

WIPO



SCIT/SDWG/10/12

ORIGINAL: English

DATE: November 21, 2008

E

WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION
GENEVA

STANDING COMMITTEE ON INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES STANDARDS AND DOCUMENTATION WORKING GROUP

Tenth Session
Geneva, November 17 to 21, 2008

REPORT

adopted by the Working Group

INTRODUCTION

1. The Standards and Documentation Working Group (SDWG) of the Standing Committee on Information Technologies (SCIT) held its tenth session from November 17 to 21, 2008.
2. The following Member States of WIPO and/or the Paris Union were represented at the session: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belarus, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, China, Czech Republic, Egypt, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jamaica, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Lithuania, Mexico, Morocco, Norway, Republic of Korea, Romania, the Russian Federation, Serbia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, United Kingdom, and the United States of America (40).
3. In their capacity as members of the SCIT, the representatives of the following organizations took part in the session: African Intellectual Property Organization (OAPI), the Benelux Office for Intellectual Property (BOIP), the European Patent Office (EPO), the Eurasian Patent Organization (EAPO), the Office for Harmonization in the Internal Market (Trade Marks and Designs) (OHIM), and the Patent Office of the Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf (GCC Patent Office) (6).

4. The Representative of the European Commercial Patent Services Group (PatCom) took part in the session in an observer capacity.
5. The list of participants appears as Annex I to this report.

Agenda Item 1: Opening of the session

6. The session was opened by Mr. Francis Gurry, Director General, who welcomed the participants.
7. During the adoption of this report, it was agreed that it should contain a reference to the comments regarding the future of the SCIT, the parent body of the SDWG, included by the Director General in his opening speech. As indicated by the Director General, the said comments should be understood as strictly preliminary remarks as the International Bureau (IB) still had to examine and discuss this question with WIPO Member States. The Director General recalled that the SDWG had no Plenary to report to because the SCIT Plenary had not met for a number of years. The IB intended to address this question and would propose an item on it for the agenda of the Assemblies of the Member States to be held in September 2009.
8. The Director General indicated that the SCIT, in its current state, needed to be revised. The IB would prepare a proposal on how to proceed with the SCIT and the SCIT Plenary and submit it for discussion and decision by WIPO Member States in September 2009. In addition, he mentioned that, at present, the SDWG was the only active body of the SCIT and that WIPO did not have, for example, a forum to discuss issues concerning policy questions related to patent information as it had had in the past under the former Permanent Committee on Industrial Property Information (PCIPI). Statistics on industrial property should also have an appropriate forum for discussion; over the last two years, the IB had published worldwide patent statistics reports and quite comprehensive statistics with respect to the Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT). In view of the fact that the said reports had been very well received, the IB would expand statistics reports to cover trademarks and industrial designs in the future. Therefore, as a preliminary approach for reflection, the new body might deal with policy issues related to industrial property information and also with the area of standards in the field of industrial property information (including certain aspects of documentation and the WIPO *Handbook on Industrial Property Information and Documentation*), as well as industrial property statistics. All of these preliminary ideas would need to be examined closely and discussed with WIPO Member States in 2009.

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

9. The SDWG unanimously elected Mr. Bruce Cox (the United States of America) as Chair and Ms. Samantha Hoy (Australia) and Mrs. Anna Grashchenkova (the Russian Federation) as Vice-Chairs.
10. Mr. Angel López Solanas, Head, Standards and Documentation Section, acted as Secretary of the session.

Agenda Item 3: Adoption of the agenda

11. The Secretariat proposed the addition of a new agenda item No. 10(d) that would read:

“Presentation, by the European Patent Office, of the Global Patent Index”.

12. The revised agenda was unanimously adopted by the SDWG and appears as Annex II to this report.

DISCUSSIONS, CONCLUSIONS, AND DECISIONS

13. As decided by the Governing Bodies of WIPO at their tenth series of meetings held from September 24 to October 2, 1979 (see document AB/X/32, paragraphs 51 and 52), the report of this session reflects only the conclusions of the SDWG (decisions, recommendations, opinions, etc.) and does not, in particular, reflect the statements made by any participant, except where a reservation in relation to any specific conclusion of the SDWG was expressed or repeated after the conclusion was reached.

PRESENTATIONS

14. The presentations given at this session of the SDWG and working documents are available on the WIPO website at:

http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/details.jsp?meeting_id=16703.

Agenda Item 4: ST.10/C Task Force (Task No. 30)

15. Discussions were based on document SCIT/SDWG/10/2 concerning the progress made by the ST.10/C Task Force on the revision of WIPO Standard ST.10/C, which provides recommendations on the presentation of bibliographic data components in published patent documents. The SDWG noted the report presented by the ST.10/C Task Force in the Annex to document SCIT/SDWG/10/2, and the oral progress report by the Task Force Leader.

16. The Task Force requested the SDWG to comment and provide guidance on the following issues raised during the discussions for preparing the proposal on the revision of WIPO Standard ST.10/C:

(a) as to whether the revision should focus only on the current contents of WIPO Standard ST.10/C, i.e., on the recommendations regarding patents only;

(b) as to whether recommendations regarding trademarks and industrial designs should be added to the revised version of WIPO Standard ST.10/C;

(c) as to whether recommendations regarding Uniform Resource Identifiers (URIs) should be added to the revised version of WIPO Standard ST.10/C; and

(d) how and when to proceed with regard to a survey on practices by industrial property offices (IPOs) concerning their use of the check digit in application numbers.

17. Following the discussions, the SDWG agreed that the ST.10/C Task Force should first focus on finalizing the proposal on the revision of WIPO Standard ST.10/C in regard to the recommendations concerning patents only, i.e., the current contents.

18. The SDWG agreed that, after the adoption of the revised version of WIPO Standard ST.10/C and the adoption of a new WIPO Standard ST.67 (dealing with trademark figurative elements), the Trademark Standards Task Force should use the revised WIPO Standard ST.10/C as a model for preparing a proposal on a new similar standard dealing with the presentation of bibliographic data for trademarks.

19. The SDWG agreed that any decision regarding the preparation of a new WIPO standard similar to WIPO Standard ST.10/C for industrial designs should be postponed until the revised version of WIPO Standard ST.10/C was adopted by the SDWG at a future session, as, at present, there is no task force dealing with industrial designs as the Trademark Standards Task Force does with trademarks.

20. With regard to the preparation of recommendations regarding URIs, the SDWG considered that this was a matter that would likely be dealt with by a separate task force. The SDWG agreed, however, that further discussions would be necessary at its next session in 2009 under an agenda item concerning the ST.10/C Task Force.

21. The SDWG noted that, with regard to the recommendations provided by WIPO Standard ST.13 for application numbers, the International Bureau (IB) had been requested, at the last session, to maintain, in the *WIPO Handbook on Industrial Property Information and Documentation* (WIPO Handbook), a list of industrial property right type codes, internal use codes within the nine-digit serial number, and check digits. This request meant that, regarding application numbers, it would be necessary to survey IPOs on the following three matters: the codes used to identify the industrial property rights, the internal codes used, and the check digit. The latter was the object of the survey referred to in paragraph 16(d), above. The SDWG also considered whether this survey should be carried out in the context of a new update or a revision of the survey published in Part 7.2 of the WIPO Handbook, former Appendix to WIPO Standard ST.10/C, concerning the form of presentation of application numbers.

22. The SDWG agreed that the survey on practices by IPOs on the use of the check digit in application numbers should not be carried out at this time. Instead, after finalizing the revision of WIPO Standard ST.10/C, the ST.10/C Task Force should prepare a questionnaire to survey IPOs regarding application numbers used. The issues to be addressed in the questionnaire should be decided by the SDWG at its next session.

23. The SDWG discussed the impact of the revision of WIPO Standard ST.13, adopted at the last session, on WIPO Standards ST.6, ST.10/B, and ST.34.

24. Following the discussions, the SDWG agreed that no change was necessary in WIPO Standard ST.6. In addition, the SDWG agreed on the following editorial changes to WIPO Standards ST.10/B and ST.34:

(a) the words “nor the application number in accordance with WIPO Standard ST.13” should be inserted in the last part of paragraph 11 of WIPO Standard ST.10/B to read: “The bar code has not been updated to incorporate the publication date in accordance with WIPO Standard ST.1, nor the application number in accordance with WIPO Standard ST.13, due to very limited use of bar codes by industrial property offices and other users. It is not expected that any additional users will be using bar codes in the future”; and

(b) the current Editorial Note to WIPO Standard ST.34 should be replaced with a new Editorial Note to read as follows: “Since the last revision of WIPO Standard ST.34, that was adopted on May 30, 1997, important changes to certain WIPO Standards related thereto have taken place, in particular the adoption of a revised version of WIPO Standard ST.13 (Recommendation for the Numbering of Applications for Industrial Property Rights) on February 21, 2008. Please note that WIPO Standard ST.13 contains the recommendations for electronic formats. If an industrial property office uses WIPO Standard ST.13 for application numbers, WIPO Standard ST.34 should not be used.”

Agenda Item 5: Proposal on the revision of WIPO Standard ST.22 (Task No. 37)

25. Discussions were based on document SCIT/SDWG/10/3 concerning the revision of WIPO Standard ST.22, which provides recommendations for facilitating Optical Character Recognition (OCR).

26. The SDWG noted the oral report given by the Leader of the ST.22 Task Force on the work done by the Task Force on the preparation of a proposal for the revision of WIPO Standard ST.22 and on the other items of the mandate received from the SDWG. The proposal on the revision of WIPO Standard ST.22 contained the two following changes with respect to the version presented at the eighth session of the SDWG in March 2007:

(a) it had been harmonized with the Trilateral Common Application Format (CAF);
and

(b) it did not provide detailed recommendations for the Japanese and Korean languages.

27. After the discussions, the SDWG adopted the revision of WIPO Standard ST.22 as reproduced in the Annex to document SCIT/SDWG/10/3, with the following changes:

(a) the words “preferably 80” should be inserted in paragraph 10(b) to read: “the paper weight should be between 70, preferably 80, and 120 g/m²”;

(b) the words “combinations of” should be inserted in the title preceding paragraph 42 to read: “Recommendations for combinations of languages”;

(c) the words “except where necessary” should be added at the end of paragraph 42 to read: “Within sections/pages of patent applications, the mixing of

Asian (i.e., ideogram based) and European (i.e., Latin and Cyrillic alphabets) languages is problematic for the OCR procedures and should be avoided, except where necessary”.

28. The ST.22 Task Force Leader presented a draft questionnaire that had been prepared to survey IPOs on the use and implementation of the revised WIPO Standard ST.22.

29. The SDWG requested the ST.22 Task Force to prepare a revised version of the questionnaire referred to in the previous paragraph for its consideration at the next session. The new questionnaire should also contain questions on OCR practices of IPOs, including software and hardware used and workflow.

30. The SDWG agreed that the survey of the IPOs regarding the revised WIPO Standard ST.22 would be conducted not earlier than June 2010.

Agenda Item 6: Proposal on the revision of WIPO Standard ST.3 (Task No. 33)

31. Discussions were based on document SCIT/SDWG/10/4, concerning the proposal to suspend the revision of WIPO Standard ST.3, keeping the short country name of the Republic of Moldova in WIPO Standard ST.3 as is at present.

32. The SDWG noted the background information provided in document SCIT/SDWG/10/4 and agreed to keep the short country name of the Republic of Moldova in WIPO Standard ST.3 as is at present, i.e., “Republic of Moldova”.

Agenda Item 7: Report by the Task Leader of the ST.36 Task Force (Task No. 38)

33. Discussions were based on document SCIT/SDWG/10/5, which contained a progress report by the Leader of the ST.36 Task Force on the revision of WIPO Standard ST.36.

34. The SDWG noted that the ST.36 Task Force had introduced a new form for submitting a proposal, i.e., Proposal For Revision (PFR) of WIPO Standard ST.36 and also noted that the PFR files which had been submitted and agreed on were available on the ST.36 Task Force’s website at: <http://www.wipo.int/scit/en/taskfrce/st36/pfr-intro.html>.

35. The SDWG noted that the ST.36 Task Force had revised WIPO Standard ST.36, in particular Annexes A and C, to carry out its initial mandate given by the SDWG. The initial mandate was to align WIPO Standard ST.36 with the changes made to Annex F of the Administrative Instructions under the Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT) (see paragraph 61 of document SCIT/SDWG/8/14). Annexes A and C were also revised to reflect the PFRs ST.36/2008/001, 003, 004, 006, and 008 which had been agreed on by the ST.36 Task Force from March to August 2008.

36. The SDWG also noted that the new version, 2.0, of Annexes A and C to WIPO Standard ST.36 was adopted by the Task Force on September 15, 2008, and published on September 30, 2008, on WIPO's website at:

http://www.wipo.int/standards/en/xml_material/st36/.

37. The SDWG further noted that the ST.36 Task Force agreed that revisions of Annexes A and C to WIPO Standard ST.36 be published twice per year, i.e., in March and September, if necessary.

38. In accordance with the request by the SDWG (see paragraph 20 of document SCIT/SDWG/9/12), the ST.36 Task Force considered whether WIPO Standard ST.36 should be revised as a consequence of the revision of WIPO Standard ST.13. The SDWG noted that the ST.36 Task Force had agreed that the revision of WIPO Standard ST.13 did not impact on WIPO Standard ST.36.

39. With regard to ongoing discussions, the Leader of the ST.36 Task Force reported that the ST.36 Task Force continued to consider several pending issues, i.e., proposals made by the Citation Practices Task Force (see paragraph 35 of document SCIT/SDWG/9/12), the remaining three PFRs ST.36/2008/002, 005, and 007 (see paragraph 20 of document SCIT/SDWG/10/5), and the introduction of new versions of industry standard DTDs (Document Type Definitions) to WIPO Standard ST.36 (see paragraph 21 of document SCIT/SDWG/10/5).

Agenda Item 8: Survey of practices in industrial property offices regarding codes used for internal purposes or individual use (Task No. 26)

40. Discussions were based on document SCIT/SDWG/10/6 concerning the survey of practices by IPOs regarding codes used for internal purposes or individual use, which is reproduced in the Annex to document SCIT/SDWG/10/6.

41. During the discussions, the Delegations of the United Kingdom and Sweden informed the SDWG that their Offices had no codes regarding patents, trademarks, or industrial designs for internal purposes or individual use. The SDWG also noted the additional information regarding the codes for internal purposes or individual use provided by the State Intellectual Property Office of the People's Republic of China.

42. The SDWG agreed that the responses provided by the Delegations of the United Kingdom and Sweden be added to the three tables of the survey. The SDWG agreed also that the additional information provided by the State Intellectual Property Office of the People's Republic of China be included in Table I for patents and Table III for industrial designs in the survey. The SDWG noted that paragraphs 5 to 7 of the survey would be amended, as a consequence of the addition of the said further information to the survey.

43. The SDWG agreed on the removal of the two columns “Source” and “External exposure” from the tables of the survey, since there was little valuable information contained therein. The SDWG requested that the valuable information that was provided under these two columns, e.g., information provided by the Industrial Property Office of the Slovak Republic, be transferred by the IB to the column “Comments”.

44. Following discussions, the SDWG requested that the IB publish the survey in Part 7 of the WIPO Handbook with the modifications referred to in the two previous paragraphs.

Agenda Item 9: Citation practices by patent offices (Task No. 36)

45. Discussions were based on document SCIT/SDWG/10/7 concerning issues associated with citation reference creation and retrieval.

46. The SDWG noted the oral report by the Task Force Leader who referred to the progress made with regard to Task No. 36.

47. The SDWG considered and approved the publication of “Citation Practices by Industrial Property Offices” replacing the existing survey concerning “Citation Practices in Patent Offices” in Part 7 of the WIPO Handbook.

48. The new version of the survey should be reproduced from the Annex to SCIT/SDWG/10/7 (derived from the responses to the survey questionnaire Circular C. SCIT 2651) and should include the following further amendments:

- page 3 paragraph 10 is to refer to the “International Common Elements (ICEs)” rather than referring to “DTDs”;
- page 7 third line should refer to “40” completed responses rather than “39”;
- page 7 the Indonesian comment to question 2 should read “Citation references are not available in patent publications yet.”; and
- page 15 question 15 should include the comments table as follows:

IPO	Comments – Question 15
AU	The AU Office answers are based on Bilateral Search Reports.
FI	ISR's are published by WIPO.
RU	The RU Office establishes the ISR. WIPO publishes the ISR.
WO	The WO Office answers are based on IPRP Chapter I and IPER/IPRP Chapter II.

Total comments: 4

49. The SDWG noted the publication of the revised term for “Citation” in the WIPO Glossary of Terms in Part 8 of the WIPO Handbook.

50. The SDWG noted the publication of the revised WIPO Standard ST.14.

Agenda Item 10(a): Presentation, by the International Bureau, on the Priority Document Access Service

51. The IB gave a presentation on the status of implementation of Priority Document Access Service, which is envisaged to become operational in April 2009. The initial system development work had benefited greatly from cooperation between the IB and several participating IPOs, namely, the Finnish Patent Office, the Japan Patent Office, the Korean Intellectual Property Office, the State Intellectual Property Office of the People's Republic of China, the United Kingdom Intellectual Property Office, the United States Patent and Trademark Office, and the European Patent Office. The presentation outlined the business features and technical aspects of the work, including the technical architecture, the project timetable, and a short demonstration of the Applicant Portal. IPOs were encouraged to participate at an early stage and to indicate their interest to the IB.

Agenda Item 10(b): Oral report, by the International Bureau, on modifications of Annex C to the Administrative Instructions under the Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT) and of WIPO Standard ST.25

52. The IB informed the SDWG that consultations, in the context of the PCT, on proposed modifications to the "Standard for the Presentation of Nucleotide and Amino Acid Sequence Listings in International Applications Under the Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT)" as set out in Annex C to the Administrative Instructions under the PCT, which had been ongoing for quite some time, had been completed and that agreement had been reached to modify Annex C and related Sections of the PCT Administrative Instructions with effect from July 1, 2009. The main objectives of the modifications to Annex C had been to make a clear distinction between, on the one hand, provisions applicable to sequence listings forming part of the application and, on the other hand, provisions applicable to sequence listings not forming part of the application but furnished for the purposes of the international search and preliminary examination.

53. The IB noted that, consequent to the modifications to Annex C, WIPO Standard ST.25, which recommended that IPOs apply the provisions set out in the PCT Sequence Listing Standard *mutatis mutandis* to all patent applications other than the PCT international applications, also needed to be modified. The Secretariat stated that it would submit to the SDWG, for adoption at its next session, a proposal to amend WIPO Standard ST.25 accordingly.

54. The SDWG noted the report by the IB.

Agenda Item 10(c): Oral report, by the International Bureau, on the use of WIPO Standard ST.66 by the Madrid System for the International Registration of Marks

55. During its oral presentation, the IB informed the SDWG that work had begun to make the current method of electronic communication known as the Madrid Electronic Communications (MECA) compliant with WIPO Standard ST.66.

56. The IB reminded that there were the three following variants of MECA:

- (a) Romarin MECA for provision of the current status of an International Registration;
- (b) Notification MECA for communications from WIPO to IPOs; and
- (c) Input MECA for communications from IPOs to WIPO.

57. The IB had already informed the SDWG that the three variants of MECA would be converted to provide tagged-data into a WIPO Standard ST.66 compliant format as and when requested by IPOs. The IB reported the following progress on the use of WIPO Standard ST.66 by the Madrid System for the International Registration of Marks:

(a) with respect to Romarin MECA, work had begun at the request of the BOIP and the OHIM, largely as part of the OHIM's TMview project. The work was almost completed. The IB had been creating daily update data which were available at <ftp://ftpird.wipo.int/wipo/madrid/romarin/ST66>. The data were provided on an "as is" basis and the IB would welcome any feedback;

(b) with regard to Notification MECA, work had begun at the request of the German Patent and Trademark Office and the Japan Patent Office. An initial draft version of the schema and some sample files had been sent to the two Offices. As with the Romarin MECA version, some changes would be required to WIPO Standard ST.66. The IB would submit a proposal to the ST.66 Task Force once the draft version would be completed; and

(c) in relation to Input MECA, no work had been done to date. However, considering that the Japan Patent Office expressed its interest to create tagged-data into a WIPO Standard ST.66 compliant format, the IB informed the SDWG that work would begin shortly.

Agenda Item 10(d): Presentation, by the European Patent Office, on the Global Patent Index

58. An oral presentation on a new patent information service, the "Global Patent Index" (GPI), was provided by a Representative of the EPO.

59. GPI is the modern successor to the Espace GlobalPat series and could be of interest to small and medium sized offices, regional patent information centers, and other patent information users. GPI, currently in pilot phase, and expected to be available early in 2009, includes bibliographic data from over 65 million patent documents; and patent family, legal status, and citation information from over 75 patent offices which will be updated weekly. GPI, based on Mimosa search technology, allows for advanced searching using 100 potential search criteria. Configurable search results can be downloaded. Links to classifications, related patent family members, and other documents are provided by GPI. The pricing policy for accessing GPI has not yet been decided.

Agenda Item 11: Proposal on the revision of WIPO Standard ST.60 (Task No. 33)

60. Discussions were based on document SCIT/SDWG/10/8 proposing the addition of a new Internationally agreed Numbers for the Identification of (bibliographic) Data code, INID code (834), to the list provided in WIPO Standard ST.60.

61. The SDWG adopted the revision of WIPO Standard ST.60 as reproduced on pages 5 and 9 of Annex II to document SCIT/SDWG/10/8.

62. The SDWG requested the ST.66 Task Force to consider the corresponding changes to WIPO Standard ST.66 as a result of the revision of WIPO Standard ST.60.

Agenda Item 12: Oral report by the Task Leader of the Trademark Standards Task Force (Task No. 20)

63. The SDWG noted the oral report by the Leader of the Trademark Standards Task Force who referred to the progress made with regard to Task No. 20 relating to the preparation of a recommendation for the electronic management of the figurative elements of trademarks.

64. The SDWG noted that the proposal for the recommendation continued being under discussion by the Task Force.

65. The Task Force Leader reminded the SDWG that, at the ninth session in February 2008, it had agreed that the Task Force should first prepare a new standard on the electronic management of the figurative elements of trademarks only. Then, after reaching agreement on the new WIPO standard for trademarks, the standard would be expanded to include patents and industrial designs. The Task Force Leader informed the SDWG that the PCT Working Group, at its first session in May 2008, had invited the SDWG to make recommendations on technical standards for color photographs and drawings in both patent and trademark applications (see paragraph 71 of document PCT/WG/1/16).

Agenda Item 13: Annual Technical Reports (ATRs) on Patent, Trademark, and Industrial Design Information Activities (Task No. 24)

66. Discussions were based on document SCIT/SDWG/10/9 concerning issues associated with Annual Technical Reports (ATRs).

67. The SDWG noted the oral report by the Task Force Leader who referred to the progress made with regard to Task No. 24 including both ATRs filed for the year 2007, and an interim progress report relating to the two-year project to improve the visibility and access to ATRs.

Agenda Item 14: Oral report on the website of the WIPO *Handbook on Industrial Property Information and Documentation* (Task No. 26)

68. The SDWG noted the oral report by the Task Force Leader who included reference to the progress made with regard to Task No. 26 relating to the updating of the WIPO Handbook and the work in progress relating to the user requirements for a new WIPO Handbook Information Management System.

Agenda Item 15: Consideration of the SDWG Task List

69. Discussions were based on document SCIT/SDWG/10/10.

70. Following a brief introduction by the Secretariat, the SDWG discussed the Tasks contained in Annex I to document SCIT/SDWG/10/10 and, in addition to updating the information regarding the status of the Tasks that had been discussed during the tenth session, including the information provided to the SDWG under agenda item 10 (Exchange of information), agreed on the following:

Task No. 17: paragraph III.3 should be revised to read: “the EPO, at the eleventh session of the SDWG, would report on discussions held within the Trilateral Offices concerning a proposal on media-independent packaging and transmission of patent information”;

Task No. 26: to remove item (d), i.e., “WIPO publications on electronic media containing IP information”, from the list given in the definition of Task No. 26.

Agenda Item 16: Schedule of activities

71. Discussions were based on document SCIT/SDWG/10/11.

72. The Secretariat proposed to the SDWG that the next session of the SDWG take place from October 26 to 30, 2009, and indicated that July 26, 2009, would be the deadline for all documents relating to the next session to be received by the Secretariat.

73. The SDWG agreed that its eleventh session was tentatively scheduled to be held from October 26 to 30, 2009.

Meetings of the SDWG Task Forces

74. During this session, the following SDWG Task Forces held informal meetings: ST.10/C Task Force, Trademark Standards Task Force, XML4IP Task Force, and ST.36 Task Force. The Task Force Leaders informed the SDWG of the progress made regarding their respective tasks in the informal meetings.

Retirement of Messrs. Paul Brewin (European Patent Office), Edmond Rishell (the United States of America), and Leif Stolt (Sweden)

75. The SDWG takes the opportunity to thank Messrs. Paul Brewin (European Patent Office), Edmond Rishell (the United States of America), and Leif Stolt (Sweden) for their many years of active participation in the meetings of the SDWG and its predecessor Permanent Committee on Industrial Property Information (PCIPI), as well as in other discussion groups. Messrs. Brewin, Rishell, and Stolt have made a huge and outstanding contribution to the field of industrial property information and documentation, and to international cooperation in this field. The SDWG extends its best wishes to them for a happy and healthy retirement.

Agenda Item 17: Adoption of the report of the session

76. This report was adopted by the participants to the tenth session of the SDWG via a restricted e-forum.

Agenda Item 18: Closing of the session

77. The meeting was closed following the reports by the Task Force Leaders on the informal meetings of the SDWG Task Forces.

[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)

AFRIQUE DU SUD/SOUTH AFRICA

Michael TWUM-DARKO, Chief Information Officer, Department of Trade and Industry, Companies and Intellectual Property Registration Office (CIPRO), Pretoria

Peet PIENAAR, Enterprise Architect, Department of Trade and Industry, Companies and Intellectual Property Registration Office (CIPRO), Pretoria

ALGÉRIE/ALGERIA

Mourad HADDADI, chef du Service informatique, Institut national algérien de la propriété industrielle (INAPI), Alger

ALLEMAGNE/GERMANY

Konrad HOFFMANN, Patent Examiner, IT International Cooperation, German Patent and Trade Mark Office, Munich

ARGENTINE/ARGENTINA

FASTAME Ines (Sra.), Secretario de Embajada, Misión Permanente, Ginebra

AUSTRALIE/AUSTRALIA

Samantha HOY (Ms.), Manager, International ICT Cooperation, Business and Information Management Solutions Group, IP Australia, Woden ACT

AUTRICHE/AUSTRIA

Katharina FASTENBAUER (Mrs.), Deputy Vice-President Technics, Head of Technical Central Unit ST, Austrian Patent Office, Vienna

BARBADE/BARBADOS

Corlita BABB-SCHAEFER (Mrs.), Permanent Mission, Geneva

BÉLARUS/BELARUS

Yulia KHORUK (Mrs.), Main Specialist, Information and Methodology Division, National Center of Intellectual Property, Minsk

BRÉSIL/BRAZIL

Ademir TARDELLI, Vice-President, National Institute of Industrial Property (INPI), Rio de Janeiro

Raul SUSTER, Head, Centre of Publication, Documentation and Information Technology, National Institute of Industrial Property, Rio de Janeiro

BULGARIE/BULGARIA

Ivanka TONEVA (Ms.), Head, Patent Information and Documentation Department, Patent Office, Sofia

Ivanka DIMITROVA (Ms.), Junior Expert, Patent Information and Documentation Department, Patent Office, Sofia

CANADA

John ROMBOUTS, Manager, Technical Architecture, Planning and Coordination services, Canadian Intellectual Property Office (CIPO), Gatineau, Québec

CHINE/CHINA

ZHAO Sheng, Official, Information Resource Management Division, Automation Department, State Intellectual Property Office (SIPO), Beijing

TANG Yanli (Ms.), Official, Management of Data Process Division, Patent Documentation Department, State Intellectual Property Office (SIPO), Beijing

WEN Xiong, Computer Division, China Trademark Office, Beijing

ÉGYPTE/EGYPT

Mohamed Hassan Moustafa BALAS, IT Manager, Egyptian Patent Office, Cairo

ESPAGNE/SPAIN

Rosa CARRERAS DURBÁN (Sra.), Coordinadora del Área de Proyectos Tecnológicos Internacionales, División Tecnologías de la Información, Oficina Española de Patentes y Marcas, Madrid

Francisco José MORENO GÓMEZ, Jefe, Servicio de Documentación, Departamento de Patentes e Información Tecnológica, Oficina Española de Patentes y Marcas, Madrid

ÉTATS-UNIS D'AMÉRIQUE/UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Betty ANDREWS (Mrs.), Director, Office of Trademark Program Control, United States Patent and Trademark Office, Alexandria, Virginia

Bruce COX, Manager, Standards Development Division, United States Patent and Trademark Office, Alexandria, Virginia

Christopher Y. KIM, International Liaison Staff, United States Patent and Trademark Office, Alexandria, Virginia

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

Arjeton UZAIRI, IT Engineer, IT Department, State Office of Industrial Property (SOIP), Skopje

FÉDÉRATION DE RUSSIE/RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Anna GRASHCHENKOVA (Mrs.), Principal Specialist, International Cooperation Department, Federal Service for Intellectual Property, Patents and Trademarks (ROSPATENT), Moscow

Valeria MAKSIMOVA (Mrs.), Deputy Head, Information Resources Development Department, Federal Institute of Industrial Property (FIPS) of ROSPATENT, Moscow

Olga TYURINA (Mrs.), Senior Researcher, Information, Resources Development Department, Federal Institute of Industrial Property (FIPS) of ROSPATENT, Moscow

Denis FOMENOK, Head of Laboratory, Federal Institute of Industrial Property (FIPS) of ROSPATENT, Moscow

FINLANDE/FINLAND

Juha REKOLA, Director, Development Division, Patents and Innovations Line, National Board of Patents and Registration, Helsinki

FRANCE

Marcel CANTET, Département de la documentation et de l'information, Recherche et développement, Institut national de la propriété industrielle (INPI), Paris

GRÈCE/GREECE

Ionnis BOUMPARIS, Deputy Director General, Industrial Property Organisation (OBI), Athens

HONGRIE/HUNGARY

Zsuzsanna TÖRÖCSIK (Mrs.), Deputy Head, Information Technology Department, Hungarian Patent Office, Budapest

IRLANDE/IRELAND

Karen RYAN (Mrs.), Patent Examiner, Patents Office, Kilkenny

ITALIE/ITALY

Cristiano DI CARLO, coordinateur informatique, Office italien des brevets et des marques, Rome

JAMAHIRIYA ARABE LIBYENNE/LIBYAN ARAB JAMAHIRIYA

Ibtisam SAAITE (Ms.), Second Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

JAMAÏQUE/JAMAICA

Richard BROWN, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

JAPON/JAPAN

Shigeki KAMIYAMA, Deputy Director, Patent Information Policy Planning Office, Information Dissemination and Policy Promotion Division, General Affairs Department, Japan Patent Office, Tokyo

Takatoshi KIMURA, Deputy Director, Services and System Optimization Promotion Office, General Affairs Division, General Affairs Department, Japan Patent Office, Tokyo

Kenichiro NATSUME, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

LITUANIE/LITHUANIA

Saulé DAUKUVIENÉ (Mrs.), Deputy Head, Information and Documentation Division, State Patent Bureau of the Republic of Lithuania, Vilnius

MAROC/MOROCCO

Mohamen EL MHAMDI, conseiller, Mission permanente, Genève

MEXIQUE/MEXICO

Javier ROA BOTELLO, Subdirector Divisional de Desarrollo de Sistemas, Instituto Mexicano de la Propiedad Industrial, México

Victoria ROMERO (Sra.), Segundo Secretaria, Misión Permanente, Ginebra

Gustavo TORRES, Asesor, Misión Permanente, Ginebra

NORVÈGE/NORWAY

Jens Petter SOLLIE, System Manager, Production and Systems, Norwegian Industrial Property Office, Oslo

Thor Magne LANGSAETER, System Coordinator, Patent Department, Norwegian Industrial Property Office, Oslo

RÉPUBLIQUE DE CORÉE/REPUBLIC OF KOREA

KIM Dong-Hwan, Deputy Director, Technical Cooperation Team, Korean Intellectual Property Office, Daejeon

KIM In-Sook, Assistant Director, Technical Cooperation Team, Korean Intellectual Property Office, Daejeon

RÉPUBLIQUE TCHÈQUE/CZECH REPUBLIC

Lucie ZAMYKALOVÁ (Ms.), Patent Law Issues, International Department, Industrial Property Office, Prague

Petr BAMBAS, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva

ROUMANIE/ROMANIA

Bogdan BORESCHIEVICI, Director, National Collection, Information System, Service Directorate, State Office for Inventions and Trademarks (OSIM), Bucharest

Adriana ATANASOAI (Mrs.), Head, Database and Electronic Information System Division, State Office for Inventions and Trademarks (OSIM), Bucharest

Alina BOROBEICA (Mrs.), Legal Advisor, International Relations Department, Romanian Copyright Office, Bucharest

Elena Daniela COLEMAN (Mrs.), Romanian Copyright Office, Bucharest

Livia Cristina PUSCARAGIU, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

ROYAUME-UNI/UNITED KINGDOM

Peter BACK, Divisional Director, Intellectual Property Office, Newport

Byron MORTON, IT Project Manager, Intellectual Property Office, Newport

SERBIE/SERBIA

Jasminka RELJIN (Ms.), Head, IT Department, Intellectual Property Office, Belgrade

SOUDAN/SUDAN

Adil Ahmed SAAD, Federal Council for Literary and Artistic Works, Ministry of Culture and Youth and Sports, Khartoum

Muna Mohamed ALI (Ms.), Legal Advisor, Registrar General of Intellectual Property,
Ministry of Justice, Khartoum

Mohamed Hassan KHAIR, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

SUÈDE/SWEDEN

Johan WINTHER, Head, Patent Information, Swedish Patent and Registration Office,
Stockholm

Leif STOLT, Process Manager, Patent Information, Swedish Patent and Registration Office,
Stockholm

Gunnar LINDBOM, Project Manager, Swedish Patent and Registration Office, Söderhamn

SUISSE/SWITZERLAND

Matthias GÜNTER, Head IT, Swiss Federal Institute of Intellectual Property, Berne

THAÏLANDE/THAILAND

Supavadee CHOTIKAJAN (Ms.), First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

UKRAINE

Galyna DOBRYNINA (Mrs.), Chairman Councilor, State Department of Intellectual
Property, Deputy Director Assistant, Ukrainian Industrial Property Institute, Kyiv

Oksana PARKHETA (Ms.), Head, Economy and Information Support Division, State
Department of Intellectual Property, Kyiv

II. ORGANISATIONS INTERGOUVERNEMENTALES/
INTERGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

OFFICE BENELUX DE LA PROPRIÉTÉ INTELLECTUELLE (OBPI)/BENELUX OFFICE
FOR INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY (BOIP)

Jean-Marie PUTZ, IT Manager, The Hague

ORGANISATION AFRICAINE DE LA PROPRIÉTÉ INTELLECTUELLE
(OAPI)/AFRICAN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANISATION (OAPI)

Hamidou KONÉ, chef du Service des signes distinctifs, Département de la propriété industrielle, Yaoundé

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

Miguel ALBRECHT, Director, Data Resources, Rijswijk

Paul BREWIN, Team Manager e-Publication, Rijswijk

Patrick LE GONIDEC, Administrator Publication, Vienna Sub-Office, Vienna

Ignacio MUÑOZ OZORES, Administrator, Directorate 4.5.2 Publication, Vienna

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

Khabibullo FAYAZOV, Vice-President, Eurasian Patent Office, Moscow

Andrey SEKRETOV, Principal Specialist, Information and Search Systems Department, Eurasian Patent Office, Moscow

OFFICE DES BREVETS DU CONSEIL DE COOPÉRATION DES ÉTATS ARABES DU
GOLFE (GCG)/PATENT OFFICE OF THE COOPERATION COUNCIL FOR THE ARAB
STATES OF THE GULF (GCC PATENT OFFICE)

Hussam Ibrahim AL-MUQHIM, IT Specialist, Riyadh

COMMUNAUTÉ EUROPÉENNE (CE)/EUROPEAN COMMUNITY (EC)

Alexandre TRAN, Head, IT Architecture and Standards, IT Department, Office for Harmonization in the Internal Market (Trade Marks and Designs) (OHIM), Alicante

III. ORGANISATION NON GOUVERNEMENTALE
NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATION

Association européenne de fournisseurs commerciaux d'information en matière de brevets (PatCom)/European Commercial Patent Services Group (PatCom):
Pierre BUFFET (directeur général délégué, Questel Orbit, Paris)

IV. BUREAU/OFFICERS

Président/Chair: Bruce COX (États-Unis d'Amérique/United States of America)

Vice-présidents/Vice-Chairs: Samantha HOY (Ms.) (Australie/Australia)
Anna GRASHCHENKOVA (Mrs.) (Fédération de Russie/Russian Federation)

Secrétaire/Secretary: Angel LÓPEZ SOLANAS (OMPI/WIPO)

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

Francis GURRY (directeur général/Director General)

Secteur PCT et brevets, Centre d'arbitrage et de médiation et Questions mondiales de propriété intellectuelle/PCT and Patents, Arbitration and Mediation Center and Global Intellectual Property Issues Sector:

Philip THOMAS (directeur conseiller principal/Senior Director-Advisor)

Service de la classification et des normes relatives à la propriété industrielle/Classification and Industrial Property Standards Service): Antonios FARASSOPOULOS (chef/Head); Angel LÓPEZ SOLANAS (chef, section des normes et de la normalisation/Head, Standards and Documentation Section); Mary BONSELL (Mrs.) (Bureau international de l'OMPI/International Bureau of WIPO); Young-Woo YUN (administrateur chargé de l'information en matière de propriété industrielle/Industrial Property Information Officer)

Service de l'information en matière de brevets et des statistiques de propriété industrielle/ Patent Information and IP Statistics Service: Christophe MAZENC (chef, Section de l'appui informatique/Head, Information Technology Support Section)

Division des systèmes informatiques du PCT/PCT Information Systems Division: Daniel CHENG (chef, Groupe du développement des applications métiers/Head, Venture Applications Development Unit)

Division de la coopération internationale du PCT/PCT International Cooperation Division: Claus MATTHES (directeur par intérim/Acting Director)

Division des services informatiques/Information Technology (IT) Division: Roger HOLBERTON (chef, Section des applications relatives aux opérations/Head, Business Applications Section)

[L'annexe II suit/Annex II follows]

ANNEX II

AGENDA

1. Opening of the session
2. Election of the Chair and two Vice-Chairs
3. Adoption of the agenda
4. ST.10/C Task Force (Task No. 30)
 - (a) Report by the Task Leader
 - (b) Draft proposal on the revision of WIPO Standard ST.10/C
See document SCIT/SDWG/10/2.
5. Proposal on the revision of WIPO Standard ST.22 (Task No. 37)
See document SCIT/SDWG/10/3.
6. Proposal on the revision of WIPO Standard ST.3 (Task No. 33)
See document SCIT/SDWG/10/4.
7. Report by the Task Leader of the ST.36 Task Force (Task No. 38)
See document SCIT/SDWG/10/5.
8. Survey of practices in industrial property offices regarding codes used for internal purposes or individual use (Task No. 26)
See document SCIT/SDWG/10/6.
9. Citation practices by patent offices (Task No. 36)
 - (a) Report by the International Bureau
 - (b) New survey concerning citation practices: summary, results and analysis
See document SCIT/SDWG/10/7.

10. Exchange of information:
 - (a) Presentation, by the International Bureau, on the Priority Document Access Service
 - (b) Oral report, by the International Bureau, on modifications of Annex C to the Administrative Instructions under the Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT) and of WIPO Standard ST.25
 - (c) Oral report, by the International Bureau, on the use of WIPO Standard ST.66 by the Madrid System for the International Registration of Marks
 - (d) Presentation, by the European Patent Office, of the Global Patent Index.
11. Proposal on the revision of WIPO Standard ST.60 (Task No. 33)
See document SCIT/SDWG/10/8.
12. Oral report by the Task Leader of the Trademark Standards Task Force
13. Report, by the International Bureau, on activities relating to the Annual Technical Reports (ATRs) on Patent, Trademark and Industrial Design Information Activities (Task No. 24)
See document SCIT/SDWG/10/9.
14. Oral report, by the International Bureau, on the WIPO *Handbook on Industrial Property Information and Documentation* (Task No. 26)
15. Consideration of the SDWG Task List
See document SCIT/SDWG/10/10.
16. Schedule of activities
See document SCIT/SDWG/10/11.
17. Adoption of the report of the session
18. Closing of the session

[End of Annex II and of document]