

W I P O

STANDARDS AND DOCUMENTATION WORKING GROUP

XML TASK FORCES' INFORMAL MEETING

MINUTES

INTRODUCTION

1. The informal meeting of the XML Task Forces of the Standards and Documentation Working Group (SDWG) was held from October 22 to 24, 2007, at WIPO premises in Geneva.
2. The following Member States of the XML Task Forces (namely the ST.36, ST.66, ST.86 and the XML4IP Task Forces) were represented at the Meeting: Australia, Canada, Denmark, Japan, Lithuania, Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, Sweden, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (17).
3. The Benelux Office for Intellectual Property (BOIP), the European Patent Office (EPO) and the Office for Harmonization in the Internal Market (Trademarks and Designs) (OHIM) (4) being members of the Task Forces took part in the session.
4. The list of participants appears as Annex I to the Minutes.

Agenda Item 1: Opening of the Meeting

5. The session was opened by Mr. Antonios Farassopoulos, Head of Classification and Industrial Property Standards Service who welcomed the participants.

Agenda Item 2: Adoption of the Agenda

6. The revised agenda (dated October 22, 2007) was unanimously adopted, with the following modifications, and appears as Annex II to these Minutes with items taken in the following order: 1 to 3, 4(c), 4(a), 4(b), 4(d), 4(e) and 5 to 19. A new agenda item "*Use of WIPO Standard ST.36 by Industrial Property Offices for filing, processing, and publication*" was added as new agenda item number 5 at the request of the EPO. New agenda item 5 involved each delegation having the opportunity to make an oral presentation (with a corresponding short text for the report). Items 5 to 18 were renumbered 6 to 19.

DISCUSSIONS, CONCLUSIONS AND DECISIONS

7. The presentations given at the Meeting (for which an electronic file is available) can be found on WIPO's website along with the working documents of this Meeting at the documentation area of the Task Force (<http://www.wipo.int/scit/en/taskfrce>).

Agenda Item 3: Introduction to the ST.36 Task Force's activities to date

Report by the Leader of ST.36 Task Force

8. The Task Force Leader explained the mandate given by the SDWG at its eighth session and the initial work of the Task Force. To undertake the initial work, the International Bureau (IB) as Leader provided the draft revised ST.36 ICE to align with the latest version of the DTDs of Annex F. A draft proposal of the revision to WIPO Standard ST.36 was also provided. The IB published the ST.36 ICEs in PDF format in accordance with the request raised in the informal meeting held at the eighth session of the SDWG.

9. The participants agreed that the IB does not need to publish the ST.36 DTDs in another format, e.g., PDF, as the DTDs are already published in XML format.

Agenda Item 4(c): Information concerning Citation Practices Task Force relating to ST.36

Presentation by the Leader of Citation Practices Task Force

10. The Task Force Leader of the Citation Practices Task Force presented the objective and background of the ongoing discussions on the revision of WIPO Standard ST.14 and other standards. The presentation paid particular emphasis to those issues which have an impact on, or from, ST.36. The ST.36 Task Force was asked to note the ST.36-related draft proposals presented in paragraph 5 of Annex II of document "Proposals for Citation Practices by Patent Offices". These, or similar proposals, would be made to the SDWG at the ninth session in February 2008.

11. In discussions about paragraph numbering, the USPTO noted that they accept the paragraph numbering provided by an applicant, but in the publication process the paragraphs are renumbered by the publisher. In this context, text editors are not relevant. Furthermore, it is not possible to impose maximum paragraph sizes on applicants for US patents. In the United States of America, the applicant often repeats the text of a long claim within the body of the application, to provide a basis for the claim. Indentations found in the US claim are repeated in the corresponding portion in the body of the patent document. The US patent document publisher numbers the indented components as sequentially numbered lists during the publication process. The EPO also renumbers paragraphs for publication. The Japanese delegation noted there is no function available to check the length of a paragraph.

12. Some discussions centered on how various elements, such as non text elements, were handled by different Offices, as follows:

(a) Non-text elements such as <math> are already in use by the USPTO. The USPTO, however, does not use the non-text element <chem> because there is no consensus about which standard to use. The EPO specifies that languages used in marking up applications must be open standard, such as CML (Chemical Markup Language). Even though CML is not a popular standard, they have no problem because they publish their data in image format as well as in XML format. Proprietary data such as ChemDraw would not be supported.

(b) Tagging used by the OHIM allows for XML annotation which functions like a table of contents existing outside the document. Pointers to particular parts of the trademark application are included in this tabular information resource. If a parameter within the application changes, the tabular information resource records the change and points one to the change. With regard to the usefulness of such an information resource for patent application, the USPTO believes this system may not be possible in the reality of the patent world because not every part of the process occurs electronically. For example, decisions such as those which occur in court cases would not necessarily be easily recordable. In addition, such information would need to be stable, that is, for at least 20 years.

(c) The necessity to publish an application as originally filed was stated to be another important factor by the EPO. Citation references must be presented as they are presented by the applicant, in the application. The EPO presents the applicant's citations as a list at the end of the document with a corresponding disclaimer. If there are no citations within the body of the document, there is no list at the end of the document. There is no indication on the EPO bibliographic data to point one to a list at the end of a document.

Agenda Item 4(a): WIPO Standard ST.36

Presentation by the Leader of ST.36 Task Force

13. The Task Force Leader presented the proposed revision of the ST.36 main body which is posted on the ST.36 Task Force e-forum. The delegates were informed of two new requested changes which are not in the documents posted on the e-forum. The first requested change is to remove the list of DTDs from paragraph 9 of the Standard. The second requested change is to remove the second sentence of paragraph 36 of the Standard.

14. Participants agreed on the proposed revision to include the addition of the International Common Elements (ICEs) to WIPO Standard ST.36 as Annex C, as proposed. With regard to the new changes, participants agreed to remove the list of Annex F DTDs while maintaining the reference to the URL of XML Canon repository. Participants agreed to keep the "Model DTD" and the "Industry-standard DTDs Incorporated by Reference".

15. Paragraphs 19 and 20 were revised to align with refining expression on the XML encoding in WIPO Standard ST.66.

16. The version number of WIPO Standard ST.36 was newly introduced to the Standard to align with the version numbering practice of WIPO Standard ST.66 and for maintenance. The version 1.2 was given to the revised Standard. The version numbering would also apply to the Annexes to the Standard independently.

17. The revision of the ST.36 agreed on by participants is attached to the Minutes.

18. A discussion about how to handle new versions of industry standard DTDs such as mathml2.dtd (see paragraph 9 in the Standard) resulted in that members should bring to the attention of the Task Force any new versions. The Task Force can then deliberate on the impact of introducing a new version of an industry standard.

19. Participants requested the IB to keep the URLs referred to in the Standard as stable as possible.

Agenda Item 4(b): Supplementary materials

Presentation by the Leader of ST.36 Task Force

20. The Task Force Leader presented the proposed revision of the ST.36 ICEs which have been aligned with the latest version of Annex F DTDs. Sixty-four new elements have been added and two elements have been removed.

21. The Task Force Leader drew attention to both the two removed elements: *sequence-listing-computer-readable-form* and *sequence-listing-written-form*, as well as to the double *table* element.

(a) The USPTO proposed that the two removed elements should be in the ST.36 ICE if the business needs of some Offices require their presence, even if the elements do not exist in the Annex F DTDs anymore. Before deciding on whether the two above-mentioned elements should be deleted, Offices will be invited to comment whether they have a business need for the above-mentioned elements. It was noted that there is a sequence listing working group within the PCT that might have a need for these elements.

(b) The table element appears twice because one of them includes industry-related elements, which should not be disturbed.

22. It was agreed that all office-specific elements should be removed from the proposed ST.36 ICE, in particular, 'ep', 'us', and 'wo' specific elements. The IB will provide a revised proposal for the revision of the ST.36 ICE.

23. It was agreed that the IB's instance of the XML Canon containing the schema version of the ICEs would be published as Supplementary Material to WIPO Standard ST.36. The XML Canon would be available as a hyperlink to the URL of XML Canon's website (<http://webaccess.wipo.int:8000/xcrqst/loginFrame.html>) available from the ST.36 supplementary materials website at http://www.wipo.int/standards/en/xml_material/st36/.

24. Participants questioned why there is restricted access to the XML Canon website and instead requested free access to anyone interested in the contents. The IB will investigate and provide an answer in due course.

Agenda Item 4(d): Draft PFCs for the PCT Annex F implying revision to the ST.36 ICEs

Presentation by the IB from the representative of the PCT in the IB

25. The IB presented the process that the PCT is following in requesting changes to the DTDs in Annex F of the Administrative Instructions and the consequential changes to ST.36 ICEs. Furthermore the IB presented changes linked to the 2008 PCT rule changes and the tentative schedule for their discussion through to approval. Following questions from the USPTO, the IB clarified that there is an expectation that should a revision request be made directly to the ST.36 ICEs, the Task Force membership includes sufficient Annex F Consultative group members that these members would be able to raise any consequential Proposals For Changes (PFCs) to Annex F, should they be required.

26. The IB will follow a modified process for Annex F approval where it will submit PFCs to the consultative group using a Circular with the distribution enlarged to include SCIT members. Feedback will be expected from both groups within the time constraints of the expedited process for the PFCs. Subsequently the PFCs will be approved and promulgated in Annex F DTDs in the knowledge that the wider group has no objections to the resultant revision requests to the ST.36 ICE. The revision requests to the ST.36 ICE will follow a schedule managed by the ST.36 Task Force.

27. The following PFCs scheduled to be submitted to the consultative group in early December 2007, are expected to be approved in February 2008 and enter into force in July 2008.

(a) PFC 07/002 - This PFC proposes a modification for the attorney-or-agent element used in power of attorney documents to allow for multiple *addressbook* entries in the case where a transliterated entry is required. The USPTO advised that in addition to the proposed change, the *addressbook* entity should be given an additional optional attribute to indicate which of the furnished addresses is the transliteration. The IB will review and update the PFC prior to submission to the consultative group.

(b) PFC 07/003 - This PFC proposes the addition of elements to ST.36 in support of the use of digital libraries in the International Application filing process.

(c) PFC 07/004 - This PFC proposes the marking of the substantial equivalence of the document for which there is a precedent request for a search.

(d) PFC 07/005 - This PFC adds a number of document types to the *package-data* element to address defects in the electronic filing package received by the IB currently. The USPTO pointed out that the *table-external* element usage may be that for which the *sequence-list-table* element usage is intended and should be reconsidered. Moreover the element names for the *electronic-receipt* and *receiving-office-information* should be

reconsidered. The IB will review and update the PFC prior to submission to the consultative group.

(e) PFC 07/006 - This PFC proposes the addition of two DTDs for sequence listings and sequence listing tables. The USPTO commented that the proposed DTD for sequence-list-tables may not be required as its functionality is already available in *table-external*. Furthermore it offered to provide the DTD it is using for US applications, where sequence listings are furnished for the encoding of said sequence listings in XML. The IB will review and update the PFC prior to submission to the consultative group.

Agenda Item 4(e): Draft proposal for the revision to the ST.36 ICEs from the EPO

Presentation by delegation from the EPO

28. The EPO presented two draft proposals. The first proposal PFC TO-07/EP1 was to add the following data elements to the ICE: *<previously-filed-application>* and *<B690>* for previously filed application. The first proposal requested for expedited consideration is urgently required by the EPO. The second proposal Draft PFC 2007 EP/2 was to add one content model *<document-changes>* to the ICE to allow for the XML tagging of corrections and changes.

29. There was no agreement on the business and legal requirements for the PFC TO-07/EP1 requesting a new element to accommodate changes to the EPC: According to Article 80 in conjunction with Rule 40(1) and (2) EPC 2000 the EPO will accept for the purposes of the filing date a reference to a previously filed application instead of a description. Such "reference filing" is provided in Article 5(7) and Rule 2(5)(a) PLT. Discussions took place about whether this was a country/region specific requirement or if an element that already exists would fulfil the need. Concern was also expressed that this request may be contingent on the imminent request for revision of INID codes.

30. The EPO, when questioned whether they could suggest a natural-language tag rather than a code (B690), replied that it has proposed both a B tag and a natural-language tag in its proposal to the Task Force. B tags are still used by the EPO in its implementation of ST36 in response to the requirements of users who have become acquainted with B tags for EPO data under the old SGML publication system. Whilst it is true that B tags are suggested by ST36 for a transition period, the EPO does not have plans to move to natural-language tags for bibliographic data mark-up in its publications in the near future. Participants wanted to know more before substantial discussion on the XML issues could begin. The EPO will, through the ST.36 Task Force e-forum, expand upon the legal requirements that can substantiate the business case for these new tags and the corresponding new INID code.

31. The participants agreed on the following schedule to review and adopt the following:

(a) The Task Force Leader will provide the final draft of the revision to the ST.36 Task Force members on October 29, if EPO provides the changes before that date.

(b) The Task Force members will be invited to comment on the final draft by November 19 (one week).

If there are no comments, the Task Force Leader will give 10 more days to receive comments (i.e., a new term finishing on November 29 would be open for comments by Task Force members). If there are still no comments after these 10 days, the proposal will be adopted as proposed.

If there are comments in the first round discussions, the second round discussions will take place as follows:

- The Task Force Leader will provide the revised draft on November 26.
- The members will be invited to comment by December 10 (one week).

If there are comments only after the second request by the TF Leader (by November 29), then the second round of discussions will take place as follows:

- The Task Force Leader will provide the revised draft on December 3.
- The members will be invited to comment by December 10 (two weeks).

If there are comments, the next round of discussions will not take place until the Task Force reaches consensus during a one week period for discussion.

The above process, if successful, could perhaps, in twelve months, provide a model for similar future requests. Using the e-forum to propose changes may obviate the need for many informal Task Force meetings.

Agenda Item 5: Use of WIPO Standards ST.36 and ST.66 by Industrial Property Offices for filing, processing, and publication

32. Each Office presented the use of WIPO Standards ST.36 and ST.66. The Offices' information is available on WIPO's website (see paragraph 7).

Agenda Item 7: Introduction to the ST.86 Task Force's activities to date

Report by Leader of the ST.86 Task Force

33. The Task Force Leader reported on the activities and reminded participants of the proposal by participants who attended the Alicante Meeting which is summarized as follows:

- The guidelines for implementation of the XML schema will be added to the main part of ST.86.
- Regarding the compatibility between ST.36 and ST.86, the ST.66: Appendix E may apply to the ST.86 *mutatis mutandis*.

- It was proposed to add “BW” “for Black and White and “IPR” for Intellectual Property Right to the draft ST.86 Appendix D, named List of Acronyms and Abbreviations, which is based on the ST.66 Appendix D.

Agenda Item 8: Discussion on the proposed draft of WIPO Standard ST.86

Presentation by Leader of the ST.86 Task Force

34. It was agreed to change paragraphs 28 and 29, and add a new paragraph after paragraph 29 to allow for the use of another encoding scheme instead of UTF-8. The new paragraph is copied from WIPO Standard ST.36, paragraph 20, with some changes. Discussions relating to the paragraphs in ST.86 that are also pertinent to ST.36 and ST.66, such as character information in paragraph 20 in WIPO Standard ST.36, should be applied in the same round, in tandem.
35. Some text was added to paragraph 64 to align with the same paragraph in WIPO Standard ST.66. Paragraph 77 was revised to give a better explanation about referencing images. The corresponding paragraph of WIPO Standard ST.66 is paragraph 75.
36. The use of Oxford English spelling was discussed and agreed to, as it is based on the UBL (Universal Business Language) from OASIS recommendation.
37. Clarification was sought about the meaning of paragraph 67 relating to occurrence indicators. The OHIM investigated further and provided an example for clarification.
38. The OHIM provided an example to clarify the use of namespaces for office specific elements as discussed in paragraph 71.
39. It was also agreed to remove PDF from paragraph 71 and to discuss it in the future to carefully define the paragraph to ensure that malicious active content cannot be introduced and other parameters such as selected restricted fonts are sufficiently defined. The agreed proposal of the ST.66 main body is attached to the Minutes.
40. Participants reviewed the proposed Appendices to the Standard.
41. With regard to Appendix A, comments previously received from five Task Force members were reviewed. The following agreements were reached. The numbers below relate to the numbers provided in the attached document entitled “Comments on draft on ST.86 XML Dictionary).
 1. *Designer* was adopted as the Element name.
 2. *Representative* was adopted as the Element name, as it is used in both MECA and ST.66.
 3. Participants agreed that month is sufficient for the length of the *DefermentPeriod*.

4. Participants agreed on *OpenToLicencingIndicator* and it was noted that clarity of definition is more important than the need to reduce prepositions and other parts of speech.
 5. The proposed ST.86 allows for both the single design per registration system (e.g., JP) and multiple designs per registration system (e.g., WO, EM).
 6. *Claim* is not used in the Standard.
 7. Statement of Monopoly (AU) is not used in the Standard and can be removed.
 8. Australia wishes to keep “Related art document (AU)” for now. Perhaps “Related Art Document (AU)” can be removed after the Australian delegation have spoken with their colleagues.
 9. While most respondents have not required Opposition elements, the delegation of Korea require more detail. The enumerated list in *OppositionBasisCodeType* will remain unchanged for now.
 10. As indicated in the point above there are no further values for enumerated list in *OppositionCurrentStatusCodeType* to be added to the proposed Dictionary. The five values for this element including “Undefined” will be retained.
 11. There are no further values to be added to the enumerated lists *PublicationSectionType*, *PublicationSubsectionType* at the moment. Further values will be proposed by AU and RU for consideration in the future.
 12. No further values will be added to the enumerated list *SignatoryCapacityCodeType* at the moment.
 13. *RoleCodeType* was replaced by *RoleType*. New enumeration values: *Owner*, *Trustee*, *Opponent*, *Third Party Requestor*, *Mortgagee*, *Holder*, *Registrant*, *Correspondent*, *Creator*, *Author* and *Agent* were added to the list of *RoleType*. Participants agreed to keep the value of *Other* as proposed. The difficulty is that value names can have different contexts in different jurisdictions, for example an *Owner* of an application in one country can mean something different than an *Owner* of an application in another region.
 14. *Record Licence*, *Record Mortgagee*, *Terminate Licence*, *Discharge Mortgagee* and *Change of Name* were added to the list of *TransactionCodeType* values. *Licence/Mortgage-Record* or *Terminate/Discharge* were removed from the list.
42. Another change regarding the ST.86 XML Dictionary is that PNG replaced PDF in the list of values for *FileFormatType*. The change should also apply to the ST.66 XML Dictionary.
43. OHIM presented the DS-XML Model Schema and Class Diagram which will be the basis for Appendix B and Appendix C, respectively. DS-XML Version 0.4 will be replaced by DS-XML Version 0.5 in early November. The Model Schema and Class Diagram will be changed to reflect the agreed changes for the XML Dictionary. The DS-XML has many similarities (for example payments) to ST.66. Release notes are published for each version of the schema. For consistency, the schema is used as the source from which other documentation is generated. Derivatives can contain as many or as few elements as are required for the business purpose; it is up to the Office to decide which elements to select from the schema. More information can be found at the website http://www.tm-xml.org/DS-XML/DS-XML_xml/index.xml.

44. Appendix D of the Standard as proposed was agreed upon.

Agenda Item 9: Preparation of the final draft of WIPO Standard ST.86 for final review

45. The Task Force co-leader (OHIM and the IB) will provide the revised XML Dictionary, Model Schema, and Class Diagram, in a few days, for consideration by the ST.86 Task Force.

Agenda Item 10: Introduction to the ST.66 Task Force's activities to date

Agenda Item 10(a): Presentation of current status and plan of MECA service to align with WIPO Standard ST.66

Presentation by the International Bureau

46. The IB presented the current status and plan of MECA service to align with WIPO. There are three "Flavors" of Trademark XML at WIPO:

(a) Romarin MECA - used for the Romarin online database. There is a ST.66 compliant version of this, which has necessitated minor changes in ST.66.

(b) Notification MECA - used for communications from WIPO to National Offices. There have been requests from DE and AT for a ST.66 version of this, and the work on an ST.66 compliant schema for this will begin shortly. Once done, data will be available in both formats to whoever requires it.

(c) Input MECA - used for communications from National Offices to WIPO. There are no plans to change existing systems as National Offices have invested heavily in these systems and there is no pressing need to change them. It is envisioned that we may create a ST.66 compliant version for an Office which will begin sending us data for the first time, but there are no plans yet.

Agenda Item 10(b): Presentation of current status and plan of TM-XML to align with WIPO Standard ST.66

Presentation by OHIM

47. OHIM presented the current status of TM-XML which was updated to comply with the Standard. Further information is available in the presented document: TM-XML-V1-1-Release-Notes.pdf.

Agenda Item 10(c): Introduction to the proposed revision of WIPO Standard ST.66 and comments by the members of the Task Force

Report by Leader of the ST.66 Task Force

48. The Task Force Leader reported on the activities of the ST.66 Task Force. Task Force members have been invited to comment on the draft proposal for revision of the WIPO ST.66 main part, Appendices A and E and the “Guideline for implementation of schemas” drafted by OHIM.
49. Two comments on the revision have been posted from Lithuania and the United Kingdom. The two Offices agreed on the revision. Two comments on the guidelines were posted from Germany and the Task Force Leader.
50. OHIM proposed to change the Appendices of the Standard to introduce new types and elements for appeals and decisions.
51. The IB proposed to update two types, i.e. *PriorityType* and *DesignatedCountryCodeType*, and two common types, i.e. *ISOCountryCodeType*, *WIPOST3CodeType*, to meet the business need for the Madrid Protocol.

Agenda Item 11: Discussion on the proposed revision of WIPO Standard ST.66

52. With regard to the main body of the Standard, the proposed revision regarding paragraphs 23, 47, 64, 68-1, 68-2, 74 and 75 was agreed to as proposed, except for a minor change to paragraph 75. It was agreed to change paragraphs 24, 28 and 29 and to add a new paragraph after paragraph 29 to align with ST.36 regarding XML character encoding. The agreed proposal is attached to the Minutes.
53. Requests for new file formats such as PDF and sound files as well as standardization of the definition (e.g. Pantone) of color marks were noted for future consideration. OHIM noted that MP3 file formats have been created in TM-XML 1.1 and proposed for the revision of the Standard. During the discussions it was mentioned that the numbers of some of these newer types of marks tend to be low and may not yet warrant the heavy workload that is required to investigate these issues.
54. With regard to Appendix E, it was agreed to remove the list of the ST.36 XML Schema fragments from paragraph 6 of the Standard. The XML Schema fragments will be only downloadable from WIPO website. The fragments will not be listed in Appendix E.
55. With regard to the XML Dictionary, OHIM proposed to add new types and elements for appeals and decisions. The JPO commented that the proposed elements should include as many common elements as possible. The selected common elements should also be applied to ST.86. The Task Force Leader expressed his concern about the time limitation to submit the final proposal to the Secretariat. The USPTO advised that they (will) closely follow the terminology dictated by the Federal court decisions. The USPTO further noted that the different Industrial Property forms (notably Patents, Designs, and Trademarks) use different

terminologies and expressed that harmonization of names across all forms might be difficult. It was agreed that the proposed changes would not be considered for ST.86 for the time being. OHIM will provide a new proposal which will accompany the summary of changes and the proposed revision of Appendix A of the Standard.

56. With regard to the Guideline for Implementation of Schemas: participants asked for more information to be added to the introduction, for example objective, goal, and audience so that non-technical people from Offices can better understand the guideline. It was agreed that the guideline was too important to be part of any one standard. The guideline will be a reference for all WIPO XML Standards with schema. It was also agreed that because the guideline is useful for all types of industrial property, it should be discussed within the framework of the XML4IP Task Force rather than the ST.66 Task Force, and that the USPTO would lead the discussion on this matter.

57. The IB proposed that *PriorityNumber* in *PriorityType* be optional rather than mandatory, to meet business needs. Participants agreed, and it was noted that OHIM had already adopted the proposal to TM-XML 1.1.

58. The IB proposed that the following values have to be added to the list of *DesignatedCountryCodeType*: AN, BH, CY, IR, KR, ME, NA, RS, SY, TN and US. The IB also noted that these were the ones the IB has found while converting data. There may be other codes from ST.3 which are missing.

59. For convenient maintenance of the *DesignatedCountryCodeType*, it was agreed that the *DesignatedCountryCodeType* should refer to *WIPOST3Code* rather than listed member countries of the International Protocol or Agreement, e.g. Madrid Protocol.

60. The IB proposed the country code 'YU' (Yugoslavia) to be added to the *ISOCountryCodeType* for the Madrid Protocol. The Task Force Leader advised that the code, 'YU', had been removed from the list of ISO 3166-1:1997 Version according to Newsletter No. V-8, published on 2003-07-23. The Leader proposed that *ISOCountryCodeType* be aligned with the latest version of the ISO 3166-1. If we need historical codes, it would be better to introduce another CodeType for country code, i.e. *ExtendedISOCountryCodeType*. Newsletters can be found from http://www.iso.org/iso/country_codes/updates_on_iso_3166.htm.

61. It was agreed to adopt the *ExtendedISOCountryCodeType* and 'YU' would mean 'Yugoslavia/Serbia and Montenegro' rather than 'Yugoslavia' as the WIPO Standard ST.3 recommends.

62. The Task Force Leader advised that the current *ISOCountryCodeType-V1997.xsd* already included the following changes which OHIM had reported regarding update of TM-XML:

(a) Add new country codes:

- AX (Åland Islands): according to the ISO 3166-1:1997 Newsletter V-9, published on 2004-02-13,
- GG (Guernsey), IM (Isle of Man), and JE (Jersey): according to the Newsletter V-11, published on 2006-03-29,

- ME (Montenegro) and RS (Serbia): according to the Newsletter V-12, published on 2006-09-26, and

(b) Remove:

- YU (Yugoslavia): according to Newsletter No. V-8, published on 2003-07-23.

63. It was agreed that the version of *ISOCountryCodeType-V1997.xsd* should be updated by *ISOCountryCodeType-V2006.xsd*. This is because the ISO published the new edition of the ISO3166-1:2006 and WIPO Standard ST.3 refers to the new edition.

64. The IB proposed to add RS (Serbia) and ME (Montenegro) to the *WIPOST3CodeType-V2006.xsd*. The Task Force Leader proposed the following changes to align with the latest version of WIPO Standard ST.3. The proposed changes were adopted:

- Add a new code “XN”, for the Nordic Patent Institute (NPI) as well as RS (Serbia) and ME (Montenegro),
- Change the “BX” Office name to the “Benelux Office for Intellectual Property (BOIP)” which was formerly the “Benelux Trademark and Designs Offices”, and
- Remove the code “YU” for Yugoslavia.

65. The Task Force Leader proposed that the version of *WIPOST3CodeType-V2006.xsd* be updated to *WIPOST3CodeType-V2007.xsd*. The proposal was adopted.

66. The IB noted a need to identify the states which no longer exist (e.g. CS, SU, DD/DL, YU) as listed in Annex B, section 2 of WIPO Standard ST.3. Whether these should be part of *WIPOST3CodeType* and commented as being historic, or should these be part of "*WIPOAUST3CodeType*", or should these be handled in some other way. OHIM also proposed *WIPOFormerST3CodeType* and the Task Force Leader proposed *ExtendedWIPOST3CodeType* to address this need.

67. It was agreed that three code types, namely *WIPOST3CodeType*, *WIPOFormerST3CodeType*, and *ExtendedWIPOST3CodeType* be used for WIPO Standard ST.3.

- *WIPOST3CodeType* contains only country names which are listed in the latest version of the WIPO Standard ST.3.
- *WIPOFormerST3CodeType* contains former codes for industrial property business needs (e.g. CS, SU, DD DT, YU).
- *ExtendedWIPOST3CodeType* should join the two code types whenever it needs.

68. It was agreed that *WIPOFormerST3CodeType* only include CS (Czechoslovakia), SU (Soviet Union), DD/DL (German Democratic Republic), and YU (Yugoslavia/Serbia and Montenegro) at the moment.

69. It was noted that Appendices A, B, and C of the Standard should be updated to reflect the changes mentioned above regarding the ISO Country Code and WIPO Standard ST.3.

Agenda Item 13: Introduction to the XML4IP Task Force's activities to date

Report by Leader of the XML4IP Task Force

70. The Task Force Leader reported that the Task Force has not had actively discussions since it was created. The Task Force Leader, however, emphasised the important role of the Task Force. The Leader reminded delegates that IP-XML was a registered trademark in the USA. It was agreed to use "XML4IP" instead of "IP-XML".

Agenda Item 14: Presentation of plan or practice of Offices

71. The JPO presented their optimization plan. They expressed their desire to achieve the global ICEs used across patents, trademarks and industrial designs as widely as possible.

72. The KIPO presented their practice using schema and the global ICE for patent, trademark, and industrial design data.

73. The USPTO gave an oral presentation plan for XML Schema.

Agenda Item 15: Discussion on a new WIPO XML Standard to be used for patents, trademarks and industrial designs (XML4IP)

74. USPTO presented their investigation on the XML4IP issues and proposed some schema elements of XML4IP. They also introduced the sample of Global ICE and compared the sample elements (e.g. Address, Name) which are already used in WIPO Standard ST.36 and ST.66/ST.86, and the proposed XML4IP.

Agenda Item 16: Review of the discussion on the XML Standards

75. The Task Force Leader showed the changes for paragraphs regarding XML encoding across the main body of the WIPO Standard ST.36 and ST.66, and proposed ST.86. The changes were proposed by EPO to consider Offices using Asian characters. The JPO supported the changes. Participants were asked to carefully review the proposed changes.

Agenda Item 17: Adoption of the Minutes of the meeting

76. It was noted that the distributed Minutes included only the discussion from October 22 to 23. Participants reviewed and adopted the Minutes up to paragraph 56 as above shown (except paragraph 52 which was left for Leader's decision and was revised. Participants are asked to review and confirm it paragraph 52. Participants are invited to comment on the other following paragraphs which were discussed on October 24.

Agenda Item 18: Presentation of Office Practices using XML Schema technology by OHIM

77. OHIM presented their practices using XML schema technology.

Agenda Item 19: Closing of the meeting

78. The meeting was closed following the presentation by OHIM and USPTO.

[End of document]