
# XML4IP Task Force Meeting

London, United Kingdom, November 10-14, 2014

Meeting REPORT

## INTRODUCTION

1. The XML4IP Task Force meeting took place in London from 10 to 14 November 2014. The following eight offices/organizations were represented at the meeting: AU, CA, GB, KR, RU, US, WIPO (IB) and UPOV. The meeting agenda was adopted as proposed by the International Bureau of WIPO and is reproduced along with the participants list as an Annex to this report.
2. The meeting was opened by Mr. Neil Feinson, Director, International Policy at the UK IPO, who welcomed the participants on behalf of the UK IPO. He emphasized that the importance of the work that the XML4IP Task Force is doing for interoperability among IP Offices.
3. Mr. Yun, as Task Force Leader, chaired the meeting. The Participants would like to extend their most sincere thanks to the UK IPO for the excellent hospitality and wonderful facilities they made available for the Task Force meeting.

## DISCUSSIONS, CONCLUSIONS, AND AgreementS

### Agenda Item 3: Adoption of the Agenda

1. The International Bureau explained that the purpose of the meeting was to prepare ST.96 version 2.0 in relation to the ST.96 Main Body and its four Annexes I to IV for approval by the XML4IP Task Force. Furthermore, the meeting should prepare the final drafts for the pending two Annexes V and VI (except their Appendixes that should be updated based on XML schema version 2.0) which will be presented at the next session of the Committee on WIPO Standards (CWS), at a date to be confirmed, for consideration and adoption by the CWS.
2. The International Bureau gave an overview of the items of Agenda for discussion, which are listed in the XML4IP task force wiki at: https://www3.wipo.int/confluence/display/xml4iptf/XML4IP+TF+2014+London+Meeting+-+Meeting+Documents. The International Bureau informed participants that upon request, it sent a WebEx invitation to TF members who could not join this meeting in person, but expressed their interest in the discussion on trademark issues. The agenda was adopted as proposed (see Annex 1).

### Agenda Item 4: Progress Report by Task Force Leader

1. The Task Force Leader delivered a progress report on the development of ST.96 since the XML4IP Task Force meeting held in Geneva in May 2014. He highlighted revision activities in the ST.96 Main Body, Annex I (DRCs) and Annex II (IP Data Dictionary) via the PFR (Proposal For Revision) process. He gave an update on progress in the preparation of the pending Annexes V and VI.
2. The Task Force Leader reported that the USPTO had provided the second draft of Schematron, which is part of Annex V, and can be used by an Office to validate their implementation schema against the ST.96 DRCs. The USPTO asked participants to test the tool and to provide comments and feedback for improvement. The tool is available from the WIPO SVN at: https://www3.wipo.int/svn/ST96.
3. The Task Force Leader also briefed participants on the outcome of the last Task Force meeting held at the USPTO in September 2014 and stated that a number of online conferences via WebEx had been held to discuss open issues and prepare for the meeting. He underlined that the goal of meeting was to prepare version 2.0 of ST.96; he noted that to-date there had been seven drafts of version 1. A number of IPOs had implemented various draft versions with each draft release containing major changes. Additionally many Offices were waiting for revisions to aspects of the schema such as the updated Country Code list and therefore it is now time to progress to version 2.0.
4. Assuming that the next CWS will take place in May 2015, the version 2.0 of XML schema should be completed by December 2014 and all other materials should be finalized by February 2015 for consideration and/or adoption by the CWS.

### Agenda Item 5: Revision of ST.96 XML Schemas

#### List of candidate schema components to be included in version 2.0

**IssueID-522**

1. The International Bureau stated that one challenge is how to improve the Payment component of the schema. This differs between the IPOs and often the expertise on this matter is not found on the Task Force.
2. It was agreed that a common transaction component could not be included in v2.0, as it requires significant work; however a plan is needed for its development. The Task Force will not be able to agree on Madrid or Hague components in a short time period, so this may also be left out of v2.0.
3. GB requested that revisions to the pat:BibliographicDataType be included in v2.0, as well as a revision to the dgn:OppositionBag component. CA stated that they will go with the consensus of the Task Force, though they are currently working on Madrid and Hague. KR indicated that they completed the development of its Hague system, based on ST.96, only for transmission of documents from KIPO to WIPO.
4. *Agreement: While Participants agreed to continue to discuss, the following items will be excluded from v2.0 due to the limited time and resource constraint:*
* *Patents*
	+ *Schema for search report and written opinions*
* *Trademarks*
	+ *Schema for the Madrid System*
* *Designs*
	+ *Schema for the Hague System*

*Action: This agreement should be reflected in IssueID-522.*

#### Naming of ST.96 XML Schemas: iprXML, patXML, tmkXML, dgnXML

1. The International Bureau introduced this topic for consideration by the Task Force. Currently ST.96 has three IP domains (Patents, Trademarks and Designs). However, other IP domains are being discussed or developed; for example, UPOV is developing a schema for plant variety protection (PVP) based on ST.96 and at CWS/4, GB proposed to extend ST.96 to cover Copyright. RU had also suggested developing a schema for geographical indications. The International Bureau therefore considered that, in the future, it would be helpful to have a generic name for business specific schemas, i.e. patXML, tmkXML, dgnXML .
2. GB noted that the name patXML conflicted with an existing EPO product used by applicants to create their Patent specification in XML. The US agreed with the International Bureau’s proposal, but suggested using a full IPR name instead of an abbreviation e.g. Patent XML, Trademark XML etc. CA agreed with the US proposal.

*Action: The* International *Bureau suggested continuing discussion on this item via IssueID-523.*

#### Revision on Common components

**IssueID-511**

1. A proposal was received from the GB to modify PaymentModeCategoryType. RU questioned the existing value “charge”, stating that it did not fit into this category. The US agreed and also queried “later payment”, GB stated that this was probably equivalent to “period of grace” in the UK. AU suggested that the schema should distinguish between different types of cards, as the processing of these is sometimes different.
2. GB indicated that they also required a component for “MaskedPAN” for obscured card numbers as well as a component for “deposit account”; it was noted this may be the equivalent of “current account”. US also need a value of “deposit account”. AU has several different uses of account e.g. for direct debits and electronic transfers.
3. *The following agreements were taken regarding the value list of* *PaymentModeCategoryType and will be reflected in v2.0:*
* *Keep the ambiguous value “Current account” but clarify the description*
* *Add “Debit Card” (description – Debit card).*
* *Add “Masked PAN” (description – Holds details of the credit or debit card number masked for security reasons).*
* *Remove “Other”*

*Action: Acronym PAN (Primary Account Number) will be added to the table of Appendix C of Annex I.*

1. GB presented a further proposal under IssueID-511, to add a new element “PaymentCardScheme” under Payment, after PaymentModeCategory. This would be an enumerated list of card types. The US noted that this would end up being very long, and that it may be better to leave as a GB extension. AU would like to include it, whereas it is not needed by KR or RU.
* *Provisional agreement and action:*
	1. *Include as an optional category: “PaymentCardProviderCategory” (with the description of “Type of debit or credit card to be used for payment”)*
	2. *GB values to be included as proposed, but other Offices also should provide comments*
1. The US requested the inclusion of the information that they exchange with Madrid. Participants and a representative of the International Bureau Madrid who attended the meeting via WebEx discussed the request and GB’s request in relation to com:Payment and agree on the following:
* com:PaymentIdentifier can be used for WIPO receipt number
* com:PaymentModeCategory can be mapped to PaymentMethodType
* Map PaymentGroup to Payment
* add new components, AccountNumber (string) and AccountHolder (name type) in Payment; and reflect the change to Ver. 2.0.

*Action: On the basis of the agreement above, GB will post a revised proposal along with revised schemas under IssueID-511 on the Wiki.*

**IssueID-515**

1. The International Bureau proposed to replace com:FigurativeElementClassificationType with com:FigurativeElementClassificationBag(Type) (or MarkImageClassificationBag). There was discussion on the most appropriate name and GB asked for clarification why this component was in the Common domain when it appeared to apply only to Trademarks. The International Bureau agreed to get further information from OHIM and therefore the discussion was postponed.

*Action: The International Bureau will contact the OHIM to get further information.*

**IssueID-519**

1. GB noted that a Transaction component should be common to all types of IP right rather than defined separately; RU supported this argument. The International Bureau stated that it was necessary to decide whether to develop a common transaction, one for Patents specifically, or a combination of common and specific.
* *Deferred agreement: awaiting a proposal from the UK IPO, so will not be included in v2.0*

**IssueID-544**

1. It was proposed to add a new element, FeePaidTotalAmount, to com:Payment, after FeePayableTotalAmount.
* *Agreement: participants agreed on the proposal and to add the change in version 2.0.*

**IssueID-545**

1. In consultation with the EPO, the International Bureau proposed to update the description of the com:ReferenceNumber component and to rename it “NPLReferenceNumber”, with a description of “A number assigned to non patent literature which has been classified and/or cited in documents such as the search report”.
* *Agreement: participants agreed on the proposed changes and to reflect them in version 2.0.*

**KR’s proposal:**  20141028\_KIPO's\_proposal\_on\_WIPO\_ST96\_Common\_revised.docx

1. For Trademarks and Designs KR requested the addition of two common elements to RelatedApplicationBag to relate an IP right to another IP right. The US suggested using the Patent structure as a starting point, however, this is for publication, rather than application. GB suggested that the structure was generic enough to be able to be used for applications. RU stated that they felt further investigation was necessary.
2. The International Bureau proposed that KR’s first option could be agreed now but that option 2 needed to be investigated further.
3. KR presented a revised proposal for Patents and Trademarks but withdrew their proposal to add new elements to Designs.
4. KR proposed to add Conversion in trademarks.
* *Agreement: Add a new element called ConversionApplicationBag (optional) in Trademark containing tmk:MarkCategory (optional), along with the elements from the DivisionalApplicationBagType.*
1. KR suggested the addition of a Conversion component to pat:RelatedDocumentBag; GB noted they required a component for regional conversion (e.g. EP to a GB domestic Patent).
* *Agreement: All participants agreed to add a new element of Conversion for Patents in RelatedDocumentBag with the same structure same as Division; but pat:ChildDocument would be optional and to add an additional optional component pat:ConversionCategory. To be included in v2.0.*

*Action: The International Bureau will create a new Issue to discuss pat:Conversion. Participant Offices to provide enumeration values for the new component, pat:ConversionCategory, on the basis of their practice.*

1. KR presented a proposal to add a new element RetroactiveApplicationDate to capture the retroactive date; the US noted this was similar to their “effective filing date”. The International Bureau asked if the US concept of Effective Filing Date could be implemented.
* *Agreement: The meeting recommended KR should use com:RightEffectiveDate instead of adding RetroactiveApplicationDate; KR agreed to do this.*
1. KR proposed to add RequestExaminationDate for Designs; it was noted that there was already an ExaminationRequestDate in Patents which could be made common.
* *Agreement: This component is needed in both Patents and Designs; therefore it is agreed that ExaminationRequestDate should be made common by moving ExaminationRequestDate from Patent to Common and modifying pat:RightsEffectiveDateBag. This needs to be reflected in v2.0.*
1. KR proposed to add a new component, PledgeBag, related to debt information, as a common component. GB and AU noted that they only hold name and address information in these cases rather than any details of the pledge/debt/mortgage. US noted that they had a concept of “conditional assignments”, but do not hold detailed information. US agreed to provide more information. RU stated that they do hold this information.

*Action: create a new issue to discuss this more thoroughly. Change the terminology to “mortgage” instead of “pledge”.*

#### Revision on Patent components

**IssueID-306**

1. RU proposed to add an optional attribute to the type PatentImageType to indicate that the drawing (or chemical formula) should be placed on the first page.
* *Agreement: agreed to use existing PublishFigure, so no need for further additions to the schema. Issue closed. It was noted that no IPOs needed the equivalent information, e.g. representative figure, in their applications.*

**IssueID-510**

1. GB proposed to add a new component Owner/Holder in Patent, noting that although Assignee existed in the Patent domain it was not considered suitable by the UK IPO patents legal team. It is noted that com:Name or tmk:HolderBag/dgn:HolderBag could possibly be used instead of adding the new component. GB commented that Owner/Holder meant the same but that “Assignee” (which is used as a synonym for “Owner” by some Offices (see INID code 73 of ST.9)) did not. The International Bureau noted that due to differences between IP types this concept did not need to be Common across them all. All agreed that a single component in the PartyBag in bibliographic data to cover all would be preferable*.*
2. The USPTO’s legal department indicated that the USPTO does not determine who is the actual owner or holder of a patent, but merely reflects who the applicant has provided as the assignee. Since these terms are not synonymous, the US prefers to keep the element of Assignee*.*
* *Agreement: Add new element of pat:OwnerBag in pat:PartyBag.*

*Action: GB will provide a draft schema of pat:OwnerBag.*

**IssueID-517**

1. PublicationAddressType was proposed by RU; AU prefers the use of more specific wording to distinguish between application and publication and noted that less information was needed for publication.
2. GB noted that they had no requirement for the proposed component. The US suggested adding the following new component and RU supports the US suggestion:
	1. Add a new component com:PublicationContact and an unbounded choice (1..2) between this element and existing com:Contact. This change will be reflected in the following components: pat:ApplicantType, pat:InventorType, pat:AssigneeType, pat:DeceasedInventorType, and pat:RegisteredPractitionerType, dgn:ApplicantType, dgn:DesignerType.
	2. Description for com:PublicationContact: Contact information for publication.
	* Reuse com:Name (Mandatory)
	* Reuse com:City (optional)
	* Reuse com:GeographicRegionName (optional)
	* com:CountryCode (optional)
	* com:PostalCode (optional)
* *Agreement: the meeting accepted the proposal from US as above. This should be included in v2.0.*

**IssueID-518**

1. Publication Schemas: The US proposes two separate schemas for Patent Application Publication and Patent Grant Publication and plans to extend and restrict existing ST.96 elements in order to create Grant Publication. The US currently has separate systems for publication and grant so if only one schema was used, then both systems would need to be updated every time any change is made. Having two schemas would allow for strong validation. Both of these are the practical reasons for creating two separate schemas.
2. GB and CA noted that they currently have one dtd for Publication, based on ST.36. CA enquired if the application publication components could be mandatory and then supplemented with optional elements for grant publication. RU noted that they use one dtd for publication, both application and grant. AU indicated that they would prefer separate schemas but that this was not a strong preference. KR stated that they prefer a single schema. The US agreed to explore the possibility of using one schema and creating separate implementation schemas. The International Bureau noted that we need a new document level component for Publication. Participants developed a draft schema component and agreed to carry on the further discussion on it via Wiki.
* *Provisional Agreement: to use one schema and to continue improving the draft schema and include it in version 2.0.*
1. Search reports – Following legislative changes, Rospatent will start to publish search reports for applications filed after 1 Oct 2014. Systems will need to be in place to publish search reports by Sept/Oct 2015 and therefore a schema is needed by that time. Development will start towards the end of 2014 or the beginning of 2015.
2. CA indicated that their search reports are currently stored in image format. KR noted that they do not currently publish search reports in XML. GB commented that they will be implementing a new publication system in the next two years which would require the inclusion of search reports. Currently they are published as an image. The US only publishes field of search information not search reports. AU already publishes search reports and examination reports in PDF format. RU stated that they would not be able to complete the draft schema in time for v2.0, but would provide something for consideration by the TF members. RU agreed to confirm timescales after consulting with colleagues by 21/11/14.
* *Agreement: It was agreed that this cannot be included in v2.0.*
1. Sequence Listings – It was noted that there was already a SequenceListText.xsd component. The US commented that there should always be reference to an external ST.25 or ST.26 file containing sequence lists if one exists; CA said this should also include the format and type of file. The International Bureau stated that the application description must be as filed and cannot be amended to include a link to an external document. The US noted the requirement for a new element pat:ExternalDocument which would cater for a sequence list document provided by the applicant and also other documentation provided by the examiner. CA commented that there should be a category element included to identify the type of document. The International Bureau stated that pat:SequenceLists and pat:TableExternal should just contain links to external documents. Pat:ExternalDocumentBag will contain links to different types of content. The US commented that they already have this for their own purposes, and demonstrated a draft for discussion. Input was requested from IPOs for the pat:DocumentContentCategory value list.
2. RU queried the meaning of pat:IssueDate as this can vary from country to country. The US stated that they use Registration date for Trademarks, whereas they use pat:IssueDate for the date of Patent publication, which is the same as the date of Patent grant. AU noted that they also have AcceptanceDate, the date on which the examiner accepts that patent can be granted, subject to opposition. GB indicated that they use PublicationDate and GrantDate. CA noted that they use LayOpenDate (publication) and GrantDate (grant). RU and US indicated that they use PublicationDate (the dates are the same for both publication and grant). KR mentioned that they use IssueDate (publication) and RegistrationDate (grant). GB indicated that if the description of IssueDate was amended to “date of publication or grant” this element may meet their requirement for pat:GrantDate. RU commented that the number of dates held in pat:PatentGrantIdentification should be limited with other dates held elsewhere.
* *Agreement:*
	+ 1. *change pat:IssueDate to pat:GrantDate. Description will be “date of grant”.*
		2. *Remove com:RegistrationDate from pat:PatentGrantIdentificationType.*
		3. *International Bureau – this schema needs to be included in v2.0, so all participants must provide comments on IssueID-518 as soon as possible.*
		4. *Create the following two new elements under BibliographicData*
* GrantPublicationDate (refer to ST.9 INID code
* ProvisionalGrantPublicationDate (refer to ST.9 INID code 44)

**IssueID-526**

1. GB introduced their proposal for changes to pat:BibliographicDataType.xsd by noting that the changes relate to the storage of data rather than specifically filing or publication and that the discussion on the document level components was not relevant to the changes requested.
2. Additionally as this proposal had been discussed previously some items were skipped as they relate to processing components which are likely to require significant revision once the new processing systems are designed.
3. GB requested a new component for RegionalConversion e.g. from an international patent to a GB domestic patent, rather than from one IP right to another. It was agreed that the new Conversion component would include a ConversionCategory which would cover this point.

*Action: Offices to provide enumerated list for ConversionType element.*

1. GB requested a new component for EntitlementApplication in pat:RelatedDocumentBag but noted that this could be a national office extension, if no other IPOs needed it. GB agreed to provide more detail on this after consultation with Legal colleagues. RU believes they may have a similar concept, but it is not clear if this refers to exactly the same thing.

*Action: The International Bureau to create a new IssueID, and IPOs to provide further input. It is also necessary to decide if it should be included in v2.0.*

1. GB proposed to add a language code component in ApplicationIdentification, PublicationIdentification and GrantIdentification using existing language code elements. The US queried whether ApplicationIdentification was the right place for this data.
* *Agreement:*
	+ *Add FilingLanguageCode (optional) in ApplicationIdentification after com:ApplicationNumber.*
	+ *Add new component com:ApplicantFileReference (optional) after com:ApplicationNumber in ApplicationIdentification.*
	+ *Add PublicationLanguageCode (optional) in PublicationIdentification and GrantIdentification.*
1. GB proposed to add new components pat:SearchRequestDate and pat:PatentRestorationDate in pat:RightEffectiveDateBag.
* *Agreement: The proposal was agreed. To be included in v2.0*
1. GB proposed the addition of InventionTitleCategory (optional) to pat:InventionTitle. The enumeration values are as provided in the proposal. The US noted they keep a record of the changes to InventionTitle.CA just keep the current version of the title. RU does not want to keep a history of changes to the titles in the BibliographicData as RU use records for this purpose.

*Action: International Bureau to create a new IssueID to further discuss this issue. To be included in v2.0*

* *US needs more time to investigate how they use this data.*
1. GB requires new components for TimeLimit data. This will be discussed further under Transaction-related issues. This is not for v2.0. It was noted at this point that the scope of the BibliographicData.xsd component needs to be reviewed and more clearly defined.
2. GB proposed a new component, pat:TranslationDate, to hold legacy information relating to the translation of documents into English for patents received prior to the London Agreement. Note that the definition has been made generic to allow the component to be more widely used. KR wants to have this translation date in WIPO Standard ST.9.

*Action: KR and GB will, if needed, provide a suggestion to include a new INID code in ST.9 in relation to translation date.*

1. GB proposed a new component pat:EarlierApplicationFilingDate

*Action: The International Bureau to create a new IssueID for further discussion. GB to clarify their requirement more fully*

1. GB proposed a new component pat:EarliestPriorityApplicationIdentification to be based on pat:ApplicationIdentificationType.xsd. See also discussion of IssueID-530. The US indicated that they needed to consider this issue further.
2. GB proposed new components to hold data concerning the concept of LicenceOfRight. Other IPOs confirmed they also have a similar concept. It was agreed that LicenceOfRightDate should be part of BibliographicData but that the Indicator elements and the cancellation date components should be in Transaction.

*Action: GB to discuss with KR given the similarity with their proposal for ApplicantIntent and to post more information on a new IssueID created by the International Bureau. Candidate to be included in v2.0.*

1. GB proposed a new component pat:SearchReportDate

*Action: To be included in Transaction record. Not part of v2.0.*

1. GB proposed a new component pat:SecurityReleaseDate

*Action: To be included in Transaction record. Not part of v2.0*

1. GB proposed a new component pat:CeasingLetterDate

*Action: To be included in Transaction record. Not part of v2.0*

1. GB proposed new components for RenewalData but noted that they should be included in Transaction record. Not part of v2.0
2. GB proposed new components for their AlertNotification function; other Offices confirmed they have potentially similar concepts but noted that they should be included in Transaction record. Not part of v2.0.
3. GB proposed components related to ApplicationPublicationFootnoteData. Other IPOs including the US and AU have a similar concept to GB footnotes. It was felt that this should be part of the Publication. The IPOs should have an informal discussion, prior to the creation of a new issue on the Wiki.
* *Agreement: To be included in v2.0*
1. GB proposed components to hold PatentFormData but noted that this should be included in Transaction. Not part of v2.0

**IssueID-529**

1. KR preferred to keep RegistrationDate (used instead of GrantDate) on PatentGrantIdentification and noted they also need IssueDate.
* *Agreement: It was noted that it had already been agreed to remove RegistrationDate and rename IssueDate to GrantDate (see the outcome of discussion on IssueID-518)*

**IssueID-530**

1. GB proposed a new component pat:EarliestPriorityIdentification; The US requested more time to discuss. International Bureau stated this should be included in v2.0, so discussion should be concluded by the end of November 2014.

**KR’s proposal:** 20141028\_KIPO's\_proposal\_on\_WIPO\_ST96\_Patent\_revised.docx.

1. KR would like to propose adding the new component pat:PatentClassificationRecordBag under pat:BibliographicData. Other Offices capture the history of classification types, but only publish the current classification. The International Bureau requested KR to provide business case to disseminate this information.

*Action: Considering the request of the International Bureau, KR and US to discuss this further and present a revised proposal.*

1. RU questioned whether this classification history was for publication, or grant. KR confirmed it was linked to the application. RU noted that it should therefore be in Transaction rather than Bibliographic data
2. KR would like to propose adding the new component pat:Keywords under pat:ApplicationBody. Other Offices do not have a requirement for this, but have no objection to an optional element being created. US mentioned that keywords should not be part of Description.

*Action:*

* 1. *KR to suggest most appropriate location for this.*
	2. *International Bureau – need to create an IssueID, and aim to include in v2.0*
	3. *Rename pat:ApplicantKeywordText*
	4. *Consult with other members of IP5 and make agreement by end of November 2014*
1. Existing ClaimTotalQuantity – KR suggested revising the description to include applications, and not just grant.
* *Agreement: Remove “in the grant”, to make the description more generic.*
1. RU commented that the International Bureau should create a new IssueID to discuss a common approach to resolving problems around Madrid, Hague, PCT etc. Not for v2.0.

*Action: Create a new IssueID*

#### Revision on Trademark components

1. The meeting was joined by Mr. Roger Holberton, the International Bureau of Madrid System, via conference call.

**IssueID-414**

1. RU noted that the meaning of “legal status” is different from “actual state”, which is a set of properties of IP at the current moment. GB commented that “actual state” is just a snapshot of the data, without a history. International Bureau stated that further discussion was needed on this issue.
* *Agreement: This is not for inclusion in v2.0. Awaiting recommendation on legal status from Legal Status TF.*

**IssueID-461**

1. There was a discussion on MarkCategoryType.

The International Bureau made reference to comments which had been made by Japan on the Wiki about consistency. These concerns were resolved with no impact on the schema. It was confirmed that the issue of special characters in value has been corrected. AU stated that some of the values are too long and suggested that the detail should go into the description. GB agreed with this. GB suggested that the whole component needed to be revised by someone from OHIM who understood how values are being used.

1. There was extensive discussion on the requirements for the different types of mark, especially the distinction between Certification Mark and Guarantee Mark. GB does not have the concept of Guarantee Mark, and would prefer to split the components out. US and AU agreed with this.
* *Agreement: split the existing enumneration values “certification mark, also known as guarantee mark” into:*
	+ *Certification mark*
	+ *Guarantee mark*
* *Agreement:*
	+ *Restore defensive mark,*
* *Descriptions are needed for these:*
	+ *All agreed that the current description for Certification Mark is accurate*
	+ *CA agreed to provide a description for Guarantee Mark , and post this on Issue-461.*
	+ *All the above should be reflected in v2.0.*
* *Other Agreements:*
	+ *Create a new issue related to TransactionCategory. The timeline must be decided, as this must be included in v2.0.*
	+ *Com:Image in MathType should be changed from mandatory to optional, as proposed by US. This needs to be reflected in v2.0.*
	+ *Reflect PreClassificationText in bibliographic data in v2.0.*

**IssueID-520**

1. GB noted that this issue duplicates the previous discussion on Owner, and that they would like to have the concept of Owner across all three IP rights.
* *Agreements:*
	1. *tmk:Holder – need to modify description by removing word “new” – agreed.*
	2. *Modify as per the proposal on the wiki.*
	3. *Too many nuances between IP rights, so easier to have specific components in each IP right, rather than having Owner/Holder in common*
	4. *This should be included in v2.0.*

**IssueID-524**

1. International Bureau will update the status of this issue based on the outcome of the Task Force meeting which took place in Alexandria, USPTO, from Sep 29 to Oct, 2014.

**IssueID-531**

1. CA proposed RepresentativeBag.xsd (optional) in both tmk:PlaintiffType.xsd and tmk:DefendantType.xsd, as parties may use specific representatives for opposition proceedings; remove RepresentativeBag.xsd from tmk:OppositionType.xsd. The US and GB supported this.
* *Agreement: All agreed. Reflect in v2.0*

**IssueID-532**

1. CA and GB commented that the descriptions still are not clear. These need to be improved so that they are understandable. RU do not use this. It was agreed that the values could be kept as they are but that we need to improve descriptions. Need further clarification on descriptions e.g. What does ED mean? What is the significance of “duly”?

*Action: International Bureau to investigate. Include in v2.0*

1. RU posted some descriptions from OHIM website. CA satisfied with definitions now, if CTM is removed. GB stated that these are too OHIM-specific, so need to be made more generic if they are going to be used more widely. Currently, no IPOs populate the values.
* *Agreement: Replace values, removing reference to CTM, to make more generic. This needs to be checked with OHIM.*

**IssueID-535**

1. Proposal to replace “Proceeding” with “Proceedings”.
* *Agreement: keep existing component names, whether singular or plural, but update documentation, to be plural. All agreed. This is to be included in v2.0.*

**IssueID-536**

1. CA provided a description of “Position” in MarkFeatureCategory. The International Bureau indicated that we need a description for all other values too.

*Action: AU and GB to draft descriptions for all others. When agreed, include in v2.0*

**IssueID-537**

1. It was proposed that tmk:ProceedingEvent should be replaced with ProceedingEventBag, as it contains multiple proceeding events. US will check this. RU and KIPO do not use this.
* *Agreement:*
	+ 1. *Above agreed. Reflect in v2.0*
		2. *CancellationProceedingsBag will not be changed, even though this would be better, as this will have an impact on systems.*

**IssueID-538**

1. Specific schema developed for electronic Madrid communications. RU felt that this was not necessary as components of ST.96 should be reused and not multiplied ST.96 unnecessarily. GB felt that this agreement would set a precedent for what we do for the Hague and PCT and that it should therefore be considered very carefully. International Bureau stated that the Task Force needs to decide preferred approach. This depends on level of granularity which we wish to use. CA agreed that we should use ST.96 as far as possible, but need to add some elements where they are not present in ST.96. CA needs this information soon, as an ongoing project depends on this (go-live next year). The International Bureau stated that this needs further consideration.

*Action: There is a need to prepare a study on the pros and cons of the different options. US to work with RU and GB. This cannot be included in v2.0*

**IssueID-539**

1. See discussion on IssueID-538 above.

**IssueID-540**

1. *Agreement: Agree proposal as stated.*

*Action: Include description: “Designation under the protocol by virtue of Article 9 sexies”. Include in v2.0.*

**IssueID-541**

1. International Bureau – proposal to add a new enumeration value "Partial Transfer" to tmk:BasicRecordCategoryType. International Bureau – all the background to this proposal is in previous meeting reports (2014 September meeting at USPTO).
2. RU will post their comments on this issue on the wiki. Already exists in RecordTransferCategory. Can this be reused? Unify with BasicRecordCategory.
* *Agreement: Not to be included in v2.0.*

*Action: RU and US will provide proposal and supporting materials.*

**IssueID-542**

1. International Bureau proposed to change data type of tmk:MarkDescriptionText from xsd:string to com:LocalizedTextType for possibility to have language code.
* *Agreement: all agreed. Include v2.0.*

**IssueID-543**

1. US stated that the categories should be made into their own components. It does not make sense to have this as OtherDate. AU commented that we could keep OtherDate but that the documentation needed to be tidied up. US stated that if it is kept, OtherDateCategory must be mandatory. GB commented that it will take more work to clean up the existing component and make it useable, than to create new specific components.
2. Participants proposed the following options for further discussion:
	1. Option 1: Remove “OtherDate” from ST.96 and define specific components per date defined in the attribute otherDateCategory, which looks necessary for Madrid.
	2. Option 2: Keep “OtherDate”, however:
		1. Change the attribute OtherDateCategory to mandatory and define it as the union of xsd:token and simpleType of the enumeration values
		2. Revise its description “Any country specific date.  An attribute defines the kind of event represented by that date” to “Any other date.  An attribute defines the kind of event represented by that date.” because the current enumeration values are related to international application.
		3. Split value of “International application or registration date” in the attribute otherDateCategory into “International application date” and “International registration date”
		4. Improve descriptions of the enumeration values in the attribute otherDateCategory

*Action: IPOs to make comments on the existing IssueID-543.*

**KR’s proposal:** 20141028\_KIPO's\_proposal\_on\_WIPO\_ST96\_Trademark\_revised.docx

1. AU wants to discourage any other format than mp3 for soundmarks, for international exchange. RU noted that they accept all types of soundmarks. The only requirement is that it is able to be opened with standard software.
2. Participants agreed to add the two values, as they are already included in MultimediaMarkFileFormatCategory. However, they noted the difficulties that AU had experienced with these formats, due to the excessive file sizes and non-standard formats.
* *Agreement: add the proposed values to SoundFileFormatCategoryType*

#### Revision on Design components

**IssueID-514**

1. Proposal to add dgn:DesignClassificationBag, to replace dgn:IndicationProduct.
	1. GB supported the proposal to replace dgn:IndicationProductBag With dgn:DesignClassificationBag as they only classify using Locarno, however they noted that due to the high level of the Locarno scheme they have designed a GB Office specific third level of classification. It was noted that other Offices such as OHIM have created their own similar extensions. KIPO also supported the proposal but noted that they have two classification systems: Locarno and domestic and therefore they also need the proposed NationalDesignClassificationBag.
	2. *Agreement: it was agreed to add an additional component, com:NationalSubclassExtension (optional), under com:LocarnoSubclass to allow for national extensions. This will follow the same structure as LocarnoSubclass, also including NationalExtensionProductIndication. Include in v2.0. It was also agreed to add a Design component, “NationalDesignClassificationBag” and IndicationProductionDescriptionText under the component.*

*Action: The International Bureau to consult with OHIM and US.*

**IssueID-528**

1. This item was discussed before on the basis of KR’s proposal and KR withdrew its proposal.

*Action: Issue to be closed based on previous discussion on KR’s proposal.*

**IssueID-546**

1. GB presented a proposal to rename dgn:OppositionBag (and OppositionBagType) to dgn:CancellationBag, and dgn:Opposition (and OppositionType) to dgn:Cancellation. It was noted that there are a variety of practices among the IPOs on Opposition and Cancellation/Invalidation.
2. The International Bureau presented the following two options:
	* 1. The first option was to amend the existing Opposition component to create a common element for pre and post-registration processes; the International Bureau noted this was the preferred option of the Hague team at the International Bureau..
		2. The second option preferred by GB, AU, US and KR was to create a new component for post registration Cancellations/Invalidations because the two concepts are different.
* *Agreement: option two was agreed by all (separate elements).*
	+ - * *For pre-registration the existing OppositionBag will be used though it was noted that the description needed to be revised. For post-registration, it was agreed to add a new component named InvalidationBag. GB will provide a draft schema and description for InvalidationBag.xsd by 21/11/14. Include in v2.0 if possible.*
			* *Description for Opposition: “Opposition procedure before the Office or any other judicial or quasi-judicial body*

**KR’s proposal:** 20141028\_KIPO's\_proposal\_on\_WIPO\_ST96\_Design\_revised.docx

1. KR would like to propose either:
	1. adding new elements in order to identify 3-dimensional modelling files and multimedia files; or
	2. adding the following values to the existing com:ImageFormatCategory
2. RU supported the first option, but proposed creating a common element for Trademark and Designs. The US proposed to introduce the concept of MixedMedia under the View component. The International Bureau stated that this needs more discussion.
* Agreement: The Participants provisionally agreed the following items and continue to discuss
	+ 1. *Include this v2.0*
		2. *Proposal to change View:*
			- * *com:FileName to, replace ImageFileName.*
				* *Add two more categories: ThreeDimesionalFormatCategory and MultiMediaFormatCategory.*
				* *Make the HeightMeasure and WidthMeasure elements optional*

*Action: International Bureau to create a new IssueID to discuss this further.*

### Agenda Item 6: Review of Proposal For Revisions (PFRs)

* 1. PFR on Main Body
		1. PFR ST96-2013-001 Rev1 (Modification to ST.96 Main Body)
1. Changes were made directly in the document during the course of discussion.

*Action: International Bureau will circulate the revised version for consideration by Task Force members.*

* + 1. KR's proposal: 20141028\_KIPO's\_proposal\_on\_ST96\_Mainbody\_revised.docx
1. *Agreements:*
* *Not to adopt proposal one (inclusion of Utility Model), as this is already covered by Patents.*
* *Defer agreement on proposal two (3D file format), until an agreement has been reached on KR’s proposal on Designs.*
	1. PFR on Annex I
1. Changes were made directly in the document during the course of discussion.

*Action: International Bureau will circulate the revised version for consideration by Task Force members.*

1. The US raised a concern that long tag names may cause performance issues.

*Action: US will provide performance test results by 21 November 2014, to include in v2.0*

1. There was discussion on how we share the implementation schema based on ST.96. International Bureau reminded the participants of the WIPO SVN to be used for sharing.­
2. There was a discussion of the Proposal on XML Schema Version Strategy. Participants agreed Option One on p.4 for version naming. This requires updates to the DRCs and relevant rules (see paras 13-19). Other changes that were agreed were made in the document.
	1. PFR on Annex II
3. Changes were made directly in the document during the course of discussion. Two appendices to Annex II, which will be updated based on schema v2.0.

*Action: International Bureau will circulate the revised version for consideration by Task Force members.*

### Agenda Item 7: XML/XSD version 1.0 vs 1.1

1. The US gave an excellent presentation (which can be found on the Wiki) on the advantages and disadvantages of XSD Schema 1.1 and the use of XML vs JSON. The conclusion was that although there would be benefits in using XML Schema 1.1 for ST.96 e.g. co-occurrence constraints, the XML processing tools have not yet caught up with the new version and therefore now is not the time to upgrade. It was agreed that the task force would continue to monitor the situation and reconsider the issue at the next meeting.
2. On the XML vs JSON situation it was noted that again there are benefits in using JSON over XML in some situations where there is only simple content to be processed but that due to limitations in areas such as validation JSON is not suitable and could not therefore replace the use of XML.

### Agenda Item 8: Annex V preparation

1. Participants reviewed the revised Annex V and agreed some improvements. Participants also noted appendices A and B will be updated based on the new schema version 2.0. US will update the appendices.

*Action: International Bureau will circulate the revised version for consideration by Task Force members.*

1. US gave a presentation on Schematron, which is used to validate data against ST.96. The doc folder contains instructions for how to run Schematron. GB stated that this is a very useful tool. An inexpensive plug-in tool Validator Buddy enables you to use this with XMLSpy as you are building schemas. RU asked GB to post a link in the Wiki of Annex V. RU would like to use Schematron, as they have been validating its implementation schemas against the ST.96 DRCs manually. KR also plans to use Schematron. It will be especially useful if schemas are developed by contractors. AU and CA will also be using this in the future. All thanked US for their efforts in developing this valuable validation tool. US confirmed that this tool is open source, and free of charge for other IPOs to use. US will confirm that it will be possible to publish this publicly.
	* 1. Task Force members should test Schematron with the current schema and rules, and provide feedback to US by 28 November. US will provide a feedback template.
		2. Task Force members to review rules by 28 November.
		3. US will make improvements to Schematron by 12 December, to allow further tests on the updated schema and rules.
		4. Task Force members to test updated Schematron for a further week, 15-19 December.
		5. US will update Schematron, if necessary, by 9 January 2015.

### Agenda Item 9: Annex VI preparation

1. Participants reviewed the proposal and agreed the revision of Annex VI and noted that further work on Appendices A, B and C will be carried out on the basis of schema version 2.0.

*Action: US will make the changes to the appendices, and all Task Force members will be invited to comment. All materials should be completed by February 2015.*

*Action: International Bureau will circulate the revised version for consideration by Task Force members.*

1. According to the proposed revision to the Section "3.4 Identity constraints" of Annex I (DRCs), the section "4.5 Identity constraints" of Annex VI should also be updated. In the previous version of DRCs, the use of xsd:ID/xsd:IDREF/xsd:IDREFS was not recommended to identify constraints. However, in the proposed revision, they are also recommended with use xsd:key/xsd:keyref/xsd:unique.
* *Agreement: Participants reviewed the proposal from US and agreed to modify the relevant paragraph 35 and Rules TR-21 and TR-22 of Annex VI.*

### Agenda Item 10: Exchange of information: Presentation on IPOs’ activities and plan related to XML

#### **UPOV**

1. The meeting received a presentation made by Ben Rivoire (Technical / Regional Officer) from the Office of the International Union for Protection of New Varieties of Plants (UPOV) on the UPOV Electronic Application Form Project. The presentation is made available on the Wiki.
2. It was recalled that the original description of the aim of the project on a prototype electronic form was to develop a multilingual, electronic form containing questions relevant for plant breeders’ rights (PBRs) applications. The aim of the prototype would be to develop an electronic form covering all relevant information required for a PBR application in the members of the Union concerned and with questions translated in the relevant languages for the members of the Union concerned. It was noted that an important aspect of the project was to agree on the format for the data to be exchanged.  Therefore it was agreed since the beginning of the project that in relation to XML format, a standard format would be developed, based on WIPO standard ST.96.
3. The participants were informed on the proposal for the development of the XML Schema to be used for the project (i.e. PVP-XML).  It was noted that the PVP-XML Schema would, as far as possible, reuse and refer to relevant components of the WIPO Standard ST.96 (“common components”).  It was agreed that components which were not covered by the ST.96 standard would be described and developed on the basis of the ST.96 Annex I (Design Rules and conventions) and UPOV XML Design Rules and Conventions (DRCs).  It was agreed that the PVP-XML would be updated in line with ST.96, as appropriate; however, it was not planned for the PVP-XML to be prepared for adoption as a WIPO standard.
4. The meeting noted that a Proof of Concept would be presented at the UPOV Council in October 2015.

#### **USPTO**

##### *Introduction*

1. The USPTO is committed to supporting and implementing WIPO Standards and is leveraging ST.96 for all future initiatives where applicable.  One of the current goals of USPTO’s Patents End-to-End (PE2E) initiative is to support patent examination activities.  PE2E is using ST.96 internally in the Examiner Tools and the Office Action prototype has incorporated ST.96 components into the document-level schemas for Incoming and Outgoing Documents.  The Trademarks Next Generation (TM NG) initiative has deployed two systems that have implemented ST.96:  Trademark Status and Documents Retrieval (TSDR) and the new Electronic Official Gazette (eoG).

##### *Current Status of ST.36*

1. The USPTO continues to publish patent applications and patent grants based on WIPO ST.36 and no end date has yet been determined.  The USPTO continues to make modifications to its implementation of ST.36 publication DTDs, known as Red Book, due to rules changes and other initiative such as The Hague Agreement, which will be implemented in early 2015**.**

##### *Current Status of ST.96:  Support to the International Bureau*

1. USPTO supports the International Bureau in reviewing, updating, and/or creating WIPO ST.96 Resources. When a new version of ST.96 has been agreed upon and is published, under the guidance of the International Bureau, the USPTO updates all annexes and the Main Body as needed.  There are six Annexes as follows:
* ST.96 Annex I: XML Design Rules and Conventions
* ST.96 Annex II: IP Data Dictionary, which includes element and attributes data dictionary and enumeration list dictionary
* ST.96 Annex III: IP XML Schemas
* XML schema resources (Patent, Trademark, Design, Common)
* ST.96 Annex IV: XML Schema Technical Specification
* ST.96 Annex V: Implementation Rules and Guidelines, which are guidelines for creating conformant and compatible schemas.
* ST.96 Annex VI: Transformation Rules and Guidelines, which include the mapping of the elements and attributes between the different standards  and updating the XSLT in support of the following transformations (ST.36 to ST.96, ST.66 to ST.96, ST.86 to ST.96 and vice-versa).
1. The USPTO also works closely with the International Bureau to update the Schematron based on V1\_0\_D7 Design Rules and Conventions (DRC) and works with other IPOs to test.  Schematron is an open source rule-based validation language for making assertions about the presence or absence of patterns in XML schemas and it is used to improve the XML implementation schema.  The ST.96 Design Rules and Conventions are coded within Schematron and can validate whether an IPO’s implementation schema follows the XML Design Rules and Conventions of ST.96.  The enforceability status is also included because not all rules are enforceable by the Schematron; however, the validation report  will identify both the components that are not conforming to the rules and provide details of the non-conformance, as well as, identify the components that relate to unenforceable rules, so that they can be easily identified and assessed manually.  The USPTO is currently updating the Schematron with the Design Rules and Conventions for Version 1 D7.  Once the Schematron update is completed, the Schematron will be provided to the Task Force members so that they can test it out with their Implementation Schemas and provide feedback to USPTO.

##### *Current Status of ST.96 V1.0 D6 in Patent End-to-End Initiative*

1. The Patent End to End project is using ST.96 version 1.0 D6.  During Phase 3 of this project, the USPTO has made some modification to the following internal schemas.
* Claims Document
* Description (Specification)
* Abstract
* Incoming Document from applicants, inventors, and other parties
* Outgoing Document from USPTO to external parties
1. USPTO is using ST.96 components to create USPTO document level schemas.  We have modified several components to meet our requirements.  We always leverage the latest published version of ST.96 for anything that can be re-used and we only add USPTO specific components as a last resort.
2. USPTO has added markup for Forms within the Incoming and Outgoing Document-level schemas for our Office Action prototype, which will include some PCT Forms.  We were able to create one generic document-level schema that covered all requirements for forms (e.g., boilerplate text, formatting, filled in data and the identification of the type of data (e.g., application number, filing date, patent number)).  We used the ST.96 components, where applicable.
3. With regards to the Publication of Patent Applications and Patent Grants, the USPTO’s focus remains on projects supporting the Examination of Patents.  The modernization of the USPTO Redbook is unknown at this time.  However,USPTO is planning a new project to make Published Patent Information available in Bulk and we are looking at ST.96 as a viable option.  In the near future, a CPC classification data product will be released based on ST.96.

##### *Current Status of ST.96 V1.0 D6 in Trademarks*

1. The USPTO Trademark Office has implemented the Trademark Status and Documents Retrieval (TSDR) and the Electronic Official Gazette (eOG) systems using ST.96 version 1.0 D3
2. The new Electronic Filing (eFILE) system has started this year with a staged deployment occurring over several years.  This project will include 60+ Forms.  The internal system will be using JSON based on ST.96 and the data exchange will be using ST.96 version 1.0 D6.

#### **Rospatent**

1. Rospatent is making efforts so in the future ST.96 will be used at all stages of the life cycle of intellectual property. At the moment Rospatent is implementing several projects related to ST.96. A new electronic application system is under development which will be receiving applications from external informational systems. The key features: one system for all kind of Intellectual property on all stages of IP life cycle, system is intended for Intersystem interactions via SOAP, Using of WIPO standard ST.96 and mandatory use of electronic signatures at all stages of interaction.
2. ST.96 is also used in IP State Electronic Registers. The State Electronic Register of inventions and utility models is already operational and the State Electronic Register of industrial designs is under development (launch on November 26).
3. Also Rospatent is developing the system of official publication. This system will contain all types IP objects, which will be stored and published in ST.96. Key features of the system: continuous publication from IP State Electronic Registers, XSLT transformation for presentation of documents, Asynchronous loading of documents.

#### **KIPO**

1. KIPO has different formats of patent publications, depending on the corresponding production period. In order to help users better utilize our gazette data in these different formats, since 2013, KIPO has been constructing ST.96-based databases for enhanced dissemination. This year, KIPO created databases of Standardized Application Names, Patent Families and Patent Classification Records in ST.96 format for public dissemination. KIPO also has converted our official gazettes and bibliographic data for patents, utility models, and designs into the ST.96 format.
2. In addition, KIPO has been providing OHIM with bibliographic data of trademarks in ST.96 format since February 2014, whereas design bibliographic data will be provided to OHIM as of December 2014. Also, in accordance with our joining of the Hague Agreement in July 2014, KIPO developed this system so that it can send international design documents to WIPO in ST.96 format, in collaboration with them.
3. KIPO plans to construct IP databases in ST.96 format for dissemination by 2017.

#### **IP Australia**

1. IPA receives a large amount of XML data through its eServices platform: online web forms for B2C customers and XML EDI for B2B customers. IPA also creates a large amount of XML data during Search, Examine and other business processes. Internally these XML data may be converted to other formats that are acceptable by the respective processing system (not all processing systems handle XML data). The XML data is largely consistent with (but not conformant to) the WIPO standard ST.36/66/86. A Common IPA model (by the extension of ST.96 V1 Common model) has been built and is in production. IPA is participating in UPOV application form project based on ST.96.  IPA did not make use of other ST.96 models so far.
2. IPA has been using MECA  for Madrid communication and has recently migrated from SGML to XML. IPA IRPI will be in production by March 2015.  IPA provides XML web services, e.g. to WIPO-CASE and WIPO-IRPI. IPA also consumes XML web services from other offices (e.g. EPO family member). IPA provides XML bulk bibliographic data for all IP rights. IPA also provides high-level XML wrapper for other PDF-based IP documents such as bulk Patent Specification data.
3. The idea of migrating XML data to ST.96 conformance has been on the radar, but so far without a committed plan for such a project.

#### **CIPO**

1. CIPO has IT systems in place for Patents, Trademarks, Industrial Designs and Copyrights. CIPO also administers Integrated Circuit Topology, though this is a manual process due to the small number of cases. Statistics from May 2013 state that at that time CIPO had 2.1 million Patents, 1.3 million Trademarks, 150 thousand Industrial designs, and 120 thousand Copyrights.
2. CIPO is currently live in producing XML for Patents and Industrial designs. Several years ago CIPO implemented an ST.36 XML repository for Patents which is used for dissemination, text search indexing (Verity), and many other data retrieval uses. Patents are also received in ST.36 format from Patent Scope and PCT Safe. CIPO also produces Industrial designs in ST.86 which is used for dissemination.
3. CIPO has projects underway for producing ST.96 for Trademarks and Industrial Designs. For Trademarks CIPO has developed an XML repository which will be leveraged for dissemination, e-commerce transactions, WIPO’s IRPI Madrid filing system, Madrid messaging, and many other future purposes. For integration with the Hague system, Industrial Designs will be communicated to and from WIPO using ST.96 compatible XML formats. The target for Madrid and Hague integration is approximately early 2016.

#### **UKIPO**

1. The UK IPO is currently embarking on a major transformation of our IPO Digital Services. This program of work plans to:
	* Deliver new digital services,
	* Replace legacy Back Office systems
	* Remove several decades of “bolt on” technology
2. This work will transform the processes and IT systems of Designs, Patents and Customer Services as well as building on the recent work to update our Trade Mark systems to allow us to become a more customer focused organization and to be able to share information with partners in the best and most efficient way.
3. All projects will use the ST.96 standard to help enforce a consistent naming standard across all systems. As has been discussed this week we have already mapped much of our Patents data to the new standard and we are now analyzing our existing Designs data.

### Agenda Item 11: Future works

1. The International Bureau briefed participants on the schedule, and asked Task Force members to offer comments on the Wiki. Initial priorities were given:
* AU: PCT
* RU: Patent Transactions, Legal Status Data, Search Reports, Geographical Indications
* CA: Madrid and Hague
* GB: PCT, and Designs data, including Hague
* KR: Madrid and Hague
* US: Madrid and Hague
1. Participants reviewed the work plan of the XML4IP Task Force, which is posted in the TF Wiki at: https://www3.wipo.int/confluence/display/xml4iptf/XML4IP+TF+2014+Work+Plan. It was agreed that the XML Schema V1\_0\_D7 is the last draft version before the version 2.0. They discussed a tentative schedule to finalize ST.96 version 2.0 and prepare a final draft for the pending Annexes V and VI.
* *Agreement: As for the version 2.0 of ST.96 Main Body, Annexes I to IV, assuming the next session of the CWS (CWS/5) will take place in May 2015, Participants agreed on the following tentative schedule:*
	+ *Nov 2014: XML4IP Task Force to discuss and approve the revision of ST.96 Main Body and Annex I (DRCs)*
	+ *Dec 2014: XML4IP Task Force to discuss and agree on open issues on XML schema components which should be included in the version 2.0.*
	+ *Jan 2015: XML4IP Task Force to review and approve the XML Schema version 2.0 and Annex IV, which will be provided by the USPTO and the International Bureau*
	+ *Feb 2015: XML4IP Task Force to review and approve the revision of Annex II*
* *With regard to the preparation of final draft of Annexes V and VI:*
	+ *Nov-Dec 2014: XML4IP TF to test Schematron which will be a part of Annex V; and the USPTO to update it based on the revised Annex I (Ver 2.0) and feedback from the XML4IP TF members*
	+ *Jan 2015:*
		- *the updated Schematron to be released for consideration and approval by the CWS*
		- *the XML4IP TF to review and test updated Appendixes A and B of Annex V and Appendixes A, B and C of Annex VI which will be provided by the USPTO and the International Bureau on the basis of Schema version 2.0.*
	+ *Feb 2015: XML4IP Task Force to submit final proposal of Annexes V and VI for consideration and adoption by the CWS.*
* *It was noted that the tentative schedule should be adapted according to the schedule of the CWS/5.*

*Action: The IB will update the work plan in the TF Wiki accordingly.*

### Agenda Item 12: Adoption of meeting report

1. Draft report was reviewed by Participants and its content was accepted by them; and will be reformatted. A final draft of meeting report will be distributed to all Participants by Nov. 17, 2014 for consideration and approval on 21 November.

### Other Matters

1. US presented some analysis on the potential impact of making changes to elements containing FileName. US proposed to create a new component com:FileName and replace existing file name components. RU and KR agree with this, but if this is implemented, KR will need to change their databases, as they have implemented vD6. CA use MarkImageBag and ImageFileName, but agree with developing more common elements.

*Action: International Bureau will create an issue on the Wiki, for discussion by participants, proposing to:*

* + 1. *Create a new common component com:FileName, with description: “name of an electronic file”, and to replace the existing components in which FileName is included.*
		2. *Replace existing attribute pat:FileName to com:DocumentFileName.*

 [Annex I follows]
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