

WIPO



SCIT/SDWG/2/14

ORIGINAL: English

DATE: December 6, 2002

WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION

GENEVA

STANDING COMMITTEE ON INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES

STANDARDS AND DOCUMENTATION WORKING GROUP

Second Session

Geneva, December 2 to 6, 2002

REPORT

adopted by the Working Group¹

INTRODUCTION

1. The Standards and Documentation Working Group (SDWG) of the Standing Committee on Information Technologies (SCIT) held its second session from December 2 to 6, 2002.
2. The following Member States of WIPO and/or the Paris Union were represented at the session: Algeria, Australia, Austria, Belarus, Bulgaria, Canada, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Egypt, France, Germany, Guatemala, Holy See, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Japan, Lithuania, Nigeria, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, United Kingdom and United States of America (34).
3. Representatives of the African Intellectual Property Organization (OAPI), the European Patent Office (EPO) and the Benelux Trademark Office (BBM) (3) took part in the session in a member capacity.

¹ This report was adopted by the members of the Working Group through electronic correspondence.

4. A representative of the International Federation of Industrial Property Attorneys (FICPI) took part in the session in an observer capacity.
5. The list of participants appears as Annex I to this report.

Summary of Discussions by the Chair

6. The Chair presented a written Summary of Discussions (document SCIT/SDWG/2/13) reflecting the major topics covered and the conclusions reached by the SDWG. A revised version of the text of that document, reflecting all comments on the Summary agreed upon during the closing session on December 6, 2002, is recorded in paragraphs 7 to 58, below.

Agenda Item 1: Opening of the Session

7. The session was opened by Mr. Neil Wilson, Head, Information Technology Services Division, who welcomed the delegates on behalf of the Director General.

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

8. The Secretariat recalled that the Chair and two Vice-Chairs of the SDWG are elected for one year, i.e., for two sessions of the Working Group, therefore, for reasons of efficiency and expediency, it was proposed and agreed that Mr. Hubert Rothe (Germany), the Chair of the first session, be retained as Chair for this meeting.

9. Mr. Neil Wilson acted as Secretary of the session.

Agenda Item 3: Adoption of the Agenda

10. The SDWG unanimously adopted the agenda, which appears as Annex II to this report.

Agenda Item 4: Inventory of SDWG Tasks

(a) *Consideration of the SDWG Task List (Document SCIT/SDWG/2/2)*

11. The SDWG discussed the tasks contained in the Annex to document SCIT/SDWG/2/2 and agreed on the following:

Task No. 7. The SDWG agreed to expand the time frame proposed for revising the Statement of Principles from 2003 to 2004 in order to have one more year to consider if it is convenient to put effort into this revision or if it would be better to take a different approach.

Task No. 8. The SDWG agreed to terminate this task due to advances in technology.

Task No. 10. The Secretariat informed the SDWG that Task No. 10 was progressing according to plan and that a report on IPDL Standards Development was to be found in document SCIT/SDWG/2/10. The SDWG agreed to add *Report on continuing progress to SDWG/3: Q2/2003* to the Proposed Action with Time Frame as Item No. 3, and to change the tense of Item No. 2 to reflect successful completion.

Task No. 11. The Secretariat stated that a report is due to the SCIT Plenary at its next session, therefore no report was prepared for this session of the SDWG.

Task No. 13. The SDWG noted an oral report by the International Bureau on the technical standard (Annex F to the Administrative Instructions under the PCT and legal framework (Part 7 of the Administrative Instructions under the PCT)) for the electronic filing and processing of international applications under the PCT.

Task No. 17. No action has been taken by the Electronic Data Processing and Exchange Standards (EDPES) Task Force on Task No. 17. The SDWG agreed to change the name of the Task to *Ongoing Electronic Data Processing and Exchange Standards Activities* following discussions on several items as proposed by the Secretariat for the EDPES Task Force.

Task No. 18. In January 2003, the Secretariat is requested to issue a circular in order to invite industrial property offices to reach an agreement on a revision of WIPO Standard ST.3 by correspondence.

Task No. 22. The Delegation of Germany drew the attention of the SDWG to the fact that the Patent Document Identification Task Force did not include the bar code item in its discussions when considering the impact of the new WIPO Standard ST.1 on WIPO Standard ST.10/B. To solve this problem the SDWG agreed to insert the following text at the end of paragraph 11 of WIPO Standard ST.10/B:

“The bar code has not been updated to incorporate the publication date in accordance with WIPO Standard ST.1 due to very limited use of bar codes by industrial property offices and other users. It is not expected that any additional users will be using bar codes in the future.”

Task No. 24. The Secretariat announced that a test exercise of a new Annual Technical Reports Management System was carried out in November 2002 with the collaboration of the Offices of Canada, Hungary, Lithuania and Spain. The test was recently completed and the Secretariat is in the process of studying the comments received from the participants.

Task No. 26. The SDWG agreed that the Secretariat would prepare a document concerning future revisions and updates of the WIPO *Handbook on Industrial Property Information and Documentation* for consideration by the SDWG at its second meeting in 2003. The document should point out the need for setting priorities, for determining the content, and for investigating new ways of updating the WIPO Handbook. It was noted by the SDWG that it may be necessary to establish a task force to further develop these concepts, and to determine their priorities. This document will serve as the basis for further discussions by the SDWG regarding the contents and the form of publication of the WIPO Handbook that is appropriate for the future.

Input from the IPC Committee of Experts of the International Patent Classification (IPC) Union is needed to ensure the timely update of IPC information in the WIPO Handbook well in advance of the introduction of the reformed IPC on January 1, 2005. The deadline for the inclusion of any such changes will be in December 2003 (i.e., the 2004 WIPO Handbook).

Task No. 29. This Task was considered as completed by the SDWG.

Task No. 30. The SDWG agreed to replace the word “demand” with the word “encourage” in paragraph II.(2).(b) of the description of the said Task.

12. With regard to the presentation made by the International Bureau concerning Task No. 13, the SDWG noted in particular that:

(i) the Annex F and Part 7 came into effect on January 7, 2002;

(ii) electronic filing development activities at various offices have been providing practical experience with the standard. In particular, the EPO had started electronic filing under the PCT on November 1, 2002. Likewise, a proof-of-concept for the standard and its associated implementations is underway at the International Bureau within the PCT-SAFE (Secure Applications Filed Electronically) Pilot project, which received its first filing (in both electronic and paper format, with the legally determinative copy being the paper version) on November 27, 2002;

(iii) a revised version of the technical standard will come into effect on December 12, 2002, containing a new change management procedure for Annex F¹;

(iv) thirteen Proposals For Change (PFCs) for Annex F have been received by the International Bureau. It is envisaged that a revised version of Annex F, taking into account the PFCs and their associated comments, will come into effect in March 2003.

13. The Delegation of the United States of America reported that the Trilateral/WIPO XML Working Group is preparing a proposal which will be made to the SCIT for setting up a new WIPO standard for Intellectual Property data that reuses the XML standards in Annex F.

14. The Representative for the International Federation of Industrial Property Attorneys (FICPI) stated its support for a generic data standard and encouraged the SDWG to continue in working towards the harmonization of electronic filing standards and their implementation.

15. The SDWG agreed not to take any action for the time being within the SCIT with regard to the planned transformation of the Annex F standard into a WIPO standard. Due consideration would be given to the scope of such a WIPO standard when deemed necessary.

¹ The change management procedure is supported by a website at:
http://www.wipo.int/pct/efiling_standard/en/welcome.html

(b) *Consideration of the requests for new tasks:*

Request for the revision of WIPO Standard ST.80 (Document SCIT/SDWG/2/3)

16. Following the introduction of document SCIT/SDWG/2/3, the International Bureau provided the SDWG with some general background information regarding The Hague Agreement Concerning the International Registration of Industrial Designs and the 1999 Act thereof.

17. During the discussions of this agenda item, the Delegation of Japan proposed to expand the scope of the task as requested in SCIT/SDWG/2/3 (i.e., the request to revise WIPO Standard ST.80 in view of the need for new INID codes arising from the implementation of the 1999 Act of The Hague Agreement) by discussing industrial design INID codes other than those directly related to The Hague Agreement.

18. The SDWG agreed:

(a) to create a task for the revision of WIPO Standard ST.80 in the framework of Task No. 33; and

(b) to establish a Task Force to handle such revision.

19. The SDWG welcomed the offer by the International Bureau to be leader of the Task Force.

Request for the revision and establishment of WIPO standards relating to trademarks (Document SCIT/SDWG/2/4)

20. Discussions were based on document SCIT/SDWG/2/4.

21. The Delegation of the Republic of Korea introduced the document, proposing to develop a series of trademark standards that were in parallel with the current WIPO standards for patents.

22. The Delegation of the United States of America expressed its concern over the proposal given the fact that the electronic processing of applications and other filings are significantly more advanced with respect to trademarks than patents, and many of the trademark offices represented at the SDWG already have highly sophisticated electronic trademark filing and processing systems in place. It was further indicated that spending the time and resources of the SDWG to develop standards relating to electronic trademark documents on the basis of paper-based patent standards seems much less critical for trademark offices than for patent offices. It was also noted that the development of standards for trademarks is being discussed in the context of the Madrid Protocol and Trademark Law Treaty and that external trademark data-element standards development could have a negative impact, particularly in the context of the Madrid Protocol. It was suggested that trademark standards in conflict with the requirements of the Madrid Protocol should be avoided.

23. Despite the opposition by the Delegation of the United States of America, there was widespread support for the proposal made by the Delegation of the Republic of Korea. The SDWG agreed that in the light of the concerns mentioned in the discussion, a Task Force should be established with mandate to prepare a detailed project brief elaborating the objectives of the task, a clear description of the need for each proposed standard and of the expected benefits of each proposed standard, as well as a prioritization of the list of proposed standards. This project brief should be ready for consideration by the SDWG at its session in December 2003.

24. The SDWG approved the establishment of such a Task Force with the mandate as described.

25. The SDWG welcomed the offer by the Korean Intellectual Property Office (KIPO) to be leader of the Task Force.

Agenda Item 5: Revision of WIPO Standard ST.6 (Task No. 29)
(Document SCIT/SDWG/2/5)

26. Following the introduction of document SCIT/SDWG/2/5 by the Secretariat, the Delegation of the United States of America, as leader of the WIPO Standard ST.6 Task Force, gave an oral progress report on the work carried out, and an overview of the revisions of WIPO Standards and the General Introduction to Part 7 of the WIPO *Handbook on Industrial Property Information and Documentation* that the WIPO Standard ST.6 Task Force proposed for approval by the Working Group.

27. The SDWG agreed to the revision of WIPO Standard ST.6 as reproduced in Annex III to this document.

28. The SDWG also agreed to the revisions of WIPO Standards ST.7/A and ST.10/B as reproduced in Annex IV to this document.

29. With respect to the proposal by the WIPO Standard ST.6 Task Force to revise paragraphs 8 to 11 of the General Introduction to Part 7 of the WIPO *Handbook on Industrial Property Information and Documentation*, the SDWG discussed an alternative proposal prepared by the Secretariat in consultation with the Chair and the Leader of the WIPO Standard ST.6 Task Force.

30. The SDWG agreed to the revision of paragraphs 8 to 11 of the General Introduction to Part 7 of the WIPO Handbook on Industrial Property Information and Documentation as given in Annex V to this document.

Agenda Item 6: Revision of WIPO Standard ST.10/C (Task No. 30)
(Document SCIT/SDWG/2/6)

31. The SDWG noted the report of the WIPO Standard ST.10/C Task Force as reproduced in document SCIT/SDWG/2/6.

32. The Delegation of Japan, as Task Force Leader, gave an oral progress report on the work carried out, the issues addressed and the agreements reached since the submission of the report contained in the said document.

33. In its progress report, the Task Force Leader highlighted the importance of revising, completing and updating the information provided in the Appendix to WIPO Standard ST.10/C in order to cover all the members of the Paris Convention and to include the presentation of both patents and utility models in the examples, as well as the application numbers assigned by receiving regional offices of a particular country in those cases where there is no uniform system established for assigning application numbers among the different receiving regional offices.

34. The SDWG agreed to replace the word “demand” with the word “encourage” in subparagraph 11(b) of Appendix 3 to document SCIT/SDWG/2/6, which should read:

“11(b) Industrial property offices should encourage and facilitate the compliance by applicants of paragraph 11(a) of WIPO Standard ST.10/C when providing the priority application number in subsequent filings.”

35. In accordance with the proposal made by the WIPO Standard ST.10/C Task Force regarding the revision of WIPO Standard ST.10/C to improve the quality of patent family data and to avoid confusion in the presentation of priority application numbers, the SDWG agreed on a two-phase process:

(i) the first phase consisting of a moderate and pragmatic solution and

(ii) a second phase with a standardized format solution.

36. During the first phase, the WIPO Standard ST.10/C Task Force will prepare a questionnaire on the revision and update of the Appendix to WIPO Standard ST.10/C that will be forwarded to the Secretariat for its distribution to the industrial property offices for its completion.

37. The Task Force will also complete a proposal concerning the recommendations set out in this standard along the lines suggested in Appendix 3 to document SCIT/SDWG/2/6.

38. In a second phase, the Task Force will present a proposal on a unified format for priority application numbers.

Agenda Item 7: Revision of WIPO standards which may require modification in view of the IPC Reform (Task No. 31) (Document SCIT/SDWG/2/7)

39. Referring to the report contained in document SCIT/SDWG/2/7, the Delegation of the European Patent Office, as Task Force Leader, made an oral progress report on the work carried out by the Task Force and on the agreements reached by the IPC Reform Working Group, at its session of November 2002, concerning the revision of IPC-related WIPO standards.

40. The SDWG noted the report of the WIPO Standards and International Patent Classification (IPC) Reform Task Force (WIPO Standard ST.8 Task Force) as reproduced in document SCIT/SDWG/2/7.

41. The SDWG supported the work done by the Task Force so far and the direction taken with regard to the mandate given to it by the SCIT Plenary.

Agenda Item 8: Establishment of an inventory of electronic data products produced by intellectual property Offices for the purpose of disseminating their intellectual property information (Task No. 32) (Document SCIT/SDWG/2/8)

42. The Delegation of Romania reported on the deliberations of the E-Products Inventory Task Force. As a result of these deliberations, the Romanian Office had developed a prototype E-Products Inventory system which was demonstrated by the Delegation to the SDWG.

43. The Delegation of Romania proposed that the system developed by the Task Force be supported by the International Bureau, possibly through the WIPONET Project, given its greater connectivity and computing platform resources.

44. During the discussions, concerns were raised as to how the International Bureau could support additional services without having participated in the deliberative or developmental process. More discussions ensued, demonstrating general support for the centralized system as developed. Concerns were also raised over the scope of the product inventory held in the system, and the degree to which users of the system and their queries would be monitored by system maintainers. It was generally agreed that users required anonymity, but information concerning the Member State administrators and their inventory control actions should be monitored.

45. *The SDWG agreed that:*

(i) *Task Force members would participate in a limited pre-production trial supported by the Romanian Office.*

(ii) *The SDWG would invite those Delegations not participating in the Task Force but who wish to participate in the pre-production trial to indicate their willingness to do so via an e-mail to the SCIT e-mail address.*

(iii) *The Task Force would prepare a report for the next session of the SDWG.*

Agenda Item 9: Report by the Secretariat on the progress made concerning Task No. 20 (Figurative elements of marks) (Document SCIT/SDWG/2/9)

46. Discussions were based on the document SCIT/SDWG/2/9.

47. *Noting the contents of the document and its two Annexes, the SDWG endorsed the next steps in the procedure as contained therein, namely, the detailed analysis of the collated results for the purpose of the determination of a recommendation as to how figurative elements of mark should be captured and displayed.*

48. The Delegations of France and the United States of America warned of the possibility that some respondents to the questionnaire may have misinterpreted some questions, their interventions referring in particular to responses to Questions 8(a), 8(b) and 8(c) of the questionnaire.

Agenda Item 10: Progress report by the Intellectual Property Digital Libraries (IPDL) Electronic Task Force on standards development (Task No. 10) (Document SCIT/SDWG/2/10)

49. As Task Force Leader, the Secretariat introduced document SCIT/SDWG/2/10, and informed the SDWG of the willingness of the IPDL Electronic Task Force to support the continuing processes outlined in this document, should the document be approved by the SDWG and later by the SCIT Plenary. The Secretariat informed the SDWG that a small budget had been made available for the calendar year 2003 for the activities outlined in SCIT/SDWG/2/10, pending the approval of the SDWG. The Secretariat outlined the activities to be undertaken by the IPDL Electronic Task Force and made the following recommendations:

(i) *Establishment of an IPDL Standards program as outlined in the First Workshop Report.*

Upon acceptance, the International Bureau shall begin work with the Task Force to implement the next six recommendations and will propose a IPDL Standards program for the next biennium.

(ii) *A basic, non-binding set of policies and standards should be developed and recommended to Member States desiring to participate in a global IPDL environment.*

The Task Force will begin work to bring a preliminary set of policy recommendations to the attention of the SDWG at the SDWG/3 meeting.

(iii) *A commitment to persistent identification and access for core IPDL collection objects is recommended.*

The Task Force will develop an example of a commitment statement for presentation at the SDWG/3 meeting.

(iv) *A standard specifying the mechanics and form of persistent identifiers should be adopted.*

The International Bureau shall prepare a comparison report with recommendations for review by the Task Force and presentation at the SDWG/4 meeting.

(v) *Establishment of a registry of IPDLs in the global IPDL system.*

The International Bureau shall prototype a simple implementation in cooperation with a small number of interested offices and report during the SDWG/4 meeting.

(vi) *Prototype Search and Retrieval.*

The International Bureau shall engage in research, experimentation and collaboration with interested Offices and report findings at the SDWG/4 meeting.

(vii) *Establishment of a standards validation process.*

The Task Force shall develop and propose a model as outlined in recommendation (7) of document SCIT/SDWG/2/10 to the SDWG at the SDWG/4 meeting.

50. In response to certain concerns raised with regard to recommendation (6) of document SCIT/SDWG/2/10 concerning the lack of availability of relevant comprehensive standards for use in IPDL search and retrieval, the Secretariat clarified the wording of the last sentence of the above-mentioned recommendation to indicate that it was not proposing to engage in new standards development in this area; rather that the intent of the sentence was to indicate the existence of various tradeoffs between the functionality of existing standards and their ease of implementation.

51. Several delegations then indicated that this was a useful report, showing progress in the right direction, and that technology issues were the best area for work to move forward, and that the Task Force should be given a mandate to investigate these matters at the first opportunity and with the full support of the SDWG.

52. The SDWG approved the recommendations as contained in SCIT/SDWG/2/10.

Agenda Item 11: Oral progress report by the Electronic Data Processing and Exchange Standards Task Force (EDPES) (Tasks Nos. 13, 17, 18 and 19)

53. The Secretariat informed the SDWG that due to the low level of participation by EDPES Task Force members, there was no substantive report on the activities of the Task Force. The Secretariat indicated that the nature of the work assigned to the EDPES Task Force required the extensive participation of individuals skilled in the area of electronic standards, preferably with active standards development experience, and with knowledge of information technology activities within the participating organization.

54. After a brief discussion on the above matter, the SDWG requested the Secretariat to:

(i) issue a circular inviting Offices to review their participation in the EDPES Task Force and if so required, make new appointments to the Task Force based upon a Task Force membership profile to be provided by the Secretariat and included in the circular;

(ii) attach an Annex to the SDWG Task List indicating each active Task Force, the tasks covered by each Task Force, and the individuals representing Member States participating in Task Force deliberations;

(iii) once a year, issue a circular containing updated information of the type indicated in sub-paragraph (ii), with an invitation to each addressee to reconsider their participation.

Agenda Item 12: Progress report by the European Patent Office on making accessible, through the EPIDOS Patent Register Service, information about the entry into the national (regional) phase of published PCT International Applications (Task No. 23)
(Document SCIT/SDWG/2/11)

55. The SDWG noted the status report made by the European Patent Office (EPO) on its progress in making accessible information concerning the entry into national (regional) phase of published PCT International Applications through the EPIDOS Patent Register Service (PRS).

56. The SDWG requested the Secretariat to issue a circular inviting those industrial property offices which have not started to submit their data to the EPO to do so. An annex to the said circular will indicate the technical requirements for the data delivery to the EPO.

57. The SDWG decided that a regular report to the SDWG on the progress of Task No. 23 should be submitted by the Secretariat every second year.

Agenda Item 13: Schedule of activities (Document SCIT/SDWG/2/12)

58. The SDWG agreed on the following timetable of meetings for the year 2003:

<i>May 5 to 9, 2003</i>	<i>Third session of the SDWG(SCIT/SDWG/3)</i>
<i>December 1 to 5, 2003</i>	<i>Fourth session of the SDWG(SCIT/SDWG/4).</i>

59. The draft of this report was sent to the participants to the second session of the SDWG for comments.

60. The report was adopted by the SDWG.

[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

Nor-Eddine BENFREHA, conseiller, Mission permanente, Genève

Mohamed CHABAWE, conseiller, Mission permanente, Genève

ALLEMAGNE/GERMANY

Hubert ROTHE, Head, 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

AUSTRALIE/AUSTRALIA

Andrew GUILD, Project Manager Systems, New Patent Solution Project, IP Australia, Woden

BÉLARUS/BELARUS

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

BULGARIE/BULGARIA

Radoslava DENEVA (Mrs.), Head, Information, Publication Activity and IP State Registers Department, Bulgarian Patent Office, Sofia

Ivanka TONEVA (Mrs.), Principal Expert, Information, Publication Activity and IP State Registers Department, Bulgarian Patent Office, Sofia

CANADA

John ROMBOUTS, Technical Architect, Canadian Intellectual Property Office, Hull

CHINE/CHINA

BU Fang, Deputy Director General, Automation Department, State Intellectual Property Office of the People's Republic of China, Beijing

COLOMBIE/COLOMBIA

Luís Gerardo GUZMÁN VALENCIA, Ministro Consejero, Misión Permanente, Ginebra

COSTA RICA

Alejandro SOLANO, Minister Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva

CROATIE/CROATIA

Vesna CERNELC-MARJANOVIC (Mrs.), Head of IT & D, State Intellectual Property Office, Zagreb

Tatjana PLEŠA (Mrs.), Information Technology Centre, State Intellectual Property Office, Zagreb

EGYPTE/EGYPT

Assem ALI, Technical Examiner, Egyptian Patent Office, Cairo

ESPAGNE/SPAIN

Ignacio MUÑOZ OZORES, Jefe del Servicio de Documentación, Departamento de Patentes e Información Tecnológica, Oficina Española de Patentes y Marcas, Madrid

ÉTATS UNIS D'AMÉRIQUE/UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Edmond RISHHELL, International Liaison Staff, Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C.

Bruce COX, Senior Advisor for XML Technologies, System Development and Maintenance Office of the Chief Information Officer, Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C.

Dominic KEATING, Intellectual Property Attaché, Permanent Mission, Geneva

FÉDÉRATION DE RUSSIE/RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Olga I. SEROVA (Mrs.), Principal Specialist, International Relations Department, Russian Agency for Patents and Trademarks (ROSPATENT), Moscow

Valeria MAKSIMOVA (Mrs.), Deputy Head Information, Resources Development Department, Federal Institute of Industrial Property (FIPS), Moscow

FRANCE

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

GUATEMALA

Andrés WYLD, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

HONGRIE/HUNGARY

Éva BAKOS (Mrs.), Deputy Director, Industrial Property Information and Education Centre, Hungarian Patent Office, Budapest

Zsuzsanna TÖRÖCSIK (Mrs.), Deputy Head, Information Technology Department, Hungarian Patent Office, Budapest

INDE/INDIA

Preeti SARAN (Mrs.), Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva

INDONÉSIE/INDONESIA

Andi NOORSAMAN SOMMENG, Director of Information Technology, Directorate General of Intellectual Property Rights, Jakarta

IRLANDE/IRELAND

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

JAPON/JAPAN

Yoshihiro FUJI, Deputy Director, Patent Information Promotion Policy Office, Patent Information Division, Japan Patent Office, Tokyo

Hirofumi MURAMORI, Assistant Director, Information Systems Affairs Division, Information Technology Planning Office, Japan Patent Office, Tokyo

LITUANIE/LITHUANIA

Saulé DAUKUVIENÉ (Ms.), Chief Specialist, Industrial Property Information, State Patent Bureau, Vilnius

NIGÉRIA/NIGERIA

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

NORVÈGE/NORWAY

Freddy STROMMEN, Head, Administrative Support Section, Trademark, Patent and Design, Norwegian Patent Office, Oslo

POLOGNE/POLAND

Richard KARCZEWSKI, IT Specialist, Informatics Department, Polish Patent Office, Warsaw

PORTUGAL

Maria Luísa ARAÚJO (Mme), chef de département, Institut national de la propriété industrielle (INPI), Lisbonne

José Sérgio DE CALHEIROS DA GAMA, conseiller juridique, Mission permanente, Genève

RÉPUBLIQUE DE CORÉE/REPUBLIC OF KOREA

YUN Young-Woo, Deputy Director, Information Planning Division, Korean Industrial Property Office, Taejon

HWANG Eun-Taek, Deputy Director, Information Planning Division, Korean Industrial Property Office, Taejon

AHN, Jae-Hyun, Intellectual Property Attaché, Permanent Mission, Geneva

ROUMANIE/ROMANIA

Bogdan BORESCHIEVICI, Director, National Patent Library, Information Systems, State Office for Inventions and Trademarks (OSIM), Bucharest

Adriana ATĂNĂSOAIE (Mrs.), Head, IT Section, State Office for Inventions and Trademarks (OSIM), Bucharest

ROYAUME-UNI/UNITED KINGDOM

Geoff COURT, Personnel & Pay Policy, The Patent Office, Newport

SAINT-SIÈGE/HOLY SEE

Diarmuid MARTIN, Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission, Geneva

SUEDE/SWEDEN

Kerstin BERGSTRÖM (Mrs.), Head, Patent Information Division, Swedish Patent and Registration Office, Stockholm

SUISSE/SWITZERLAND

Roland TSCHUDIN, chef, séminaires, Institut fédéral de la propriété intellectuelle, Berne

THAÏLANDE/THAILAND

Supark PRONGTHURA, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

II. ORGANISATIONS INTERGOUVERNEMENTALES/
INTERGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

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

Hamidou KONE, chef, Service informatique et statistique, Yaoundé

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

Marc KRIER, Director, Applied Research and Development, Rijswijk

Graham DAY, Directorate 4.1.7, Development and Maintenance, Rijswijk

Georg PANTOGLOU, Director, Co-operation Programmes and INPADOC, Vienna
Sub-Office, Vienna

Johannes KIESBAUER, Director, Publications, Vienna

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

Jean-Marie PUTZ, IT Manager, La Haye

III. ORGANISATION NON GOUVERNEMENTALE
NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATION

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

IV. BUREAU/OFFICERS

Président/Chair: Hubert ROTHE (Allemagne/Germany)

Vice-présidents/Vice-Chairs: Jean-François LESPRIT (France)
Claudio R. TREIGUER (Brésil/Brazil)

Secrétaire/Secretary: Neil WILSON (OMPI/WIPO)

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

Division des services informatiques/Information Technology Services Division:
Neil WILSON (chef/Head); Angel LÓPEZ SOLANAS (chef, Service des normes et de la documentation/Head, Standards and Documentation Service); James FULLTON (conseiller principal/Senior Counsellor); Roger HOLBERTON (analyste-programmeur principal/Senior Analyst-Programmer, Applications Development and Support Section Business Applications Unit)

Division des projets informatiques/Information Technology Projects Division: Karl KALEJS (chef de projet, Groupe des dépôts électroniques/Project Manager, Electronic Filing Unit)

Département des marques, des dessins et modèles industriels et des indications géographiques/ Trademarks, Industrial Designs and Geographical Indications Department : Grégoire BISSON (chef, Section des enregistrements internationaux de dessins et modèles industriels et des projets spéciaux/Head, International Industrial Designs Registrations and Special Projects 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. Inventory of SDWG Tasks
 - (a) Consideration of the SDWG Task List
See document SCIT/SDWG/2/2.
 - (b) Consideration of the requests for new tasks
See documents SCIT/SDWG/2/3 and SCIT/SDWG/2/4.
5. Revision of WIPO Standard ST.6 (Task No. 29)
 - (a) WIPO Standard ST.6 Task Force oral progress report by the Task Leader
 - (b) Proposal by the WIPO Standard ST.6 Task Force on the revision of WIPO Standard ST.6
See document SCIT/SDWG/2/5.
6. Revision of WIPO Standard ST.10/C (Task No. 30)
 - (a) WIPO Standard ST.10/C Task Force oral progress report by the Task Leader
 - (b) Proposal by the WIPO Standard ST.10/C Task Force on the revision of WIPO Standard ST.10/C
See document SCIT/SDWG/2/6.
7. Revision of WIPO standards which may require modification in view of the IPC Reform (Task No. 31)
 - (a) WIPO Standards and IPC Reform Task Force oral progress report by the Task Leader
 - (b) Proposal(s) by WIPO Standards and IPC Reform Task Force on the revision of WIPO Standards
See document SCIT/SDWG/2/7.

8. Establishment of an inventory of electronic data products produced by intellectual property Offices for the purpose of disseminating their intellectual property information (Task No. 32)
 - (a) E-Products Inventory Task Force oral progress report by the Task Leader
 - (b) Proposal(s) by the E-Products Inventory Task Force on the Inventory
See document SCIT/SDWG/2/8.
9. Report by the Secretariat on the progress made concerning Task No. 20 (Figurative elements of marks)
See document SCIT/SDWG/2/9.
10. Progress report by the IPDL Electronic Task Force on standards development (Task No. 10)
See document SCIT/SDWG/2/10.
11. Oral progress report by the Electronic Data Processing and Exchange Standards Task Force (Tasks Nos. 13, 17, 18 and 19)
12. Progress report by the European Patent Office on making accessible, through the EPIDOS Patent Register Service, information about the entry into the national (regional) phase of published PCT International Applications (Task No. 23)
See document SCIT/SDWG/2/11.
13. Schedule of activities
See document SCIT/SDWG/2/12.
14. Summary of discussions by the Chair
15. Closing of the session

[Annex III follows]

ANNEX III

REVISION OF WIPO STANDARD ST.6

1. Revision of paragraph 3 of WIPO Standard ST.6 adopted by the SCIT Standards and Documentation Working Group at its second session on December 6, 2002:

Insert the following reference to WIPO Standard ST.1:

WIPO Standard ST.1 Recommendation Concerning the Minimum Data Elements Required to Uniquely Identify a Patent Document;

2. Revision of paragraph 13 of WIPO Standard ST.6 adopted by the SCIT Standards and Documentation Working Group at its second session on December 6, 2002:

13. The following recommendations are made to give guidance to industrial property offices wishing to change their present numbering systems or to start new numbering systems for published patent documents:

- (a) the publication number should consist of digits (i.e., numerals) only;
- (b) the total number of digits, subject to a maximum of 13, is to be determined by each industrial property office according to its needs. The number of digits should be as short as possible to satisfy those needs;
- (c) the number given to a published patent document (first-level publication according to WIPO Standard ST.16) should increase in a numerical sequence within a given year or longer period of time;
- (d) the number given to a second or subsequent published patent document resulting from an application should be the same number as that given to the first published patent document resulting from that application; for example, 1/2002/000002 would be used for the first level publication (e.g., 18 month publication of an application), for the granted patent publication and for any corrections resulting from a single application and its publications. For complete identification of a patent document, see WIPO Standard ST.1;
- (e) the number should only be used for patent documents resulting from a single application. For example, in the case where the same numbering sequence is used for more than one type of industrial property right (e.g., patent for invention and utility model) or more than one regional office within a country or organization, then the same publication number should not be used more than once:
 - (i) to establish sufficiently unique document numbers, offices may use additional identifiers of one or two digits, e.g. for the designation of the type of Industrial Property Right or the Regional Office, if necessary. Any additional identifiers must be considered to be included within the maximum number of digits as set forth in paragraph 13(b) above. WIPO Standard ST.16 codes, when used as recommended by WIPO Standard ST.1, provide the recommended way of providing publication level information. WIPO Standard ST.16 also provides information on some types of industrial property rights when related only to patent documents;
 - (ii) where an application spawns additional applications (e.g. an application claiming domestic priority, a continuation of a prior application, a divisional application, etc.), these additional application(s) should be considered to be separate application(s) and thus should be assigned different publication number(s);

(f) if found suitable, the year of publication of the patent document may form part of the publication number; in that case, the publication number may be formed by a year, the serial number and if required, an additional identifier as provided for in subparagraph (e):

(i) in case of a year, the year should be represented by four digits according to the Gregorian calendar and preceding the serial number;

(ii) in case of a serial number it is recommended that a maximum of seven digit serial number be unique, in the sense of subparagraph (e), for all patent document publications;

- (iii) the order of the components should be:
- a. the identifier, if necessary;
 - b. the year, if found suitable;
 - c. the serial number;

(g) for the sake of readability of a publication number, when presented in visual form:

(i) the identifier, year designation and serial number may be separated from each other by a slash or a dash;

(ii) the serial number may have additional digit grouping through the use of commas, or dots, or spaces.

Examples of presentation of publication numbers according to this recommendation:

2001-12345	2001/12345		
2001/1234567	2001/1,234,567	2001/1.234.567	2001/1 234 567
1234567890	1,234,567,890	1.234.567.890	1 234 567 890

If different types of industrial property rights share a number sequence:

2003/123456 for a patent for invention
 2003/123457 for a utility model publication
 2003/123458 for a design patent, etc.

or, where there is an overlap in the number sequence between different types of industrial property rights and an additional identifier is used to establish uniqueness, e.g., 10 for a patent for invention, 20 a utility model, 30 a design patent:

10/2003/123456 for a patent for invention
 20/2003/123456 for a utility model publication
 30/2003/123456 for a design patent, etc.

or, where there is an overlap in the number sequence between different regional offices within a country or organization and an identifier is used to establish uniqueness:

1/2003/1234567 for a patent for invention from Region A using 1 as an identifier
 2/2003/1234567 for a patent for invention from Region B using 2 as an identifier

[Annex IV follows]

ANNEXIV

REVISION OF WIPO STANDARD ST.7/A AND ST.10/B

WIPO STANDARD ST.7/A

1. Revision of title of WIPO Standard ST.7/A adopted by the SCIT Standards and Documentation Working Group at its second session on December 6, 2002:

Title – Add a reference to a footnote explaining the potential conflict with WIPO Standard ST.6. The footnote itself will be provided at the end of the Standard following paragraph 25.

8–UPAPER TURE CARD MICROFORM¹

¹ This Standard has not been updated to incorporate revisions to WIPO Standard ST.6 due to very limited use of this media by industrial property offices. It is not expected that any additional offices will be providing data on this media in the future.

2. Revision of paragraph 18 of WIPO Standard ST.7/A adopted by the SCIT Standards and Documentation Working Group at its second session on December 6, 2002:

Paragraph 18 – Add a reference to the same footnote.

4–15 document number according to WIPO Standard ST.6¹ (or ST.13 if application numbers are used as publication numbers)

3. Revision of paragraph 19 of WIPO Standard ST.7/A adopted by the SCIT Standards and Documentation Working Group at its second session on December 6, 2002:

Paragraph 19 – Add a reference to the same footnote.

19. As a consequence of amending the punch fields to indicate the document number, the publication date and the symbol of the International Patent Classification, columns 36 to 52 of the punch field reserved for free punching by the receiving office will be reduced to columns 49 to 52¹.

WIPO STANDARD ST.10/B

1. Revision of paragraph 11(b) of WIPO Standard ST.10/B adopted by the SCIT Standards and Documentation Working Group at its second session on December 6, 2002:

11(b) the publication number of the patent document as given by the publishing authority in accordance with WIPO Standard ST.6 (13 character positions in the barcode).

2. Revision of paragraph 14 of WIPO Standard ST.10/Adopted by the SCIT Standards and Documentation Working Group at its second session on December 6, 2002:

14. For industrial property offices intending to change their present numbering systems or to start new numbering systems for published patent documents or applications (in case application numbers are used as publication numbers), it is recommended that the barcode consist of 19 characters.

Position	Description
1	Start/stop code(*) ⁽¹⁾ ;
2,3	ST.3 code
4,5	Reserved for offices that intend to indicate, according to WIPO Standard ST.6, a one or two -digit identifier. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If only a one -digit identifier is used, position 4 should be left blank, i.e., coded as a "space" character according to Table I, and position 5 should be reserved for the identifier. • If such an identifier is not indicated at all, positions 4 and 5 should be left blank.
4,5 (only for situations where the application number is also used as the publication number)	Position 4 –Should always be left blank, i.e., be coded as a "space" character according to Table I. Position 5 –Reserved for offices that intend to indicate, according to WIPO Standard ST.13, the type of industrial property right as part of the application number by a letter code. If such a letter code is not indicated, position 5 should also be left blank.
6–16	a) Remainder of the publication number (11 remaining characters according to WIPO Standard ST.6, i.e., 4 -digit year and 7 -digit serial number), or b) Application number used as the publication number (11 characters according to WIPO Standard ST.13).
17,18	ST.16 code
19	Start/stop code(*) ⁽¹⁾

If the document number, which is represented by characters in positions 6 through 16, is less than 11 characters, it should be zero filled to the left, e.g., *CC●●00000679439B5*. If the document number contains a year designation of four digits preceding the serial number and the serial number has less than seven digits, it should be zero filled to the left of the serial number, e.g., *CC●●20010012345A1*. If the ST.16 code does not include a digit in the second position, a space should be coded, e.g., *CC●●20010012345A●*⁽²⁾.

⁽¹⁾ The start/stop code in the standard "Bar Code 39" font is normally represented by the human -readable character "39".

⁽²⁾ In these examples a dot indicates a blank position (a "space" character according to Table I).

3. Revisionofparagraph16ofWIPOStandardST.10/AdoptedbytheSCITStandards andDocumentationWorkingGroupatitssecondsessiononDecember6,2002:

16. Examplesofbarcodedataaccordingtoparagraphs14and15,above,areshown below:⁽³⁾

- (a)
- | | |
|---------------------|---|
| *CC●●00002540533B1* | (publicationnumberaccordingtoWIPOStandardST.6) |
| *CC●220030654321A1* | (publicationnumberaccordingtoWIPOStandardST.6) |
| *CC3020031234567B1* | (publicationnumberaccordingtoWIPOStandardST.6) |
| *CC●●20001234567A1* | (applicationnumberaccordingtoWIPOStandardST.13) |
| *CC●a20001234567A1* | (applicationnumberaccordingtoWIPOStandardST.13) |

[AnnexVfollows]

⁽³⁾ Intheseexamplesadotindicatesablankposition(a“space”characteraccordingtoTableI).

ANNEX V

GENERAL INTRODUCTION TO PART 7 OF THE WIPO HANDBOOK

Revision of paragraphs 8 to 11 of the General Introduction to Part 7 of the WIPO *Handbook on Industrial Property Information and Documentation* adopted by the SCIT Standards and Documentation Working Group at its second session on December 6, 2002:

Survey of Numbering Systems

8. In order to better understand the “Survey of Numbering Systems Used, or Intended to Be Used, by Industrial Property Offices with Regard to Applications, Published Documents and Registered Rights,” reproduced in Section 7.5, it is recommended to consult WIPO Standards [ST.13](#) and [ST.6](#), which set out recommended formats for the numbering of applications for patents, supplementary protection certificates, industrial designs and layout-designs of integrated circuits and for the numbering of published patent documents, respectively.

9. The Survey of numbering systems mentioned in paragraph 8, above, shows examples of forms of presentation of application numbers (see Table I) and publication and/or registration numbers (see Table II) of many countries. The examples do not show for each industrial property office all of the components which are needed to uniquely identify an application or a published patent document. Users are recommended to consult WIPO Standards [ST.13](#) or [ST.6](#) when in doubt about the correctness of an application or publication number.

10. As a general rule, one can say that the following three elements are needed to uniquely identify a patent application: the two-letter code according to WIPO Standard [ST.3](#) for the identification of the issuing office or organization, a set of two or four digits to indicate the year (or the range of years) of filing of the application and a serial number given to the individual application. In addition to those elements, some offices indicate the type of industrial property right by using letter codes or numerical codes as part of the number.

11. The complete identification of a published document usually comprises four elements, namely: the two-letter code of the issuing office or organization according to WIPO Standard ST.3, a document number according to WIPO Standard ST.6 of up to 13 digits, the kind-of-document code according to WIPO Standard ST.16 to indicate the publication level, and (in some cases) the date of publication of the document as provided by WIPO Standard ST.9 INID codes (40) through (48). The publication numbers of some offices contain, as part of the second element, an indication of the year of publication of the patent document. See WIPO Standard ST.1 for further details regarding unique identification of patent documents.

[End of Annex V and of document]