

XML4IP Task Force Meeting

Alexandria, USA, November 4-8, 2013

Meeting REPORT

## INTRODUCTION

The XML4IP Task Force meeting took place in Alexandria from 4 to 8 November 2013. The following seven offices/organizations were represented at the meeting: AU, EM, GB, KR, RU, US and the International Bureau (IB). The adopted meeting agenda and participants list are reproduced as Annexes to this report.

The meeting was opened by the IB and welcome statements were made by Mark Powell, Senior Advisor to the Director and Toby Bennett, Director of the Office of Program Administration Organization from USPTO. Mr. Lopez Solanas from the IB chaired the meeting.

The TF participants would like to extend most sincere thanks to USPTO for the excellent hospitality and wonderful facilities they made available for us during our Task Force meeting. The pleasant atmosphere contributed to our work and aided us in continuing our progress in discussions about the XML standard for Industrial Property (IP).

## DISCUSSIONS, CONCLUSIONS, AND AgreementS

### Agenda Item 3: Progress report on the ST.96 Development by the Task Force Leader

The Task Force Leader delivered a progress report on the development of ST.96 since the last XML4IP Task Force meeting. He highlighted the revision of Annex III (XML Schema), discussion on change of rules in Annex I (DRCs), amendments to the Main Body and results of the testing carried out on Annex VI.

The Task Force Leader stated an objective for the task force members to determine which of the discussion items that will be discussed this week should be included in the next version of ST.96 (version 2.0). The outcome of this meeting will be posted on the Wiki for comment by all Task Force members whose comments will be further discussed for moving forward with finalizing version 2.0. He also expected other outcomes, i.e., final drafts of Annexes V and VI, PFRs of the Main Body and Annexes I, II, III and IV.

### Agenda Item 4: the scope of ST.96

The GB Delegation presented their proposal for expanding the scope of ST.96 to include Copyright domain for which the copyright owners cannot be determined, or when determined, contacted. GB stated that they have already decided to use the ST.96 Design Rules. The AU Delegation added that they would like to see ST.96 cover Plant Breeder Rights. EM (OHIM) Delegation also wants to extend ST.96 to support Geographical Indications. The RU Delegation noted that they had already presented a proposal on Geographical Indications schema in 2012 for consideration by the Task Force that was discontinued. The IB stated that the mandate of the XML4IP TF is to revise ST.96, which covers only the three IP modalities, patents, trademarks, and designs. The IB explained that if GB, AU and EM Offices wanted to expand the scope of ST.96 to cover Copyright, Plant Breeder Rights and Geographical Indication issues, these proposals would also mean an extension of the standardization-effort scope of the CWS. Therefore, since this discussion was out of the scope of ST.96 and of the mandate given by the CWS to the XML4IP TF, the said Offices should present their proposals for consideration by the CWS whenever they consider it appropriate.

The US Delegation presented their proposal for moving several elements (P, Heading, and PatentImage) to Common to use for administrative/reference documents beyond the scope of filing to publication. AU added that they also would like to use ST.96 for internal messaging. GB stated that they may possibly want to be able to use this in the future. While the IB realizes that ST.96 cannot possibly meet all needs, there may be some fundamental common constructs that can be extended to meet other IPO needs. There was further discussion regarding the fact that paragraph is a common markup and so it logically makes sense to include it in the common namespace. However, it was also discussed that since the only area using paragraph right now is Patent domain it should remain in the patent namespace to adhere to DRCs. These state that if a component is only used in one domain it should be defined within that namespace. The IB stated that since this is not a simple movement, they would like the USPTO to provide examples of how MarkImage and ViewType would extend com:Image and also provide a revised content model for P.

After several discussions on the movement of P, finally, the TF participants agreed to move pat:P in its entirety to com:P so that IP Offices will be able to use ST.96 to mark-up any other IP-related documents, e.g., administrative documents and internal messaging.

### Agenda Item 5: Revision of ST.96 XML Schemas (Annex III): ST.96 Common

Issue 479 (Presentation components) – Closed. Participants noted the discussions TF members had and agreed to close the issue.

Issue 485 (Locarno Classification) – Closed. GB said that they are still waiting to hear from their colleagues, but it doesn’t look like they will need any changes. Participants initially agreed on the proposal posted on the Wiki and to close the issue. Finally, however, TF participants agreed to replace the word “Locarno” in the components names with “Design”. Please refer to the agreement on Issue 514 below.

Issue 500 – Closed. USPTO Business area confirmed external reference should implement a single reference at this time not the multiple references. Participants agreed to close this issue and update Annex I, Appendix C of DRC to change extRefs to extRef.

Issue 503:

1. US Delegation presented its proposal on common Image, MarkImage and View which were extended from com:Image. Even though it was initially planned to keep the patent specific items from paragraph in the patent namespace, it was determined that due to the need for backward compatibility with ST.36 it would be better to move all the components in paragraph to the common namespace. Even though this provided backward compatibility, the TF participants considered that it was not correct to include the patent specific components in common namespace. It was noted that there was an issue with moving all the normal paragraph markup components to the common namespace, because the DL component, which would be considered a normal paragraph markup component contained a patent component. The USPTO agreed to re-evaluate their requirements and approach and report back to the group.
2. The USPTO presented an example of how tmk:MarkImage could be extended from com:Image with additional TM specific components. There was much discussion that centered around the pros and cons of extending versus reusing elements. Although some TF participants supported extending as long as the amount of nesting was kept at one level, which would not add too much complexity and it would keep the number of components that would need to be redefined to a minimum, there was no consensus. Therefore, additional discussion was needed for the following items:

* Common Image
* Including Image in Phrase Type
* Extend Image for MarkImage and View

1. The USPTO presented their proposal to add ViewKindCategory and ViewCategory to ViewType to support Design. Even though TF participants tentatively agreed to simplify things by using a basic common Image (com:Image) without ImageContentCategory and to extend com:Image for MarkImage and ViewType, the WIPO IB requested that the USPTO provide OHIM with their requirements for Image within their reference documents (e.g., values for ImageContentCategory) and to think about what the best approach is for the three modalities. It was noted that if the decision is made to move paragraph to the common namespace, then image would also move to the common namespace.
2. Finally, it was agree that PatentImage from Patent to Common in its entirety and rename to Image. The TF participants also agreed to add com:Image to PhraseType. MarkImage and ViewType will not be changed.

The UPSTO presented their proposal to replace the current ResolutionQuantity element with two elements: HorizontalResolutionQuantity and VerticalResolutionQuantity. The TF participants agreed to use a choice between single resolution and dual resolution.

Issue 505: TF participants discussed empty elements and agreed as follows:

* + 1. AuthorizationType: TF participants agreed to keep the current AuthorizationCategory as mandatory. OHIM, UK IPO, and USPTO will provide improved description text for this element.

Action Item: OHIM, UK IPO, and USPTO will provide improved description text for this element

* + 1. ReimbursementType: TF participants agreed to keep as currently defined in D5.
    2. ElectronicAccessType: TF participants agreed to keep as currently defined in D5.
    3. PatentDocumentIdentification: TF participants agreed to keep as currently defined in D5.
    4. RelatedPublication: TF participants agreed to keep as currently defined in D5.
    5. RelatedApplication: TF participants agreed to keep as currently defined in D5.
    6. BasicApplication: TF participants agreed to keep as currently defined in D5.
    7. ExparteAppealType: TF participants agreed to keep as currently defined in D5.
    8. GoodsServicesClassificationBagType: TF participants agreed to keep as currently defined in D5.
    9. LegalProceedingsType: TF participants agreed to keep as currently defined in D5.
    10. RecordNationalInternationalReplacementType: TF participants agreed to keep the current structure in D5.
    11. RegistrationShortNotationType: TF participants agreed to keep as currently defined in D5.
    12. DesignRepresentationSheet: OPEN. OHIM stated that fully optional would work best and identifying the mandatory elements will be best addressed in implementation, which was the approach for ST.36 and ST.66. Rospatent and USPTO would prefer to provide stronger validation if possible by using a choice of SheetFileName and ViewBag.
    13. BasicRegistrationApplicationType: TF participants agreed to use unbounded choice.

TF participants also discussed orphan elements and agreed as follows:

* + URI, URIBag, URIBagType: TF participants agreed to remove these components.
  + CorrectionNotice, CorrectionNoticeType, GazetteReferenceDate, OriginalDocumentKindCode, OriginalDocumentPublicationDate and RepublishDocumentKindCode: TF participants agreed to remove these components which are not used any component.

Issue 507 – Closed.

1. TF participants agreed to keep the component name of DateTime and change the DRC to use DateTime instead of Timestamp as the representation term. When ST.96 moves to XML 1.1 there will be the possibility to add a new representation term Timestamp with the data type of xsd:dateTimeStamp, which would include a mandatory time zone. TF participants initially agreed to add the components for SubmissionDateTime in Common. Participants also agreed on the description of SubmissionDateTime which would read “The date and time that a form or document is submitted to an IP office.” The TF participants agreed that the element and description applied regardless of whether the submission was submitted via paper, fax, or electronic means. However, considering the agreement on IssueID-506(Patent eRenewal) below, TF participants agreed to defer adding SubmissionDateTime to ST.96.
2. FilingDate, ApplicationDate, ApplicationDateTime, DesignApplicationDate, DesignApplicationDateTime:
   * + - TF participants agreed to change the data type of tmk:ApplicationDate to com:DateType
       - TF participants agreed to keep the names of pat:FilingDate, dgn:DesignApplicationDate and tmk:ApplicationDate components as they are in D5 in their namespaces.

IssueID-511 Payment: No Decision. GB’s Proposal for Credit Card or Deposit Account Payments: The GB will provide their latest proposal and work with USPTO and GB to analyze/incorporate the WIPO payments and will present on Thursday.

Action Item: GB will provide their latest proposal and will work with USPTO to analyze and incorporate WIPO payments.

Action Item: TF participants agreed to further investigate whether we can have a global transaction in common.

Action Item: WIPO IB will set up a WebEx to discuss this issue

Issue 513 - Application Number (ApplicationNumberText ¦ ST13ApplicationNumberType): The TF participants agreed to fix the error ST13ApplicationNumberType with the proposed pattern in Wiki and keep the current ApplicationNumber model.

<xsd:simpleType name="ST13ApplicationNumberType">

    <xsd:restriction base="xsd:string">

        <xsd:pattern value="\d{2}\d{4}\d{9}"/>

    </xsd:restriction>

</xsd:simpleType>

GB delegation stated that ST13ApplicationNumber fix is still missing the office ST3 code.

Action Item: This will be further investigated and, if necessary, fixed by the IB in collaboration with GB and US.

Issue 515 – FigurativeElementClassificationType, MarkImageCategory, ViewCategory: The TF participants agreed with the following

* Keep the current Content Model
* Change the name of ViennaCategoryCodeType to CategoryCodeType. There is no need to change the description of the CategoryCode (“code of classification of figurative elements”).

Rospatent’s proposals

Rospatent presented their requirement to have a separate ContactAddress for publication that only included Name and CountryCode in one element. The USPTO has the same issue and only publishes Name, City, State, and Country. The TF participants agreed to added a new component, PublicationAddressType (com:CityName?, com:GeographicalRegionName?, com:CountryCode) to Bibliographic Data.

Action Item: The IB will create a new Issue ID for discussion on PublicationAddress(Type ).

Rospatent expressed its need to populate Name and Address in one field. Knowing potential needs from other IPOs, the participants agreed to add a new element, ContactText (Contact information in free format) in ContactType and a choice between the group of current Contact child elements and ContactText)

Other proposals

As per JPO’s comment, it was agreed that data type of BitDepthQuantity will be changed from “integer” to “nonNegativeInteger”.

It was agreed that:

* all components related to category, code, and identifier will be defined using xsd:token;
* all simple types containing enumerations will be defined as xsd:token instead of xsd:string; and;
* all simple types with enumeration values starting with a numeric value will be updated to begin with a non-numeric character in the first position. For example, HeadingLevelCodeType will contain values H1, H2, H3, H4,…H15 instead of 1, 2, 3, 4.

TF participants agreed to add the following values to ResolutionUnitCodeType:

* DPI: Dots per inch
* PPI: Pixels per inch

### Agenda Item 6: Revision of ST.96 XML Schemas (Annex III): ST.96 Patent

Issue 425 – Closed. TF participants agreed on JPO’s proposal to move IncorporationByReferenceIndicator to PriorityClaimBag from PriorityClaim and update its description as follows: "Indicate that an element or part is incorporated by reference in the (international) application"

Issue 439 (ST.9 INID codes). TF participants agreed to include the reference of the ST.9 INID code in the descriptions of Patent components where possible.

Action Item: WIPO IB, Rospatent , and USPTO will work to update the mapping of the INID codes to ST.96 D5/D6 and will set up a deadline.

Issue 478 – Open. Patent Announcement/Notification: Decision Postponed

Issue 483 (Patent Classification) – Open. TF participants agreed to the following:

* 1. Add a new ECLAClassificationBag proposed by GB to PatentClassificationBag
  2. Add IPCRClassificationBag to PatentClassificationBag. IPCRClassificationBag contains multiple current IPCRClassification elements.
  3. Change descriptions of values ‘F’ and ‘L’ as posted by the IB
* F: “First position of classification symbol”
* L: “Later position of classification symbol”

Action Item: GB will follow-up to determine whether they will need to add the linked indexing code group and unlinked indexing code to IPCClassification.

Action Item: US and GB will organize online meeting to discuss PatentDocumentKindCode within 2 weeks.

Action Item: US needs to decide whether we still need SchemeOriginationCode.

Action Item: US will create the new ECLAClassificationBag based on GB proposal.

Issue 501 – Closed. ClaimText, CrossReference, FigureReference: TF participants agreed that ClaimText, CrossReference, FigureReference can stay as they are in D5.

Issue 502 – Closed. OriginalPatentDocumentIdentification: TF participants agreed to the following changes.

1. PatentRepublicationInformation(Type) to PatentDocumentRepublication(Type)
2. PreviousCorrectionInformationBag(Type) to PreviousCorrectionBag(Type)
3. PreviousCorrectioninformation(Type) to PreviousCorrection(Type)

Issue 504 – Closed. ReferenceCitationBag Proposal 1 (item 24) and Proposal 2 (item 25): The TF participants agreed to create a new element, ReferenceCitationFreeFormat (with the same two attributes as ReferenceCitationType) defined as PType and change ReferenceCitationBag to a choice between ReferenceCitation and new ReferenceCitationFreeFormat (“Reference cited in support of the application in free format”).

Issue 506, Issue 512 (Patent Renewal Document and OnlineFiling ) – Closed. TF participants discussed Patent Renewal Document and OnlineFiling proposed by GB and agreed on the need of a higher level component, Transaction, such as TrademarkTransaction. It was agreed to close the issues and create a new Issue to discuss PatentTransaction or common Transaction.

Action Item: IB will create new issue to cover Patent Transactions, which is related to Patent Renewal and Patent Online Filing.

Action Item: GB, EM and IB will work together to determine the approach/direction.

Issue 510 – Owner vs Holder: TF participants agreed to the following

1. Rename NewHolder to Holder in tmk:HolderBag and dgn:HolderBag, unless there is a name conflict
2. Change Choice type between PreviousHolder and NewHolder (renamed to Holder)to Sequence
3. Continue discussion on this issue.

Action Item: USPTO will check to ensure there is no name conflict.

Action Item: WIPO IB will create new issue for renaming the HolderBag and post on wiki.

KIPO’s Proposal

Issue Add RegistrationDate: TF participants agreed to the following changes to PatentGrantIdentification:

1. Change description for IssueDate to “Date of Publication”.
2. Add com:RegistrationDate with the description of “Date of Registration”

Issue AppealInformation: No other IPO currently has reviewed or worked in this area with regards to this standard. No delegation has markup data for appeal now. TF participants asked KIPO to continue the development and share its progress with TF members.

Issue TechnologyTransfer and NationalFundingResearchProject: It was noted that no other IPOs have the requirement to mark-up this information in details. USPTO populates the information in paragraph text format in the description section of patent application body. Therefore, TF participants agreed that KIPO add the detailed mark-up in their own implementation.

Rospatent’s Proposals

Rospatent publishes abstract in two languages RU and EN. The TF participants agreed to a new document component for patent publication like it is represented in ST.36 (xx-patent-document.dtd). It was agreed that ApplicationBody will not be amended because it was not designed to be used for publication.

Action Item: USPTO, Rospatent, and the IB will work together to propose a new component for patent publication that will reuse the existing components within 2 weeks.

Rospatent reported that in D5 the com:IPOfficeCode exists in both ApplicationIdentification and its child element, ApplicationNumber. TF participants agreed that IPOfficeCode is required in ApplicationNumber since ApplicationNumber is independently used by other components; therefore the current structure is correct and no changes are required.

According to Rospatent’s comments on PartyBag in D5, TF participants agree to the following

1. revise the description to be “Collection of parties”
2. change Sequence to Multiple Choice

With regard to Rospatent’s comments on pat:InternationalPublishingData in D5, the element for the publication date of a PCT application (INID87) is missing from the element pat:InternationalPublishingData. The TF participants agreed that Rospatent should be using PatentPublicaitonIdentfication in pat:InternationalPublishingData.

Other proposals

TF participants agreed to change the description of FilingDate with “The date assigned by the Patent Office that identifies when an application meets certain criteria to qualify as having been filed.”

TF participants agreed to add the following descriptions for pat:subsetIndicator in ProtectionRequestType: “Protection request for the designated Office”. TF participants noted that USPTO and WIPO/IB will investigate further the missing descriptions in applicantSequenceNumberReference attribute used by SuccessorRightsType.

TF participants agreed to remove PatentDocument.xsd that was erroneously included in D4 and subsequently D5.

With regard to DL, as a correction, it was agreed to move the multiple choice of DT and DD directly under DL.

It was agreed to change pat:RelatedDocumentType to pat:DocumentRelationType. Since pat:RelatedDocumentType (used by elements in RelatedDocumentBag) and pat:RelatedDocumentBagType in D5 represent different business concepts, to avoid the confusion.

### Agenda Item 7: Revision of ST.96 XML Schemas (Annex III): ST.96 Trademark

Issue 414 - Mark Record: There is another TF that will work on LegalStatus starting in December ­of 2013. The WIPO IB recommended that the XML4IP TF move forward with the current MarkCurrentStatusCode, which provides free format legal status description text. It was noted that the understanding is that certain Offices will define their own internal structures, which at some point should be formulated into a specific proposal for the XML4IP TF.

Issue 415 - Other DateCategory: Rospatent presented their proposal to add tmk:OtherPriorityBag and Priority Details. The WIPO IB requested Rospatent to define their business requirements for the OtherPriorityBag so that the TF participants could determine how best to move forward. The TF participants agreed to keep PriorityBag until Rospatent provides further information.

Action Item: RU provides the revised proposal on OtherPriorityBag.

Issue 461 – MarkCategoryType:

1. There was much discussion on this topic. Rospatent stressed their need to keep the current values for Well-Known mark. Several of the other TF participants proposed to simplify the values, since multiple values could be supplied. The simplification presented by the Madrid Office and supported by the GB and the USPTO included the following values: TM, Service mark, Individual, Collective, Certification, and Well-known. The following options were identified:
   1. Keep the values the same as they are currently
   2. Collapse 3 well-known into only one well-known
   3. Simplify the values
   4. Add Well-known indicator
2. Rospatent stated that the option “iii” above is what they had originally proposed but it was rejected by the USPTO. Rospatent supports the option “ii” partially (collapse Well-known 16 TRIPS (2) and 16 TRIPS (3) into only one well-known, but also keep Collective well-known)and also has no objection to option "i" (Keep the values the same as they are currently) as WIPO has provided a reasonable explanation for it.
3. The IB proposed that MarkCategoryType is kept the same except for making changes to the special characters used in the enumerations and that each TF participant should consult with their own legal department and then provide corresponding comments on the wiki within 2 weeks of the end of this Task Force meeting.

Action Item: Keep the same and consult with each office’s legal department to ensure we understand the difference between 16(2) TRIPS and 16(3) TRIPS. Each office would then provide corresponding comments on the wiki within 2 weeks from today.

In addition, KIPO presented their proposal to add the following three additional values to MarkCategoryType.

1. Geographical Indication collective mark application for registration
2. Geographical Indication Certification Mark
3. Business emblem application for registration

The IB and other TF participants inquired into whether the requirements for each of these new categories were consistent with the existing mark categories. If the requirements are different, then maybe they should be considered as new modalities, in which case KIPO should create a proposal to the CWS requesting to include them in the scope of ST.96. This is similar guidance to that provided to the GB with regards to the Copyright area. Since KIPO is the only office that handles Business Emblem Mark, the TF participants agreed to extend the MarkCategory to fit their needs in their implementation.

Issue 482 (CollectiveMark) – Closed. The TF participants agreed to add two new elements,ie., MarkUserBag (**com:Contact+, com:CommentText?)** and MarkFeatureDescription (xsd:string). The participants also agreed the following text for the description respectively:

1. MarkUserBag: Collection of mark users
2. MarkFeatureDescription: Description of particular features or criteria of the product or service.

Issue 484 ("MaintenanceFiling" vs "MarkRecordType") – Closed. The TF participants agreed that the two components are different and they will both remain. It was agreed to close the issue.

Issue 492 (**Plaintiff** and **Opponent** in Opposition) – Closed.

1. The TF participants agreed option 1 as posted on the Wiki Option 1 is reproduced below and the Issue is closed.

***Option 1:****Keep 'Plaintiff' and delete 'Opponent'; and add "opponent" in the description of 'Plaintiff''. It would read "The party that is seeking legal remedies in a national trial or board proceeding. Also known as pursuer, claimant, opponent or petitioner in some jurisdictions."*

1. TF participants also agreed to add all elements in Opponent to Plaintiff if they do not exist in Plaintiff and then remove Opponent.

Rospatent’s proposal

tmk:OppositionBag and TransactionErrorBag should be optional: The TF participants agreed to change tmk:OppositionBag in TrademarkType and TransactionErrorBag in TrademarkTransactionBodyType to optional.

KIPO’s proposals

Final retroactive date: The TF participants agreed that KIPO will reuse the DivisionalApplicationBag and create ChangeApplicationBag(Type) with the two child elements defined in DivisionalApplicationBag.

Type of Trademark: Decision Postponed

Here are the options that the TF participants identified:

* 1. Unbounded so multiple values could be selected (e.g., Mark with only colour and Three D Mark)
  2. Create new values for OtherCombinedVisual and OtherCombined Non-Visual
  3. Only use the values that are agreed Madrid values and then others become national values

Action Item: KR will report its implementation on ChangeApplicationBag(Type) to the XML4IP TF.

AuthorityCorrection: The TF participants discussed a proposal from KIPO and admitted the need of authority correction. However, this issue need to be further investigated because there may be more events.

Action Item: GB will provide the full list of the Events within 2 weeks.

Action Item: WIPO IB will set up a WebEx for the TF participants to discuss where these events should be used. Note: GB stated they thought it would be in BasicRecordCategory.

Other proposals

TF participants agreed to add the following descriptions for the missing descriptions elements or attributes found in Schema D5 Trademark:

1. Trademark: ChangeDescriptionText: “Description of the nature of the change to a data element within the registration that is being republished”
2. Trademark: RegistrationChange: “The details about the changes that have been made to a registration”
3. Trademark: ChangeText: “Detailed description of the change”
4. Trademark: PreviousRegistrationStatusBag: “The status of the case that has been identified as being previously registered. For example, the details of the status of a previous international registration that served as the basis for the current national registration.”
5. Trademark: RegistrationChangeBag:  “The collection of the changes to Trademark Registration”

It was noted that TrademarkApplication.xsd exists in 2 places in Schema D5 version. TF participants agreed that TrademarkApplication.xsd in Document folder will be kept as is, but TrademarkApplication.xsd in Trademark folder will be deleted.

It was also noted that different data types, e,g., xsd:date and DateType, are used by Date components. TF participants agreed that the current definition of date related components will remain unchanged. Xsd:date and DateType are defined and used for different purposes. A component that requires a full date will be defined using xsd:date. Components that do not always have the full date will be defined using DateType. The Appendix B of Annex I will be updated stating that representation term date can be assigned to DateType or xsd:date.

It was noted that “Code” related components do not always contain enumerations. Appendix B of Annex I description for code needs to be more relaxed to allow freeform entries. Description will be updated as follow: “Represents finite, predetermined values, or free format.”

In order to avoid local declaration, TF participants agreed to update EarlierMark to directly use EarlierMarkType.xsd as follow:

<xsd:element name="EarlierMark" type="tmk:EarlierMarkType">

### Agenda Item 8: Revision of ST.96 XML Schemas (Annex III): ST.96 Design

Issue 514 dgn:IndicationProductBag(Type) is a generic model: No Decision Yet

TF participants discussed the proposal posted by the TF Leader. TF participants considered the proposal along with the agreed Locarno Classification under Issue 485. The TF participants agreed to the following:

1. Replace word Locarno with word Design throughout the LocarnoClassificationBag and within LocarnoClassfication including description.
2. Need new attribute/element: DesignClassificationScheme: Locarno, National

Issue 516 ViewAngleCategory to dgn:ViewType: TF participants agreed to add new ViewAngleCategory element to dgn:ViewType with values of Front, Back, Left, Right, Top, Bottom, Isometric, Front surface, Back surface and Reference.

Action Item: KIPO and AU will propose the improved descriptions for the values.

KIPO’s proposals

TF participants agreed to add a new element for DesignPublicationCategory to PublicationType in Design with the following values:

* + - PreRegistration publication
    - PostRegistration publication

Action Item: KIPO will provide the new DesignPublicationCategory element to capture the two values PreRegistrationPublication and PostRegistrationPublication under the PublicationType in Design.

The TF participants agreed to create a new element for Design: OriginalApplication with the following child elements: OriginalApplicationIdentifier, OriginalApplicationDate, OriginalApplicationKindCode.

Action Item: KIPO will provide the description of elements and values of OriginalApplicationKindCode.

SubsequentDesignationDate: TF participants agreed that KIPO should use Tmk:RecordEffectiveDate.

Other proposals

TF participants agreed to add the following descriptions in periodCategory attribute: “Category of time period”.

### Agenda Item 9: Revision of ST.96 Design Rules and Conventions (Annex I)

Rule GD-05: TF participants agreed to change word “or” to “and”.

Rule GD-06: TF participants agreed to the use of the “{“ to indicate optional.

Rule GD-13: TF participants agreed to modify Rule GD-13 as follows:

“Acronyms and abbreviations at the beginning of an attribute declaration MUST appear in all lower case. All other acronym and abbreviation usage in an attribute declaration MUST appear in as listed in Appendix C.”

Rule GD-30: TF participants agreed to replace dash with underscore.

Rule SD-07 TF participants agreed to USPTO’s proposed change.

USPTO reported the following special characters in the enumeration values will cause automatic Java code generation tool to fail:

* Values beginning with numbers: 0-9
* Period in the values: period (.)
* Comma in the values: comma (,)
* Spaces in the beginning of the values: spaces
* Dashes in the values: dash (-)
* Ampersand in the values: ampersand (&amp;)

In order to avoid the problem, with regard to SD-45, TF participants agreed with the following:

1. Proposed Rule SD-45: The characters used in enumeration lists MUST be restricted to the following set: {a-z, A-Z, space underscore (\_)}.
2. Add the following statement: “Enumeration values should not start with a numeric digit.”
3. Remove special characters except underscore and white space from enumerated values because of a limitation with JAVA object transformation web service tools
4. Change “&” to the word “Ampersand”

Action Item: WIPO IB will change the wording of the rule to make it clearer.

Action Item: WIPO IB will identify all the components that have leading numeric values and the other prohibited characters in an enumerated list.

Action Item: US and IB will change the description to explain how to render the “&” in XML.

The TF participants agreed on the changes to all special characters in values as documented in Annex III which is attached as a separate file (D6\_EnumerationValues\_AnnexIII.xls).

DRC paragraph 75: TF participants agreed to change extRefs to extRef.

DRC paragraph 80: TF participants agree on the changes that the IB proposed.

Action Item: The WIPO IB will decide later where to put the release number for Release Notes.

DRC Appendix A: TF participants agreed to update Appendix A in order to reflect the updated Rules in the table.

DRC Appendix B: It was agreed that Timestamp needs to be replaced with DateTime

DRC Appendix C: TF participants agree to

1. replace ExtRefs with ExtRref.
2. add the abbreviation “H{n}” to the table with description of Heading Level where “n” is within 1-15.

DRC paragraph 19: It was noted that paragraph 19 may need to be updated.

Action Item: WIPO IB will determine what to do with paragraph 19: either remove or update.

The USPTO presented XML 1.1 – US presented that the advantage and disadvantages of using the new XML version, 1.1. The TF participants agreed that ST.96 should use XML 1.0, but continue discussing whether ST.96 should adopt XML 1.1 via Wiki.

In order to revise Annex I, the TF Leader proposed to create a PFR based on discussions and agreements made at the TF meeting. TF participants agreed on the proposal.

### Agenda Item 10: Preparation of a final draft for ST.96 Annex V

TF participants discussed draft Annex V and agreed that its main body is well documented, but its Appendixes should be updated based on Annex III version 1.0 D6. TF participants agreed to add two more examples regarding flattened schemas in Appendixes since flattened schemas is recommended as implementation by IPOs.

With regard to the final draft of Annex V for adoption by the CWS, TF participants agreed that Annex V should be prepared based on the next official Schema which will be versioned as version 2.0.

USPTO presented XML related technologies (e.g., JSON) and TF participants agreed on continuing discussion on the new XML technologies via IssueID-508.

Action item: USPTO will update Appendixes A and B to reflect Design and Flattened/Implementation models.

### Agenda Item 11: Preparation of final draft for ST.96 Annex VI

The US delegation reported their progress on the development of Annex VI. The USPTO updated Appendixes of Annex VI based on XML Schema version 1.0 D5 and TF members were invited to test them. TF participants noted the test results reported by Rospatent and corrections made by the USPTO. TF participants agreed that Annex VI main body is well documented, but its Appendixes should be updated based on Annex III version 1.0 D6.

TF participants agreed that Annex VI should be prepared based on the next official Schema which will be versioned as version 2.0 for adoption by the CWS.

Action item: USPTO will update Appendixes A, B, and C of Annex VI according to Schema D6 by the end of November.

### Agenda Item 12: Revision of ST.96 Main Body

TF participants reviewed the proposal for changes made by the TF Leaders. There were different views on adding “SVG” because it is not recommended for trademark and industrial design while it is recommended for patents. US Delegation proposes to add it to com:ImageFormatCategory which is used by PatentImage, MarkImage and View. In order to include “SVG” in the Category, first it should be agreed to add “SVG” in the list of image file format for three IP modalities in paragraph 28 of Main Body. Therefore, TF participants agreed to continue discussion on this matter.

The TF Leader proposed to continue discussion on the revision of Main body via a PFR which will be posted by the IB and TF participants agreed on the proposal.

### Agenda Item 13: Revision of ST.96 Data Dictionary (Annex II)

Current version of Annex II is based on D3. The TF Leader reported that USPTO and the IB prepared a draft revision based on D5. It was noted that USPTO and the IB will continue updating Annex II based on D6, which will include reference to ST.9 INID code in the descriptions of dictionary entries by the end of November. Other IPOs will be invited to review once this revision is available in WIKI.

### Agenda Item 14: Report on IP offices' activities regarding WIPO Standard ST.96 by Delegations

Six Offices (AU, EM, GB, KR, RU, US, WIPO/Madrid) made presentations on their practices regarding WIPO Standards ST.96. AU Delegation presented its plan to use ST.96 for internal and external systems; and implement ST.96 in the area of industrial designs in 2014. EM Delegation showed its efforts and services to map ST.96 and ST.66 schemas, particularly for ASEAN countries. GB Delegation gave an oral report that UKIPO will implement ST.96 for patent business first and design and trademark. KR Delegation reported its development activities and plan for dissemination data using ST.96. RU Delegation presented its ST.96 implementation plan as well as current development activities; and informed TF participants that Rospatent will start development of official publication using ST.96 in 2014. US Delegation reported its progress of ST.96 implementation in patent and trademark business. WIPO/Madrid made oral report that it does not use ST.96 yet, but can accommodate its members for communication of Madrid data in ST.96 format.

### Agenda Item 15: Other matters: Update Work plan

TF participants agreed that the next draft version of XML Schema, D6, will be prepared by November 15, 2013 based on the agreements and decisions made at the meeting.

TF participants also discussed and agreed that the next official version of XML schema will be version 2.0 due to major changes. Release of version 2.0 will largely depend on the inputs by TF members and progress on the development of new proposals on patent transaction component and patent publication document. TF participants hoped to have version 2.0 in the first half of 2014 and wished to have those important changes in the version.

TF participants also agreed to prepare PFRs for Main body and Annex I to revise them based on the agreements and decisions made at the meeting.

TF participants agreed to prepare next drafts of Annex V and Annex VI by the end of November based on XML Schema D6 and invite TF members to test them. TF participants also agreed that the final drafts of Annexes V and VI be prepared based on the version 2.0.

TF participants agreed to hold next TF meeting in spring 2014.

### Agenda Item 16: Adoption of report

The meeting report will be approved via email.
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## ANNEX I: ADOPTED AGENDA

1. Opening of the meeting and Welcome to delegations (USPTO)
2. Adoption of the agenda
3. Progress Report on XML4IP Project since last XML4IP TF meeting (WO/IB)
4. The scope of ST.96
   1. Proposals from TF members: GB, US
   2. Scope of the next version of ST.96
5. Revision of ST.96 XML Schemas (Annex III): ST.96 Common
6. Revision of ST.96 XML Schemas (Annex III): ST.96 Patent
7. Revision of ST.96 XML Schemas (Annex III): ST.96 Trademark
8. Revision of ST.96 XML Schemas (Annex III): ST.96 Design
9. Revision of ST.96 Design Rules and Conventions (Annex I)
   1. Proposals and comments made by TF members
   2. XML version 1.1
10. Preparation of a final draft for ST.96 Annex V
    1. Proposals and comments made by TF members
    2. Schematron
    3. XML as a temporary transport vehicle vs. as permanent storage
11. Preparation of final draft for ST.96 Annex VI
12. Revision of ST.96 Main Body
13. Revision of ST.96 Data Dictionary (Annex II)
14. Report on IP offices' activities regarding WIPO Standard ST.96 by Delegations
15. Other matters
    1. Update Work Plan
16. Adoption of meeting report
17. Closing the meeting
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## ANNEX II: PARTICIPANTS LIST

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **NAME** | **OFFICE / ORGANIZATION** |
| Jeff LI | IPA, AU |
| Alexandre TRAN | OHIM, EM |
| Simon TAYLOR | UKIPO, GB |
| Julie DALTREY | UKIPO, GB |
| Dong Guk SUN | KIPO, KR |
| Yong Tae KIM | KIPO, KR |
| Soo Jeong CHO | KIPI, KR |
| Yury ZONTOV | ROSPATENT, RU |
| Alexander DYUZHEV | ROSPATENT, RU |
| Christopher KIM | USPTO, US |
| Kathryn TINDLE | USPTO, US |
| Steve BECKMANN | USPTO, US |
| Narith TITH | USPTO, US |
| Li WANG | USPTO, US |
| Honwei Li | USPTO, US |
| Sunil GERA | USPTO, US |
| Angel LOPEZ SOLANAS | WIPO/IB |
| Young-Woo YUN | WIPO/IB |
| Roger HOLBERTON | WIPO/Madrid & Hague |
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**ANNEX III** is attached as a separate file, D6\_EnumerationValues\_AnnexIII.xls.
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