

WIPO



SCIT/SDWG/4/14
ORIGINAL: English
DATE: January 30, 2004

E

WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION
GENEVA

STANDING COMMITTEE ON INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES
STANDARDS AND DOCUMENTATION WORKING GROUP

Fourth Session
Geneva, January 26 to 30, 2004

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 fourth session from January 26 to 30, 2004.
2. The following Member States of WIPO and/or the Paris Union were represented at the session: Austria, Belgium, Canada, China, Croatia, Czech Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Hungary, Indonesia, Ireland, Japan, Kenya, Lithuania, Mauritius, Mexico, Norway, Panama, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, United Kingdom and United States of America (40).
3. Representatives of the African Intellectual Property Organization (OAPI), the Benelux Trademark Office (BBM), the European Patent Office (EPO), the Eurasian Patent Organization (EAPO), the European Community (EC), the African, Caribbean and Pacific Group of States (ACP Group) and the League of Arab States (LAS) (7) took part in the session in a member capacity.

4. A Representative of the Patent Documentation Group (PDG) 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. Neil Wilson, Acting Director, PCT Information Systems Division, who welcomed the participants on behalf of the Director General.

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

7. In recognizing the mandate of elected officials to officiate at two sessions of the SDWG, the Working Group unanimously reelected Mr. Leif Stolt (Sweden) as Chair and Mr. Bogdan Boreschievici (Romania) and Mr. Yun Young-Woo (KIPO) as Vice-Chairs.

8. Mr. Neil Wilson acted as Secretary of the session.

Agenda Item 3: Adoption of the Agenda

9. The SDWG unanimously adopted the agenda, which appears as Annex II to this report.

Agenda Item 4: Prioritization of the tasks of the Standards and Documentation Working Group

10. In making an oral presentation on this item, the Secretariat drew the attention of the SDWG to the increasing number of requests for standardization in the industrial property information and documentation area and the variety of actors in the industrial property community, including industrial property offices. Within the framework of the SDWG, such requests generally fell into two broad categories: the establishment, maintenance and revision of WIPO Standards; and the preparation of surveys and other documents relating to industrial property documentation and information. The resulting Standards are published both in the *WIPO Handbook on Industrial Property Information and Documentation* CD-ROM and on the Internet.

11. It is further recalled that the SDWG undertook its work through the establishment of task forces comprising a task force leader and members. Once a specific task force has been established, the successful follow-up and completion of the task depends on the input and active participation, not only of the task force leader but also each and every task force member. As such, the active participation of task force members is crucial to the appropriate completion of the tasks. The role of the International Bureau (IB) in this process is one of task force facilitation. The IB is also required to give advice and assistance and provide facilities for the task force leaders and task force members in order for them to carry out their work. However, the IB cannot replace the substantive contributions by task force members from industrial property offices.

12. The Secretariat further stated that it was likely that new tasks would be identified and new task forces established during the current session of the SDWG. However, due consideration should be taken regarding the impact of this work, not only on the limited resources available at the IB, but also at the industrial property offices that the delegates represent. Therefore, the Secretariat urged the SDWG, while reflecting upon the increase in the workload of the Working Group to consider refocusing its efforts in line with the activity of specific task forces. In particular, thought should be given to addressing only the high priority and most relevant tasks, taking due consideration of the makeup of the task force membership, and ensuring that the task force membership is competent and willing to make substantive and committed contributions to the process.

13. The Secretariat reminded the Working Group that the General Rules and Procedures of WIPO governing documents for meetings require that the documents be submitted three and a half months in advance so that they would be ready for distribution to Member States at least two months before the meeting, in order to allow sufficient time for all Member States to receive and consider the appropriate documentation. Therefore, the SDWG was advised that the Working Group should convene its sessions only at intervals of no less than eight to nine months.

14. Following interventions by the Delegations of the Netherlands and the United States of America, the SDWG agreed that the joint problems of the process incumbent on the production of meeting documentation and the prioritization of the work of the SDWG should be reflected in the report of the session and left open for further consideration. These issues would also be considered, as necessary, when deciding how to proceed on individual agenda items and, in particular, when discussing the SDWG Task List (see document SCIT/SDWG/4/12) under agenda item 16.

Agenda Item 5: Revision of WIPO Standard ST.80 (Task No.33/1)

15. The Report of the WIPO Standard ST.80 Task Force was contained in the Annex to document SCIT/SDWG/4/2 and was approved by the SDWG without comment.

16. The Appendix to the document also contained a suggested “Changes to the List of INID codes under Standard ST.80; concerning INID codes (68), (69), (80), (81), (82), (83), (85), (89) and the English version of (87).” These were also approved by the SDWG with the following amendment, and are reproduced in full in Annex III to this report:

(2) Category (80)

(b) Amend and expand the definition of code (81) to confirm current practice and include reference to designations under the 1999 Act, as follows:

(81) Contracting Parties concerned

- I - Contracting Parties designated under the 1934 Act
- II - Contracting Parties designated under the 1960 Act
- III - Contracting Parties designated under the 1999 Act

17. The Secretariat also proposed changes to the wording of the two sub-titles shown in the WIPO Standard ST.80, Category (80). The SDWG agreed to the following revised wording:

(1) *Information regarding designated Contracting Parties/Contracting Parties concerned*

(2) *Information regarding the owner(s)*

18. A suggestion by the Delegation of the United States of America that the SDWG agree a related change to WIPO Standard ST.9, related to INID code (86) was also approved as given in paragraph 7(b) of the Annex to document SCIT/SDWG/4/2. The Delegation's proposed revision of related Note (i), to replace the word "*The*" with "*With regard to patents for invention, the*" was approved by the SDWG as the only Note requiring a change; the other three notes being either already equally applicable to both design patents and patents for invention, or clearly shown as PCT-related.

19. Finally, the SDWG agreed that the approved revisions of WIPO Standard ST.80 had concluded the work required under Task No. 33/1 and that this task could now be removed from the SDWG Task List.

Agenda Item 6: Revision of WIPO Standard ST.10/C (Task No.30)

20. As leader of the ST.10/C Task Force, the Delegation of Japan provided a progress report on the work that had been carried out by the Task Force since the last session of the Working Group and a proposal by the Task Force on the revision of WIPO Standard ST.10/C. The work is highlighted in SCIT/SDWG/4/3.

21. The Delegation of the Republic of Korea provided a short written document outlining their proposed changes to the recommendations set out in the report of the Task Force. The Delegation asked that these proposals be reviewed by the Task Force.

22. Several delegations intervened to express support for the proposal put forward by the Delegation of the Republic of Korea.

23. The Patent Documentation Group (PDG) highlighted the importance of WIPO Standard ST.10/C for industrial property offices (IPOs) and commercial data users alike as it greatly facilitates the creation of patent families.

24. In response to a question of the Delegation of Canada, the Delegation of Republic of Korea indicated that their proposed changes were simply a reorganization of the presentation of bibliographic data components rather than a substantive change in the content of the material developed by the Task Force.

25. The Delegation of Japan indicated its support for the changes put forward by the Delegation of the Republic of Korea and agreed that these changes should be reviewed by the Task Force at the second phase.

26. The Secretariat suggested the following paragraph renumbering: 11(aa) to 11, 11(a) to 12(a) and 11(b) to 12(b).

27. The Delegation of the Netherlands questioned the purpose of paragraph 11(aa) as it did not appear to have an audience. The Delegation suggested that intellectual property offices were already aware of the material presented in the paragraph, and that applicants were not in the habit of consulting WIPO standards before submitting applications. The Delegation suggested changing or combining the paragraphs in question in light of this observation.

28. The Delegation of the United States of America responded that the paragraph in question was written to give convincing evidence to the majority of offices not yet following this procedure to invest the time and money required to do so. The Delegation recommended retaining the paragraph break of 11(aa) as proposed by the Task Force.

29. Further interventions occurred in support of the comments of the Delegation of the United States of America and the editorial changes developed during the discussion.

30. The SDWG approved the text of WIPO Standard ST.10/C as reproduced in Annex IV to this report. The Task Force completed the first phase. The SDWG requested that the Task Force review paragraph numbering issues and adjust WIPO Standard ST.10/C according to comments received during discussions and the proposal submitted by the Delegation of the Republic of Korea at the second phase.

31. The Secretariat presented background and conclusions concerning the need for revision of WIPO Standard ST.13. Prior to the third session of the SDWG, the European Patent Organisation (EPO) proposed an informal discussion concerning the impact of changes to WIPO Standard ST.6 on WIPO Standard ST.13. An Informal Discussion Group on the revision of WIPO Standard ST.13 was established to discuss various issues related to the Standard.

32. The Informal Discussion Group on the revision of WIPO Standard ST.13 has indicated that it was not advisable to start a revision of WIPO Standard ST.13 at present. The ST.10/C Task Force has not yet completed its work concerning a unified format of priority application numbers and, during its discussions, the Task Force would very likely need to refer to and consider the recommendations on application numbers that are set out in WIPO Standard ST.13. In order to avoid inconsistent recommendations between WIPO Standard ST.10/C and WIPO Standard ST.13, the Informal Discussion Group proposed that the SDWG request the ST.10/C Task Force to consider the impact of the revision of WIPO Standard ST.10/C on WIPO Standard ST.13 during the second phase of its discussions, when a proposal on a unified format for priority application numbers would be considered. Then, the Task Force would report back on this issue to the SDWG. The SDWG recommended that frequent revisions of the Standard be avoided and that proposals concerning WIPO Standard ST.13 be considered at the same time as proposals concerning WIPO Standard ST.10/C.

33. The Delegation of the EPO pointed out the importance of avoiding too many changes to the various WIPO Standards, including WIPO Standard ST.13, as frequent changes can be confusing to offices. The Delegation of the United States of America supported the comments of the Delegation of the EPO.

Agenda Item 7: Revision and establishment of WIPO Standards relating to trademarks

34. In presenting an oral progress report on the work of the Trademark Standards Task Force, the Korean Intellectual Property Office (KIPO), as Task Force Leader, reminded the SDWG of the drivers behind the need for Trademark standards; the introduction of the Internet had brought a need for the electronic management of trademark data and there was a requirement for interoperability between industrial property offices, in particular, those in the process of setting up new systems. KIPO recalled that the Task Force had been created at the second session of the SDWG, held in December 2002, and had begun its work by conducting a survey with the aim of prioritizing its work. The results of the “Survey of requests for revision or establishment of WIPO Standards related to Trademarks” were contained in document SCIT/SDWG/4/4 and had shown two main priorities from the 13 standards presented to Member States for ranking in order of importance. The two standards afforded the highest priority were:

- A. Standard (or recommendation) for the electronic management of figurative elements of marks; and
- B. Standard (or recommendation) for the XML relating to the electronic process and exchange of trademark data.

35. With regard to (A) KIPO proposed that a survey be conducted of WIPO Member States on their practices regarding image format, with emphasis on five main areas, namely: procedural and technical aspects of problems incurred in conversion of marks; the capture and manipulation of three-dimensional objects; color management, in particular, with respect to the increasing requirements of electronic filing; the desired size for images; and software licensing issues. The survey would be circulated by the IB and the results examined by the Trademark Standards Task Force. KIPO also proposed that the Task Force consider the use of professional experts in what is a highly technical area. Finally, KIPO said that it was confident that the Task Force would complete its work on Task No. 20 in 2004.

36. The Delegation of Japan supported the project brief as set out in the document under consideration and agreed with the approach outlined by KIPO for dealing with the issue of the figurative elements of marks, but asked to clarify who could be responsible for the preparation of the XML Standard.

37. The Secretariat proposed that Task No. 20 be re-worded to better reflect the work underway. Interventions from the Delegations of France and Romania also suggested that the Task No. 20 be sub-divided to acknowledge the related issues of industrial designs. However, the Delegations of Canada, the Netherlands and the Benelux Trademark Office (BBM), argued that, although there existed many similarities between trademarks and industrial designs, the inclusion of the latter in this task could make the issue overly-complex, particularly with regard to problems of data confidentiality (not required for trademarks) and the number of images (one only for trademarks but several for a model).

38. The SDWG agreed that:

- (a) Task No. 20 be re-worded to read “prepare, for adoption as a WIPO Standard, a recommendation for the electronic management of the figurative elements of trademarks”; and

(b) the eventual results of the work on Task No. 20 be considered, at a later date, for their application to industrial designs.

39. Regarding the proposal for a new XML standard (B), KIPO reminded the SDWG that a five-member experts group had already been set up by the Office for Harmonization in the Internal Market (OHIM), comprising OHIM, WIPO and Delegations from the German Patent and Trade Mark Office, the UK Patent Office and the Benelux Trademark Office (BBM). The Task Force would meet with the OHIM Experts Group to agree how to take the work forward on this issue whilst ensuring close cooperation between the two groups and no duplication of effort. In response to a question from the Delegation of Japan regarding the need to solicit technical help from information technology experts in the work of the Task Force, KIPO said that it would raise the matter at its next meeting.

40. The Representative of BBM said that it now received 55% of its trademark filings electronically. It also exchanged trademark data electronically with OHIM and WIPO. However, the Delegation cautioned that the standardization work required a significant amount of effort to succeed and the SDWG would need to work very closely on the matter.

41. Following a suggested wording for a new SDWG Task on the preparation of an XML standard for trademarks by the Secretariat, the Delegation of the United States of America emphasized that the standard should deal with issues external to IPOs, i.e., those concerning filing and data exchange. Issues of process were internal and specific to individual IPOs and should, therefore, remain outside the scope of the proposed new standard. This view was supported by the Delegations of Canada and BBM.

42. The Delegation of the Netherlands questioned whether a new task was necessary for the SDWG; was it not more prudent to accept the work of the OHIM Experts Group. The Delegation of Canada said that a more international view was required, than that potentially being taken by the OHIM Group. However, all delegations agreed on the need for continued close cooperation between the SDWG Task Force and the OHIM Experts Group.

43. The SDWG agreed that:

(a) a new Task be created with the wording: "Prepare an XML standard for the electronic external process and exchange of trademark data"

(b) KIPO be assigned as Task Leader for this new task, and

(c) the Trademarks Standards Task Force continue to work in close cooperation with the OHIM Experts Group.

44. Regarding the remaining 11 standards in the KIPO survey, the SDWG decided to place work on hold until such time as standards A and B were completed.

Agenda Item 8: Renewal of the WIPO Handbook on Industrial Property Information and Documentation (Task No. 26)

45. Discussions were based on Document SCIT/SDWG/4/5.
46. The Secretariat gave a presentation concerning future revisions and updates of the WIPO Handbook on *Industrial Property Information and Documentation*, summarizing document SCIT/SDWG/4/5.
47. The PDG indicated that the WIPO Handbook is a very valuable source of information for both office and commercial users. The PDG commented that the value of the publication could be enhanced through reorganization, Web-based publication, or through outsourcing of the management and publication of the Handbook.
48. Several delegations also commented on the value of the WIPO Handbook and indicated their support for a substantive revision of the contents and publication procedures of the WIPO Handbook, but in many cases indicated that their ability to provide resources in support of this activity were limited. In particular, delegations requested the archiving of obsolete material and the publication of the complete WIPO Handbook on the Internet.
49. The Secretariat questioned the SDWG as to the advisability of publishing the obsolete portions of the Handbook on the Internet.
50. The Delegation of Germany expressed its reluctance to publish outdated information on the Internet and suggested that a Task Force would be in the best position to take up this issue.
51. The Secretariat proposed the creation of a Task Force for the discussion and preparation of a proposal to renew the contents of the WIPO Handbook and its publication and maintenance procedures as described in document SCIT/SDWG/4/5. This proposal was accepted by the SDWG. The SDWG further agreed that issues relating to publication and archiving be addressed by this new Task Force. The SDWG welcomed the offer of the IB to act as Task Force leader.

Agenda Item 9: Revision of WIPO Standard ST.3

52. Discussions were based on document SCIT/SDWG/4/6.
53. The Secretariat summarized the issues outlined in SCIT/SDWG/4/6 concerning problems relating to the country code designation for Serbia and Montenegro as proposed in International Standard ISO Standard 3166.
54. The Delegation of the Czech Republic indicated that the two-letter country code CS can bring difficulties not only to the three countries concerned (Czech Republic, Slovakia and Serbia and Montenegro) but also to users of industrial property information in the international community. The Delegation indicated that country code CS was used in patent documents published by the former Czechoslovakia during the period of 1919 to 1993. The Delegation indicated that because of this and other instances of the use of code CS, it is

inadvisable to reuse code CS and the alternative proposal for the use of double codes (CS and YY) is only acceptable if there is no other solution. WIPO Standard ST.3 should be aligned with ISO 3166 if possible, however, standards must diverge if ISO requires CS to be used for Serbia and Montenegro.

55. The Delegation of Canada supported the intervention by the Delegation of the Czech Republic and indicated that it does not support the two code solution.

56. The Delegation of Slovakia supported the interventions of the Czech and Canadian Delegations and supported only the use of code YY for Serbia and Montenegro.

57. The Delegations of the United States of America, Germany, Poland, Romania, Austria, Spain, the Netherlands, the EPO, the *Organisation Africaine de la Propriété Intellectuelle* (OAPI), and the Representative of the PDG indicated that the proposed country code of CS presents implementation issues that cannot be reasonably circumvented and indicated that the use of two codes to designate Serbia and Montenegro would be too confusing. Furthermore, several delegations indicated that discussions with the Serbia and Montenegro Industrial Property Office should be undertaken concerning this matter.

58. The SDWG agreed that no decision concerning the adoption of a two-letter country code (or set of country codes) for Serbia and Montenegro can be made until after a formal response from ISO is received.

59. The SDWG also agreed that in the interim, the two-letter country code YU in WIPO Standard ST.3 would continue to be used to designate Serbia and Montenegro with an accompanying footnote to explain the current situation.

60. The Delegation of the United States of America raised the issue of the need of a two-letter code to represent, in WIPO Standard ST.3, the Community Plant Variety Office (European Union) (CPVO) and, eventually, also the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). The Secretariat indicated that a code to represent the CPVO was necessary for those industrial property offices issuing plant patents; however, it was unlikely that the OECD would meet the conditions to be in WIPO Standard ST.3 in a near future. The Secretariat also informed that it had already consulted the ISO 3166 Maintenance Agency with regard to this matter. The Secretariat offered to contact the CPVO in order to present a proposal regarding the inclusion of this Organization in WIPO Standard ST.3 for the consideration of the SDWG at its next session. The SDWG agreed with the proposal.

Agenda Item 10: Recommended minimum contents for intellectual property offices' websites

61. Discussions were based on Document SCIT/SDWG/4/7.

62. The PDG presented document SCIT/SDWG/4/7 and summarized the results of their survey of intellectual property offices Websites. The PDG indicated that most offices were substantially in compliance with recommendations issued by WIPO. However, the PDG indicated that, in some cases, IPOs Websites were missing legal texts, annual reports, statistical data and English language translations. In conclusion, IPOs were reminded to take into consideration WIPO recommendations for IPO Websites.

63. The SDWG agreed with the proposal by the Secretariat to publish Part 8.5 of the WIPO Handbook on the Internet.

Agenda Item 11: Coding of document categories in search reports and front pages of patent documents

64. Discussions were based on Document SCIT/SDWG/4/8.

65. In introducing document SCIT/SDWG/4/8, the Secretariat reminded delegates that WIPO Standard ST.14 recommends that IPOs should include all relevant references cited in the course of a search or examination procedure in their granted patents and in their published patent applications.

66. The Secretariat referred to the letter of the Patent Documentation Group (PDG) dated August 20, 2003 (reproduced as an Annex to document SCIT/SDWG/4/8), where the PDG expressed the view that the valuable knowledge that is created through examining patent applications should be made available to the industrial property user community and proposed to broaden the application of WIPO Standard ST.14 to that effect. The letter further recommended that the standard should be used not only by IPOs publishing search results but also by all other IPOs examining patent applications.

67. The Delegation of Japan expressed interest in providing such information but suggested that in order to do so it would need to dramatically modify its examination practices and publication procedures relating to relevant references cited in the course of examination.

68. The Delegation of Austria suggested that the existing provisions of WIPO Standard ST.14 provided ample opportunities as to how to proceed on the issues raised in the document.

69. The Delegation of the United States of America observed that the proposed use of the codes would not be applicable to the publication of granted and published patents, adding that where other patent dossiers are subjected to public file inspection, even more complete information is made available to third parties.

70. In conclusion, the SDWG agreed that the item was important but that it was not a priority at this time. Furthermore, the SDWG noted that the requested information is already made available, either fully or partially by most patent offices.

Agenda Item 12: Corrections relating to patent information published by patent offices

71. Discussions were based on Document SCIT/SDWG/4/9.

72. In introducing document SCIT/SDWG/4/9, the Secretariat reminded delegates that the guidelines given by WIPO Standard ST.50 aim at providing guidance to industrial property offices and other suppliers of patent information concerning the issuance of corrections, alterations and supplements relating to patent information published in paper form or on machine-readable media.

73. The Secretariat referred to the letter from the Patent Documentation Group (PDG), dated August 20, 2003 (reproduced in the Annex to document SCIT/SDWG/4/9), which informed the IB that, since the adoption of WIPO Standard ST.50, there have been developments that do not appear to be in accordance with the said Standard. The letter proposed to carry out a survey on the status of the correction procedures undertaken by industrial property offices.

74. After the SDWG heard a number of interventions from delegations that the implementation of WIPO Standard ST.50 was problematic and that such a survey would be beneficial, the Delegation of the United States of America offered in cooperation with the IB and the PDG, to coordinate the development of such a questionnaire, and to present the draft questionnaire to the next session of the SDWG for its consideration.

75. The SDWG agreed to create a Task with the following wording: "Prepare a questionnaire and carry out a survey on the implementation of WIPO Standard ST.50 and on the status of the correction procedures in the industrial property offices."

Agenda Item 13: Harmonization and identification of the parts of patent specifications

76. Discussions were based on Document SCIT/SDWG/4/10.

77. The Secretariat referred to the letter from the PDG, dated August 20, 2003 (reproduced in the Annex to document SCIT/SDWG/4/10) proposing a survey of industrial property offices concerning issues related to the harmonization of the methods and identification of the specific parts of the description text. The Representative of the PDG presented a summary of the issues outlined in the letter.

78. Delegates made several interventions emphasizing the need for the consistent referencing of document components, but also pointed out the challenges of implementation. The SDWG considered and supported the possibility of creating a new SCIT Task concerning this matter. It was recommended that a proposal be made to the SCIT Plenary to create a new SCIT Task. The Task would concern the preparation of a questionnaire to be distributed to IPOs to survey their current practices in the identification of specific parts in published patent documents. The proposed wording for this Task is as follows: "Prepare a questionnaire and carry out a survey in order to clarify the different practices by industrial property offices regarding the difficulties in citing specific parts of the description of the invention text in a patent document."

79. The Delegation of Germany volunteered assistance to the PDG and the IB in the implementation of this Task.

Agenda Item 14. Report by the International Bureau on the Annual Technical Reports (ATRs) Management System (Task No. 24)

80. Discussions were based on Document SCIT/SDWG/4/11.

81. The Secretariat made a progress report on SCIT Task No. 24, the Annual Technical Report (ATR) Management System.

82. The Delegation of the United States of America highlighted the importance of Annual Technical Reports (ATRs) for the consistent collection and presentation of relevant information about the operations of IPOs. The Delegation encouraged offices to file ATRs through the new system.

83. Several delegations indicated their satisfaction with the system and made suggestions for improvements.

84. The Delegation of Japan expressed concerns in the following areas: security, increased workload, the inability to readily amend submitted reports, and need for certification of submitted reports with a WIPO logo.

Agenda Item 15: Report on progress made by the Electronic Data Processing and Exchange Standards Task Force (Tasks Nos. 13, 17, 18 and 19)

85. The Secretariat, as Task Leader for Tasks 13, 17, 18, and 19, presented an oral report on the activities of the Electronic Data Processing and Exchange Standards (EDPES) Task Force. The Secretariat indicated that the Task Force had been nearly inactive since the previous meeting of the SDWG and had made no progress on any of its Tasks. The Task Force had, however, convened a brief meeting on January 27, 2004, to discuss the disposition of the proposed WIPO Standard ST.36 (Recommendation for the Processing of Patent Documents Using XML (Extensible Markup Language)). The Trilateral-WIPO XML Working Group (TWXWG) has developed a first draft of this new standard and submitted it to the EDPES Task Force for review on October 15, 2003.

86. The Representative of the European Patent Organization made a brief presentation concerning the background and contents of the new proposed standard, including a calendar for its adoption. The proposed calendar is as follows:

January/February 2004	Presentation to SDWG and SCIT of the draft of the proposed WIPO Standard ST.36 for consultation
February-June 2004	Consultation period
March 2004	Meeting of TWXWG
June 2004	If necessary, proposed special meeting (at WIPO) to discuss all comments and the final version of WIPO Standard ST.36
July 2004	Submission of document to Secretariat for inclusion in the agenda for next SDWG meeting
November 2004	Recommendation to adopt new WIPO Standard ST.36 by SDWG

87. The SDWG agreed with this calendar.

88. For further information, interested parties may refer to the EDPES Task Force Web Forum at <http://webforum.wipo.int/>.

89. The Secretariat pointed out the need for participation by members of the EDPES Task Force and asked for suggestions as to how to encourage such participation.

90. The Delegation of the United States of America suggested that the Secretariat inform Task Force members as to the correct usage of the automatic message notification feature of the Web forum.
91. The Delegation of the Netherlands pointed out that the lack of participation by members may be due to a lack of resources on the part of smaller offices and differing priorities from those of the Trilateral offices.
92. The Delegation of the United States of America indicated that despite the lack of progress by the EDPES Task Force, decisions must be made with respect to the impact of changes to WIPO Standard ST.8 on WIPO electronic data standards. The Delegation suggested that the Secretariat send an electronic mail message to all Task Force members indicating the availability of material related to this activity on the Web forum and indicate a deadline of thirty days for comments.
93. The Secretariat agreed to this proposal.
94. The Delegation of the United States of America asked for comments concerning the plans of the SDWG with respect to updating WIPO Standard ST.8 in light of the proposed WIPO Standard ST.36 efforts.
95. The Representative of the EPO indicated that the new IPC code structure was agreed upon at the November Trilateral meeting in Tokyo. The Delegation indicated that new tags for WIPO Standard ST.36 should be made available as soon as possible, perhaps in March. The new IPC coding also requires a small change to WIPO Standard ST.36. The EPO will put forward a paper on this matter for the next SDWG meeting.
96. The Delegation of Japan reminded the SDWG that the new version of the International Patent Classification (IPC) would be in use in January 2005. WIPO Standard ST.36 must support the new IPC encoding by the end of 2004. The Delegation expressed the view that the timing for the necessary acceptance of the proposed new standard was good. The Delegation emphasized that the proposed WIPO Standard ST.36 is of great importance to the Japanese Patent Office.
97. The Representative of the EPO indicated that despite the lack of participation by Task Force members, the Web forum has proven extremely useful and thanked the Secretariat for establishing this service.

Agenda Item 16: Consideration of the SDWG Task List

98. Discussions were based on Document SCIT/SDWG/4/12.
99. The SDWG discussed the tasks contained in the Annex to document SCIT/SDWG/4/12 and agreed on the following:

Task No. 6: The Delegation of the Netherlands asked for a status report on the GlobalPat CDROM collection contract as it seemed to have expired. The IB indicated that no agreement had been reached between EPO and WIPO on this matter. The Delegation of the EPO commented that the last three months of 'frontfile' processing was underway. Production of GlobalPat will finish if no agreement is reached between EPO and WIPO.

Task No. 10: The Delegation of Canada asked whether an IPDL Workshop would be held in 2004. The Secretariat indicated that it was unlikely that a workshop would be held. The Delegation of Japan inquired as to whether the mandate of the IPDL Task Force should be extended as it expires in January 2004. The Delegation of the Netherlands recommended that the SCIT be advised to close Task No. 10. The SDWG agreed.

Task No. 11: The Secretariat inquired as to whether this task should also be closed as it was related to Task No. 10. The SDWG agreed to recommend to the SCIT that Task No. 11 be closed.

Task No. 13: The Delegation of the United States of America inquired as to whether this Task could be closed in light of discussions concerning proposed WIPO Standard ST.36. The Secretariat indicated that the scope of this Task is greater than what is in proposed WIPO Standard ST.36; namely, this Task contains references to matters relating specifically to the PCT. After further discussions, the SDWG agreed with the Secretariat, which suggested a redraft of the text of this Task to make it more understandable. The SDWG agreed that the text be redrafted.

Task No. 17: The Delegation of Germany suggested that the wording of the text of this Task be redrafted, and to include a reference to the proposed WIPO Standard ST.36. The SDWG agreed.

Task No. 20: The SDWG agreed that the title and text of this Task be redrafted to reflect the results mentioned in paragraph 38 of this document.

Task No. 24: The Delegation of the United States of America suggested that the wording of the text of this Task be redrafted. The SDWG agreed.

Task No. 26: The Delegation of the United States of America suggested that the wording of the text of this Task be redrafted. The SDWG agreed.

Task No. 30: The Delegation of Japan asked that two sentences be added to the text of the Task. The first sentence would read as follows: "On October 10, 2003, the Japan Patent Office, as Task Leader, submitted a proposal for the revision of WIPO Standard ST.10/C. The proposal was accepted by the SDWG and the Task Force completed the first phase." The SDWG agreed to these changes.

Task No. 31: The Delegation of the United States of America indicated that the Task has been completed for non-electronic standards. In particular, it should be noted that IPC Reform would not affect WIPO Standards ST.7/A, ST.7/E, ST.11, ST.12/C, ST.18, and ST.19 because of the limited use of those Standards by industrial property offices. The Delegation further stated that industrial property offices would need to gain more experience before amending WIPO Standards ST.11, ST.18 and ST.19. The SDWG agreed that a brief statement should be added to WIPO Standards ST.7/A, ST.7/E and 12/C to indicate that they have not been updated to incorporate revisions to WIPO Standard ST.8 due to the very limited use of this media by industrial property offices. The SDWG agreed that this Task was completed regarding the non-electronic WIPO Standards.

Task No. 32: The Delegation of Canada asked for an update on the status of the transfer of the electronic inventory system from the Office for Inventions and Trademarks of Romania to WIPO. The Delegation of Romania replied that its Office had sent a letter to the IB informing of its agreement regarding its participation in a group of experts for the transfer and implementation of the system; since then no activity had occurred concerning this transfer. The Delegation of Canada asked that the Secretariat keep the SDWG informed of any future discussions between the Office for Inventions and Trademarks of Romania and WIPO, to which the SDWG agreed. The Delegation of the United States of America indicated the utility of having an accurate list of published documents from each office, including a description of files, kind codes, and document numbers. This would allow offices to know with precision whether their collections are complete. The Delegation of the EPO offered to make available information on the collections contained in their DOC-DB database. The IB offered to research the availability of patent inventories currently available through other sources and, IB resources permitting, will report on its findings at the next SDWG meeting.

Task No. 33: The Delegation of Austria indicated a need to update Section III. 2 and III. 3 with respect to timelines in the text. The SDWG agreed.

Task No. 33/1: The Delegation of the United States of America suggested to update the text of this Task in order to mention the revision of WIPO Standard ST.9 that has been adopted by the SDWG in this session. The Working Group agreed.

Agenda Item 17: Exchange of Information: New publication procedures and data supply
Oral presentation by the German Patent and Trade Mark Office

100. The SDWG noted with gratitude the information provided by the Delegation of Germany concerning the modifications relating to publications and data supply, including the launch of the new Internet platform “DPMApublikationen,” that the German Patent and Trade Mark Office implemented as of January 1, 2004. The presentation is available at the SDWG/4 Web page (http://www.wipo.int/scit/en/meeting/sdwg/4/index_4.htm).

Agenda Item 18: Schedule of activities

101. Discussions were based on Document SCIT/SDWG/4/13.

102. Following a short discussion, the SDWG agreed to hold its fifth session from November 8 to 12, 2004.

103. The Secretariat reminded Task Leaders that in order to facilitate the provision of working documents in all three languages for the fifth session, the deadline for submission of texts to the Secretariat would be July 20, 2004.

Agenda Item 19: Adoption of the report of the session

104. This report was adopted by the Standards and Documentation Working Group (SDWG) of the Standing Committee on Information Technologies (SCIT).

Agenda Item 20: Closing of the session

105. The meeting was closed following the adoption of the Report.

[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

Hubert ROTHE, Head, Industrial Property Information for the Public, Supply of Literature, German Patent and Trade Mark Office, Munich

AUTRICHE/AUSTRIA

Elvira GRONAU (Mrs.), Head of Technical Department 3C, Austrian Patent Office, Vienna

BELGIQUE/BELGIUM

Alain LAMBERMONT, ingénieur, Service public fédéral économie, PME, classes moyennes et énergie, Section information brevets, Office de la propriété intellectuelle, Bruxelles

CANADA

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

CHINE/CHINA

NING Long, Deputy Director General, Automation Department, State Intellectual Property Office of the People's Republic of China, Beijing

CROATIE/CROATIA

Marija SEVER (Mrs.), Division for Application and Granted Rights Registers, State Intellectual Property Office, Zagreb

Tatjana PLEŠA (Mrs.), Information Technology Centre, State Intellectual Property Office, Zagreb

ÉGYPTE/EGYPT

Neveen MAHMOUD, Information Specialist, Computer Department, Egyptian Patent Office, Academy of Scientific Research and Technology, Cairo

EL SALVADOR

Fresia MONTERRUBIO (Mlle), conseillère, Mission permanente, Genève

ERYTHRÉE/ERITREA

Bereket WOLDEYOHANMES, chargé d'affaires, Mission permanente, Genève

ESPAGNE/SPAIN

Ignacio MUÑOZ OZORES, Jefe del Servicio de Documentación, Departamento de Patentes e Información Tecnológica, Oficina Española de Patentes y Marcas, Madrid

ÉTATS UNIS D'AMÉRIQUE/UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Edmond RISHELL, International Exchanges and Standards Specialist, United States Patent and Trademark Office, Washington, D.C.

Robert JOHNSON, Supervisory Computer Engineer, United States Patent and Trademark Office, Washington, D.C.

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

Dejan MILANOV, Network Administrator, Information Technology Unit, Industrial Property Protection Office (IPPO), Skopje

FÉDÉRATION DE RUSSIE/RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Olga SEROVA (Mrs.), Principal Specialist, International Relations Department, Russian Agency for Patents and Trademarks (ROSPATENT), Moscow

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

FINLANDE/FINLAND

Païvi RAATIKAINEN (Ms.), Deputy Director, Trademarks and Designs Line, National Board of Patents and Registration, Helsinki

Juha REKOLA, Head, Development Division, National Board of Patents and Registration, Helsinki

FRANCE

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

GRÈCE/GREECE

Adamantia NIKOLAKOPOULOU (Mme), chef de section, Direction de la propriété commerciale et industrielle, Office des marques, Athènes

Marina HONDROPOULOU (Mme), ministre conseiller, expert en propriété intellectuelle, Ministère des affaires étrangères, Athènes

GUATEMALA

Gabriel ORELLANA, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

HAÏTI/HAITI

Jenane ROCHER (Mme), consultante, Mission permanente, Genève

HONGRIE/HUNGARY

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

INDONÉSIE/INDONESIA

Andy NOORSAMAN SOMMENG, Director of Information Technology, Directorate General of Intellectual Property Rights, Jakarta

Dewi KARTONEGORO, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

IRLANDE/IRELAND

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

JAPON/JAPAN

Yoshihiro FUJI, Deputy Director, Patent Information Promotion Policy Office, Patent Information Division, Japan Patent Office, Tokyo

Shiro ANKYU, Deputy Director, Information Systems Affairs Division, Trademark, Design and Administrative Affairs Department, Japan Patent Office, Tokyo

Shintaro TAKAHARA, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

KENYA

David N. NJUGUNA, Patent Examiner, Kenya Industrial Property Office, Nairobi

LITUANIE/LITHUANIA

Saulé DAUKUVIENÉ (Ms.), Chief Specialist, Industrial Property Information, State Patent Bureau, Vilnius

MAURICE/MAURITIUS

Smazi SAHADURKHAN (Ms.), Technical Adviser, Permanent Mission, Geneva

MEXIQUE/MEXICO

Santiago REYNA ORTIZ, Coordinador Departamental de Desarrollo de Sistemas de Patentes, Instituto Mexicano de la Propiedad Industrial, México

NORVÈGE/NORWAY

Vegar JOHNSRUD, Senior Executive Officer, Norwegian Patent Office, Oslo

PANAMA

Jorge Alejandro TROYANO, Asesor Legal, Secretaría Nacional de Ciencia, Tecnología e Innovación (SENACYT), Panamá

PAYS-BAS/NETHERLANDS

Siep DE VRIES, Head, Chemical Division, Netherlands Industrial Property Office, Rijswijk

POLOGNE/POLAND

Ryszard KARCZEWSKI, IT Specialist, Informatics Department, Patent Office of the Republic of Poland, Warsaw

PORTUGAL

Maria Luísa Sam Pedro ARAÚJO (Mme), chef de département, Institut national de la propriété industrielle (INPI), Lisbonne

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

RÉPUBLIQUE DE CORÉE/ REPUBLIC OF KOREA

KIM Jong-An, Senior Director, Information Planning Division, Korean Intellectual Property Office, Daejeon

YUN Young-Woo, Head, IT Cooperation Unit, Information Planning Division, Korean Intellectual Property Office, Daejeon

LEE Byung-Jae, Deputy Director, Information Planning Division, Information Planning Division, Information and Documentation Bureau, Korean Intellectual Property Office, Daejeon

PARK Yong-Ju, Deputy Director, International Cooperation Division, Korean Intellectual Property Office, Daejeon

REPUBLIQUE TCHÈQUE/CZECH REPUBLIC

Dobroslav PICMAN, Head, Public Reading Room, Industrial Property Office, Prague

ROUMANIE/ROMANIA

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

Elisabeta BALBAIE (Mrs.), Examiner, Patent Directorate, State Office for Inventions and Trademarks (OSIM), Bucharest

Florian CIOLACU, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

ROYAUME-UNI/UNITED KINGDOM

Geoff COURT, Senior Classification and Documentation Manager, The Patent Office, Newport

Dave FRASER, Head of Applications Development, The Patent Office, Newport

SLOVAQUIE/SLOVAKIA

Ratislav MARCOK, Director, Patent Documentation and Information Department, Industrial Property Office of the Slovak Republic, Banská Bystrica

SUÈDE/SWEDEN

Kerstin BERGSTRÖM (Mrs.), Head, Patent Information, Swedish Patent and Registration Office, Stockholm

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

Gunnar LINDBOM, IT-Controller, Design and Trademark Division, Swedish Patent and Registration Office, Söderhamn

SUISSE/SWITZERLAND

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

THAÏLANDE/THAILAND

Supark PRONGTHURA, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

UKRAINE

Galyna DOBRYNINA (Ms.), Head, Division of Information Support, State Department of Intellectual Property, Kyiv

II. ORGANISATIONS INTERGOUVERNEMENTALES/
INTERGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

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

Hamidou KONE, chef, Service informatique et statistique, Yaoundé

Laoubara MBAÏOUNDAKOM NASSIYO, chef, Service de la publication et de la
documentation, Yaoundé

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

Jean-Marie PUTZ, chef des services auxiliaires, La Haye

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

Marc KRIER, Director, Applied Research and Development, Rijswijk

Paul BREWIN, Principal Administrator, Rijswijk

Alfred WENZEL, Publications, Vienna Sub-Office, Vienna

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

Khabibullo FAYAZOV, Vice President, Eurasian Patent Organization, Moscow

Andrey SEKRETOV, Chief Specialist, Eurasian Patent Organization, Moscow

COMMUNAUTÉ EUROPÉENNE (CE)/EUROPEAN COMMUNITY (EC)

Nicolas VIGNERON, External Relations, Office for Harmonization in the Internal Market (Trade
Marks and Designs) (OHIM), Alicante

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

GROUPE DES ÉTATS D'AFRIQUE, DES CARAÏBES ET DU PACIFIQUE (GROUPE DES ÉTATS ACP)/AFRICAN, CARIBBEAN AND PACIFIC GROUP OF STATES (ACP GROUP)

Marwa KISIRI, Ambassabor, Delegation Office, Geneva

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

Lamine MOUAKI BENANI, conseiller, Délégation permanente, Genève

III. ORGANISATION NON GOUVERNEMENTALE
NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATION

Groupe de documentation sur les brevets/(PDG)/Patent Documentation Group (PDG):
Ralf H. BEHRENS (Secretary General, PDG, Weil der Stadt)

IV. BUREAU/OFFICERS

Président/Chair:	Leif STOLT (Suède/Sweden)
Vice-présidents/Vice-Chairs:	Bogdan BORESCHIEVICI (Roumanie/Romania) Young-Woo YUN (République de Corée/ Republic of Korea)
Secrétaire/Secretary:	Neil WILSON (OMPI/WIPO)

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

Division de l'informatique/IT Division: Helen FRARY (Ms.) (chef, Section de l'appui au programme informatique/Head, IT Program Support Section)

Division des systèmes d'information du PCT/PCT Information Systems Division:
Neil WILSON (Directeur par intérim/Acting Director); Angel LÓPEZ SOLANAS (chef, Service des normes et de la documentation/Head, Standards and Documentation Service); James FULLTON (conseiller principal/Senior Counsellor); Sabine PINZAN (Ms.) (Administrateur principal chargé de l'information en matière de propriété industrielle/Senior Industrial Property Information Officer)

Département des marques, des dessins et modèles industriels et des indications géographiques/Trademarks, Industrial Designs and Geographical Indications Department:
Grégoire BISSON (chef, Section des enregistrements internationaux de dessins et modèles industriels et des projets spéciaux/Head, International Industrial Designs Registrations and Special Projects Section); Roger HOLBERTON (chef, Section de l'informatique/Head, Information Technology Section)

Service des systèmes de recherche de technologies/Technology Documentation Service: William GUY (chef, Section de la documentation sur les technologies/Head, Technology Documentation 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. Prioritization of the tasks of the Standards and Documentation Working Group
Oral presentation by the Secretariat
5. Revision of WIPO Standard ST.80 (Task No.33/1)
 - (a) ST.80 Task Force oral progress report by the Task Leader
 - (b) Proposal by the ST.80 Task Force on the revision of WIPO Standard ST.80
See document SCIT/SDWG/4/2.
6. Revision of WIPO Standard ST.10/C (Task No.30)
 - (a) ST.10/C Task Force oral progress report by the Task Leader
 - (b) Proposal by the ST.10/C Task Force on the revision of WIPO Standard ST.10/C
See document SCIT/SDWG/4/3.
7. Revision and establishment of WIPO Standards relating to trademarks
 - (a) Trademark Standards Task Force oral progress report by the Task Force Leader
 - (b) Proposal by the Trademark Standards Task Force
See document SCIT/SDWG/4/4.
8. Renewal of the WIPO *Handbook on Industrial Property Information and Documentation* (Task No. 26)
See document SCIT/SDWG/4/5.
9. Revision of WIPO Standard ST.3
See document SCIT/SDWG/4/6.
10. Recommended minimum contents for intellectual property offices' websites
See document SCIT/SDWG/4/7.

11. Coding of document categories in search reports and front pages of patent documents
See document SCIT/SDWG/4/8.
12. Corrections relating to patent information published by patent offices
See document SCIT/SDWG/4/9.
13. Harmonization and identification of the parts of patent specifications
See document SCIT/SDWG/4/10.
14. Report by the International Bureau on the Annual Technical Reports (ATRs) Management System (Task No. 24)
See document SCIT/SDWG/4/11.
15. Report on progress made by the Electronic Data Processing and Exchange Standards Task Force (Tasks Nos. 13, 17, 18 and 19)
Oral report by the Secretariat
16. Consideration of the SDWG Task List
See document SCIT/SDWG/4/12.
17. Exchange of Information: New publication procedures and data supply
Oral presentation by the German Patent and Trade Mark Office
18. Schedule of activities
See document SCIT/SDWG/4/13.
19. Adoption of the report of the session
20. Closing of the session

[Annex III follows]

ANNEX III

STANDARD ST.80

RECOMMENDATION CONCERNING BIBLIOGRAPHIC DATA RELATING TO INDUSTRIAL DESIGNS

(Identification and Minimum requirements)

*Revision adopted by the SCIT Standards and Documentation Working Group
at its fourth session on January 30, 2004*

INTRODUCTION

1. This Recommendation is aimed at improving the access to information relating to industrial designs in general and to the bibliographic content of design documents, design certificates and entries in official gazettes in particular.
2. This Recommendation provides for codes whereby the various bibliographic data relating to industrial designs, e.g., as given on the first page of a design document, on a design certificate and in an entry in an official gazette, can be identified without knowledge of the language used and the industrial property laws, conventions or treaties applied.
3. This Recommendation further indicates the bibliographic data which, as a *minimum*, should be printed on the first page of a design document and be published as part of an entry in an official gazette.

DEFINITIONS

4. For the purposes of this Recommendation, the expression:
 - (a) "industrial designs" includes two-dimensional and three-dimensional features of shape and surface of objects, and thus covers both concepts of "designs" and "models" where a distinction is made between the former and the latter; the term "industrial designs" does not include design patents, for which WIPO Standard ST.9 is applicable;
 - (b) "design documents" means published documents relating to industrial design registrations or deposits, and published applications therefor;
 - (c) "design certificate" means the official document which is delivered to a design owner certifying that his or her design has been registered or renewed, i.e., has been entered in the design register of the country or organization in question, or has been renewed (this definition also covers "certificates" or "registry extracts" delivered by the industrial property office, e.g., for the purposes of proceedings in court);
 - (d) "official gazette" means an official publication containing announcements with respect to industrial designs made in accordance with requirements under national or regional industrial property legislation or international industrial property conventions or treaties;
 - (e) "entry in an official gazette" means a comprehensive announcement, including bibliographic data, made in an official gazette regarding an industrial design registration or a deposit or an application therefor;
 - (f) "INID" is the acronym for "Internationally agreed Numbers for the Identification of (bibliographic) Data."

REFERENCES

5. References to the following Standards are of relevance to this Standard:

WIPO Standard ST.2	Standard Manner for Designating Calendar Dates by Using the Gregorian Calendar;
WIPO Standard ST.3	Recommended Standard on Two-Letter Codes for the Representation of States, Other Entities and Intergovernmental Organizations;
WIPO Standard ST.9	Recommendation Concerning Bibliographic Data on and Relating to Patents and SPCs;
WIPO Standard ST.81	Recommendation Concerning the Content and Layout of International Design Gazettes.

IDENTIFICATION OF BIBLIOGRAPHIC DATA AND MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS

6. The list of definitions of bibliographic data with their corresponding INID codes is given in Appendix 1 to this Recommendation and entitled "List of INID codes." To assist industrial property offices and users of industrial property documentation, Appendix 2 to this Recommendation contains those INID codes, with their definitions and/or notes, which were used at a certain period of time but have either ceased to be available for use or have been amended.
7. The list has been organized into categories (10 to 80) to facilitate grouping of related data. Categories can contain several groupings.
8. The INID codes which are preceded by a single asterisk (*) relate to those data elements which are considered to be the minimum elements which should appear on the first page of a design document and in an entry in an official gazette. (See also paragraph 13 in this respect.)
9. The INID codes which are preceded by a double asterisk (**) relate to those data elements which are considered to be minimum elements in circumstances specified in the accompanying notes.

APPLICATION OF CODES

10. The INID codes should be associated with the corresponding bibliographic data in so far as these data normally appear on the first page of a design document, on a design certificate or in an entry in an official gazette.
11. Provided the presentation of bibliographic data in entries in an official gazette is uniform, INID codes may be applied to the bibliographic data in a representative specimen entry in each issue of the gazette, instead of being included in each entry.
12. The INID codes should be printed in Arabic numerals, preferably within small circles, or, if this is not possible, in parentheses, immediately *before* the corresponding bibliographic data.
13. If bibliographic data to which INID codes are assigned in accordance with this Recommendation do not appear on the first page of a design document, on a design certificate or in an entry in an official gazette—because they are not applicable (e.g., when no priority is claimed) or for some other reason—it is not necessary to call attention to the non-existence of such elements (e.g., by leaving a space or by providing the relevant INID code followed by a dash).
14. Two or more INID codes may be assigned to a single bibliographic data element, when necessary.
15. Category codes ending in "0" can themselves be used in one, or both, of the following situations:
 - (a) where several individual bibliographic data elements of the same category are present and it is desired to present those individual data elements together without using individual INID codes;
 - (b) where none of the specific INID codes can be assigned to one of the bibliographic data elements which clearly fall within the category definition.
16. The presentation of calendar dates identified by any of the INID codes concerned should be in the sequence and format as recommended in WIPO Standard ST.2.
17. In order to allow the users of design documents, design certificates and official gazettes to make maximum use of the INID codes, it is recommended that a list of the codes used or the complete Recommendation be published in the gazette, at regular intervals (see WIPO Standard ST.81).

IMPLEMENTATION

18. Industrial property offices can start using the Recommendation at any time. It is recommended that when implementing the INID codes an announcement in the sense of paragraph 17 be made and the International Bureau of WIPO be informed, e.g., by forwarding a sample of the official gazette.

APPENDIX 1

LIST OF INID CODES

(10) *Data concerning the registration/renewal*

- * (11) Serial number of the registration and/or number of the design document
- ** (12) Plain language designation of the kind of published document
- * (14) Serial number of the renewal where different from initial registration number
- * (15) Date of the registration/Date of the renewal
- (17) Expected duration of the registration/renewal
- (18) Expected expiration date of the registration/renewal
- ** (19) Identification, using the two-letter code according to WIPO Standard ST.3, of the authority publishing or registering the industrial design

Note: **Minimum data element for design documents only, as defined in subparagraph 4(b).

(20) *Data concerning the application*

- * (21) Serial number of the application
- * (22) Date of filing of the application
- * (23) Name and place of exhibition, and date on which the industrial design was first exhibited there (exhibition priority data)
- (24) Date from which the industrial design right has effect
- (27) Kind of application or deposit (open/sealed)
- (28) Number of industrial designs included in the application
- (29) Indication of the form in which the industrial design is filed, e.g., as a reproduction of the industrial design or as a specimen thereof

(30) *Data relating to priority under the Paris Convention*

- * (31) Serial number assigned to the priority application
- * (32) Date of filing of the priority application
- * (33) Two-letter code, according to WIPO Standard ST.3, identifying the authority with which the priority application was made

Notes: (i) With the proviso that when data coded (31), (32) and (33) are presented together, category code (30) can be used, if so desired.

(ii) For international deposits made under the Hague Agreement, the two-letter code "WO" is to be used.

(40) *Date(s) of making information available to the public*

- (43) Date of publication of the industrial design before examination by printing or similar process, or making it available to the public by any other means
- (44) Date of publication of the industrial design after examination, but before registration, by printing or similar process, or making it available to the public by any other means
- (45) Date of publication of the registered industrial design by printing or similar process, or making it available to the public by any other means
- (46) Date of expiration of deferment

(50) *Miscellaneous Information*

- * (51) International Classification for Industrial Designs (class and subclass of the Locarno Classification)
- (52) National classification
- (53) Identification of the industrial design(s) comprised in a multiple application or registration which is (are) affected by a particular transaction when not all are so affected
- * (54) Designation of article(s) or product(s) covered by the industrial design or title of the industrial design
- ** (55) Reproduction of the industrial design (e.g., drawing, photograph) and explanations relating to the reproduction
- (56) List of prior art documents, if separate from descriptive text
- (57) Description of characteristic features of the industrial design including indication of colors
- (58) Date of recording of any kind of amendment in the Register (e.g., change in ownership, change in name or address, renunciation to an international deposit, termination of protection)

Notes: (i) Code (52) should be preceded by the two-letter code, according to WIPO Standard ST.3, identifying the country whose national classification is used (the two-letter code should be indicated within parentheses).

(ii) **Minimum data element for design documents only, as defined in subparagraph 4(b).

* For the meaning of this asterisk, see paragraph 1. of this Recommendation.

SCIT/SDWG/4/14
Annex III, page 4

(60) *References to other legally related application(s) and registration(s)*

- (62) Serial number(s) and, if available, filing date(s) of application(s), registration(s) or document(s) related by division
- (66) Serial number(s) of the application, or the registration, of the design(s) which is (are) a variant(s) of the present one
- (68) Number of the assigned part of the registration
- (69) Number of the registration resulting from the merger

Note: Category code (60) should be used by countries which were previously part of another entity for identifying bibliographic data elements relating to applications or registrations of industrial designs, which data had initially been announced by the industrial property office of that entity.

(70) *Identification of parties concerned with the application or registration*

- ** (71) Name(s) and address(es) of the applicant(s)
- (72) Name(s) of the creator(s) if known to be such
- ** (73) Name(s) and address(es) of the owner(s)
- (74) Name(s) and address(es) of the representative(s)
- (78) Name(s) and address(es) of the new owner(s) in case of change in ownership

Note: **If registration has taken place on or before the date of making the industrial design available to the public, the minimum data requirement is met by indicating the owner(s); in other cases, by indicating the applicant(s).

(80) *Identification of certain data related to the international registrations of industrial designs under the Hague Agreement Concerning the International Registration of Industrial Designs and data related to other international conventions*

Information regarding designated Contracting Parties/Contracting Parties concerned

- (81) Contracted Parties concerned
 - I Contracting Parties designated under the 1934 Act
 - II Contracting Parties designated under the 1960 Act
 - III Contracting Parties designated under the 1999 Act
- (82) Statements contained in the international application
- (83) Indication as to whether there is a possibility of review or appeal
- (84) Designated Contracting State(s) under regional conventions

Information regarding the owner(s)

- (85) Habitual residence of the owner(s)
- (86) Nationality of the owner(s)
- (87) Domicile of the owner(s)
- (88) State in which the owner(s) has (have) a real and effective industrial or commercial establishment
- (89) "Applicant's Contracting Party"

Note: The data to be referenced by INID codes (81) to (88) should be indicated by using the two-letter code according to WIPO Standard ST.3.

APPENDIX 2

DELETIONS AND AMENDMENTS TO THE CODE LIST GIVEN IN APPENDIX 1

INID Code	Previous definition(s) of code	Pertinent previous note(s)	Date of deletion or amendment	Kind of change
(45)	Date of publication of the registered industrial design by printing or similar process, or making it available to the public by any other means/Date of issuing the registration certificate	–	November 29, 1996, by PCIP/EXEC/XIX	Code definition amended
(80)	Identification of certain data related to the international deposit of industrial designs under the Hague Agreement Concerning the International Deposit of Industrial Designs and data related to other international conventions	–	January 30, 2004, by SCIT/SDWG/4	Code definition amended
(81)	Designated State(s) according to the 1960 Act	–	January 30, 2004, by SCIT/SDWG/4	Code definition amended
(82)	State(s) concerned according to the 1934 Act	–	January 30, 2004, by SCIT/SDWG/4	Code definition amended
(87)	Residence or headquarters of the owner(s)	–	January 30, 2004, by SCIT/SDWG/4	Code definition amended (only English version)

[Annex IV follows]

SCIT/SDWG/4/14

ANNEX IV

STANDARD ST.10/C

PRESENTATION OF BIBLIOGRAPHIC DATA COMPONENTS

Editorial Note prepared by the International Bureau

In accordance with the decision taken by the Standard and Documentation Working Group (SDWG) of the Standing Committee on Information Technologies (SCIT) at its third session on May 8, 2003, the new revisions of paragraphs 2 and 3 of Standard ST.10/C have been adopted and will come into force on January 1, 2005. These revisions incorporate changes made necessary by the IPC reform initiative. Industrial property offices are asked to implement the new versions of paragraphs 2 and 3 of the Standard for all patent documents with a publication date from January 1, 2005, onwards. For patent documents published prior to that date, the previous text of paragraphs 2 and 3 of the Standard should continue to be used.

The previous versions of paragraphs 2 and 3 of Standard ST.10/C, valid until December 31, 2004, are reproduced as an Annex to the new Standard ST.10/C.

STANDARD ST.10/C

PRESENTATION OF BIBLIOGRAPHIC DATA COMPONENTS

*Revision adopted by the SCIT Standards and Documentation Working Group
at its fourth session on January 30, 2004*

PRESENTATION OF DATES

1. For the representation of calendar dates according to the Gregorian calendar, which are printed or displayed in industrial property documents, in entries in official gazettes or in electronic records, WIPO Standard ST.2 is applicable.

PRESENTATION OF CLASSIFICATION SYMBOLS

2. The recommended abbreviation of the International Patent Classification is "Int.Cl.". The version indicator (year) has to be placed in round brackets after the abbreviation "Int.Cl.", if the set of IPC symbols on the document includes at least one core level symbol.

The recommended presentation of classification symbols in printed or formatted display form is as follows:

- classification symbols presented in a tabular form, in such a manner as to facilitate machine transcription;
- the core level symbols printed in regular font style and the advanced level symbols in italics;
- the invention information symbols printed in bold font style and the other information symbols in regular;
- the version indicator for each advanced level symbol (year, month) placed in round brackets after each advanced level symbol.

3. One sample representation of IPC classification symbols and indicators is:

Int. Cl. (2005)
B28B 5/02
B28B 1/29 (2006.03)
H05B 3/18 (2007.06)

Where: **B28B 5/02** is core level classification (regular font style) and invention information (bold font style);
B28B 1/29 is advanced level classification (italics font style) and invention information (bold font style); and
H05B 3/18 is advanced level classification (italics font style) and non-invention information (regular font style).

IPC symbols are defined in Part 5 of the WIPO *Handbook on Industrial Property Information and Documentation* and in the latest version of the Guide to the IPC.

This presentation is effective beginning with the January 1, 2005, edition of the IPC.*

4. The recommended abbreviation of the International Classification for Industrial Designs is "LOC". According to the recommendation of the Committee of Experts of the Locarno Union, the edition of the Classification should be indicated by an Arabic numeral in parentheses, e.g., LOC (6) Cl. 8-05. Classification symbols should be presented with all elements of a given symbol contained in the same line, preferably in such a manner as to facilitate machine transcription. If the numbers of several classes or subclasses must be indicated for one and the same subject matter, the classes should be separated by semicolons and subclasses by commas (for example, LOC (6) Cl. 8-05, 08; 11-01).

PRESENTATION OF APPLICATION NUMBERS

5. Experience has shown the need for application numbers to be presented in a clear, unambiguous manner. The considerations given below apply equally to all presentations of application numbers of patent documents whether to the application number accorded to the application filed in the issuing industrial property office or that filed in the priority country or with an organization.

* See "[Editorial Note](#) by the International Bureau" on the cover page.

6. The presentation of the application number should preferably be:

- (a) exactly in the manner used by the country or organization concerned in full, or
- (b) abbreviated to the minimum significant part, enabling the application to be uniquely identified.

7. When the application number is abbreviated to the minimum significant part (deletion of letters and numerals given by the country or organization concerned for internal or special purposes such as check digits, classification marks, etc.), a need exists for a more uniform presentation thereof, in particular when information presented on the first page of patent documents is composed for printing (e.g., typeset, photocomposed, retyped, etc.). An application number, as represented by the country or organization concerned, may therefore be represented in a more uniform manner using the following rules:

- (a) if the number contains a full stop, a comma, or perhaps a space, one or more of these characters or spaces may be omitted. One or more of these characters or spaces may be inserted for the sake of legibility;
- (b) if the number contains a slash or a hyphen, these characters must be retained. A hyphen may be replaced by a slash;
- (c) the sequence of characters should be left in its original order, e.g., the digits indicating the year of filing of the application must be printed in their original positions;
- (d) no character or set of characters forming the minimum significant part of the application number, other than those characters mentioned in subparagraphs (a) and (b), above, should be altered, e.g.:
 - (i) the year of the Emperor's reign appearing in Japanese application numbers should not be altered according to the Gregorian calendar;
 - (ii) no infilling zeros should be removed or added, e.g., 74/0069 should not be printed as 74/69 or 74/00069;
- (e) in the case of a utility model application number, a letter or set of characters may be used by the country or organization concerned for uniquely defining the application. The letter or set of characters should be removed and the letter "U" inserted after the application number, separated by two blank spaces. The words "utility model" may be added in the plain language of the publishing country or organization;
- (f) year designations according to the Gregorian calendar should be represented by four digits;
- (g) in the case of PCT application numbers, the alphanumeric string consisting of the letters "PCT," the two-letter code identifying the receiving office, and the year, is a significant part of the application number and must not be omitted.

For guidance, two tables setting out the form of presentation of application numbers currently used by several countries or organizations, the minimum significant part of the numbers and the recommended presentation in abbreviated form as priority application numbers, are given in the Appendix to this Standard.

IDENTIFICATION OF COUNTRIES, ORGANIZATIONS AND OTHER ENTITIES ISSUING OR REGISTERING PATENT DOCUMENTS

8. Two-letter codes according to WIPO Standard ST.3 should be used when indicating:

- (a) the country, organization or other entity in which a convention priority application was filed;
- (b) the country, organization or other entity that published prior art patent documents; and
- (c) the country, organization or other entity publishing the patent document. The name of the country, organization or other entity publishing the patent document may be given in plain language, in addition to the ST.3 code, if so desired.

USE AND PRESENTATION OF CHECK DIGITS

9. Check digits are used by several industrial property offices in relation to application numbers or publication numbers for the purposes of internal control. Different systems are in use by different industrial property offices. Most systems give rise to a single control character, either a numeral from "0" to "9" or a letter from "A" to "Z". It is clear that the control character has to be associated with the application number or with the publication number so as to facilitate its control function. However, the control character is not regarded as a significant part of the application number nor as a significant part of the publication number.

10. In order to avoid confusion, it is recommended that the following rules be applied if industrial property offices wish to print a control character associated with an application number or with a publication number on patent documents or in official gazettes:

(a) the control character should consist of a single numeral; letters should not be used so as to avoid confusion with WIPO Standard ST.16;

(b) the control character should be printed immediately after the application number or publication number to which it refers but separated therefrom by a full stop or by a hyphen and preferably in a type font different from that used in the number to which it refers;

(c) industrial property offices publishing control characters associated with application numbers or with publication numbers should publish in their official gazette information explaining their use, repeated at intervals of less than one year.

PRESENTATION OF PRIORITY APPLICATION NUMBERS

11. Priority application numbers are provided to applicants by industrial property offices in the notifications of the first filing and in the certificates of priority under the Paris Convention. Priority application numbers are then cited by applicants when filing a subsequent application for the same or related subject matter before a subsequent industrial property office in accordance with the Paris Convention. The priority application number can then be used by industrial property offices to link all related patent document "families" together in databases and computerized search systems. This ability to create patent families is tremendously valuable to industrial property offices for examination purposes, for example, when a better date of filing is needed during the prosecution of a later unrelated application. Patent families also permit patent examiners to review previously published patent documents in a preferred language, if available. Patent families can help offices save significant classification resources (financial, staffing, etc.) by allowing industrial property offices to use the classifications of one patent family member for all members of the patent family.

These and other uses of patent families make the accurate recording of the priority application number by applicants a critical concern of all industrial property offices. Even small deviations from the correct priority application number format can cause patent documents to not be collected into a patent family. Correction of errors in priority data cause huge expense for industrial property offices. Therefore, it is critical that the provisions of this section of the standard be implemented by industrial property offices as soon as possible.

12. (a) In order to improve the quality of patent family data and to avoid confusion in the presentation of priority application numbers, the following recommendations are made:

Industrial property offices (IPOs) should always provide priority application number complying with "Recommended Presentation in Abbreviated Form as a Priority Application Number" given in the Appendix to the Standard ST.10/C (in addition to the application number or the minimum significant part of the number) when presenting the application number of a patent document in the notification of the first filing and in the certificate of priority. The "Recommended Presentation in Abbreviated Form as a Priority Application Number" should be presented with the Standard ST.3 code (preferably in a specified line or column along with the title "The number of your priority application, to be used for filing abroad under the Paris Convention, is") to be easily recognized as priority number by other IPOs and applicants.

Example of presentation of "Recommended Presentation in Abbreviated Form as a Priority Application Number":

The number of your priority application, to be used for filing abroad under the Paris Convention, is JP2000-001234

(b) Industrial property offices should encourage and facilitate the compliance by applicants of paragraph 12(a) of the Standard ST.10/C when providing the priority application number in subsequent filings.

[End of Annex IV and of document]