



BUNDESMINISTERIUM FÜR
VERKEHR, INNOVATION UND TECHNOLOGIE
Oberste Behörde für den gewerblichen Rechtsschutz
A-1014 Wien, Kohlmarkt 8-10
1372-GR/2000

Vienna, September 28, 2000
Telefon (01) 534 24-0
Telefax (01) 534 24-520
DVR:0078018
ReferentIn: HR Dr.phil. E. Gronau
DW: 320

Ms.

Helen **F R A R Y**

Head

IT Business Management Section

WIPO

34, chemin des Colombettes

CH-1211 Geneva 20

Re.: Circular SCIT 2513 - Proposal for the restructuring of the Standing
Committee on Information Technologies (SCIT)

Dear Ms. Frary,

In response to your Circular SCIT 2513 of September 1, 2000, I would like to submit herewith the comments of the Austrian Patent Office on document SCIT/RES/1 Rev. concerning first proposals for the restructuring of SCIT.

The APO generally supports the concept of separating the activities and responsibilities of SCIT into two new main areas, one being responsible for formulating policy guidance and giving technical advice for an overall IT strategy in the field of intellectual property protection, and one dealing with issues relating to standardization, documentation and dissemination of IP information.

In particular, we would like to comment on the proposal as set out below:

STANDING COMMITTEE ON TECHNICAL STANDARDS AND DOCUMENTATION

To § 11: As under SCIT, the new Committee should also report to other Assemblies of the Union concerned.

To § 12: We wonder which reasons would justify the establishment of a Standing Committee which would exclusively deal with the adoption of new or revised standards. Within SCIT, standardization and documentation work is being carried out by a working group and/or task forces. On the other hand, we support the proposal for a procedure of immediate promulgation after the adoption of new or revised standards.

To § 13: Included in the current Working Program of SCIT are several tasks which do not explicitly refer to standards, e.g. monitoring of certain activities like the operation of WIPO Global Network, conducting studies, Annual Technical Reports etc. Which body would be responsible for those task which would not fall under the mandate of the new Standing Committee? The competence for making proposals for new tasks should be defined. Will the Committee have the responsibility to formulate policies regarding the Working Program?

To § 14: We agree that there should be no working groups and/or task forces of a permanent nature.

To § 15: According to which criteria would the composition of the Committee be set up? Would it be open to all Member States and other organizations concerned?

ADVISORY GROUP ON INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

To § 17: As with the Standing Committee on Technical Standards and

Documentation the mandate which would be given to this Group is not sufficiently clear. If the role of the Advisory Group would be to give technical guidance **on the overall IT strategy** of WIPO then its mandate would need to be clearly defined in relation to the mandates and responsibilities of other WIPO bodies.

Against the background of experiences gained since the establishment of SCIT, it is to be expected that it will take some time until the new bodies will be able to work efficiently. Therefore we consider it necessary that the second draft of a restructuring document should already include a comprehensive definition of the mandate, objectives and responsibilities together with detailed proposals regarding the rules of procedure and working methods.

Yours sincerely,

i.A. HR Dr. E. Gronau
Head of Technical Department XI
Austrian Patent Office