

WIPO



SCIT/ITPWG/2/9
ORIGINAL:English
DATE:February5,2003

E

WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION
GENEVA

STANDING COMMITTEE ON INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY PROJECTS WORKING GROUP

Second Session
Geneva, February 3 to 7, 2003

REPORT

Adopted by the Working Group

INTRODUCTION

1. The Information Technology Projects Working Group (ITPWG) of the Standing Committee on Information Technologies (SCIT) held its second session from February 3 to 5, 2003.
2. The following Member States of WIPO were represented at the session: Australia, Bangladesh, Canada, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Czech Republic, Egypt, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Lithuania, Malta, Mexico, Morocco, Nigeria, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Spain, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States of America and Zambia (38).
3. Representatives of League of Arab States (LAS), the Benelux Trademark Office (BBM), the Eurasian Patent Organization (EAPO), the European Patent Office (EPO), the Patent Documentation Group (PDG) and the International Confederation of Societies of Authors and Composers (CISAC) (6) took part in the session.
4. The list of participants appears as Annex I to this report.

AgendaItem1:OpeningoftheSession

5. ThesessionwasopenedbyMr. A. Roach,ChiefInformationOfficer(CIO)and Director,InformationTechnologyProjectsDivision,whowelcomedtheparticipants on behalf oftheDirectorGeneral.

AgendaItem2:ElectionoftheChairandtwoVice-Chairs

6. TheSCITITPWGunanimouslyelectedMr.R.Hüsing(Germany)asChairand Mr. J. Rombouts(Canada)andMr.B.Boreschievici(Romania)asVice-Chairs.

7. Mr.RoachactedastheSecretaryofthesession.

AgendaItem3:AdoptionoftheAgenda(Document SCIT/ITPWG/2/1)

8. TheITPWGunanimouslyadoptedtheagenda,whichappearsas AnnexIItothisreport.

AgendaItem4:ReviewofprogressintheimplementationoftheWIPO NETProject (Document SCIT/ITPWG/2/2)

9. InintroducingdocumentSCIT/ITPWG/2/2,theSecretariatremindedtheITPWGofthe twoprimarygoalsoftheProject,namelytodeliverequipmentandInternetaccessto IntellectualPropertyOfficeswhichhadnoneandthentoprovidesecuredcommunication servicesbetweenallNationalOffices.TheProjectbudgetforthe2003/2004was29.2million Swissfrancsand implementationwasscheduledforcompletionbytheendoftheyear.To date,ofthe138 IntellectualPropertyOffices(IPOs)entitledtoreceiveWIPO NET,the Secretariatwasawaitingrepliesfrom28IPOs,atotalof100 IPOshadbeensurveyedand,of these,54hadreceivedtheWIPO NETKIT.OftheremainingsurveyedIPOs,23 wereawaiting confirmationoftheirsitereadiness.TheSecretariatHADexperiencedsomedelaysin deploymentthelatterpartof2002duetothe developmentofthesecondgolddisk. e.the software,whichisloadedontothedesktopequipmentdeliveredtotheIPOs.ThisHADnow beenresolvedandequipmentwasagainbeingshippedtothewaitingIPOs.Ofthose 177 IPOswhoalreadyHADInternetaccess164 HADreturnedlettersofinterestintheProject. Withregardtotraining,ofthe315 IPOsentitledtoreceivetraining,140 focalpointsfrom 114 countriesHADalreadyattendedoneof14 regionaltrainingworkshopswith12more workshopsscheduledfor2003.TheSecretariatappealedtothoseMemberStateswhoHADyet tocompleteWIPO NETdeploymenttodosoassoonaspossibletoallowtheProjecttobe completedontimeattheendof2003.

10. OnthesubjectofthefuturesustainabilityoftheWIPO NET,theSecretariatinformingthe ITPWGthatitwishedtoinstigateaprocessofof-evaluationofstakeholders'business requirementsandtomeasureWIPO NET'sabilitytoresponddtothem.Anumberofbusiness applicationswereunderdevelopmentanditwasplannedthatWIPO NETwouldbeanintegral partofotherWIPOautomationactivitiese.g.PCTSecureApplicationsFiledElectronically (PCT-SAFE),IntellectualPropertyDigitalLibrary(IPDLs)andInformationManagementfor thePatentCooperationTreaty(IMPACT).Workwasregularly undertakentokeepthedesk topoperatingsystemsoftwareuptodateandeverythreemonths SociétéInternationalede TélécommunicationAéronautique (SITA)willdistributetoeachIPOaCDcontainingthe

necessary virus protection files and system upgrades. This channel will also be used to distribute new business applications e.g. a trademark software package in the Latin and Caribbean Region.

11. The Delegation of Canada raised a question concerning the process of communications between IPOs with Internet access, and in particular the larger Offices that have existing networked systems. Although highly desirable, it had been impossible to establish a system architecture whereby WIPO NET could be linked to an existing system on a server-to-server basis. The Delegation also requested clarification on what was covered in the WIPO NET annual operational budget of 12.3 million Swiss francs.

12. In response, the Secretariat said that, having resolved the problem of the gold disk, the Project Team was now able to focus on the issue of gateway-to-gateway communications. However, there remained a number of security issues that would need to be resolved, particularly if an IPO had separate Internet access that could permit a user access to WIPO NET. The Secretariat had been working with International Business Machines (IBM) to resolve such issues and was in the process of raising a contract revision for IBM to proceed with security-related technical work. Given the ongoing requirement for a gateway-to-gateway communications, the matter was perceived as being one of WIPO NET operations rather than project development and would be implemented before the end of 2003.

13. The Secretariat further stated that with regard to the issue of on-going WIPO NET costs, the figure quoted related, basically, to outsourcing of operations to IBM. However, the sum also included: a small component for the SITA helpdesk, telecommunications charges for the WIPO-funded 30 hours on Internet access per IPO provided with the equipment on the SITA network and the leasing of equipment.

14. The Delegation of Zambia, speaking on behalf of the Africa Group, requested the Secretariat for the Project update and asked for information specific to the deployment of WIPO NET in the African Region. It also requested information on the sustainability of the network in the long-term. The Secretariat undertook to provide the information requested and encouraged Member States to utilize the WIPO NET helpdesk as much as possible to ensure that staff of IPOs were able to maintain and optimize their usage of the network.

15. In response to an intervention from the Delegation of the United Kingdom emphasizing the further elaboration of the possible links between WIPO NET, Patnet and Trinet prior to expending resources on the development of gateway-to-gateway communications, the Secretariat agreed that such connections would provide the required communication pipes between IPOs negating the need for gateway communications with WIPO NET for some IPOs.

16. The Delegation of Germany expressed its understanding that WIPO NET, as a global information infrastructure, must be connected to all IPOs regardless of their size. In this respect, it requested further information on the possible connection of WIPO NET to Patnet, given that this was of particular interest to the current and future member countries of the European Union.

17. In response to the questions of WIPO NET connectivity with other networks, the Secretariat recalled that the said subject was reported on a meeting held recently in Tokyo between the European Patent Office (EPO), the Japan Patent Office (JPO) and the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) and WIPO. The purpose of the meeting had been to discuss the connection of WIPO NET, Patnet (the network between the EPO and its

members) and Trinet (the network of the Trilateral Offices: Japan, EPO, United States and WIPO). The latter of which would shortly be moving to Internet-based technologies. WIPO, as leader of the *ad hoc* Task Force established at the meeting, had been charged with producing a plan for connecting the networks and did not anticipate that the planning work of the Task Force would take very long. The goal of the plan was to allow a user on any of the networks to move across them and access services transparently. The planning stage would also produce a recommendation on the level of the budget required to complete the work and the Secretariat undertook to give a status report on the work for the SCIT Plenary at its next meeting in June 2003.

18. The Delegation of the EPO endorsed the oral report of the Tokyo meeting and added that not all Patent users were on the Internet and other solutions had been employed based on business requirements. The EPO, USPTO and JPO were committed to producing a concrete plan for discussion at the Trilateral Meeting to be held in June 2003, in order to make progress as fast as possible on the matter. Such progress would require WIPO to ensure that data exchange between its own systems, i.e. WIPO NET, PCT-SAFE and IMPACT was implemented and that the necessary interfaces between the systems were available.

19. The Secretariat assured the meeting that the strategy within WIPO was that all the Organization's E-business would be carried on WIPO NET. This was not the case at the moment as some legacy systems were still running on the International Computing Center (ICC) but that it was planned to migrate the data exchange mechanisms onto WIPO NET as soon as was feasible.

20. The Delegation of the United States agreed with previous speakers that there needed to be further encouragement for the use and promotion of WIPO NET. It asked the Secretariat to provide the meeting with information on the volume of data on the network and the metrics being used to measure the actual use of the system. The Delegation also requested information on the level of usage of the IBM data center and forecasts on future load increases and individual transaction costs. With regard to the issue of promotion of the network, the Delegation asked how this would be carried out and over what period of time. Also, what key success factors would be used to determine the take-up of the network.

21. The Secretariat replied that work was being carried out with IBM to look at the issue of metrics. Unfortunately, as the network was secure it was not possible to monitor the volume or content of traffic. However, some applications were already moving gigabytes of data per week from the File Transfer Protocol (FTP) server. Given that training had only begun in April 2002, it was expected that use of the network would increase in the short term, for example, discussion groups had already been established and IPOs were requesting help to build websites. Work was also underway with the SITA Helpdesk to provide Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) and to construct a database of user's questions. With regard to transaction costs, it was impossible to quote figures as WIPO NET had yet to establish the notion of a transaction. A plan for the promotion of use of WIPO NET was currently being prepared with the close cooperation of the Cooperation for Development Sector, where a number of activities have been planned for 2003, again to stimulate WIPO NET usage in developing and least developed countries. Finally, in 2003 an independent study was planned on the long-term support of WIPO NET to establish whether or not to remain totally outsourced, partially outsourced, or to insource operations.

22. The Delegation of France said that it regretted that the French documentation for the meeting had not been available in sufficient time to allow for detailed study. With regard to WIPONET, the Delegation reiterated the need for the security of the network and the various IPOs connected to it, either directly or through other networks such as Patnet.

23. The Delegation of Canada referred to an earlier intervention emphasizing the need for secure transmissions between the various Member States networks. It remained unclear as to how the various WIPO systems (WIPONET, IMPACT and PCT-SAFE) would all fit together now that connection to Patnet and Trinet was being considered. The Delegation also supported the need for a change to the system of project status reporting; it would prefer to see WIPO's own internal project reports being made available to Member States, on the basis that they would be sufficiently detailed and timely to be of use in the automation planning of individual IPOs. Finally, the Delegation asked about IBM's pricing structure with particular reference to the potential and significant increase in the number of WIPO NET users once the network is disconnected to Patnet or Trinet.

24. The Secretariat replied that the IBM contract was fixed cost but based on a number of assumptions; one of which being that the network would be configured for 2,000 users. Therefore, an increase in the number of users would have a bearing on costs, as would be the case if additional users were connected via a gateway.

25. The Delegation of the League of Arab States and the Delegation of Egypt, requested the Secretariat to consider, budgetary issues aside, the provision of an Arabic language version of WIPONET.

26. The Delegation of the United States of America supported the intervention of the Delegation of Canada that the level of information on WIPO's projects being made available to Member States should be significantly improved. Only then could Member States be sure that their own automation planning took into account dependencies on WIPO's activities. Also, that a mechanism needed to be established for delegates to have an input into the metrics being developed for WIPONET and how the network plan should evolve in terms of business application development. This would then allow for the critically important activity of the assessment and reassessment of stakeholder business requirements.

27. In response to a question from the Delegation of the BBM, regarding the use of WIPONET in the area of trademarks, the Secretariat clarified an earlier statement that the regular distribution of system updates and patches on CD-ROM by SITAC could be used to transport business application software, for example, a trademark software currently being deployed by the WIPO Intellectual Property Office (IPO) Automation Division.

28. The Delegation of Australia shared the position of several other delegations in that it was dependent on the delivery of certain WIPO systems for its own automation planning. Of particular interest were a number of issues relating to security, capacity and gateway-to-gateway communication. The Delegations supported, therefore, the desire of the Standing Committee for an increase in the detail and transparency of WIPO's information technology planning and status reports. This would be of significant value to the Delegation and to all Member States in terms of realizing the benefits from WIPO's projects. The Delegation also supported the need for a formal mechanism for the SCIT to identify new business opportunities and future business applications for WIPONET.

29. The Delegation of the United States of America proposed to the Working Group that a Task Force be created for the purpose of identifying business opportunities and applications for WIPO NET.

30. Having received the support of several Delegations, the ITPWG agreed to set up a Task Force to discuss the utilization of WIPO IT systems in support of core business processes of Member States. The Task Force was requested to consider in particular:

(a) the gathering/collection of procedural, technical and functional requirements from WIPO Member States for ensuring the maximum benefit and utilization of WIPO IT systems; and

(b) the integration of WIPO IT systems functionality (i.e., PCT -SAFE, IMPACT, WIPO NET) as well as data and information exchange between WIPO IT systems and the IT systems of Member States.

31. The Task Force will conduct its business electronically and present its findings, no later than November 2003, for consideration by the SCIT ITPWG at its next meeting in February 2004.

32. Member States were invited to nominate their representatives to the Task Force to the Task Force leader no later than March 31, 2003.

33. The Delegation of the United States of America was appointed as leader of this Task Force.

34. In concluding the debate on this item, several Delegations emphasized the need for all WIPO's information technology projects to be reported to the SCIT, including those implemented under the aegis of the IPO Automation Division.

35. *The ITPWG noted the contents of the document SCIT/ITPWG/2/2.*

Agenda Item 5: Review of progress in the implementation of the IMPACT Project
(Document SCIT/ITPWG/2/3)

36. In introducing the document SCIT/ITPWG/2/3, the Secretariat gave the following presentation on the status of the project focusing on delivery, feedback from users, next steps and future needs.

37. The Project, with a budget of 40 million Swiss francs, was proceeding within budget and had recorded delivery of several major milestones. The PCT Intermediate Scanning Office (ISO) had been deployed in September 2001 and since then had saved the preparation and sending of approximately 500 to 600 kilos of paper per week. Four big IPOs (European Patent Office, Japan, Republic of Korea and the United States of America Offices) now receive all priority documents on DVD. Scanning of documents has also been extended to include PCT pamphlets, corrected versions of already published pamphlets, declarations under Rule 4.17, international preliminary examination reports (IPERs), translations when not in English and priority documents.

38. The IMPACT communications system delivered a flexible electronics system for the delivery of data and documents between the International Bureau and IPOs and again reduced the volume of paper being processed and shipped. The IMPACT communications system was divided into two parts: the systematic communication and the specific communication components. The systematic communications system was delivered to the PCT Operations team in July 2002, for acceptance testing, and is now operational resulting in all pamphlets being prepared for publication using IMPACT. Fourteen IPOs now use systematic communication. The system can distribute documents on paper, CD-ROM and DVD. The specific communications system was delivered to the PCT Operations team in September 2002, is now operational and is being deployed to IPOs. With regard to the module for an electronics system for the receiving office at the International Bureau (RO/IB), the specifications had been drafted in Spring 2002, however, the operational structure is being finalized, which prevents the sign-off of the specifications document, leading to a delay in the start of the RO/IB development phase.

39. Aside from the RO/IB module development work on IMPACT will be completed by the end of March 2003, when the automation system for the IB will be delivered to PCT operations. After acceptance testing, the IB system will be deployed progressively during the remainder of 2003. The IB system allows WIPO to accommodate the growth of PCT filings and to contain staff growth as well as enabling the electronic processing of PCT applications.

40. In respect of the overall Project timetable, the development of IMPACT had been scheduled to take 36 months, and to conclude in December of 2002. Mid-2002 it was necessary to revise the Project time-line to 39 months following several problems, in particular the bankruptcy of one of the main contractors and the departure from the Project of several key developers. In concluding its presentation, the Secretariat cited issues to be addressed, such as, expectation management, the need to earn project capability and the importance of change management. In the case of the latter, one of the successes of the Project lay in the fact that that PCT was re-structured to be ready to receive the new system.

41. In response to the concern of the Delegation of Japan that the IMPACT Project would be able to receive Japanese character PCT filings from January 2004, the Secretariat said that the data receipt package of the system had been partially tested and was available for receiving electronic data. However, further discussions were still required to finalize arrangements for some character sets, e.g., Japanese and Korean. Once this issue is resolved, the data receipt package will go into a formal testing phase to confirm its functionality.

42. The Delegation of Portugal thanked the Secretariat for its presentation and asked if IMPACT was intended to replace the SPIDI system for data exchange.

43. The Secretariat replied that it was intended that the systematic and specific communications systems would meet the needs of IPOs for data exchange and that bilateral discussions may be held to investigate the requirements of IPOs on a case-by-case basis. IPOs will be invited to contact the Secretariat following the distribution of a circular announcing the availability of the two new IMPACT communications systems.

44. The Delegation of Canada raised the issue of project reporting, saying that much of the detail included in the Secretariat's oral report had been lacking in the written reports received to-date, e.g., in explaining the reasons behind the Project delay. This lack of information had led delegates to arrive at the meeting with insufficient knowledge to make informed decisions. The Delegations supported the breaking-down of the Project into manageable modules but

wanted more information on the timelines and budgets of all the options being proposed for possible future developments to the PCT systems. Finally, the Delegations sought clarification on whether delay in the RO/IB module could cause either the Project to go over its budget or could it result in a reduction in scope.

45. With regard to the question on RO/IB the Secretariat said that it was confident that, once the requirements document had been approved by the PCT the module could be delivered in a short time and at little cost in particular under the scenario proposed by the IMPACT Project. However, should the module only be implemented after the IMPACT development team had been dispersed the responsibility for the work would fall to the system maintenance team unless the RO/IB module was beyond their capabilities resulting in a new development team being required at significant cost.

46. The Delegation of Australia supported the need for more detailed and transparent project reporting and the concerns raised, both about the work effort required to implement the two communications and RO/IB modules and the need for integration between the IMPACT and PCT -SAFE systems. The Delegation also raised a number of specific questions with regard to the IMPACT Project; had there been an actual estimate of the effort and time frame required to implement the RO/IB module, should a decision be made to proceed; what time frame could be expected for true electronic communication (i.e., rather than physical media) with the communications systems; and how were integration issues between the various projects (WIPO NET, IMPACT and PCT -SAFE) being addressed in the context of the existing projects and structures?

47. The Secretariat cautioned the meeting that no development funds were available for IMPACT beyond March 2003. However, the two communications systems were largely operational and work on the external interface, whereby IPOs could place orders for data directly with the IMPACT system was well underway. Integration with the PCT -SAFE system was a priority and, although the two areas are structured as discreet activities, there is an element of coordination and cooperation between the two project teams.

48. The Delegation of Canada took the floor to reiterate the need for integration across all of WIPO's IT projects, not just internally but also externally with IPO systems.

49. In response, the Secretariat cited the agreement on standards for electronic filing contained in Annex F of the PCT Administrative Instructions, as an example of successful integration within which WIPO NET would be a primary integration platform.

50. The Delegation of the United States of America stated that it was establishing its own planning horizon for key milestones and interdependencies and recognized that, as PCT-SAFE may be an opportunity for the USPTO to expedite its electronic filing plans, the integration of IMPACT and PCT -SAFE would be critical in minimizing the effort required by the USPTO to extract and format documents and exchange them electronically with WIPO. However, the Delegation was unclear as to, historically, why the Secretariat had favored the route of separate systems development for PCT automation and electronic filing rather than using a systems integrator to coordinate the two related project activities. Such a strategy required good project management by WIPO and strengthened the need for Member States to receive regular and detailed project status reports.

51. In response, the Secretariat recalled the history of the two projects and the original reasoning for splitting the two projects, these included, *inter alia*, issues of security, visibility, transparency and priority. Given the good internal communication within the Secretariat there was no reason why the two projects could not both be delivered successfully, particularly given their differing sets of requirements and users. The Secretariat would also be happy to make available to Member States all test scripts, test reports and test planning with respect to the issue of integration.

52. In response to a question from the Delegation of the European Patent Office (EPO) about the inclusion of file inspection and public file inspection within the scope of IMPACT, the Secretariat replied that this functionality was currently being discussed with the Office of the PCT.

53. In concluding this item, the Delegation of Canada sought clarification from the Secretariat on the number of IPOs receiving DVDs under IMPACT. The number was confirmed as being three to four IPOs having written to the International Bureau waiving their right to receive their communications on paper.

54. *The ITPWG noted the contents of the document SCIT/ITPWG/2/3.*

Agenda Item 6: Review of progress in the implementation of the PCT -SAFE Project (Document SCIT/ITPWG/2/4)

55. In introducing document SCIT/ITPWG/2/4, the Secretariat recalled the two objectives for the project; to adopt a standard for electronic filing of PCT applications, and to build a system for electronic filing and processing using PCT -EASY as its basis. The project comprised of four major technical components; the PCT -SAFE Safe editor or authoring tool, the PCT -SAFE client, which is an extension of PCT -EASY, Public Key Infrastructure (PKI) services, and the receiving server, which runs the receiving office. The Project High Level Plan, that was first published in August 2001 is divided into two steps, the first of which, the pilot or proof of concept, has slipped by some four months and is now scheduled to begin in February 2003. The second step of the build is still on time as the Project hopes to recoup some of the time lost by shortening the pilot phase.

56. The Secretariat further recalled that, in November 2002, the Project received its first filing under the pilot. During the pilot a range of 42 selected users, from a wide demographic of private companies and patent attorneys, and geographic regions will use the PCT -SAFE client software to file electronically, normally over the Internet, but also on physical media, and only with the RO/IB. The pilot users received training at one of three sessions held late in 2002 in Geneva, Washington and Tokyo. Low level digital certificates have been deployed to all pilot participants, these are installed and working and has been verified from a security standpoint. With regard to cooperation with other Offices, the Secretariat expressed its interest to know the level of cooperation it had received from the EPO whom made software and expertise available to the Project. The use of the EPO's PCT plug-in ensures that the client architecture is such that, when the user selects the PCT procedure the plug-in activates allowing one single product to be maintained and developed by the EPO and WIPO. The new version server received from the EPO is also much richer in terms of PCT functionality and PCT requirements.

57. The Secretariat also reminded delegates that the software will be made available free to Member States and applicants; the editor and the Client will be available free of charge and downloadable via the PCT-SAFE website; the receiving servers software will be made available to any Receiving Office under the PCT where requests sit; and a low level certificate will be obtainable via a WIPO website and it is planned via WIPO NET. In addition, the Secretariat also expressed interest to participate in some form of open source, and was already working with the EPO towards such an arrangement. With regard to an enterprise version of PCT-SAFE, contact had been made with patent management software vendor to see if they were interested in deploying PCT-SAFE software into their own environments and thereby providing a more multi user, integrated solution to the niche of the market where their customers are replaced.

58. The Delegation of the Republic of Korea requested more information on the pilot phase of the project and asked if the high level of reusable components would result in budgetary savings.

59. The Secretariat responded by explaining that the pilot phase was essentially proof of concept and that WIPO would be pleased to make public the test results, scenarios and scripts used during the pilot. This has already been done for the Trilateral Offices and could easily be extended to all Member States. With regard to the issue of the budget, as it was only the mid-point of the biennium it was too early to identify financial savings, although some were expected. However, it was important to note that much of the Project expenditure was allocated to resourcing the core team and these numbers were unlikely to change regardless of the level of component reuse.

60. The Delegation of the EPO took the floor to comment upon the strength of cooperation and harmonisation with WIPO. A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) was under preparation to cover the servers software where by the EPO will take over the PCT client or plug-in once it is operational and it will be maintained by PCT-SAFE. In respect of open source, the EPO had decided to go open source for its full *epolines* software with respect to electronic-filing. Finally, the EPO reminded the Secretariat of the need to include all electronic filing systems in its promotion of the functionality of online filing under the PCT.

61. In response to a question from the Delegation of the United Kingdom about the future developments of the online filings system and their inclusion within the MOU between WIPO and the EPO, the Secretariat was pleased to report that the move, by the EPO to open source, would mean that future cooperation would be assured and would take place in a more rich development environment.

62. The Delegation asked if the MOU between WIPO and the EPO granted the compatibility of both projects on electronic filing (Epoline/eOLF from EPO and PCT-SAFE/PCT-EASY from WIPO), especially with regard to updating versions or, on the contrary, responsibility for maintaining coherence between the two systems would lie with the OEPM (Oficina Española de Patentes y Marcas).

63. The Secretariat reassured delegates from those IPOs with existing connections to the *epolines* system that the question of what versions of PCT-SAFE or the PCT plug-in would be taken care of by coordination directly with the EPO. For a non-European Member State that wishes to participate in electronic filing and that wishes to use the *epolines* system, the responsibility for coordination between the systems will lie with WIPO.

64. The Delegation of the United States of America asked if disclosure of test information could be extended to security and all other tests, e.g. simulation modules and stress tests on the hardware. The Delegation also supported the earlier statement by the Delegation of the Republic of Korea that it expected budget savings to be found on the Project given the high level of component reuse and the efficient savings derived from the Project. It requested that the Secretariat provide a broad update cost benefit analysis of what has been achieved to date as compared to the original Project plans or estimates, as well as any savings to be accrued from any remaining Project assumptions.

65. The Delegation of the United States of America also said that the USPTO was currently developing plans for a PCT -SAFE pilot to run, possibly from June 2003. It suggested, that due to the WIPO PCT -SAFE pilot nearing completion during June 2003, that the feasibility of combining the two pilots beginning in that month be assessed. The Delegation also supported the need for integration among the PCT -SAFE, IMPACT and WIPO NET projects.

66. With regard to the issues of a cost benefit analysis and providing comparisons between the project results and baselines, the Secretariat reported that some of that work had already been undertaken and would be finalized as part of a system of project post implementation reviews, that would be presented to the SCIT in due course. The Secretariat would also make available all test data, with the exception of security testing given the sensitivity of this information.

67. The Delegation of Japan said that it was anxious about any delay to the Project as it planned to use PCT -SAFE to receive English -language PCT applications made to the JPO. This concern was shared by the Secretariat who were working to respect the critical paths of delivery of the necessary software to IPOs.

68. The Delegation of France reported that it had received its first national filings in January 2003 and was expecting its first online PCT filings during the second half of 2003. The Delegation asked whether the Secretariat foresaw the extension of online functionality to other areas of intellectual property, e.g., trademarks.

69. The Delegation of Germany took the floor to support the use of online functionality for trademarks and asked if other areas, such as IP rights associated with utility models and industrial design were also being considered.

70. The Secretariat responded that whilst the standards established for PCT -SAFE could undoubtedly be used for the purpose of other intellectual property filings they had historically only been conceived within the context of the PCT Union and PCT Assembly and therefore the scope of the project did not extend beyond a PCT filing.

71. The Delegation of the BBM stressed that the security demands on trademarks were different from those in the patent field and that a system for electronic trademark registration already existed with the BBM. The system had proved to be very successful as, having been open to trademark agents for six months, 30% of registrations had been received electronically. This figure had risen to 50% since the system had been opened to individual applicants some four months previously. The success of the system was due in part to the simpler security requirements over those necessary for a patent filing.

72. The ITPWG noted the contents of the document SCIT/ITPWG/2/4.

Agenda Item 7: Review of progress in the implementation of the Classification Automated Information System (CLAIMS) Project (Document SCIT/ITPWG/2/5)

73. In introducing document SCIT/ITPWG/2/5, the Secretariat reminded delegates that although the process of IPC Reform was likely to continue for some time, the CLAIMS Project was scheduled for completion by the end of 2003. The IPC classification system currently comprises some 70,000 entries and under the reformed system would include a small core layer with 20,000 stable entries coupled with an advanced layer modeled on the US Classification which is continuously updated. The goal of the reform effort was to establish a Master Classification Database searchable by the advanced layer. The CLAIMS Project itself comprised four tracks; automatic categorization, translation or linguistic support, development of IPC tutorial areas and IPC support conforming to the *ad hoc* needs of the IPC reform community. Problems had been experienced with the translation systems but these had been expected and some success was recorded. With regard to the IPC tutorial track, open source software had been used for development and had proved cost effective. The system had been developed by the end of 2002 and is currently being loaded with data.

74. The Secretariat further elaborated the progress that had been made in the project by using methodologies such as rapid application development. An overview was given of the next deliverables in the CLAIMS Project, which will be to improve the links within the system, e.g., to the master classification database, and to provide assistance to the translation of the advanced level of the IPC to French using translation memory and the development of interactive IPC tutorials.

75. The Delegation of the United States requested clarification of the date of the end of March 2003 that had been set for the completion of testing.

76. The Secretariat replied that, due to some new data being made available, the testing would continue for a further period of approximately one month to improve the quality of the database.

77. The ITPWG noted the contents of the document SCIT/ITPWG/2/5.

Agenda Item 8: Review of progress in the implementation of the Administrative Information Management System (AIMS) Project (Document SCIT/ITPWG/2/6)

78. The Secretariat gave a comprehensive presentation of the AIMS Project. The presentation was divided into four main parts: Project objectives, scope, expected benefits and current status. The objective of the AIMS project was to replace WIPO's aging financial system and to replace the budget reporting system with a more modern and integrated system. The Project is using the opportunity to streamline those business processes which fall within the scope of the Project; primarily finance business processes, financial management reporting and the budget control processes. In implementing the AIMS Project, WIPO expects to have productivity gains across the budget and finance area, as well as qualitative and visible improvement, in the financial management reporting within the Organization. The final solution will be a flexible system that will be able to better accommodate the future changes in the business processes, as well as a financial controlling structure. In its conception, the AIMS Project was thought of as a platform for future extension and consolidation of all administrative systems, e.g. Human Resources, Procurement, etc.

79. In terms of the status of activities, the Secretariat further indicated that the project was commenced on January 1, 2002, and, following a comprehensive evaluation of possible solutions, WIPO selected the PeopleSoft software package for the financial and budget modules, in September 2002. In spite of delays on some activities, the overall target date for completion was still June 2004.
80. The Delegation of the United States of America requested further elaboration on the methodology used for the project and its deliverables, in particular the aspects relating to the replacement of the existing system, the Finance Division legacy system (FINAUT).
81. In response, the Secretariat said that the methodology for business process modeling, was a standard methodology supported by tools such as Visio for documenting business processes and translating those business process requirements into software requirements. The Project was also using the Gartner Group's decision driver tool to translate requirements into a checklist of software solution and software requirements for the purposes of the evaluation process. For the implementation phase, the Project will be using the proposed methodology from the successful vendor selected for the implementation of the PeopleSoft modules. The Secretariat also confirmed that the AIMS Project would replace the existing finances system, FINAUT.
82. The Delegation of the United States of America requested further information regarding the future steps toward a total Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) system for WIPO.
83. The Secretariat said that there was a high priority to replace the financial core systems as a first step and then, depending upon business requirements, to extend the ERP system into other business areas.
84. In response to a question from the Delegation of Canada requesting further information on the budget for the Project, the Secretariat confirmed that the Project should not exceed the approved budget. This had been possible due to a number of factors, including the negotiated price of the software and the fact that WIPO had built up an internal team of consultants and internal staff for the purposes of delivering the Project.
85. The Delegation of United Kingdom questioned the feasibility of the planned completion date of June 2004, given the fact that the design phase had yet to be completed.
86. The Secretariat confirmed that at the end of the design phase, there would be a revalidation of the initial plan and at that point the final Project completion dates would be committed to.
87. The Delegation of Canada raised a question concerning the Failsafe Organization-wide Customer-oriented Upgradeable Secure (FOCUS) Project and why there had been no status report on that Project. The Delegation suggested that a post-implementation review of the FOCUS Project be conducted, and that this review contain detailed information on lessons learned, best practices and whether the Project had been delivered on time and within budget.
88. The Secretariat recalled that the FOCUS Project concerned the modernization of the WIPO internal computer rooms together with the network infrastructure for the office buildings where WIPO staff are deployed. It was confirmed that the Project had been

completed during the course of 2002 as per the original scope but that there was some additional work to be completed in 2003 in the context of the refurbishment of the building, which represented a minimal investment. -WMO

89. *The ITPWG noted the contents of the document SCIT/ITPWG/2/6.*

Agenda Item 9: Information and Communication Technology Program for the 2004 -2005 Biennium

90. The Secretariat informed the Working Group that, due to the fact that the preparation of the Program and Budget for 2004 -2005 was ongoing, it was not yet possible to provide information at this stage. The Secretariat advised delegates that a draft Program and Budget document would be available in preparation for the Program and Budget meeting which will be held from April 28 to 30, 2003.

91. The Delegation of Canada, requested more information on the work of the IPO Automation Division, to see what areas may be of interest to IP that also provide assistance to Developing Countries.

92. The Secretariat confirmed that this information would be made available to the SCIT Plenary at its next meeting in June 2003 and to the ITPWG on an ongoing basis.

93. The Delegation of United Kingdom also raised a question related to the program and budget process and how the SCIT could give input to that process.

94. The Secretariat informed the ITPWG that the discussions which had been taking place in the context of the Working Group would form part of the input process via the report of the meeting. The draft Program and Budget would be presented by the Director General to the Program and Budget Committee in April 2003 and to the General Assembly in September 2003. Prior to this meeting, the SCIT Plenary meeting will meet in June and could report to the General Assembly on issues concerning information technologies, should it wish to do so.

95. *The ITPWG noted the oral report given by the Secretariat, in particular, the information provided on the timetable for the preparation and adoption of the draft Program and Budget document.*

Agenda Item 10: Schedule of activities

96. *The ITPWG noted the tentative calendar of meetings in the year 2004 as proposed in document SCIT/ITPWG/2/8 and agreed to the following timetable:*

February 23 to 27, 2004: Third meeting of the Information Technology Projects Working Group (SCIT/ITPWG/3)

97. *The Working Group also agreed that the meeting may be shortened to three days if the draft agenda so allowed.*

Agenda Item 11: Exchange of Information

98. *The ITPWG noted with appreciation a presentation given by the Eurasian Patent Office on the Eurasian patent information system, EAPATIS.*

Agenda Item 12: Adoption of the Report

99. The Delegation of the United States of America noted that a number of paragraphs in the report referred to requests from delegates for more timely and detailed project status reporting from the Secretariat and asked for clarification on how this would be achieved. The Secretariat replied that the matter would be brought to the attention of the Director General and a proposal would be submitted to the SCIT Plenary at its next meeting in June 2003. In the interim efforts would be made to make the requested improvement to the project status reporting mechanism. he

100. In response to a question from the Delegation of the United States of America on when the data referred to in paragraphs 48, 55 and 60 would be made available to Member States, the Secretariat said that it was impossible to commit to a precise date but that every effort would be made to circulate the data as soon as possible.

Agenda Item 13: Closing of the Session

101. *This report was adopted by the Information Technology Projects Working Group (ITPWG) of the Standing Committee Information Technologies (SCIT).*

[Annexes follow]

ANNEXE I/ANNEXI

I.ÉTATS MEMBRES/MEMBER STATES

(dans l'ordre alphabétique des noms français des États)
(in the alphabetical order of the names in French of the States)

ALLEMAGNE/GERMANY

Rudolf HÜSING, Head of Section "Strategic Duties," German Patent and Trademark Office, Munich

AUSTRALIE/AUSTRALIA

Andrew GATELY, Manager, IT Enterprise Architecture, IP Australia, Woden

BANGLADESH

Kazi Imtiaz HOSSAIN, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva

CANADA

John ROMBOUTS, Technical Architect, Informatics Branch, Canadian Intellectual Property Office, Department of Industry, Hull

Alain HOUDE, Project Office, Patent Branch, Canadian Intellectual Property, Department of Industry, Hull

Quan-Ling SIM, A/Chief, International Affairs, Canadian Intellectual Property, Department of Industry, Hull

CHINE/CHINA

NING Long, Deputy Director General, Automation Department, Patent Office of the State Intellectual Property Office, Beijing

COLOMBIE/COLOMBIA

Luis Gerardo GUZMAN VALENCIA, Ministro Consejero, Misión permanente, Ginebra

COSTARICA

Alejandro SOLANO ORTIZ, Minister Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva

CROATIE/CROATIA

Vesna JEVTIĆ (Mrs.), Information Technology Department, State Intellectual Property Office, Zagreb

Vesna ČERNELČ-MARJANOVIĆ (Mrs.), Head, Information Technology Department, State Intellectual Property Office, Zagreb

ÉGYPTE/EGYPT

Salah Eldin ELSAKKARY, Computer Engineer, Egyptian Patent Office, Academy of Scientific Research and Technology, Cairo

ESPAGNE/SPAIN

Mariano ESTÉVEZ GARCIA, Jefe Servicio de Sistemas Informáticos, Oficina Española de Patentes y Marcas, Madrid

ÉTATS-UNIS D'AMÉRIQUE/UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Frederick SCHMIDT, Administrator, Search and Information Resources Administration, Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C.

Dominic J. KEATING, Intellectual Property Attaché, Executive Office of the President, Permanent Mission, Geneva

Brad HUTHER, Senior Advisor to the Under Secretary of Commerce, Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C.

Doug BOURGEOIS, Chief Information Officer, Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C.

FÉDÉRATION DE RUSSIE/RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Alexey GVINEPADZE, Member of the Board, Russian Agency for Patents and Trademarks (Rospatent), Moscow

Marina V. KRYUKOVA (Mrs.), Deputy Director, International Cooperation Department, Russian Agency for Patents and Trademarks (Rospatent), Moscow

FINLANDE/FINLAND

JuhaREKOLA,Head,DevelopmentDivision,PatentsandInnovationsLine,Natio
nalBoard
ofPatentsandRegistration,Helsinki

FRANCE

BernardPINGLIER,chef,Serviceinformatique,Institutnationaldelapropriétéindustrielle
(INPI),Nanterre

GRÈCE/GREECE

MariosBELIBASSAKIS,SecretaryofEconomicandCommercialAffairs,Athens

DaphneZOGRAFOS(Ms.),Advisor,PermanentMission,Geneva

GUATEMALA

AndrésWYLD,FirstSecretary,PermanentMission,Geneva

HONGRIE/HUNGARY

ÁgnesVADÁSZ(Ms.),InformationCounsellor,HungarianPatentOffice,Budapest

INDONÉSIE/INDONESIA

DewiKU SUMAASTUTI(Ms.),FirstSecretary,PermanentMission,Geneva

IwanWIRANATA -ATMADJA,MinisterCounsellor,PermanentMission,Geneva

IRLANDE/IRELAND

DoloresCASSADY(Mrs.),PatentExaminer,PatentsOffice,Kilkenny

ITALIE/ITALY

VittorioRAGONESI,Conse illerjuridique,Ministèredesaffairesétrangères,Rome

JAPON/JAPAN

Toyohide WATANABE, Deputy Director, Information Systems Affairs Division, Trademark, Design and Administrative Affairs Department, Patent Office, Tokyo

Takashi YAMASHITA, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

Mitsuru SONO, Director, Information Technology Planning Office, Information Systems Affairs Division, Trademark, Design and Administrative Affairs Department, Patent Office, Tokyo

KENYA

Julius Magwaga MAVYA, Computer System Analyst, Kenya Industrial Property Office (KIPO), Nairobi

LITUANIE/LITHUANIA

Elena LIOLIENÈ (Mrs.), Head of Automation Sector, State Patent Bureau, Vilnius

MALTE/MALTA

Tony BONNICI, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

MAROC/MOROCCO

Khalid SEBTI, Premier secrétaire, Mission permanente, Genève

MEXIQUE/MEXICO

Karla Tatiana ORNELAS LOERA (Mlle), Troisième secrétaire, Mission permanente, Genève

Santiago REYNA ORTIZ, Coordinador departamental de desarrollo de sistemas de patentes, Instituto Mexicano de la Propiedad Industrial y por la Tercera, México

NIGÉRIA/NIGERIA

Aliyu Muhammed ABUBAKAR, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva

NORVÈGE/NORWAY

TrondSLETVOLD,Head,InformationTechnology,NorwegianPatentOffice,Oslo

FreddySTRØMME N,NorwegianPatentOffice,Oslo

POLOGNE/POLAND

AnnaPALUCHOWSKA(Mrs.),Expert,InformationDepartment,PatentOffice,Warsaw

PORTUGAL

JorgeA.RODRIGUESALVIM,Director,InformationTechnology,NationalInstituteof
IndustrialProperty,Lisbonne

RÉPUBLIQUEDECORÉE/REPUBLICOFKOREA

SONYoung -Sik,Director,InformationDevelopmentDivision,KoreanIntellectualProperty
Office,Taejon

KIMJin,DeputyDirector,InformationPlanningDivision,KoreanIntellectualProperty
Office,Taejon

RÉPUBLIQUETCHÈQUE/CZECHREPUBLIC

VladimirKLOZ,Director,IndustrialPropertyOffice,AdministrationDepartment,Prague

HanaBOKOVÁ(Ms.),HeadofInformationServiceSection,IndustrialPropertyOffice,
PatentInformationDepartment,Prague

ROUMANIE/ROMANIA

BogdanBORESCHIEVICI,Director,NationalCollection,PatentLibrary,ITandServices
Directorate,StateOfficeforInventionsandTrademarks(OSIM),Bucharest

AdrianaRositaATĂŃĂSOAIE(Mrs.),Head,ITSection,StateOfficeforInventionsand
Trademarks(OSIM),Bucharest

ROYAUME-UNI/UNITEDKINGDOM

GeoffBENNETT,Head,InformationTechnologyServices,ThePatentOffice,Newport

PamTARIF(Mrs.),SecondSecretary,PermanentMission,Geneva

SRILANKA

Himalee ARUNATILAKA (Ms.), First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

THAÏLANDE/THAILAND

Supark PRONGTHURA, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

Kanchana WA NICHKORN (Ms.), Policy Researcher, National Electronics and Computer Technology Center, Bangkok

UKRAINE

Andriy TYMOKHYN, Head, System Analysis and IT Division, State Department of Intellectual Property, Ministry of Education and Science, Kiev

ZAMBIE/ZAMBIA

Edward CHISANGA, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

II. ORGANISATIONS INTERGOUVERNEMENTALES/
INTERGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

LIGUE DES ÉTATS ARABES/LEAGUE OF ARAB STATES (LAS)

Mouaki LAMINE, Conseiller, Mission permanente, Genève

BUREAU BENELUX DES MARQUES (BBM)/BENELUX TRADE MARK OFFICE (BBM)

Dick VERSCHURE, Deputy Director, The Hague

ORGANISATION EURASIENNE DES BREVETS (OEAB)/EURASIAN PATENT
ORGANIZATION (EAPO)

Alexander BURTSEV, Chief Specialist, EAPO Dataware Department, Moscow

Vassily TROUBATCHEV, Specialist of Automation Department, Moscow

OFFICE EUROPEEN DES BREVETS (OEB)/EUROPEAN PATENT OFFICE (EPO)

Gérard GIROUD, Principal Director, Documentation/Tools, Rijswijk

Alfred WENZEL, Administrateur principal, Vienne

III. ORGANISATIONS INTERNATIONALES NON GOUVERNEMENTALES/
INTERNATIONAL NON - GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

GROUPE DE DOCUMENTATION SUR LES BREVETS (PDG)/PATENT
DOCUMENTATION GROUP (PDG)

Ralf H. BEHRENS, Secretary General, Weilder Stadt

CONFÉDÉRATION INTERNATIONALE DES SOCIÉTÉS D'AUTEURS ET
COMPOSITEURS (CISAC)/INTERNATIONAL CONFEDERATION OF SOCIETIES OF
AUTHORS AND COMPOSERS (CISAC)

François-Xavier NUTTALL, consultant IT, Neuilly -sur-Seine

IV. BUREAU/OFFICERS

Présidente/Chair:	Rudolf HÜSING (Germany)
Vice-présidents/Vice-Chairs:	John ROMBOUTS (Canada) Bogdan BORESCHIEVICI (Romania)
Secrétaire/Secretary:	Allan ROACH (OMPI/WIPO)

V. BUREAU INTERNATIONAL DEL'ORGANISATION MONDIALE
DELAPROPRIÉTÉ INTELLECTUELLE(OMPI)/
INTERNATIONAL BUREAU OF THE
WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION(WIPO)

Allan ROACH(directeur,Division desprojetsinformatiques/Director,Information TechnologyProjectsDivision);Colin BUFFAM(chefdeprojetduprojetWIPO NET,Division desprojetsinformatiques/Project Manager,WIPO NETProject,InformationTechnology ProjectsDivision);Chitra NARAYANASWAMY(chefdeprojetduprojetAIMS,Division desprojetsinformatiques/ProjectManager,AIMSProject,InformationTechnologyProjects Division);Michael HELKE(chefde projetduprojetIMPACT,Divisiondesprojets informatiques/ProjectManager,IMPACTProject,InformationTechnologyProjects Division);Gabor KARETKA(chefdeprojetduprojetCLAIMS,Divisiondesprojets informatiques/ProjectManager,CLAIMSProject,InformationTechnologyProjects Division);Neil WILSON(chef,Divisiondesservicesinformatiques/Head,Information TechnologyServicesDivision);Karl KALEJS(chefdesdépôtsélectroniques,Divisiondes projetsinformatiques/Head,Electronic -FilingUnit, InformationTechnologyProjects Division)

[L'annexeII suit/
AnnexII follows]

ANNEX II

AGENDA

	<u>Paragraphs</u>
1. OpeningoftheSession	5
2. ElectionoftheChairandtwoVice -Chairs	6- 7
3. Adoptionoftheagenda	8
4. ReviewofprogressintheimplementationoftheWIPO NETProject SeedocumentSCIT/ITPWG/2/2.	9–35
5. Reviewofprogressint heimplementationoftheIMPACTProject SeedocumentSCIT/ITPWG/2/3.	36–54
6. ReviewofprogressintheimplementationofthePCT -SAFEProject SeedocumentSCIT/ITPWG/2/4.	55–72
7. ReviewofprogressintheimplementationoftheCLAIMSProject SeedocumentSCIT/ITPWG/2/5.	73–77
8. ReviewofprogressintheimplementationoftheAIMSProject SeedocumentSCIT/ITPWG/2/6.	78–89
9. InformationandCommunicationTechnologyProgramforthe 2004- 2005Biennium	90–95
10. Scheduleof activities SeedocumentSCIT/ITPWG/2/8.	96–97
11. Exchangeofinformation	98
12. AdoptionoftheReport	99–100
13. ClosingoftheSession	101

[EndofAnnexIIandofdocument]