

WIPO



SCIT/SDWG/3/9
ORIGINAL: English
DATE: May 6, 2003

WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION
GENEVA

STANDING COMMITTEE ON INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES STANDARDS AND DOCUMENTATION WORKING GROUP

Third Session
Geneva, May 5 to 8, 2003

REPORT

Adopted by the Working Group

INTRODUCTION

1. The Standards and Documentation Working Group (SDWG) of the Standing Committee on Information Technologies (SCIT) held its third session from May 5 to 8, 2003.
2. The following Member States of WIPO and/or the Paris Union were represented at the session: Bulgaria, Croatia, Germany, France, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Lithuania, Mexico, Morocco, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom and United States of America (23).
3. Representatives of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the International Telecommunication Union (ITU), the African Intellectual Property Organization (OAPI), the Benelux Trademark Office (BBM), the European Patent Office (EPO), the Eurasian Patent Organization (EAPO) and the European Community (EC) (7) took part in the session in a member capacity.
4. Representatives of the following organizations took part in the session in an observer capacity: International Federation of Industrial Property Attorneys (FICPI), World Conservation Union (IUCN) and Association Bouregreg (BOUREGREG) (3).

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

Agenda Item 1: Opening of the Session

6. The session was opened by Mr. Allan Roach, Chief Information Officer (CIO) and Director, Information Technology Projects Division, who welcomed the participants on behalf of the Director General.

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

7. The SDWG unanimously elected Mr. Leif Stolt (Sweden) as Chair and Mr. Bogdan Boreschievici (Romania) and Mr. YUN Young -Woo (KIPO) as Vice -Chairs.

8. Mr. Allan Roach acted as Secretary of the session.

Agenda Item 3: Adoption of the Agenda

9. The agenda was adopted as it appeared in document SCIT/SDWG/3/1.

Agenda Item 4: Oral Progress Report by the Task Leader on the Revision of WIPO Standard ST.80 (Task No. 33/1)

10. In introducing the oral progress report on the revision of WIPO Standard ST.80, the Task Force Leader recalled the creation of the task based upon the need for new codes for Internationally agreed Number s for the Identification of (bibliographic) Data (INID) in anticipation of the entry into force of the 1999 Act of The Hague Agreement. The basic proposals submitted to the Task Force were designed to facilitate the introduction of new codes or the revision of existing codes in order to ensure that the International Bureau could, when necessary, carry out a clear publication of the announcements to be made under the 1999 Act. As such, the proposal focused on category (80) codes, and to a lesser extent, the category (60) codes within ST.80. Following publication of a number of draft recommendations, comments had been received from eight of the 14 Task Force members. As no comments were received in relation to category (60) codes, it was assumed that they were endorsed by the Task Force. However, some editorial comments had been received with regard to the proposal concerning category (80) with respect to the -numbering of certain codes. Accordingly a amended proposal had been submitted to the Task Force in mid -April 2003 and had been endorsed thereafter. Thus, it was planned that the Task Force would be able to make its final proposal for approval by the next meeting of the SDWG.

11. In finalizing its proposals for the revision of ST.80, the Task Force Leader stated that a number of issues remained to be resolved. Firstly, as the project brief stated as a possible secondary objective the facilitation of the presentation of international deposits of industrial design in electronic databases, a proposal for the creation of a new category (90) codes was submitted to the Task Force. In reaction to this proposal however, the Office for Harmonization in the Internal Market (Trade Marks and Designs) (OHIM) had declared that it also intended to develop and use a new category (90) to answer its own needs. Secondly, three Offices represented in the Task Force had informed the Secretariat that they intended to

make proposals to the Task Force on their needs with regard to publications under WIPO Standard ST.80. Recognizing the potential for conflict among the various parties interested in the revision of ST.80, some members of the Task Force had also indicated that it would be timely to consider moving the standard from two to three digits. Finally, representatives of administrations that were not familiar with the concept of industrial designs, but rather with that of design patents stressed the need to coordinate any radical revision of WIPO Standard ST.80 with an analogous revision of WIPO Standard ST.9.

12. In assessing the number of new requests being received by the Task Force, a question had arisen between the incompatibility of conducting a thorough but lengthy review of ST.80 and the requirement to produce a suitable version of the standard prior to the entry into force of the 1999 Act of The Hague Agreement. The Task Force Leader therefore, proposed that the Task Force focus its work only on the proposals concerning categories (60) and (80) and that the SDWG give consideration to the need for an in-depth revision of WIPO Standard ST.80 in due course, under the leadership of an appropriate Task Leader. The in-depth review could also take into account a suggestion previously received from, notably, the United States Patent and Trademark Office that the related WIPO Standard ST.9 should be examined for possible revision.

13. The Delegation of the United States of America reiterated its position that before any final decision was taken regarding the exclusive revision of categories (60) and (80) under WIPO Standard ST.80, it was necessary to look at others similar INID codes, e.g., those covered under WIPO Standard ST.9. Therefore, the work of the Task Force should be extended to cover the provision of guidance on ST.9, INID codes and bibliographic items to be provided on design patent documents. The Delegation supported the in-depth revision of ST.80, the inclusion of ST.9, the expansion to a three-digit code and, where possible, that the creation of codes for bibliographic items provided in ST.80 and ST.9 should be consistent.

14. The Delegation of France said that the situation was indeed complex and that there was a need to review in more detail the current status as well as the proposals made by OHIM. The Delegation recalled that the proposal to expand to three-digit codes had been discussed with reluctance during previous meetings but that now the issue had been raised again. Therefore, it would be necessary for the SDWG to return to this matter at its next meeting and to decide then if a new Task Force was required and, if so, how its mandate would be defined.

15. In agreeing to consider, at its next meeting, the work of the Task Force on ST.80 in more detail, the SDWG requested that the report of the Task Force to that meeting include a number of specific points: a final proposal for the revision of category (60) and (80) INID codes under ST.80 needed to facilitate the timely implementation of the 1999 Act of The Hague Agreement; with a recommendation on the impact, if any, of these proposed changes on ST.9; the potential need for the creation of a new set of category (90) INID codes; and the need to extend the mandate of the Task Force to consider *inter alia* specific questions related to the expansion of the two-digit INID code, the need to include a parallel revision of ST.9 and the identification of a possible new Task Leader for this work.

Agenda Item 5: Revision of WIPO Standard ST.10/C (Task No. 30)

(Document SCIT/SDWG/3/2)

16. In introducing document SCIT/SDWG/3/2, the Secretariat recalled that the two -phase approaches suggested in the paper was the result of proposals submitted by the ST.10/C Task Force regarding the revision of WIPO Standard ST.10/C to improve the quality of patent family data and the presentation of priority application numbers. During the first phase, it was planned to undertake a revision and updating of the Appendix to ST.10/C, and a proposal concerning the revision of the recommendations set out in this Standard. In the second phase, the Working Group would receive a proposal from the Task Force on a unified format for priority application numbers. On January 29, 2003, the JPO as Task Force Leader, had submitted to the Secretariat two questionnaires concerning the revision and update of the Appendix to ST.10/C for distribution to and completion by Industrial Property Offices. Unfortunately however, it had not been possible to distribute these questionnaires before mid-April, 2003.

17. In its oral report as Task Leader, the Delegation of Japan said that significant progress had been made since the last meeting of the SDWG. Two different questionnaires and letters entitled "Maintenance of the tables in the Appendix to WIPO Standard ST.10/C (SDW GTask No. 30)" were now available on the WIPO website. The introduction to the questionnaire contained a list of the problem that it was intended to resolve and it had been decided to produce two versions to serve the different needs of the two distinct groups of targeted Intellectual Property Offices (IPOs) i.e., those that were already listed in the tables of the ST.10/C Appendix and those that were members of the Paris Convention but were not listed in the Appendix to the standard. In the case of the former, the purpose of the questionnaire was to ask IPOs to verify the accuracy of the information contained in the Appendix tables. In both cases, the aim of the document had been to emphasize with IPOs the importance of the Standard ST.10/C and to encourage them to complete and update the Appendix tables as appropriate. Following the delay in the distribution of the questionnaires it is expected that the Task Force will be able to report to the next session of the SDWG on its findings.

18. The Delegation of the Republic of Korea, in recalling the objective of the Task Force to provide a unified format for priority application numbers, cautioned the meeting that consideration would need to be given to the differing types of industrial property rights and the needs of regional receiving offices, before agreement on a unified format would be possible.

19. The Representative of the European Patent Organisation (EPO) agreed that there was a need to consider the question of industrial property rights and a method for ensuring their unique identification. The Task Force Leader stated that this issue would be firstly discussed at the forthcoming Task Force meeting and would be included in ongoing Task Force discussions.

Agenda Item 6: Revision of WIPO Standards which may require Modification in view of the IPC Reform (Task No. 31)

(Document SCIT/SDWG/3/3)

20. As Task Leader for SDWG Task No. 31, the Representative of the EPO began by introducing document SCIT/SDWG/3/3, for a revised WIPO Standard ST.8 and amendments to be made to WIPO Standards ST.10/B and ST.10/C, intended to bring the Standards into

line with the program of IPC reform. The SDWG regretted the late submission of the document which was only available in the English language but agreed to consider it, recognizing the time pressure to agree there revised standards in time for national offices to implement the necessary changes to their automation systems prior to the revised IPC coming into force on January 1, 2005. The Representative of the EPO stated that the proposals for revision had been produced in close cooperation with the Working Group on IPC reform and in informal consultations with members of the SCIT Electronic Data Processing and Exchange Standards (EDP ES) Task Force.

21. The Delegation of the United States of America recommended that the proposed revision to WIPO Standards ST.8, ST.10/B and ST.10/C be adopted as soon as possible. WIPO, the EPO and individual Intellectual Property Offices should need to prepare for the storing, printing, displaying and use of this data. As the Delegation had previously suggested, if the EDPESTask Force could provide input soon (i.e. at the current SDWG meeting or within one month from the meeting), then perhaps the standards, as currently revised, could be finalized and adopted by correspondence so that a delay till adoption by the next session of the SDWG would be avoided. The Delegation also suggested that, if the XML portion of the WIPO Standard ST.8 needed more consideration, then the SDWG could adopt the current draft of the Standard as phase I of a two-phase revision process for the whole Standard. Phase II would provide the XML version produced by the EDPESTask Force. The Delegation looked to the Secretariat to suggest a way to proceed to make this phased approach possible. Finally, the Delegation said that the need for approval of at least the current versions of ST.8 and the related changes to ST.10/C was critical to all national offices. The XML revisions would also be equally important to many Intellectual Property Offices.

Revision of WIPO Standard ST.8

22. The Representative of the EPO recalled that the approach taken had been to revise WIPO Standard ST.8 while maintaining the previous format of fixed fields represented in a table, so as to facilitate, to the greatest extent possible, a smooth transition for IPOs between the old and new formats. The alternative, raised by the EDPESTask Force, for an eXtensible Markup Language (XML) based standard had been set aside for a later phase on the basis that it represented too radical a change and was not likely to be acceptable to all IPOs on short term. With regard to the specific changes in the new working document, the Representative of the EPO gave the following explanations:

- Paragraph 3: the value X was removed from the table as the IPC Reform Group had decided to remove the possibility of the X notation as a means of inventing a new class or symbol if an examiner is unable to identify the correct place for an invention;
- Paragraph 3, position 9: the use of the "slash as a separator" was specified as one possible value for a separating character;
- Paragraph 3, position 40: insertion of the word "data" for reasons of consistency;
- Paragraph 7, position 28: insertion of the words "each subject matter" in the first line to add a clarification from the previous version of the text;
- Paragraph 7, positions 31 - 38: the format for specifying dates was standardized;

- Paragraph 7, position 40: the IPC Reform Group had agreed on the use of automatic classification, therefore, the decision to include the word “document” in the last bullethad been taken to make the text more general; and

Paragraph 9: deleted to remove reference to X notations.

23. The SDWG, in agreeing to the textual changes proposed by the Task Force Leaders as shown above also agreed the following amendments proposed by other delegations:

- Paragraph 7, position 28: in the second sentence, the deletion of the words “ or gives other broad classifications to documents ”;
- Paragraph 7, position 39: to be amended to read “ *Original data is the first data allotted to the document. In the case of a publishing office assigning classification symbol at the core level, another office may also assign advanced level symbols as original data.* ”;
- Paragraph 7, positions 41 -42: the first sentence to be amended to read, “ *Since part of the original data in the advanced level and the reclassified data can be delivered by offices other than the publishing office, the information source of such data is recorded by a field of two characters* ”; and
- Example: the dates contained in the example and the record were amended to read “ *Int. Cl. (2005), B28B1/29(2006.03), H05B3/18(2007.06)* ”.

24. In line with the agreement on the revised method of report adoption by the SDWG, it was agreed that, the finalized text of the revised ST. 8 would be published by the Secretariat, as soon as possible, on its web site at <http://www.wipo.int/scit/en/meeting/sdwg/3/technical/annexes.htm>.

25. In concluding the debate on the revision of ST. 8, the SDWG agreed on the date of January 1, 2005 as the date when the amended standard should come into force. This would allow the standard to be implemented in coordination with the IPC Reform effort. With regard to the issue of how to manage two versions of ST. 8 in the interim (the existing and revised versions) it was agreed that the revised version would be published to Member States with an annex containing the existing standard and an editorial note inviting IPOs to transfer to the new version as soon as possible, but in particular for all classifications of applications with a publication date from January 1, 2005 onwards.

Revision of WIPO Standard ST. 10/B

26. The SDWG agreed the proposed amendment to paragraph 5(e) of WIPO Standard ST. 10/B as contained in the Appendix II to document SCIT/SDWG/3/3.

Revision of WIPO Standard ST.10/C

27. The Representative of the EPO drew the attention of the SDWG to two amendments in the revised working document concerning the amendments to WIPO Standard ST.10/C:

Paragraph 2: to be amended to read “ ... *The version indicator (year) has to be placed in round brackets after the abbreviation “Int. Cl.”, if the set of IPC symbols on the document includes at least one core level symbol.* ” The reason for this change being that if the document only includes advanced level symbols then the year and the month is published after the advanced level classification symbol, so there is no need to refer to the core level IPC edition; and

Paragraph 3, example: the dates contained in the example were amended to read “*Int. Cl. (2005), B28B1/29(2006.03), H05B3/18(2007.06)* ”.

28. The agreed revised text of WIPO Standards ST.10/B and ST.10/C will be made available to delegates on the WIPO website contained in paragraph 22, above.

29. In concluding its report on this item, the Representative of the EPO reminded the Working Group that the standard did not deal with issues of exceptional cases and that it was the responsibility of each IPO to determine how to manage these cases. The Task Force recognized that standardization in exceptional cases was impossible and that the Standard had been developed so as to deal only with the majority of cases, where the front page would fit on a single page.

30. With regard to the implementation of the new version of ST.10/C, a number of delegations raised the issue of synchronization with the work of the SCIT Task Force on the revision of ST.10/C, headed by the JPO. The Working Group concluded that, in this particular case, the publication of a revised WIPO Standard ST.10/C twice in one year could not be avoided and would prevent any conflict with the work of the ST.10/C Task Force. Finally, the SDWG agreed that the last paragraph of the revised WIPO Standard ST.10/C would be amended to read “ *It is desirable that this Standard be implemented by industrial property offices as the latest as of January 1, 2005.* ”

Agenda Item 7: 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/3/4)

31. The Delegation of Romania, as Task Leader for Task No. 32, took the floor to report on the progress to establish an inventory of electronic data products. At the last session of the SDWG in December 2002, the Delegation had given a demonstration of its prototype system that was hosted on the State Office for Inventions and Trademarks website, and which allowed IPOs to present information about their official gazettes, books, CD-ROMs containing industrial property and other information as they desired. As of mid-April, 2003, 10 national offices had been registered as national database administrators (Australia, Egypt, France, Hungary, Ireland, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russia, Spain and United

States of America). A further fifteen national offices (Germany, Netherlands, Republic of Moldova and United Kingdom) and one intergovernmental organization (BBM) had queried the database.

32. With regard to the future of the database, the Delegation of Romania drew the attention of the Working Group to a suggestion in the Annex to the document SCIT/SDWG/3/4 that the International Bureau take on the job to support the system, possibly through the functionality offered via the WIPO NET network. The Delegation hoped that the global coverage of WIPO NET would encourage more national offices to use the inventory, and sought the agreement of the SDWG on this proposal.

33. In replying to the proposal of the Delegation of Romania, the Secretariat said that it was not necessary for the SDWG to make a formal decision on the involvement of WIPO NET as the Secretariat was open to begin discussions with the State Office for Inventions and Trademarks of Romania on the feasibility of a transfer of the database onto a WIPO NET platform. However, issues of knowledge transfer, systems administration, content management and the conclusion of a finished product would need to be agreed on a bilateral basis prior to any such transfer.

34. The Delegation of the United States of America thanked the State Office for Inventions and Trademarks of Romania for all its work on this matter, and asked to be advised as to when a batch upload facility would be available in order for the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) to prepare for its participation in testing the transfer of a large number of their electronic product descriptions to the database.

35. The Delegation of Spain, supported by the Delegation of Germany, inquired whether it would be possible to standardize on the format of the content of the inventory so that offices are able to input data in a uniform manner. Also whether or not an expansion of the scope of the inventory had been agreed to include content other than electronic products.

36. The Representative of the African Intellectual Property Organisation (OAPI) said that it appreciated the quality of the report and asked if it would be possible to have the URL for the databases so that national offices could examine the inventory.

37. In concluding the discussion of the SDWG on this item, the Chairman summed up the agreement of the Working Group that: the State Office for Inventions and Trademarks and the International Bureau would begin bilateral discussions on the possible transfer of the inventory database to a WIPO NET platform; and that the Task No. 32 was considered as being completed.

Agenda Item 8: Report by the Secretariat on the Progress Made Concerning Task No. 20

(Figurative Elements of Marks)

(Document SCIT/SDWG/3/5)

38. Document SCIT/SDWG/3/5 contained an update on the progress made concerning SDWG Task No. 20 regarding the figurative elements of marks. The Secretariat reminded the SDWG that, at its second session, it had received the results of a questionnaire that had been distributed in order to collect information from IPOs on formats currently in use for the

figurative elements of marks. The SDWG had agreed that the next step in the process would be to analyze the results of the questionnaire and to present the results of this analysis to the third session of the SDWG.

39. The Delegation of the United States of America said that it was satisfied with the document but that the recommendations in the paper on the capture and display of figurative elements of marks should be expanded to include issues such as management, the conversion of marks that do not conform to the listed requirements; the handling of three-dimensional images; and the identification of a standard for the quality of marks once converted.

40. The Delegation of Japan, requested that the paragraph 25(d) of the document be amended to include the YCrCb color space as this was commonly used for images in the JPEG format.

41. The Delegation of France, in commending the work done so far, raised the specific issue of the current requirement for Madrid system figurative elements of marks being a square of 8x8cm. However, there was no corresponding specific requirement for digital images, only a minimum or maximum size expressed in the number of pixels. The document did not appear to address what the Delegation believed was an important issue, as the question of the dimensions of digital images was directly related to the sizes of files that could in future be exchanged electronically.

42. The Representative of the Benelux Trademark Office (BBM) supported the suggestion contained in the document to engage the services of an independent specialist to look into issues of colour management. As an increasing number of original exist only in digital images, the question arose as to how to deal with International Color Consortium (ICC) profiles knowing that the original was only a computer, and not a paper image. The Delegation also raised a question about the licensing issues around the use of GIF software for the capture and manipulation of (black and white) images.

43. In summing up the discussions on this item, the Chairman identified a number of issues that should be considered: the capture and manipulation of three-dimensional objects; color management, in particular with respect to the increasing requirements of electronic filing; the desired size for images (whether expressed in centimeters or pixels); and software licensing issues e.g., for GIF software. In agreeing to deal with these items, the SDWG also agreed that, in preference to the creation of a new Task Force, this work should be subsumed within the mandate of the existing Task Force dealing with standardization in the field of Trademarks, under the leadership of the Korean Intellectual Property Office (KIPO).

Agenda Item 9: Progress Report by the IPDL Electronic Task Force Leader on Standards Development (Task No. 10)
(Document SCIT/SDWG/3/6)

44. In introducing document SCIT/SDWG/3/6, the Secretariat, as Task Leader for the IPDL Electronic Task Force on Standards Development, said that there were two main areas for discussion. With regard to the procedural aspects of the work under this item, it had not been possible to hold the planned third IPDL standards workshop, as a result, there was a lack of progress to be presented to the SDWG. However, the Secretariat had been able to undertake a amount of preliminary research which had resulted in the findings contained in the document under discussion. The mandate of the Task Force had also expired in January 2003,

and the Secretariat recommended its extension for a further 12 months. Reviewing the list of findings contained in the Annex to the document, the Secretariat highlighted, in particular, a sample statement concerning the organizational commitments to the persistent published electronic data objects and the policy recommendations concerning the permanence of electronic information. The Secretariat had published, on the IPDL Electronic Task Force website, some preliminary material relating to sample statements concerning the organizational commitments, and was hoping to elicit the comments of Task Force members.

45. Also in the document, the Secretariat noted a list of recommendations concerning the permanence of electronic and published information. These had been based upon a scheme that had been produced by the United States National Library of Medicine and, the purpose of which was to illustrate a simple mechanism for describing how permanent a document published by an IPDL should be. In concluding its review of the document, the Secretariat recalled that, following a request made at the last session of the SCIT Plenary, concerning permanent identifiers schemes, the second IPDL workshop had discussed the issue of archival resource keys, and had requested the Secretariat to perform a comparison between this and the Digital Object Identifiers (DOI). This work had been deemed not necessary as it was discovered that the National Library of Australia had already produced an excellent report on the comparisons. It was expected that the Australian document would be presented to a future meeting of the SDWG for inclusion in future discussions on this matter.

46. In response to a question made by the Representative of the EPO on whether or not it was planned to hold the third session of the IDPL standards workshop, the Secretariat indicated that it intended to convene the meeting using electronic means, so as, in part, to facilitate the inclusion of more external experts in this area.

47. The SDWG approved the widening of the workshop to include external experts and agreed that the IPDL Electronic Standards Task Force should be recreated under the aegis of the SDWG, with its current mandate, for a period of one year.

Agenda Item 10: Oral Progress Report by the Electronic Data Processing and Exchange Standards Task Force (Tasks Nos. 13, 17, 18 and 19)

48. In its role as Task Leader, the Secretariat gave an oral update on the work of the Electronic Data Processing and Exchange Standards (EDPES) Task Force. The Task Force had suffered in the past from a lack of participation and, following a request from the SDWG at its second session, the Secretariat had sent out a SCIT circular to all national offices requesting new nominations. It had been stressed that a certain level of technical knowledge was required from Task Force members along with sufficient time for active participation in Task Force activities. As a result of the circular, a new 24-member EDPES Task Force had been established. The new members had been added to the EDPES website forum and documents from the WIPO Standards ST.6 and ST.8 Task Forces were made available for review for a second time. The Secretariat had also prepared a separate document of potential changes required to WIPO electronic standards based on the deliberations of the WIPO Standards ST.6, ST.8 and Patent Documentation Identification (PDI) Task Force, and the document had been circulated for review and comment in late April 2003. Should the new level of EDPES Task Force participation prove inadequate, the matter would once again be brought to the attention of the SDWG.

49. The Delegation of Japan reported that the Trilateral Offices (JPO, USPTO and the EPO) were working together on a new XML standard corresponding to WIPO Standard ST.32. They expected to finalize the draft in the near future and would submit the text to the EPDES Task Force for consideration, prior to its eventual presentation to the SDWG for adoption.

50. The Secretariat indicated that the draft XML standard had already been anticipated under SDWG Task No. 17 and that any member of the Trilateral Offices was welcome to post the text on the EPDES website, once it was ready.

Agenda Item 11: Consideration of the SDWG Task List

(Document SCIT/SDWG/3/7)

51. The SDWG reviewed the list of Tasks as contained in Annex I to document SCIT/SDWG/3/7. The following comments were received with respect to individual tasks.

Task No. 11 : the Delegation of the United States of America noted that the implementation of this task was dependant on the successful adoption of the communication standards planned under Task No. 10.

Task No. 13 : the Delegation of France informed the meeting that the Industrial National Property Institute had received its first electronic PCT filing on April 28, 2003. In response to a question from the Delegation of France regarding the change process to the Annex F standard for electronic filing, the Secretariat replied that a change control process had already been established and that any national office would be welcome to contribute to the development of the standard. The standard was currently under the responsibility of the PCT Assembly as it formed an integral part of Annex F to the PCT Administrative Instructions and would be passed to the SCIT for adoption as a WIPO Standard at a later date once more experience had been gained in the use of the standard.

Task No. 24 : the Secretariat gave an oral update on its activities to improve the Annual Technical Reports (ATRs) preparation and publication process. The SCIT/ATR website currently allowed access to the ATRs for the period 1998 - 2001 and since 2001, ATR data had been collected through an electronic report form. In November 2002, the Secretariat commenced piloting an electronic ATR management system with four national offices (Canada, Hungary, Lithuania and Spain) to facilitate the preparation, submission and processing of ATRs. Following the pilot test, it was decided that the ATR management system would be released in 2003 and that all national offices would be invited to submit their 2002 ATRs on-line using the new system. A circular to this effect and guidelines for using the system would soon be distributed to all national offices. It was expected that the new system would deliver three main benefits: the faster access to and update of ATRs; the quicker receipt by the Secretariat of the ATR data; and the almost immediate publication of the ATRs on the Internet. Finally, the Secretariat will conduct an exercise to gather feedback on the new system and would welcome comments from national offices.

Task No. 26 : in response to a question raised by the Representative of the EPO, the Secretariat reminded the Working Group that the 2002 version of the WIPO *Handbook on Industrial Property Information and Documentation* was available on CD-ROM. However, changes to standards made at the December 2002 session of the SDWG were

not included on the CD-ROM but were available on the SCIT webpage. Proposal on the future development of the WIPO Handbook would be made to the next session of the SDWG.

Task No. 32: the SDWG noted its decision under agenda item 7 that the Task had now been completed.

Task No. 33: the Secretariat informed the meeting that changes to WIPO Standard ST.3 had now been agreed by correspondence and that the new version of the standard was available on the SCIT website. However, a further amendment would be required, following the change in country name of Yugoslavia to Serbia and Montenegro. The proposed change will be circulated to national offices, for agreement by correspondence, once the new country code has been communicated to WIPO.

52. The SDWG approved the Task List, as contained in Annex I to the document SDWG/3/7 and Annex II to the same document, and noted that the finalized version of the Task List would be made available at the website address given in paragraph 22 of this report.

Agenda Item 12: Schedule of Activities

(Document SCIT/SDWG/3/8)

53. Following a short discussion on the desirability of having a number of revised standards available for adoption at its next session, the SDWG agreed to hold its fourth session from January 26 to 29, 2004.

54. The Secretariat reminded Task Leaders that, to facilitate the provision of working documents in all three languages, for the January session, the deadline for submission of texts to the Secretariat would be October 1, 2003.

Agenda Item 13: Adoption of the Report

55. This report was adopted by the Standards and Documentation Working Group (SDWG) of the Standing Committee on Information Technologies (SCIT).

Agenda Item 14: Closing of the Session

56. The meeting was closed following the adoption of the Report.

[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)

ALLEMAGNE/GERMANY

Hubert ROTHE, Head, Industrial Property Information for the Public, Supply of Literature,
German Patent and Trademark Office, Munich

BULGARIE/BULGARIA

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

CROATIE/CROATIA

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

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

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

Gary CANNON, Director, Office of Trademark Program Control, US Patent and Trademark
Office, Washington, D.C.

Dominic KEATING, Intellectual Property Attaché, Permanent Mission, Geneva

Ria THOMAS (Mrs.), Economic Officer, Permanent Mission, Geneva

FÉDÉRATION DERUSSIE/RUSSIAN FEDERATION

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, Paris

HONGRIE/HUNGARY

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

INDONÉSIE/INDONESIA

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

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

IRLANDE/IRELAND

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

ITALIE/ITALY

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

JAPON/JAPAN

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

Toyohide WATANABE, Deputy Director, Information Systems Affairs Division, Trademark,
Design and Administrative Affairs Department, Japan Patent Office, Tokyo

LITUANIE/LITHUANIA

Salė DAUKUVIENĖ (Ms.), Chief Specialist, Industrial Property Information, State Patent
Bureau, Vilnius

MAROC/MOROCCO

Khalid SEBTI, Premier secrétaire, Mission permanente du Royaume du Maroc, Genève

MEXIQUE/MEXICO

Santiago REYNAORTIZ, Coordinador Departamental de Desarrollo de Sistemas de Patentes, Instituto Mexicano de la Propiedad Industrial, México

POLOGNE/POLAND

Malek Merzy ZAWADZKI, Head, Exchange of Information, Polish Patent Office, Warsaw

PORTUGAL

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

RÉPUBLIQUE DE CORÉE/REPUBLIC OF KOREA

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

YUN Youngwoo, Deputy Director, Computer Expert, International Technical Co-operation, Korean Intellectual Property Office, Daejeon

IM JaeSung, Deputy Director, Analyst, Information Planning Division, Information and Documentation Bureau, Korean Intellectual Property Office, Daejeon

NOE SeokHyoun, Deputy Director, Information Management Division, Information and Documentation Bureau, Korean Intellectual Property Office, Daejeon

ROUMANIE/ROMANIA

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

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

ROYAUME-UNI/UNITED KINGDOM

Geoff COURT, Senior Classification and Documentation Manager, The Patent Office, Newport

SUEDE/SWEDEN

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

Leif STOLT, Process Manager, Patent Information, Swedish Patent and Registration Office, Stockholm

SUISSE/SWITZERLAND

Matthias GÜNTER, Head IT, Federal Institute of the Intellectual Property, Bern

II. ORGANISATIONS INTERGOUVERNEMENTALES/
INTERGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

ORGANISATION DES NATIONS UNIES POUR L'ÉDUCATION, LA SCIENCE ET LA
CULTURE (UNESCO)/UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND
CULTURAL ORGANIZATION (UNESCO)

Boyan RADOYKOV, spécialiste du programme, Division de la Société de l'information, Genève

UNION INTERNATIONALE DE TÉLÉCOMMUNICATIONS
(UIT)/INTERNATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATION UNION (ITU)

Niiya MASAMICHI, Engineer, Telecommunication Standardization Bureau, Geneva

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

Hamidou KONE, chef, Service informatique et statistique, Yaoundé

Laoubara MBAOUNDAKOMNASSIYO, chef, Service de la Publication et de la Documentation, Yaoundé

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

Jean Marie PUTZ, IT -Manager, The Hague

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

Marc KRIER, Director, Applied Research and Development, Rijswijk

Robert Jan MEUN, Administrator, Rijswijk

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

Alexey PORKHUNOV, Deputy Director, Search and Information Systems Department, Moscow

COMMUNAUTÉ EUROPÉENNE (CE)/EUROPEAN COMMUNITY (EC)

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

III. ORGANISATIONS NON GOUVERNEMENTALES
NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

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

Union mondiale pour la nature (UICN)/World Conservation Union (IUCN) : Jean THIE (Head, Information Management Group, Gland)

Association Bouregreg (BOUREGREG) : Fawzia TALOUT (Mrs.) (membre du bureau, Casablanca)

IV. BUREAU/OFFICERS

Président/Chair: Leif STOLT (Sweden)

Vice-présidents/Vice-Chairs: Bogdan BORESCHIEVICI (Romania)
Young-Woo YUN (KIPO)

Secrétaire/Secretary: Allan ROACH (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:
Allan ROACH (Directeur des services informatiques et Directeur, Division des projets informatiques/Chief Information Officer and Director, IT Projects Division);
Angel LÓPEZ SOLANAS (chef, Service des normes et de la documentation/Head, Standards and Documentation Service); James FULLTON (conseiller principal/Senior Counsellor);
Sabine PINZAN (Ms.) (Administrateur principal chargé de l'information en matière de propriété industrielle/Senior Industrial Property Information Officer); Thierry BOUQUET (Analyste principal des systèmes/Senior Systems Analyst).

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 des dessins et modèles industriels et des projets spéciaux/Head, International Industrial Designs Registrations and Special Projects Section).

[L'annexe II suit/Annex II follows]

ANNEXII

AGENDA

1. Opening of the session
2. Election of the Chair and two Vice -Chairs
3. Adoption of the agenda
4. Oral progress report by the Task Leader on the revision of WIPO Standard ST.80 (Task No.33/1)
5. Revision of WIPO Standard ST.10/C (Task No. 30)
Seedocument SCIT/SDWG/3/2.
6. Revision of WIPO Standards which may require modification in view of the IPC Reform (Task No.31)
Seedocument SCIT/SDWG/3/3.

Revision of WIPO Standard ST.8
Revision of WIPO Standard ST.10/B
Revision of WIPO Standard ST.10/C
7. 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)
Seedocument SCIT/SDWG/3/4.
8. Report by the Secretariat on the progress made concerning Task No.20 (Figurative Elements of Marks)
Seedocument SCIT/SDWG/3/5.
9. Progress report by the IPDLE Electronic Task Force Leader on standards development (Task No.10)
Seedocument SCIT/SDWG/3/6.
10. Oral progress report by the Electronic Data Processing and Exchange Standards Task Force (Tasks Nos.13,17,18 and 19)
11. Consideration of the SDWG Task List
Seedocument SCIT/SDWG/3/7.

12. Schedule of activities
See document SCIT/SDWG/3/8.
13. Adoption of the report
14. Closing of the session

[End of Annex II and of document]