

产权组织标准委员会（CWS）

第十一届会议

2023 年 12 月 4 日至 8 日，日内瓦

关于名称数据清理准则的提案

名称标准化工作队共同牵头人编拟的文件

背 景

1. 在 2017 年举行的产权组织标准委员会（CWS）第五届会议上，标准委员会工作计划增添了一项新任务：第 55 号任务。在同一届会议上还设立了名称标准化工作队，并向其分配了第 55 号任务，任务说明如下：

“设想制定一项产权组织标准，帮助工业产权局更好地从源头确保申请人名称的质量，编写关于采取进一步行动以实现工业产权文献中申请人名称标准化的提案并提交标准委员会审议。”

（见文件 CWS/5/22 第 85 至 88 段。）

2. 标准委员会在 2019 年举行的第七届会议上注意到，秘书处按照第六届会议商定的结果，在 2018 年 11 月分发了一份关于工业产权局使用申请人标识符的调查。由于关于使用标识符的调查已经完成，工作队提议参照该调查修订第 55 号任务的说明。标准委员会批准了修订后的第 55 号任务说明，现为：

“设想制定一项产权组织标准，帮助工业产权局更好地从源头确保申请人名称的质量；编写关于采取进一步行动以实现工业产权文献中申请人名称标准化的提案并提交标准委员会审议。”

（见文件 CWS/7/29 第 72 至 79 段。）

3. 国际局于 2019 年主办了一次讨论名称标准化问题的讲习班。受邀与会的主管局和业界发言人分享了做法和可能的解决方案。在此次讲习班上，国际局注意到各局在名称标准化的数据清理方面有许多不同方法。

4. 工作队自上届会议以来在工作计划方面取得的进展进一步详见文件 CWS/11/22。

拟议准则

5. 名称标准化工作队在第 55 号任务的框架下，编写了关于一套支持工业产权局进行名称数据清理的准则的最终提案。这些准则载于本文件附件。

6. 编写这些准则旨在提供一般性和高层次建议。由于法律要求、数据做法、清理目的、数据的预期用途、资源要求和技术考虑等因素各不相同，因此没有对于所有工业产权局都最适用的单一方法。这些建议旨在反映可适用于任何局的一般做法，以支持清理客户的名称数据，进而支持下游用户使用更好的名称标准化和名称匹配技术。

7. 工作队注意到，产权组织标准 ST. 20 提出了建议，制作公开申请人和其他客户名称的专利文献索引，并推动这些索引中出现的名称使用统一表示形式，同时对索引自身中的名称采用统一的排序方法。因此，准则终稿将提及该标准，并支持使用该标准。

8. 如果标准委员会在本届会议上批准了这些准则，建议委员会请秘书处发布于《产权组织手册》第三部分：https://www.wipo.int/standards/en/part_03_standards.html。

9. 请标准委员会：

(a) 注意本文件及其附件的内容；

(b) 审议并批准上文第 5 至 7 段所述并转录于本文件附件的准则；以及

(c) 如上文第 8 段所述，请秘书处在《产权组织手册》第三部分发布准则。

[后接附件]

GUIDELINES FOR THE DATA CLEANING OF NAMES

*Proposal presented for approval by the Committee on WIPO Standards (CWS)
at its eleventh session*

Introduction	2
DEFINITIONS	2
INTAKE	2
TRANSFORMATION OF NAMES	3
VALIDATION AND DISAMBIGUATION	3
MAINTENANCE	3
PUBLICATION AND DATA EXCHANGE	4
STATISTICAL PURPOSES	4
References	4
ANNEX	1
Transliteration examples:	1
Transcription examples:	2
Translation examples:	2

GUIDELINES FOR THE DATA CLEANING OF NAMES

*Proposal presented for approval by the Committee on WIPO Standards (CWS)
at its eleventh session*

INTRODUCTION

1. This set of guidelines covers general considerations for the intake, processing, cleaning, and publication of clean name data. It does not address the many complex issues with approaches to data cleaning, name localization or transformation such as transliteration, transcription or translation, or approaches to name standardization such as selection of algorithms, where and when transformations are applied, frequency, or merging strategies. These decisions will vary greatly depending on the party applying them, the purpose of transformations, and the quickly evolving nature of matching algorithms.
2. It should be noted that WIPO Standard ST.20 provides recommendations to produce indexes to patent documents giving names of applicants and other customers, and to promote a uniform presentation of names occurring in name indexes as well as a uniform method of ordering the names in the index itself.

DEFINITIONS

3. In the context of this document:
 - (a) "IPO" refers to an Intellectual Property Office, which manage application and registration process for intellectual property rights.
 - (b) "Customer data" means data on applicants, registrants, owners, legal representatives, or other parties held by an IPO in connection with an IP right, application, registration, or other instrument. This standard is primarily concerned with customer name data: personal names, business names, and related information such as city, address, or email that can be used to disambiguate potential name matches.
 - (c) "Clean data" means data that is accurate, consistent, and reliable, free from errors and duplication. As the degree of cleanness in a large complex data set is difficult to measure, various metrics may be used as proxies for cleanness or related properties, such as fitness for purpose.
 - (d) "Transliteration" means the mapping of source language character(s) to target language (phonetic) character(s).
 - (e) "Transcription" means the mapping of a source language character/logogram/syllable/phoneme to something that corresponds to the sound in the respective system of the target language.
 - (f) "Translation" represents the meaning of a word or concept in the source language with something that corresponds to the meaning in the target language.

INTAKE

4. IPOs may provide the ability for customers to create and manage electronic customer records containing published name information: personal names, business names, names of legal representatives, and related information such as city, address, or email.
5. IPOs should allow a customer record to be associated with multiple applications or registrations for IP rights, so that customers may reuse the same name information for multiple applications or registrations and update their name information in one place.
6. IPOs may provide a form(s) which customers use to request the IPOs to create or change their name or related information. IPOs may also allow customers to enter and update their name or related information themselves, or may require a designated party such as employees, contractors, or an external service to enter and update customer records at the customer's request.
7. Multiple records for one customer may be created and managed by different entities, such as different legal representatives. IPOs should consider this when designing their customer record systems, as multiple records for a single customer may contain slight variations of the same data or be updated at different times by different representatives.

8. IPOs may support entry of the customer's name in native characters of the customer's language, in addition to the customer's name in language(s) that the language of operation for an IPO, which should be stored using UTF-8¹ encoding. For instance, an IPO that works in English could allow separate fields for an applicant name in English and the original applicant name in Korean.

9. IPOs may optionally use identification numbers to identify customers. Identification numbers may be created by the IPO or used from an external source, such as a registered business number or passport number. Identification numbers alone do not resolve many issues with clean customer data, such as duplicate entries, name changes, and outdated or incorrect information. IPOs using identification numbers should continue to pay attention to and address the considerations in other parts of these guidelines.

TRANSFORMATION OF NAMES

10. For data exchange and processing, including the receipt of international applications or registrations, IPOs may consider the name transformation (see the Annex to this document). It is recommended that IPOs should send and receive name data using UTF-8 encoding.

11. It should be noted that the localization or conversion of customer names is extremely error prone as there are no generally accepted or uniformed standards. For localization or conversion of names, there are three ways referred to in this set of guidelines: transliteration, transcription and translation. If IPOs transliterate, transcribe or translate characters from one language (such as Greek) to another (such as English), they should publish their scheme of transliteration, transcription or translation. The transliterated, transcribed or translated document, or parts of the document, should be made available to the customer for review and customers should have a way to submit corrections if the transliteration, transcription or translation is flawed.

12. Reverse transliteration should be avoided if possible, instead it is recommended to use the original name instead. For instance, an application filed by "Phony Corp" might be transliterated to Greek characters as "Φονι Κορπ" in an IPO system, and on publication might be reverse transliterated from Greek back to Latin characters as "Foni Corp", leading to mismatches. Examples of common issues arising from reverse, or re-transliteration, re-transcription or re-translation are available in the Annex to this set of guidelines.

VALIDATION AND DISAMBIGUATION

13. Validation and disambiguation approaches should be designed to meet specific objectives, either administrative or statistical, and appropriate methods applied given the objectives. Approaches to name matching and disambiguation should be appropriately scoped and risk assessed given their design objective to ensure appropriate levels of disambiguation are achieved for the use case.

14. IPOs may choose to perform validation of submitted customer information, including automated checks. Validation results should be made available to the customer, and corrections accepted by the customer if needed, including ways to bypass an automated validation mechanism, in case it provides incorrect or incomplete results.

15. IPOs attempting to disambiguate name records (i.e., find duplicate entries) may wish to consider more than just the customer names. Names are not inherently unique. For example, there may be multiple individuals named "John Smith" or multiple companies named "Data Corp". Comparing related data points such as city, post code, birthdate, or other information, where available, can increase the likelihood of successful matches.

16. Any validation or disambiguation process initiated by the IPO that potentially could have legal effects, such as correcting or standardizing the name of the registered owner of an IP right, should be confirmed by the customer before the change is made in the IPO's system.

MAINTENANCE

17. IPOs should develop a strategy to periodically clean data in customer name databases, including searching for and attempt to resolve duplicate records, i.e., multiple records for the same entity. In some instances, the duplicates may be merged or combined, for instance, records with slight unintentional differences in spelling such as "ABC Corp" and "ABC Corp.". In other instances, maintaining separate records might be preferable. Each IPO should decide what approach fits best for their own name record management system. The strategy may include the involvement of the concerned customers of the records in the data cleaning process and the responsibility of the cleaned data.

18. IPOs should provide a mechanism for customers to update their name information on multiple applications or IP rights by entering the information once. For instance, this could be achieved by associating each application or IP right with a single customer record containing name information, or by allowing customers to select multiple applications or IP rights and submit one instance of updated name information to be applied to all of them.

¹ UTF-8 is an encoding system for Unicode.

19. IPOs may designate someone to be responsible for clean data issues, including development of metrics for measuring clean data, regular monitoring and reporting of those metrics, and taking action to improve customer data when needed.

PUBLICATION AND DATA EXCHANGE

20. IPOs should make available updates to name information that are made after an IP right has published. For instance, if “ABC Corp” changes their name to “XYZ Corp” in their customer record, then the name “XYZ Corp” should be associated with the IP right in online publications. The original name may also appear on the published IP right, according to legal requirements of the IPO.

21. If an IPO has other forms of a customer name, such as original name expressed using native characters, these should be included in published data and the data exchanged with other IPOs.

22. If an IPO uses identification numbers to identify entities, the numbers should be included in published data and data exchanged with other IPOs. If the identification numbers are sensitive and cannot be shared, then the IPO should indicate which customer data uses these identification numbers, such as by replacing the sensitive numbers with generated unique numbers for publication.

STATISTICAL PURPOSES

23. For statistical purposes, IPOs may attempt to match customer data with variations in customer names, or other fields, to achieve counts that are more accurate. In such cases, IPOs should publish their matching strategy or algorithm along with the statistical results so others can understand the methodology used.

REFERENCES

24. References to the following Standard are of relevance to this set of guidelines:

WIPO Standard ST.20 Preparation of name indexes to patent documents

[Annex follows]

ANNEX

DIFFERENT MEANS OF NAME TRANSFORMATION

*Proposal presented for approval by the Committee on WIPO Standards (CWS)
at its eleventh session*

Although transliteration and transcription are different concepts from a linguistic perspective, the result is usually very similar for character-based writing systems. However, transcription provides a more practical result, because only standard characters from the target language are required for the conversion.

With English as the Lingua Franca of the global(ized) economy, it is generally overlooked that transcription is rarely standardized between any pair of languages. In the best case there are official definitions for [xx] -> [en] leading to the assumption that [xx] -> [en] -> [yy] is equal to [xx] -> [yy], which is usually not correct.

TRANSLITERATION EXAMPLES²:

Figure 1 shows below an example of letter correspondence and remarks regarding this transliteration.

Source and Target words	Letter Correspondence	Description
English to Persian		
John /dʒɒn/	J o h n	<i>h</i> is a silent letter (no sound is associated to the letter) and is not transliterated
جان /dʒɒn/	ج ا ن	
Arabic to English		
نجيب /nædʒiːb/	ن ج ي ب	short vowel /æ/ on N is normally not written in Arabic script
Najib /nædʒiːb/	Na j i b	
English to Japanese		
Bill /bi:l/	B i l l	each syllable in Japanese is a consonant-vowel sequence
ビル [bi-ru]	\ / \ / ビ ル	
English to Hindi		
Adam /ædəm/	A d a m	the second "a" is not transliterated in Hindi
अदम /ædəm/	अ द म	

Figure 1: Transliteration example

² Machine Transliteration Survey

https://www.researchgate.net/figure/Transliteration-examples-in-four-language-pairs-Letter-correspondence-shows-how-the_fig1_220566444

TRANSCRIPTION EXAMPLES:

Shown below are examples where transcription can lead to inaccuracies:

[ru]: Ш → [de]: sch³

[ru]: Ш → [en]: sh

[ko]: ㅸ → [de]: ja⁴

[ko]: ㅸ → [en]: ya

[gr]: Ω → latin: O⁵

[da]: Æ → [de]: Ä or AE, [en]: AE⁶

TRANSLATION EXAMPLES:

In the first example, it is clear that the direct translation can lead to issues:

[de]: Aktiengesellschaft → [en]: corporation, stock co, ...

[ru]: ОАО Силовые машины → [en]: OJSC "Power Machines" - OR - [en]: Open Joint-stock Company "Power Machines"

A second example below, which demonstrates a typical borderline cases of the Romanization of a Chinese company name shown in Figure 2 are:

- [zh]: 北京东土科技股份有限公司 → [en] transliterated (pinyin): běi jīng dōng tǔ kē jì gǔ fèn yǒu xiàn gōng sī ;
- [zh]: 北京东土科技股份有限公司 → [en] transcribed (pinyin): beijing dongtu keji gufen youxian gongsi
- [zh]: 北京东土科技股份有限公司 → [en] translated (English): Beijing, China Science and Technology Joint-stock Limited Company
- [zh]: 北京东土科技股份有限公司 → in reality : Kyland Technology Co., Ltd.

(71) 申请人: 北京东土科技股份有限公司 (KYLAND TECHNOLOGY CO., LTD) [CN/CN]; 中国北京市石景山区实兴大街 30 号院 2 号楼 8 层 901, Beijing 100041 (CN)。

Figure 2: Romanization of Chinese company name

[End of Annex and of guidelines]

³ https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kyrillisches_Alphabet#Russisch

⁴ https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Koreanisches_Alphabet

⁵ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Romanization_of_Greek

⁶ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dania_transcription