ST.36 Task Force revised Annexes A and C to WIPO Standard ST.36 two times in 2009 to reflect the Proposals For Revision (PFRs) agreed by the Task Force. The SDWG was informed that the latest version, 2.2, of Annexes A and C to WIPO Standard ST.36 was available on the WIPO's website at: http://www.wipo.int/standards/en/xml_material/st36/, and the previous versions and revision history of Annexes A and C were also available on the WIPO's website at: http://www.wipo.int/standards/en/xml_material/st36/revision-history/index.html. The SDWG was also informed that the PFR files which had been submitted and agreed on were available on the ST.36 Task Force's website at: <http://www.wipo.int/scit/en/taskforce/st36/pfr-intro.html>.

43. With regard to other activities carried out by the Task Force, the SDWG noted that the Task Force agreed that WIPO Standard ST.36 should not be revised to reflect the new version of industry-standard document-type definitions (DTDs), such as MathML 3.0, because IPOs were not currently in a position to change or update their practices.

44. The SDWG also noted that the Task Force had been using the new platform for its electronic forum, i.e., Wiki eForum, since March 2009, and had adopted a linear format for the PFRs replacing a box form to facilitate its discussion via Wiki eForum.

45. The SDWG considered the review carried out by the ST.36 Task Force regarding the recommendations of the Citation Practices Task Force described in the Annex to document SCIT/SDWG/11/6.

46. The SDWG agreed that there was a need for guidelines to uniquely identify the different parts of a patent document across different publication platforms, as referred to in the Annex to document SCIT/SDWG/11/6. The SDWG also agreed to create a new task: "Prepare guidelines, for implementation by IPOs, regarding paragraph numbering, long paragraphs, and consistent rendering of patent documents".

47. The SDWG also created the corresponding Task Force for the new task referred to in the previous paragraph. The SDWG welcomed the offer by the Delegation from the United States of America and designated the United States Patent and Trademark Office as the Task Force Leader.

Agenda Item 10: Questionnaire to survey industrial property offices on the implementation and promotion of WIPO Standard ST.22 (Task No. 37)

48. Discussions were based on document SCIT/SDWG/11/7, concerning a proposal by the ST.22 Task Force to prepare a questionnaire to survey IPOs on their implementation and promotion of WIPO Standard ST.22, which provides recommendations for facilitating Optical Character Recognition (OCR).

49. The SDWG noted that, in addition to the questions on the use of WIPO Standard ST.22, the questionnaire also contained questions on OCR practices of IPOs, including software and hardware used and workflow.

50. After the discussions, the SDWG approved the questionnaire on the implementation and promotion of WIPO Standard ST.22 as reproduced in the Annex to document SCIT/SDWG/11/7, with the following changes:

(a) the word “Percentage” should be inserted just at the end of Question 12, which should read as follows:

“12. If applicable, please indicate the percentage of applications for which replacement sheets are requested with respect to the total number of applications (filed on paper or e-filed) having the text body of the application submitted in image form, and the period of time of reference (e.g., 15% in the first half of 2009):

Percentage:

Please comment if necessary.”;

(b) In Question 17, the word “moment(s)” should be replaced with “stage(s)”; thus, the sentence would then read: “If ‘YES’, at what stage(s) of the procedure does your Office forward the patent documents to the external contractor?”.

51. The SDWG agreed that the IB should conduct the survey on the implementation and promotion of WIPO Standard ST.22 in 2011.

52. Document SCIT/SDWG/11/7 also contained a proposal regarding the agreement by the SDWG, at its seventh session, to bring the revision of WIPO Standard ST.22 that was adopted by the SDWG in November 2008 to the attention of applicants, offices, commercial information providers and patent attorneys.

53. The SDWG requested the IB to issue, in the first quarter of 2010, a circular to inform SDWG members of the revision of WIPO Standard ST.22 that was adopted by the SDWG in November 2008. The circular should also invite IPOs to bring the revised Standard to the attention of interested parties and to promote the use of the Standard by applicants (e.g., publishing a notice in their patent gazettes and on their websites).

Agenda Item 11: Progress report, by the European Patent Office and the International Bureau, on Task No. 23 (national/regional phase of published PCT international applications)

54. Discussions were based on document SCIT/SDWG/11/8.

55. The SDWG noted the status reports, given by the EPO and the IB, concerning the inclusion, in databases, of information about the entry, and, where applicable, the non-entry, into the national (regional) phase of published PCT international applications. The

Representative of the EPO encouraged IPOs that did not yet provide their information to participate in this project. The SDWG expressed its thanks to the EPO and the IB for the progress made on Task No.23, as well as to IPOs for providing their corresponding data.

Agenda Item 12: Oral report by the Task Leader of the XML4IP Task Force (Task No. 41)

56. The XML4IP Task Force Leader provided a presentation on the activities of the Task Force to prepare a proposal for an XML4IP standard which would be a WIPO standard dealing with XML resources to be used for patents, trademarks and industrial designs.

57. The SDWG noted that the Task Force had been discussing objectives, scopes, contents, and design rules and conventions of XML4IP, as well as the preparation of the Global International Common Elements of XML4IP. The SDWG also noted that the XML4IP Task Force had a tentative plan to submit a set of draft proposals for the XML4IP standard at the first session of the CWS for its comments.

58. The SDWG was informed that the IB had created the WIPO Internal XML Task Force to participate in the preparation of proposals on the XML4IP standard and to study the impact on WIPO practices and on the WIPO resources required for the implementation of the new standard.

Agenda Item 13: Guidelines for the electronic management of the figurative elements of trademarks (Task No. 20)

59. Discussions were based on document SCIT/SDWG/11/9, which contained a proposal for a new WIPO standard on the electronic management of the figurative elements of trademarks. The proposal had been prepared by the Trademark Standards Task Force within the framework of Task No. 20.

60. The SDWG adopted the new WIPO Standard ST.67, entitled “Recommendation for the electronic management of the figurative elements of trademarks”, as reproduced in the Annex to document SCIT/SDWG/11/9 with the following changes:

(a) The definition of the DPI (Dots Per Inch) in paragraph 2(q) of the Annex to document SCIT/SDWG/11/9 was moved to just after the definition of “resolution” in paragraph 2(c). Therefore, paragraph 2(q) would be 2(d), and paragraph 2(d) would become 2(e), and subsequently the following subparagraphs should be renumbered.

(b) In the last sentence of the definition of DPI, the word “resolution” was added between “a” and “measurement”, and the words “in this standard” were deleted from the last sentence. The last sentence, therefore, would read: “In this Standard, therefore, DPI is referred as a resolution measurement for all devices.”

61. Following the discussions, the SDWG requested that the Trademark Standards Task Force discuss further the issues related to digital image formats, as well as color management and online publication, referred to in paragraph 5 of document

SCIT/SDWG/11/9, in order to present the corresponding proposals for consideration by the CWS at its first session.

62. The SDWG noted that Task No. 20 would continue until the completion of the preparation of the proposals referred to in the previous paragraph.

63. The SDWG also considered whether a new task should be established to discuss the expansion of WIPO Standard ST.67 to include the recommendations for images, photographs and drawings related to patent and industrial design documents as referred to in paragraphs 3 and 6 of document SCIT/SDWG/11/9.

64. The SDWG agreed that the decision to create the task referred to in the previous paragraph should be postponed until completion of the preparation of the proposals mentioned above in paragraph 61 in order to gain knowledge and experience resulting from the work by the Trademark Standards Task Force.

Agenda Item 14: Annual Technical Reports (ATRs) on Patent, Trademark, and Industrial Design Information Activities (Task No. 24)

65. Discussions were based on document SCIT/SDWG/11/10 concerning issues associated with Annual Technical Reports (ATRs).

66. The SDWG noted the oral report by the ATRs Task Force Leader who referred to the number of ATRs filed for the year 2008, and also to the two-year project to improve the visibility and access to ATRs. The Task Force Leader referred, in particular, to the detailed information provided in document SCIT/SDWG/11/10 regarding the actions taken since July 2007 to improve the statistical (web traffic) information on the ATRs, to improve the visibility of the ATRs, to simplify the access to the ATRs on WIPO's website, to analyze and address the apparent constraints in accessing the ATRs made available through the ATR Management System, and to organize the addition of the three modalities of ATRs (i.e., patents, trademarks, or industrial designs) to search engine indexes (e.g., Google).

Agenda Item 15: Progress report, by the International Bureau, on the WIPO STAD (WIPO Standards Administration Database) (Task No. 26)

67. The SDWG noted the presentation and demonstration provided by the IB on the WIPO STAD (WIPO Standards Administration Database). The WIPO STAD project was launched by the IB in November 2008 to meet the requests made by the SDWG. The SDWG also noted that the WIPO STAD would include the features regarding WIPO Standards, and Examples and IPO Practices, i.e. Parts 3 and 7, respectively, of the WIPO Handbook.

68. The SDWG further noted investments and achievements, main features related to Part 3, and the project plan of the WIPO STAD; as well as that the tentative period for completion of the WIPO STAD was in the fourth quarter of 2010.

69. In recognizing the interest of the project, some delegations asked the IB about the possibility of having access to the WIPO STAD in order to provide their comments on the development of the project. The IB explained that all the WIPO STAD developments were carried out within the WIPO Intranet and, due to security reasons, it was not yet possible to give access to the system to external users at that stage of the project. The SDWG noted that it was, however, the intention of the IB to make the WIPO STAD accessible to CWS members for testing and comments in due course in 2010. For this purpose, the IB would invite CWS members to participate in a test exercise of the WIPO STAD either through the Renewal of the WIPO Handbook Task Force or by opening the WIPO STAD to all external users.

Agenda Item 16(a): Presentation, by the International Bureau, on the Priority Document Access Service and document exchange issues

70. The IB gave a presentation on the status of the Digital Access Service (DAS) for Priority Documents, which was launched on April 1, 2009. The SDWG noted that the Service was administered by the IB, and the Japan Patent Office, the Korean Intellectual Property Office, the Spanish Patent and Trademark Office, the United Kingdom Intellectual Property Office and the United States Patent and Trademark Office made up the five participating Offices. It was also noted that other IPOs were expected to join the service in the next several months. The presentation outlined the basic features, including a short demonstration of the applicant portal. Possible enhancements in the future were outlined, including the extension to priority documents needed for the PCT, better management of access permissions, a portal service for small IPOs, the extension of the DAS to other types of documents and other industrial property sectors. Noting that the success of the system would increase significantly as the number of participating IPOs grew, IPOs were encouraged to consider their participation in the DAS and to contact the IB to initiate their entry into the system.

71. The Delegation from Japan advised that the Japan Patent Office had been actively encouraging the IB to intensify its promotion of the DAS.

Agenda Item 16(b): Presentation, by the International Bureau, on new Wiki spaces created for the SDWG Task Force electronic forums

72. The SDWG noted the presentation given by the IB on new Wiki spaces created for the SDWG Task Force electronic forums (hereinafter called the "Wiki eForum"), which were offered and run by the IB. The Wiki eForum had been used by four SDWG Task Forces, namely the ST.36, ST.66, ST.86, and XML4IP Task Forces since March 2009.

73. The IB highlighted three important procedures for using the Wiki eForum:

(a) First, a nominee by an IPO to the interested Task Force should create a username of WIPO Wiki through the WIPO User Center (<https://www3.wipo.int/cas/login>). The IB emphasized the importance of following the naming conventions for the username agreed on by the said four SDWG Task Forces, i.e., "xx-an initial letter of first name followed by the last name"; where 'xx' was the WIPO Standard ST.3 country or organization code of the nominee, which would be followed by a dash, the initial letter of the first name and the last

name (if the nominee had two last names, the last name was the first last name); e.g., “ca-jsmith” should be the username for John Smith from Canada.

(b) After the creation of the username, the IPO should send an e-mail accompanying the relevant information of the nominee, including his/her username, to the IB at scit.mail@wipo.int to request permission to access the interested Task Force Wiki eForum.

(c) In addition, once the nominee was allowed to access the Wiki eForum, the IB recommended that the nominee should set up the function *Watches* in the Wiki eForum to receive e-mail notifications of the changes in the Wiki eForum.

74. The SDWG also noted that the Wiki eForum could be extended to other existing SDWG Task Forces in accordance to the request by the Task Forces. The SDWG further noted that new task forces should use the Wiki eForum instead of the current email-based platform.

Agenda Item 17: Consideration of the SDWG Task List

75. Discussions were based on document SCIT/SDWG/11/11.

76. Following a brief introduction by the Secretariat, the SDWG discussed the Tasks contained in Annex I to document SCIT/SDWG/11/11 and, in addition to updating the information regarding the status of the Tasks that had been discussed during the eleventh session, including the information provided to the SDWG under agenda item 16 (Exchange of information), agreed on the following:

Task No. 23: in paragraph V.1, the words “to supplement the existing EPIDOS (European Patent Information and Documentation Systems) Patent Register Service (PRS)” should be replaced with “to supplement the existing EPO Patent Register Service (PRS)”, and in the last sentence “by the EPO (EPIDOS)” with “by the EPO”;

Task No. 26: in paragraph III.1, the words “under (a) to (e)” should be replaced with “under (a) to (c)”;

Task No. 39: in accordance with the request by the SDWG (see paragraph 20 of document SCIT/SDWG/9/12), the SDWG noted that the ST.66 Task Force had discussed the impact of the revision of WIPO Standard ST.13 on WIPO Standard ST.66 and agreed that no change was necessary in WIPO Standard ST.66; and

Task No. 42: in accordance with the request by the SDWG (see paragraph 20 of document SCIT/SDWG/9/12), the SDWG noted that the ST.86 Task Force had discussed the impact of the revision of WIPO Standard ST.13 on WIPO Standard ST.86 and agreed that no change was necessary in WIPO Standard ST.86.

Agenda Item 18: Schedule of activities

77. Following an oral proposal by the Secretariat, the SDWG agreed that the first session of the new CWS was tentatively scheduled to be held from November 8 to 12, 2010.

Meetings of the SDWG Task Forces

78. During this session, the following SDWG Task Forces held informal meetings: ST.10/C Task Force, Trademark Standards Task Force and XML4IP Task Force. The Task Force Leaders informed the SDWG of the progress made regarding their respective tasks in the informal meetings.

Adoption of the report of the session

79. This report was adopted by the participants to the eleventh session of the SDWG via a restricted e-forum.

Agenda Item 19: Closing of the session

80. The meeting was closed following the reports by the Task Force Leaders on the informal meetings of the SDWG Task Forces.

[Annexes follow]

ANNEXE I/ANNEX I

I. ÉTATS MEMBRES/MEMBER STATES

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

ALGÉRIE/ALGERIA

Mourad HADDADI, chef du Service informatique, Institut national algérien de la propriété industrielle (INAPI), Alger

ALLEMAGNE/GERMANY

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

Konrad HOFFMANN, Patent Examiner, Information Technology International Cooperation, German Patent and Trade Mark Office, Munich

ARGENTINE/ARGENTINA

Inés Gabriela FASTAME (Srta.), Primer Secretario, Misión Permanente, Ginebra

AUSTRALIE/AUSTRALIA

Samantha HOY (Ms.), Manager, International ICT Cooperation, Business and Information Management Solutions Group, IP Australia, Woden ACT

AUTRICHE/AUSTRIA

Katharina FASTENBAUER (Mrs.), Deputy Vice-President, Head of Technical Central Unit, Austrian Patent Office, Vienna

BARBADE/BARBADOS

Corlita BABB-SCHAEFER (Mrs.), Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva

BÉLARUS/BELARUS

Julia KHORUK (Mrs.), Chief Specialist, Information Department, National Center of Intellectual Property, Minsk

BRÉSIL/BRAZIL

Luci Mary GONZALEZ GULLO (Mrs.), Head, Studies Division, National Institute of Industrial Property (INPI), Rio de Janeiro

COLOMBIE/COLOMBIA

Martha Irma ALARCÓN (Sra.), Ministro Plenipotenciario, Misión Permanente, Ginebra

Hansel Esteban MANRIQUE CAMPOS, Stagiare, Misión Permanente, Ginebra

COSTA RICA

Carlos GARBANZO, Ministro Consejero, Misión Permanente, Ginebra

ÉGYPTE/EGYPT

Sanaa SHEHATA (Mrs.), Information Specialist, Egyptian Patent Office, Academy of Scientific Research and Technology (ASRT), Ministry of Scientific Research, Cairo

Mohamed GAD, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

ESPAGNE/SPAIN

Rosa CARRERAS DURBÁN (Sra.), Coordinadora del Área de Proyectos Tecnológicos Internacionales, División Tecnologías de la Información, Oficina Española de Patentes y Marcas, Madrid

Francisco José MORENO GÓMEZ, Jefe, Servicio de Documentación, Departamento de Patentes e Información Tecnológica, Oficina Española de Patentes y Marcas, Madrid

ÉTATS-UNIS D'AMÉRIQUE/UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Betty ANDREWS (Mrs.), Director, Office of Trademark Program Control, United States Patent and Trademark Office, Alexandria

Christopher Y. KIM, International Liaison Staff, United States Patent and Trademark Office, Alexandria

Otto Hans VAN MAERSSSEN, Counselor, Permanent Mission, Geneva

FÉDÉRATION DE RUSSIE/RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Anna YA.GRASHCHENKOVA (Mrs.), Principal Specialist, International Cooperation Department, Federal Service for Intellectual Property, Patents and Trademarks (ROSPATENT), Moscow

Valeria MAKSIMOVA (Mrs.), Deputy Head, Information Resources Development Department, Federal Service for Intellectual Property, Patents and Trademarks (ROSPATENT), Moscow

Olga TYURINA (Mrs.), Senior Researcher, Information Resources Development Department, Federal Service for Intellectual Property, Patents and Trademarks (ROSPATENT), Moscow

Denis FOMENOK, Head of Laboratory, Federal Service for Intellectual Property, Patents and Trademarks (ROSPATENT), Moscow

FINLANDE/FINLAND

Juha REKOLA, Director, Development Division, Patents and Innovations Line, National Board of Patents and Registration, Helsinki

FRANCE

Marcel CANTET, Département de la documentation et de l'information, Recherche et développement, Institut national de la propriété industrielle (INPI), Paris

Delphine LIDA (Mme), conseillère (affaires économiques et développement), Mission permanente, Genève

INDE/INDIA

Kotthapally NANDINI (Ms.), First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

INDONÉSIE/INDONESIA

Yasmi ADRIANSYAH, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

IRAN (RÉPUBLIQUE ISLAMIQUE D’)/IRAN (ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF)

Ali NASIMFAR, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

IRAQ

Ahmed AL-NAKASH, Third Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

IRLANDE/IRELAND

Karen RYAN (Mrs.), Patent Examiner, Patents Office, Kilkenny

ITALIE/ITALY

Cristiano DI CARLO, coordinateur informatique, Office italien des brevets et des marques, Rome

JAPON/JAPAN

Yoshihiko YOSHIDA, Deputy Director, Information Systems Affairs Division, Japan Patent Office, Tokyo

Teruo OKAZAKI, Deputy Director, Patent Information Policy Planning Office, Japan Patent Office, Tokyo

Tomohiro HAKAMATA, Information Technology Planning Office, General Affairs Division, General Affairs Department, Japan Patent Office, Tokyo

KENYA

Rose MAKENA MUCHIRI (Ms.), Principal Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva

LITUANIE/LITHUANIA

Daiva URBAITYTE (Ms.), Chief Specialist, General Affairs Division, State Patent Bureau of the Republic of Lithuania, Vilnius

MALAISIE/MALAYSIA

Rafiza ABDUL RAHMAN (Miss), Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva

MEXIQUE/MEXICO

Eloina GALAVIZ TORRES (Sra.), Especialista en Sistemas, Instituto Mexicano de la Propiedad Industrial (IMPI) México

NORVÈGE/NORWAY

Jens Petter SOLLIE, System Manager, Production and Systems, Norwegian Industrial Property Office, Oslo

POLOGNE/POLAND

Irena BIELECKA (Ms.), Director, Information Technology Department, Patent Office of the Republic of Poland, Warsaw

PORTUGAL

Luis SERRADAS TAVARES, Legal Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva

RÉPUBLIQUE DE CORÉE/REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Jaeyul AHN, Deputy Director, Technical Cooperation Team, Korean Intellectual Property Office, Daejeon

In-Sook KIM (Ms.), Assistant Director, Technical Cooperation Division, Korean Intellectual Property Office, Daejeon

Seong-Joon PARK, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

RÉPUBLIQUE POPULAIRE DÉMOCRATIQUE DE CORÉE/DEMOCRATIC PEOPLE'S
REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Sok MYONG JONG, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva

RÉPUBLIQUE TCHÈQUE/CZECH REPUBLIC

Olga NOVOTNÁ (Miss), Information Technology Analyst, Patent Information Department, Industrial Property Office, Prague

ROYAUME-UNI/UNITED KINGDOM

Geoff COURT, Head, PD Admin Support Services, Intellectual Property Office, Newport

Ioan PETERS, Head, Technical Design, Intellectual Property Office, Newport

SÉNÉGAL/SENEGAL

El Hadji Ibou BOYE, deuxième secrétaire, Mission permanente, Genève

SUÈDE/SWEDEN

Gunnar LINDBOM, Information Technology-Controller, Trademark Department, Swedish Patent and Registration Office, Söderhamn

SUISSE/SWITZERLAND

Alexandra GRAZIOLI (Mme), conseillère juridique, Institut fédéral de la propriété intellectuelle, Berne

Matthias GÜNTER, Head, Information Technology, Swiss Federal Institute of Intellectual Property, Bern

UKRAINE

Galyna DOBRYNINA (Mrs.), Deputy Director Assistant, State Department of Intellectual Property, Kyiv

Oksana PARKHETA (Ms.), Head, Economy and Information Support Division, State Department of Intellectual Property, Kyiv

YÉMEN/YEMEN

Fawaz AL-RASSAS, Third Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

ZAMBIE/ZAMBIA

Catherine LISHOMWA (Mrs.), Director, Public Relations, Permanent Mission, Geneva

II. ORGANISATIONS INTERGOUVERNEMENTALES/
INTERGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

OFFICE BENELUX DE LA PROPRIÉTÉ INTELLECTUELLE (OBPI)/BENELUX OFFICE
FOR INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY (BOIP)

Jean-Marie PUTZ, Information Technology Manager, The Hague

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

Miguel ALBRECHT, Director, Data Resources, Rijswijk

Keri ROWLES, Patent Information, Vienna

Patrick LE GONIDEC, Project Administrator, DSS Patent Info, Vienna

Raul SUAREZ Y GONZALEZ, Project Manager ePublication, Directorate 2.7.22, External Products and Services, Rijswijk

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

Andrey SEKRETOV, Principal Specialist, Information and Search Systems Department, Eurasian Patent Office, Moscow

COMMUNAUTÉ EUROPÉENNE (CE)/EUROPEAN COMMUNITY (EC)

Bernardo VIANA, Special Cooperation Programmes, Institutional Affairs and External Relations Department, Office for Harmonization in the Internal Market (Trade Marks and Designs) (OHIM), Alicante

Alexandre TRAN, Head, Information Technology Architecture and Standards, Information Technology Department, Office for Harmonization in the Internal Market (Trade Marks and Designs) (OHIM), Alicante

CENTRE SUD/SOUTH CENTRE

Nirmalya SYAM, Programme Officer, Innovation and Access to Knowledge Programme, Geneva

Heba WANIS (Ms.), Intern, Geneva

III. ORGANISATION NON GOUVERNEMENTALE
NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATION

Association européenne de fournisseurs commerciaux d'information en matière de brevets (PatCom)/European Commercial Patent Services Group (PatCom): Pierre BUFFET
(directeur général délégué, Questel S.A., Paris)

IV. BUREAU/OFFICERS

Présidente/Chair:	Samantha HOY (Ms.) (Australie/Australia)
Vice-présidents/Vice-Chairs:	Konrad HOFFMANN (Allemagne/Germany) Andrey SEKRETOV (OEAB/EAPO)
Secrétaire/Secretary:	Angel LÓPEZ SOLANAS (OMPI/WIPO)

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

Yo TAKAGI, directeur exécutif du Département de l'infrastructure mondiale en matière de propriété intellectuelle/Executive Director, Global Industrial Property Infrastructure Department

Claus MATTHES, directeur du Département du PCT et brevets/Director, PCT and Patents Department

Jean-Paul HOEBRECK, directeur adjoint du Département de l'infrastructure mondiale en matière de propriété intellectuelle/Deputy Director, Global Industrial Property Infrastructure Department

Antonios FARASSOPOULOS, chef du Service des classifications internationales et des normes de l'OMPI /Head, International Classifications and WIPO Standards Service

Angel LÓPEZ SOLANAS, chef de la Section des normes de l'OMPI/Head, WIPO Standards Section

William MEREDITH, chef du Service mondial d'information/Head, Global Information Service

Daniel CHENG, chef de la Section de la recherche-développement, Groupe du développement des applications innovantes/Head, Research and Development Section, Venture Applications Development Unit

Young-Woo YUN, administrateur principale chargé de l'information en matière de propriété industrielle de la Section des normes de l'OMPI/Senior Industrial Property Information Officer, WIPO Standards Section

Olivier COLLIOD, consultant de la Section des opérations et de l'appui informatique/Consultant, Information Technology Operations and Support Section

[L'annexe II suit/
Annex II follows]]

ANNEX II

AGENDA

1. Opening of the session
2. Election of the Chair and two Vice-Chairs
3. Adoption of the agenda
4. Report of the forty-seventh series of the Assemblies of WIPO Member States concerning the Standing Committee on Information Technologies (SCIT)
See documents WO/GA/38/10 and SCIT/SDWG/11/13.
5. ST.10/C Task Force (Task No. 30)
 - (a) Report by the Task Leader
 - (b) Proposal on the revision of WIPO Standard ST.10/C
 - (c) Issues to be addressed in the questionnaire to survey industrial property offices on application numbers used
 - (d) Presentation, by the European Patent Office, on Uniform Resource Identifiers (URIs)
See document SCIT/SDWG/11/2.
6. Proposal on the revision of WIPO Standard ST.25 (Task No. 33)
See document SCIT/SDWG/11/3.
7. Revision of WIPO Standard ST.3 (Task No. 33/3)
 - (a) Proposal on the revision of WIPO Standard ST.3
 - (b) New procedure for the revision of WIPO Standard ST.3
See document SCIT/SDWG/11/4.
8. Correction procedures in patent offices (Task No. 35)
 - (a) Report by the International Bureau
 - (b) Survey concerning correction procedures: summary, results and analysis
 - (c) Proposal on the revision of WIPO Standard ST.50
See document SCIT/SDWG/11/5.

9. Progress report by the Task Leader of the ST.36 Task Force (Task No. 38)
See document SCIT/SDWG/11/6.
10. Questionnaire to survey industrial property offices on the implementation and promotion of WIPO Standard ST.22 (Task No. 37)
See document SCIT/SDWG/11/7.
11. Progress report, by the European Patent Office and the International Bureau, on Task No. 23 (national/regional phase of published PCT international applications)
See document SCIT/SDWG/11/8.
12. Oral report by the Task Leader of the XML4IP Task Force (Task No. 41)
13. Guidelines for the electronic management of the figurative elements of trademarks (Task No. 20)
 - (a) Report by the Task Leader of the Trademark Standards Task Force
 - (b) Proposal on the adoption of new WIPO Standard ST.67
See document SCIT/SDWG/11/9.
14. Annual Technical Reports (ATRs) on Patent, Trademark and Industrial Design Information Activities (Task No. 24)
See document SDCIT/SDWG/11/10.
15. Progress report, by the International Bureau, on the WIPO STAD (WIPO Standards Administration Database) (Task No. 26)
16. Exchange of information:
 - (a) Presentation, by the International Bureau, on the Priority Document Access Service and document exchange issues
 - (b) Presentation, by the International Bureau, on new Wiki spaces created for the SDWG Task Force electronic forums
17. Consideration of the SDWG Task List
See document SCIT/SDWG/11/11.
18. Schedule of activities
19. Closing of the session

[End of Annex II and of document]

ANNEX III

WORKING PAPER ON THE
COMMITTEE ON GLOBAL IP INFRASTRUCTURE (CGI)

Mandate and Possible Tasks

1. The mandate of the Committee on Global IP Infrastructure (hereinafter referred to as “the CGI”) is that, with a view to facilitating the coordination and development of global IP infrastructure (WIPO Strategic Goal IV), the CGI should provide WIPO member States with a multilateral forum for considering and taking appropriate actions on matters concerning the following possible tasks:

- (a) technical policies, recommendations and statements of principles regarding IP information dissemination (International Bureau);
- (b) practical, technical and operational matters regarding the digital networking of IP offices and the International Bureau, and a common platform for their international collaboration for processing industrial property applications (International Bureau, Japan);
- (c) advice and assistance with regard to digitization of IP information and electronic document management of IP offices and the International Bureau (International Bureau, Japan);
- (d) exchange of views and cooperation on the application of new technologies useful to enhancing global IP infrastructure such as machine translation technologies and search engines (International Bureau, Eurasian Patent Organization);
- (e) recommendations on system architecture facilitating IP information exchange (International Bureau);
- (f) matters concerning IP services to facilitate IP information exchange, e.g., enhancement of WIPO Priority Documents Digital Access Service (DAS) (Japan);
- (g) databases of registration of IP rights (United Kingdom);
- (h) international cooperation and the provision of technical assistance to IP offices for the modernization of technical infrastructure (International Bureau, Japan);
- (i) the exchange of experience and sharing of good practices, the use of common tools and the consideration of coherent approaches to various projects for interchange of data and information of intellectual property (United States of America) (e.g., XML conversion of IP documents (Eurasian Patent Organization));

- (j) consideration of a forum to allow exchange of views on ICT management (Australia);
- (k) consideration of technical aspects to support the implementation of projects undertaken within the framework of WIPO Development Agenda (Australia);
- (l) the use of new technologies for IP applications processing (United Kingdom, Japan);
- (m) technologies to be used for an electronic publication of IP information (United Kingdom);
- (n) technologies to be used for online filing of IP applications (International Bureau, Japan); and
- (o) ICT security issues associated with Global IP infrastructure (Norway).

Between brackets is indicated the delegation which proposed the corresponding task.

2. The CGI will not deal with matters concerning legal norms or WIPO standards and international classifications since they have been covered by existing committees or by the Committee on WIPO Standards (“CWS”) which the General Assembly approved to create.

Working Procedures

3. The CGI and CWS will follow the Standing Committee on Information Technologies’ (“SCIT”) working methods and procedures as summarized below (more details are included in document SCIT/7/14), where appropriate, subject to further modifications agreed by the Committee concerned:

- (a) a proposal to be made by a member State or by the Secretariat of WIPO for discussion and possible approval by the Committee on the creation of a new task;
- (b) discussions by the Committee or by a task force for making recommendations or taking actions to be decided by the Committee, and where necessary, by the Assembly concerned; and
- (c) the completion of the task.

[Annex IV follows]

ANNEX IV

STANDARD ST.50

GUIDELINES FOR ISSUING CORRECTIONS, ALTERATIONS AND
SUPPLEMENTS RELATING TO PATENT INFORMATION

*Revision adopted by the SCIT Standards and Documentation Working Group
at its eleventh session on October 30, 2009*

INTRODUCTION

1. The present Guidelines aim at providing guidance to industrial property offices and other suppliers of patent information on how to issue corrections, alterations and supplements relating to patent information published in any format, for the purposes of promoting an unambiguous and uniform presentation of such corrections, alterations and supplements. Unless specified otherwise each guideline paragraph is media neutral and concerns all media types including paper and electronic media (such as DVD-ROM or CD-ROM optical discs or an online Internet publication).
2. These Guidelines have been established on the basis of the experiences of several industrial property offices and users of patent information.

DEFINITIONS

3. For the purposes of these Guidelines, the expression:
 - (a) "patent document(s)" includes patents for invention, plant patents, design patents, utility certificates, utility models, documents of addition thereto and published applications therefor;
 - (b) "patent gazette" means a journal issued by a national, regional or international industrial property authority (referred to as "industrial property office") and which contains announcements with respect to patent documents. A patent gazette may be issued in one or more media type, e.g., paper and online Internet publication. A patent gazette may be published as an "official bulletin", "official journal", etc.;
 - (c) "publication" means making information available to the public for inspection, supplying a copy on request, or producing multiple copies by using any medium (paper, optical disc, online publication, etc.);
 - (d) "correction" means data issued with the aim of replacing erroneous information previously published, deleting spurious information, or adding data erroneously omitted from the information previously published. For example, publishing IPC symbols in replacement of other IPC symbols erroneously allotted to a patent document is a "correction". A correction may sometimes be called "corrigendum", "erratum", or "error";
 - (e) "alteration" means data issued with the aim of updating or replacing initially correct information previously published. An alteration may be called an amendment. For example, publishing the new name or address of the owner of a patent, publishing new IPC symbols after the scope of claims has been amended are "alterations";
 - (f) "supplement" means data issued with the aim of giving information that is in addition to the information previously published. For example, a search report, a supplementary search report or a revised version of a search report issued after initial publication of a patent document are "supplements". Translations of patent documents are not covered by this expression;
 - (g) "subscriber(s)" means (a) customer(s), including (an) industrial property office(s), which has (have) an agreement with the industrial property offices or other suppliers of patent information, to be supplied with patent documentation products on a regular or continuous basis, e.g., using media such as an optical disc or online Internet subscriber access;
 - (h) "entry in a patent gazette" means at least one comprehensive announcement in a gazette regarding the making available to the public of the complete text, claims (if any) and drawings (if any) of a patent document;
 - (i) "search index" is a collection of stored data to facilitate fast and accurate information retrieval. A search index may be compiled regularly and automatically by a machine; and
 - (j) "machine readable carrier" means a medium capable of storing data in a form that can be accessed by an automated sensing device.

USE OF WIPO STANDARDS AND OF CODES

4. The following WIPO Standards should be applied when issuing corrections, alterations and supplements:

WIPO Standard ST.2	Standard Manner for Designating Calendar Dates by Using the Gregorian Calendar;
WIPO Standard ST.3	Recommended Standard on Two-Letter Codes for the Representation of States, Other Entities and Intergovernmental Organizations;
WIPO Standard ST.9	Recommendation Concerning Bibliographic Data on and Relating to Patents and SPCs;
WIPO Standard ST.10/D	Guidelines on Physical Characteristics of Patent Documents Particularly Relevant to Reproducibility and Legibility of Such Documents;
WIPO Standard ST.16	Recommended Standard Code for the Identification of Different Kinds of Patent Documents;
WIPO Standard ST.17	Recommendation for the Coding of Headings of Announcements Made in Official Gazettes;
WIPO Standard ST.22	Recommendation for the Presentation of Patent Applications Typed in Optical Character Recognition (OCR) Format;
WIPO Standard ST.32	Recommendation for the Markup of Patent Documents Using SGML (Standard Generalized Markup Language);
WIPO Standard ST.33	Recommended Standard Format for Data Exchange of Facsimile Information of Patent Documents
WIPO Standard ST.36	Recommendation for the Processing of Patent Information using XML (Extensible Markup Language)
WIPO Standard ST.40	Recommendation Concerning Making Facsimile Images of Patent Documents Available on CD-ROM.

5. The INID codes provided for in WIPO Standard [ST.9](#), the two-letter codes under WIPO Standard [ST.3](#) and International Standard ISO 3166:1993, the kind-of-document codes provided for in WIPO Standard [ST.16](#), the codes for identifying headings of announcements provided for in WIPO Standard [ST.17](#), as well as the methodology for coding corrections contained in WIPO Standard [ST.32](#), [ST.33](#) or [ST.36](#), should be used, whenever suitable and applicable, when issuing corrections, alterations and supplements. The presentation of calendar dates in any of the announcements of corrections, alterations and supplements should be in the sequence and format as recommended in WIPO Standard [ST.2](#).

6. The physical characteristics of announcements regarding corrections, alterations and supplements provided in paper form should comply with the respective guidelines contained in WIPO Standard [ST.10/D](#) for the purposes of reproducibility and legibility.

GUIDELINES FOR ISSUING CORRECTIONS

Corrections to patent documents

7. Any significant error detected in the bibliography or in other parts of the patent document should lead to a republication. Errors are considered significant if the correct information is not immediately and clearly identifiable. Corrections to information contained in patent documents should be identified as corrections and be published by using, at least, the same medium of publication as the original document, that is, by issuing:

- (a) corrected versions of the first page, or
- (b) corrected versions of the complete patent document (pamphlet).

If an industrial property office cannot follow this provision, it should publish, at least, the individual corrected parts of the document together with the updated first page.

8. Corrected versions referred to in paragraph 7, above, should be identified, on the first page, by one of the numeric codes provided for in paragraph 10 of WIPO Standard [ST.16](#), preceded by the appropriate letter code corresponding to the publication level of the corrected document. (See the AT (i) example in the document "Examples concerning correction procedures of Patent Offices", [Part 7.4.2.](#))

9. The first page of a corrected version should always indicate the date of issuance of the corrected document. It is recommended to indicate that date by using INID code (48) of WIPO Standard [ST.9](#). (See the US (ii) example in the document "Examples concerning correction procedures of Patent Offices", [Part 7.4.2.](#))

10. An industrial property office should provide additional correction information if it is necessary for unambiguous identification of the category and nature of the correction.

(a) It is recommended to indicate such additional correction information by using supplementary correction codes as defined in paragraphs 30 and 31, below. If such additional correction information is published on the first page of the corrected document, it should be provided by using INID code (15) of WIPO Standard [ST.9](#). It is recommended to indicate, in plain language, the most important legal consequences of the correction, if necessary.

(b) In addition, the information providing the date of issue of previously published versions of corrections may be indicated under this INID code. Each previously corrected version should be identified by indicating at least the following information of that corrected version:

- [ST.16](#) kind-of-document code;
- Date of issue;
- Issue number of the gazette containing the announcement of the correction, where the publication date of the correction is different from the date of announcing the correction in the gazette;
- Supplementary correction code, if used, associated with the [ST.16](#) kind-of-document code of the original, first published version of the patent document. This information should be printed in parentheses. (See the EP (i) example in the document "Examples concerning correction procedures of Patent Offices", [Part 7.4.2.](#))

(c) It is further recommended to provide the date of publication of the original version of the patent document, by using the appropriate INID code, e.g., (43), (45), etc., immediately below the listing of previous versions of corrections given under INID code (15). That information should also contain the [ST.16](#) kind-of-document code and the issue number of the patent gazette in which the publication of the original version of the patent document had been announced, if necessary.

(d) In case of an online Internet publication, it is recommended to provide a hyperlink to a corrected document from the Internet page on which the original document (or notification on correction) is published. (See the second image of the WO (i) and (ii) examples in the document "Examples concerning correction procedures of Patent Offices", [Part 7.4.2.](#))

11. The information given under INID codes (15) and (48) should be provided using plain language, whenever possible, in addition to any codes used. (See the KZ (i) example in the document "Examples concerning correction procedures of Patent Offices", [Part 7.4.2.](#))

12. The information that a complete patent document or a part thereof is a corrected version should be given either by a printed indication "Correction", "Corrected Version", "Corrigendum" (or an equivalent expression in the language of the document) on the first page, or by a respective plain language designation under INID code (12) according to WIPO Standard [ST.9](#). (See the RU (i) example in the document "Examples concerning correction procedures of Patent Offices" ([Part 7.4.2.](#)))

13. Where the medium is paper, the publication of corrections contained on paper strips stapled or stuck to the original patent document should be avoided.

14. The fact that a correction was made should be recorded by the industrial property office in its patent register or, if not possible, in a way appropriate to the national practice.

15. Corrected versions should be distributed to subscribers free of charge and in the same way in which the original document was delivered, i.e., without a separate order.

16. Examples of corrected first pages of patent documents can be seen in AT (i), BG (i), EP (i) and (ii), GB (ii), HU (i), KR (i), KZ (i), SK (i) and (ii), RU (i), US (ii), and the third images of WO (i) and (ii) of the document "Examples concerning correction procedures of Patent Offices", [Part 7.4.2.](#)

Announcements of corrections to patent documents

17. In addition to the publication of the corrected versions of patent documents, or of parts thereof, referred to in paragraphs 7 and 8, above, the correction should, preferably, be announced in the patent gazette by indicating:

- * (a) the publication number of the patent document;
- * (b) the kind-of-document code provided for in WIPO Standard [ST.16](#);

* Minimum data which should be indicated in a patent gazette if an announcement is decided upon.

(c) the location of the error in the original document (e.g., paragraph, page, column, and/or line number) if the location of the correction is not clearly defined by the respective INID code according to WIPO Standard [ST.9](#);

(d) the kind of correction (to be) made by giving the previously published (erroneous) information, as well as the correct information.

The announcement of a correction should be made in the issue of the gazette corresponding to the publication date of the corrected document.

18. It is recommended to present corrections to patent documents announced in a patent gazette in a structured layout. (See the EA (i) example in the document "Examples concerning correction procedures of Patent Offices", [Part 7.4.2.](#))

19. Examples of corrections to patent documents as announced in a patent gazette can be seen in AR (i) and (ii), BG (ii), CN (i) and (ii), CZ (i) to (iv), EA (i) to (iv), EP (i) and (ii), ES (i), GE (i), GR (i), JP (i), KZ (ii), MG (i), SK (iii), and UA (i) to (iii) in the document "Examples concerning correction procedures of Patent Offices", [Part 7.4.2.](#)

Corrections to patent gazettes

20. Where erroneous information relating to patent documents has been published in a patent gazette and not in the patent documents themselves, corrections should be made in the relevant entry of a subsequent issue of the gazette itself, and not in a separate location, e.g., a different paper sheet, a different optical disc, or a different Internet address. The announcements of corrections should contain, as a minimum:

(a) the publication number or, if no publication number has yet been assigned, the application number of the patent document;

(b) the number and the year of the gazette in which the erroneous information was published, and sufficient indications which allow for the locating of such information in the gazette;

(c) the kind of correction to be made by giving the previously published (erroneous) information, as well as the correct information.

21. It is recommended to present corrections to a patent gazette in a structured layout. (See EA (ii) of the document "Examples concerning correction procedures of Patent Offices", [Part 7.4.2.](#))

22. In order to facilitate the handling of announcements of corrections related to the adding of erroneously omitted information to entries in a patent gazette, it is recommended to repeat the defective entry and to give information which denotes exactly the location and particular form the correction takes. If spurious information previously published in a patent gazette is to be deleted, the same principle should be applied appropriately. (See GE (i) of the document "Examples concerning correction procedures of Patent Offices", [Part 7.4.2.](#))

Additional special recommendations for corrections to patent documents on optical discs

23. If a patent document published on optical disc contains significant errors or if the patent document is not completely accessible due to technical defects of the optical disc, a correct and complete version of the patent document should be issued on the same optical disc series as soon as possible.

(a) If a patent document published on optical disc in addition to one or more non-optical disc media types (e.g., paper and/or the Internet) and containing erroneous information is corrected on the non-optical disc media type, that document should be reissued at least on the same optical disc series as initially published and at the same time as the correction relating to the non-optical disc media type was announced. The identification of the document reissued on optical disc should correspond exactly to the corrected non-optical disc media type version of the patent document.

(b) If a patent document published on a non-optical disc media type and optical disc is not completely accessible on the optical disc due to technical defects of the data carrier, the document should be reissued on the same optical disc series as early as possible. The patent document reissued on the optical disc should correspond exactly to the non-optical disc media type version initially published.

24. If a patent document is reissued on optical disc, it is recommended to include (a) reference(s) to the document in any search index which relates to the patent document published on the same optical disc series. The reference(s) should enable the user to immediately locate all versions of the same patent document published in fully accessible form on the said optical disc series.

(a) If a patent document is reissued on optical disc because the original document, published on a non-optical disc media type and on optical disc, contained significant errors, it should be possible to locate the original erroneous document.

(b) If a patent document is reissued on optical disc because the original document was not accessible due to technical defects of the optical disc, only those versions of the patent document which are fully accessible are of interest.

25. The information given in the search index, which refers to the reissue of a patent document on optical disc, should enable the user to determine unambiguously the [ST.16](#) kind-of-document code of the original patent document, which has been corrected or has had to be reissued.

26. The information given in the search index referring to the correction of an erroneous patent document on optical disc should enable the user to determine easily the date of issuance of the corrected patent document.

27. The information given in the search index, which refers to the reissue of a patent document which was not fully accessible, should enable the user to determine easily the publication date of the original document which was not accessible on optical disc, but was accessible on other media.

Corrections to machine-readable carriers other than optical discs

28. Corrections to information issued on such machine-readable carriers should be communicated to the user on the same type of carrier and with the same format as the original information which was provided and should be made available as soon as possible.

29. The corrected information should be given in a way which enables the user to update datafiles automatically.

Supplementary correction codes

30. Offices should apply, if found suitable, supplementary correction codes in order to enable the user to uniquely identify the nature of the correction of a patent document.

31. The following supplementary correction codes are available for application:

(a) Wn, where

- W indicates the category of the correction, meaning that, due to errors in the content of the document, the correction takes place in all publication media,
- n is a counter identifying the version number of the correction, i.e., whether it is the first, second, etc., correction of the same document.

The codes Wn should always be associated with the kind-of-document code, provided for in WIPO Standard [ST.16](#), of the original, first published, version of the patent document, e.g., W3A1 for the third corrected version of an A1 document.

(b) ZC, where

- Z indicates the category of the correction, meaning that the document is reissued on only one specific medium due to technical defects of the same,
- C indicates the specific medium, i.e., CD-ROM, on which the document has been reissued due to technical defects of the same.

The code ZC shall not be published on the first page of the reissued document. It should be used only in search indexes to enable the user to retrieve the reissued document.

(c) YF or, alternatively, Yn, where

- YF can be used to identify electronic replacement files, containing corrections solely to errors significant to this medium only and to non-significant errors in the bibliography or text parts of a document, where a corrected version in accordance with paragraph 7, above, has not been issued. “Vicosity” or “apparatus”, for instance, can be immediately and clearly identified by a person. However, they would not be hit by searching for “viscosity” or “apparatus” in a database,
- Yn can be used to identify electronic replacement files, as in the case of code YF, however, with the intention of identifying, by the counter n, the version number of the replacement file, i.e., whether it is the first, second, etc., replacement file for the same document.

(d) DL, to identify the cancellation of an announcement of a corrected version. The code DL should always be associated with the kind-of-document code, provided for in WIPO Standard [ST.16](#), of the original, i.e., first published, version of the patent document.

32. An example of the use of supplementary correction codes can be seen in the BG (i) example in the document “Examples concerning correction procedures of Patent Offices”, [Part 7.4.2](#).

GUIDELINES FOR ISSUING ALTERATIONS

Patent documents and patent gazettes

33. Alterations relating to information previously published in patent documents and possibly also in the patent gazette should be identified as such and should, preferably, be announced in the patent gazette; they need not be the subject of a republication of the patent document itself. The announcement of an alteration should indicate:

- (a) the publication number of the patent document;
- (b) the kind-of-document code provided for in WIPO Standard [ST.16](#);
- (c) the location of the updated or replaced information in the patent document (e.g., paragraph, page, column, and/or line number) if the location of the alteration is not clearly defined by the respective INID code according to WIPO Standard [ST.9](#);
- (d) the information being altered, if any;
- (e) the alteration itself.

34. An alteration, or at least the fact that an alteration was made, should be recorded by the industrial property office in its patent register.

35. Examples of alterations relating to information published in patent documents and in patent gazettes are reproduced in CN (iii) and (iv), EA (v) and (vi), ES (ii), GE (ii), HU (ii), LT (i), UA (iv), and WO (iii) and (iv) in the document "Examples concerning correction procedures of Patent Offices", [Part 7.4.2](#).

Machine-readable carriers and online Internet databases containing legal status information

36. Alterations which refer to information previously issued on such a machine-readable carrier, e.g., an optical disc, an online Internet database, should be communicated in such a way so as to allow automatic updating of databases without manual interference. This updating should not require a user to maintain the complete set of data.

GUIDELINES FOR ISSUING SUPPLEMENTS

Patent documents and patent gazettes

37. Additional information issued after the initial publication of a patent document should be published in the form of an updated version of the first page along with the supplement. The new first page should be marked "Supplement" (or an equivalent expression in the language of the document). It is recommended to allot to each publication of a supplement a different kind-of-document code. (See the ES (iii) example in the document "Examples concerning correction procedures of Patent Offices", [Part 7.4.2](#).)

38. Supplements should be distributed to subscribers by the industrial property office which issued the initial document in the same way that the initial document was delivered, i.e., without a separate order.

39. In addition to the publication of a supplement mentioned in paragraph 37, above, the supplement should be announced in the patent gazette indicating:

- (a) the publication number of the supplement;
- (b) the kind-of-document code provided for in WIPO Standard [ST.16](#) and allotted to the supplement;
- (c) the designation of the supplement (its title).

The announcement should clearly indicate, when necessary, the publication number and/or the publication level (kind of document) of the patent document that the supplement refers to. (See the HU (iii) example in the document "Examples concerning correction procedures of Patent Offices", [Part 7.4.2](#).)

40. Examples of supplements are reproduced in EA (vii) to (x), ES (iii), HU (iii), and WO (v) in the document "Examples concerning correction procedures of Patent Offices", [Part 7.4.2](#).

Additional special recommendations for patent documents on optical discs

41. If supplements relating to patent documents previously published on optical disc are provided, they should be issued as soon as possible by including the additional information in a subsequent issue of the optical disc.

42. It is recommended that producers of optical discs establish a procedure to automatically inform users of such supplements. This procedure should make it possible for the user:

(a) to determine easily the date on which a supplement was issued;

(b) to locate the supplement in the optical disc(s) concerned, e.g., by way of reference to the disc containing the patent document which the supplement refers to.

A full set of optical discs, together with cumulative indexes (machine-readable and downloadable), should enable a user to have a set of complete information.

Machine-readable carriers other than optical discs

43. Supplements which refer to patent documents previously issued on such a machine-readable carrier should be communicated in such a way so as to allow automatic updating of databases without manual interference. This updating should not require a user to maintain the complete set of data.

44. It is recommended to record on the machine-readable carrier the additional information (the supplement) in one record.

[End of Annex IV and of document]