

WIPO



SCIT/ITPWG/1/13

ORIGINAL: English

DATE: September 7, 2001

E

WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION
GENEVA

STANDING COMMITTEE ON INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY PROJECTS WORKING GROUP

First Session
Geneva, September 3 to 7, 2001

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 first session from September 3 to 7, 2001.
2. The following Member States of WIPO were represented at the session: Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Brazil, Canada, Cape Verde, China, Croatia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Guatemala, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Japan, Kenya, Latvia, Madagascar, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Nigeria, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States of America and Venezuela (51).
3. Representatives of the International Labour Office (ILO), the Benelux Trademark Office (BBM), the European Community (EC), the Eurasian Patent Organization (EAPO), and the European Patent Office (EPO) (5) took part in the session.
4. The list of participants appears as Annex I to this report.

Agenda Item 1: Opening of the Session

5. The session was opened by Ms. H. Frary, in her capacity as Secretary of the session.

Agenda Item 2: Election of the Chair and two Vice-Chairs

6. The SCIT ITPWG unanimously elected Mrs. H. Saha (India) as Chair and Mr. N.C. Teziev (Bulgaria) and Mr. R. Johnson (United States of America) as Vice-Chairs.

7. In accepting the Chair, Mrs. Saha recalled the role of information technology (IT) within the intellectual property (IP) system. The 21st century would be the century of knowledge and of the mind and, as such, access to knowledge was extremely important. There was an increasing gap in knowledge between developed and developing countries, which needed to be bridged in the shortest time possible. The exponential growth of scientific knowledge increased demands for new forms of intellectual protection as well as access to IP-related information and an ability to convert knowledge into wealth through the process of innovation would determine its future. Among the key challenges facing WIPO and the IP community in the 21st century were those presented by continuing advances in digital technologies, the boom in electronic information exchange and the technology gap between developed and developing countries. It was clear that Member States are determined to make greater use of the potential that IT offers in promoting international cooperation in the field of IP.

Agenda Item 3: Adoption of the Agenda (Document SCIT/ITPWG/1/1 Rev.1)

8. In response to a question from the Delegation of Bulgaria as to why the item on the Draft Information Security Policy had been removed from the revised agenda, the Secretariat said that the text was still under consideration by an internal WIPO task force, but that it hoped to include the item in a future SCIT meeting.

9. With this clarification the ITPWG unanimously adopted the agenda which appears as Annex II to this report.

Agenda Item 4: Consideration of the Task List of the ITPWG (Document SCIT/ITPWG/1/2)

10. In introducing the document SCIT/ITPWG/1/2, the Secretariat reminded the meeting that the SCIT Plenary, at its meeting in January 2001, had divided the tasks within the SCIT Work Program between its two working groups, Standards and Documentation (SDWG) and the ITPWG, and had instructed them to review the individual tasks, taking into account the suggestions made during the debate at the Plenary meeting. The outcome of this discussion on the task list would be relayed to the SCIT Plenary at its next session in December 2001.

11. The Delegation of France asked for clarification on the exact role of Task Leaders to be assigned to each task. It recalled that the suggestion had been made at the SCIT Plenary by the Delegation of the United Kingdom as a means to ensure good leadership so that work moves ahead.

12. The Delegation of the United Kingdom replied that its primary concern had been the proliferation of tasks and the extension of the program of work for the SCIT when there was not a wide base of support for the work. There had been problems in the past with not making progress on particular tasks and a Task Leader was required to monitor progress and to report to the SCIT on possible problems or constraints.

13. The Secretariat recalled that the ITPWG would, under item 12 of its agenda, consider methods for electronic reporting on the IT Program to Member States. The SCIT Plenary, in agreeing its new working methods in January 2001, had approved a four monthly reporting cycle to all Member States and that this would address the issue of informing delegates on the progress in all major IT activities.

14. The Delegation of Australia said that the monitoring function of the ITPWG should be better defined to include the industry-recognized role of project/activity assurance, whereby it is determined if the activity remains viable, the required business benefits are achieved and the critical success factors are monitored and reported upon. This was a different role from that of project management in that it concentrated on strategy rather than day-to-day management.

15. The Delegation of Bulgaria raised concerns about the overlap between the mandate of the ITPWG to monitor the implementation of WIPO's IT Program and the identification of individual tasks that referred to one individual project, for example, Task No. 1, which was concerned only with the WIPONET Project.

16. The Secretariat recalled that the Task List had existed before the ITPWG and agreed that there was overlap in certain areas in terms of the monitoring role of the Working Group. Under the new SCIT working methods, the Secretariat was committed to produce, to the ITPWG, regular performance reports on all major activities that were covered under Working Group tasks. The Secretariat had recommended the deletion of some tasks from the Work Program either because they fell within the overall mandate of the ITPWG, or because they were being dealt with elsewhere in the International Bureau and were beyond the management responsibility of the IT Program. In particular, Task Nos. 2, 5 and part of 14 fell under the remit of the newly created Intellectual Property Office (IPO) Automation Division.

17. In response to requests for clarification on the role of the IPO Automation Division, the Secretariat said that it had been created by the Director General in April 2001. Its mandate was three-fold: firstly the development of a policy framework; secondly, the coordination of all assistance-related activities in IT that WIPO carries out in its Member States; and thirdly, the provision of technical guidance in assisting in the modernization of and automation of IPOs. The Division is presented in the Draft Program and Budget for the 2002-2003 biennium under Main Program 12, Cooperation with Developing Countries, and would work closely with this Sector.

18. As the work of this new Division is in the early stages of planning and the modality of Member States' involvement in its activities is still to be defined, the ITPWG decided to refer the following tasks to the next session of the SCIT Plenary for a decision on their retention as part of the SCIT Work Program:

Task No. 2: Study the potential of electronic commerce, its infrastructure and the usage of tools therefore by IPOs;

Task No. 5: Monitor pilot projects, undertaken by the International Bureau, to evaluate viable, cost-effective and user-friendly solutions for the streamlining and automation of IP administration functions, in particular, those solutions most suitable for small IPOs; and

Task No. 14 (second part): The provision, to developing countries, of technical assistance in the area of the electronic filing of patent and trademark applications.

19. The ITPWG also decided to delete Task Nos. 1, 9, 12, 14 (first part), 16 and 27 from its Work Program, on the understanding that the monitoring and advisory role of the Working Group, in respect of these activities, would be maintained through the process of progress reporting to the ITPWG. Also, that proposals for new activities could be considered under the SCIT process for task initiation.

OVERVIEW PRESENTATION OF WIPO'S IT PROJECTS

20. A comprehensive presentation on WIPO's IT Program was given, which focused on the interrelationships between the different IT projects, the challenges WIPO is facing with continual growth in the applications for IP, and the expected benefits that the IT program will bring to the Secretariat, Member States and the general public.

21. The Delegations of Australia and Mexico drew attention to the fact that the presentation had given Member States a strategic overview of the IT projects as well as of the combined benefits for the IP community and Member States and WIPO. The Delegation of Mexico also stated that this highlighted the need for a harmonized system and global systems for different programs that WIPO is carrying out in terms of IT.

22. The Delegation of Egypt raised a question concerning the possibility of including the diplomatic missions in Geneva as part of WIPO's IT strategy, similar to the Geneva Diplomatic Community (GDCnet) for all international organizations based in Geneva.

23. The Delegation of the United Kingdom inquired whether it would be possible for some formal very high-level strategic document to be produced based on the presentation. In response, the Secretariat agreed to the request and suggested that it could be presented to the SCIT Plenary in December.

24. In responding to the Delegation of Egypt, the Secretariat recalled that GDCnet is an Internet-based system, WIPO's web site has links to the GDCnet and that the project was being implemented by the International Telecommunications Union (ITU). WIPO contributes financially to the implementation of the GDCnet.

Agenda Item 5: WIPONET Project Status Report (Document SCIT/ITPWG/1/3)

25. In response to a question from the Delegation of the United States of America regarding the availability of the information and documentation addressed to those IPOs to be provided with Internet connectivity under the WIPONET Project, the Secretariat said that it was currently not available on the Internet, partly for security reasons. However, some of the information related to deployment tracking was already available on WIPO's Intranet and the Secretariat undertook to look into the feasibility of making this available to a wider audience. With regard to those IPOs already with Internet connectivity, the English version of a circular

letter had been dispatched on August 20, 2001, requesting those Offices to appoint a WIPONET Focal Point and an Alternate Focal Point and detailing the responsibilities of these persons as well as the training to be offered under the project. Training for 166 already connected IPOs will commence from mid-October and should be finished towards the end of November. This will enable the already connected IPOs to start using the WIPONET Central Services immediately.

26. The Delegation of Bulgaria requested clarification about the use of the *Société Internationale de Télécommunications Aéronautiques* (SITA) network for WIPONET and its possible implications for WIPONET security, in particular access to the information exchanged through WIPONET by SITA. The Secretariat informed the delegate that the SITA network would be used only as a communication link between the International Bureau and the Internet and also for connecting the IPOs receiving the WIPONET KIT to the Internet. WIPONET was based upon open Internet standards and the benefit of using the SITA network was its widespread coverage and reliability. SITA will have absolutely no access to the data transmitted over their network as this data will be encrypted and travel through a secure socket layer (SSL) established between the computers at the IPOs and the WIPONET CENTER.

27. The Delegation of the United Kingdom observed that the project Status Report provided no financial information and said that it considered this information a vital element of project monitoring. The Delegation also stressed the importance of using WIPONET services for other WIPO projects, such as the PCT E-filing which may help to reduce costs.

28. The Secretariat informed the Working Group that the WIPONET CENTER, when it becomes operational in October, will provide an authentication service and not a full PKI solution. This authentication service will provide from 80 to 90 per cent security of that of a PKI solution. If this authentication service fulfills the requirements of E-filing, WIPONET will be able to provide this service.

29. In response to questions from the Delegation of France regarding access to and performance on the network by IPOs with Internet connectivity, the Secretariat said that the SITA network had about 17 links to the Internet scattered throughout the world, which would allow the already connected IPOs to use a combination of the Internet and the SITA network. An example of routing of data by the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) was quoted whereby it will use the Internet only for a short distance, but the major part across the Atlantic will be carried by the SITA network. This system will also allow the already connected IPOs to benefit from the quality of the SITA network. Regarding the connectivity of other networks such as PATNET, the Secretariat said that if such networks were using Internet technology then connectivity between them and the WIPONET would be automatically established.

30. The Delegation of France expressed its support to the observation made by the Delegation of the United Kingdom with regard to the need for financial information about the project. The Delegation requested that a breakdown of the costs involved into various categories such as telecommunications costs and equipment costs, be given. The Delegation also felt that, given that only five IPOs had so far been provided with the WIPONET KIT, it appeared to be an ambitious target to connect 61 other Offices by the end of the year.

31. In response to a question from the Delegation of Australia as to a business model for the operation and management of WIPONET the Secretariat confirmed that a number of documents would be made available. With regard to a question from the Delegation

concerning the security environment envisaged for IPOs for managing general IP information the Secretariat said that guidelines were being developed to assist those IPOs which do not have any security policy at present.

32. The Delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea expressed its support for the recommendation of the Secretariat to advance deployment in the IPOs identified under Phase Two of the project in place of those Offices where installations cannot be undertaken for the time being.

33. The Delegation of Australia supported the policy of the Secretariat in ensuring coordination and reliance among the various projects. This was a sound approach to introduce cost-effectiveness and efficiency in the long term. The Delegation requested clarification as to whether the WIPONET costs were dependent upon the number of users and if any approximations had been made with regard to the extent to which WIPONET will be used.

34. The Secretariat said that although the design of the WIPONET was capable of handling a very large number of users, the service level agreement with IBM covered 2,000 users belonging to 320 IPOs. Any addition to that number would have a financial impact on the operational costs of WIPONET. With regard to the IPOs connected to the SITA network, there was a fixed cost for installation and recurring communication costs, which are limited to 30 hours of communication a month for each IPO.

35. The working group noted the contents of document SCIT/ITPWG/1/3.

Agenda Item 6: IMPACT Project Status Report (Document SCIT/ITPWG/1/4)

36. The Delegation of the European Patent Office (EPO) sought clarification on whether the PCT scanning office would implement OCR facilities that could be of benefit to the IPDL Project. The Delegation also requested information on the commencement of electronic filing and whether that would be possible only in December 2002, given the interrelationship between the PCT Electronic Filing and the IMPACT Project deliverables.

37. The Secretariat, confirmed that the PCT scanning office did not envisage OCR capabilities and that the office's function was to turn documents only into an image. The OCR Project, which is currently ongoing falls under the IPDL Project, and will only continue until December 2001.

38. The Delegation of Japan noted that the IMPACT Project was running three or four months behind schedule and urged the Secretariat to take the necessary steps and investigate options for accelerating the project, bearing in mind issues of cost-effectiveness and efficiency.

39. In response to a question from the Delegation of the United States of America on the technical operation of the PCT scanning office and how integration with the electronic filing systems would work when essentially the documents filed electronically were going to be submitted as character coded data, the Secretariat said that the current scope of the IMPACT system provides for processing both types of applications.

40. The Secretariat thanked the Delegation of Australia for its offer to help in the testing of electronic communications for the transfer of business-to-business information.

41. The Delegation of France stated that it would be desirable, given the completion date of the project's first phase, to have greater detail about the International Bureau and Receiving Office phases. The Delegation also asked if the Receiving Office functionality of IMPACT could be extended so that national offices could use it in their capacity of receiving office.

42. The working group noted the contents of document SCIT/ITPWG/1/4.

Agenda Item 7: PCT Electronic Filing Project Status Report (Document SCIT/ITPWG/1/5)

43. The Delegation of Japan expressed its concern about the delay of four months reported in the status report and, in particular, that changes in the schedule for the promulgation of the legal framework and technical standard for PCT Electronic Filing may affect Member States in the development of their own electronic filing systems. The Secretariat replied that delays would be avoided if at all possible but that it did not foresee any delay in the overall schedule for promulgation.

44. The Delegation of the United Kingdom in referring to an independent report on the PCT Electronic Filing Project, entitled "Electronic Filing Budget Analysis" prepared by PriceWaterhouseCoopers and issued in August 2001, said that it was difficult to make a precise budget estimate without a detailed project plan. In addition, the Delegation noted its expectation that a significant proportion of the technical standard and project infrastructure components of the project, which make up 24 per cent of the proposed project allotment, would be completed by the end of the year. The Delegation, therefore, requested that the Secretariat consider hastening the milestone for preparation of a detailed project plan, currently scheduled in the High-Level Project Plan for December 2001, as its timely delivery would assist in building confidence in the project allotment estimation.

45. Upon a request for clarification by the Delegation of the United Kingdom, the Secretariat confirmed that the draft legal framework and technical standard for PCT electronic filing envisaged the possibility, for example, that a British applicant could use the EPO-produced "epoline" software to prepare and file an international application with either the United Kingdom Office or the EPO as PCT receiving office, provided that the software conformed to the legal framework and technical standard for PCT electronic filing.

46. Noting that seven comments papers on the July drafts of the proposed legal framework and technical standard for PCT electronic filing had been received by the Secretariat, the Representative of the EPO requested the Secretariat to report on the workload implications in terms of achieving promulgation of the legal framework and technical standard for PCT electronic filing by the end of the year, as planned. The Secretariat advised that, pending further consultations, it did not foresee delays in promulgation by the end of the year. The Delegation of the EPO also informed the Working Group that it had recently produced software for electronic filing based on PCT-EASY.

47. The Delegation of the Republic of Korea reported that over 150 developing countries do not have an electronic filing system, highlighting the growing divide between developed and developing IPOs. The Delegation also noted its concern that IPOs developing their own electronic filing software may not be giving due consideration to the need for interoperability

of electronic filing software solutions. In this regard, the PCT Electronic Filing Project was being implemented by WIPO at a crucial time and the Delegation hoped that the project would be completed as planned. The Delegation also advised that its own electronic filing software was a successful tool, based on extensive research and development by the Korean Intellectual Property Office (KIPO), and offered assistance to the Secretariat in its electronic filing project activities.

48. The Delegation of France requested clarification of the relationship between the project and developments made by the EPO, expressing its understanding that the Secretariat intended to merge the EPO solution into its own prototype solution which would be available only in 2003, although the EPO software was already operational to a certain extent. The Secretariat advised that it was currently in a prototyping iteration aimed at evaluating existing electronic filing software components, which included the EPO's epoline software and the USPTO's Electronic Filing System (EFS) software, for possible reuse and/or customization. The approach of evaluating the feasibility of reusing or customizing existing software had been adopted very early in the project. The Secretariat also advised that the prototyping iteration was planned for completion by the end of 2001. Project methodology which had been adopted required the development of executable releases of software very early in the schedule, and that the first of such deliverables could be expected during the beta iteration of the High-Level Project Plan which is planned for April 2002. The Secretariat also pointed out that part of the mandate given to it by Member States was to produce a technical standard for electronic filing. The Pilot activities under Step 1 of the High-Level Project Plan were a proof-of-concept process which aimed at the validation and possible revision of the technical standard, following the lessons learned from the Pilot.

49. The working group noted the contents of document SCIT/ITPWG/1/5.

Agenda Item 8: Intellectual Property Digital Libraries (IPDL) Project Status Report (Document SCIT/ITPWG/1/6)

50. The Delegation of Mexico took the floor to emphasize the importance of providing IPDL services in Spanish.

51. The Delegations of Hungary and the Benelux Trademark Office (BBM) asked when the Hague data collection would be made available, and also if there were future plans to develop a common user interface for accessing national data collections. The Secretariat responded that a prototype for the Hague data collection was developed but because the full collection was not yet available in electronic form, further developments were suspended in 2000. In an effort to respond to the needs of Member States, the Secretariat will publish the existing electronic data. In response to a question raised about the development of a common user interface, the Secretariat explained that the development and/or identification of standards is a necessary first step, and that is why the project would focus on this activity during the next biennium.

52. The Delegation of the EPO asked if the Secretariat intended to continue the provision of full-text PCT data after December 2001, and if there were plans to extend existing contracts with Jouve, the company that is currently providing OCR (Optical Character Recognition) services. The Delegation emphasized the importance of full-text data to IPOs that need to carry out electronic searches and to the commercial sector. The Delegation referred to item 6 of the Status Report and asked what specific future developments were planned on the search

engine. The Delegation also asked what policy the Secretariat intended to pursue with respect to offering search and retrieval functionality through IPDL as compared to services offered by the private sector.

53. The Secretariat responded that the same search engine currently used would be further developed for searching and retrieving full-text data. The Secretariat invited the Delegation to contact members of the Project Team to obtain additional technical information in this regard. The Secretariat explained that the IPDL Project would not compete with commercially available information services and would only provide basic search and retrieval functionality.

54. On the question of the OCRing of PCT data, the Secretariat said that there were sufficient funds to continue the activity under the IPDL Project budget until the end of 2001, but that funds were unavailable in the 2002-2003 biennium given the priorities within the IT budget.

55. The Delegation of Australia raised the issue of standards and the knowledge-based nature of IP work. The Delegation further raised the importance of providing easy access to patent information and of the development of standards to avoid creating an IP environment with fragmented collections of information which would be extremely difficult and time-consuming to access and retrieve. The Delegation indicated that the work on standards should have a visible place in the budget.

56. The Delegation of the Russian Federation asked how the work of developing standards would be financed over the next biennium and expressed concern over the lack of funds to support the PCT OCR activity into the next biennium, given the high priority of this work. The Secretariat responded that there was a provision within the regular IT Services budget to provide funds and human resources to continue to finance the work on the development of standards, but that the Secretariat would rely on the help of the SCIT Task Force and other experts from Member States and the Internet community where required.

57. The Delegation of France pointed to the pressing need to develop standards and proposed to the Secretariat that the work focus on data exchange and communication as there was a great need to resolve the integration of existing IPDLs. The Delegation also asked whether the concept could further be supported by the development of a virtual library during the 2002-2003 biennium. The Secretariat agreed with the pressing need to develop and/or identify standards and explained that this was the reason for initiating the work by hosting an informal workshop with experts from Member States and industry in July 2001. The Secretariat then explained that the work would continue through an existing SCIT Task Force which would review and further develop the documentation produced during the workshop.

58. The Delegation of the United States of America supported the statement of the EPO in urging the continuation of the PCT OCR activities.

59. The working group noted the contents of document SCIT/ITPWG/1/6.

Agenda Item 9: FOCUS Project Status Report (Document SCIT/ITPWG/1/7)

60. The Delegation of France asked if the Secretariat had considered the possibility of outsourcing the management of the computer facilities put in place by the FOCUS Project, as

well as the outsourcing of the PKI certification processes needed in the WIPONET and PCT E-Filing Projects. The Delegation also asked if the Secretariat had considered the establishment of a disaster recovery site for the facilities put in place by the FOCUS Project.

61. The Secretariat replied that during the execution of all IT projects, all such scenarios were considered, in particular the outsourcing of facilities management. In the case of the outsourcing of the management of the FOCUS deliverables, it had been decided to opt for internal management due to its cost-effectiveness and the confidential nature of the Secretariat's data, in particular that of the PCT. The Secretariat further explained that the WIPONET Project already utilized outsourced PKI certification services, and that, to the greatest extent possible, the PCT Electronic Filing Project would follow the same principle. On the question of disaster recovery, the Secretariat said that while the establishment of a disaster recovery site for the FOCUS Project facilities was desirable, the cost implications were prohibitive.

62. The working group noted the contents of document SCIT/ITPWG/1/7.

Agenda Item 10: IBIS Project Status Report (Document SCIT/ITPWG/1/8)

63. The Delegation of France noted the progress that had been made in the project over the last few months. The Delegation proposed that the same XML Tags should be used in the XML markup of the various language versions of IPC stating that this will be important in the future phases of the project. Referring to paragraph 8 of the document, clarification was requested on what stages of the IPC reform were going to have an effect on the IBIS Project.

64. The Delegation of the United States of America said that it appreciated the approach taken with the open technology being used and expressed its satisfaction with the progress made so far. Information was requested about the standardization of the XML tagging and DTD harmonization with the PCT Electronic Filing Project.

65. The Delegation of Bulgaria, asked if there were any plans to coordinate the standardization efforts of the IBIS and IPDL Projects. The Delegation asked about search techniques and the planned future use of the IPC for automated search.

66. The Secretariat confirmed that the same DTD would be used for the various language versions of IPC. Referring to the link between the IBIS Project and the IPC reform, it was emphasized that there were no workflow level processes for the reformed IPC revision available. The "outpointers" could be considered as good examples of the problems; there remained several unclear issues in the Business Process. The link between the PCT Electronic Filing and the IBIS Project in respect of the XML or DTD standardization was marginal. It was noted that the search facilities in IBIS would be very basic; to provide links to the patent databases was considered a higher priority than the search itself.

67. The Delegation of Australia suggested that the XML and DTD standards be looked at from a corporate WIPO perspective to ensure interoperability, not only across the systems but also between Member States.

68. The Delegation of the EPO asked for additional information on the components of the IBIS Project. The Delegation wanted to know how the search possibilities offered under the IPC would be integrated with IPDL. In respect of the handling of chemical formulae, the

Delegation proposed not to integrate chemical search into the IPC, but to leave this task to specialized chemical search systems. The Delegation suggested the development of an information dissemination policy to provide access to the IPC XML source files for the offices, the commercial and the non-commercial sector.

69. The working group noted the contents of document SCIT/ITPWG/1/8.

Agenda Item 11: IT Services Status Report (Document SCIT/ITPWG/1/9)

70. The Delegation of the United Kingdom asked the Secretariat where work would be undertaken, either in the IT Projects or the IT Services Division, when confronted by a major enhancement to an existing system. The Delegation also asked who within the Secretariat was responsible for systems assurance or systems testing. In response the Secretariat said that activities were assessed on an individual basis depending on the required system enhancement or the redefined business need. Systems testing was performed within the context of the project itself, and during the systems commissioning process the IT Services Division ensures the existence of documentary evidence that the testing process has been concluded to the satisfaction of the project stakeholders.

71. The Delegation of the United States of America inquired as to the readiness of the IT Services Division to receive the new technologies, in particular the facilities furnished under the FOCUS Project. In replying the Secretariat pointed out that commissioning task forces had already been established for the IBIS and IPDL Projects, which would ensure the readiness of the IT Services Division to receive these technologies, both in terms of budget and skilled staff.

72. The Delegation of Australia inquired as to how the International Bureau proposed to assess the performance of the IT Services Division, thus ensuring that it continued to provide cost-effective services that are of value and benefit to the Organization. The Delegation also sought clarification on how the ongoing support costs of the system commissioned into production were estimated by the Secretariat, suggesting that it could be on a percentage basis of the total project development budget.

73. The Secretariat replied that the need to better report the activities of the IT Services Division was under discussion within the Organization. The IT Program had an objective under the draft Program and Budget for the next biennium to develop Service Level Agreements (SLAs) and that work had already begun with a team of Quality Assurance consultants with a view to establishing performance standards. The Secretariat further indicated that the process for establishing SLAs would be discussed in more detail at future SCIT meetings. The Secretariat then confirmed that the IT Services Division was also involved in the preparation of budgets, in particular that part of the budget that addresses the provision of ongoing support.

74. The Delegation of Australia then offered observations on the assessment of performance in the provision of ongoing IT services. There were two categories of ongoing services that overlap; one is internal to WIPO and the other concerns services to Member States. Therefore, the issue of performance standards becomes very important to Member States, especially those performance standards for services between IPOs and WIPO. Clarification and agreement on such performance standards would therefore become very important. A second component, would be the identification of appropriate benchmarks. For a large

Organization such as WIPO and with its expanding IT projects, future directions and strategies, it becomes at times difficult to assess current progress and benchmarking is one of the tools that could be used against performance standards.

75. The working group noted the contents of document SCIT/ITPWG/1/9.

Agenda Item 12: IT Program Reporting (Document SCIT/ITPWG/1/10)

76. In introducing the document the Secretariat recalled that the SCIT Plenary at its session held in January 2001, having created the ITPWG, requesting the International Bureau to produce status reports to the Working Group every four months, in electronic form, on the major activities under the IT Program. The document contained a generic report format for consideration by the ITPWG. The Secretariat intended to submit its first status reports to the ITPWG in January 2002, to coincide with the start of the next biennial budget cycle.

77. The Delegation of the United States of America, in recognizing the importance of the information to be provided, in allowing the ITPWG to assess progress and provide useful suggestions and advice regarding the implementation of projects, said that the reports should be as complete and as thorough as possible. To this end, a number of additions were required to the draft report format, including information on the project's business model, estimated business returns to the International Bureau, deviations from the original project plan, overall time line, percentage expenditures to date, any anticipated budget shortfalls and information on critical linkages or dependencies to other IT projects. A new section should also be added to cover the issue of customer feedback to give an indication of how a project is being received by its external customer groups. Finally, rather than waiting until January to see these reports, the Delegation proposed that the Secretariat apply the draft report format to a single major project for submission to the SCIT Plenary at its next session in December 2001. This would allow for any fine-tuning to the report format before the first round of reports was issued in 2002.

78. The Delegation of Spain said that the contents of the status reports needed to be sufficiently detailed for the ITPWG to be able to monitor what is happening in a project. Therefore, very detailed information was required on costing, timelines and required resources. Additional technical information would also be needed to allow IPOs to coordinate their own projects so to avoid any conflicts with WIPO systems and to be able to leverage existing knowledge and experience.

79. The Delegation of the BBM, in supporting the intervention of the United States of America, said that emphasis should be given to the targets of and returns and benefits expected from individual projects. This would allow for a completed project to be evaluated to determine if goals had been met.

80. The Delegation of the United Kingdom requested the inclusion, in the report format, of more information on the financial aspects of a project. Figures on the actual versus the planned spend were a very important part in the progress monitoring of a project. Also, another concept for inclusion was that of project tolerance or contingency, i.e., a percentage applied either to the project budget or timetable that, if reached, would trigger a project re-planning effort. The Delegation also requested that an annex be added to each of the first round of status reports to include a full list, by project, of all deliverables with their corresponding scheduled delivery dates.

81. The Delegation of Australia said that the monitoring function of the ITPWG should be better defined to include the issues of project scope, technical strategy for action, business model, project plan and budgets for each of the key elements identified in the plan. Care should also be taken to ensure that qualitative and not just quantitative measurements were considered in an attempt to reduce risk and to prevent budget-creep.

82. The Delegation of the EPO said that it was important to delineate the management role of the ITPWG from that of the SCIT Plenary. The Working Group consisted mainly of experts in the IT field who would like to receive information on the technical solutions envisaged in the individual projects. This would help prevent problems of overlap between WIPO projects and those being carried out by national or regional IPOs. The Working Group would then also have a role in ensuring the compatibility of technical solutions decided upon.

83. In recalling the mandate of the ITPWG, the Secretariat said that, while the inclusion of some technical reporting would be possible in the program reports, this should not be done to the exclusion of issues such as budgets, time lines and planning that fell clearly within the competence of the Working Group.

84. The Delegation of Romania stressed the importance of monitoring the evolution of major projects, particularly for those IPOs involved in developing their own, complementary systems.

85. The Delegation of France supported the view that the ITPWG would be unable to fulfill its mandate if the reports submitted to it by WIPO did not contain sufficient levels of technical information. This would allow for an interaction between WIPO projects and those in national IPOs.

86. The Secretariat said that it was important to consider the issue of reporting on technical issues in light of the different mechanisms available. The SCIT had approved a project initiation process, which had a large technical component at the planning stage. Project status reports, therefore, would only report on any changes to already agreed technical standards or requirements and it would not be the intention of the Secretariat to impose a new technical solution in a major project without first bringing it to the SCIT for discussion. However, in response to the request by Delegations for technical information to be made available, the Secretariat undertook to look at the publication of such information on its web site.

87. In response to a question from the Delegation of Austria on the opportunity of IPOs to comment on each four-monthly progress report, the Secretariat replied that this may be done via electronic means or directly at a SCIT meeting.

88. In summing up the discussion, the Chair confirmed the decision of the Working Group that the amended generic report format should be annexed to the report of the ITPWG session, and used in the presentation of a major IT project to the SCIT Plenary, at its session to be held in December 2001, for final adoption by that meeting.

Agenda Item 13: Technical Review of the IT Projects Proposed for Implementation in the 2002-2003 Biennium (Document SCIT/ITPWG/1/11)

89. In introducing the document, the Secretariat explained that the Program and Budget Committee (PBC), at its last session in April 2001, had decided that the contents of the document on IT Projects to be funded from surplus funds in the 2002-2003 biennium (document PBC/3/3), should be given to the ITPWG for technical review. The document contained requests for individual appropriations for five IT projects for the years 2002-2003. Three projects (WIPONET, IMPACT and PCT Electronic Filing) were ongoing, CLAIMS was the second phase of automation efforts required by the IPC Reform effort and AIMS was a new project to replace WIPO's aging finance systems. All five projects were contained in the IT Strategic Implementation Plan that had been approved by the SCIT at its fourth Plenary session, held in Geneva from December 6 to 10, 1999. With regard to the issue of relaying the outcome of the ITPWG discussion back to the PBC, the Chair of the Working Group would be invited to make an oral report to the PBC and delegates were encouraged to brief their Delegations to the PBC accordingly.

90. It was the decision of the ITPWG that the five project proposals should be considered in turn and that in the report of the meeting on this agenda item individual interventions should be recorded as well as the conclusion of the Working Group with regard to each project.

WIPONET PROJECT

91. The Delegation of the United Kingdom said that on the basis of additional financial information that had been supplied by the Secretariat on project expenditure to date and on the project status report and presentation made by the WIPONET Project Manager, the Delegation was able to support the budget proposed for the project in the 2002-2003 biennium.

92. The Delegation of France asked for clarification on the issue of fixed-recurring costs, in particular with regard to hardware leasing for the WIPONET Center. It wondered if savings might be found in future if management of the production systems were to be brought in-house.

93. The Secretariat replied that a substantial amount of the cost shown was attributed to the leasing of equipment for the Center. Under the terms of the agreement with the contractor, the equipment would be paid off over a five-year period, after which point WIPO would own the equipment. Also, WIPO would be able to upgrade or change the equipment at any point, should that be necessary, simply by paying the difference in price between the old and the new systems. The Organization had also been guaranteed a residual value of around 20 per cent should there be a need to change the equipment some years into the future. With regard to the Helpdesk, the decision had been taken to outsource the facility as the SITA already had a well-established operation in Canada that could provide cover, 24 hours per day, seven days per week, to WIPO's 177 Member States and 310 customer IPOs.

94. In response to a question from the Delegation of the BBM, the Secretariat confirmed that the figures shown in the document under "Operating Expenditure" included staff costs for the ongoing system support services to be provided by the IT Services Division.

95. The Delegation of Australia asked for confirmation of the decrease in operating costs in the 2004-2005 biennium and for information on the accuracy of the original budget estimates against actual expenditure in the current biennium. In response, the Secretariat said that as the latest round of budget forecasting had only been completed in early 2001 the estimates were expected to be very accurate as they were based on actual contractual obligations and costs.

96. The Delegation of the United States of America highlighted the section in the document covering expected results and performance indicators and suggested that, in the case of the latter, they should be associated with quantitative values that would indicate a level of success had been achieved. For example, a target number should be set for the number of web sites that WIPONET will host.

97. The Delegation of Australia took the floor again to ask if the budget figures shown for the 2002-2003 biennium were based on any assumptions, such as system usage, that would cause them to vary. In its response the Secretariat explained that this was indeed the case as estimates had been calculated on several variables, *inter alia* the purchase of 2,000 user licenses and the allocation of 30 hours of dial-up connectivity, per IPO, per month. If changes were required in these areas, then the budget would need to change to reflect this fact.

98. In concluding the debate on the WIPONET Project, it was the opinion of the ITPWG that the scope and budget for the project, contained in document PBC/3/3, was acceptable and should be recommended for approval by the Program and Budget Committee at its next session in September 2001.

IMPACT PROJECT

99. The Delegation of France asked for clarification as to the apparent increase of 50 per cent in the development cost of the project. The Secretariat replied that an increase of 2 million Swiss francs had been requested in the budget for development work to cover staff costs that would be charged to the project from January 2002, and that the major increase (20.14 million Swiss francs) was needed to cover the operating expenses of the parallel running of the legacy systems with the IMPACT systems as they move into production over the next biennium.

100. In response to a question from the Delegation of Australia regarding the lack of efficiency and savings in the budget resulting from the implementation of the IMPACT system, the Secretariat said that these would be shown in the PCT operational budget and not that of the IT Program.

101. In concluding the debate on the IMPACT Project, it was the opinion of the ITPWG that the scope and budget for the Project, contained in document PBC/3/3, was acceptable and should be recommended for approval by the Program and Budget

Committee at its next session in September 2001.

PCT ELECTRONIC FILING PROJECT

102. The Delegation of the United States of America proposed that, with regard to the two stated objectives of the project, the second be redrafted to replace the words “based on” with “that will be readily accepted by users of.”

103. The Delegation of the United Kingdom noted the following: the good progress that had been made on agreeing technical standards and their planned completion by the end of 2001; the additional information provided by the Secretariat regarding the fact that the figure requested of 18.3 million Swiss francs represented a three-year project budget, included an enterprise version of the software, and of which 18 per cent had already been committed in 2001; the desire on the part of the Secretariat to reuse the best parts of existing electronic filing systems; the desire of the Secretariat to harmonize its work with the electronic filing efforts of other IPOs; the commitment of the Secretariat to make maximum use of the services provided by the WIPONET Project; the independent report by PriceWaterhouseCoopers which concluded that, in the absence of a detailed technical plan, it was not possible to come up with precise estimates for the costs of the project; and the intention of the Secretariat to bring forward production of this plan to October of this year. Having taken all these points into account, the Delegation felt that the requested budget was still too high but sought confirmation from the Secretariat on the allotment of project funds over more than one biennium.

104. In replying to the previous speaker, the Secretariat said that it wished to draw the attention of the working group to several important points. Firstly, it recalled that paragraph 20 of document PBC/3/3 states that “the (PCT electronic-filing) Project, however, still remained closely linked to the IMPACT Project and would need to rely on funding from that project budget allocation or from the budget allocation within that project until such time as the funds requested in this proposal for 18.3 million Swiss francs for the project were made available.” Therefore, funding for the PCT Electronic Filing Project of approximately 2.5 million Swiss francs to date had been provided by the IMPACT Project. However, as work had progressed under IMPACT and requirements had changed *vis-à-vis* the matter of electronic filing, it was clear that insufficient funds were available under IMPACT and, therefore, a total revision of the budget estimate for the electronic filing component had taken place. Using lessons learned from other major IT projects, it was also clear that it would not be practicable to embark on a project of this size with a biennial rather than a project budget. Therefore, a three-year project budget of 18.3 million Swiss francs was proposed to cover the 2001-2003 period. Once the necessary budget is appropriated for the PCT Electronic Filing Project the funds borrowed from IMPACT, totaling 2.5 million Swiss francs, would be repaid.

105. The Secretariat also gave further information on the breakdown of costs within the budget of 18.3 million Swiss francs, namely that it included funds for 14 staff for a three-year period. It was important to note that these staff were not only part of the Project Team but also supported the current PCT-EASY system, through the provision of Helpdesk and Training services. The close linkage between the existing PCT-EASY system and the development of the new electronic filing system meant that the knowledge of these staff was invaluable in the project development and implementation. PCT-EASY is currently responsible for 32 per cent of PCT filings and has over 6,000 registered users.

106. However, the implementation of a PCT electronic filing system was not as simple as amending the current PCT-EASY software. Additional functionality is required, in particular in areas such as security and the requirement to build upon existing products, which are currently under evaluation in the WIPO E-filing laboratory, namely the EPO and USPTO e-filing products. It is WIPO's intention to take the best components of these systems, with the ultimate objective of building the best possible solution for the PCT to meet its unique requirements of language and differing national capacities among its 114 member countries.

107. The Delegation of Japan gave its support to the use of surplus resources to fund a project such as PCT Electronic Filing that would be of direct benefit to the users of the PCT system. The resulting system would produce many benefits, such as the rationalization of business processes and an increase in information availability. Also, consideration should be given to increasing the system functionality to include the receipt of notifications from a receiving office, for example for accomplishing a higher electronic filing rate.

108. The Delegation of France, in supporting the views of previous speakers, said that it appreciated the additional information that had been provided by the Secretariat on the project and, in particular, the opportunity to visit WIPO's E-filing laboratory. However, the requested budget still appeared to be high when compared to similar initiatives in other national or regional IPOs and taking into account the fact that the Secretariat intends to reuse existing development components.

109. The Delegation of Mexico thanked the Secretariat for the provision of additional information and emphasized the importance that Mexico, as a developing country, placed on the implementation of the project. The Delegation recalled discussions at the Diplomatic Conference on the Patent Law Treaty, held in 2000, where reference was made to the effect that as of the June 2, 2005, IPOs so wishing might make electronic filing mandatory for patent applications. Clearly, this placed an immense burden on developing countries who had been reassured by the Director General's stated commitment providing the necessary assistance to enable developing countries to be in a position to submit applications and receive them electronically from mid-2005. The Delegation believed that the proposed PCT electronic filing system represented the response of the Director General to that commitment. Therefore, the Delegation of Mexico was able to give its wholehearted support to the implementation of the project and its associated budget.

110. In replying to the Delegation of Mexico, the Chair expressed her personal satisfaction that a representative of a developing country had drawn attention to the fact of a mandatory requirement under the Patent Law Treaty. The move to electronic filing in mid-2005 would indeed be a problem for many developing countries and she too was mindful of the role that the PCT Electronic Filing Project would play in meeting the Director General's commitment to developing countries, least developed countries (LDCs) and countries in transition to provide technical assistance in this area.

111. The Delegation of Australia made a proposal to the ITPWG that it include in its conclusion on the project two major risks that may impact the successful implementation of agreed deliverables within budget and timeframes. These being: the costs of Public Key Infrastructure (PKI) as per comments made in the report by PriceWaterhouseCoopers; and that the Annex F standard is not yet proven and may require a refinement and changes.

112. In response to a question from the Delegation of Kenya, the Secretariat confirmed that funding of direct technical assistance to IPOs in the area of electronic filing would be an

element for the budget of WIPO's Cooperation for Development Sector and not its IT Program.

113. The Delegation of the United States of America took the floor to request additional information on the development of an enterprise version of PCT-EASY. The Secretariat responded that it was the intention of the project to integrate, to the greatest extent possible, the existing PCT-EASY software and client base into the electronic filing system. The goal of the enterprise version of the software was to enable larger applicants and larger attorney companies that are dealing with the PCT to participate in electronic filing. These larger applicants are traditionally based in developed countries and, while the initial requirement is to provide a viable electronic filing system, the needs of these particular clients would need to be addressed to ensure the longer term success of the project. Feedback from larger applicants has shown that they are interested in using PCT-EASY but are unable to install it in a multi-user environment and, thus, incorporate it into their office workflow or interface it with legacy systems.

114. The Delegation of Spain said that, in providing information to the PBC on the negative risks to the project budget, as suggested by the Delegation of Australia, information should also be included on variables that may result in a decrease of the required budget, for example, the maximization of component reuse from existing electronic filing systems.

115. In concluding the debate on the PCT Electronic Filing Project, the ITPWG agreed on the scope and budget for the project as contained in document PBC/3/3, and recommended it for approval by the Program and Budget Committee at its next session in September 2001.

116. In agreeing the proposed budget level of 18.3 million Swiss francs, the Working Group decided that the PBC should be advised of the two major risks that may impact the successful implementation of agreed deliverables within budget and timeframes. These being: the costs of Public Key Infrastructure (PKI) as per comments made in the report by PriceWaterhouseCoopers; and that the Annex F standard is not yet proven and may require a refinement and changes. The Working Group also recognized the opportunity to leverage existing electronic filing systems which may result in a decrease in the level of funds required.

CLAIMS PROJECT

117. The Delegation of France took the floor to ask for clarification on the breakdown of the budget for the project, in particular, as to whether or not it included an amount for work to continue on the issue of automatic translation. The Delegation also asked that, following the

deletion of Task No. 12 from the ITPWG Work Program that the contents of this task be reflected in the stated objectives for the project. It also requested an amendment to the Performance Indicators for the project to allow for a qualitative as well as quantitative assessment of progress, for example, in the standard of different language versions.

118. On the question of automatic translation the Secretariat replied that CLAIMS would build upon the work of the IBIS Project and was committed to investigating and testing as much as possible, the new technology in this area. A more detailed breakdown of the project expenditure would be available once a detailed project plan had been finalized.

119. In response to a question from the Delegation of the United States of America regarding the outsourcing of the machine translation service the Secretariat said that it was the intention of the project to evaluate all possibilities, including the option of outsourcing.

120. In concluding the debate on the CLAIMS Project, the ITPWG agreed on the scope and budget for the project as contained in document PBC/3/3, and recommended it for approval by the Program and Budget Committee at its next session in September 2001.

AIMS PROJECT

121. The BBM congratulated the Secretariat on the quality of the AIMS Project description and asked if the Development Team would include WIPO staff, in particular, the future users of the new system. The Secretariat confirmed that this was indeed the case, that the Project Sponsor was the Director for WIPO's Finance Division, the Project Manager was a WIPO staff member and that the Project Board included representatives from all business units affected by the new system.

122. The Delegation of Australia requested that, in developing the requirements for the project, functionality be included to cover interfaces with Member States, for example the support of electronic payments under the International Registration Systems.

123. In concluding the debate on the AIMS Project, the ITPWG agreed on the scope and budget for the project as contained in document PBC/3/3, and recommended it for approval by the Program and Budget Committee at its next session in September 2001.

OTHER MATTERS: PCT OCR

124. The EPO, recalling the earlier discussions on the future of the IPDL Project, requested that extra funds be found to cover the data capture of published PCT applications through optical character recognition (OCR) scanning in the next biennium. This work was of particular importance, not only to IPOs but also to users of the patent system as it provided access to much needed information in full-text database form. The Delegation proposed that

the Chair of the ITPWG, in her oral report to the PBC, request additional funds of not more than 4 million Swiss francs be allocated to this work.

125. The statement of the EPO was strongly supported by the Delegations of Australia, Austria, France, Germany, Mexico, Russian Federation and Sweden.

126. In giving its support to the Delegation of the EPO, the Delegation of the United States of America asked that additional information from the Secretariat be provided to the PBC, in the form of a business case to justify the increased expenditure.

127. The Secretariat, in response to a request for more detailed costing for the OCR work, replied that there were three main areas of expenditure: quality control costs for the biennium were estimated to be 150,000 Swiss francs; development costs for loading the data and checking the formats when the data arrives at WIPO were estimated at 250,000 Swiss francs; and production costs were given at 1,250,000 Swiss francs for 2002 and 1,550,000 Swiss francs for 2003, respectively. This gave a total estimate of up to 4 million Swiss francs. However, additional costs would be incurred in the process for awarding a contract for the work and increases in the numbers of PCT applications would result in increases to the number of pages to be OCRed, thus raising costs.

128. In concluding its discussions on the continuation of the PCT OCR work into the 2002-2003 biennium, it was decided that the Chair of the Working Group would present the Program and Budget Committee at its next session, in September 2001, with a business case prepared by the Secretariat justifying the continuation of this project beyond 2001 and requesting that the Program and Budget Committee consider an increase in the budget of the IT Program for 2002-2003 as indicated in paragraph 127 above.

OTHER MATTERS: IPDL PROJECT

129. In response to interventions from the Delegations of Austria and France the Secretariat agreed to produce, for the SCIT Plenary at its session in December 2001, proposals for the future scope and implementation of the IPDL Project.

130. In replying to a question from the Delegation of Hungary on when work would be completed on the publication of data under the Hague Collection the Secretariat agreed that this was an urgent requirement. The Secretariat said that there were two problems to solve before a full industrial designs collection could be made available through the IPDL facilities; firstly, bibliographic data existed for all international deposits in force, but it was incomplete as regards international deposits recorded before October 1998 and not renewed since then; secondly, images were available in electronic form only since 1999. Work was currently underway to find alternative sources to create the full backfile of the required images.

131. The Delegation of the Russian Federation, supported by the Delegation of Australia, in recognizing the importance of the

standards work to be completed in the area of IPDLs, requested the Working Group to recommend to the SDWG, through the SCIT Plenary, that this matter be treated as a priority task. This view was supported by the ITPWG as a whole.

Agenda Item 14: Schedule of activities

132. The ITPWG noted the tentative calendar of meetings in the year 2002 as proposed in document SCIT/ITPWG/1/12 and agreed to the following timetable:

June 10 to 14, 2002 Second meeting of the Information Technology Projects Working Group (SCIT/ITPWG/2)

Agenda Item 15: Closing of the Session

133. This report was adopted by the ITPWG at its closing meeting on September 7, 2001.

[Annexes follow]

ANNEXE I/ANNEX I

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, Division 2.5.3, German Patent and Trademark Office, Munich

ARABIE SAOUDITE/SAUDI ARABIA

Fuad REDWAN, Assistant Director General of Patents, General Directorate of Patents, King Abdul-Aziz City for Science and Technology, Riyadh

AUSTRALIE/AUSTRALIA

Sarbjit SIDHU (Ms.), Chief Information Officer, IP Australia, Woden

AUTRICHE/AUSTRIA

Elvira GRONAU (Mrs.), Head, Technical Department XI, Austrian Patent Office, Vienna

Anton ZIMMERMANN, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

BAHREÏN/BAHRAIN

Ahmed A.M. AL SHEROOQI, Assistant Undersecretary, Press and Publications, Ministry of Information, Manama

BÉLARUS/BELARUS

Irina EGOROVA (Mrs.), First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

BOSNIE-HERZÉGOVINE/BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

Dragana ANDELIC (Mrs.), First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

BRÉSIL/BRAZIL

Cláudio ROSEMBERG TREIGUER, Jefe CEDIN, Instituto Nacional da Propriedade Industrial (INPI), Rio de Janeiro

BULGARIE/BULGARIA

Nikolay Christov TERZIEV, Head, Automated Systems and Technologies Department, Patent Office of the Republic of Bulgaria, Sofia

CANADA

John ROMBOUTS, Technical Architect, Informatics Services Branch, Canadian Intellectual Property Office, Hull

David USHER, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

CAP-VERT/CAPE VERDE

Justino GOMES MIRANDA, technicien, Direction générale de la communication, Cabo Verde

CHINE/CHINA

ZHANG Xiyi, Deputy Director General, Planning and Development Department, State Intellectual Property Office, Beijing

CROATIE/CROATIA

Kristina BUBANKO-ŽIGER (Ms.), Deputy Director General, State Intellectual Property Office, Zagreb

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

DANEMARK/DENMARK

Preben GREGERSEN, Minister Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva

ÉGYPTE/EGYPT

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

Ahmed ABDEL LATIF, Third Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

ESPAGNE/SPAIN

Mariano BITRIÁN CALVO, Coordinator Sistemas de Información, Oficina Española de Patentes y Marcas, Madrid

Ana PAREDES (Sra.), Consejera, Misión Permanente, Ginebra

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.

Robert JOHNSON, Deputy Director, Office of System Architecture and Engineering, Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C.

Michael MEIGS, Counselor for Economic Affairs, Permanent Mission, Geneva

EX-RÉPUBLIQUE YOUGOSLAVE DE MACÉDOINE/THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA

Irena JAKIMOVSKA (Mrs.), Head, Patent Section, Industrial Property Protection Office, Ministry of Economy, Skopje

FÉDÉRATION DE RUSSIE/RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Alexey GVINEPADZE, Deputy Director, Russian Agency for Patent and Trademarks (Rospatent), Moscow

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

FINLANDE/FINLAND

Paivi RAATIKAINEN (Ms.), Head of Section, Trademark and Designs Line, National Board of Patents and Registration, Helsinki

Juha REKOLA, Head, Development Division, Patents and Innovation Line, National Board of Patents and Registration, Finnish Patent Office, Helsinki

FRANCE

Bernard PINGLIER, chef, Service informatique, Institut national de la propriété industrielle (INPI), Paris

Jean-François LESPRIT, chargé de mission, Institut national de la propriété industrielle (INPI), Paris

Michèle LYON (Mme), chargée de mission, Département des brevets, Institut national de la propriété industrielle (INPI), Paris

Michèle WEIL-GUTHMAN (Mme), conseiller, Mission permanente, Genève

GHANA

Joseph Jainy Nwaneampeh, Minister, Permanent Mission, Geneva

GUATEMALA

Andrés WYLD, Primer Secretario, Misión Permanente, Ginebra

HONGRIE/HUNGARY

Csaba CZINKÓCZKY, Head, Information Technology Department, Hungarian Patent Office, Budapest

Ágnes VADÁSZ (Ms.), Information Counselor, Hungarian Patent Office, Budapest

INDIA

Homai SAHA (Mrs.), Minister (Economic), Permanent Mission, Geneva

INDONÉSIE/INDONESIA

Andy Noorsaman SOMMENG, Director, Information Technology, Directorate General of Intellectual Property Rights, Department of Justice and Human Rights, Tangerang

Umar HADI, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

IRAQ/IRAK

Ghalib ASKAR, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

IRLANDE/IRELAND

Dolores CASSIDY (Ms.), Patent Examiner, Patents Office, Kilkenny

JAPON/JAPAN

Yasuhiro SUTO, Deputy Director, Information Systems Affairs Division, Trademark, Design and Administrative Affairs Department, Patent Office, Tokyo

Takashi YAMASHITA, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

KENYA

Florence Karimi MUGENDI (Ms.), Information Officer/Public Relations Officer, Kenya Industrial Property Office (KIPO), Nairobi

Evans Mboi MISATI, Patent Examiner in Charge, Patent Information and Documentation Center (PIDOC), Kenya Industrial Property Office (KIPO), Nairobi

LETTONIE/LATVIA

Guntis RAMANS, Head, Department of Examination of Inventions, Patent Office, Riga

NIGÉRIA/NIGERIA

Maigari Gurama BUBA, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

MADAGASCAR

Olgatte ABDOU (Mme), premier secrétaire, Mission permanente, Genève

MAROC/MOROCCO

Khalid SEBTI, premier secrétaire, Mission permanente, Genève

MEXIQUE/MEXICO

Santiago REYNA ORTÍZ, Coordinador Departamental de Desarrollo de Sistemas de Patentes, Instituto Mexicano de la Propiedad Industrial (IMPI), México

Karla Tatiana ORNELAS-LOERA (Sra.), Agregada Diplomática, Misión Permanente, Ginebra

PAYS-BAS/NETHERLANDS

Jennes H.A.C. DE MOL, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

PHILIPPINES

Maria Angelina M. STA. CATALINA (Mrs.), First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

Visitación V. ASIDDAO (Miss), Attaché, Permanent Mission, Geneva

POLOGNE/POLAND

Maria JURCZAKOWSKA (Mrs.), Director, Informatics Department, Patent Office, Warsaw

PORTUGAL

Olívia ALVES (Mme), Coordinator New Projects, Instituto Nacional da Propriedade Industrial, Lisboa

José Sergio DE CALHEIROS DA GAMA, conseiller juridique, Mission permanente, Genève

RÉPUBLIQUE DE CORÉE/REPUBLIC OF KOREA

YOON Jaekap, Director, Information Planning Division, Korean Intellectual Property Office, Taejon

JANG Juneho, Senior Deputy Director, Information Planning Division, Korean Intellectual Property Office, Taejon

JANG Dae Kyo, Deputy Director, Information Planning Division, Korean Intellectual Property Office, Taejon

RÉPUBLIQUE POPULAIRE DÉMOCRATIQUE DE CORÉE/DEMOCRATIC PEOPLE'S
REPUBLIC OF KOREA

JANG Chun Sik, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva

ROUMANIE/ROMANIA

Gabriel JIPA, System Engineer, State Office for Inventions and Trademarks (OSIM),
Bucharest

Adriana Rosita ATANASOAI (Mrs.), Head, IT Section, State Office for Inventions and
Trademarks (OSIM), Bucharest

ROYAUME-UNI/UNITED KINGDOM

Geoff BENNETT, Head, Information Technology Services, The Patent Office, Newport

Joe BRADLEY, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

SLOVAQUIE/SLOVAKIA

Milan MÁJEK, premier secrétaire, Mission permanente, Genève

SLOVÉNIE/SLOVENIA

Marta JAKI (Mrs.), Assistant Director, Slovenian Intellectual Property Office (SIPO),
Ljubljana

Marko REBERŠEK, Programmer, Slovenian Intellectual Property Office (SIPO), Ljubljana

SUÈDE/SWEDEN

Lars BJÖRKLUND, Deputy Director General, Swedish Patent Office, Stockholm

SUISSE/SWITZERLAND

Roland Jean TSCHUDIN, Head Training, Institut fédéral de la propriété intellectuelle, Berne

Sabine BLASER (Mme), Institut fédéral de la propriété intellectuelle, Berne

THAÏLANDE/THAILAND

Supark PRONGTHURA, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

TUNISIE/TUNISIA

Mounir BEN RJIBA, premier secrétaire, Mission permanente, Genève

UKRAINE

Lyubov MOROZOVA (Mrs.), Head of Innovation Activity Division, Ukrainian Center for Innovations and Patent Information Services, State Department of Intellectual Property, Ministry of Education and Science, Kiev

Andriy RYAZANOV, Head of Information Technology Department, Ukrainian Industrial Property Institute, State Department of Intellectual Property, Ministry of Education and Science, Kyiv

VENEZUELA

Jorge BERRIZ BEITIA, IT Advisor, Servicio Autónomo de la Propiedad Industrial (SAPI), Ministerio de Industria y Comercio, Caracas

II. ORGANISATIONS INTERGOUVERNEMENTALES/
INTERGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

BUREAU INTERNATIONAL DU TRAVAIL (BIT)/INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE (ILO)

Nadim Robert HABRA, Director, Bureau of Information Technology and Communications, Geneva

BUREAU BENELUX DES MARQUES (BBM)/BENELUX TRADEMARK OFFICE (BBM)

Dick VERSCHURE, vice-président, La Haye

COMMUNAUTÉ EUROPÉENNE (CE)/EUROPEAN COMMUNITY (EC)

Nicolas VIGNERON, Representative, Technical Cooperation Division, Office de l'harmonisation dans le marché intérieur (marques, dessins et modèles) (OHMI)/Office for Harmonization in the Internal Market (Trade Marks and Designs) (OHIM), Alicante

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

Vassili TROUBATCHEV, Specialist, Moscow

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

Gérard GIROUD, Principal Director, Documentation, Rijswijk

Guillaume MINNOYE, Principal Director, Information Systems, The Hague

III. BUREAU/OFFICERS

Présidente/Chair: Homai SAHA (Mrs.) (Inde/India)

Vice-présidents/Vice-Chairs: Nikolay Christov TERZIEV (Bulgarie/Bulgaria)
Robert JOHNSON (États-Unis d'Amérique/United States of America)

Secrétaire/Secretary: Helen FRARY (Ms.) (OMPI/WIPO)

IV. BUREAU INTERNATIONAL DE L'ORGANISATION MONDIALE
DE LA PROPRIÉTÉ INTELLECTUELLE (OMPI)/
INTERNATIONAL BUREAU OF THE
WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION (WIPO)

Allan ROACH (directeur, Division des projets informatiques /Director, Information Technology Projects Division); Colin BUFFAM (chef de projet du projet WIPONET, Division des projets informatiques/Project Manager, WIPONET Project, Information Technology Projects Division); Helen FRARY (Ms.) (chef, Section de la gestion des techniques de l'information/Head, Information Technology Business Management Section); Michael HELKE (chef de projet du projet IMPACT, Division des projets informatiques/Project Manager, IMPACT Project, Information Technology Projects Division); Gabor KARETKA (chef de projet du projet IBIS, Division des projets informatiques/Project Manager, IBIS Project, Information Technology Projects Division); Neil WILSON (chef, Division des services informatiques/Head, Information Technology Services Division); Karl KALEJS (chef des dépôts électroniques, Division des projets informatiques/Head, Electronic-Filing Unit, Information Technology Projects Division)

[L'annexe II suit/
Annex II follows]

ANNEX II

AGENDA

	<u>Paragraphs</u>
1. Opening of the session	5
2. Election of the Chair and two Vice-Chairs	6 - 7
3. Adoption of the agenda	8 - 9
4. Consideration of the Task List of the ITPWG See document SCIT/ITPWG/1/2.	10 - 24
5. WIPONET Project Status Report See document SCIT/ITPWG/1/3.	25 – 35
6. IMPACT Project Status Report See document SCIT/ITPWG/1/4.	36 – 42
7. PCT Electronic Filing Project Status Report See document SCIT/ITPWG/1/5.	43 - 49
8. IPDL Project Status Report See document SCIT/ITPWG/1/6.	50 – 59
9. FOCUS Project Status Report See document SCIT/ITPWG/1/7.	60 – 62
10. IBIS Project Status Report See document SCIT/ITPWG/1/8.	63 – 69
11. IT Services Status Report See document SCIT/ITPWG/1/9.	70 - 75
12. IT Program Reporting See document SCIT/ITPWG/1/10.	76 - 88
13. Technical Review of the IT Projects proposed for implementation in the 2002-2003 biennium See document SCIT/ITPWG/1/11.	89 - 131
14. Schedule of Activities See document SCIT/ITPWG/1/12.	132
15. Closing of the session	

[Annex III follows]

ANNEX III

GENERIC PROJECT/ACTIVITY STATUS REPORT FORMAT

PROJECT/ACTIVITY NAME

1. Background: This section will include information on the project business model and the business returns expected after the successful delivery of the project. It may also be used to describe any important historical changes in the project scope or assumptions that have affected the achievement of objectives and that need to be highlighted to stakeholders.
2. Variations to Agreed Business Models, Scope, and/or Technical Strategy: This section to be completed as necessary.
3. Project/Activity Status: This section will briefly cover two main points
 - (a) An update on whether or not the project/activity is on-time, set against a time-line for the entire project;
 - (b) An update on whether or not the project/activity is within budget, including percentage figures for current expenditure.

In the case of any deviations from the baseline project/activity plan a brief explanation will be given, this will include information on any anticipated budget under or overruns.
4. Summary of Progress Since the Last Review: This section will include a list of the key tasks that have been completed since the last review and those that are in progress with an indication on whether or not they are on schedule.
5. Project/Activity Milestones/Deliverables Planned and Achieved: This section will contain information on progress in the delivery of the specific milestones and deliverables planned for the time-period under review. It should be noted that the Secretariat differentiates between milestones and tasks in its planning.
6. Project/Activity Milestones/Deliverables for the Next Reporting Period: This section will briefly describe the planned milestones and deliverables scheduled for the following four-month reporting period and will note any changes or deviations from the original project plan.
7. Key Issues and Action(s) Taken or Recommended: This section will describe any major issues that are affecting the project/activity completion or achievement of objectives along with any corrective action that has been taken or is recommended. Information will also be provided on the impact of this action on critical linkages or dependencies with other IT projects or activities and any changes to the technical specifications approved in the original or revised project plan.
8. Customer Feedback: This section will report on contacts, if any, with customers, including reports on beta testing, work shops and target groups.

[End of Annex III and of document]