

XML4IP Task Force of the Committee on WIPO Standards (CWS)

Twentieth Session
Seoul, March 11 to 15, 2019

MEETING REPORT

Prepared by the International Bureau

MEETING REPORT	1
INTRODUCTION	3
DISCUSSIONS, CONCLUSIONS, AND AGREEMENTS	3
Agenda Item 2: Adoption of the Agenda	3
Agenda Item 3: General statements by Delegations	3
Agenda Item 4: Progress Report by Task Force Leader	3
Agenda Item 5: ST.96 interoperable implementation	3
Agenda Item 6: Visual representation of XML data	4
Agenda Item 7: New WIPO Web API standard and Pilot Projects	5
Agenda Item 8: JSON Specification	6
Agenda Item 9: ST.96 Common Components	7
Agenda Item 10: ST.96 Patent Components	7
Agenda Item 11: Geographical Indication XML (GIN)	9
Agenda Item 12: Copyright Orphan Work XML	10
Agenda Item 13: ST.96 Industrial Design Components	11

Agenda Item 14: ST.96 Trademark Components	11
Agenda Item 15: Work plan – ST.96 Revision	12
Agenda Item 16: Review of draft Meeting Report	13
Agenda Item 17: Closing of Session 1.	13
ANNEX I: PROPOSED AGENDA.....	14
ANNEX II: PARTICIPANTS LIST	15
ANNEX III: ACTION ITEMS	16
Agenda Item 5: ST.96 interoperable implementation.....	16
Agenda Item 7: New WIPO Web API standard and Pilot Projects	16
Agenda Item 8: JSON Specification	16
Agenda Item 9: ST.96 Common Components.....	16
Agenda Item 10: ST.96 Patent Components	16
Agenda Item 10(b): Examination Report and Search Report XML	17
Agenda Item 10(d): Request Form XML.....	17
Agenda Item 10(e): Authority File XML (ST.37 Annex III).....	17
Agenda Item 10(f): Patent Legal Status/ Patent Record XML.....	17
Agenda Item 10(g): Other open issues.....	17
Agenda Item 11: Geographical Indication XML (GIN).....	17
Agenda Item 12: Copyright Orphan Work XML	17
Agenda Item 13: ST.96 Industrial Design Components	17
Agenda Item 13(b): Other open issues.....	18
Agenda Item 14: ST.96 Trademark Components	18
Agenda Item 14(a): Information sharing on Madrid XML	18
Agenda Item 14(b): Other open issues.....	18

INTRODUCTION

1. The XML4IP Task Force meeting took place in Seoul from March 11 to 15, 2019. The following sixteen Offices/Organizations were represented at the meeting: the Austrian Patent Office (APO), IP Australia (IPA), the Canadian Intellectual Property Office (CIPO), the Eurasian Patent Organization (EAPO), the European Patent Office (EPO), the European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO), the Italian Patent and Trademark Office (IPTO), the Japan Patent Office (JPO), the Korean Intellectual Property Office (KIPO), the Federal Service for Intellectual Property (ROSPATENT), the Saudi Authority for Intellectual Property (SAIP), the Spanish Patent and Trademark Office (OEPM), the United Kingdom Intellectual Property Office (UK IPO), the International Union for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants (UPOV), the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO), and the International Bureau of the World Intellectual Property Organization (IB).

2. The meeting was opened by Mr. Yun, as Task Force leader, who expressed pleasure in meeting delegates again at the 20th XML4IP meeting. Mr. Sam Sup Moon, Director General, Information and Service Bureau, KIPO, offered welcoming remarks. He outlined the achievements of the Task Force made so far as well as the new tasks and discussions ahead, with a special emphasis on ST.96 interoperable implementation and capturing new patent components with XML data including XML components for patent legal status and priority document.

3. This is a summary of discussions reflecting conclusions and agreements. Further details on discussions are available in daily reports which are posted in the Task Force Wiki at: <https://www3.wipo.int/confluence/display/xml4iptf/XML4IP+TF+2019+Seoul+Meeting+-+Meeting+Report>. All presentations and working documents would be available on the Task Force Wiki at: <https://www3.wipo.int/confluence/display/xml4iptf/XML4IP+TF+2019+Seoul+Meeting+-+Working+Documents>.

DISCUSSIONS, CONCLUSIONS, AND AGREEMENTS

Agenda Item 2: Adoption of the Agenda

4. The agenda was adopted as proposed and is reproduced as Annex I to this report. Annex II details the Task Force meeting participants and Annex III is a full list of the action items resulting from the discussion over the five days.

Agenda Item 3: General statements by Delegations

5. General statements were made by the following offices: APO, CIPO, EAPO, EPO, EUIPO, IPA, IPTO, JPO, KIPO, OEPM, ROSPATENT, UK IPO, UPOV and USPTO who provided a summary of their IP data projects, in particular any progress made in adopting ST.96 for data transactions. The statements are available at: <https://www3.wipo.int/confluence/display/xml4iptf/XML4IP+TF+2019+Seoul+Meeting+Report+-+Day+1>.

Agenda Item 4: Progress Report by Task Force Leader

6. Mr Yun, the Task Force leader, provided a summary of the outcomes of CWS/6 and an update of the progress of the tasks of the XML4IP Task Force. He emphasized the importance of the Task Force's work in the era of 4th industrial revolution and appreciated the collaboration and contribution of Task Force members. His presentation is available at: <https://www3.wipo.int/confluence/display/xml4iptf/XML4IP+TF+2019+Seoul+Meeting+Report+-+Day+1>.

Agenda Item 5: ST.96 interoperable implementation

7. Discussions were based on materials posted on [POC – Phase 2](#).

8. The XML4IP Task Force is investigating how to improve data exchange of ST.96 instances between IP Offices. This is both for the provision and consumption of data and applies not only to XML but potentially to JSON in the future.

9. This issue was first raised by ROSPATENT while the USPTO has been very proactive in providing two potential approaches to resolve the issue.
10. According to Annex V of ST.96, the two approaches are a conformant customization and a compatible customization. These can co-exist but a conformant customization is best for data exchange.
11. Initially, all schemas were conformant but IPOs began producing their own specific components. In order to avoid the same situation of ST.36 implementation by IPOs with their own 'flavors' and difficult to exchange data in ST.36 format, the participants agreed to work together to find a solution for interoperable implementation of ST.96.
12. CIPO indicated the need for a checklist or guide for offices when producing their conformant schemas. Annex V of ST.96 provides an implementation guideline but is over 10 years old and may need to be updated.
13. The pros and cons of each of the approaches provided by the USPTO were discussed by the delegates, including how to migrate to newer versions and the ease to which it can be adopted.
14. The following topics were also discussed; Madrid and Hague transactions; how far the change needs to be propagated up for it to be considered conformant; and whether the consuming office needs to know about what has been modified.
 15. It was concluded that:
 - (a) Approach 2 should only be expanded to add optional components;
 - (b) The solution should meet the following criteria:
 - i) stop propagation up to the root level (for the data producer);
 - ii) make changes easily identifiable (for the data consumer); and
 - iii) make the changes as targeted as possible (that is, only the applicant);
 - (c) Based on current analysis, Approach 1 or Approach 2 will not be able to achieve these goals;
 - (d) A revised Annex V of ST.96 will need to be prepared by the Task Force members once an approach for interoperable implementation has been agreed upon.
 16. The participants agreed on the following actions to be taken:
 - (a) USPTO to perform further analysis, to see Approach 2 fit within business rules, business data and practices by going through the customization in US Implementations.
 - (b) The IB to organize a WebEx discussion to further explore the use cases and scenarios and obtain responses from Task Force members on the guidelines to be developed by the USPTO. The first week of April 2019 will be the tentative date of the WebEx meeting.
 - (c) USPTO to work with Task Force members to try to find a solution to meet the following criteria: i) stop propagation up to the root level (for the data producer); ii) make changes easily identifiable (for the data consumer); and iii) make the changes as targeted as possible.

Agenda Item 6: Visual representation of XML data

17. Discussions were based on materials posted on [Visual representation of XML data](#) referring to Task No. 63: Develop visual representation(s) of XML data, based on WIPO XML Standards, for electronic publication.
18. The participants recalled that ROSPATENT had raised the topic at CWS/6 and highlighted the need for standardization. The scope includes:

- (a) What should be the resulting format for displaying information (PDF, PDF-A, HTML, PostScript) in the electronic age?
- (b) How to treat non-Latin fonts (in particular embedded fonts).
- (c) The use of hyperlinks – useful for the visualization of data and important to the user.
- (d) The positioning of components (title page, abstract, main drawing) within the output. We have been using ideas/concepts developed for paper forms, even with Hague or Madrid. Some elements which are considered important for a paper application, such as the number of pages or title page, may no longer be useful or might be vague.
- (e) Is there a need to have links to the processing program in the header of the ST.96 XML document? The conversion may need to be multi-step.
- (f) Should an IPO provide the user with visualization tools?
- (g) If each Office has its own 'brand' which may be updated, then would a model stylesheet be worth developing?

19. The IB provided background and context while ROSPATENT provided two examples for the Task Force to consider. USPTO stated that XSLT itself has to transform an XML instance, which must be ST.96 compliant. ROSPATENT noted that even if visualization is not included in the XML Standards, perhaps recommendations should be provided on how Offices can render/display their XML data.

20. It was concluded that the XML4IP Task Force recommend the reassignment of this Task to the Digital Transformation Task Force for consideration by the CWS/7 and ask the Digital Transformation Task Force to prepare a minimum recommendation for XML visualization. The Task Force leader also noted the need for providing an example XML instance, to be incorporated into WIPO Standard ST.96, and suggested adding a new Annex VII to ST.96 for the sample XML instances. The participants agreed to add a new Annex VII.

21. The participants agreed on the following actions to be taken:

- (a) The IB, in collaboration with USPTO, to draft new Annex VII to be considered by Task Force members;
- (b) IB to draft a new description for Task 63 for approval at CWS/7.

Agenda Item 7: New WIPO Web API standard and Pilot Projects

Agenda Item 7(a): Review of draft standard

- 22. Discussions were based on the materials posted in [M2M: 5th Round](#).
- 23. During a review of draft Web API standard the following points were covered:
 - (a) The IB provided feedback on the progress made so far and summarized the feedback it has received, particular from the EPO who provided further details on this feedback.
 - (b) The IB indicated that this is a set of good practices for developers and not strict guidelines.
 - (c) Some delegations queried the inclusion of security models in the Standard and the SOAP chapter, however no resolution was reached during the discussion.
 - (d) The IB revisited outstanding action items from the Moscow Meeting.
- 24. It was concluded that the XML4IP Task Force recommended a new Task Force be created for the Web API topic, as it involves a different target audience, for consideration at CWS/7.

Agenda Item 7(b): Progress on two pilot projects

25. Discussions were based on materials posted on [OPD-inspired API](#) and presentation made by IPA.

26. IB explained the background of the two pilot projects, OPD-inspired API and patent legal status API, which will serve as example models.

27. With regard to OPD-inspired API, the IB informed the participants of progress with DocList API among other web services provided in OPD. The IB explained its plan to produce a WIPO Standard-compliant API inspired by OPD for WIPO-Case. As an extension, the IB is also providing a mapping between categories in OPD and WIPO-Case so that they can standardize document categories. The presentation can be found here: <https://www3.wipo.int/confluence/display/xml4iptf/DocList+Specification%3A+Web+API>

28. The IB asked which IPOs will participate in piloting DocList API or other API inspired by OPD. As no Office expressed its interest in continuing OPD-inspired API project, the IB proposed to wrap up the project with DocList and refocus on WIPO-CASE, if there is a demand. The IB also suggested that the finalization of OPD-inspired API pilot with DocList be reported at CWS/7.

29. The participants noted the IB's proposal and agreed to inform the CWS of the XML4IP decision on the finalization of OPD-inspired API pilot with DocList.

30. With regard to Patent Legal Status API, IPA presented the development progress. Several discussion points were raised in this presentation including the frequency of data updates and whether a common legal status API would be useful to Offices. IPA also indicated that they were looking for other offices to test the UI (not developers). The presentation can be found here:

https://www3.wipo.int/confluence/download/attachments/543523003/Legal%20Status%20-%20API%20Project_AU.ppt?version=1&modificationDate=1552324015265&api=v2

31. It was concluded that Offices may not be ready to participate at the moment, but that the IB is prepared to work with IPA when the Offices are ready to start exchanging patent legal data through a common API.

32. The IB suggested a potential API for discussion, which would provide the IB with Authority File data-sets.

33. It was agreed to continue discussing the potential API for authority file exchange with the IB.

34. The participants agreed on the following actions to be taken:

(a) The IB to provide progress on the two pilot API projects and the progress of the WIPO-CASE Web API at CWS-7.

(b) IPOs to nominate testers for the IPA patent legal status API who work in the business areas rather than in API development.

(c) TF members to continue discussing the potential authority file API.

Agenda Item 8: JSON Specification

35. Discussions were based on the materials posted at [JSON 1st Round](#).

36. The IB provided a summary of the first round of discussions regarding the JSON specification produced by the USPTO. The IB wanted the Task Force to explain whether they wanted to continue with the development of a JSON specification.

37. The USPTO indicates that the JSON schema is only in regards to a vocabulary used as they wish to avoid any confusion in naming between XML and JSON schemas. It is based on the ST.96 naming conventions.

38. The IB sought Task Force members' input on whether JSON is used in data exchange by offices and the appropriate schema level to start building the vocabulary (document, aggregate or atomic). The general consensus is that it would be better at the atomic level.

39. UK IPO requested that more examples be provided and IPA asked if we can build a library.

40. It was concluded that the first draft of the JSON specification, based on USPTO document, was found to be satisfactory. As UK IPO requested, the participant agreed to provide more examples in the JSON specification. The participants agreed to provide their comments on the draft standard document and to add more examples. The participants also agreed to develop JSON schema starting from the basic/atomic and USPTO agreed to provide more examples of candidate components for the JSON schema that is ST.96-compliant. EUIPO agreed to provide examples for GI-related components.

41. The participants agreed on the following actions to be taken:

- (a) USPTO to provide more examples of candidates for the JSON schema that is ST.96-compliant.
- (b) EUIPO to provide examples for GI-related components.
- (c) USPTO and the IB to update the JSON specification and to develop JSON schema in collaboration with TF members.

Agenda Item 9: ST.96 Common Components

42. Discussions were based on pending discussions on eight outstanding issues on the XML4IP Issue register: [IssueID-557](#), [IssueID-616](#), [IssueID-617](#), [IssueID-619](#) (design), [IssueID-623](#), [IssueID-628](#), [IssueID-630](#), [IssueID-631](#) and Task Force members were requested to provide their input.

43. The participants agreed on the following actions to be taken:

- (a) [IssueID-557](#): UK IPO to provide more input to the renewal proposal.
- (b) [IssueID-616](#): ROSPATENT to discuss the two proposals with their developers and propose any new ideas.
- (c) [IssueID-616](#): Offices to look at their own practice to see where job title is placed and provide information so that the Task Force can determine whether a separate category for job title is needed.
- (d) [IssueID-617](#): UK IPO to provide the "tightened" spread sheet.
- (e) [IssueID-619](#): IB to close this issue. (IssueID-619).
- (f) [IssueID-630](#): IB to analyze the former ISO country code to see if there are any more "missing countries" in the ST.3 former code and also if IPR documents were produced by such countries.
- (g) [IssueID-630](#): USPTO to carry out a similar exercise.
- (h) [IssueID-630](#): the IB to analyze the former ISO country code to see if there are any more "missing countries" in the ST.3 former code and also if IPR documents were produced by such countries; USPTO, EPO and CIPO to review and provide similar lists of any priority records where the priority country is a gap from the current ST.3 by the end of March.

Agenda Item 10: ST.96 Patent Components

Agenda Item 10(a): Patent Transaction

44. Discussions were based on materials posted on [IssueID-606](#).

45. ROSPATENT presented a schema to capture patent transactions based on the Patent Record Schema created by the USPTO for the Moscow meeting. The IB sought input on whether Offices would use these elements.

46. It was agreed that the USPTO and ROSPATENT will continue developing the schema until the end of April 2019. The UK IPO will provide input in regards to the SPC-related identifiers. The amended schema will be presented at CWS/7 for either or amendment adoption by participants.

47. The participants agreed on the following actions to be taken:

- (a) ROSPATENT and USPTO to update and finalize the schema until April.
- (b) UK IPO to review the SPC-related identifiers at the level of patent transaction and develop a response.

Agenda Item 10(b): Examination Report and Search Report XML

48. Discussions were based on [IssueID-618](#).

49. The IB presented a summary of the recent work to update the schema to comprehensively capture all of the PCT opinion forms (PCT/237, 408, 409). The question was raised whether including Examination Report/Search Report within ST.96 was appropriate considering PCT does not currently use it. The UK IPO provided further input into the revisions, which the IB agreed to consider. The JPO requested a mapping document to provide clarification on the new components.

50. The participants agreed on the following actions to be taken:

- (a) IB to provide improved/updated mapping to PCT forms as requested by JPO.
- (b) IB to respond to queries by the UK IPO and update Examination Report if necessary.
- (c) IP Offices to volunteer to test the updated Examination Report schema.
- (d) Task Force members to consider whether it is worthwhile implementing ST.96 with PCT considering that Hague and Madrid are already ST.96-compliant.

Agenda Item 10(c): Priority Document XML

51. Discussions were based on materials posted on [Priority Doc](#) and [P-Doc 1st Round](#).

52. The IB began by introducing the subject and reminding Task Force members of KIPO's proposal to capture priority document information in XML format. Part of KIPO's proposed schema is a PDF attachment of the priority document. The IP5 already use WIPO DAS to exchange priority documents. However, unlike generating other schemas, it was noted that adopting this new format may have legal impacts. For instance, determining which is the legal document: the XML or paper version.

53. The participants agreed that the IB should draft the priority document XML schema. The IB sought the support of Task Force members in conducting this exercise.

Agenda Item 10(d): Request Form XML

54. Discussions were based on materials posted on [Request Form](#) and [Request Form 1st Round](#).

55. The IB presented a mapping of ST.96 components to the PLT international model request form. Several Offices had questions in regards to the mapping and agreed to provide feedback on this document.

56. The participants agreed on the following actions to be taken:

- (a) IPOs to provide feedback on the mapping of PLT form to ST.96.

Agenda Item 10(e): Authority File XML (ST.37 Annex III)

57. Discussions were based on Authority File XML (ST.37 Annex III).

58. The IB asked Task Force members to provide feedback on whether the Authority File components should be included as part of the ST.96 library. Version control of ST.96 was discussed including the rules for a major or a minor release, the use of SVN for maintaining ST.96 versions and when offices should invest in upgrading to the next version. The outstanding issues from the discussion are for future discussion:

- (a) Should ST.27/37/97 form part of the ST.96 library and;
- (b) What would be the strategy for updating the design/implementation components?

59. The participants agreed on the following actions to be taken:

- (a) IB to create a new project for Task Force members to consider whether other implementation schemas of WIPO Standard ST.27, ST.37 & ST.87 should form part of the ST.96 library and whether there should be two separate versioning schemes: one for design components and the other for implementation schema.

Agenda Item 10(f): Patent Legal Status / Patent Record XML

60. Discussions were based on the materials posted on [Patent Legal Status](#)/ Patent Record XML ([IssueID-606](#)).

61. The IB provided a summary of the recent online discussions in regards to the patent legal status XML. In particular, the issue of a one-to-many relationship between legal status events and supplementary event data. The UK IPO indicated that there needs to be more meaningful descriptions provided to assist in implementation. IPA indicated the need to finalize the schema so they could move forward with the development of the patent legal status API.

62. The participants agreed on the following actions to be taken:

- (a) UK IPO to test the latest version of the Patent Legal Status schema and CIPO will participate if time permits under their current priorities; USPTO will confirm if they can participate. IPA confirmed they would participate as part of their API testing.

Agenda Item 10(g): Other open issues

63. Discussions were based on the materials posted on [IssueID-618](#), [IssueID-620](#) (citation) and [IssueID-627](#) as well as two proposals by the UK IPO.

64. The participants agreed on the following actions to be taken:

- (a) [IssueID-618](#): UK IPO agreed to assist with testing the schema but noted this would be after they had completed the testing of the Legal Status schema.
- (b) [IssueID-620](#): UK IPO to update their proposal and invite the Task Force members' feedback.
- (c) [IssueID-627](#): IB to ask PCT for a response or clearer definition for this component.

Agenda Item 11: Geographical Indication XML (GIN)

65. Discussions were based on [GIN: 3rd Round](#).

66. The IB provided a summary of discussions to date on the topic. ROSPATENT, who drafted the schema, is not yet able to provide a timeline for implementation.

67. Other Task Force members indicated that they have not yet considered implementing GIs in ST.96 or that it was not a relevant issue for them.

68. The IB asked the assistance of the Task Force to identify any common components between the new GI schema and trademark components so that these can be moved to the *common* namespace.

69. The EUIPO presented to participants their *GIview* project.

70. The following issues remain unresolved and will require future input from Task Force members:

- (a) what the territorial units for the schema will be;
- (b) the use of JSON versus XML;
- (c) an appropriate GI classification schema; and
- (d) the use of 'GI' instead of 'GeographicalIndication' in component labels.

71. After summarizing the discussion of the current schema, ROSPATENT agreed to provide an updated schema by 22 March 2019. EUIPO, ROSPATENT and CIPO and potentially IB/Lisbon will participate in testing the schema.

72. The participants agreed on the following actions to be taken:

- (a) JPO and KIPO to provide feedback from their respective agricultural ministries on their national classification system.
- (b) ROSPATENT to provide the updated schema according to the discussion at this Meeting by the end of next week.
- (c) EUIPO and ROSPATENT (and tentatively CIPO) to participate in the testing exercise.
- (d) IB to ask Lisbon whether they can participate in the testing exercise. The IB also asked Task Force members to provide contacts in other relevant governmental authorities who could be of assistance here.
- (e) Task Force members to review their national ProductCategory lists.
- (f) Task Force members to review ST.96, DRC rules regarding one business area (e.g. gin) using components from another business area (eg. tmk).

Agenda Item 12: Copyright Orphan Work XML

73. Discussions were based on the proposals by UK IPO posted on [Copyright: R1](#).

74. The IB provided a summary of this development and recalled that the CWS/6 approved the inclusion of copyright orphan work schema into the ST.96 library. The UK IPO also provided some background information in regards to this Task. The Task Force was particularly interested in whether a JSON specification had been considered. The EUIPO is already using JSON for capturing orphan works.

75. The UK IPO will continue to develop the schema and once completed EUIPO, CIPO, USPTO and SAIP have agreed to participate in testing the schema. The tentative timeline for completion is September 30, 2019. Update on the progress of this Task will be provided at CWS/7.

76. The participants agreed on the following actions to be taken:

- (a) EUIPO, CIPO and SAIP to complete the testing and / or mapping exercise by the end of September.
- (b) JPO, USPTO and KIPO to contact the authority in charge of copyright to share the schema and ask for their help with testing.
- (c) UK IPO to review and update the schema as necessary to allow multiple languages where appropriate.

Agenda Item 13: ST.96 Industrial Design Components

77. The discussion began with the Hague area presenting their progress on converting all communication to ST.96, with the scheduled date for the transition to be the end of 2020. The IB will continue to provide data in both formats until then.

Agenda Item 13(a): Information sharing on Hague XML

78. Discussions were based on the following open issues: [IssueID-628](#), [IssueID-631](#). During the discussion, two more Issues, #632 and #633, were created. The IB/Hague area will assist in proposing potential changes to the schema.

79. The participants agreed on the following actions to be taken:

[IssueID-628](#): (BusinessEntityStatusCategory)

(a) ROSPATENT to review and confirm whether changing the Design Application would be needed considering any future changes to the Hague component.

(b) IB to revise the proposal for meeting the needs of the USPTO to accommodate various business entities by this week.

(c) USPTO to check if this revised proposal affects its structure and confirm whether it can agree to the revised proposal.

[IssueID-631](#):

(d) ROSPATENT to consider the place for adding the element (either dgn:AffectedDesign or dgn:HagueDivision) and revise its proposal.

(e) IB to raise a new Issue ID on the wiki to cover the comments made by IB/Hague.

[IssueID-632](#): dgn:PrincipalDesignCategory

(f) Task Force members to develop a solution to address IB/Hague and KIPO concerns in this regard.

[IssueID-633](#): (dgn:HagueGrantProtectionRequestType, dgn:HagueGrantProtectionType)

(g) KIPO and JPO to check the proposal and provide comments by the end of March 2019.

Agenda Item 13(b): Other open issues

80. Discussions were based on the other open issues [IssueID-546](#) and [IssueID-574](#).

81. The participants agreed on the following actions to be taken:

(a) [IssueID-546](#): USPTO to review the proposal and provide comments.

(b) [IssueID-574](#): UK IPO to consider whether DesignRecord can be reused instead of creating a new DesignBibliographicData.

Agenda Item 14: ST.96 Trademark Components

82. Discussions were based on the report of testing of Madrid transactions between CIPO and Madrid/IB and pending issues, [IssueID-608](#), [IssueID-629](#), [IssueID-541](#), [IssueID-619](#), [IssueID-622](#), [IssueID-625](#) and [IssueID-634](#) (new).

83. Several of the open issues on the XML4IP Issue Register in regards to the *tmk* namespace were discussed. A number of these issues had already been resolved in the latest version of ST.96 (v3.1).

84. The participants agreed to close the three following Issues: [IssueID-541](#), [IssueID-608](#), and [IssueID-619](#).

Agenda Item 14(a): Information sharing on Madrid XML

85. To commence this session, CIPO briefed the Task Force on their plan to commence Madrid communication with the Madrid/IB by mid-June this year. The IB asked if any other Offices had plans to adopt ST.96 for Madrid. Other Offices indicated that this could be a possibility in the future but with no definite plans.

[IssueID-629](#)

86. CIPO went through the CA Proposed Release Notes for ST.96_V3_1_T1, which is a version produced for testing purposes, posted on the Wiki to explain the logic behind the modifications that CIPO worked on with USPTO and the Madrid/IB.

87. The IB asked if Offices had noted these changes and if they had any comments. ROSPATENT commented that they have studied the Release Notes, and asked the IB whether 3D trademarks can be captured in Madrid. The IB answered that both 3D and sound marks are part of Madrid now, with discussions going on regarding other non-traditional marks. The IB explained the debate around whether a list of *RestrictedPermissibleValues* should be specific to Madrid, separately from the large number of permissible values in general for Trademark. The Madrid/IB said that it can manage IB to Office communication and for Office to IB communication, if the Offices can provide information on what values they allow, then the Madrid/IB can filter these.

88. CIPO were asked how they are progressing and they explained that they have started testing ST96_V3_1_T1, and will continue testing with ST96_V3_1_T2 after they go live with T1 (when it is available).

89. The participants agreed that CIPO will provide further feedback on the IssueID-629 if needed and the IB will reflect the proposed modifications for T2. The test results should be reported to the XML4IP Task Force and the agreed modifications should be incorporated in the next version of ST.96, V4_0, which is planned for release on October 1, 2019.

[IssueID-634](#)

90. CIPO proposed adding element *MadridDesignationRecordIdentifier* to some *MadridOfficeToIB* transactions in order to enable the Madrid system to identify the contents of transactions.

91. The participants agreed on the following actions to be taken:

- (a) [IssueID-629](#): CIPO to provide further comment on [IssueID-629](#);
- (b) [IssueID-634](#): (i) CIPO to provide the revised proposal by March 22, 2019; (ii) Task Force members to review and provide comments by the end of March 2019; and
- (c) CIPO, USPTO and IB to prepare ST96_V3_1_T2 for testing.

Agenda Item 14(b): Other open issues

92. The participants agreed on the following actions to be taken:

- (a) [IssueID-622](#): IB to provide comments to close this Issue ID.
- (b) [IssueID-625](#): CIPO to provide feedback to the revised description proposed by the IB.

Agenda Item 15: Work plan – ST.96 Revision

93. The Participants agreed to release the next version ST96 V4_0 on October 1, 2019 and proposed that the following modifications and new components be incorporated in this new release:

- (a) Main body and Annex I: amendments will depend on the conclusion regarding the different versioning scheme for design schema components and

implementation schema, e.g. ST.37 AF XSD; and a separate namespace, and reference between two business areas, e.g. patent component refers to trademark component;

- (b) Annex III:
 - i) Patent: Patent Legal Status, Examination Report, Priority Document XML, Patent Transaction, Patent Record
 - ii) Trademark: Madrid transactions
 - iii) Design: Hague transactions
 - iv) GIN
 - v) Copyright orphan works;
- (c) Annex V: depending on the conclusion of interoperable implementation;
- (d) Annex VI: for every major release, we need to update appendix A, B and C (mapping and XSLT between old standards and ST.96). This update is therefore required for version 4.0;
- (e) New WIPO Web API Standard and Pilot Projects:
 - i) Should be drafted before June;
- (f) Potential new Annex for JSON Specification & Schema;
- (g) Potential new Annex for Visual representation of XML data; and
- (h) Potential new Annex VII of ST.96 for sample XML instances.

Agenda Item 16: Review of draft Meeting Report

94. This session of the XML4IP Task Force Meeting was the first meeting to provide a daily update of the Meeting Report directly on the Task Force Wiki. This allowed participants to provide their feedback directly there. At the end of the session, Task Force members reviewed this work. All participants noted that this new way of preparing and reviewing daily reports was effective.

95. This formal Meeting Report is a condensed summary of the five days and includes a summary of the Action Items and a list of participants.

Agenda Item 17: Closing of Session 1.

96. The session was declared closed at 18:00 on March 15, 2019.

[Annex I follows]

ANNEX I: PROPOSED AGENDA

XML4IP Task Force 2019 Seoul Meeting

1. Opening of the meeting
2. Adoption of the agenda
3. General statements by Delegations
4. Progress report by the Task Force Leader
5. ST.96 interoperable implementation
6. Visual representation of XML data (Task No. 63: Develop visual representation(s) of XML data, based on WIPO XML Standards, for electronic publication.)
7. New WIPO Web API standard and Pilot Projects
 - (a) Review of draft standard
 - (b) Progress on two pilot projects
 - i) OPD-inspired API
 - ii) Patent Legal Status API
8. JSON Specification
9. ST.96 Common Components
10. ST.96 Patent Components
 - (a) Patent Transaction
 - (b) Examination Report and Search Report XML
 - (c) Priority Document XML
 - (d) Request Form XML
 - (e) Authority File XML (ST.37 Annex III)
 - (f) Patent Legal Status/ Patent Record XML
 - (g) Other open issues
11. Geographical Indication XML (GIN)
12. Copyright Orphan Work XML
13. ST.96 Industrial Design Components
 - (a) Information sharing on Hague XML
 - (b) Other open issues
14. ST.96 Trademark Components
 - (a) Information sharing on Madrid XML
 - (b) Other open issues
15. Future work
16. Review of draft Meeting Report
17. Closing of the session

[Annex II follows]

ANNEX II: PARTICIPANTS LIST

IPO code	First name	Surname	Email
AT	Gerald	Schwarz	gerald.schwarz@patentamt.at
AU	Michael	Burn	michael.burn@ipaaustralia.gov.au
CN	Derek	Spero	derek.spero@canada.ca
EA	Anton	Ovchinnikov	antony@eapo.org
EA	Evgenii	Tiurin	etyurin@eapo.org
EA	Vladislav	Kondratenko	kondratenko_vn@mail.ru
EM	Alexandre	Tran	alexandre.tran@euipo.europa.eu
EP	Fernando	Ferreira	fferreira@epo.org
EP	Nicholaos	Chardalias	nchardalias@epo.org
ES	Jose Carlos	Torres Diaz	jose.torres@oepm.es
GB	Julie	Daltrey	julie.daltrey@ipo.gov.uk
IT	Fabrizio	Fornari	fabrizio.fornari.ext@mise.gov.it
IB	Dmitri	Stoliartchouk	dmitri.stoliartchouk@wipo.int
IB	Roger	Holberton	roger.holberton@wipo.int
IB	Young-Woo	Yun	youngwoo.yun@wipo.int
JP	Hiroyuki	Nishibori	nishibori-hiroyuki@jpo.go.jp
JP	Soichiro	Hasegawa	hasegawa-soichiro@jpo.go.jp
KR	Jumi	Lee	jumi.lee@korea.kr
KR	Sangwoo	Jeong	emrakul409@korea.kr
KR	Jeong Hui	Han	hanjh@kipi.or.kr
KR	Hye-won	Ahn	hyewonahnn@kipi.or.kr
KR	Eumel	Lee	eumellee@kipi.or.kr
MX	Rubén	Martínez Corte	ruben.martinez@impi.gob.mx
RU	Ilya	Kononenko	I_kononenko@fips.ru
RU	Vladislav	Mamontov	vladmamontov@rambler.ru
RU	Yuri	Zontov	yury.zontov@gmail.com
SA	Abdulaziz	Alfulaij	afulaij@saip.gov.sa
SA	Saad	AlHudibi	hodaibi@saip.gov.sa
US	Arti	Shah	arti.shah@uspto.gov
US	Li	Wang	li.wang@uspto.gov
US	Tyle	Auduong	tyle.auduong@uspto.gov
XU	Hend	Madhour	hend.madhour@upov.int

[Annex III follows]

ANNEX III: ACTION ITEMS

Agenda Item 5: ST.96 interoperable implementation

1. USPTO to perform further analysis, to see Approach 2 fit within business rules, business data and practices by going through the customization in US Implementations.
2. IB to organize a WebEx discussion to further explore the use cases and scenarios and obtain responses from Task Force members on the guidelines to be developed by the USPTO. The first week of April 2019 will be the tentative date of the WebEx meeting.
3. USPTO to work with Task Force members to try to find a solution to meet the following criteria: i) stop propagation up to the root level (for the data producer); ii) make changes easily identifiable (for the data consumer); and iii) make the changes as targeted as possible.

Agenda Items 6: Visual Representation of XML data (Task No. 63)

4. IPOs to consider whether they would be interested in the IB developing an API for gathering updates to Authority Files.
5. IB to draft new Task description for Task 63 adoption at CWS/7.

Agenda Item 7: New WIPO Web API standard and Pilot Projects

6. The IB to provide progress of this OPD-inspire example model and the progress of the WIPO-Case Web API at CWS-7.
7. IPOs to nominate testers for the IPA patent legal status API who work in the business areas rather than in API development.

Agenda Item 8: JSON Specification

8. USPTO to provide more examples of candidates for the JSON schema that is ST.96-compliant.
9. EUIPO to provide examples for GI-related components.

Agenda Item 9: ST.96 Common Components

10. [IssueID-557](#): UK IPO to provide more input to the Renewal proposal.
11. [IssueID-616](#): ROSPATENT to discuss the two proposals with their developers and propose any new ideas.
12. [IssueID-616](#): Offices to look at their own practice to see where job title is placed and provide information so that the Task Force can determine whether a separate category for job title is needed.
13. [IssueID-617](#): UK IPO to provide the "tightened" spread sheet
14. [IssueID-619](#): IB to close this issue. (IssueID-619)
15. [IssueID-630](#): IB to analyze the former ISO country code to see if there are any more "missing countries" in the ST.3 former code and also if IPR documents were produced by such countries.
16. [IssueID-630](#): USPTO to carry out a similar exercise at USPTO.
17. [IssueID-630](#): the IB to analyze the former ISO country code to see if there are any more "missing countries" in the ST.3 former code and also if IPR documents were produced by such countries; USPTO, EPO and CIPO to review and provide similar lists of any priority records where the priority country is a gap from the current ST.3 by the end of March.

Agenda Item 10: ST.96 Patent Components

18. ROSPATENT and USPTO to update and finalize the schema until April.
19. UK IPO to review the SPC-related identifiers at the level of patent transaction and develop a response.

Agenda Item 10(b): Examination Report and Search Report XML

20. IB to provide improved/updated mapping to PCT forms as requested by JPO.
21. IB to respond to queries by the UK IPO and update Examination Report if necessary.
22. IP Offices to volunteer to test the updated Examination Report schema.
23. Task Force members to consider whether it is worthwhile implementing ST.96 with PCT considering that Hague and Madrid are already ST.96-compliant.

Agenda Item 10(d): Request Form XML

24. IPOs to provide feedback on the mapping of PLT form to ST.96.

Agenda Item 10(e): Authority File XML (ST.37 Annex III)

25. IB to create a new project for Task Force members to consider whether other implementation schemas of WIPO Standard ST.27, ST.37 & ST.87 should form part of the ST.96 library and whether there should be two separate versioning schemes; one for design component and the other for implementation schema.

Agenda Item 10(f): Patent Legal Status/ Patent Record XML

26. CIPO will participate if time permits under our current priorities and UK IPO to test the latest version of the Patent Legal Status schema; USPTO will confirm if they can participate. IPA confirmed they would participate as part of their API testing.

Agenda Item 10(g): Other open issues

27. [IssueID-618](#): UK IPO agreed to assist with testing the schema but noted this would be after they had completed the testing of the Legal Status schema.
28. [IssueID-620](#): UK IPO to update their proposal and invite the Task Force members' feedback.
29. [IssueID-627](#): IB to ask PCT for a response or clearer definition for this component.

Agenda Item 11: Geographical Indication XML (GIN)

30. JPO and KIPO to provide feedback on their respective agricultural ministries and provide their national classification system.
31. ROSPATENT to provide the updated schema according to the discussion at this meeting by the end of next week.
32. EUIPO and ROSPATENT (and tentatively CIPO) to participate in the testing exercise.
33. IB to ask Lisbon whether they can participate in the testing exercise.
34. Task Force members to review their national ProductCategory lists.
35. Task Force members to review ST.96, DRC rules regarding one business area (e.g. gin:) using components from another business area (eg. tmk:)

Agenda Item 12: Copyright Orphan Work XML

36. EUIPO, CIPO and SAIP to complete the testing and / or mapping exercise by the end of September.
37. JPO, USPTO and KIPO to contact the authority in charge of copyright to share the schema and ask for their help with testing.
38. UK IPO to review and update the schema as necessary to allow multiple languages where appropriate.

Agenda Item 13: ST.96 Industrial Design Components

39. [IssueID-628](#): (BusinessEntityStatusCategory)

- (a) ROSPATENT to review and confirm whether changing the Design Application would be needed considering future change to the Hague component.
- (b) IB to revise the proposal for meeting the needs of the USPTO to accommodate various business entities by this week.
- (c) USPTO to check if this revised proposal affects its structure and confirm whether it can agree to the revised proposal.

40. [IssueID-631](#):

- (a) ROSPATENT to consider the place for adding the element (either dgn:AffectedDesign or dgn:HagueDivision) and revise its proposal.
- (b) IB to raise a new Issue Id on the wiki to cover the comments made by IB/Hague.

41. [IssueID-632](#) (dgn:PrincipalDesignCategory): Task Force members to develop a solution to address IB/Hague and KIPO concerns in this regard.

42. [IssueID-633](#) (dgn:HagueGrantProtectionRequestType, dgn:HagueGrantProtectionType): KIPO and JPO to check the proposal and provide comments by the middle of next week.

Agenda Item 13(b): Other open issues

- 43. [IssueID-546](#): USPTO to review the proposal and provide comments.
- 44. [IssueID-574](#): UK IPO to consider whether DesignRecord can be reused instead of creating a new DesignBibliographicData.

Agenda Item 14: ST.96 Trademark Components

Agenda Item 14(a): Information sharing on Madrid XML

- 45. [IssueID-629](#): CIPO to provide further comment on [IssueID-629](#).
- 46. [IssueID-634](#): (i) CIPO to provide the revised proposal by March 22, 2019; (ii) Task Force members to review and provide comments by the end of March 2019.
- 47. CIPO, USPTO and IB to prepare ST96_V3_1_T2 for testing

Agenda Item 14(b): Other open issues

- 48. [IssueID-622](#): IB to provide comments to close this Issue ID.
- 49. [IssueID-625](#): CIPO to provide feedback to the revised description proposed by the IB.

[End of Annex III and of document]