

## **Webinar: WIPO Sequence Validator**

*hosted by the International Bureau of WIPO*

**Virtual, May 12, 2021**  
**12:00 – 13:30 (CEST)**

### **RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS**

*prepared by the International Bureau of WIPO*

Following are the responses to the questions raised at the Webinar.

**Q1: Will you send a link to participants with the presentation after today's webinar?**

A1: As we have done for the two previous webinar training sessions, we will publish both the recording of the session and the slide-deck on the associated event page. For this session, you can find these publications at: [https://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/details.jsp?meeting\\_id=62850](https://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/details.jsp?meeting_id=62850) .

**Q2: During the presentation, you indicated that an API communicates over HTTP. I hope an API actually uses HTTPS? Not HTTP?**

A2: Actually as is indicated in the slides, an API can use any means to communicate between two electronic devices. It is a web service which communicates over HTTP. HTTPS could be used but is not mandatory. API security and authentication protocols should be established instead. Recommendations for these are described in WIPO ST.90.

**Q3: Is it possible for an Office to use the WIPO Sequence desktop tool instead of the WIPO Sequence Validator in order to validate the sequence listings?**

A3: It is not recommended that Offices use the WIPO Sequence desktop tool to perform this verification process as the desktop tool only supports validation by uploading each sequence listing one-by-one into an instance of the tool.

Additionally, the validation performed by the desktop tool is slightly different to that performed by the WIPO Sequence Validator in that the verification report is highlighting relevant issues for an Office when considering compliance with WIPO ST.26.

**Q4: What assurances, if any, does the WIPO Sequence Validator make about maintaining the submitted sequence listing "in-confidence"?**

A4: The WIPO Sequence Validator should be incorporated into the internal Office IT environment. Therefore it is up to the Office to ensure that application and associated sequence listing data are kept secure.

**Q5: Are there scheduled uptimes and downtimes for the WIPO Sequence Validator? Or is it up to each Office to establish their own uptimes and downtimes?**

A5: Yes to the second question. WIPO has developed the Validator service for incorporation into internal patent Office environments but does not dictate when the service must be available.

**Q6: Do I correctly understand that use of the Validator (aka WAR (not JAR)) is conducted on the servers of the given IPO, e.g., the USPTO? Meaning uploading a sequence into Validator does not violate foreign filing laws? If data is exported outside of one's own country then it could violate foreign filing laws.**

A6: Whether the Service as a WAR or the SpringBoot JAR is selected by the Office for their particular IT environment, the validation process is completely internal to the Office environment. The server that is required for the WAR service is an application server and not a web server. This web service is not exposed externally.

**Q7: Will the files under the folder structure be archived after a certain time or will we need to schedule a script to manage the files?**

A7: As the folder structure currently required when installing the Validator service on an internal server must be created by the patent Office themselves, how the contents of this folder structured are archived or backed up is a decision for the relevant Office.

**Q8: Are the validation checks always done automatically by the WIPO Sequence Validator, or are there any manual steps that need to be done when a submission with sequence listings is received by the Office?**

A8: How an Office integrates the WIPO Sequence Validator as part of their e-filing process is up to them. Offices should indicate to their applicants exactly what checks will be performed at the moment of filing, if this process is automated.

This process could be automated in that the formality check is performed when an application and associated application is uploaded. Otherwise there will need to be a manual call to the Validator service to initiate the validation process by a requestor.

**Q9: Can the validate function of the WIPO Sequence Validator be fully automated so that there is no need of any manual step(s)?**

A9: The use of the 'validate' endpoint, of the WIPO Sequence Validator, could be fully automated by creating a callback endpoint which makes a request to the Validator to validate a file at an existing location. Any resulting errors or warnings would be returned as part of the response to this separate callback API, configured by the patent office. The initial trigger for the request could be the receiving of a sequence listing as part of the filing process, after the successful completion of the formality check.

**Q10: Are there any objections to my running the validator on my own server, even if I am not a national or regional patent Office?**

A10: WIPO plans to distribute the WIPO Sequence Validator to the Offices and support Offices if there is any technical problems. If other institutions, such as patent attorney firms, wish to use it, please contact us at [standards@wipo.int](mailto:standards@wipo.int).

**Q11: Will WIPO provide use cases on implementation and in-house automation, like the ones mentioned by USPTO?**

A11: In April 2021, WIPO organized an ST.26 implementation workshop with Offices discussing progress on their implementation plan. The USPTO, who is quite advanced in their efforts to integrate the Validator into their IT environment, presented on their experience. We will investigate how we can best share this information to interested parties who were not in attendance.

**Q12: Would the start time and end time, returned as part of the callback response, be defined by the system time on the server that is running the Validator service as a JAR?**

A12: Yes, the start and the end time will be taken from the server on which the Validator service is deployed.

**Q13: Will the Validator Service as a JAR file be updated from time-to-time?**

A13: Yes, both implementations of the Validator (WAR/JAR) will be updated when necessary. For instance, if there is an approved revision to WIPO ST.26.

**Q14: Is there a way to subscribe to a way to learn when a new version of the JAR has been published by WIPO?**

A14: Currently it has been agreed by Offices that their contact points should be contacted via email when there is a new version of the Validator service available. Interested parties who wish to stay informed of any WIPO Standards projects, should subscribe to the WIPO Standards newsletter at: [https://www3.wipo.int/newsletters/en/#wipo\\_standards](https://www3.wipo.int/newsletters/en/#wipo_standards)

**Q15: Is there a reason not to use the full validation directly during filing [when the line of communication is still open with the client system who made the request (synchronously)]? Is it just because of the potentially long time it could take to fully validate a sequence?**

A15: It is up to Offices to choose which degree of validation they conduct at the e-filing stage (either formality or full). However as the full validation will always take longer than the formality check, it is not recommended to conduct this check synchronously.

**Q16: If a sequence listing is created using the WIPO Sequence desktop tool, then will a full validation using the WIPO Sequence Validator find any errors?**

A16: If an ST.26 sequence listing is reimported into the WIPO Sequence desktop tool and validated there will be no reported errors unless:

- (1) The ST.26 sequence listing has been subsequently edited; or
- (2) The sequence listing was generated using an older version of the tool.

**Q17: Regarding the verification report in XML, do you have anything to turn this into a formatted document such as a PDF?**

A17: Currently the verification report is provided only as an XML document, in the same manner as the ST.26 sequence listing. However, as with the WIPO Sequence desktop tool, using either stylesheet or a FOP, it is possible to format this XML document into a more human readable format such as HTML or a PDF document.

**Q18: Do you have any plan to provide the comparison function that can show the differences between two sequence listings via WIPO Sequence Validator? We think this comparison function is a common requirement for Offices to perform substantive examination**

A18: After hearing recent requests from a number of Offices, the International Bureau is investigating how the WIPO Sequence Validator could be modified to include a side-by-side comparison feature for two ST.26-compliant sequence listings.

**Q19: If the WIPO Sequence desktop tool cannot generate a non-compliant listing, then why the need for IPOs to use the WIPO Sequence Validator to also verify the sequence listing?**

A19: Although use of WIPO Sequence to generate an ST.26-compliant sequence listing is recommended, an applicant can use any tool they wish. Offices should validate whether the filed sequence listings comply with ST.26 using the WIPO Sequence Validator.

In addition, an Office may have a specific requirement for sequence listings filed at their Office, e.g., a language requirement for any free text qualifier annotations. In this case they wish to validate the sequence listings with the specific requirements configured in their deployment of the Validator service.

**Q20: Is there a commitment from WIPO that the validator API will always get the exact same validation result as the validation function in the authoring tool?**

A20: The WIPO Sequence suite of tools (WIPO Sequence desktop tool and WIPO Sequence Validator) have been developed to support users to ensure that filed sequence listings are compliant with WIPO ST.26. In principle, the validation results from both tools should be identical if the configuration of these tools was the same. However, the configurations are slightly different as each serves a different purpose. These type of configurations are small tweaks to the severity reported in the verification report. For instance, an Office can turn on a warning which will report when a filed sequence listing does not have free text qualifiers provided in English.

While there should be no surprises at the time of filing for the applicant who uses the WIPO Sequence desktop tool to generate their sequence listing after filing, the content of sequence listings prepared with the WIPO Sequence desktop tool is the user's responsibility.

**Q21: In the case that errors are found during the initial formality validation check conducted by the Validator service, will the validation stop or continue till it gets to the end?**

A21: The WIPO Sequence Validator web service will not interrupt its validation process until either the full or formality check is complete unless there was an interruption to the Validator in which case the HTTP status code will indicate there was a communication error. The verification report should be comprehensive of all of the errors and warnings generated due to the specific sequence listing.

[End of document]