

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

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

### **QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE PRIORITIZATION OF CWS TASKS**

*Document prepared by the Secretariat*

#### **SUMMARY**

1. This document proposes next steps regarding the formal prioritization survey questionnaire for the Committee on WIPO Standards (CWS) work program. The Secretariat considers that the results of the informal survey conducted in July 2024 was sufficient to meet the aims set out in previous sessions of the CWS.

#### **BACKGROUND**

2. At its tenth session held in 2022, the Committee on WIPO Standards (CWS) discussed the prioritization of the Tasks that forms its Work Program. Noting that Intellectual Property Offices (IPOs) may have different priorities, the CWS understood that several considerations would need to be made by the Secretariat when prioritizing Tasks, including the scheduled actions to be carried out by the Task Force, whether there is active participation by participating Offices and the level of experience of those Offices. (See paragraph 26 of document CWS/10/22).

3. At the same session, the Secretariat posed several questions to the CWS for consideration, relevant to prioritizing Tasks and preparing the Work Program. Those questions are reproduced below (see paragraph 13 of document CWS/10/3):

*(a) What does high priority mean in the context of Tasks? Does this mean all CWS members should participate in high priority Tasks instead of maintaining their interest in other Tasks which are lower in priority? Does it mean all Task Force members should take some action on the Task? The Secretariat has observed that most Task Forces consist of a small group of highly motivated members, sometimes as small as a single member, who substantially drive the work forward; a larger number of participating members who review*

*and comment; and an even larger number of quiet members who rarely attend meetings or submit comments.*

*(b) Should the CWS limit the number of high priority Tasks to avoid overloading CWS members with work which cannot be completed in a timely manner? If so, how should the limit of high priority Tasks be set, given that different Tasks require different amounts of resources and effort to complete? Five simple tasks may be feasible to complete, while five complex Tasks may be challenging to make progress on all of them.*

*(c) If the proponent Offices complete a Task which has low priority, what will the CWS do? Should low priority Tasks wait for review and adoption by the CWS until higher priority Tasks are complete or should substantial progress be made?*

4. At the eleventh session of the CWS, as agreed at the previous session, the Secretariat presented for consideration by the CWS a draft survey questionnaire. It was prepared by the Secretariat in consultation with the leaders of the CWS Task Forces for determining the priority of CWS Tasks. Some delegations noted that it was not clear over which timeframe this questionnaire was applicable to or what the next steps would be after responses were provided by Offices. Several delegations were interested to know whether the status of a Task would be impacted by their responses in the survey questionnaire. (See paragraphs 34 and 36 of document CWS/11/28.)

5. At the same session, instead of approving the draft survey questionnaire, the CWS agreed the following: that Members of CWS Task Forces be asked to collaborate on a simplified and improved version of the questionnaire; that the new revised draft questionnaire be presented for consideration at the twelfth session; and informally, information regarding the prioritization of Tasks by Task Force Members should be gathered and these results be presented also at the twelfth session. (See paragraph 40 of document CWS/11/28).

#### RESULTS OF INFORMAL SURVEY ON PRIORITIZATION

6. As agreed at the eleventh session of the CWS, the Secretariat invited all members of CWS Task Forces to participate in an informal survey on the CWS Task prioritization via the shared wiki space for all the CWS Task Forces. The questionnaire consisted of two main sections: the first asking Offices to indicate which of the active CWS Tasks or activities that they considered to be a priority and the second whether they considered the results of this informal survey served their purposes.

7. The Secretariat performed an analysis of the feedback provided by the 21 participating Offices, which indicated that following priority for active CWS Tasks:

Active CWS Task	Number of Offices indicating a priority
Task No. 41 – Support the necessary revision of WIPO Standards ST.36, ST.66, ST.86 and ST.96	11
Task No. 44 – Support the necessary revision of WIPO Standard ST.26	11
Task No. 66 – Provide or publish patent authority file in compliance with WIPO Standard ST.37	11
Task No. 47 – Support the necessary revision of WIPO Standards ST.27, ST.61 and/or ST.87	9
Task No. 56 – Implement and promote WIPO Standard ST.90	9

Task No. 41 – Implement WIPO Standard ST.96 (any component)	8
Task No. 44 – Support the International Bureau for the upgrade of WIPO Sequence Suite	8
Task No. 24 – Submit Annual Technical Reports on patent, trademark and industrial design activities	7
Task No. 47 – Implement WIPO Standards ST.27, ST.61 or ST.87	7
Task No. 56 – Support the necessary revision of WIPO Standard ST.90	7
Task No. 56 – Support the development and maintenance of API Catalog for IP	7
Task No. 62 – Support the preparation of a proposal for the recommendation on a common requirements specification for a DOCX to XML (DOCX2XML) converter	7
Task No. 58 – Support the preparation of a proposal for a set of 10 recommendations on ICT and IP administration	6
Task No. 59 – Support the preparation of a proposal for a new WIPO standard supporting the potential application of blockchain technology within the IP ecosystem	5
Task No. 55 – Support the preparation of a proposal for a new WIPO standard on data cleaning of names	4
Task No. 64 – Support the necessary revision of WIPO Standard ST.97 and the implementation of Standard	5
Task No. 65 – Implement the new WIPO Standard ST.92	5
Task No. 61 – Support the necessary revision of WIPO Standards of WIPO Standard ST.91	4
Task No. 65 – Support the development of a new WIPO standard on a priority document data package (WIPO standard ST.92)	4
Task No. 50 – Support maintenance and update of surveys published in Part 7 of WIPO Handbook	2
Task No. 61 – Implement WIPO Standard ST.91	3
Task No. 62 – Support the preparation of a proposal for revisions of WIPO Standards developed for paper or image-based business process and documentation	2
Task No. 52 – Support the preparation of a proposal for the update of Part 6.1 of WIPO Handbook	1
Task No. 63 – Support the preparation of a proposal for visual representation(s) of XML data, based on WIPO XML Standards, for electronic publication	1

8. For the three other related CWS activities included in the questionnaire, the responses were as follows:

CWS related activity	Number of Offices indicating priority
Exchange IP data with other Offices	13
Participate in training on WIPO Standards or products such as WIPO Sequence Suite	6
Implement other WIPO Standards which are not mentioned above	5

9. Finally, 17 of the 21 Offices (81 per cent) indicated that the simplified survey addresses their concerns raised at the last session of the CWS. However, two Offices provided comments on how to improve the questionnaire:

- *“The questionnaire considers subtasks for different CWS tasks. This is a good improvement. A ranking or order of supported subtasks by each office is missing in the questionnaire. Perhaps this might help to compile a final order of subtasks from highest to lowest priority”.*
- *“[T]he survey is a good start to better understand in what areas the priorities of the various IPOs reside. The key will be to leverage this information to find common priorities, reach consensus on those select key priorities and achieve results.”*

#### PROPOSAL FOR NEXT STEP

10. The Secretariat recalls the CWS of its questions regarding Task prioritization referred to in paragraph 3 above, and notes that different IPOs seem have different priorities and a different sense of urgency, depending on their own agenda. Therefore, the Secretariat proposes that any results of the survey on Task prioritization should be used for information only, not directing the priority of the CWS work program. The analysis of the informal survey results above provides any guidance that Offices may need when prioritizing their own activities.

11. The Secretariat considers that the results of the informal survey conducted in July 2024 was sufficient to meet the aims set out in previous tenth and eleventh sessions of the CWS. In this regard, the Secretariat considers that a formal survey on the prioritization is not required. Therefore, no formal survey questionnaire is presented for consideration at the current session. The Secretariat proposes not to conduct a formal survey on the Task prioritization, but instead the CWS review the priority of each Task when it considers its program. At this session, the CWS Work Program with Task List is presented as document CWS/12/2.

12. *The CWS is invited to:*

*(a) note the content of the present document; and*

*(b) consider and approve the proposal for next step, as referred to in paragraphs 10 and 11 above.*

[End of document]