

## Minutes of ST.36 Task Force Informal Meeting (2008-02-21)

### INTRODUCTION

1. The ST.36 Task Force held its informal meeting during the SDWG ninth session on February 21, 2008, at WIPO premises. Delegations from 12 offices participated in the meeting. The Task Force discussed the following agenda:

1. Review of the proposed revisions of ICEs and Model DTD
2. Discussion on the procedure to delete or change elements of ICEs
3. Introduction of the Swiss Office's request to revise Model DTD
4. Discussion on the stricter and tighter ST.36
5. Introduction of PFCs for PCT
6. Others
  - Introduction of CAF
  - Request related to new INID code 27

### DISCUSSION & AGREEMENT

2. Item No. 4 of the agenda above, "Discussion on the stricter and tighter ST.36", was withdrawn in the meeting due to the limited discussion time.

#### Review of the proposed revision of ICEs and Model DTD Discussion on the procedure to delete or change elements of ICEs

3. The proposed revisions of ST.36 ICEs and Model DTD (see Appendix 1 to these minutes) were circulated on January 21, 2008, through the Task Force electronic forum for consideration by the Task Force. The proposal is to prepare a revision of the International Common Elements (ICEs) of WIPO Standard ST.36 on the basis of the latest version of the DTDs provided by the PCT Administrative Instructions (Annex F DTDs).

4. The participants to the meeting reviewed the proposed revision and agreed on the following:

- "Office-specific elements" (type 'a') and "non-compliant naming convention elements of Annex F DTDs" (type 'c') should not be introduced into the ST.36 ICEs;
- "Elements used by common elements / DTDs in Annex F" (type 'e') and "elements proposed to be used by only xx-patent-document.dtd" (type 'f') should be introduced into the ST.36 ICEs;

- “No longer-used elements in Annex F” (type ‘d’) should remain as deprecated status (no longer to be used) in the ICEs. (See ST.36, paragraph 37<sup>1</sup>). Some participants suggested keeping the removed element in the ICEs as same current status for a while, but the participants reached the above-mentioned agreement to avoid newly the use of the deprecated elements by offices;
- The participants agreed to add the date of change status of each element (e.g., adoption date, deprecation date) to manage the version of each element. It was also agreed to insert the release date of the ST.36 ICE file into the file to manage the ICE version; and
- The EPO reserves its comments on the “elements used by only wo-specific elements or DTDs” (type ‘b’).

#### Introduction of the Swiss Office’s request to revise Model DTD

5. This proposal concerns the definition of INID 15 (correction information) with the "self-explanatory" elements of the ST.36 Model DTD (xx-patent-document-v1-0.dtd).

6. The participants agreed that the Task Force would review the proposal after completion of the proposed revisions of the ICEs and Model DTD even though the EPO agreed on the proposal.

#### Introduction of PFCs (Proposals For Changes) for PCT

7. The International Bureau of PCT advised that it had published five PFCs on the Annex F Consultative website and expects to publish a further two PFCs on February 22.

8. The PFCs can be summarized as follows:

- a. PCT/EF/PFC 08/001 “Changes to Annex F, Appendix I, section 3.6 (power of attorney)”, allowing multiple address-book entries enabling support of transliterations of address;
- b. PCT/EF/PFC 08/002 “Changes to Annex F, Appendix I, section 3.6 (priority document Digital Access Service)”, allowing the PCT request to support the use of the DAS;
- c. PCT/EF/PFC 08/003 “Changes to Annex F, Appendix I, section 3.6 (2008 PCT rule changes)”, allowing capture of earlier-search document information in the request form;
- d. PCT/EF/PFC 08/004 “Changes to Annex F, Appendix I, section 3.6 (package-data)”, correction to support specific document types that are codes as 'other'; and

---

<sup>1</sup> Once it is determined that an ICE is deprecated (it shall no longer be used), the change of status will be noted in the ICEs repository and the date after which the element shall no longer be used.

- e. PCT/EF/PFC 08/005 “Changes to Annex F, Appendix I, section 3.6 (The XML tagging of corrections and changes)” (IB/EP), enabling support for corrections and changes in documents.

Comments on the above PFCs are due on February 26, 2008

9. There are two further PFCs:
  - a. PCT/EF/PFC 08/006 “Changes to Annex F, Appendix I, section 3.6 (Attribute to indicate intended use of email address)”, for the PCT request form; and
  - b. PCT/EF/PFC 08/007 “Changes to Annex F, Appendix I, section 3.6 (Correction to support request check list attributes for sequence listings and tables supplied in electronic form), correction to remove the need for a processing instruction that currently carries this data.

Comments on the two further PFCs are due on April 4, 2008

10. For all of the above PFCs, they all impact on the ST.36 ICEs and Model DTD, and have made the proposals taking into account the need for ST.36 usage (full descriptions using non PCT specific terminology where possible).

#### Others

11. The JPO introduced the CAF (Common Application Form)<sup>2</sup>. The CAF has been reviewed and almost agreed on by the Trilateral Offices (EPO, JPO and USPTO). The participants were informed that the proposal of CAF would be circulated in the middle of March 2008 for consideration by the PFCs Consultative group and the ST.36 Task Force.
12. The EPO briefed on the addition of INID code (27) related to the implementation of the EPC 2000. This new INID code had already been discussed during the SDWG meeting (see SCIT/SDWG/9/4), but the EPO reminded the ST.36 Task Force of it for further consideration.
13. The Task Force Leader highlighted many of the requests from other SDWG Task Forces, i.e., Citation Practice TF, ST.10/C TF and the requests related to the revision of WIPO Standard ST.9.

#### ACTION PLAN

1. The EPO to comment on the “elements used by only wo-specific elements or DTDs” (type ‘b’) in the proposed revisions of the ICEs and Model DTD for the further consideration by the Task Force by early March 2008;
2. The Task Force to take the 2<sup>nd</sup> round consultation for the proposed revisions of the ST.36 ICEs and Model DTD for 2 weeks. If there are no controversial comments, the proposed revisions would be considered as adopted;

---

<sup>2</sup> Copies of the presentations given at the meeting are available on the ST.36 Task Force web page:  
<http://www.wipo.int/scit/en/taskfrce/st36/background.htm>

3. The IB to update the ST.36 ICEs to control versioning in element-level (i.e., adding the date of adoption or deprecation to each element in the ICEs);
4. The IB to circulate the new PFCs for PCT which were (or would be) circulated in 2008 to the Task Force for consideration; and
5. The Task Force to consider the requests from other SDWG Task Forces, i.e., Citation Practice TF, ST.10/C TF and the requests related to the revision of WIPO Standard ST.9.

[Appendix 1 follows]

## Appendix 1

### **Draft Proposal for Revision of ST.36 ICE and ST.36 Model DTD** **Prepared for ST.36 Task Force Review**

January 21, 2008

1. The Standard and Documentation Working Group (SDWG) at its eighth session requested the ST.36 Task Force undertake the following:
  - (a) to prepare a revision of the International Common Elements (ICEs) of WIPO Standard ST.36 on the basis of the latest version of the DTDs provided by the PCT Administrative Instructions (Annex F DTDs); and
  - (b) to consider whether it was necessary to revise any other part of WIPO Standard ST.36 as a consequence of changes made to Annex F since the adoption of the Standard in November 2004, and if necessary, to revise the Standard.
2. To understand changes applied to the Annex F DTDs, we have investigated the Proposals for Changes (PFCs) to the PCT e-filing standard as all of these changes are processed using the PFC procedure. For further information on the procedure, please consult with the PFC website at [http://www.wipo.int/export/sites/www/efiling\\_standard/en/](http://www.wipo.int/export/sites/www/efiling_standard/en/).
3. Several Annex F PFCs were submitted and already processed since 2005, but the ST.36 ICEs were not revised in synchronization. The elements added to the Annex F DTDs, therefore, have not been introduced into the ST.36 ICEs. To align Annex F DTDs with the ST.36 ICEs, the ICEs should be revised according to the processed PFCs. All PFCs which are already processed are available at the [http://www.wipo.int/efiling\\_standard/en/pfc\\_files\\_already\\_processed.htm](http://www.wipo.int/efiling_standard/en/pfc_files_already_processed.htm).
4. In general, the PFCs aim to revise the Annex F DTDs, but some previous PFCs included the requests for changes of the Model DTD which is Annex A to the ST.36 - DTDs of model for publication- i.e., *xx-patent-document.dtd*. To reflect the said PFCs, the revision of the Model DTD should be considered. The revision may impact to the ST.36 ICEs as the revision of Annex F DTD does.
5. The IB has, as part of this exercise, prepared draft proposals for revision of the Model DTD, i.e., *xx-patent-document-v1-1\_draft.dtd* as Appendix 1 and of the ICE as Appendix 2 to this document.
6. With regard to the revision of the ST.36 ICE, it was pointed out that the changes regarding the elements in the Annex F DTDs and Model DTD cannot be automatically applied to the ST.36 ICEs. Sixty elements have been proposed to be added to the Annex F DTDs or the Model DTD, and two elements have been removed from the DTDs since 2004. The added and removed elements are reproduced in the attached document, *ST36ICEs\_elements-changes\_20080115.xls*. For a better understanding of the proposed changes, the newly added and removed elements in the DTDs are categorized by six types as follows:
  - a. office-specific elements which is used by Annex F DTDs;

- b. elements which are without 'wo' prefix, but used by only wo-specific elements / DTDs in Annex F;
- c. elements which names are not compliant with the ST.36 naming convention for elements;
- d. Elements in the ICEs which are no longer used by the latest Annex F DTDs, but may still be used by offices;
- e. Elements which are used by common elements / DTDs in Annex F; and
- f. Elements which are proposed to be used by only xx-patent-document.dtd.

Types	Elements
a. Office-specific elements	wo-amended-claims wo-amendment-info wo-application-info wo-bib-change-info wo-bibliographic-data wo-bio-material-after-pub wo-correction wo-demand-info wo-dtext wo-ocr-text wo-priority-info wo-publication-info wo-published-application wo-published-text wo-pubnum wo-repub-code wo-search-report wo-text-letter-code wo-xml-application
b. Elements used by only wo-specific elements or DTDs	abstract-figure bib-change-request biological-material-doc combined-declaration considered-not-made declaration-info designated-states-as-dec elected-office front-page iper-status isr-status later-election made-by pct-art64 pct-pub-info pct-rule91-1f pct-rule91-1f-doc previous-record priority-claim-considered-not-made priority-claim-considered-not-made-doc priority-claim-ib-info relevant-date withdrawn
c. Non-compliant naming convention	art17.2a-doc PCT-All pct-art17.2a
d. No longer-used elements in Annex F	sequence-listing-computer-readable-form,

	sequence-listing-written-form
e. Elements used by common elements or DTDs in Annex F	address-4 address-5 confdate date-opinion-completed doi incorporation-by-reference limitation-of-search o restoration-fee restoration-quantity restore-rights restore-rights-reason
f. Elements proposed to be used by only xx-patent-document.dtd	date-application-partially-withdrawn date-opposition-filed srep-search-opinion

7. Regarding the elements in type ‘a’ and ‘c’ above-mentioned, it is proposed that they should not be introduced into the ST.36 ICEs. Office-specific elements cannot be a part of the ICE. For example of excluding office-specific element from the ST.36 ICE, the elements ‘ep-chg’ and ‘ep-chg-info’ are already used by current xx-patent-document-**v1-0**.dtd, but should not be introduced to the current ST.36 ICE. With regard to promoting office-specific element to a common element, please refer to the paragraph 39 of the ST.36. For further information on the ST.36 naming convention, please refer to *Naming international common elements* section in the ST.36.

8. As for the elements in type ‘d’, it is proposed that they should be included to the ST.36 ICEs because they may still be used by offices even though they have been removed from Annex F DTDs since 2004. It is also proposed that elements in Type ‘e’, should be included to the ST.36 ICEs because they are already used by common elements in ST.36 ICEs.

9. The elements in type ‘b’ above-mentioned are noted, because the elements are currently used by only wo-specific DTDs. The IB for PCT, however, proposes that the elements should be introduced into the ST.36 ICEs, because the elements relate to the information which may be of common interest for exchange in the future, even if they are currently used by only wo-specific DTDs. Therefore, the elements should be reserved for future use.

10. With regard to the elements in type ‘f’, the elements were introduced to xx-patent-document-**v1-1\_draft**.dtd (as attached) following a consultation by the wrong route: although these relate only to ST.36 and not Annex F, they were included in an Annex F proposal for change. The three elements should be introduced to the ICEs. For further information on the elements, please refer to the PCT/EF/PFC 06/001, [http://www.wipo.int/export/sites/www/efiling\\_standard/en/pfc\\_already\\_processed/pfc-06-001.pdf](http://www.wipo.int/export/sites/www/efiling_standard/en/pfc_already_processed/pfc-06-001.pdf). It was notified to Offices of all PARIS states (not only PCT ones) as well as to a number of NGOs, using Circular C. PCT 1078, as well as notified to the Annex F Consultative Group.

11. You are kindly invited to comment the said proposals in paragraphs 7 to 10.

[Participant’s List follows]

Appendix 2

Participants' List of ST.36 TF Meeting (2008-02-21)

List of participants ST-36 TF

Tsutomu IGARASHI JPO igarashi-tsutomu@jpo.go.jp  
Donghyun SOHN KIPO kipokipo@korea.kr  
Donghwan KIM KIPO ramhenry80@kipo.net  
Paul Brewin EPO pbrewin@epo.org  
Samatha Hoy IPA/strat. Samatha.hoy@ipa.strat.gov.za  
Peet Pienaar CIPRO(RSO) ppienaar@cipro.gov.za  
Julie Daltrey UK-IPB julie.daltrey@ipo.gov.uk  
John Rombouts CIPRO rombouts.john@ic.gc.ca  
Rob Wills IPA Australia rob.wills@ipaaustralia.gov.au  
Katharina FASTENBAUER, Austria, katharina.fastenbauer@patentamt.at  
Anna GRASHEHENKOVA, Russia, agrashehenkova@rupfo.ru  
Fedor VOSTAIKOV, Russia, vostaikov@rupfo.ru  
Valeria Maksimova Rospatent, vmaksim@rupfo.ru  
Martin Kracke, Austria, martin.kracke@patentamt.at  
Konrad Hoffmann, DPMA, Konrad.Hoffmann@dpma.de  
Patrik LEGONIDEC EPO plegonidec@epo.org  
Keri Rowles, EPO krowles@epo.org  
Bruce.Cox@uspto.gov  
Peter Waring (WIPO)

[End of document]