

世界知识产权组织标准委员会(CWS)

第三届会议

2013年4月15日至19日，日内瓦

关于制定商标领域新 WIPO 标准的建议

秘书处编拟的文件

1. WIPO 标准委员会(CWS)在 2012 年 4 月/5 月的第二届会议上，决定设立一项新任务(第 46 号任务)，对开发商标领域进一步标准的便利性开展研究，并将该任务分配给商标标准工作队。工作队被要求将研究结果与进一步活动的计划提交将于 2013 年举行的标准委员会会议审议。(见文件 CWS/2/14 第 44 段。)
2. 为了研究在商标领域开发进一步标准的业务需求、这些进一步标准的预期收益、拟进行标准化的要素以及为这些要素提出的初步建议，商标标准工作队在成员之间进行了两次调查。此外，这两次调查还被用来确定进一步标准化的选题。经过调查，工作队确定了开发新 WIPO 标准的 12 个选题，交标准委员会审议。调查的详情见本文件附件，供标准委员会审议。
3. 商标标准工作队建议：
 - (a) 第一阶段，标准委员会从下列三个备选方案中选定一至两个选题，把重点放在选定的选题上：
 - 关于声音商标电子管理的建议；
 - 关于动作商标或多媒体商标电子管理的建议；
 - 关于公布的商标文献的建议；

- (b) 关于为其余 10 或 11 个选题开发相应的标准，应当暂停工作，直到选定的选题完成标准化；
 - (c) 第 46 号任务应视为完成，并从标准委员会任务单中删去；
 - (d) 商标标准工作队应当停止。
- (见附件第 12 段至第 15 段。)
4. 根据上述以及附件第 13 段中工作队的建议，国际局建议标准委员会审议并批准：
- (a) 设立新任务，就选定的选题编写建议，以作为一项商标领域的 WIPO 标准通过(见上文第 3 段(a))；
 - (b) 成立一支新工作队负责新任务；
 - (c) 指定工作队牵头人；并
 - (d) 要求工作队就所开展的工作提交进展报告，其中包括新标准的开发日程表，交标准委员会第四届会议审议。
5. 选题讨论以及上述未来工作方面，在工作队的最后一轮讨论中，澳大利亚、加拿大和日本的代表表示希望由同一个工作队同时处理声音商标和动作商标或多媒体商标。

6. 请标准委员会：

(a) 注意本文件附件中提供的调查结果；

(b) 按上文第 3 段(a)中所述，选定编写新 WIPO 标准提案的选题；

(c) 批准按上文第 3 段(b)中所述，暂停其余 10 或 11 个选题的工作，直到选定的选题完成标准化；

(d) 按上文第 3 段(c)中所述，将第 46 号任务视为完成，并从标准委员会任务单中删去；

(e) 按上文第 3 段(d)中所述，停止商标标准工作队；

(f) 按上文第 4 段(a)中所述，设立新任务，就选定的选题编写建议，以作为 WIPO 标准通过；

(g) 按第 4 段(b)中所述, 成立一支新工作队负责新任务;

(h) 按上文第 4 段(c)中所述, 指定工作队牵头人; 并

(i) 按上文第 4 段(d)中所述, 要求工作队就所开展的工作提交进展报告, 其中包括新标准的开发日程表, 交标准委员会第四届会议审议。

[后接附件]

关于制定商标领域新WIPO标准的便利性的调查

背景

1. WIPO 标准委员会(CWS)在 2012 年 4 月/5 月第二届会议上, 同意设立一项新任务(第 46 号任务), 任务说明如下:

“对开发商标领域进一步标准的便利性开展研究, 并制定相应的提案, 其中应说明需求和每项新进展的预期收益以及各项提案的优先顺序。”

2. 标准委员会决定把这项任务分配给商标标准工作队, 要求工作队将研究结果与进一步活动的计划提交将于 2013 年举行的标准委员会会议审议。

3. 商标标准工作队在标准委员会第二届会议期间于 2012 年 5 月 1 日举行了一次非正式会议, 讨论今后要做的工作, 以及商标领域进一步标准化的一些可能选题。工作队成员商定, 在工作队内部进行一次调查, 以研究各商标局的进一步标准化业务需求, 并编写相应的建议。

4. 在 2004 年 1 月的第四届会议上, 原标准与文献工作组(SDWG)决定, 应当进一步关注商标信息的标准化, 并就商标标准工作队所确定的一份包括 13 项商标标准事项的清单达成一致意见。SDWG 商定, 优先开发两项新标准, 即现有的 WIPO 标准 ST.66 和 ST.67。关于其他 11 项商标标准的修订或必要时的制定, 标准委员会在第一届会议上决定应当暂停工作, 直到第 20 号任务完成。第 20 号任务在标准委员会第二届会议上被视为完成。(见文件 SCIT/SDWG/4/4 附件二; 文件 SCIT/SDWG/4/14 第 34 段至第 44 段, 文件 CWS/1/9 和文件 CWS/1/10 第 52 段和文件 CWS/2/14 第 42 段。)

调查结果总结

5. 为执行第 46 号任务, 在商标标准工作队成员之间进行了两次调查。调查旨在研究在商标领域开发进一步标准的业务需求、这些进一步标准的预期收益、拟进行标准化的要素以及为这些要素提出的初步建议, 另一个目的是为进一步标准化确定选题。

6. 第一次调查的问卷有三个部分。第一部分涉及 2012 年 5 月工作队会议上讨论的进一步标准化的可能选题; 第二部分涉及其他可能的选题; 最后一部分涉及 2004 年暂停的剩余 11 项建议。以下七个商标局参加了调查: 澳大利亚(AU)、加拿大(CA)、内部市场协调局(EM)、日本(JP)、大韩民国(KR)、俄罗斯联邦(RU)和联合王国(GB)。

7. 以参加第一次调查的工作队成员提供的答复为基础, 确定了商标领域可进一步标准化的 12 个选题: 六个新选题加上从剩余 11 项建议中选出的六个选题。被确定的每个选题都得到了一个或多个参加第一次调查的成員的支持。确定的 12 个选题是:

- 1) 关于声音商标电子管理的建议
- 2) 关于嗅觉(气味)商标电子管理的建议
- 3) 关于立体商标电子管理的建议
- 4) 关于全息图商标电子管理的建议

- 5) 关于动作商标或多媒体商标电子管理的建议
- 6) 关于位置商标电子管理的建议
- 7) 关于唯一化标识商标文献所需最低限度数据元素的建议
- 8) 尼斯分类号在可机读记录中的标准化登记
- 9) 关于公布的商标文献的建议
- 10) 与商标信息有关的更正、替换和增补出版准则
- 11) 用于标识不同种类商标文献的推荐标准代码
- 12) 关于官方公报中公告标目的编码建议。

8. 以第一次调查的答复为基础，第二次调查旨在进一步从预期收益、拟进行标准化的要素以及初步建议方面对确定的每个选题进行研究，并了解所确定选题的优先顺序。结果详见本文件附录，供标准委员会审议。以下十个商标局参加了调查：澳大利亚(AU)、加拿大(CA)、法国(FR)、内部市场协调局(EM)、日本(JP)、大韩民国(KR)、俄罗斯联邦(RU)、瑞典(SE)、联合王国(GB)和美利坚合众国(US)。

结束语

9. 按标准委员会的要求，商标标准工作队对开发商标领域进一步标准的便利性开展了研究，并以两次调查的结果为基础确定了 12 个选题。

10. 对于 12 个选题中的每一个，工作队均分析了有待解决的需求或问题、拟进行标准化的要素以及开发相应新标准的预期收益。这项分析的结果在本文件附录中报告，供标准委员会审议。这项分析应被视作一项初步研究，目的是向标准委员会提供信息，以决定在开发商标领域的新标准时，标准委员会应首先着重于哪个(哪些)选题。

11. 工作队还研究了第二次调查的答复方对 12 个选题中的每一个表达的倾向性和迫切性。相应的结果见附录表 3 中的总结，供标准委员会审议。

12. 工作队认为，分析结果明确显示了在商标领域继续开发新标准的便利性。由于许多商标局已经开始或正在考虑保护非传统商标，所以在这一过程中应尽早制定新标准，使标准委员会成员在这些商标的电子处理方法上有明确的方向。根据两次调查提供的信息，可以选出多个选题。但是，考虑到为每个可能的选题开发一项标准所需的时间、资源和工作量，工作队希望建议，作为第一阶段，标准委员会最初把重点放在一至两个选题上编写新标准提案。具体而言，根据附录表 3 中总结的优先顺序，工作队建议从下列三个备选方案中选定选题：

- 关于声音商标电子管理的建议
- 关于动作商标或多媒体商标电子管理的建议
- 关于公布的商标文献的建议。

13. 工作队建议，标准委员会从上段中选定标准化选题之后，标准委员会设立新任务，并成立一支新工作队负责新任务，以就选定的选题编写提案，供未来作为新 WIPO 标准审议和通过。
14. 关于为其余 10 或 11 个选题开发相应的标准，工作队建议暂停工作，直到上段中提议的新任务完成。
15. 工作队还希望建议将第 46 号任务视为完成，从标准委员会任务单中删去，并停止商标标准工作队。

[后接附录(英文)]

APPENDIX

RESULTS OF TWO SURVEYS

In Table 1 below, collective information is available regarding the 12 candidates; and the expected benefits from the standards, the features to be standardized and tentative recommendation for each candidate as well as preference of respondents to each candidate. In Table 2 below, further information regarding other features to be standardized or recommendations, based on the practices in the responded trademark offices, which may be useful for future standardization work. Table 3 shows the priority to each candidate by trademark offices who responded in the second survey.

Table 1: Business needs and tentative recommendations

Candidate for further standardization	Necessity/Benefits/Features to be standardized	Tentative recommendations	Priority (H, M or L)
Recommendation for the electronic management of sound marks	<p>As trademark business environment has changed rapidly, sound marks have been often recognized and accepted by some Industrial Property Offices (IPOs).</p> <p>Due to the absence of international standards for the electronic management of sound marks, IPOs need to establish their own ways to process the sound mark data.</p> <p>In order to assist IPOs on how to process the electronic management of sound marks in a common way and to facilitate sound mark data exchange among IPOs, a WIPO standard should be established to provide recommendation on the electronic management of sound marks, in particular, on file format and size.</p>	<p>File format: MP3, WAV</p> <p>File size: 3MB, 2MB</p> <p>Sampling rate for mini use 22.05 KHz for music and combined sound use 22.05 KHz or 44.1 KHz</p> <p>Bit depth: 16 bits</p> <p>Channels: 2=stereo</p> <p>Streaming, surround and loop are not allowed</p>	<p>H: AU, CA, EM, FR, KR, RU, US (7)</p> <p>M: GB, JP (2)</p> <p>L: SE (1)</p>
Recommendation for the electronic management of olfactory (scent) marks	<p>As trademark business environment has changed rapidly, olfactory (scent) marks have been often recognized and accepted by some IPOs.</p> <p>Due to the absence of international standards for the electronic management of olfactory (scent) marks, IPOs need to establish their own ways to process the olfactory (scent) mark data.</p> <p>In order to assist IPOs on how to process the electronic management of olfactory (scent) marks in a common way and to facilitate sound mark data exchange among IPOs, a WIPO standard should be established to provide recommendation on the electronic management of olfactory (scent) marks, in particular, how to handle these types of marks.</p>	<p>File format: ST.67</p>	<p>H: n/a</p> <p>M: FR, JP (2)</p> <p>M/L: CA (1)</p> <p>L: AU, EM, GB, KR, RU, SE, US (7)</p>

Candidate for further standardization	Necessity/Benefits/Features to be standardized	Tentative recommendations	Priority (H, M or L)
<p>Recommendation for the electronic management of three-dimensional marks</p>	<p>As trademark business environment has changed rapidly, three-dimensional marks have been often recognized and accepted by some IPOs.</p> <p>Due to the absence of international standards for the electronic management of three-dimensional marks, IPOs need to establish their own ways to process the three-dimensional mark data.</p> <p>In order to assist IPOs on how to process the electronic management of three-dimensional marks in a common way and to facilitate three-dimensional mark data exchange among IPOs, a WIPO standard should be established to provide recommendation on the electronic management of three-dimensional marks, in particular, on file format and procedures (e.g., single image or multiple images).</p>	<p>Single image with multiple views using file formats recommended in ST.67</p> <p>Resolution: 300dpi-400dpi</p>	<p>H: EM, GB, KR (3)</p> <p>M: AU, CA, FR, JP, RU (5)</p> <p>L: SE, US (2)</p>
<p>Recommendation for the electronic management of hologram marks</p>	<p>As trademark business environment has changed rapidly, hologram marks have been often recognized and accepted by some IPOs.</p> <p>Due to the absence of international standards for the electronic management of hologram marks, IPOs need to establish their own ways to process the hologram mark data.</p> <p>In order to assist IPOs on how to process the electronic management of hologram marks in a common way and to facilitate hologram mark data exchange among IPOs, a WIPO standard should be established to provide recommendation on the electronic management of hologram marks, in particular, on file format.</p>	<p>File format: ST.67</p> <p>Resolution: 300dpi-400dpi</p>	<p>H: n/a</p> <p>M: CA, FR, GB, JP, KR, RU (6)</p> <p>L: AU, EM, SE, US (4)</p>
<p>Recommendation for the electronic management of motion or multimedia marks</p>	<p>As trademark business environment has changed rapidly, motion or multimedia marks have been often recognized and accepted by some IPOs.</p> <p>Due to the absence of international standards for the electronic management of motion or multimedia marks, IPOs need to establish their own ways to process the motion or multimedia mark data.</p> <p>In order to assist IPOs on how to process the electronic management of motion or multimedia marks in a common way and to facilitate motion or multimedia mark data exchange among IPOs, a WIPO standard should be established to provide recommendation on the electronic management of motion or multimedia marks, in particular, on file format and size.</p>	<p>File format: ST.67 for image; and MPEG, MOV and AVI for multimedia</p> <p>Resolution: 300dpi-400dpi</p>	<p>H: AU, CA, FR, KR, RU, US (6)</p> <p>M: EM, GB JP (3)</p> <p>L: SE (1)</p>

Candidate for further standardization	Necessity/Benefits/Features to be standardized	Tentative recommendations	Priority (H, M or L)
Recommendation for the electronic management of position marks	<p>As trademark business environment has changed rapidly, position marks have been often recognized and accepted by some IPOs.</p> <p>Due to the absence of international standards for the electronic management of position marks, IPOs need to establish their own ways to process the position mark data.</p> <p>In order to assist IPOs on how to process the electronic management of position marks in a common way and to facilitate position mark data exchange among IPOs, a WIPO standard should be established to provide recommendation on the electronic management of position marks, in particular, on file format and size.</p>	File format: JPEG, TIFF	<p>H: n/a</p> <p>M: CA, FR, JP, KR, RU (5)</p> <p>L: AU, EM, GB, SE, US (5)</p>
Recommendation concerning the minimum data elements required to uniquely identify a trademark document	This Recommendation defines the minimum data elements required to uniquely identify all types of trademark documents whether published in paper or electronic form.	N/A	<p>H: FR, RU, SE (3)</p> <p>M: EM, KR, US (3)</p> <p>L: AU, CA, GB, JP (4)</p>
Standard recording of the NICE classification symbols on machine-readable records	This recording convention provides that symbols of the International Classification of Goods and Services for the purposes of the registration of Marks (NICE Classification) should be presented on machine-readable records for the exchange of information in machine-readable form, in a fixed-length field.	N/A	<p>H: EM, FR, RU (3)</p> <p>M: KR, US (2)</p> <p>L: AU, CA, GB, JP (4)</p> <p>? : SE (1)</p>
Recommendation for published trademark documents	It has been recognized that, with increasing international exchange of published trademark documents, there is a need to adopt some uniform procedures relating to the format and physical characteristics of trademark documents, as well as to the layout and presentation of bibliographic data components.	N/A	<p>H: FR, KR, RU, SE (4)</p> <p>M: EM, US (2)</p> <p>L: AU, CA, GB, JP (4)</p>
Guidelines for issuing corrections, alterations and supplements relating to trademark information	These guidelines aim at providing guidance to industrial property offices and other suppliers of trademark information on how to issue corrections, alterations and supplements relating to trademark information published in paper form or on machine-readable media, for the purposes of promoting an unambiguous and uniform presentation of such corrections, alterations and supplements.	N/A	<p>H: SE (1)</p> <p>M: EM, FR, RU (3)</p> <p>L: AU, CA, GB, JP, KR US (6)</p>

Candidate for further standardization	Necessity/Benefits/Features to be standardized	Tentative recommendations	Priority (H, M or L)
Recommended of standard code for the identification of different kinds of trademark documents	<p>The aim of this recommendation is to provide for groups of letter codes in order to distinguish patent documents published by industrial property offices. The letter codes also facilitate the storage and retrieval of such documents.</p> <p>*The ST.16 belongs to the Group I (General purpose standards for patents, marks and designs) of WIPO Standards. There is no code for trademark</p>	N/A	<p>H: EM, FR, SE (3)</p> <p>M: KR, RU (2)</p> <p>L: AU, CA, GB, JP, US (5)</p>
Recommendation for the coding of headings of announcements made in official gazettes	<p>Since WIPO Standard ST.17 is to improve the informative value of Official Gazettes, by including standard codes with the various headings, it should include contents about trademark with double letter-coded headings that were related to trademarks and not yet recorded.</p>	N/A	<p>H: FR, RU (2)</p> <p>M: EM, GB, KR (3)</p> <p>L: AU, CA, JP, SE, JP (5)</p>

Table 2: Trademark offices' practices regarding the candidates

Candidate for further standardization	Trademark offices' practices (e.g., other features to be standardized or recommendation)
<p>Recommendation for the electronic management of sound marks</p>	<p>EM: Total Application (Aug 2012) = 167 (134 TM Registered).</p> <p>One graphical representation is mandatory with the possibility to join one file containing a recording of the sound (optional).</p> <p>Image file: JPEG, 300 dpi, RGB colour encoding, max 2 MB.</p> <p>Sound file: MP3, max 2 MB (about 2 minutes of play).</p> <p>US: The Office currently accepts the following: "The reproduction must be in an electronic file in .wav, .wmv, .wma, .mp3, .mpg, or .avi format and should not exceed 5 MB in size for audio files and 30 MB for video files"</p> <p>Sound marks can be expressed in audio file with description such as musical notes or written explanation.</p> <p>Standards for audio file can be set in a way that permits easy access by the public and usability.</p> <p>The accessibility by public to the standard file formats should be considered. MP3 is a patented, non-free file format. CWS is asked to consider including one or more open-source or patent-free file formats. This comment applies to other questions likewise.</p> <p>KR: For the expression of musical notes, there are several file formats including midi formats. Defining the standards for midi file or other formats for expressing musical notes should be made.</p> <p>CA: The Office agrees a standard will need to be established for sound marks (as quickly as possible). CA would recommend that within this standard there is guidance on how to handle these marks (ex. have a sound file in the recommended format as well as an image of the sound as either musical notes or a sound wave and possibly a textual description). The reason for the image or textual description is so that the mark can be identified in non-electronic media (an Office report/letter). If an image is included it should follow ST.67. If a textual description is included then ST.66/96 would need to accommodate this text.</p> <p>SE: Sound marks are most important to find recommendation for among this categories (candidate 1-6)</p> <p>JP: The Office is considering the introduction based on the followings.</p> <p>Sound marks will be managed with image data of trademark samples, text data of trademark descriptions and audio files.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Format of electronic audio file: MP3 - Size of electronic audio file: We are considering whether or not a storage limitation should be set. - Trademark sample (mark image): A single image or multiple images of a same scale size. - Resolution: <JPEG> 200dpi <TIFF(only in black and white)> 400dpi - We would not fix the file size, either 3MB or 2MB. It is better to determine the size below 3MB.(JP)

Candidate for further standardization	Trademark offices' practices (e.g., other features to be standardized or recommendation)
Recommendation for the electronic management of olfactory (scent) marks	<p>EM: Total Application (Aug 2012) = 7</p> <p>Note: Due to the very few cases, this type is now included in the type "Other"</p> <p>US: There are very few of these in our inventory.</p> <p>KR: It is not clear whether there is an electronic file format that can express and store olfactory data.</p> <p>ST.67 does not mention olfactory data. File format for olfactory mark should be reconsidered.</p> <p>CA: The Office is curious why ST.67 is being suggested for olfactory marks. Until such time as the actual scent can be recorded I would suspect that the mark would be identified with a textual description describing the scent. Therefore I would suggest that this may just require an identified text in the ST.66 (and ST.96) XML format to contain this text. I have put the priority on this item as Medium or Low as the ST.66/96 work would be minimal and in fact this would be more of a monitoring activity to see how Offices handle olfactory marks as they become more common.</p> <p>JP: JPO has not yet considered. Thus, JPO would like to share the information with other offices.</p>
Recommendation for the electronic management of three-dimensional marks	<p>EM: Total Application (Aug 2012) = 6786 (3492 TM Registered).</p> <p>Current practice: 1 graphical representation (file) is mandatory.</p> <p>Image file: JPEG, 300 dpi, RGB colour encoding, max 2 MB.</p> <p>US: There are very few of these in our inventory(US)</p> <p>KR: The current status of standard setting of 3-D marks seems to address expressing 3-D marks in a single image with multiple views. In that case, 2-D file formats will suffice.</p> <p>Regarding 2-D formats, in line with our comments for audio file, we think it'd be appropriate to include one or more open-source or patent-free file formats in the standard formats.</p> <p>Since there are file formats that can express 3-D shapes (e.g. 3ds, dwg, dxf, iges), the CWS is asked to consider inclusion of 3-D file formats.</p> <p>For now, doesn't appear that dominantly used file formats have emerged or industry-standard or de facto standard has been determined. Given the situation, It'd be appropriate to discuss the standard features of the 3-D file formats.</p> <p>Also, at least one or more neutral (open-source or patent-free) file formats (e.g., dxf, iges) should be considered.</p> <p>CA: The Office agrees this could be handled in ST.67 although I am wondering why JPEG was identified (should be either PNG or TIFF).</p> <p>SE: Three-dimensional marks are most important to find recommendation for among this candidate (number 1-6)</p> <p>JP: The Office has introduced its own system.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Trademark sample (mark image): A single image or multiple images of a same scale size. - Resolution: <JPEG> 200dpi <TIFF(only in black and white)> 400dpi

Candidate for further standardization	Trademark offices' practices (e.g., other features to be standardized or recommendation)
<p>Recommendation for the electronic management of hologram marks</p>	<p>EM: Total Application (Aug 2012) = 9 Note: Due to the very few cases, this type is now included in the type "Other"</p> <p>US: There are very few of these in our inventory</p> <p>KR: Same as audio file formats.</p> <p>CA: The Office agrees this could be handled in ST.67.</p> <p>JP: The Office is now considering the following contents.</p> <p>Hologram marks will be managed with image data of trademark samples and text data of trademark descriptions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Trademark sample (mark image): A single image or multiple images of a same scale size. - Resolution: <JPEG> 200dpi <TIFF(only in black and white)> 400dpi(JP)
<p>Recommendation for the electronic management of motion or multimedia marks</p>	<p>EM: Too few cases to justify a separated type. Included in the type "Other" (same for position mark) Total App "Other" (Aug 2012) = 581 (180 TM Registered) Current practice: 1 graphical representation is mandatory Image file: JPEG, 300 dpi, RGB colour encoding, max 2 MB</p> <p>US: The Office's inventory of these has been increasing quite rapidly.</p> <p>KR: Since many offices accept motion mark expressed either in motion picture file or in a series of still images, covering both still images and motion picture file formats are appropriate. Like our comments on audio file formats, one or more open-source or patent-free file format should be considered. The file formats of MPEG, MOV and AVI might not be freely usable formats.</p> <p>CA: The Office agrees a standard will need to be established for motion marks (as quickly as possible). I would recommend that within this standard there is guidance on how to handle these marks (ex. have a motion file in the recommended format as well as a single image of multiple views of the motion and possibly a textual description). The reason for the image or textual description is so that the mark can be identified in non-electronic media (an Office report/letter). If an image is included it should follow ST.67. As per my previous email I would question the use of "AVI" format as it requires specific plug-ins that limit is general use. If a textual description is included then ST.66/96 would need to accommodate this text.</p> <p>JP: The Office is now considering the following contents.</p> <p>Motion or multimedia marks will be managed with image data of trademark samples and text data of trademark descriptions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Trademark sample (mark image): A single image or multiple images of a same scale size. - Resolution: <JPEG> 200dpi <TIFF(only in black and white)> 400dpi(JP)

Candidate for further standardization	Trademark offices' practices (e.g., other features to be standardized or recommendation)
Recommendation for the electronic management of position marks	<p>US: The Office doesn't define position marks</p> <p>KR: ST.67 can appropriately handle this issue, can't it?</p> <p>CA: The Office would suggest this follow a similar approach as three dimensional marks, as a single image with multiple views to identify the position. As an image this should follow ST.67 (PNG or TIFF). There may also be a requirement to provide a textual description and so ST.66/96 would need to allow for this text.</p> <p>JP: The Office is now considering the following contents.</p> <p>Position marks will be managed with image data of trademark samples and text data of trademark descriptions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Trademark sample (mark image): A single image or multiple images of a same scale size. - Resolution: <JPEG> 200dpi <TIFF(only in black and white)> 400dpi(JP)
Recommendation concerning the minimum data elements required to uniquely identify a trademark document	<p>US: The Office has 300 different types of trademarks documents defined in our content repository.</p> <p>KR: The phrase "all types of trademark documents" isn't clear. If the phrase means the type of trademark document that serves as status indicator for a trademark (i.e., application, first office action, final refusal, etc.), then the work would be useful.</p>
Standard recording of the NICE classification symbols on machine-readable records	<p>CA: This information is already contained within ST.66/96 and given its current simple structure (2 digit codes) do not believe a separate standard would be required. If/when the NICE structure is modified to have class and sub-classes (similar to the Vienna Class structure) then this may need to be reviewed.</p> <p>SE: The meaning of the proposed candidate was unclear to the Office.</p>
Recommendation for published trademark documents	N/A
Guidelines for issuing corrections, alterations and supplements relating to trademark information	SE: It is very important.
Recommended of standard code for the identification of different kinds of trademark documents	N/A
Recommendation for the coding of headings of announcements made in official gazettes	CA: The Office believes a more important discussion may be the future of Official Gazettes. Given the increasing use of electronic Gazettes and search systems, there should be a discussion on the ongoing requirement of a Gazette and what will constitute "publication".

Table 3: Summary of respondents' preference

List of Standard proposed for Trademarks	Priority										Total		
	AU	CA	EM	FR	JP	KR	RU	SE	UK	US	H	M	L
Recommendation for the electronic management of sound marks	H	H	H	H	M	H	H	L	M	H	7	2	1
Recommendation for the electronic management of olfactory (scent) marks	L	M/L	L	M	M	L	L	L	L	L	0	3	8
Recommendation for the electronic management of three-dimensional marks	M	M	H	M	M	H	M	L	H	L	3	5	2
Recommendation for the electronic management of hologram marks	L	M	L	M	M	M	M	L	H	L	1	5	4
Recommendation for the electronic management of motion or multimedia marks	H	H	M	H	M	H	H	L	M	H	6	3	1
Recommendation for the electronic management of position marks	L	M	L	M	M	M	M	L	L	L	0	5	5
Recommendation concerning the minimum data elements required to uniquely identify a trademark document	L	L	M	H	L	M	H	H	L	M	3	3	4
Standard recording of the NICE classification symbols on machine-readable records	L	L	H	H	L	M	H	-	L	M	3	2	4
Recommendation for published trademark documents	L	L	M	H	L	H	H	H	L	M	4	2	4
Guidelines for issuing corrections, alterations and supplements relating to trademark information	L	L	M	M	L	L	M	H	L	L	1	3	6
Recommended of standard code for the identification of different kinds of trademark documents	L	L	H	H	L	M	M	H	L	L	3	2	5
Recommendation for the coding of headings of announcements made in official gazettes	L	L	M	H	L	M	H	L	M	L	2	3	5