

Committee on WIPO Standards (CWS)

Seventh Session
Geneva, July 1 to 5, 2019

ALTERNATIVE PROPOSAL CWS/7/17 ANNEX I

Document prepared by the International Bureau

INTRODUCTION

1. After publication of CWS/7/17, the United Kingdom Intellectual Property Office made a proposal to amend the revision captured by this working document. These amendments effect only Annex III of ST.37 although there will be an impact on Annex IV to ensure that these two implementations remain interoperable.
2. After consultation with the Authority File Task Force Leader, the EPO, this proposal was accepted as a better alternative and will be provided to participants of the seventh session at the commencement of the Committee of WIPO Standards (CWS/7).
3. The XSD captured in Annex III has been amended in line with the proposal below, with the exception of item (5), and is provided as an Annex to the present document. The DTD from Annex IV has also been amended to ensure the two Annexes remain interoperable. The amended DTD will also be provided as an Annex to this document.

ALTERNATIVE PROPOSAL

4. The following items summarize the proposal:
5. < Authority File >- Annotation corrected to replace '*therefore*' with '*therefor*' as originally stated as this is grammatically correct.
6. < AFLatestDocumentDate >- Description corrected to be:

"Date of the most recently published document listed in this authority file."

7. < AuthorityFileEntry >- Proposal for a new description:

“An authority file entry consists of data required to uniquely identify a patent publication according to WIPO ST.37”

8. < groupAFCategory >- Proposal for a new description:

“Identifies how the authority files has been grouped i.e., by date, publication-level or document-kind code”.

9. < contentCategory >- Proposal to change this element to be type Boolean, potentially named groupedAFIndicator, to indicate whether the Authority File is grouped or not (with values Yes/No). The proposed description for this indicator is:

“Indicates that the authority file has been grouped, or not, according to one of the defined categories.”

10. < backupCategory >- Provide more meaningful descriptions for three possible values for this element. Also potentially this element could be renamed to be ‘updateAFCategory’, as this potentially the purpose of this element would be clearer to IP Offices when implementing. The proposed new descriptions are shown below:

- (a) ‘full’: *“A complete new authority file is provided at each update period.”*
- (b) ‘incremental’: *“Only the new authority file entries published since the last update period are provided.”*
- (c) ‘differential’: *“Only the records which have changed or are required to be updated since the last update period are provided.”*

11. < BeginRangeNumber >/< EndRangeNumber >- Propose a description for these elements:

- (a) < BeginRangeNumber >: *“First number in the range.”* and
- (b) < LastRangeNumber >: *“Last number in the range.”*

12. < DataCoverageURI >- Propose a new description for these element:

“URI where a detailed description of the data coverage of the authority file is available.”

13. < ExceptionCodeList >, < ExceptionCodeDefinition > and < ExceptionCodeDescriptionText > -Propose new descriptions for these elements, which are as follows:

- (a) < ExceptionCodeList >: *“List of exception codes that have a different or specific definition in use by the IP Office rather than the definitions of exception codes defined in WIPO ST.37.”*
- (b) < ExceptionCodeDefinition >: *“A set of Exception codes, particularly the codes N, W and X, and their descriptions as defined by the IP Office, which are different from definitions in WIPO ST.37.”*
- (c) < ExceptionCodeDescriptionText >: *“A different or specific description of an exception code, which an IP Office uses in their authority file.”*

14. < ExceptionCodeType > – Proposed new description for the following exception codes: [N], [W], [X], which require the IP Office to provide a description if they are used, as follows:

- (a) 'N': *“The use of code ‘N’ must be described in the IP Office's Authority Definition File.”*
- (b) 'W': *“The use of code ‘W’ must be described in the IP Office's Authority Definition File.”*
- (c) 'X': *“The use of code ‘X’ must be described in the IP Office's Authority Definition File.”*

15. < PublicationDateRange >- Proposal to amend current description to remove the second sentence: documentation:

“ Publication date range over which the authority file is valid. ~~Part of the definition file component.~~”

16. < PublicationNumber > and < RequestedPriorityDocumentIndicator > - Request that the descriptions remain the same as in WIPO ST.96, as follows:

- (a) < PublicationNumber >: “Publication Number“
- (b) < RequestedPriorityDocumentIndicator >: “The receiving office is requested to prepare and transmit to the IB a certified copy of the earlier application.“

[End of document]