

**WIPO IP Information Roundtable**  
**1 December 2020 9:00-14:00 GMT**  
**virtual meeting via WebEx hosted by Sandrine Ammann, WIPO**

This was my first time attending a WIPO IP Information Roundtable meeting; I think it was the first fully virtual meeting and maybe the first time opened out to a wider audience of individual IP information professionals?

There were 32 attendees; three BPIP members (Kathy Burrows (in part), Jeanette Eldridge, Jane List (in part)) attended, as well as representatives from CEPIUG and member users groups (e.g. CH, IT, NL), ISBQPIP/PDG, PIUG.

I have added some links as I was checking to see what was already in the public domain (as the meeting covered launches of new services and features since the beginning of 2020, and some planned for 2021 and beyond). Sandrine also provided slidesets for each of the presentation, so all are available on the BPIP website, along with these notes, for sharing with BPIP members.

UG attendees were asked to submit notes to share between CEPIUG and PDG, so I've added a few paragraphs to the combined document, which should also be available to BPIP via the CEPIUG.

---

**Topic 1: [WIPO Proof](#) (see [WIPO PROOF information booklet.pdf](#))**

Speaker: Claudio Cocorocchia, Senior Business Manager, Global Infrastructure Sector

A new digital service for individual and corporate innovators who are generating intellectual assets or data to enable protection of IP which falls outside normal IP protection routes.

Aims to support the innovation lifecycle by providing “proof of existence” at a specific time, from ideation and beyond, anywhere IP is generated.

Complements what's already available via [WIPO PCT](#) (patents), [WIPO Madrid](#) (trademarks), [WIPO Hague](#) (designs) but for e.g. trade secrets, creative works & designs, research & data – to help establish proof of “first in time = first in right”.

WIPO Proof provides tokens – “fingerprint” of a digital file generated by browser then encrypted using Public Key Infrastructure (PKI) – similar to blockchain but older, more established technology. Tokens are tamper-proof, not even WIPO can modify, stringent regulations apply – WIPO was audited last month and will be accredited shortly.

Tokens cost 26CHF individually or cheaper as bundles; tokens stored initially for 5 years with options to extend. Certificates which are valid internationally and recognised in jurisdictions worldwide can be provided as pdfs in 10 languages across European, Asian, Arabic, etc. – 193 member states approved in 2019 general assemblies.

Note that it is NOT a registry/repository of the actual works, no original files – presumably just the encrypted metadata? – so confidentiality retained.

Use cases:

- Trade secrets – need to demonstrate safeguards of confidentiality, e.g. NDAs, etc., to deter theft, misuse by partners or employees

- Creative works – formal copyright doesn't exist in some countries; also helps to protect individual contributions to collaborative works to address infringements, misappropriations
- Data – data particularly does not benefit from normal protection services, so essential to find a way to protect against theft or misuse
- Can apply to other digital assets like licences, so token details could be provided along with licensing contract, to help avoid legal disputes later

Part of WIPO's tools on integrated platform with single sign-on.

Since launch (6 months) ~2500 registered customers across 119 different countries.

More info, videos and webinars available: <https://wipoproof.wipo.int/wdts/>.

**Post-meeting note:** In response to the attendee survey sent out by WIPO, I suggested that WIPO PROOF would be particularly relevant to promote to universities and their funding bodies, alongside the IP support WIPO provide; it would sit well alongside funders' requirements for research data management and open access publication of government-funded research, while still providing reassurance to researchers and their institutions of intellectual property protections.

---

## **Topic 2: PCT Updates** (see [PCT Update IP Info Roundtable 2020.pdf](#))

Speaker: Christine Bonvallet, Director, PCT International Cooperation Division, PCT Legal and International Affairs Department, Patents and Technology Sector

Several graphical reports on PCT data from 2019-2020 including

- China has become origin of most PCT applications, overtaking USA ([https://www.wipo.int/pressroom/en/articles/2020/article\\_0005.html](https://www.wipo.int/pressroom/en/articles/2020/article_0005.html))
- The top 5 countries account for ~80% of PCT filings
- PCT vs Paris route – PCT accounts for ~60%

Similar graphs (but interactive) can be viewed at:

<https://www.wipo.int/edocs/infogdocs/en/ipfactsandfigures2019/>; see also the WIPO PCT Yearly Review (<https://www.wipo.int/pct/en/activity/index.html>) for 2019.

It was noted that even with the impact of Covid-19, the target level of filings during 2020 is at 93% vs 2019.

There have been amendments to a number of PCT Rules from 1 July 2020 (see <https://www.wipo.int/pct/en/highlights/>), e.g.

- clarifying the rules around “incorporation by reference” and “erroneously filed” documents, as there have been differing interpretations in the past; details available here: <https://www.wipo.int/export/sites/www/pct/guide/en/gdvol1/pdf/gdvol1.pdf>.

Rule updated as a consequence of Covid-19 impacts:

- interpretation that PCT Rule 82quater.1 of the Regulations under the Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT) applies in the current circumstance of global COVID-19 disruption, see: [https://www.wipo.int/export/sites/www/pct/en/covid\\_19/82quater.pdf](https://www.wipo.int/export/sites/www/pct/en/covid_19/82quater.pdf)

Other rules with relevance for patent information professionals include:

- a requirement for the International Preliminary Examining Authority (IPEA) to copy certain documents from its file to the IB, which the IB would make available to the public on behalf of the elected Office (Rules 71 and 94) – documents will be shared via Patentscope

Forthcoming meeting on PCT minimum documentation objectives on 7-11 December:

<https://www.wipo.int/export/sites/www/pct/en/circulars/2020/1611.pdf>

will include discussions on several objectives:

- Objective B: inclusion of national patent collections
- Objective C: bibliographic & text components of patent data to be present in patent collections
- Objective D: non-patent literature and traditional knowledge-based prior art

Also detailed is the elearning resources compilation, forming a skills framework for examiners' training, available from: [https://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/doc\\_details.jsp?doc\\_id=469361](https://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=469361), which has been updated with resources available from commercial providers; contributions from other experts are welcome – contact [lutz.mailander@wipo.int](mailto:lutz.mailander@wipo.int). The vendor resources include:

Derwent Learning	<a href="https://clarivate.com/derwent/learning/home/">https://clarivate.com/derwent/learning/home/</a>
CAS / STN	<a href="https://www.cas.org/support">https://www.cas.org/support</a>
Questel	<a href="https://www.questel.com/resources/">https://www.questel.com/resources/</a>

Muriel Bourgeois (CEPIUG chair) noted that “working together on education is a hot topic for patent information professionals”, which led nicely on to the next topic:

#### **Topic 4: Possible Collaboration/Partnerships with users groups\*** (no Topic 3 on the agenda)

Speaker: Sandrine Ammann, Marketing & Communications Officer, Global Databases Division, Global Infrastructure Sector

\*Sandrine contacted a number of attendees to gather input in advance (see **Appendix 1**), which resulted in brief presentations from the point of view of CEPIUG, PDG and QPIP (see [collaboration\\_usersgroups.pdf](#)).

Sandrine began by describing the main routes WIPO currently have to gather user feedback:

- Annual PDG meeting – actually the IMPACT working group (<https://www.p-d-g.org/organisation/working-group/impact>) – the most formal and long-standing route, from which minutes are produced;
- Annual IP Information Roundtable – this meeting, which gathers comments and feedback, but has no real formal process and produces no minutes
- Fee-based webinars – in conjunction with AIDB and PIUG, delivered to expert user audiences as highly technical training on specific topics, the more technical features of Patentscope, etc.
- WIPO Inspire (see later)

Suggestions from Sandrine for more interaction opportunities:

- Newsletter to user groups?
- UG slot at the annual IP Information Roundtable – a good idea!

**Guido Moradei, CEPIUG/PDG** (see [collaboration\\_usersgroups.pdf](#))

Further points made:

- Summarised different aspects of what is seen as bidirectional collaboration
- **There would be significant value of the IP Information Roundtable being set up as a formal advisory group**
- Inspire will be new opportunity to gather input from UGs
- Surveys – e.g. current survey on ISR and opinion – feedback currently being gathered emphasises that all data on forms can/should go into database for use
- Importance of developing information education

Contribution opportunities include:

WIPO Academy – trainers/tutors from UGs

<https://www.wipo.int/academy/en/>

Technology and Innovation Support Centers (TISCs) project – worldwide, different languages; WIPO database training

See Report 2019 (Published 2020)

<https://www.wipo.int/publications/en/details.jsp?id=4500&plang=EN>

<https://www.wipo.int/tisc/en/background.html>

WIPO committees – can be difficult for WIPO to identify opportunities for UGs in different sectors

Examples include

- Committee of Standards <https://www.wipo.int/cws/en/>
- Committees of Experts
  - Committee of Experts of the IPC Union  
[https://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/topic.jsp?group\\_id=115](https://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/topic.jsp?group_id=115)
  - Committee of Experts of the Locarno Union  
[https://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/topic.jsp?group\\_id=208](https://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/topic.jsp?group_id=208)
  - Committee of Experts of the Nice Union <https://www.wipo.int/classifications/nice/en/>
  - Committee of Experts of the Vienna Union  
[https://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/topic.jsp?group\\_id=203](https://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/topic.jsp?group_id=203)

Task forces – role may be limited to observer?

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

- Some task forces have been requested/populated by UGs
- Limited participation by attorneys – some UGs also have attorney membership
- Lots of work, huge commitment but important

Special projects?

- Sometimes confidential
- UGs could help to find experts

UGs could submit papers to WIPO Magazine

[https://www.wipo.int/wipo\\_magazine/en/](https://www.wipo.int/wipo_magazine/en/)

World Intellectual Property Day (26 April annually) topics?

- **Need a day dedicated to “patent information” – maybe 2022?**

UGs could collaborate

[https://www.wipo.int/ip-outreach/en/ipday/2020/green\\_future.html](https://www.wipo.int/ip-outreach/en/ipday/2020/green_future.html)

### **Muriel Bourgeois, CEPIUG chair/CFIB**

Long partnership with WIPO, CEPIUG has presented at annual meetings, only time for F2F sharing with UGs.

- **A specific committee is needed for education and training**

### **Bettina de Jong, ISBQPIP chair/PDG**

- Formal contact with PDG (IMPACT) – fixed seat – twice yearly, focused on raw data.
- PDG invite WIPO to other working groups
- Supports an advisory group role for IP Round Table, cf. EPO advisory committee on information and documentation
- Better to have minutes/documents to share to gather wider input to meeting discussions, rather than just from the individual attending
- Would get good two-way communication through formalising the relationship
- QPIP – opportunity to collaborate with WIPO Academy on training?

**NB:** WIPO have regular meetings with PATCOM (PATCOM is an association of commercial patent information providers based mainly in Europe, which works to ensure a fair balance between the free information services of patent offices, commercial value-added patent information services and users’ interests) – complementary to these meetings; see for example last WIPO/PATCOM meeting summary from 6 February 2020:

[https://patcom.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/200206\\_Minutes\\_WIPO\\_PatCom\\_FINAL.pdf](https://patcom.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/200206_Minutes_WIPO_PatCom_FINAL.pdf)

**NB:** Although Lucy Antunes is now at CAS, I think she attends as PIUG rep.

In discussing WIPO newsletters, Sandrine noted that many already exist – see

<https://www3.wipo.int/newsletters/en/> – but not one specifically for patent information users – would need to highlight e.g. unique features of Patentscope vs other databases. Maybe not a full newsletter, but at least updates?

**(Post-meeting note:** there are news items on the Patentscope page

<https://www.wipo.int/patentscope/en/>), but do they need to be highlighted more/branded in some way?)

## **Topic 5: Classifications (IPC–IPCCAT–Locarno–Nice–Vienna)**

(see [20201201 IP roundtable Classification.pdf](#))

Speakers: Ning Xu, Head, International Patent Classification Section, & Alison Züger, Head, Mark & Design Classifications Section, both International Classifications & Standards Division, Global Infrastructure Sector

### **IPC**

A recap of the meetings cancelled due to Covid-19 restrictions but still progress made in terms of discussions in the IPC e-forum and electronically; the emphasis was on physics, information and communication technology, with new groups/subdivisions approved.

The IPC committee of experts went ahead in February; this focused on the semiconductor area – a deeply subdivided and complex class, with a structure established many years ago, not now fit for modern purposes, so new class approach agreed.

Recognition of new emerging tech areas of AI, intelligent robots, unmanned aerial vehicles, etc.; unmanned vehicle already promoted from IP5 to IPC; imaging tech next to go to IP5.

[IP5](#) and IPC both have e-forum; the IP5 forum has WIPO as observer, and information visible is only the cover pages of projects available to the public unless subscribed users; the [IPC e-forum](#) is more open to the national offices and the public.

### **IPCCAT**

News item from Oct 2019: [IPCCAT-neural at IPC subgroup level is now cross lingual in 10 languages.](#)

Useful resource for small national offices. See also [IPC PUB](#) help.

### **Nice, Vienna, Locarno Classifications**

NICE classification for trademarks and Vienna classification for the figurative description of trademarks, Locarno classification for industrial designs

### **NCL 11-2021**

News item from June 2020: an advance electronic publication of the Nice Classification NCL (11-2021) is now available on [NCL PUB](#).

### **VCL (8)**

Next meeting postponed from November 2020 to February 2021.

Next edition in force from January 2022, but annual versions in force each January, with simple, not structural, changes. 2021 will see increase in number of changes.

### **LOC (13)**

News item from June 2020: an advance electronic publication of the Locarno Classification 13th edition (LOC (13)) is now available on [LOCPUB](#).

---

**Topic 6:** [WIPO Inspire](#) (see [WIPO INSPIRE\\_IP roundtable.pdf](#))

Speaker: Vipin Saroha, Associate Information Management Officer, Partnerships, Platforms and Tools Section, Innovation and Knowledge Infrastructure Department, Global Infrastructure Sector

News item 4 November 2020: [WIPO Expands its Suite of Online Services for Innovators with New Patent Information Tool](#).

23 reports now available, will include more such as EPO databases. Democratising data on different databases. User perspective – open to all users not just TISC users. Comparison tool focuses on filtering by requirements of the user.

Vendors asked to submit and to keep updated. Users can sign in and save reports as favourites, so will be notified if a report is flagged as updated.

Vendors can request to register as an author and will “own” the reports. UGs can review, but comments reviewed and validated by WIPO and vendor.

A brief demo was given, showing the country coverage map, comparison report filters, report creation options, etc.

Clarification was given on some of the data included, for example there is a “legal status included” category in the feature list, but this does not define the extent of the data available, for example, which countries’/territories’ data are included; inclusion of all legal status registries and databases would be challenging, but may expand coverage later.

Guido emphasised that users would want to be able to select multiple features of what legal status data is present from which countries.

WIPO (rather surprisingly!) asked for help from UGs to identify contacts within vendor companies with whom the submission of reports could be discussed.

Bettina confirmed that this is an area for collaboration with UGs, currently putting forward vendor contacts who should then be able to provide the best information on the features required for the reports, and also emphasised that comments from expert users would be important to add in.

Although the currency of the report updates is held internally, this is not visible on the platform.

Somebody mentioned [ASPI](#):

“The Access to Specialized Patent Information (ASPI) program is a public-private partnership administered by WIPO and made possible through cooperation with leading patent information providers; through the program, eligible patent offices and academic and research institutions in developing countries can receive free or low-cost access to sophisticated tools and services for retrieving and analyzing patent data.”

I wasn’t sure if this was a data point in the features for the comparison tool, but would be useful for users to see?

---

#### **WIPO Inspire – Post-meeting notes:**

There are a few questions/comments that occurred to me at the time, and subsequently:

- Although the focus is stated as being on the user, and UGs were asked to make contributions (see BPIP email dated 10/11/20), it seems that vendors have the most control of what goes into the reports, and actually the reports appear to be focused mainly on factual details of the content, or what type of searching is possible to do, rather than anything around the user experience. So maybe the comparisons, although useful to inexperienced users, will be limited to “factual” elements, rather than usability aspects?
- I was concerned that reports would essentially be overwritten when updated, so we might lose visibility of what changes have happened over time, what features might have been added at a particular time, and indeed, what might have been removed. So version control, visibility of update history, and access to previous versions of the report are important.
- In terms of vendors having authorship/ownership of the reports, how will WIPO deal with the actual individual vendor authors concerned, particularly in personnel turnover, company takeovers/mergers, website location changes for links out to vendor materials, etc. – some vendors struggle to keep all of these things up to date for themselves, never mind for WIPO!
- What about other databases (like CA/CAPlus; PubChem, etc.) which are not exclusively patent databases, but include a significant amount of patent information and patent-specific search/display/reporting features?
- With expert users (through their UGs) having the potential to review reports, I’m unclear now what level of input/impact they can have – not very exciting to be just fact checking what the vendors say about their content and features, much more interesting to get experts saying (as we do at BPIP meetings!) what they’ve found works well/badly, what they like about product X vs product Y, etc. – then the challenge may be to present this as the view of the user group, rather than the individual, so that it is taken on board and included in the report?

This all made me think of existing resources already reviewing and comparing patent information tools, e.g. :

- Stephen Adams’ new edition of [Information Sources in Patents!](#)
- Jinfo reviews of patent information resources – e.g. [Market landscape – patent products](#), [Product review of Minesoft PatBase](#)
- Many published articles which usefully provide user perceptions and case studies (too many to list!)
- And, last but not least, the [Intellogist blog](#), which used to be one of my frequent ports of call, which also lists a few other useful resources (and Stephen’s book!). I was under the impression that the blog was no longer maintained, confirmed by a 2017 item on the [PIUG forum](#), which comes full circle, stating in 2018, that:

“CPA Global has reached an agreement with WIPO regarding the future of Intellogist. WIPO has been working hard to restore the Intellogist data, and will be hosting it on a new platform. Going forward, the plan is for WIPO to partner with PIUG to review and update the Intellogist content.”

In discussion with other attendees, it was confirmed that

“PIUG has been working with WIPO in conjunction with CEPIUG and PDG on providing user insights for the vendor reports for the WIPO Inspire platform. Vipin Saroha, who spoke at the roundtable, has been working with us to identify vendors, provide contacts, as well as contribute to the reports.”

So WIPO Inspire is the “successor” of the Intellogist platform. This may be discussed further at the next CEPIUG Meeting.

## **Topic 10: PATENTSCOPE Latest Developments/plans/practical cases (No topics 7-9)**

This was an extensive session on details of new features in development or launched since the last WIPO IP Information Roundtable meeting.

### **Markush search developments** (see [Markush search a preview.pdf](#))

Speakers: Christophe Mazenc, Director, Global Databases Division, Global Infrastructure Sector

Currently in beta, shown to a few selected users.

Chemical Search (see [PIUG-PF](#) article) is only for explicit structures; WIPO have licensed provider data (Clarivate Analytics (Derwent) Markush Data) and are [already] [partnering](#) with InfoChem.

The 500 simplest structures are enumerated\* for each Markush formula and populate a new search field ENUM. The search is performed in the same platform as explicit chemical searching, which means a low barrier to use.

\*using algorithm from Infochem, applied to all attached parts and finding simplest of each through all combinations to generate InChIkeys for each.

The search uses a simplified iterative search developed by InfoChem which takes a bit longer to display all the sets of results. Matched answers are highlighted.

Not yet launched because of the length of results display time, they are waiting for a more powerful server to be installed in January, so launch soon after. Also looking at similarity search.

In response to a query about whether WIPO will do the same for biosequence searching, cf. SureChEMBL on EMB website – undecided, but would be another multi-year project.

### **Patentscope patent families** (see [Complete\\_Patentscope\\_Patent\\_families.pdf](#))

Speaker: Magdalena Zelenkovska, Senior Patent Data Manager, Patent Database Section, Global Databases Division, Global Infrastructure Sector

Developments include enrichment of the [PCT family](#) with US-related documents data (which may not include the PCT as a priority) and documents with common priority data, which includes data from those authorities who have separate national entry phase.

Two stages of integration – US first, includes reissues, division, etc. and identification of “first parent”; then also reviewing priority dates, starting with the PCT or the US or from grouped applications based on identical priority data, to which additional verification is applied; priority data are as delivered by the originating office.

To be published by end of Dec 2020, then all families available for search; inclusion criteria will be visible. Will have one version of each invention displayed.

**Post-meeting note:** Although not yet describing the above enhancements to the Patentscope PCT family, I think [this slideset](#) gives a good overview of the different interpretations of “extended” patent families across different authorities.

### **Patentscope interface** (see [Patentscope-2020 new UI.pdf](#))

Speaker: Justin Diaconescu, Head, Patent Database Section, Global Databases Division, Global Infrastructure Sector

The “new” user interface has been [in place for a year](#). User feedback has been good, some problems with fonts/ contrast have been resolved.

The presentation showed the dashboard and its various features and search options. The dashboard includes widgets (for Patentscope, WIPO Pearl) for a customisable view.

[WIPO Pearl](#) is for suggesting synonyms, translations, developed by terminology specialists at WIPO, not a machine algorithm.

There are now 25 Language Analyzers, which are used for searching in full text; Language Stemming tool shows wildcard vs stemming options to assist search.

CPC Search has been available since January 2020; it is updated data with data from national systems – see [Patentscope User’s Guide](#), updated May 2020.

[WIPO Translate](#) (see [IPRoundTableWIPOTranslate.pdf](#))

Speaker: Bruno Pouliquen, IP Data Machine Learning Development Manager, Advanced Technology Applications Center (ATAC), Global Databases Division, Global Infrastructure Sector

New activities include improvements in dealing with the transliteration of author names across alphabets, processing [speech into text](#)/translated text using AI-based tools and applications, e.g. machine translation of [ISR/WOSA](#).

WIPO Translate is heavily used in Patentscope – 18 language pairs currently available. Highest usage in zh (Chinese) to en; jp to en.

WIPO are doubling translation capacity by the installation of a new CPU server this week.

1 December 2020 saw the official launch of WIPO translate inside a private company.

Benchmarking reveals WIPO better performance than Google Translate across all languages; [DeepL](#) is better than both only for English to French.

Developments in image search were discussed in response to audience questions: started with [trademarks](#); the [global brand database](#) allows searching for similarity of logos. Looking at removing characters from logos in order to focus on the “marks” themselves.

Industrial designs image searching also developing – often photos from different orientations, so looking at comparing sets of images – good preliminary results, the first system is in the design phase, looking to go into production in 2021.

Confirmed that Arabic languages to English are included in WIPO Translate, but limited training data available so quality lower than for other non-Western languages.

---

Christophe then gave a summary of the top level changes:

- New Director General [Dr Daren Tang](#) took office from October 2020
- Underlines importance of IP information and the users
- Covid-19 impacted but still able to achieve efficient online meetings

- Continue to use AI in WIPO work and use other new technologies (e.g. WIPO Proof) to achieve goals
- Member states expect services in more languages
- Deputy DGs and Assistant DGs candidates announced end of November 2020 and appointments approved by [Coordination Committee](#) on 3 December 2020
- No immediate changes to activities – approved by WIPO member states for 2 years from 2020-2022; focus will be on planning for 2023 onwards

As the meeting closed, Muriel reiterated a positive response to WIPO's aim to improve interactions with user groups, particularly through creating future meeting minutes and sharing of materials.

Sandrine confirmed she would send presentations through and would also ask for feedback from user groups.

It was suggested to broaden the scope of the IP Information Roundtable meetings and associated communications to include trademarks and designs not just purely patent information.

---

## Appendix 1

**From:** AMMANN Sandrine

**Sent:** 26 November 2020 14:14

**To:** Jane List; Bourgeois, Muriel; Segreteria AIDB; Guido Moradei; Lindquist, Rosanna T; Lucy Antunes

**Subject:** IP Information Roundtable - cooperation with users groups

Dear All,

I would like to ask for your contributions for my slot about cooperation/collaboration between users groups and WIPO.

As nothing really exists at the moment, I will share with you some ideas I had for future collaboration but, if you agree, I would also like to give you the floor to share your exceptions and experiences with other offices so that we can move forward to implement possibly something a bit more formal.

I am aware that the deadline is very short, I apologize about this. Let me know your thoughts.

Many thanks

Best regards

Sandrine

---

**Jeanette Eldridge**  
**11/12/2020**