

## **Committee on WIPO Standards (CWS)**

### **Twelfth Session Geneva, September 16 to 19, 2024**

DRAFT REPORT

*Prepared by the Secretariat*

#### INTRODUCTION

1. The Committee on WIPO Standards (herein after referred to as “the Committee”, or “the CWS”) held its Twelfth Session in Geneva from September 16 to 19, 2024.
2. The following Member States of WIPO and/or members of the Paris Union and Bern Union were represented at the session: Algeria; Angola; Antigua and Barbuda; Armenia; Australia; Austria; Bhutan; Brazil; Bulgaria; Burkina Faso; Canada; Czech Republic; Chile; China; Denmark; Egypt; El Salvador; Eswatini; Ethiopia; Finland; France; Gambia; Germany; Ghana; Guatemala; Hungary; India; Iran (Islamic Republic of); Iraq; Ireland; Italy; Jamaica; Japan; Kenya; Kyrgyzstan; Lithuania; Morocco; Mexico; Netherlands (Kingdom of The); Niger; Norway; Oman; Pakistan; Peru; Poland; Portugal; Republic of Korea; Republic of Moldova; Russian Federation; the United Kingdom; the United States of America; Saudi Arabia; Serbia; Singapore; Slovakia; Spain; Syrian Arab Republic; Sweden; Switzerland; Togo; Ukraine; Uzbekistan; Vanuatu; Zambia (64).
3. In their capacity as members of the CWS, the representatives of the following Intergovernmental Organizations took part in the session: African Intellectual Property Organization (OAPI); Eurasian Patent Organization (EAPO); European Patent Organization (EPO) and the European Union (EU) (4).
4. Representatives of the following Intergovernmental Organizations and Non-Governmental Organizations took part in the session in an observer capacity: European Law Students' Association (ELSA International); International Association of Young Lawyers (AIJA); Confederacy of Patent Information User Groups (CEPIUG); Patent Documentation Group (PDG); International Trademark Association (INTA); and MALOCA Internationale (6).
5. The list of participants appears as Annex I to this report.

#### Agenda Item 1: Opening of the session

6. The Twelfth Session was opened by the by the elected Chair, Mr. Michael Cristiano who thanked the Secretariat, and Members and Observers of the Committee for the cooperative efforts to create interconnected, harmonious and efficient standards and recommendations for the benefits of the whole community of Intellectual Property (IP). The Assistant Director General, Mr. Ken-Ichiro Natsume, welcomed the participants on behalf of the Director General of WIPO, highlighted the importance of the CWS to enhance collaboration between Member States, and thanked all the CWS Task Force members for their important contribution this year. By referring to the results of the side event organized by International Bureau at the last WIPO Assemblies, he highlighted the importance of the interoperability of data platforms and the use of data standards. He also stressed the importance of the Global Identifier project in terms of the benefits for the IP community.

#### Agenda Item 2: Election of the two Vice-Chairs

7. The CWS unanimously elected, for its twelfth and thirteenth sessions, Mr. Ali Alharbi (Saudi Arabia) and Mr. Alexandre Ciancio (Brazil) as the Vice-Chairs, whose terms will begin immediately.

8. Mr. Young-Woo Yun (WIPO) acted as Secretary to the CWS.

#### DISCUSSION OF THE AGENDA ITEMS

#### Agenda Item 3: Adoption of the agenda

9. The CWS unanimously adopted the agenda as proposed in document CWS/12/1 PROV.3 with some editorial amendments. The adopted agenda is published as document [CWS/12/1](#) on the meeting page.

10. The Chair invited delegations to provide any general statements, but no statements were made.

#### PRESENTATIONS

11. The presentations, working documents and any other related documents from this session have been published on the WIPO website at:  
[https://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/details.jsp?meeting\\_id=80922](https://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/details.jsp?meeting_id=80922).

#### DISCUSSIONS, CONCLUSIONS, AND DECISIONS

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

#### Agenda Item 4: CWS Work Program

#### Agenda Item 4(a): Work Program and Task List of the CWS

13. Discussions were based on document [CWS/12/2](#).

14. The Secretariat informed the Committee that there were 19 active Tasks, where 14 Tasks were assigned to a specific Task Force and five Tasks were not. Furthermore, there were two Tasks in abeyance. The CWS noted that prior to the twelfth session, there were twelve CWS Task Forces active. Subject matter experts from 63 CWS members and three CWS observers participate in the Task Forces.

15. The CWS reviewed the Tasks listed under its current Work Program and noted the analysis by the Secretariat of the resources required for each of the Tasks, in terms of

complexity and estimated activity level. The activity level for each Task was categorized as “very active”, “active”, “occasional” and “inactive” while the categories for the complexity were “complex”, “medium” and “simple”. Upon request at the twelfth session, the Secretariat published the results of their analysis as document [CWS/12/4A-IB](#) on the meeting page for the reference of the CWS. The Secretariat noted several editorial errors in document [CWS/12/2](#) and published the corrected document [CWS/12/2 Corr.](#) on the meeting page.

16. The Delegation of the United States of America supported the Secretariat’s proposal to have a summary of the complexity of CWS Tasks published but noted that the workload is likely change from year to year.

17. The CWS also noted that in 2024, the Secretariat conducted an audit of Task Force membership and was removing entries which were no longer valid. The updated CWS Task Force membership is available on WIPO website at:

<https://www.wipo.int/cws/en/taskforce/members.html>.

18. The CWS noted proposals for consideration at the twelfth session, which would impact its Work Program:

- to revise seven WIPO Standards, namely ST.3, ST.9, ST.27, ST.61, ST80, ST.87, ST.91, which were described in the documents [CWS/12/18 CORR.](#), [CWS/12/19](#), [CWS/12/21](#);
- to adopt two new WIPO Standards, which were presented in document [CWS/12/16](#) recommending best methods for data cleaning of names and document [CWS/12/15](#) recommending a new WIPO standard on the data package format for the electronic exchange of a patent priority document package; and
- to consider whether ATR collection should be continued, as described on the document [CWS/12/24](#).

19. With regard to the Task No.41, the Representative of European Patent Organization (EPO) asked if any future revisions of WIPO Standard ST.36 would be managed by XML4IP Task Force, and this was confirmed by the International Bureau.

20. The CWS considered the Task List as presented in the Annex to document [CWS/12/2 and CWS/12/2 Corr.](#)

21. The CWS approved the Secretariat to incorporate the agreements reached at present session as the updated CWS Work Program and publish the updated CWS Work Program Overview on the WIPO website. The updated Task List is presented as Annex II to this report.<sup>21</sup> The CWS agreed that the Secretariat prepare an analysis of complexity and estimated activity level for each of the Tasks in the consultation with Task Forces Leaders and include the information in the Task List for consideration at the thirteenth session of the CWS.

#### Agenda Item 4(b): Questionnaire on the prioritization of CWS Tasks

22. Discussions were based on document [CWS/12/3](#).

23. The Secretariat presented the results of the informal survey on the prioritization of CWS Tasks and the analysis of the feedback provided by the 21 participating Offices. The Secretariat confirmed that the results of the survey on Task prioritization should be used for information only, instead of directing the priority of the CWS Work Program. The CWS noted that the analysis of the informal survey results contained within the document may also provide any guidance that Offices may need when prioritizing their own activities.

24. The Secretariat proposed not to conduct a formal survey on the Task prioritization, but instead allow the CWS to review the priority of each Task when it considers its program at its annual session. Several delegations supported the Secretariat proposal not to conduct a formal survey and expressed their concerns regarding the volume of work expected by Offices participating in the Task Forces. The CWS also noted that its Task Forces suffer from a lack of active participation and feedback from the IP offices. Some delegations suggested that setting certain Tasks to 'in abeyance' or prioritizing certain Tasks for a specific time period, might help to overcome this situation.

25. The CWS agreed not to conduct a formal survey on the Task prioritization, but instead the CWS review the priority of each Task considering the informal survey results when it considers its Work Program.

26. The CWS agreed that the Secretariat conduct an annual review of the activities of all CWS Tasks in consultation with the CWS Task Forces; and then propose which Task(s) can be held in abeyance or can be considered a priority.

#### Agenda Item 5: Progress Reports by the Task Forces

27. The CWS noted that 11 Task Forces had submitted their written report using a common template and one Task force would deliver an oral report.

#### Agenda Item 5(a): Report on Task No. 41 by the XML4IP Task Force

28. Discussions were based on document [CWS/12/4](#) which was presented by the XML4IP Task Force Leader, the International Bureau.

29. The CWS noted the progress made by the Task Force regarding Task No. 41 since the last session of the Committee including the planned release of WIPO ST.96 version 8.0 in October 2024, incorporating new XML schemas which capture trademark and industrial design legal status data. The CWS also noted the challenges faced by XML4IP Task Force including the large number of topics to be managed, the lack of feedback on certain revisions and the lack of participation from small IP offices.

#### Agenda Item 5(b): Report on Task No. 44 by the Sequence Listings Task Force

30. Discussions were based on document [CWS/12/5](#) which was presented by the Sequence Listings Task Force Leader, the Representative of the EPO.

31. The Sequence Listings Task Force Leader explained that there was no proposed revision to WIPO Standard ST.26 to be considered at the present session, as the Task Force has been considering two substantive proposals for revisions suggested by the EPO and the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) which should be carefully handled. The Committee noted that the Task Force had agreed to continue discussions on the EPO's proposal to lift the minimum length requirement of residues in a sequence. The Task Force also agreed to collect feedback on the proposal from the users of WIPO Standard ST.26 through a formal survey in order to have a complete picture. Therefore, the Task Force plans to prepare a survey questionnaire which should be addressed to patent applicants or their representatives.

32. Several delegations expressed their concern regarding any substantive changes to WIPO Standard ST.26 being made and indicated that implementation should be handled with care and in consultation with both IP offices and users. The Secretariat encouraged all CWS Members to participate and contribute to the activities of Sequence Listings Task Force.

#### Agenda Item 5(c): Report on Task No. 47 by the Legal Status Task Force

33. Discussions were based on document [CWS/12/6](#) which was presented by the International Bureau as Legal Status Task Force Leader.
34. The International Bureau presented the progress made since the last session of the CWS, including the proposed revision to the three legal status Standards ST.27, ST.61 and ST.87. The International Bureau noted some inconsistencies between the three Standards and so proposed revisions to maintain consistency between the Standards. In 2024, the Task Force organized two joint-meetings with the XML4IP Task Force in April and June to discuss the development of design legal status XML components, which are based on the proposed revision to Annex II of ST.87.
35. The International Bureau encouraged IP offices to provide their mapping table, which maps between their national legal status events and those indicated in one of the legal status Standards, or update their existing mapping tables which are published in [Part 7.13 of the WIPO Handbook](#).
36. The Delegation of China was concerned regarding the recategorization of existing legal status events in WIPO Standard ST.27 because it is implementing WIPO ST.27 after completing their mapping table. However, it confirmed that it would support the addition of new events to the Standards as needed.
37. The Delegation of the United States of America informed the CWS that it had updated its mapping table and would provide the updated mapping table shortly. This is the first step of its process to implement WIPO Standards ST.27 and ST.61.
38. The Delegation of United Kingdom was concerned that the recategorization of patent legal status events in WIPO ST.27 would impact its ongoing digital transformation activities which include the implementation of ST.27. However, it supported discussions for new events. The CWS noted that no IP office uses the 'event indicators' that were included in WIPO ST.27. The Delegation of Germany indicated that it was still waiting on users' feedback regarding its WIPO ST.27 implementation before considering implementing the 'event indicators'.
39. The Representative of the EPO emphasized the importance of WIPO Standard ST.27 and reiterated its commitment to contribute to this Task. It asked if there is any plan to update WIPO Standard ST.36 to support the implementation of WIPO ST.27, as was done with WIPO Standard ST.96. The International Bureau responded that there is not plan to revise WIPO ST.36 unless there is a request from the Member States.

#### Agenda Item 5(d): Report on Task No. 50 by the Part 7 Task Force

40. Discussions were based on an oral report on Task No. 50 delivered by the International Bureau, as the Part 7 Task Force Leader. The CWS noted the work plan and challenges of the Task Force.
41. The Delegation of Russian Federation asked if WIPO Handbook Part 7.3.2 could be updated in the case where new document types are produced by an Office instead of waiting for the update through a survey. The International Bureau suggested that Part 7 Task Force would discuss whether revisions to Part 7.3 of the WIPO Handbook should be made upon the request by an Office to reflect its new practice or the revisions should be made with the results of a relevant survey in which all Offices would be invited to respond.
42. The CWS noted that the Part 7 Task Force would present a proposal for the way of revising Part 7.3 for consideration at the next session of the CWS.
43. The CWS approved conducting a survey to inform updates to WIPO Handbook Part 7.2.6 and Part 7.2.7 in 2025. The CWS also noted that Part 7 Task Force will report the survey results at the thirteenth session of the CWS.

Agenda Item 5(e): Report on Task No. 52 by the Public Access to Patent Information (PAPI) Task Force

44. Discussions were based on document [CWS/12/7](#) which was presented by the International Bureau, as the Leader of the PAPI Task Force.
45. The CWS noted that the PAPI Task Force had worked to prepare a proposal for the update of the WIPO Handbook Part 6.1, which recommends the minimum contents for an IP office website. The Delegation of the United States of America commented that Office's website design principles are determined by the individual IP office guidelines.
46. The CWS noted that the PAPI Task Force plans to present a proposal for the update of WIPO Handbook Part 6.1 for consideration at its thirteenth session.

Agenda Item 5(f): Report on Task No. 55 by the Name Standardization Task Force

47. Discussions were based on document [CWS/12/8](#), and the revised document [CWS/12/8 REV.](#) which were presented by the Delegation of the Republic of Korea and the International Bureau, as the Name Standardization Task Force Co-Leaders.
48. The CWS noted that the Task Force had prepared a revised proposal for a set of recommendations on the process of data cleaning and names and submitted it for consideration and adoption by the current session. The proposal is reproduced as the Annex to document [CWS/12/16](#).
49. Assuming the proposed new WIPO Standard ST.93 is adopted by the CWS, the Task Force proposed to revise the description of Task No. 55 as follows:

“Share customer name cleaning practices, including any algorithms used, as well as where and how to use the clean data; prepare a set of practical guidelines for IP offices; and ensure the necessary revisions and updates of WIPO Standard ST.93”.

50. As the CWS did not adopt the improved proposal for WIPO Standard ST.93, the proposal for the revised description of Task No. 55 by the Task Force was also not approved.

Agenda Item 5(g): Report on Task No. 56 and No. 64 by the API Task Force

51. Discussions were based on document [CWS/12/9 Rev.](#) which was presented by the Task Force Co-Leaders: the Delegation of Canada and the Representative of the European Union.
52. The CWS noted that the International Bureau had launched '[API Catalog for Intellectual Property](#)' in July 2024, which is a unified platform that offers a list of APIs provided by IP institutions for their products and services. Regarding the specific activities conducted under Task No. 56, the CWS noted that the API Task Force supported the successful launch of the API Catalog; assessed the implementation of WIPO Standard ST.90 by IP offices; and discussed a potential revision of WIPO ST.90.
53. The Delegation of Australia expressed its support for the API Catalog for Intellectual Property project as it considers it a useful resource for the IP community to access IP information through APIs. The Delegation also indicated that its participation in the project provided it the opportunity to review and improve its own API guidelines. The Delegation also encouraged other Offices to participate in the API Catalog to expand its usefulness. It committed its continuing support to the project to move forward regarding future improvements.



54. The Delegation of the United States of America asked if it was possible to track the number of visits to the API Catalog for IP website. The Secretariat confirmed that the number of visits to the API Catalog website can be captured however it cannot determine how visitors are using the API Catalog because it is not a gateway.

55. The API Task Force noted that the promotion of the API Catalog would require more APIs from Offices and other IP institutions after the launch. Considering the completion of the API Catalog's development, the Task Force proposed to update the description of Task No. 56.

56. The CWS noted the content of the document, in particular, the release of the [API Catalog for IP](#), and encouraged its Members and Observers to participate in the API Catalog by responding to Circular C.CWS 185.

57. The CWS encouraged its Members to test the XML2JSON transformation tool.

58. The CWS noted the definition of the compatibility matrix Excel template and encouraged its Members to evaluate the compliance of their APIs with WIPO Standard ST.90 using the compatibility matrix.

59. The CWS approved the revised description of the Task No. 56, which reads:

“Ensure the necessary revisions and updates of WIPO Standard ST.90; support the International Bureau in promoting and implementing WIPO Standard ST.90; and promote the API Catalog for Intellectual Property (IP) and facilitate the further participation of IP institutions in the API Catalog”

#### Agenda Item 5(h): Report on Task No. 58 by the ICT Strategy Task Force

60. Discussions were based on document [CWS/12/10](#) which was presented by the Delegation of Australia, as a Task Force Co-Leader. The CWS noted the content of the document, in particular the progress made on the updated 10 Recommendations by the Task Force, which are provided as the Annex to [CWS/12/22](#). The improved proposal for a set of 10 Recommendations took into consideration the feedback received in response to Circular [C.CWS 180](#) as well as during discussions at Task Force meetings held in 2024.

61. The Task Force also presented a proposal for a revised description for Task No. 58 in light of the fact that the 10 Recommendations were prepared and presented for adoption at the session. One delegation noted that Task No. 58 could be proposed to be closed by the Task Force at the next session if the Recommendations are generic enough to not require an update in the future. Another delegation indicated that Recommendations 2, 8 and 9 seem duplicative and suggested that the Task Force consider simplifying these to minimize the total number of Recommendations in the near future.

62. The CWS approved the revised description of the Task No. 58, which reads:

“Facilitate the implementation of the ICT related Recommendations by IP offices and the International Bureau; and evaluate and update these Recommendations as needed to maintain their relevance.”

#### Agenda Item 5(i): Report on Task No. 59 by the Blockchain Task Force

63. Discussions were based on document [CWS/12/11](#) which was delivered by the Delegation of the Russian Federation, as the Blockchain Task Force Leader.

64. The CWS noted the content of the document, in particular, the work plan and the challenges experienced by the Task Force.

Agenda Item 5(j): Report on Task No. 61 by the 3D Task Force

65. Discussions were based on document [CWS/12/12](#) delivered by the Delegation of the Russian Federation, as the 3D Task Force Leader.

66. The CWS noted the content of the document, in particular, the proposed revision to WIPO Standard ST.91 and the challenges experienced by the Task Force.

Agenda Item 5(k): Report on Task No. 62, No. 63 and No. 65 by the Digital Transformation Task Force

67. Discussions were based on document [CWS/12/13](#) which was presented by the Delegation of the United States of America, as the Digital Transformation Task Force Leader.

68. The CWS noted that the Task Force had conducted a review and performed an analysis of the functionality of DOCX2XML converters in use at the USPTO and at the International Bureau. The analysis has been consolidated as a concise specification and posted for comment on the Task Force wiki space.

69. The CWS noted the content of the document, in particular, the progress made by the Task Force in providing a final draft of the patent priority document exchange package Standard for consideration and adoption at the current session.

70. The CWS encouraged Offices that are currently using DOCX2XML converters to share information with the Digital Transformation Task Force regarding the functionalities of their converters. The CWS noted that sharing information would enable the Task Force to have a broader view on what converters are available and to be better placed to provide improvements to the draft of the common set of requirements for DOCX2XML converters.

Agenda Item 5(l): Report on Task No. 66 by the International Bureau

71. Discussions were based on document [CWS/12/14](#), which were presented by the International Bureau, as the Task No. 66 Leader.

72. The International Bureau reported that it was coordinating bilateral clinics with interested IP offices before the end of 2024, with priority given to those Offices requiring the greatest level of support. The CWS noted that the International Bureau would then continue the clinics for those Offices who are closer to achieving the requirements set out by the PCT Minimum Documentation Task Force.

73. The Delegation of Canada indicated that it had been working to improve their existing WIPO ST.37-compliant authority file to satisfy the new PCT Minimum Documentation requirements and appreciate the offer of clinics made by the International Bureau.

74. The CWS encouraged IP offices to participate in the clinics being held by the International Bureau after performing their self-assessment checklist available on the [PCT Minimum Documentation Task Force wiki](#).

Agenda Item 6: Development of WIPO Standards

Agenda Item 6(a): Proposal for a new WIPO Standard on the data package format for the electronic exchange of priority documents



75. Discussions were based on document [CWS/12/15](#), which was prepared by the Digital Transformation Task Force and presented by the Delegation of the United States of America as the Task Force Leader. The CWS considered proposals for a new draft Standard, WIPO Standard ST.92, an implementation plan of the Standard, and a revised description for Task No. 65.

76. The Secretariat clarified that the proposed Standard covers only the patent priority documents. The Secretariat informed the CWS that the Digital Transformation Task Force would further develop the Standard to incorporate trademarks and industrial designs at a later stage if the Standard is adopted at the current session. Several delegations explicitly endorsed the proposal of the new Standard.

77. Regarding the proposed implementation plan for the Standard, there were some concerns expressed by several delegations regarding the deadline specified for the conclusion of the “sunset period” as July 1, 2027 and the operational impact on WIPO Digital Access Service (DAS) which is used for priority documents exchange. The International Bureau indicated its intention to work towards implementing the new Standard in WIPO-DAS before the proposed deadline of the sunset period.

78. The Secretariat proposed that this deadline be “tentative”. The Delegation of China suggested that the Digital Transformation Task Force conduct a survey to know whether the deadline for the conclusion of the sunset period is feasible to all Offices.

79. The CWS adopted new WIPO Standard ST.92 as presented in Annexes of document [CWS/12/15](#).

80. The CWS approved the proposal for the revised description of Task No. 65 which reads:

*“Ensure the necessary revisions and updates of WIPO Standard ST.92 and support IP offices for their implementation of the Standard before July 1, 2027.”*

81. The CWS requested that the Digital Transformation Task Force prepare a survey questionnaire on the implementation plan for WIPO ST.92, and that the Secretariat issue a circular inviting all Offices to respond to the survey. The CWS noted that the Digital Transformation Task Force would report the results of the survey for consideration at its thirteenth session.

82. The CWS agreed that at this stage this tentative deadline applies only to the adopted Standard, i.e., patent priority documents, and the discussion should continue once the new Standard is revised to incorporate recommendations for trademark and industrial design priority documents.

83. The CWS agreed that the International Bureau plans to update the WIPO-DAS, to accept and provide priority documents compliant with the new Standard ST.92. The WIPO DAS update should be discussed with WIPO-DAS Participating Offices. The CWS also noted that the International Bureau would organize meetings where WIPO DAS Offices and the Digital Transformation Task Force would be invited.

Agenda Item 6(b): Proposal for a new WIPO Standard supporting the data cleaning of names

84. Discussions were based on documents [CWS/12/16](#) and [CWS/12/16 REV.](#) , which was published after amendments that were made during the session. These documents were prepared and presented by the Name Standardization Task Force Co-Leaders the Delegation of the Republic of Korea and the International Bureau.

85. The Delegation of Japan supported the adoption of the draft standard, if it is optional to implement. However, it did not approve the publication of the currently proposed Japanese transliteration tables as a part of WIPO Handbook, which are referenced by the draft standard. The Secretariat said that the proposed transliteration tables could be replaced with one provided by the Japan Patent Office.

86. The Delegation of Ukraine proposed that the draft Standard explicitly reference the Unicode Standard, recognizing that Cyrillic should not be represented as a single national script. The CWS supported the proposal and updated the draft proposal during the session to include the reference proposed by the Delegation, as document CWS/12/16 REV.

87. While several delegations supported adoption of the new Standard, the Delegation of China requested more time to more thoroughly investigate a potential impact of the proposed new standard and to consult internally as well as with its customers. The Secretariat explained that in principle all WIPO Standards are recommendations based on best practices and their implementation is up to IP offices or any interested entities. The Secretariat also highlighted that WIPO Standards could be revised anytime to reflect new practices or recommendations.

88. The Delegation of Russian Federation expressed that it was flexible on adoption of the new Standard. However, the Delegation was in favor of decisions by consensus and as such if some delegations still have concerns or questions regarding the proposed standard then the proposed standard should be sent back to the Task Force for further improvement and consideration.

89. The International Bureau proposed to organize a workshop on the topic of name standardization, and more specifically the data cleaning of customer names. Any interested parties would be invited to the workshop.

90. The CWS did not adopt the proposed WIPO Standard ST.93. Instead, the CWS requested that the Name Standardization Task Force revisit and continue to improve the draft Standard if needed. The CWS encouraged Offices and IP Industry to nominate experts to join its Name Standardization Task Force.

91. The CWS requested that the International Bureau organize a workshop on data cleaning of names in 2025 where any interested parties may attend. The CWS also requested its Members and Observers to support the International Bureau by promoting the workshop.

#### Agenda Item 6(c): Proposal for the revision of WIPO Standards ST.3, ST.9 and ST.80

92. Discussions were based on document [CWS/12/18 CORR.](#) which was presented by the International Bureau.

93. The International Bureau explained that the proposed revisions to WIPO Standard ST.80 aim to align the Standard with changes that were made to the legal framework of the Hague System since the last revision of WIPO ST.80; to make minor corrections to the terminology and references used under the Hague System, and to enhance the understanding of published information. The proposed revisions to WIPO Standards ST.3 and ST.9 are related to the proposed revisions to WIPO ST.80 and aim to amend INID codes and references in relation to the Hague, Madrid and PCT Systems.

94. Several delegations explicitly supported the proposed revision of those Standards and would continue to assess how the revisions would impact the existing processes and practice on their Offices. One delegation asked the effective date of the revised Standards. The Secretariat confirmed that the new version of each Standard would come into force on the date that the new versions are published on the WIPO website.

95. The CWS approved the revisions to the WIPO Standards ST.3, ST.9 and ST.80 as presented in the document [CWS/12/18 CORR.](#)

96. The CWS requested the Secretariat publish the revised WIPO Standards in WIPO Handbook and communicate the publication via a circular to all CWS Members.

#### Agenda Item 6(d): Proposals for the revision of WIPO Standards ST.27, ST.61 and ST.87

97. Discussions were based on documents CWS/12/19 and [CWS/12/19 REV.](#), which was published after the amendments that were made during the session.

98. The Delegation of Republic of Korea proposed several amendments, including the removal of the “WIPO DAS access code” which was added to event category A, as it is not relevant to the legal status event of an IP application. The proposal of the Delegation of Korea was supported by several delegations.

99. After a question from the Delegation of the United States of America, the International Bureau proposed the removal of the “Not in force date” from event Category B as it is the same as the “Effective date” defined in those Standards.

100. The Delegation of Germany informed the CWS that its Office has already implemented WIPO Standard ST.27 and invited IP industry users to test its implementation available on its Office website. The Delegation offered presenting on its implementation at a future Task Force meeting, if requested.

101. The CWS approved the revisions to the three WIPO Standards ST.27, ST.61 and ST.87, as presented in the Annex I, Annex II and Annex III to document CWS/12/19 REV, including the amendments to Event Categories A and B mentioned above and several other editorial corrections.

102. The CWS asked the Secretariat to publish the revised WIPO Standards ST.27, ST.61 and ST.87 in the WIPO Handbook and to communicate the publication via circular to CWS Members.

#### Agenda Item 6(e): Proposal for the revision of WIPO Standard ST.91

103. Discussions were based on document [CWS/12/20](#) which was presented by the 3D Task Force.

104. The Delegations of United Kingdom and Germany explicitly supported the revision and thanked the Task Force for their work.

105. The CWS approved the proposed revision to WIPO Standard ST.91 as proposed in the Annex to document [CWS/12/20](#).

106. The CWS requested that the Secretariat publish the revised version in Part 3 of the WIPO Handbook and communicate the publication via a circular to the CWS Members.

Agenda Item 6(f): Proposal for improvement of copyright orphan work metadata in WIPO Standard ST.96

107. Discussions were based on document [CWS/12/21](#) which was presented by the International Bureau.

108. The CWS noted that the International Bureau proposed that the CWS consider selecting one of the two following options in order to make progress on the copyright orphan work metadata standardization:

- Option 1: incorporate the proposed right holders and creative work categories which were published as the Annex to document CWS/10/7 in the next or future version of WIPO ST.96; or
- Option 2: continue the discussion on the proposals either via the XML4IP Task Force or an alternative forum with subject matter experts.

109. One delegation expressed concern that its Office does not have the appropriate subject matter experts to support the development of these components. The Secretariat responded that it would be seeking nominations from all IP offices in Member States, including copyright Offices, to put forward appropriate experts in copyright orphan works.

110. The CWS noted that it was premature to incorporate the amendments to the two components in the next version of WIPO Standard ST.96, version 8.0.

111. The CWS agreed on the Option 2 mentioned above and approved that the XML4IP Task Force should continue its discussion to improve the copyright orphan work components in WIPO Standard ST.96, on the basis of the proposals which were reproduced in Annex to document [CWS/10/7](#).

112. The CWS encouraged its Members and Observers to nominate their subject matter experts to the XML4IP Task Force to participate in the improvement of relevant WIPO ST.96 XML components.

Agenda Item 6(g): Analysis of survey results on the implementation of WIPO Standard ST.91

113. Discussions were based on document [CWS/12/26](#) which was prepared and presented by the 3D Task Force Leader.

114. The CWS noted that the individual responses and the collated responses have been published in Part 7.17.2 of the WIPO Handbook and the analysis of the survey results by the 3D Task Force is included in document CWS/12/26. The Secretariat proposed that an information session on 3D models and images be held for all interested parties in 2025.

115. The CWS considered the analysis on the responses received for the implementation of WIPO Standard ST.91 survey and agreed to publish it in Part 7.17.2 of the WIPO Handbook.

116. The CWS supported the organization of an information session on 3D models and 3D images by the Task Force in 2025, where all interested parties will be invited.

Agenda Item 7: Implementation of WIPO Standards by Offices

Agenda Item 7(a): WIPO Standard ST.26

117. The Secretariat introduced WIPO Standard ST.26 and expressed its concern regarding the level of awareness of the obligation to implement WIPO ST.26 for smaller patent Offices. For Offices still needing assistance in implementing WIPO ST.26, the Secretariat encouraged

them to contact the International Bureau with any training requests. The Secretariat also encouraged the Member States to join the Sequence Listings Task Force, at least to observe

and follow discussions as a means of knowledge transfer. The CWS Members were encouraged to inform their users regarding potential substantive revisions to WIPO ST.26 in 2025.

118. The CWS noted the presentations provided by International Bureau and the Representative of the EPO. The Delegations of the United Kingdom and United States of America also orally shared their WIPO ST.26 implementation experiences.

#### Agenda Item 7(b): WIPO Standard ST.37

119. The Secretariat introduced the agenda Item with an introduction to WIPO Standard ST.37 and the relevant work of the PCT Minimum Documentation Task Force.

120. The CWS noted presentations by the Delegations of Australia and Austria on their implementation of WIPO ST.37. The Delegations of the United Kingdom, the Russian Federation and the United States of America, and the Representative of the EPO also orally shared their implementation experiences.

121. The Delegation of China asked the Delegations of Australia and Austria details regarding their plan to implement the PCT Minimum Documentation requirements. The Delegation of Austria replied that it is already in the testing phase after its upgrade to version 2.2 and is expecting to be ready by January 1, 2026. The Delegation of Australia confirmed that it would also start with testing in 2025.

122. The Representative of the EPO expressed that it would appreciate a more active role taken by the International Bureau in the facilitation of the PCT Minimum Documentation exchange between the International Searching Authorities. The International Bureau confirmed that they would assist where possible.

#### Agenda Item 7(c): WIPO Standards ST.27, ST.61 and ST.87

123. The Secretariat opened the agenda Item with an introduction to WIPO's legal status Standards. CWS noted a presentation by the Delegation of the Republic of Korea.

124. The CWS noted that the Delegations of China, Germany, Norway, Spain, the United Kingdom and the United States of America, and the Representative of the Eurasian Patent Organization who also orally shared their implementation experiences of WIPO Standards ST.27, ST.61 and ST.87. Those Delegations indicated that they were seeking further feedback regarding their implementation of those Standards.

125. The Representative of Patent Documentation Group (PDG) appreciated the efforts by Offices in implementing those Standards and stated that it would review and provide feedback. For its more meaningful feedback, the Representative indicated that IP industry needs an expansion of the number of IP offices who have implemented the WIPO legal status Standards.

#### Agenda Item 7(d): WIPO Standard ST.90

126. The Secretariat opened the agenda Item with an introduction to WIPO Standard ST.90. CWS noted presentations by the Representatives of the European Union and the Eurasian Patent Organization. The Delegations of Canada and the United States of America also orally shared their implementation experience.

Agenda Item 8: Policies and activities relating to intellectual property (IP) data, information system and information services

Agenda Item 8(a): Recommendations on Blockchain Applications in the United Nations system by the Joint Inspection Unit (JIU)

127. Discussions were based on document [CWS/12/27](#), which was presented by the International Bureau. This document provides a summary of work-to-date conducted by the International Bureau to implement the Recommendations on the use of blockchain applications in the United Nations (UN) system by the Joint Inspection Unit of the United Nations System (JIU).

128. The CWS noted that the International Bureau considered that the following Recommendations 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6 were relevant to its work, and took some actions to implement them. The CWS also noted that the International Bureau had reported its implementation status for the Recommendations to the Program Budget Committee (PBC) since September 2021, and the PBC noted that Recommendations 1, 2, 3 and 4 were completed and Recommendation 6 is in progress. The International Bureau reported its latest implementation status to the thirty-seventh session of the PBC held in June 2024 and informed the PBC of its plan on Recommendation 6 to encourage WIPO Member States to engage with the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL) in its exploratory and preparatory work on legal issues that relate to blockchain, in the broader context of the digital economy and digital trade as recommended at the twelfth session of the CWS (see Annex I of document WO/PBC/37/6 Rev.). In relation to Recommendation 6, the CWS noted that the International Bureau had introduced some activities of the UNCITRAL and provided in 2022 its analysis of the UNCITRAL Model Law on Electronic Transferable Records for consideration by the Blockchain Task Force.

129. The Delegation of China expressed concerns regarding the implementation of the UN Recommendations and indicated that this topic may be outside the scope of the mandate of CWS. The Delegation of the Russian Federation, as the Leader of the Blockchain Task Force, commented that when considering the issues pertaining to blockchain in the field of IP, the CWS has established the Task Force. Its goal is to study the possibility of using blockchain technologies in procedures for ensuring the protection of IP rights and processing information on IP subjects and their use, and encouraged Offices to participate in the work of the Task Force. The Delegation also indicated that it already adhered to the strict and consistent implementation of the Recommendations of the JIU.

130. The CWS encouraged IP offices to implement Recommendation 6 of the JIU's Recommendations on Blockchain Application in the United Nations system, as stated below:

“The governing bodies of the United Nations system organizations should encourage Member States to engage with the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law in its exploratory and preparatory work on legal issues that relate to blockchain in the broader context of the digital economy and digital trade, including on dispute resolution, which is aimed at reducing legal insecurity in that field.”

Agenda Item 8(b): Recommendations on ICT and IP administration

131. Discussions were based on document [CWS/12/22](#), which was presented by the by the ICT Strategy Task Force.

132. The CWS considered the improved set of 10 Recommendations relating to ICT and IP administration. Several delegations expressed their explicit support for the Recommendations



as proposed. They also supported that the Recommendations be reported by the Secretariat to the WIPO General Assembly in 2025.

133. The Delegation of the Russian Federation proposed to amend the first Recommendation to state, “strive to optimize” rather than “optimize”. The Secretariat preferred that the Recommendations were not updated at this stage. The Delegation agreed to withdraw its request.

134. The CWS also noted presentations under the agenda Item by the Delegations of China and Canada in relation to its adopted digital transformation strategies and ICT system modernization efforts.

135. The CWS considered and adopted the proposed set of 10 Recommendations as presented in document [CWS/12/22](#).

136. The CWS requested that the Secretariat present the set of adopted Recommendations at the WIPO General Assembly in 2025.

137. The CWS encouraged its Members and the Observers to implement the set of Recommendations and share their plan or experience in implementing those Recommendations at the next session of the CWS.

138. The CWS also noted that the International Bureau would organize a meeting on ICT leadership in early 2025 considering the Recommended Action (c) under Recommendation 2.

#### Agenda Item 8(c): Proposal for recommendations on data exchange framework and platform

139. Discussions were based on document [CWS/12/23 REV. and CWS/12/23 REV. 2](#), which were presented by the International Bureau and the Delegations of Japan and Saudi Arabia.

140. As a follow-up of the decisions made at the eleventh session of the CWS, the Secretariat invited, in May 2024, Offices to participate in a survey regarding problems, which they may be experiencing in exchanging IP data, and potential solutions to address the problems. The Secretariat presented the results of the survey and thanked all Offices who replied to the survey.

141. The Delegations of Japan and Saudi Arabia presented together a project brief for the creation of a new Task and a Task Force to manage work relating to an investigation of potential solutions to the problems raised in the responses to the survey.

142. In response to the project brief, the Secretariat proposed to add a new Task, i.e., Task No. 67, to the CWS Work Program with the following description:

“Analyze existing practices and challenges experienced by IP offices in conducting IP data exchange with a view to explore solutions to improve access to global IP data.”

143. The Secretariat also proposed the creation of a new corresponding Task Force to manage the new Task, with the name “IP Data Exchange Task Force” with the co-leadership of Japan Patent Office (JPO), the Saudi Authority for Intellectual Property (SAIP) and the International Bureau.

144. Several delegations expressed their concerns regarding the proposed solutions contained within the project brief, detailed in Annex II of CWS/12/23 REV. 2. The Secretariat suggested

that those concerns be addressed during early Task Force discussions instead of amending the project brief.

145. The CWS approved the creation of Task No. 67 with the following Task description:

“Analyze practices and challenges of IP offices in exchanging their data; explore technical solutions; and prepare recommendations on IP data exchange.”

146. The CWS approved the establishment of the new Task Force “IP Data Exchange Task Force” and designated JPO, SAIP and the International Bureau as the Co-Leaders of the new Task Force. The CWS assigned Task No. 67 to the Task Force.

147. The CWS requested the Secretariat to issue a circular, inviting its Members to nominate their subject matter experts to the new Task Force.

148. The CWS noted that the IP Data Exchange Task Force would report the results of Task Force discussions at the next session of the CWS.

#### Agenda Item 8(d): Global Identifier for natural persons and legal entities

149. The International Bureau reported the progress made on the Global Identifier (GID) project since the last session of the CWS. The International Bureau highlighted the importance of the project for the IP community and summarized its three phases:

- Phase I: identifying the business requirements, conducting a feasibility study and the development of the technical documentation including the technical specification;
- Phase II: finalizing of the documentation for Minimum Viable Product (MVP), including the Terms of Use agreement and governance documentation, and the development of a sandbox environment for testing. Testing will be conducted with mock-up data amongst the participating Offices and IP industry associations, who will be part of this Phase II. Phase 2 is planned to commence in October 2024; and
- Phase III: the global level implementation of the GID system which is planned to start late 2026.

150. The Delegation of Germany thanked the International Bureau for the progress report and asked if the project documentation could be published. The International Bureau confirmed that it would create a dedicated wiki for the GID project including FAQ and would share the public documentation there.

151. The Delegation of China indicated its appreciation for the presentation which provided it with details regarding the Global ID project, and asked if the project would have an impact on PCT operations. The Secretariat clarified that implementing the Global ID will be optional, and that individual IP offices and IP applicants would decide whether to use it or not. As regards its implementation in the PCT System, it should be discussed further within the PCT Working Group.

#### Agenda Item 8(e): Report on 2023 Annual Technical Reports (ATRs)

152. Discussions were based on document [CWS/12/24](#) which was prepared and presented by the International Bureau.

153. The CWS noted the collection of Annual Technical Reports (ATRs) conducted under the framework of Task No.24, including the pilot of the simplified template over the past three years.

Considering the increased number of ATRs provided by Offices and the number of visits to the ATR pages during the past three years, the International Bureau proposed continuing the ATR collection, using the simplified template, while adding a new topic to collect the information regarding the implementation activities of WIPO Standards by Offices.

154. Several Delegations explicitly supported the proposal to continue collection of ATRs using simplified template and suggested that the newly proposed topic provide a structured response to the question.

155. The CWS approved the continuation of ATR collection using the simplified template as well as the inclusion of the proposed new topic in the simplified template, for which the title reads as follows:

“Activities of the implementation of WIPO Standards related to Patent (Trademark or Industrial Design) Information”.

#### Agenda Item 9: Technical assistance and collaboration on global information systems

##### Agenda Item 9(a): Report by the International Bureau on the provision of technical advice and assistance for capacity building to industrial property offices in connection with the mandate of the CWS

156. Discussions were based on document [CWS/12/25](#), which was presented by the International Bureau.

157. The CWS noted it's the activities conducted during 2023 supporting training and technical advice on the use of WIPO Standards by the International Bureau. One of the main activities was to support the implementation of WIPO Standard ST.26 and of the use of WIPO Sequence Suite. The importance of WIPO's IP Office Business Solutions suite was highlighted as it aims to enhance national and regional IP offices' business systems and technical infrastructure to help them provide more cost effective and higher-quality services to their own stakeholders. Different activities were provided in relation to the capacity building of IP officers and examiners for the utilization of international tools, supporting the better understanding of WIPO Standards and IP data exchange.

158. The CWS noted the content of the document, in particular the 2023 activities of the International Bureau related to providing technical advice and assistance for capacity building to IPOs regarding dissemination of IP standards information.

159. The CWS also noted that the report would serve as the basis of the relevant report to be presented to the WIPO General Assembly to be held in 2025.

##### Agenda Item 9(b): WIPO Sequence Suite development

160. The International Bureau presented an update on the development of WIPO Sequence Suite since the last session of the Committee. The CWS noted that the “WIPO Sequence Performance Improvement” project had been launched in June 2023 with the aim to both improve the performance of the WIPO Sequence Validator and to upgrade outdated architecture components. The International Bureau has performed a series of production checks to ensure that the new version 3.0.0 is ready to be released in production and intended to release the new version before the end of 2024. The International Bureau informed the CWS that their subscription list has expanded to approximately 5,000 subscribers.

161. The Representative of the EPO, in its role as the Task Force Leader of the Sequence Listings Task Force, thanked the International Bureau for the efforts in developing the WIPO Sequence Suite and committed to support future development and testing.

162. The CWS noted the progress made on the WIPO Sequence Suite Performance Improvement project, particularly the release of version 3.0.0 of the WIPO Sequence Validator planned for later this month.

Agenda Item 9(c): API Catalog for Intellectual Property (IP)

163. The International Bureau presented a brief introduction of the launch of the “API Catalog for Intellectual Property” project and its plans for future development. The API Catalog was launched in July this year and the presentation provided a summary of the main features of the API Catalog, its expected benefits as well as its plan for future improvements.

164. The CWS agreed to promote the use of the API Catalog for IP by IP Offices.

165. The Delegation of Canada and the Representative of the European Union congratulated the International Bureau and the API Task Force for the successful completion of this project and extended its sincere appreciation to all those participants who contributed to its success. They reasserted their commitment to supporting this activity.

Agenda Item 9(d): Authority File Portal

166. The International Bureau presented the updates made to the Authority File Portal since the last session of the CWS, which now provides authority files for 32 participating Offices and Organizations.

167. The CWS considered the proposal by the Delegation of the United Kingdom to restart the Authority File Task Force and noted that the Delegation volunteered to lead the Task Force. The International Bureau proposed to update the description of Task No.66, to support any necessary updates to WIPO Standard ST.37, proposed by the Task Force.

168. Several delegations supported the proposal of revising the Task description for Task No.66 as well as its assignment to the restarted Authority File Task Force.

169. The Delegation of Togo indicated its appreciation for the work of the CWS and for the opportunity for small countries like its Delegation to participate in the Committee in person. This type of participation improves the awareness of WIPO Standards in those countries where the resources and capacities are unlikely available. The Delegation also appreciated the support offered by the International Bureau in terms of trainings.

170. The CWS approved the creation of the Authority File Task Force and designated the Delegation of the United Kingdom as the Task Force Leader.

171. The CWS also approved assigning Task No. 66 to the Authority File Task Force with the following description:

“Encourage IP offices to provide their patent authority file in compliance with WIPO Standard ST.37 by providing any technical support or training necessary, based on available resources; and undertake any necessary revisions and updates to WIPO Standard ST.37.”

Agenda Item 10: Summary by the Chair

172. The Summary by the Chair was prepared and distributed for information purposes. The CWS noted the Summary by the Chair.

Agenda Item 11: Closing of the session

173. The meeting was closed by the Chair on September 19, 2024.

[Annex I follows]

## LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS/LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

### I. ÉTATS MEMBRES/MEMBER STATES

(dans l'ordre alphabétique des noms français des États)  
(in alphabetical order of the names in French)

#### ALGERIE/ALGERIA

Youcef ZIANE (M.), chef, Département de la promotion des innovations, Direction de la promotion de l'innovation et transfert des techniques, Institut national algérien de la propriété industrielle (INAPI), Ministère de l'industrie, Alger

Belgacem TABAI (M.), conseiller, Mission permanente, Genève

#### ALLEMAGNE/GERMANY

Thomas PLARRE (Mr.), Examiner, German Patent and Trade Mark Office (DPMA), Munich

#### ANGOLA

Augusto Sebastião MIRANDA (Mr.), Head of Department, Department of Industrial Innovations and Creations, Angolan Institute of Industrial Property (IAPI), Ministry of Industry and Commerce, Luanda

#### ANTIGUA-ET-BARBUDA/ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA

Kyle KENTISH (Mr.), Deputy Registrar, Antigua and Barbuda Intellectual Property and Commerce Office (ABIPCO), Ministry of Justice and Legal Affairs, St. John's

#### ARABIE SAOUDITE/SAUDI ARABIA

Ali ALHARBI (Mr.), Head, Intellectual Property Information, Saudi Authority for Intellectual Property (SAIP), Riyadh

Heba ALSAIGH (Ms.), Senior Business Solutions Specialist, Information Technology, Saudi Authority for Intellectual Property (SAIP), Riyadh

Hebah ALOMARI (Ms.), Beneficiary Services Specialist, Beneficiary Services, Saudi Authority for Intellectual Property (SAIP), Riyadh

#### ARMÉNIE/ARMENIA

Vardan AVETYAN (Mr.), Chief Specialist, Intellectual Property Office, Ministry of Economy, Yerevan

#### AUSTRALIE/AUSTRALIA

Michael CRISTIANO (Mr.), Chief Information Officer and General Manager, Chair of the Committee on WIPO Standards, Innovation and Technology Group, IP Australia, Canberra



Julia PRICE (Ms.), Acting Director, Enabling Services and International Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) Cooperation, Innovation and Technology Group, IP Australia, Canberra

Ivanka BARISIC (Ms.), International Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) Cooperation Specialist, Innovation and Technology Group, IP Australia, Canberra

#### AUTRICHE/AUSTRIA

Gloria MIRESCU (Ms.), Patent Examiner, Austrian Patent Office, Federal Ministry for Climate Change Protection, Vienna

#### BHOUTAN/BHUTAN

Ninda DEMA (Ms.), Intellectual Property Officer, Department of Media, Creative Industry, and Intellectual Property (DoMCIP), Ministry of Industry, Commerce and Employment (MoICE), Thimphu

#### BRÉSIL/BRAZIL

Alexandre CIANCIO (Mr.), General-Coordinator, Patent Technological Information, National Institute of Industrial Property (INPI), Ministry of Development, Industry, Commerce and Services (MDIC), Rio de Janeiro

Cristina VIEIRA MACHADO ALEXANDRE (Ms.), Counsellor, Permanent Mission to the WTO, Geneva

#### BULGARIE/BULGARIA

Dail DAILOV (Mr.), Junior Expert, Administrative and Legal, Financial and Economic Activities, Patent Office of the Republic of Bulgaria, Sofia

#### BURKINA FASO

Emmanuel ZONGO (M.), chef, Département du transfert de technologies, Secrétariat permanent du Centre national de la propriété industrielle (SP-CNPI), Ministère de l'industrie, du commerce et de l'artisanat, Ouagadougou

#### CANADA

Sudeep ACHARYA (Mr.), Director, Investments and Program Management, Canadian Intellectual Property Office (CIPO), Innovation and Science and Economic Development Canada (ISED), Gatineau

Derek SPERO (Mr.), Solution Architect, Digital Transmission Systems (DTSS), Canadian Intellectual Property Office (CIPO), Innovation Science and Economic Development Canada (ISED) Ottawa

Emeterio DUQUE (Mr.), Technical Officer, Operations, Canadian Intellectual Property Office (CIPO), Innovation Science and Economic Development Canada (ISED), Gatineau

Raphaëlle MARTIN (Ms.), Technical Advisor, Canadian Intellectual Property Office (CIPO), Innovation, Science, and Economic Development Canada (ISED), Ottawa

Brendan RICKEY (Mr.), Technical Advisor, Canadian Intellectual Property Office (CIPO), Innovation, Science, and Economic Development Canada (ISED), Ottawa

#### CHILI/CHILE

Javier HERESI MANOSALVA (Sr.), Jefe, Unidad de Transformación Digital, Instituto Nacional de Propiedad Industrial (INAPI), Ministerio de Economía, Santiago

#### CHINE/CHINA

CONG Shan (Ms.), Divisional Director, Information Technology Department, Patent Office, China National Intellectual Property Administration (CNIPA), Beijing

MA Xiaolei (Ms.), Officer, Intellectual Property Publishing House, China National Intellectual Property Administration (CNIPA), Beijing

ZHAO Xiangguang (Mr.), First-level Principal Officer, Patent Documentation Department, Patent Office, China National Intellectual Property Administration (CNIPA), Beijing

#### DANEMARK/DENMARK

Martin CORNELIUSSEN (Mr.), Head, Information Technology Development, Information Technology, Danish Patent and Trademark Office, Ministry of Industry, Business and Financial Affairs, Taastrup

#### ÉGYPTE/EGYPT

Walaa SALAH SADIK (Ms.), Director, Information Technology Department, Egyptian Patent Office, Academy of Scientific Research and Technology (ASRT), Ministry of Scientific Research, Cairo

Soheir HELMY (Ms.), Director, Information Technology 3, Egyptian Patent Office, Academy of Scientific Research and Technology (ASRT), Ministry of Scientific Research, Cairo

Mohamed Adel Mohamed HASSANIN (Mr.), First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

#### EL SALVADOR

Coralia OSEGUEDA (Sra.), Consejera, Misión Permanente, Geneva

#### ESPAGNE/SPAIN

María Rosa CARRERAS DURBÁN (Sra.), Jefa de Área de Servicios Electrónicos de Divulgación de Propiedad Industrial, División de Tecnologías de la Información, Oficina Española de Patentes y Marcas (OEPM), Ministerio de Industria, Comercio y Turismo, Madrid

ESWATINI

Sandile Lelfred HLATSHWAYO (Mr.), Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva

ÉTATS-UNIS D'AMÉRIQUE/UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Nelson YANG (Mr.), Senior Advisor and Director, International Patent Business Solutions, United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO), Department of Commerce, Alexandria

Li WANG (Ms.), Director, Enterprise Data Architecture Division, United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO), Department of Commerce, Alexandria

Arti SHAH (Ms.), International Program Manager, Office of International Cooperation, United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO), Department of Commerce, Alexandria

Virginia HO (Ms.), Information Technology Specialist, Enterprise Data Architecture Division, United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO), Department of Commerce, Alexandria

Kathleen KALAFUS (Ms.), Technical Specialist, Scientific and Technical Information Center, United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO), Department of Commerce, Alexandria

Liejun WU (Ms.), Lead Trademark Business Operations Specialist, Trademark/Data Quality Management and System Sustainment, United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO), Department of Commerce, Alexandria

Narith TITH (Mr.), Information Technology Specialist, Enterprise Data Architecture Division, United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO), Department of Commerce, Alexandria

Alicia ANTOINE (Ms.), Business Analyst, Office of International Patent Cooperation, United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO), Department of Commerce, Alexandria

Maryam IPAKCHI (Ms.), International Patent Business Analyst, Office of International Patent Cooperation, International Patent Business Solutions, United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO), Department of Commerce, Alexandria

Francisco TSCHEN (Mr.), International Patent Program Analyst, International Patent Business Solutions, United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO), Department of Commerce, Alexandria

Marina LAMM (Ms.), Intellectual Property Attaché, Multilateral Economic and Political Affairs (MEPA), Permanent Mission, Geneva

Natalie WEISSENBERGER (Ms.), Intellectual Property Assistant, Multilateral Economic and Political Affairs (MEPA), Permanent Mission, Geneva

ÉTHIOPIE/ETHIOPIA

Atinaw MARSHET ZERIHUN (Ms.), Second Secretary, Permanent Mission

FEDERATION DE RUSSIE/RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Vladislav MAMONTOV (Mr.), Head, Multilateral Cooperation Division, International Cooperation Department, Federal Service for Intellectual Property (Rospatent), Moscow

Evgeniia KOROBENKOVA (Ms.), Adviser, Multilateral Cooperation Division, International Cooperation Department, Federal Service for Intellectual Property (Rospatent), Moscow

Ilya KONONENKO (Mr.), Deputy Head, Federal Institute of Industrial Property (FIPS), Moscow

Olga FEDOSEEVA (Ms.), Deputy Head, Division for Information Search Systems Design, Center for Design, Development and Maintenance of Applied Information Systems, Federal Institute of Industrial Property (FIPS), Moscow

Valeriya MAKSIMOVA (Ms.), Senior Patent Researcher, Federal Institute of Industrial Property (FIPS), Moscow

Olga TIURINA (Ms.), Senior Patent Researcher, Federal Institute of Industrial Property (FIPS), Moscow

#### FINLANDE/FINLAND

Jouko BERNDTSON (Mr.), Senior Patent Examiner, Finnish Patent and Registration Office (PRH), Ministry of Economic Affairs and Employment, Helsinki

#### FRANCE

Sylvie MERESSE (Mme), chargée de diffusion des données dessins et modèles et indications géographiques, Direction de la propriété industrielle et des entreprises, Institut national de la propriété industrielle (INPI), Lille

#### GAMBIE/GAMBIA

Aliou JABANG (Mr.), Senior Legal Clerk/Administrator, Registrar General's Department, Ministry of Justice, Banjul

#### GHANA

Grace ISSAHAQUE (Ms.), Registrar-General, Registrar General's Department, Ministry of Justice, Accra

Winnie AKUSHIKA MYERS (Ms.), Assistant State Attorney, Registrar General's Department, Ministry of Justice, Accra

Teddy EDU-YAW (Mr.), Principal Information Technology/Information Manager Officer, Registrar General's Department, Ministry of Justice, Accra

Samuel OHENE-KANKAM (Mr.), Principal Information Technology/Information Manager Officer, Registrar General's Department, Ministry of Justice, Accra

#### GUATEMALA

Flor de María GARCÍA DÍAZ (Sra.), Consejera, Misión Permanente ante la Organización Mundial del Comercio (OMC), Ginebra

HONGRIE/HUNGARY

Judit JANCSKÁR (Ms.), Receiving Office Officer, Receiving and Official Publication Section, Hungarian Intellectual Property Office (HIPO), Budapest

INDE/INDIA

Rekha VIJAYAM (Ms.), Joint Controller, Patents and Designs, Office of the Controller General of Patents, Designs and Trademarks (CGPDTM), Department for Promotion of Industry and Internal Trade (DPIIT), Ministry of Commerce and Industry, New Delhi

MS RAGHAVENDRA (Mr.), Assistant Controller, Patents and Designs, Office of the Controller General of Patents, Designs and Trademarks (CGPDTM), Department for Promotion of Industry and Internal Trade (DPIIT), Ministry of Commerce and Industry, New Delhi

Mohan BYLAPUDI (Mr.), Office of the Controller General of Patents, Designs and Trademarks (CGPDTM), Department for Promotion of Industry and Internal Trade (DPIIT), Ministry of Commerce and Industry, New Delhi

Saurabh NAIR (Mr.), System Analyst, Information Technology, Patents and Designs, Office of the Controller General of Patents, Designs and Trademarks (CGPDTM), Department for Promotion of Industry and Internal Trade (DPIIT), Ministry of Commerce and Industry, New Delhi

IRAN (REPUBLIQUE ISLAMIQUE D')/IRAN (ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF)

Hesam ADARANG (Mr.), Patent Examiner, Iranian Patent Office, Intellectual Property Center of the Islamic Republic of Iran, Tehran

IRAQ

Thanaa MOHAN MASHKOUR (Ms.), Director, Department of Industrial Development and Regulation, Ministry of Industry and Minerals, Baghdad

Maria FAISAL JASSIM (Ms.), Associate Engineer, Department of Industrial Development and Regulation, Ministry of Industry and Minerals, Baghdad

IRLANDE/IRELAND

Alena LANE (Ms.), Patent Examiner, Intellectual Property Office of Ireland (IPOI), Kilkenny

ITALIE/ITALY

Lino FANELLA (M.), Information Technology Consultant, Division III, Directorate General for the Protection of Industrial Property, Italian Patent and Trademark Office, Ministry of Enterprises and Made in Italy, Rome

Felice PISCITELLO (M.), Attaché (Intellectual Property), Permanent Mission, Geneva

JAMAÏQUE/JAMAICA

Vivian ROSE (Mr.), Deputy Director/Legal Counsel, Jamaica Intellectual Property Office (JIPO), Ministry of Industry, Investment and Commerce, New Kingston

JAPON/JAPAN

HARA Kazuhide (Mr.), Deputy Director, Patent Information Policy Planning Office, Japan Patent Office (JPO), Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry (METI), Tokyo

SAKAGUCHI Takeshi (Mr.), Deputy Director, Patent Information Policy Planning Office, Japan Patent Office (JPO), Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry (METI), Tokyo

TSUDA Kenji (Mr.), Deputy Director, Information Technology and Patent Information Management Office, Japan Patent Office (JPO), Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry (METI), Tokyo

TAKAHASHI Asuka (Ms.), Assistant Director, Information Technology and Patent Information Management Office, Japan Patent Office (JPO), Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry (METI), Tokyo

ITO Yuichi (Mr.), First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

KENYA

Anthony MATHENGE (Mr.), First Counsellor, Trade, Permanent Mission, Geneva

KIRGHIZISTAN/KYRGYZSTAN

Artyk BAZARKULOV (Mr.), Head, Examination Department, State Agency of Intellectual Property and Innovation under the Cabinet of Ministers (Kyrgyzpatent), Bishkek

LITUANIE/LITHUANIA

Liūnė STOROŽENKAITĖ (Ms.), Adviser, Industrial Property Information Division, Industrial Property Information Division, State Patent Bureau of the Republic of Lithuania, Vilnius

MAROC/MOROCCO

Dalal MHAMDI ALAOUI (Mme), directrice par intérim, Direction générale, Bureau marocain des droits d'auteur (BMDA), Rabat

MEXIQUE/MEXICO

Jazmín SALGADO DELGADO (Sra.), Especialista en Propiedad Industrial, Dirección Divisional de Relaciones Internacionales, Instituto Mexicano de la Propiedad Industrial (IMPI), Ciudad de México

Itzel FERNÁNDEZ PANDO (Sra.), Asesora, Misión Permanente, Ginebra

Rodrigo Alonso LÓPEZ TOVAR (Sr.), Tercer Secretario, Propiedad Intelectual, Misión Permanente, Ginebra



## NIGER

Abdoulaye GARBA SADOU (M.), directeur général, Agence nationale de la propriété industrielle et de la promotion de l'innovation (AN2PI), Ministère de l'industrie et de l'entrepreneuriat des jeunes, Niamey

## NORVÈGE/NORWAY

Jens Petter SOLLIE (Mr.), Business Architect, Digital Services, Norwegian Industrial Property Office (NIPO), Oslo

## OMAN

Faisal AL HINAI (Mr.), Director, Permanent Mission to the World Trade Organization (WTO), Geneva

## OUZBÉKISTAN/UZBEKISTAN

Ikram ABDUKADIROV (Mr.), Head, Invention and Utility Model Department, Intellectual Property Center, Ministry of Justice, Tashkent

Karel-Ieronim MAVLYANOV (Mr.), Expert, Industrial Technologies and Construction, Department of Inventions and Utility Models, Trademarks and Service Marks, Intellectual Property Center, Ministry of Justice, Tashkent

Nilufar RAKHMATULLAEVA (Ms.), Top Examiner, Invention and Utility Model Department of Trademarks and Service Marks, Intellectual Property Center, Ministry of Justice, Tashkent

## PAKISTAN

Uzair Zahir SHAIKH (Mr.), First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

## PAYS-BAS (ROYAUME DES)/NETHERLANDS (KINGDOM OF THE)

Saskia JURNA (Ms.), First Secretary (WIPO Group B Coordinator), Permanent Mission, Geneva

## PEROU/PERU

Fancy DE LOS SANTOS LÓPEZ (Sra.), Asesora, Dirección de Signos Distintivos, Instituto Nacional de Defensa de la Competencia y de la Protección de la Propiedad Intelectual (INDECOPI), Presidencia del Consejo de Ministros (PCM), Lima

Gwendy PAZ (Sra.), Subdirectora, Dirección de Signos Distintivos, Instituto Nacional de Defensa de la Competencia y de la Protección de la Propiedad Intelectual (INDECOPI), Presidencia del Consejo de Ministros (PCM), Lima

## POLOGNE/POLAND

Marek GAJEWSKI (Mr.), Head of Division, Information Technology, Patent Office of the Republic of Poland, Warsaw

PORTUGAL

Vítor FARIA (Mr.), Head, Information Systems Department, Ministry of Justice, Portuguese Institute of Industrial Property (INPI), Ministry of Justice, Lisbon

REPUBLIQUE ARABE SYRIENNE/SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC

Reem ABID (Ms.), Director, International Cooperation, Ministry of Internal Trade and Consumer Protection, Damascus

REPUBLIQUE DE COREE/REPUBLIC OF KOREA

LEE Jintae (Mr.), Director, Deliberation and Industry Research Team, Korea Copyright Commission, Jinju

CHOI Jin Ah (Ms.), Deputy Director, Industrial Property Data Management Division, Korean Intellectual Property Office (KIPO), Daejeon

KWON Seokhun (Mr.), Deputy Director, Industrial Property Information System Division, Korean Intellectual Property Office (KIPO), Daejeon

LEE Jumi (Ms.), Deputy Director, Industrial Property Information Policy Division, Korean Intellectual Property Office (KIPO), Daejeon

KIM Donghyun (Mr.), Assistant Director, Industrial Property Information Policy Division, The Korean Intellectual Property Office, Daejeon

LEE Jinyong (Mr.), Counsellor (Intellectual Property Attaché), Permanent Mission, Geneva

KIM Minyoung (Ms.), Researcher, Deliberation and Industry Research Team, Korea Copyright Commission, Jinju

REPUBLIQUE DE MOLDOVA/REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA

Olga CICINOVA (Ms.), Head, Workflow Division, Patent Department, State Agency on Intellectual Property (AGEPI), Chisinau

Nicolae DIMOV (Mr.), Lead Specialist, Information Technologies Division, State Agency on Intellectual Property (AGEPI), Chisinau

RÉPUBLIQUE TCHÈQUE/CZECH REPUBLIC

Jakub JUZL (Mr.), Information Technology Analyst, Patent Information Department, Industrial Property Office of the Czech Republic, Prague

ROYAUME-UNI/UNITED KINGDOM

Julie DALTRY (Ms.), Head, Metadata Management, Data, Intellectual Property Office (UK IPO), Newport

Elizabeth Barbara Alice WILSON (Ms.), Senior Intellectual Property Attaché, Permanent Mission to the World Trade Organization (WTO), Geneva

Lauren JOHNSON (Ms.), Data Steward, Digital Data and Technology (DDaT), Intellectual Property Office (IPO), Newport

Valeriano SIMONE, Intellectual Property Attaché, Permanent Mission

#### SERBIE/SERBIA

Nada PAVLOVIC (Ms.), Head, Publication and Quality Department, Intellectual Property Office of the Republic of Serbia, Belgrade

#### SINGAPOUR/SINGAPORE

Rouxin LAI (Ms.), Assistant Director, Information Technology Department, Intellectual Property Office of Singapore (IPOS), Singapore

Sreeja SASINDRAN (Ms.), Assistant Director, Patents/Future Systems Team, Intellectual Property Office of Singapore (IPOS), Ministry of Law, Singapore

Weihao Bryan YIP (Mr.), Group Director, Registries Cluster, Intellectual Property Office of Singapore (IPOS), Singapore

Jin Xuan LUM (Mr.), Senior Executive, Registry of Patents, Design and Plant Variety (PDPVP), Intellectual Property Office of Singapore (IPOS), Singapore

#### SLOVAQUIE/SLOVAKIA

Katarina DOVALOVA (Ms.), Data Analyst, Information Technology Department, Industrial Property Office of the Slovak Republic, Banská Bystrica

#### SUÈDE/SWEDEN

Åsa VIKEN (Ms.), Process Owner, Patent Department, Swedish Intellectual Property Office (PRV), Stockholm

Anders SVENSSON (Mr.), Process Owner, Design and Trademark Department, Swedish Intellectual Property Office (PRV), Söderhamn

#### SUISSE/SWITZERLAND

Mirko GALLI (M.), chef, Développement des services et innovation, Services de technologie et d'infrastructure, Institut fédéral de la propriété intellectuelle (IPI), Berne

Kilian AELLEN (M.), ingénieur senior, Exigences, Technologies de l'information et de la communication (TIC), Services de technologie et d'infrastructure, Institut fédéral de la propriété intellectuelle (IPI), Berne

#### TOGO

Mouhamed Nour-Dine ASSINDOH (M.), ministre-conseiller, Mission permanente, Genève

## UKRAINE

Andrii ABAKUMOV (Mr.), Head, Digital Development and Electronic Services, State Organization “Ukrainian National Office for Intellectual Property and Innovations (UANIPPIO)”, Kyiv

Maryna HEPENKO (Ms.), Leading Intellectual Property Professional, Cooperation with WIPO and Other International Organizations Unit, State Organization “Ukrainian National Office for Intellectual Property and Innovations (UANIPPIO)”, Kyiv

Nadiia KOLOMIETS (Ms.), Leading Intellectual Property Professional, Patent Information, Documentation and Standardization Unit, State Organization “Ukrainian National Office for Intellectual Property and Innovations (UANIPPIO)”, Kyiv

Antonina KRAUZE (Ms.), Leading Expert, Quality Control and Improvement of Examination of Applications Unit, Ministry of Economy of Ukraine, State Organization “Ukrainian National Office for Intellectual Property and Innovations (UANIPPIO)”, Kyiv

Oleksandr MONASTYRETSKYI (Mr.), Leading Analyst of Computer Systems, Division of Digital Development and Electronic Services, State Organization “Ukrainian National Office for Intellectual Property and Innovations (UANIPPIO)”, Kyiv

Andrii ZOZULIUK (Mr.), Head, Department of International Cooperation, State Organization “Ukrainian National Office for Intellectual Property and Innovations (UANIPPIO)”, Kyiv

## VANUATU

Lorenzies LINGTAMAT (Mr.), Senior Copyright and Related Rights Officer, Vanuatu Intellectual Property Office, Ministry of Tourism, Trade, Industry, Commerce, and Ni-Vanuatu Business, Port Vila

## ZAMBIE/ZAMBIA

Kenneth MUSAMVU (Mr.), Expert, Copyright Administration, Intellectual Property Department, Patents and Companies Registration Agency (PACRA), Lusaka

## **II. ORGANISATIONS INTERGOUVERNEMENTALES/INTERGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS**

### ORGANISATION AFRICAINE DE LA PROPRIETE INTELLECTUELLE (OAPI)/AFRICAN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION (OAPI)

Narcisse DJENARBE MOYODINGAM (M.), directeur, Direction des systèmes d'information et de la publication, Yaoundé

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

Denis ZASTAVNYI (Mr.), Director, Information Technologies Department, Moscow

Andrey SEKRETOV (Mr.), Director, Integration Solutions Division, Information Technologies Department, Moscow

### ORGANISATION EUROPEENNE DES BREVETS (OEB)/EUROPEAN PATENT ORGANISATION (EPO)

Elke VON BREVERN (Ms.), Expert, Patent Filing Process and Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT) Affairs, Munich

Fernando FERREIRA (Mr.), Administrator, Information Technology Cooperation, Rijswijk

Clara BOIANGIU (Ms.), Patent Examiner, Biotechnology, Rijswijk

Leslie RIPAUD (Ms.), Patent Examiner – SEQL Expert, DG1 Biotechnology, Munich

Roland NELSON (Mr.), Head, Engineering and Architecture Department, The Hague

Johannes SCHAAF (Mr.), Administrator, Chief Economist Unit, Vienna

Monika NEUMANN (Ms.), Legal Expert, Directorate Patent Law and Processes, Munich

Theodor PALEOLOG (Mr.), Team Manager, Back Office Information Technology Tools, The Hague

### UNION EUROPEENNE (UE)/EUROPEAN UNION (EU)

Pamela LÓPEZ VEIGA (Ms.), Team Lead, Information Technology Architecture and Quality Service, Digital Innovation Department, Alicante

Panagiotis SPAGOPOULOS (Mr.), Information Technology Architecture Lead, Digital Innovation Department, Alicante

Raymond KLAASSEN (Mr.), Head of Operations, Digital Innovation Department, Alicante

Carlos LUNA (Mr.), Information Technology Expert, Digital Innovation Department, Alicante

Soraya BERNARD (Ms.), Intellectual Property Project Manager Specialist, International Cooperation Area, Alicante

### III. ORGANISATIONS NON GOUVERNEMENTALES/NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

Association européenne des étudiants en droit (ELSA International)/European Law Students' Association (ELSA International)

J. Maria SHAKIR (Ms.), Head of Delegation, Brussels

Saba Nejan YÜCE (Ms.), Delegate, Brussels

Association internationale des jeunes avocats (AIJA)/International Association of Young Lawyers (AIJA)

Neha SARASWAT (Ms.), Partner, Department of Intellectual Property and Technology, Saraswat and Company, Advocates and Intellectual Property Attorneys, New Delhi

Vikas SARASWAT (Mr.), Partner, Department of Intellectual Property and Technology, Saraswat and Company, Advocates and Intellectual Property Attorneys, New Delhi

Confederacy Of Patent Information User Groups (CEPIUG)

Guido MORADEI (Mr.), Delegate, Relations with IPOs, Varese

Groupe de documentation sur les brevets (PDG)/Patent Documentation Group (PDG)

Nicholas COLE (Mr.), Senior Information Scientist, Legal Department, London

Arndt MECKE (Mr.), Deputy Chair, Working Group "IMPACT", Munich

International Trademark Association (INTA)

Tat-Tienne LOUEMBE (Mr.), Chief Representative Officer, Europe and Intergovernmental Organizations, Brussels

Olha VOLOTKEVYCH (Ms.), Consultant, Brussels

MALOCA Internationale

Sonia MURCIA ROA (Ms.), TKGRs holder, Self-Determination, Geneva

Leonardo RODRIGUEZ PEREZ (Mr.), Global Governance, Geneva

### IV. BUREAU/OFFICERS

Président/Chair

Michael CRISTIANO (M./Mr.)  
(Australie/Australia)

Vice-Présidents/Chairs

Alexandre CIANCIO (M./Mr.),  
(Brésil/Brazil)

Ali ALHARBI (M./Mr.),  
(Arabie saoudite/Saudi Arabia)

Secrétaire/Secretary

Young-Woo YUN (M./Mr.) (OMPI/WIPO)



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

Ken-Ichiro NATSUME (M./Mr.), sous-directeur général, Secteur de l'infrastructure et des plateformes/Assistant Director General, Infrastructure and Platforms Sector

Kunihiko FUSHIMI (M./Mr.), directeur, Division des classifications internationales et des normes, Secteur de l'infrastructure et des plateformes/Director, International Classifications and Standards Division, Infrastructure and Platforms Sector

Michael RICHARDSON (M./Mr.), directeur, Division du développement fonctionnel du PCT/Director, PCT Business Development Division

Young-Woo YUN (M./Mr.), chef, Section des normes, Division des classifications internationales et des normes, Secteur de l'infrastructure et des plateformes/Head, Standards Section, International Classifications and Standards Division, Infrastructure and Platforms Sector

Daniel CHENG (M./Mr.), chef, Section du développement de produits, Division des solutions opérationnelles à l'intention des offices de propriété intellectuelle, Secteur de l'infrastructure et des plateformes/Head, Product Development Section, Intellectual Property Office Business Solutions Division, Infrastructure and Platforms Sector

Quan-Ling SIM (M./Mr.), chef, Service des opérations, Service d'enregistrement de La Haye, Secteur des marques et des dessins et modèles/Head, Operations Service, The Hague Registry, Brands and Designs Sector

Thomas MARLOW (M./Mr.), administrateur principal chargé des politiques, Section de la politique opérationnelle du PCT, Division du développement fonctionnel du PCT, Département des services du PCT/PCT Services Department, PCT Business Policy Section, PCT Business Development Division

Yongwoong KIM (M./Mr.), administrateur principal de programme, Bureau du sous-directeur général (SIP), Secteur de l'infrastructure et des plateformes/Senior Program Officer, Office of the Assistant Director General (IPS), Infrastructure and Platforms Sector

Emma FRANCIS (Mme/Ms.), spécialiste des données de propriété intellectuelle de la Section des normes, Division des classifications internationales et des normes, Secteur de l'infrastructure et des plateformes/Intellectual Property Data Expert, Standards Section, International Classifications and Standards Division, Infrastructure and Platforms Sector

Erjola MURATAJ (Mme/Ms.) Administratrice chargée d'information sur la propriété intellectuelle, Section des normes, Division des classifications internationales et des normes, Secteur de l'infrastructure et des plateformes/Intellectual Property Information Officer, Standards Section, International Classifications and Standards Division, Infrastructure and Platforms Sector

[Annex II follows]

**TASK LIST**

## (a) Tasks discontinued at this session:

No Tasks were discontinued at this session.

## (b) Tasks created at this session and on which work has not started:

Task No. 67: Analyze existing practices and challenges experienced by IP offices in conducting IP data exchange with a view to explore solutions to improve access to global IP data

## (c) Tasks revised at this session:

Task No. 56: Ensure the necessary revisions and updates of WIPO Standard ST.90; support the International Bureau in promoting and implementing WIPO Standard ST.90; and promote the API Catalog for Intellectual Property

Task No. 58: Facilitate the implementation of the ICT related Recommendations by IP offices and the International Bureau; and evaluate and update these Recommendations as needed to maintain their relevance.

Task No. 65: Ensure the necessary revisions and updates of WIPO Standard ST.92 and support IP offices for their implementation of the Standard before July 1, 2027.

Task No. 66: Encourage IP offices to provide their patent authority file in compliance with WIPO Standard ST.37 by providing any technical support or training necessary, based on available resources; and undertake any necessary revisions and updates to WIPO Standard ST.37.

## (d) Tasks on which work remains to be done:

Task No. 24: Collect and publish Annual Technical Reports (ATRs) on Patent, Trademark and Industrial Design Information Activities of the CWS Members (ATR/PI, ATR/TM, ATR/ID).

Task No. 44: Support the International Bureau by testing new releases based on available resources and providing user feedback on the WIPO Sequence Suite; and prepare necessary revisions of WIPO Standard ST.26

Task No. 50: Ensure the necessary maintenance and update of surveys published in Part 7 of the WIPO Handbook on Intellectual Property Information and Documentation.

- Task No. 52: Prepare a proposal for the update of the WIPO Handbook Part 6.1 "Recommended minimum contents for intellectual property offices' websites".
- Task No. 55: Prepare a proposal for future actions aimed at achieving the standardization of names in Intellectual Property (IP) documents, with the view to developing a WIPO standard to assist IP offices in providing a better "quality at source" in relation to names.
- Task No. 61: Ensure the necessary revisions and updates of WIPO Standard ST.91, including methods of search for 3D models and 3D images.
- Task No. 62: Review paper or image-based WIPO Standards in view of electronic filing and publication and exchange of IP documentation and propose revisions of those Standards or new recommendations if needed; and prepare a proposal for the recommendation on a common requirements specification for a DOCX to XML (DOCX2XML) converter.

(e) Tasks to ensure continuous maintenance of WIPO Standards:

- Task No. 41: Ensure the necessary revisions and updates of WIPO Standards ST.36, ST.66, ST.86 and ST.96; and support the implementation of those Standards.
- Task No. 47: Ensure the necessary revisions and updates of WIPO Standards ST.27, ST.87, and ST.61; prepare supporting materials to assist the use of those Standards in the IP community; and support the XML4IP Task Force to develop XML components for legal status event data.
- Task No. 59: Explore the possibility of using blockchain technology in the processes of providing IP rights protection, processing information about IP objects and their use; Collect information about IPO developments in use of and experience with blockchain, assess current Industry Standards on blockchain and consider merit and applicability to IPOs; Develop reference models of using blockchain technology in the IP field, including guiding principles, common practice and use of terminology as a framework supporting collaboration, joint projects and proofs of concept; and Prepare a proposal for a new WIPO standard supporting the potential application of blockchain technology within the IP ecosystem.
- Task No. 64: Ensure the necessary revisions and updates of WIPO Standard ST.97.

(f) Tasks of continuing activity and/or information nature:

Task No. 18: Identify areas for standardization relevant to the exchange of machine-readable data on the basis of projects envisaged by such bodies as the Five IP Offices (IP5), the Five Trademark Offices (TM5), the Industrial Design 5 Forum (ID5), ISO, IEC and other well-known industry standard-setting bodies.

Task No. 33: Ongoing revision of WIPO Standards.

Task No. 33/3: Ongoing revision of WIPO Standard ST.3.

Task No. 63: Develop visual representation(s) of XML data, based on WIPO XML Standards, for electronic publication.

(g) Tasks on which work has been held in abeyance:

Task No. 43: Prepare guidelines, for implementation by industrial property offices, regarding paragraph numbering, long paragraphs, and consistent rendering of patent documents.

Task No. 60: Prepare a proposal for the numbering of INID codes regarding word marks and figurative marks, on splitting INID code (551), and a potential INID code for combined marks.

[End of Annex II and of document]