

# Industrial Property

Published monthly  
Annual subscription:  
180 Swiss francs  
Each monthly issue:  
18 Swiss francs

28th Year - No. 4  
April 1989

Monthly Review of the  
World Intellectual Property Organization

## Contents

### NOTIFICATIONS CONCERNING TREATIES

- Madrid Agreement (Marks), Nice Agreement, Hague Agreement. Application to Aruba . . . . . 119
- Budapest Treaty. Change in Fees under Rule 12.2 of the Regulations under the Budapest Treaty and Extension of the List of Kinds of Microorganisms and Material Accepted for Deposit: American Type Culture Collection (ATCC) (United States of America) . . . . . 119

### ACTIVITIES OF THE INTERNATIONAL BUREAU

- The World Intellectual Property Organization in 1988. WIPO and Development Cooperation Activities in the Field of Industrial Property . . . . . 121

### STUDIES

- The North-South Imbalance in Europe, by *A. de Elzaburu* . . . . . 159
- Industrial Property Protection for Advanced Biotechnological Processes and Products, by *E. Häusser* . . . . . 161

### NEWS ITEMS

- Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Grenada . . . . . 165

- CALENDAR OF MEETINGS . . . . . 166

### INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY LAWS AND TREATIES (INSERT)

Editor's Note

### UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

- United States Code, Title 15, Chapter 22—Trademarks (as last amended by the Trademark Law Revision Act of 1988 (Public Law 100-667 of November 16, 1988)) (*This text replaces the one previously published under the same code number*) . . . . . Text 3-001

© WIPO 1989

Any reproduction of official notes or reports, articles and translations of laws or agreements published in this review is authorized only with the prior consent of WIPO.

ISSN 0033-1430



## Notifications Concerning Treaties

### Madrid Agreement (Marks), Nice Agreement, Hague Agreement

#### Application to Aruba

The Director General of WIPO, referring to Madrid (Marks) Notification No. 38, Nice Notification No. 67 and The Hague Notification No. 28, dated July 22, 1988,<sup>1</sup> informed interested governments that, within the period of six months after the date of the said notifications, no objection was communicated to him against the proposal of the Government of the Netherlands set forth in its Note No. 4175, dated June 24, 1988, attached to the said notifications, and that, consequently, on February 20, 1989, the Government of the Netherlands deposited with the Director General of WIPO declarations that the application of each of the following mentioned treaties is suspended by the Government of the Netherlands in respect of Aruba for an indefinite period and retroactive to the time at which the treaty became applicable to Aruba: the Madrid Agreement Concerning the International Registration of Marks of April 14, 1891, as revised at Nice on June 15, 1957, and at Stockholm on July 14, 1967; the Nice Agreement Concerning the International Classification of Goods and Services for the Purposes of the Registration of Marks of June 15, 1957, as revised at Stockholm on July 14, 1967, and at Geneva on May 13, 1977; the Hague Agreement Concerning the International Deposit of Industrial Designs of November 6, 1925, as supplemented by the Additional Act of Monaco of November 18, 1961, the Complementary Act of Stockholm of July 14, 1967, and the Protocol of Geneva of August 29, 1975 (see Madrid (Marks) Notification No. 37 of August 8, 1986,<sup>2</sup> Nice Notification No. 64 of August 8, 1986,<sup>3</sup> the Hague Notifications Nos. 24 and 25 of August 8, 1986<sup>4</sup>).

*Madrid (Marks) Notification No. 40, Nice Notification No. 68, and The Hague Notification No. 29, of February 27, 1989.*

<sup>1</sup> These notifications were not published in this review.

<sup>2</sup> See *Industrial Property*, 1986, p. 343.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 344.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 343 and 344, respectively.

### Budapest Treaty

#### Change in Fees under Rule 12.2 of the Regulations under the Budapest Treaty and Extension of the List of Kinds of Microorganisms and Material Accepted for Deposit

##### AMERICAN TYPE CULTURE COLLECTION (ATCC) (United States of America)

The Director General of WIPO was informed by a notification received on March 1, 1989, dated February 24, 1989, from the Government of the United States of America of a change in the fees charged by the American Type Culture Collection (ATCC) as an international depositary authority under the Budapest Treaty on the International Recognition of the Deposit of Microorganisms for the Purposes of Patent Procedure, and of an extension of the list of kinds of microorganisms and material accepted for deposit by the said authority.

We have received a notification from the American Type Culture Collection regarding a new schedule of fees and the kinds of microorganisms and material accepted by that organization. In accordance with Rule 12.2(a) of the Regulations under the Budapest Treaty, I am pleased to notify you of the following changes in the fees:

##### *Fees to Distribute Cultures*

*Per Item*

##### *ATCC Cultures*

Algae, Bacteria, Bacteriophages, Fungi, Plant Tissue Cultures, Plasmids, Protozoa, Vectors and Yeasts	US\$ 45
U.S. Non-Profit Institutions . . . . .	45*
Foreign Non-Profit Institutions . . . . .	70
Other U.S. and Foreign Institutions . . . . .	70

##### *ATCC Cell Lines and Oncogenes*

U.S. Non-Profit Institutions . . . . .	50
Foreign Non-Profit Institutions . . . . .	50**
Other U.S. and Foreign Institutions . . . . .	80

\* There is an additional \$ 25 per culture handling and processing charge.

\*\* There is an additional \$ 30 per culture handling and processing charge.

*ATCC Viruses, Animal & Plant, Rickettsiae and Chlamydiae*

U.S. Non-Profit Institutions . . . . .	40
Foreign Non-Profit Institutions . . . . .	40***
Other U.S. and Foreign Institutions . . . . .	64

Cell lines ordered as flasks, protozoa sent as test tubes and others special-ordered as test tubes carry an additional lab fee of \$ 35.

Minimum invoicing is \$ 45. Orders received for lesser amounts will be invoiced at the minimum.

Shipping Charges—Perishable or pathogenic materials which by their nature require special packaging, handling and/or shipping are shipped FOB origin, freight prepaid via carrier of ATCC's choice.

Further, in accordance with Rule 3.3 of the Regulations under the Budapest Treaty, the American Type Culture Collection is now prepared to accept the following microorganisms and material: algae, animal embryos, animal viruses, bacteria, cell lines, fungi, hybridomas, oncogenes, plant viruses,

\*\*\* There is an additional \$24 per culture handling and processing charge.

plasmids, plant tissue cultures, phages, protozoa, seeds, yeasts.

[End of text of the notification of the Government of the United States of America]

The fees set forth in the said notification of the Government of the United States of America will apply as from the thirtieth day following the date (April 30, 1989) of the publication of the said fees in the present issue of *Industrial Property*, that is, as from May 30, 1989 (see Rule 12.2(c) of the Regulations under the Budapest Treaty), and will replace the fees published in the July/August 1986 issue of *Industrial Property*.<sup>1</sup>

The extension of the list of the kinds of microorganisms and material that will be accepted for deposit by the American Type Culture Collection (ATCC) will take effect as from the date (April 30, 1989) of its publication in the present issue of *Industrial Property*.

*Budapest Communication No. 52 (this Communication is the subject of Budapest Notification No. 77 of March 6, 1989).*

<sup>1</sup> See Budapest Notification No. 52 of July 16, 1986, in *Industrial Property*, 1986, p. 240.

## Activities of the International Bureau

### The World Intellectual Property Organization in 1988\*

#### WIPO and Development Cooperation Activities in the Field of Industrial Property

##### I. Intellectual Property Activities: Promotion of the Worldwide Recognition of and Respect for Intellectual Property

###### Objectives

The general objective is to promote the realization of the benefits of intellectual property—both industrial property and copyright—for the social, economic and cultural progress of any country and for the continuous promotion of the cause of peace.

As a natural avenue leading to such benefits, the objective is also to promote accession to the treaties on the recognition and protection of intellectual property rights administered by WIPO by countries not yet party to them.

###### Activities

During the period covered by this report, WIPO continued to promote acceptance by States of the WIPO Convention and of the other treaties administered by WIPO. In addition to the activities referred to below in relation to specific treaties, discussions on such acceptance took place during WIPO missions to States, particularly developing countries, in meetings with Permanent Missions of States in Geneva and in contacts with delegations of States at intergovernmental meetings. Notes concerning the advantages of acceptance of particular treaties for particular countries were prepared and sent to the competent authorities of the countries concerned.

\* This article is the first part of a report on the main activities of WIPO in general and in the field of industrial property. Activities in the fields of copyright and neighboring rights are covered in a corresponding article in the review *Copyright*.

The first part deals with the activities of WIPO as such and with development cooperation activities in respect of industrial property and patent information. The second part, which will appear in the May issue of this review, will deal with other industrial property and patent information activities.

In general, the report follows the order in which activities are set out in the program for the 1988-89 biennium, approved by the Governing Bodies of WIPO and the Unions administered by WIPO in 1987. It recalls, from the said program, the objectives of the activities described.

**Convention Establishing the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO).** On February 22, 1988, Ecuador deposited its instrument of ratification of the WIPO Convention. The WIPO Convention entered into force in respect of Ecuador on May 22, 1988.

On March 28, 1988, Guinea-Bissau deposited its instrument of accession to the WIPO Convention. The WIPO Convention entered into force in respect of Guinea-Bissau on June 28, 1988.

On May 16, 1988, Trinidad and Tobago deposited its instrument of accession to the WIPO Convention. The WIPO Convention entered into force in respect of Trinidad and Tobago on August 16, 1988.

On May 18, 1988, Swaziland deposited its instrument of accession to the WIPO Convention. The WIPO Convention entered into force in respect of Swaziland on August 18, 1988.

On October 1, 1988, Malaysia deposited its instrument of accession to the WIPO Convention. The WIPO Convention entered into force in respect of Malaysia on January 1, 1989.

On December 8, 1988, Liberia deposited its instrument of accession to the WIPO Convention. The WIPO Convention entered into force in respect of Liberia on March 8, 1989.

Those accessions brought the number of States party to the WIPO Convention to 123. They were the following: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany (Federal Republic of), Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Holy See, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philip-

pinas, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Africa, Soviet Union, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

*Treaties Providing for the Substantive Protection of Intellectual Property*

**Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property.** On March 28, 1988, Guinea-Bissau deposited its instrument of accession to the Paris Convention. The Paris Convention entered into force in respect of Guinea-Bissau on June 28, 1988.

On May 16, 1988, Trinidad and Tobago (already a party to the Paris Convention) deposited its instrument of accession to the Paris Convention (Stockholm Act (1967)). The Stockholm Act (1967) entered into force in respect of Trinidad and Tobago on August 16, 1988.

On June 23, 1988, Malaysia deposited its instrument of accession to the Paris Convention. The Paris Convention entered into force in respect of Malaysia on January 1, 1989.

The accessions of Guinea-Bissau and Malaysia brought the number of States party to the Paris Convention to 99.

**Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works.** On May 16, 1988, Trinidad and Tobago deposited its instrument of accession to the Berne Convention. The Berne Convention entered into force in respect of Trinidad and Tobago on August 16, 1988.

On May 20, 1988, Peru deposited its instrument of accession to the Berne Convention. The Berne Convention entered into force in respect of Peru on August 20, 1988.

On November 16, 1988, the United States of America deposited its instrument of accession to the Berne Convention. The Berne Convention entered into force in respect of the United States of America on March 1, 1989.

On December 8, 1988, Liberia deposited its instrument of accession to the Berne Convention. The Berne Convention entered into force in respect of Liberia on March 8, 1989.

Those four accessions brought the number of States party to the Berne Convention to 81.

**Geneva Convention for the Protection of Producers of Phonograms Against Unauthorized Duplication of Their Phonograms.** On June 27, 1988, Trinidad and Tobago deposited its instrument of accession to the Phonograms Convention. The said Convention entered

into force in respect of Trinidad and Tobago on October 1, 1988. On that date, the number of States party to the Phonograms Convention reached 42.

**Brussels Convention Relating to the Distribution of Programme-Carrying Signals Transmitted by Satellite.** On October 20, 1988, the Soviet Union deposited its instrument of accession to the Satellites Convention. The said Convention entered into force in respect of the Soviet Union on January 20, 1989. On that date, the number of States party to the Satellites Convention reached 12.

*Treaty in the Field of Double Taxation*

**Madrid Multilateral Convention for the Avoidance of Double Taxation of Copyright Royalties.** On April 15, 1988, Peru deposited its instrument of accession to the Madrid Convention. The Convention is not yet in force.

**II. Promotion of Accession to the Treaties Providing for the International Registration of Industrial Property Rights and Promotion of the Use of Such Treaties**

**Objectives**

The general objective is to promote the realization of the benefits of treaties administered by WIPO and providing for the international registration of industrial property rights, registration that makes the protection of such rights on the international level more secure and less expensive than separate applications for registrations in national registers.

The objective is also to promote accession to those treaties by countries not yet party to them.

The treaties in question are the following:

- (i) the Patent Cooperation Treaty;
- (ii) the Madrid Agreement Concerning the International Registration of Marks;
- (iii) the Hague Agreement Concerning the International Deposit of Industrial Designs;
- (iv) the Lisbon Agreement for the Protection of Appellations of Origin and their International Registration;
- (v) the Trademark Registration Treaty (*currently not used*);
- (vi) the Vienna Agreement for the Protection of Type Faces and their International Deposit (*not yet in force*);
- (vii) the Geneva Treaty on the International Recording of Scientific Discoveries (*not yet in force*).

Finally, the objective is also to ensure that, through regular contacts between WIPO on the one hand and the governments of States and international organizations on the other hand, there should be full awareness of what is being done and planned on either side in order to inspire mutually more and more useful activities, to combine forces whenever possible and to avoid unnecessary duplication.

**Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT).** On December 21, 1988, Burkina Faso deposited its instrument of accession to the PCT. The PCT entered into force in respect of Burkina Faso on March 21, 1989. The accession of Burkina Faso brought the number of States party to the PCT to 41.

**Madrid Agreement Concerning the International Registration of Marks.** Tunisia ceased to be a member of the Madrid Union with effect from April 9, 1988.

On August 22, 1988, Portugal deposited its instrument of ratification of the Stockholm Act of July 14, 1967, as amended on October 2, 1979, of the Madrid Agreement. The Stockholm Act (1967) entered into force, with respect to Portugal, on November 22, 1988.

### III. Development Cooperation with Developing Countries in the Fields of Industrial Property and Patent Information

#### Objective

The objective is to assist developing countries in the establishment or modernization of intellectual property systems suited to their development goals in the following ways:

- (i) developing human resources;
- (ii) facilitating the creation or improvement of national or regional legislation;
- (iii) facilitating the creation or improvement of governmental and other institutions for the administration of national or regional legislation and the exercise of the rights granted by such legislation;
- (iv) encouraging domestic inventive and creative artistic activity and the protection of the expressions of folklore;
- (v) facilitating the acquisition of foreign patented technology, and the access to foreign works protected by copyright;
- (vi) facilitating the access to and the use of technological information contained in patent documents;
- (vii) facilitating the creation of a corps of practitioners.

#### Activities

##### *Development of Human Resources in Regular and Global, Regional and National Training Courses and Seminars*

#### REGULAR AND GLOBAL TRAINING PROGRAM

In 1988, WIPO received 628 applications for *training in industrial property* from 101 developing countries, three other countries and 11 organizations. Two-hundred-and-ninety-one of these applications from the following 92 countries and seven organizations were accepted and led to the completion of the courses listed below: Argentina, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo, Cook Islands, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jordan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Republic of Korea, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syria, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe, African Regional Industrial Property Organization (ARIPO), Economic Community of the Great Lakes Countries (CEPGL), Federation of Arab Scientific Research Councils (FASRC), Central American Institute for Research and Industrial Technology (ICAITI), Nutrition Institute for Central America and Panama (INCAP), International Seed Testing Association (ISTA), African Intellectual Property Organization (OAPI).

The following 32 countries, four intergovernmental organizations and two institutions agreed to contribute in full or in part to the payment of the travel expenses and subsistence allowances, or otherwise, for training in the field of industrial property: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Benin, Brazil, Bulgaria, China, Czechoslovakia, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany (Federal Republic of), Ghana, Hungary, India, Israel, Japan, Malawi, Mexico, Netherlands, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Soviet Union, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Switzerland, Togo, United Kingdom, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Benelux Trademark Office (BBM), European Patent Office (EPO), OAPI, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), CompuMark (Antwerp), International Patent Documentation Center (INPADOC) (Vienna).

The remainder of the cost was borne by the budget of WIPO.

The following training courses took place in 1988 (listed in chronological order):

(a) in February and March, six trainees attended a Specialized Advanced Training Course (in English) on Patent Examination, organized by WIPO in cooperation with the Government of Japan, in *Tokyo*, with the financial support of Japan; the participants came from China, India, the Philippines, the Republic of Korea and Thailand; lectures were given by officials of the Japanese Patent Office and other Japanese institutions;

(b) in February and March, 20 trainees attended an Introductory Training Course (in English) on the Law and Administration of Trademarks, in *Canberra*, organized by WIPO in cooperation with the Government of Australia, and with the financial support of UNDP; the participants came from Bangladesh, China, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Fiji, India, Indonesia, Nepal, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, Samoa, Sri Lanka, Thailand and Viet Nam; lectures were given by WIPO consultants from Australia, Germany (Federal Republic of) and India, as well as by a Deputy Director General of WIPO;

(c) in May, three trainees attended a Training Course (in French) on Patent Documentation and Searching at the *EPO in The Hague*; the participants came from Benin, Côte d'Ivoire and Tunisia; their travel and subsistence costs were funded by the EPO; the Course was followed by visits to the EPO headquarters in Munich and to WIPO;

(d) in May and June, five trainees attended a Training Course (in English) on Trademarks, in *Washington*, at the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO), with the financial support of UNDP; the participants came from the Philippines, the Republic of Korea and Thailand; lectures were given by officials of the USPTO and other United States institutions;

(e) in June, 20 trainees attended a Training Course (in English) on the Law and Administration of Patents, organized by WIPO in cooperation with the International Intellectual Property Training Institute (IIPTI) of the Republic of Korea and the Korea Industrial Property Office (KIPO), in *Seoul*, and with the financial support of UNDP; the participants came from Bangladesh, China, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Sri Lanka, Thailand and Viet Nam; two nationals of the Republic of Korea also participated; lectures were given by WIPO consultants from Australia, Canada, France and Germany (Federal Republic of), by officials from IIPTI, from KIPO and from other Korean institutions, and by two WIPO officials; the participation of the lecturers was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project, with the

exception of the lecturer from France whose participation was financed through funds made available to WIPO by the Government of France;

(f) in June and July, 24 trainees attended a Training Course (in English) on Patent Information, organized by WIPO and the USSR State Committee for Inventions and Discoveries, in *Moscow*, and with financial support from a trust fund established by the Soviet Union with the UNDP; the participants came from Argentina, Brazil, Bulgaria, China, Cuba, Ecuador, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, India, Libya, Mexico, Nigeria, the Philippines, Poland, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Somalia, Syria, Turkey, Viet Nam and Zambia; lectures were given by a WIPO consultant from the Republic of Korea and two WIPO consultants from the EPO, by officials from the USSR State Committee for Inventions and Discoveries and from other Soviet institutions, and by two Deputy Directors General and another WIPO official; the participation of the lecturer from the Republic of Korea and one of the lecturers from EPO was financed by the above-mentioned trust fund and the participation of the other EPO lecturer was financed by the EPO;

(g) in June and July, four trainees attended a Training Course (in English) on Patent Documentation and Searching at the *EPO in The Hague*; the participants came from Argentina, Egypt, the Philippines and FASRC; their travel and subsistence costs were funded by the EPO and UNDP; the Course was followed by visits to the EPO headquarters in Munich and to WIPO;

(h) in June and July, 11 trainees attended a General Introductory Course on Industrial Property (in English), organized by WIPO in cooperation with the Government of Malawi, in *Lilongwe*, and with the financial support of the Swedish International Development Authority (SIDA); the participants came from Ethiopia, the Gambia, Ghana, Lesotho, Liberia, Malawi, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, the United Republic of Tanzania and Zimbabwe; lectures were given by WIPO consultants from the Netherlands, Swaziland, Sweden and ARIPO, as well as by a WIPO official;

(i) in July and August, 30 trainees attended a Training Course (in English) on Intellectual Property for Developing Countries of Asia and the Pacific, organized by WIPO, with the cooperation of the Government of Sri Lanka and the Sri Lanka Foundation, in *Colombo*, and with the financial support of UNDP; the participants came from Bangladesh, Bhutan, China, the Cook Islands, Fiji, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kiribati, Malaysia, Maldives, Mongolia, Papua New Guinea, the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Thailand, Tuvalu and Viet Nam; four nationals of Sri Lanka also participated; lectures were given by WIPO consultants from Canada,



India, Japan, the Republic of Korea, Switzerland and the United Kingdom, as well as by two WIPO officials; the Director General attended the opening of the Course;

(j) in August and September, 15 trainees attended a General Introductory Course on Industrial Property (in French) organized by WIPO and OAPI in cooperation with the Government of Benin, in *Cotonou*, and with the financial support of UNDP; the participants came from Burkina Faso, Burundi, the Central African Republic, Chad, Equatorial Guinea, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Madagascar, Morocco, Rwanda, Senegal, Zaire and OAPI; four nationals of Benin also participated; lectures were given by two WIPO consultants from France and by OAPI and WIPO officials; the participation of the lecturers from France was financed through funds made available to WIPO by the Government of France;

(k) in September, immediately preceding the Forum and the courses referred to in (l), (m), (n), (o), (p), (q) and (r), below, 76 trainees attended an Orientation Seminar (in Arabic, English, French and Spanish) on General Aspects of Industrial Property, at the headquarters of WIPO in *Geneva*; the participants came from Argentina, Benin, Bolivia, Brazil, Cameroon, China, the Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, Guatemala, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, Singapore, Sudan, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe, ARIPO, ICAITI, INCAP, ISTA and OAPI; in addition, officials of the Permanent Missions to the United Nations Office at Geneva of a number of countries attended the Seminar; lectures were given by WIPO officials; the participants also attended the WIPO Worldwide Forum on the Impact of Emerging Technologies on the Law of Intellectual Property;

(l) in September, 11 trainees attended a Specialized Training Course (in French) on Trademarks, organized by WIPO and the Benelux Trademark Office (BBM), at *BBM in The Hague*; the participants came from Brazil, the Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Lebanon, Madagascar, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Tunisia, Uruguay and Zaire; their subsistence costs were funded by BBM; lectures were given by officials of BBM, representatives of private enterprise, officials of member States of BBM and by a WIPO official; the Course was followed by visits to private enterprises in Belgium and the Netherlands;

(m) in September and October, 15 trainees attended a Seminar (in English and French) on "Technical Information as an Aid to Industrial Development: Patent Documents," organized jointly by WIPO and the EPO, at the *EPO in The Hague*; the participants came from

Argentina, Brazil, the Congo, Egypt, Kuwait, Malaysia, Mexico, Morocco, the Philippines, Singapore, Tunisia, Venezuela, ARIPO, ISTA and OAPI; their travel and subsistence costs were funded by the EPO; lectures were given by officials of the EPO, representatives of private enterprise, officials of Member States of the EPO and WIPO officials; the Seminar was followed by a visit to the EPO headquarters in Munich;

(n) in September and October, eight trainees attended a Specialized Training Course (in English) on Patent Information, organized by WIPO and the Patent Office (*Octrooiiraad*) of the Netherlands, in *The Hague*, with the assistance of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Development Cooperation of the Government of the Netherlands; the participants came from Brazil, China, Egypt, India, Malaysia, the Philippines, the Republic of Korea and Venezuela; their subsistence costs were funded by the Netherlands; lectures were given by officials of the Patent Office of the Netherlands; this Course was followed for one of the participants by practical training at INPADOC in Vienna;

(o) in September and October, 26 trainees attended a General Introductory Course (in English and French) on Industrial Property, organized jointly by WIPO and the Center for the International Study of Industrial Property (CEIPI) with the cooperation of the National Institute of Industrial Property of France (INPI), at *CEIPI, in Strasbourg*, and with the financial support of France, the United Kingdom, Finland and Switzerland; the participants came from Bangladesh, Benin, Brazil, Cameroon, Costa Rica, Cuba, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, Guinea, Indonesia, Jordan, Kenya, Mali, Mauritius, Nepal, Panama, Sudan, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe and INCAP; lectures were given by the Director General and professors of CEIPI and lawyers and patent attorneys associated with CEIPI, officials of INPI (France), the Max Planck Institute for Foreign and International Patent, Copyright and Competition Law, the EPO and WIPO, as well as representatives of private enterprise in France; this Course was followed, for most of those concerned, by practical training in industrial property in one of the following countries or organization: Czechoslovakia, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, India, Israel, Switzerland, United Kingdom, OAPI;

(p) in September and October, 10 trainees attended a Training Course (in Spanish) on Industrial Property, organized by WIPO and the Registry of Industrial Property of Spain in *Madrid*; the participants came from Argentina, Bolivia, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru and Venezuela; about half of the travel and subsistence costs of the participants were funded by Spain; lectures were given by officials of the Spanish Registry and by WIPO officials;

(q) in September and October, three trainees attended a Training Course (in English) on Industrial Property, organized by WIPO and the German Patent Office, in *Munich*, with the cooperation and financial support of the Carl Duisberg Gesellschaft (CDG); the participants came from Brazil, India and the Philippines;

(r) in September and October, four trainees attended a Training Course (in English) on Patent Searching and Examination, organized by WIPO and the Swedish Patent Office in *Stockholm*, and with the financial support of SIDA and the Swedish Commission for Technical Cooperation (BITS); the participants came from China, Mexico, the Philippines and ICAITI; lectures were given by officials of the Swedish Patent Office;

(s) in October, 13 trainees attended a Seminar (in Spanish) on Industrial Property and its Impact on the Development Process, organized by WIPO and the National Institute of Industrial Property (INPI) of Brazil in *Rio de Janeiro*; the participants came from Argentina, Bolivia, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Paraguay, Uruguay and Venezuela; half of the travel costs and all subsistence costs were funded by Brazil; lectures were given by officials of INPI (Brazil) and of various Brazilian governmental and private institutions and by a WIPO official;

(t) in October, five trainees attended a Training Course (in French) on the Promotion of Inventive and Innovative Activities, organized by WIPO and the Government of Bulgaria in *Varna*; the participants came from Benin, the Congo, the Guinea, Madagascar and the CEPGL; lectures were given by officials of the Institute of Inventions and Rationalizations of Bulgaria, professors of national Bulgarian educational institutions, two WIPO consultants from France and Germany (Federal Republic of), and a WIPO official; the subsistence costs of participants and lecturers were funded by Bulgaria;

(u) in October, 17 trainees attended a Workshop (in English) on the Drafting of Patent Specifications and Claims, organized by WIPO in cooperation with the Government of Ghana in *Accra*, with the financial support of UNDP; the participants came from Ethiopia, Lesotho, Liberia, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Swaziland, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania and Zimbabwe; 73 nationals of Ghana also participated; lectures were given by three WIPO consultants from the United Kingdom and ARIPO and by two WIPO officials;

(v) in October, four trainees attended a Seminar (in English) on Industrial Property, organized by WIPO in cooperation with the Government of Liberia in *Monrovia*, and with the financial support of UNDP; the Seminar was attended by approximately 50 participants from Liberia and the above-mentioned four trainees

who came from the Gambia, Ghana, Nigeria and Sierra Leone; lectures were given by a government official of Liberia, the Director General of ARIPO, two WIPO consultants from Sweden and the United States of America and by a WIPO official;

(w) in October and November, five trainees attended a Training Course (in English) on Patent Examination at the EPO in *Munich*; the participants came from Brazil, Egypt, the Philippines and Venezuela; their travel and subsistence costs were funded by the EPO and UNDP; the Course was preceded by a visit to the EPO in The Hague and followed by a visit to WIPO;

(x) in October and November, 11 trainees attended a Training Course (in English) on Patent Examination, organized by WIPO and the USPTO in *Washington*, with the financial support of UNDP; the participants came from China, Egypt, Malaysia, Pakistan, the Republic of Korea, Thailand, Yugoslavia and ARIPO; lectures were given by officials from the USPTO and from other United States institutions;

(y) in November, 21 trainees attended a Seminar (in French) on Practical Aspects of the Industrial Property System Instituted by the Bangui Agreement, organized by WIPO and OAPI in *Lomé*, in cooperation with the Government of Togo, and with the financial support of UNDP; the participants came from Benin, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, the Central African Republic, Chad, the Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Gabon, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Senegal and Zaire; some 20 nationals of Togo also participated; lectures were given by two WIPO consultants from the Congo and Côte d'Ivoire, by two WIPO consultants from France, and by WIPO officials; the participation of one lecturer from France was financed by UNDP and the participation of the other was financed through funds made available to WIPO by the Government of France.

In addition to the above courses, special training programs and study visits were organized, mostly in the framework of UNDP-funded technical cooperation projects, for 58 officials from Bangladesh, Brazil, Chile, China, Egypt, El Salvador, India, Jamaica, Laos, Malaysia, Mexico, Mongolia, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, Sri Lanka, Syria, Thailand, Turkey, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, the Latin-American Integration Association (ALADI) and the Permanent Secretariat of the General Treaty on Central American Economic Integration (SIECA); the above programs and study visits included visits to one or several of the following countries, organizations and institutions: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Brazil, Czechoslovakia, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany (Federal Republic of), Japan, Mexico, Philippines, Soviet Union, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, BBM, EPO, CompuMark (Antwerp), INPADOC (Vienna).

In most cases, the arrangements for training in 1988 included visits to WIPO headquarters.

## REGIONAL AND NATIONAL

### *Africa*

*Benin.* In August and September, a General Introductory Course on Industrial Property was organized by WIPO and OAPI in cooperation with the Government of Benin, in Cotonou, and with the financial support of UNDP.

In November, two government officials attended a Seminar on Practical Aspects of the Industrial Property System Instituted by the Bangui Agreement, organized by WIPO and OAPI in cooperation with the Government of Togo, in Lomé, and with the financial support of UNDP.

*Burkina Faso.* In August and September, a government official attended a General Introductory Course on Industrial Property, organized by WIPO and OAPI in cooperation with the Government of Benin, in Cotonou, and with the financial support of UNDP.

In November, a government official attended a Seminar on Practical Aspects of the Industrial Property System Instituted by the Bangui Agreement, organized by WIPO and OAPI in cooperation with the Government of Togo, in Lomé, and with the financial support of UNDP.

*Burundi.* In August and September, a government official attended a General Introductory Course on Industrial Property, organized by WIPO and OAPI in cooperation with the Government of Benin, in Cotonou, and with the financial support of UNDP.

*Cameroon.* In November, five government officials attended a Seminar on Practical Aspects of the Industrial Property System Instituted by the Bangui Agreement, organized by WIPO and OAPI in cooperation with the Government of Togo, in Lomé, and with the financial support of UNDP.

*Central African Republic.* In August and September, a government official attended a General Introductory Course on Industrial Property, organized by WIPO and OAPI in cooperation with the Government of Benin, in Cotonou, and with the financial support of UNDP.

In November, a government official attended a Seminar on Practical Aspects of the Industrial Property System Instituted by the Bangui Agreement, organized by WIPO and OAPI in cooperation with the Government of Togo, in Lomé, and with the financial support of UNDP.

*Chad.* In August and September, two government officials attended a General Introductory Course on

Industrial Property, organized by WIPO and OAPI in cooperation with the Government of Benin, in Cotonou, and with the financial support of UNDP.

In November, a government official attended a Seminar on Practical Aspects of the Industrial Property System Instituted by the Bangui Agreement, organized by WIPO and OAPI in cooperation with the Government of Togo, in Lomé, and with the financial support of UNDP.

*Congo.* In November, a government official attended a Seminar on Practical Aspects of the Industrial Property System Instituted by the Bangui Agreement, organized by WIPO and OAPI in cooperation with the Government of Togo, in Lomé, and with the financial support of UNDP.

*Côte d'Ivoire.* In November, two government officials attended a Seminar on Practical Aspects of the Industrial Property System Instituted by the Bangui Agreement, organized by WIPO and OAPI in cooperation with the Government of Togo, in Lomé, and with the financial support of UNDP.

*Equatorial Guinea.* In August and September, a government official attended a General Introductory Course on Industrial Property, organized by WIPO and OAPI in cooperation with the Government of Benin, in Cotonou, and with the financial support of UNDP.

*Ethiopia.* In June and July, a government official attended a General Introductory Course on Industrial Property, organized by WIPO in cooperation with the Government of Malawi, in Lilongwe, and with the financial support of SIDA.

In October, a government official attended a Workshop on the Drafting of Patent Specifications and Claims, organized by WIPO in cooperation with the Government of Ghana, in Accra, and with the financial support of UNDP.

*Gabon.* In November, a government official attended a Seminar on Practical Aspects of the Industrial Property System Instituted by the Bangui Agreement, organized by WIPO and OAPI in cooperation with the Government of Togo, in Lomé, and with the financial support of UNDP.

*Gambia.* In June and July, a government official attended a General Introductory Course on Industrial Property, organized by WIPO in cooperation with the Government of Malawi, in Lilongwe, and with the financial support of SIDA.

*Ghana.* In June and July, a government official attended a General Introductory Course on Industrial Property, organized by WIPO in cooperation with the Government of Malawi, in Lilongwe, and with the financial support of SIDA.

In October, a Workshop on the Drafting of Patent Specifications and Claims was organized by WIPO in cooperation with the Government of Ghana in Accra, and with the financial support of UNDP.

*Guinea.* In August and September, a government official attended a General Introductory Course on Industrial Property, organized by WIPO and OAPI in cooperation with the Government of Benin, in Cotonou, and with the financial support of UNDP.

*Guinea-Bissau.* In August and September, a government official attended a General Introductory Course on Industrial Property, organized by WIPO and OAPI in cooperation with the Government of Benin, in Cotonou, and with the financial support of UNDP.

*Lesotho.* In June and July, a government official attended a General Introductory Course on Industrial Property, organized by WIPO in cooperation with the Government of Malawi, in Lilongwe, and with the financial support of SIDA.

In October, a government official attended a Workshop on the Drafting of Patent Specifications and Claims, organized by WIPO in cooperation with the Government of Ghana, in Accra, and with the financial support of UNDP.

*Liberia.* In June and July, a government official attended a General Introductory Course on Industrial Property, organized by WIPO in cooperation with the Government of Malawi, in Lilongwe, and with the financial support of SIDA.

In October, two WIPO officials participated in a Subregional Seminar on Industrial Property which was organized by WIPO in Monrovia in cooperation with the Government of Liberia and with the financial support of UNDP. The Seminar was attended by approximately 50 participants from both the public and private sectors including government officials from Liberia and four participants from the following countries: Gambia, Ghana, Nigeria, Sierra Leone. Lectures were delivered by a government official of Liberia, the Director General of ARIPO, two WIPO consultants from Sweden and the United States of America and by a WIPO official.

Also in October, a government official attended a Workshop on the Drafting of Patent Specifications and Claims, organized by WIPO in cooperation with the Government of Ghana, in Accra, and with the financial support of UNDP.

*Madagascar.* In August and September, a government official attended a General Introductory Course on Industrial Property, organized by WIPO and OAPI in cooperation with the Government of Benin, in Cotonou, and with the financial support of UNDP.

*Malawi.* In June and July, 11 trainees attended a General Introductory Course on Industrial Property organized by WIPO in cooperation with the Government of Malawi, in Lilongwe, and with the financial support of SIDA.

*Mali.* In November, a government official attended a Seminar on Practical Aspects of the Industrial Property System Instituted by the Bangui Agreement, organized by WIPO and OAPI in cooperation with the Government of Togo, in Lomé, and with the financial support of UNDP.

*Mauritania.* In November, a government official attended a Seminar on Practical Aspects of the Industrial Property System Instituted by the Bangui Agreement, organized by WIPO and OAPI in cooperation with the Government of Togo, in Lomé, and with the financial support of UNDP.

*Morocco.* See under "Arab Countries."

*Niger.* In November, a government official attended a Seminar on Practical Aspects of the Industrial Property System Instituted by the Bangui Agreement, organized by WIPO and OAPI in cooperation with the Government of Togo, in Lomé, and with the financial support of UNDP.

*Nigeria.* In October, three government officials attended a Workshop on the Drafting of Patent Specifications and Claims, organized by WIPO in cooperation with the Government of Ghana, in Accra, and with the financial support of UNDP.

*Rwanda.* In August and September, a government official attended a General Introductory Course on Industrial Property, organized by WIPO and OAPI in cooperation with the Government of Benin, in Cotonou, and with the financial support of UNDP.

*Senegal.* In August and September, a government official attended a General Introductory Course on Industrial Property, organized by WIPO and OAPI in cooperation with the Government of Benin, in Cotonou, and with the financial support of UNDP.

In November, two government officials attended a Seminar on Practical Aspects of the Industrial Property System Instituted by the Bangui Agreement, organized by WIPO and OAPI in cooperation with the Government of Togo, in Lomé, and with the financial support of UNDP.

*Sierra Leone.* In June and July, a government official attended a General Introductory Course on Industrial Property, organized by WIPO in cooperation with the Government of Malawi, in Lilongwe, and with the financial support of SIDA.

In October, a government official attended a Workshop on the Drafting of Patent Specifications and Claims, organized by WIPO in cooperation with the Government of Ghana, in Accra, and with the financial support of UNDP.

*Somalia.* See under "Arab Countries."

*Sudan.* See under "Arab Countries."

*Swaziland.* In October, a government official attended a Workshop on the Drafting of Patent Specifications and Claims, organized by WIPO in cooperation with the Government of Ghana, in Accra, and with the financial support of UNDP.

*Togo.* In November, a Seminar on Practical Aspects of the Industrial Property System Instituted by the Bangui Agreement was organized by WIPO and OAPI in Lomé, in cooperation with the Government of Togo and with the financial support of UNDP. About 20 nationals of Togo participated in the Seminar.

*Uganda.* In October, two government officials attended a Workshop on the Drafting of Patent Specifications and Claims, organized by WIPO in cooperation with the Government of Ghana, in Accra, and with the financial support of UNDP.

*United Republic of Tanzania.* In June and July, a government official attended a General Introductory Course on Industrial Property, organized by WIPO in cooperation with the Government of Malawi, in Lilongwe, and with the financial support of SIDA.

In October, three government officials attended a Workshop on the Drafting of Patent Specifications and Claims, organized by WIPO in cooperation with the Government of Ghana, in Accra, and with the financial support of UNDP.

*Zaire.* In August and September, two government officials attended a General Introductory Course on Industrial Property, organized by WIPO and OAPI in cooperation with the Government of Benin, in Cotonou, and with the financial support of UNDP.

In November, two government officials attended a Seminar on Practical Aspects of the Industrial Property System Instituted by the Bangui Agreement, organized by WIPO and OAPI in cooperation with the Government of Togo, in Lomé, and with the financial support of UNDP.

*Zimbabwe.* In October, two government officials attended a Workshop on the Drafting of Patent Specifications and Claims, organized by WIPO in cooperation with the Government of Ghana, in Accra, and with the financial support of UNDP.

### *Arab Countries*

*Egypt.* In July, a WIPO official and the Director of the Patent Information and Documentation Unit (PIDU), within the Federation of Arab Scientific Research Councils (FASRC), undertook a mission to Cairo and spoke at a national Seminar on the Usefulness of Patents in Research and Development Activities which took place at the headquarters of the Academy of Scientific Research and Technology (ASRT). The Seminar was attended by some 50 participants from various national departments, the University of Cairo, as well as patent and trademark agents. The Seminar was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project.

In December, a WIPO official visited Cairo and spoke at a national Seminar on Patents. Thirty-five participants from ASRT, universities, as well as patent and trademark agencies, participated in the Seminar. The mission was funded by the UNDP-financed country project.

*Jordan.* In December, WIPO organized, in Amman, in cooperation with the Government of Jordan and with the financial support of UNDP, a Policy Planning Meeting on Industrial Property for Arab Countries.

*Libya.* In October, WIPO organized, in Tripoli, in cooperation with the Industrial Research Centre (IRC) a national Seminar on the Role of Patents in Research and Development Activities. Forty government officials from the IRC, universities, the Secretariat for Planning, the Secretariat for Industry, and the Secretariat for Justice participated in the Seminar. A WIPO official, as well as the Director of the Patent Information and Documentation Unit (PIDU), spoke at the said Seminar. The Seminar was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project.

*Morocco.* In August and September, a government official attended a General Introductory Course on Industrial Property, organized by WIPO in cooperation with the Government of Benin, in Cotonou, and with the financial support of UNDP.

In November, WIPO organized, in cooperation with the National Center for the Coordination and Planning of Scientific and Technological Research, Rabat, a national Seminar on the Role of Patents in Research and Development Activities. Fifty participants came from the National Center for Scientific Research, the Industrial Property Office, the Chamber of Commerce, the Planning Department, the Economy Department, the Moroccan Association for Inventors and universities. A WIPO official, as well as the Director of the Patent Information and Documentation Unit (PIDU), spoke at the said Seminar. The Seminar was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project.

*Somalia.* In June and July, a government official attended a General Introductory Course on Industrial

Property, organized by WIPO in cooperation with the Government of Malawi, in Lilongwe, and with the financial support of SIDA.

In October, a government official attended a Workshop on the Drafting of Patent Specifications and Claims, organized by WIPO in cooperation with the Government of Ghana, in Accra, and with the financial support of UNDP.

*Sudan.* In June and July, two government officials attended a General Introductory Course on Industrial Property, organized by WIPO in cooperation with the Government of Malawi, in Lilongwe, and with the financial support of SIDA.

In July, a WIPO official and the Director of the Patent Information and Documentation Unit (PIDU) undertook a mission to Khartoum and participated in a national Seminar on the Usefulness of Patents in Research and Development Activities, which took place at the headquarters of the Council for Scientific Research (CSR). The Seminar was attended by some 50 participants from various national government departments and the University of Khartoum. The Seminar was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project.

In October, a government official attended a Workshop on the Drafting of Patent Specifications and Claims, organized by WIPO in cooperation with the Government of Ghana, in Accra, and with the financial support of UNDP.

#### *Asia and the Pacific*

*Australia.* In February and March, an Introductory Training Course on the Law and Administration of Trademarks, for government officials from developing countries in Asia and the Pacific, was held in Canberra. It was organized by WIPO and the Government of Australia with the financial support of UNDP. The Course was attended by 20 government officials from 15 developing countries in Asia and the Pacific, namely, Bangladesh, China, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Fiji, India, Indonesia, Nepal, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, Samoa, Sri Lanka, Thailand and Viet Nam. Lectures were given by a Deputy Director General, three WIPO consultants from Australia, Germany (Federal Republic of) and India, and by officials of the Australian Patent, Trade Marks and Designs Office.

*Bangladesh.* In June, two government officials attended a Training Course on the Law and Administration of Patents for government officials from developing countries in Asia and the Pacific, organized by WIPO and the Government of the Republic of Korea, in Seoul, and with the financial support of UNDP.

In July and August, two government officials attended a Training Course on Intellectual Property for Developing Countries of Asia and the Pacific, organized

by WIPO, with the cooperation of the Government of Sri Lanka and the Sri Lanka Foundation, in Colombo, and with the financial support of UNDP.

*Bhutan.* In July and August, a government official attended a Training Course on Intellectual Property for Developing Countries of Asia and the Pacific, organized by WIPO, with the cooperation of the Government of Sri Lanka and the Sri Lanka Foundation, in Colombo, and with the financial support of UNDP.

*China.* In June, two government officials attended a Training Course on the Law and Administration of Patents for government officials from developing countries in Asia and the Pacific, organized by WIPO and the Government of the Republic of Korea, in Seoul, and with the financial support of UNDP.

In July and August, two government officials attended a Training Course on Intellectual Property for Developing Countries of Asia and the Pacific, organized by WIPO, with the cooperation of the Government of Sri Lanka and the Sri Lanka Foundation, in Colombo, and with the financial support of UNDP.

In October, a Symposium on Creativity and the Promotion of Inventive Activities was organized jointly by WIPO and the International Federation of Inventors' Associations (IFIA), in cooperation with the State Science and Technology Commission of China and the China Association of Inventions, and with the financial support of UNDP, in Beijing. The Symposium was attended by the Director General and three WIPO officials. One-hundred-and-twenty-five participants attended the Symposium; they comprised government officials working in institutions and departments responsible for the protection of inventions and the promotion of inventive activity, officials of national associations of inventors, representatives of other interested circles, such as professors, lawyers and industrialists from the following 32 countries: Bangladesh, Bulgaria, China, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Finland, Germany (Federal Republic of), Greece, Hungary, India, Japan, Libya, Malaysia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Singapore, Soviet Union, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, United Kingdom, United States of America, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia. The keynote speakers at the Symposium came from China, Germany (Federal Republic of), Japan, the Philippines and the United States of America. The travel and subsistence expenses of 13 participants, who were officials of national inventors' associations, were funded by the UNDP-financed regional project. Those 13 participants were from the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, India, Malaysia, Nepal, Pakistan, the Republic of Korea, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Thailand and Viet Nam. The travel and subsistence expenses of one of the speakers from the Federal Republic of Germany were funded by the Government of that country, while the travel and

subsistence expenses of the remaining speakers were funded by the UNDP-financed regional project.

*Cook Islands.* In July and August, a government official attended a Training Course on Intellectual Property for Developing Countries of Asia and the Pacific, organized by WIPO, with the cooperation of the Government of Sri Lanka and the Sri Lanka Foundation, in Colombo, and with the financial support of UNDP.

*Fiji.* In July and August, a government official attended a Training Course on Intellectual Property for Developing Countries of Asia and the Pacific, organized by WIPO, with the cooperation of the Government of Sri Lanka and the Sri Lanka Foundation, in Colombo, and with the financial support of UNDP.

*India.* In June, two government officials attended a Training Course on the Law and Administration of Patents for government officials from developing countries in Asia and the Pacific, organized by WIPO and the Government of the Republic of Korea, in Seoul, and with the financial support of UNDP.

In July and August, two government officials attended a Training Course on Intellectual Property for Developing Countries of Asia and the Pacific, organized by WIPO, with the cooperation of the Government of Sri Lanka and the Sri Lanka Foundation, in Colombo, and with the financial support of UNDP.

In November, WIPO organized, in cooperation with the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry (FICCI), and with the financial support of UNDP, a Seminar on Licensing and Technology Transfer Arrangements, in New Delhi. The Seminar was attended by approximately 250 participants from industry and commerce, lawyers, patent attorneys, academics and officials from government departments concerned with licensing and technology transfer in India. Papers were presented by WIPO consultants from Australia, France, the United Kingdom and India, as well as by a WIPO official. A Deputy Director General and a WIPO consultant from India also attended the Seminar. The Seminar was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project; the travel and subsistence expenses of the speaker from France were funded by the Government of that country.

*Indonesia.* In June, four government officials attended a Training Course on the Law and Administration of Patents for government officials from developing countries in Asia and the Pacific, organized by WIPO and the Government of the Republic of Korea, in Seoul, and with the financial support of UNDP.

In July and August, two government officials attended a Training Course on Intellectual Property for Developing Countries of Asia and the Pacific, organized by WIPO, with the cooperation of the Government of

Sri Lanka and the Sri Lanka Foundation, in Colombo, and with the financial support of UNDP.

*Iran (Islamic Republic of).* In July and August, a government official attended a Training Course on Intellectual Property for Developing Countries of Asia and the Pacific, organized by WIPO, with the cooperation of the Government of Sri Lanka and the Sri Lanka Foundation, in Colombo, and with the financial support of UNDP.

*Japan.* In February and March, WIPO and the Japanese Patent Office (JPO) organized, in Tokyo, a Specialized Advanced Training Course in Patent Examination.

*Kiribati.* In July and August, a government official attended a Training Course on Intellectual Property for Developing Countries of Asia and the Pacific, organized by WIPO, with the cooperation of the Government of Sri Lanka and the Sri Lanka Foundation, in Colombo, and with the financial support of UNDP.

*Laos.* In December, WIPO organized in Vientiane, in cooperation with the Government of Laos, and with the financial support of UNDP, a General Introductory Seminar on Industrial Property. There were about 50 participants who were government officials. The lecturers were the Director General of INPI (France), a WIPO consultant from France and a WIPO official. The participation of the Director General of INPI and the French consultant was financed by the Government of France.

*Malaysia.* In June, two government officials attended a Training Course on the Law and Administration of Patents for government officials from developing countries in Asia and the Pacific, organized by WIPO and the Government of the Republic of Korea, in Seoul, and with the financial support of UNDP.

In July and August, three government officials attended a Training Course on Intellectual Property for Developing Countries of Asia and the Pacific, organized by WIPO, with the cooperation of the Government of Sri Lanka and the Sri Lanka Foundation, in Colombo, and with the financial support of UNDP.

Also in July and August, a WIPO official and a WIPO consultant from Australia participated as speakers in a national Workshop on Industrial Designs, in Kuala Lumpur, organized by the Government of Malaysia, and in another meeting on industrial designs organized by Universiti Teknologi Malaysia (UTM) and the Malaysian Inventions and Designs Society (MINDS) with the assistance of the Registry of Trade Marks and Patents of Malaysia.

*Maldives.* In July and August, a government official attended a Training Course on Intellectual Property for Developing Countries of Asia and the Pacific, organized

by WIPO, with the cooperation of the Government of Sri Lanka and the Sri Lanka Foundation, in Colombo, and with the financial support of UNDP.

*Mongolia.* In July and August, a government official attended a Training Course on Intellectual Property for Developing Countries of Asia and the Pacific, organized by WIPO, with the cooperation of the Government of Sri Lanka and the Sri Lanka Foundation, in Colombo, and with the financial support of UNDP.

*Papua New Guinea.* In July and August, a government official attended a Training Course on Intellectual Property for Developing Countries of Asia and the Pacific, organized by WIPO, with the cooperation of the Government of Sri Lanka and the Sri Lanka Foundation, in Colombo, and with the financial support of UNDP.

*Philippines.* In June, two government officials attended a Training Course on the Law and Administration of Patents for government officials from developing countries in Asia and the Pacific, organized by WIPO and the Government of the Republic of Korea, in Seoul, and with the financial support of UNDP.

In July and August, two government officials attended a Training Course on Intellectual Property for Developing Countries of Asia and the Pacific, organized by WIPO, with the cooperation of the Government of Sri Lanka and the Sri Lanka Foundation, in Colombo, and with the financial support of UNDP.

*Republic of Korea.* In June, 20 trainees attended a Training Course on the Law and Administration of Patents, organized by WIPO in cooperation with the International Intellectual Property Training Institute (IIPTI) and the Korea Industrial Property Office (KIPO), in Seoul, and with the financial support of UNDP.

In July and August, two government officials attended a Training Course on Intellectual Property for Developing Countries of Asia and the Pacific, organized by WIPO, with the cooperation of the Government of Sri Lanka and the Sri Lanka Foundation, in Colombo, and with the financial support of UNDP.

*Samoa.* In July and August, a government official attended a Training Course on Intellectual Property for Developing Countries of Asia and the Pacific, organized by WIPO, with the cooperation of the Government of Sri Lanka and the Sri Lanka Foundation, in Colombo, and with the financial support of UNDP.

*Singapore.* In April, a national Seminar on "Technological Innovations: A Focus on Patents," organized jointly by the Economic Development Board (EDB) of Singapore, the Singapore Institute of Standards and Industrial Research (SISIR) and the Singapore Inventors' Development Association (SIDA), with the

cooperation of WIPO and the financial support of UNDP, was held in Singapore. The Seminar was attended by about 130 participants. Papers were presented at the Seminar by a WIPO official, two WIPO consultants from the Netherlands and Switzerland, and by Singapore officials.

*Solomon Islands.* In July and August, a government official attended a Training Course on Intellectual Property for Developing Countries of Asia and the Pacific, organized by WIPO, with the cooperation of the Government of Sri Lanka and the Sri Lanka Foundation, in Colombo, and with the financial support of UNDP.

*Sri Lanka.* In June, two government officials attended a Training Course on the Law and Administration of Patents for government officials from developing countries in Asia and the Pacific, organized by WIPO and the Government of the Republic of Korea, in Seoul, and with the financial support of UNDP.

In July and August, a Training Course on Intellectual Property for Developing Countries of Asia and the Pacific was organized by WIPO, with the cooperation of the Government of Sri Lanka and the Sri Lanka Foundation, in Colombo, and with the financial support of UNDP.

*Thailand.* In June, two government officials attended a Training Course on the Law and Administration of Patents for government officials from developing countries in Asia and the Pacific, organized by WIPO and the Government of the Republic of Korea, in Seoul, and with the financial support of UNDP.

In July and August, two government officials attended a Training Course on Intellectual Property for Developing Countries of Asia and the Pacific, organized by WIPO, with the cooperation of the Government of Sri Lanka and the Sri Lanka Foundation, in Colombo, and with the financial support of UNDP.

*Tuvalu.* In July and August, a government official attended a Training Course on Intellectual Property for Developing Countries of Asia and the Pacific, organized by WIPO, with the cooperation of the Government of Sri Lanka and the Sri Lanka Foundation, in Colombo, and with the financial support of UNDP.

*Viet Nam.* In May, WIPO organized in Ho Chi Minh City, in cooperation with the National Office on Inventions (NOI) of Viet Nam and the Committee for Science and Technology of Ho Chi Minh City, and with the financial support of UNDP, a national Seminar on Industrial Designs and the Promotion of Innovative Activity. There were 280 participants from Viet Nam, representing industrial, commercial, cooperative, scientific and development institutions, as well as officials concerned with industrial property administration. Lectures were delivered by WIPO consultants from



Finland, the Netherlands, the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom, two Vietnamese officials and a WIPO official.

In June, two government officials attended a Training Course on the Law and Administration of Patents for government officials from developing countries in Asia and the Pacific, organized by WIPO and the Government of the Republic of Korea, in Seoul, and with the financial support of UNDP.

In July and August, two government officials attended a Training Course on Intellectual Property for Developing Countries of Asia and the Pacific, organized by WIPO, with the cooperation of the Government of Sri Lanka and the Sri Lanka Foundation, in Colombo, and with the financial support of UNDP.

*Hong Kong.* In March, a Symposium on Industrial Property and Economic and Technological Development, organized by WIPO in cooperation with the JPO, and with the assistance of the Government of Hong Kong, was held in Hong Kong. The Symposium was attended by 39 government officials from Bangladesh, China, Hong Kong, Indonesia, Malaysia, Nepal, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, Singapore, Sri Lanka and Thailand. In addition, approximately 110 other participants from the private sectors of Australia, China, Hong Kong, Indonesia, Japan, Malaysia, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, Singapore and Thailand attended the Symposium. Two officials from the JPO, three officials from WIPO and a WIPO consultant from Japan also attended the Symposium. Papers were presented at the Symposium by WIPO consultants from Australia, China, France, Germany (Federal Republic of), Japan, Sweden, the United Kingdom, the United States of America and Hong Kong. The Symposium was financed through funds made available to WIPO by the Government of Japan.

#### *Latin America and the Caribbean*

*Argentina.* In June, a judge from Argentina participated in a Seminar on Intellectual Property for Latin American Judges organized by WIPO in cooperation with the Venezuelan School for the Judiciary and the Industrial Property Registry, in Caracas.

In October, a government official attended a Seminar on Industrial Property and its Impact on the Development Process, organized by WIPO and the National Institute of Industrial Property (INPI) of Brazil, in Rio de Janeiro, and partly financed by Brazil.

*Bolivia.* In October, a government official attended a Seminar on Industrial Property and its Impact on the Development Process, organized by WIPO and INPI (Brazil), in Rio de Janeiro, and partly financed by Brazil.

*Brazil.* In June, a judge from Brazil participated in a Seminar on Intellectual Property for Latin American Judges organized by WIPO, in cooperation with the Venezuelan School for the Judiciary and the Industrial Property Registry, in Caracas.

In October, a Seminar on Industrial Property and its Impact on the Development Process was organized by WIPO and INPI (Brazil), in Rio de Janeiro.

*Colombia.* In June, a judge from Colombia participated in a Seminar on Intellectual Property for Latin American Judges organized by WIPO, in cooperation with the Venezuelan School for the Judiciary and the Industrial Property Registry, in Caracas.

In October, a government official attended a Seminar on Industrial Property and its Impact on the Development Process, organized by WIPO and INPI (Brazil), in Rio de Janeiro, and partly financed by Brazil.

*Costa Rica.* In June, a judge from Costa Rica participated in a Seminar on Intellectual Property for Latin American Judges organized by WIPO, in cooperation with the Venezuelan School for the Judiciary and the Industrial Property Registry, in Caracas.

In October, a government official attended a Seminar on Industrial Property and its Impact on the Development Process, organized by WIPO and INPI (Brazil), in Rio de Janeiro, and partly financed by Brazil.

*Cuba.* In October, a government official attended a Seminar on Industrial Property and its Impact on the Development Process, organized by WIPO and INPI (Brazil), in Rio de Janeiro, and partly financed by Brazil.

*El Salvador.* In October, a government official attended a Seminar on Industrial Property and its Impact on the Development Process, organized by WIPO and INPI (Brazil), in Rio de Janeiro, and partly financed by Brazil.

*Guatemala.* In October, a government official attended a Seminar on Industrial Property and its Impact on the Development Process, organized by WIPO and INPI (Brazil), in Rio de Janeiro, and partly financed by Brazil.

*Honduras.* In October, a government official attended a Seminar on Industrial Property and its Impact on the Development Process, organized by WIPO and INPI (Brazil), in Rio de Janeiro, and partly financed by Brazil.

*Mexico.* In June, a judge from Mexico participated in a Seminar on Intellectual Property for Latin American Judges organized by WIPO, in cooperation with the

Venezuelan School for the Judiciary and the Industrial Property Registry, in Caracas.

In October, two government officials attended a Seminar on Industrial Property and its Impact on the Development Process, organized by WIPO and INPI (Brazil), in Rio de Janeiro, and partly financed by Brazil.

*Paraguay.* In October, a government official attended a Seminar on Industrial Property and its Impact on the Development Process, organized by WIPO and INPI (Brazil), in Rio de Janeiro, and partly financed by Brazil.

*Peru.* In June, a judge from Peru participated in a Seminar on Intellectual Property for Latin American Judges organized by WIPO, in cooperation with the Venezuelan School for the Judiciary and the Industrial Property Registry, in Caracas.

*Uruguay.* In October, a government official attended a Seminar on Industrial Property and its Impact on the Development Process, organized by WIPO and INPI (Brazil), in Rio de Janeiro, and partly financed by Brazil.

*Venezuela.* In June, a Seminar on Intellectual Property for Latin American Judges was organized by WIPO, in cooperation with the Venezuelan School for the Judiciary and the Industrial Property Registry, in Caracas, and with the financial support of UNDP. Judges from Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Mexico and Peru, as well as 20 judges from Venezuela, participated. Lectures were given by WIPO consultants from Germany (Federal Republic of), Spain, the EPO and two WIPO officials. The participation of the lecturers from Spain and the EPO was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project and the participation of the WIPO consultant from the Federal Republic of Germany through funds made available to WIPO by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany.

In October, a government official attended a Seminar on Industrial Property and its Impact on the Development Process, organized by WIPO and INPI (Brazil), in Rio de Janeiro, and partly financed by Brazil.

#### *Development of National and Regional Legislation and Institution Building in Developing Countries*

##### *Africa: Intercountry*

*Intercountry Project for Africa.* During the period under review, WIPO continued to execute the UNDP-financed regional project for the UNDP Fourth Cycle (1987-91).

In February, two WIPO officials had discussions with UNDP officials in New York. A tentative work plan was submitted to UNDP which laid down the modalities of execution of the project and the subsequent monitoring and evaluation which would be conducted annually.

In April, WIPO organized a "Policy Planning Meeting on Industrial Property," in Harare. The following countries and intergovernmental organization were represented: Botswana, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Malawi, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Swaziland, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia, Zimbabwe, ARIPO.

The purpose of the meeting was for the countries to consider and approve a tentative project work plan, of the UNDP-financed regional project, for the 1988-89 biennium.

The discussions were based on a working document prepared by WIPO for the meeting, which also contained a summary of the industrial property situation in member and potential member States of ARIPO.

Among the activities proposed, the participants placed emphasis on meeting the needs of their countries in the following areas: legislation, development of human resources, technical cooperation among developing countries, strengthening of links between the industrial property focal points and users and potential users, strengthening of national industrial property institutions and regional cooperation. The meeting was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project.

*WIPO/ARCT/ARIPO/OAPI Cooperation Agreement.* In May, WIPO was represented at the third session of the Joint Consultative Committee, established under the Quadripartite Cooperation Agreement among WIPO, the African Regional Centre for Technology (ARCT), ARIPO and OAPI, held in Harare. The other three organizations were represented by the Executive Director of ARCT, the Director General of ARIPO and the Deputy Director General of OAPI.

The Committee adopted and discussed its agenda which dealt, *inter alia*, with the following topics:

- (a) report of each organization on activities undertaken by it to implement the recommendations of the second session;
- (b) joint activities planned for 1988-89 within the framework of the Quadripartite Agreement.

It was decided that the fourth session would be held in Yaoundé, in April or May 1989.

During the meeting of the Committee, several activities were proposed for implementation within the UNDP-financed regional project for Africa.

*African Intellectual Property Organization (OAPI).* In April, a WIPO official attended the 26th session of the OAPI Board which was held in Bangui. During the

session, a number of items pertaining to cooperation between WIPO and OAPI were identified and discussed. They concerned mainly several meetings to be organized in Africa, with the financial support of the UNDP-financed regional project, in the field of industrial property.

In May, a WIPO consultant from Belgium undertook a mission to OAPI in order to advise OAPI on the improvement of its administrative procedures for the granting of patents and registration of trademarks, the printing of the gazette, as well as to make preliminary recommendations for the establishment of a system of collection and use of patent documents. The mission was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project.

In June, the Deputy Director General of OAPI visited WIPO headquarters and had discussions with a Deputy Director General and other WIPO officials on cooperation between the two organizations.

In December, two WIPO officials participated in an OAPI Users' Meeting which was organized in Paris by WIPO and OAPI with the cooperation of INPI (France). The meeting was attended by about 40 participants from French enterprises and patent agencies. The meeting was financed partly through funds made available to WIPO by the Government of France and the UNDP-financed regional project.

*African Regional Industrial Property Organization (ARIPO).* In February, two WIPO officials had discussions with UNDP officials in New York on the possibility of the prolongation of the "SWAP Arrangement" concluded three years ago to enable member States of ARIPO to pay their contributions in local currencies.

Also in February, a WIPO consultant from Belgium undertook a mission to ARIPO to improve and expedite the processing of patent applications, to advise on the building up of the ARIPO patent data base as well as to study the possibilities for accessing international patent data bases. The mission was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project.

In April, three WIPO officials attended, in Harare, the first session of the Council of Ministers of ARIPO. The following member States of ARIPO participated: Botswana, Ghana, Kenya, Lesotho, Malawi, Sudan, Swaziland, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

In May, an official from ARIPO participated as a speaker in a symposium on patent information which was organized as part of the Permanent Committee on Development Cooperation Related to Industrial Property.

In June and July, an official from ARIPO participated as a speaker in a General Introductory Course on Industrial Property which was organized, in Lilongwe, in cooperation with the Government of Malawi.

In November, three WIPO officials participated in an Industrial Property Seminar which was organized, in Harare, concurrently with the 12th session of the Administrative Council of ARIPO. The Seminar was

attended by 30 Government officials who were also representing their countries in the ARIPO Council session. The countries represented were the following: Botswana, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Malawi, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Swaziland, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia, Zimbabwe. Three WIPO consultants from Germany (Federal Republic of), Nigeria and Sweden also participated. The Seminar was financed through funds made available to WIPO by the Governments of Germany (Federal Republic of) and Sweden.

*Organization of African Unity (OAU).* In May, a WIPO official participated in the OAU Conference of Heads of State and Government which celebrated the 25th anniversary of that Organization. The WIPO official addressed the Heads of State and Government of Africa in a ceremony in which a WIPO Gold Medal was handed over to an outstanding African inventor and innovator from Niger.

In November, a WIPO official visited Addis Ababa and was received by the Secretary General of the OAU. They discussed ways and means of further strengthening cooperation between the two organizations in both industrial property and copyright matters, including a seminar on industrial property to be held next year.

#### *Individual Countries in Africa*

*Angola.* In July and August, a WIPO official visited Luanda and had discussions with government officials on the draft laws prepared with the assistance of WIPO and evaluated the needs of that national office in terms of equipment and training. The possibility of holding an industrial property regional seminar for the African Portuguese-speaking countries, namely, Angola, Cape Verde, Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique and Sao Tome and Principe was also discussed.

*Benin.* In March, a WIPO official visited Cotonou to discuss with government and UNDP officials a UNDP draft project for the modernization and creation of new services within the National Center for Industrial Property (CENAPI).

*Botswana.* In July, two WIPO officials and a WIPO consultant from Sweden undertook a mission to Gaborone. They had discussions with government officials on legal and administrative matters and on the training and equipment needs of the Department of the Registrar of Companies, Business Names, Trade Marks, Patents and Designs. The mission was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project and by SIDA.

*Burkina Faso.* In July, a WIPO official visited Ouagadougou to discuss with government officials the possibility of holding a national seminar on the

promotion of innovation later in 1988. The mission also identified the equipment needs of the Directorate of Industrial Development.

*Cape Verde.* In April, a WIPO official visited Praia to discuss with government officials possible technical cooperation with WIPO in the establishment of an industrial property system as well as possible activities within the framework of the UNDP-funded regional project for Africa. The mission was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project.

*Ethiopia.* In May, a WIPO official visited Addis Ababa and had discussions with government officials on the establishment of a national industrial property office as well as on the proposed industrial property law which was drafted with the assistance of WIPO. The Government of Ethiopia expressed the wish to receive a WIPO consultant after the promulgation of the law which is expected to occur later in 1988.

In November, a WIPO official visited Addis Ababa and had discussions with government officials on WIPO's assistance in strengthening the Patent and Technology Transfer Office.

*Gambia.* In May, the Registrar General of the Gambia had discussions in Geneva with WIPO officials to discuss certain aspects of the draft industrial property law prepared by WIPO for his country as well as to plan for a WIPO mission to Banjul later in the year.

In September, two WIPO officials undertook a mission to Banjul. They held discussions with government officials concerning the draft industrial property law prepared by WIPO.

*Guinea.* In March, a joint WIPO and OAPI mission visited Conakry and held discussions with government officials regarding possible accession of Guinea to the Bangui Agreement which instituted OAPI as well as on cooperation with WIPO.

*Lesotho.* In May, a Lesotho delegation, led by the Attorney General, visited WIPO. The delegation brought with them a revised draft law on industrial property. The initial draft had been prepared by WIPO and transmitted to the Government of Lesotho for comments. The delegation met the Director General and WIPO officials to discuss the revised draft and cooperation with WIPO.

In July, two WIPO officials and a WIPO consultant from Sweden undertook a mission to Maseru. They finalized, together with government officials, the draft industrial property law prepared by WIPO. The mission was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project and by SIDA.

*Liberia.* In September, two WIPO officials undertook a mission to Monrovia. They held discussions with government officials and the private sector to

prepare for the first industrial property seminar to be organized in that country.

In December, a government official had discussions in Geneva with the Director General and WIPO officials on cooperation between Liberia and WIPO.

*Mauritius.* In December, a WIPO official and the Director General of ARIPO undertook a mission to Port Louis. They had discussions with government officials on cooperation between Mauritius and both WIPO and ARIPO. The mission was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project.

*Morocco.* See under "Individual Arab Countries."

*Nigeria.* In August, government officials visited WIPO and had discussions with the Director General and WIPO officials. The visit was part of the Government's activities leading up to the reform of the Nigerian intellectual property system.

*Rwanda.* In October, a WIPO official visited Kigali and discussed with government officials the industrial property law as well as other related matters, including the organization of a national seminar on intellectual property. The mission was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project.

*Senegal.* In April, a WIPO official visited Dakar to discuss with government and UNDP officials the situation of a proposed UNDP-financed country project as well as possible development cooperation activities that could be undertaken under the UNDP-financed regional project. The mission was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project.

*Seychelles.* In December, a WIPO official and the Director General of ARIPO undertook a mission to Mahé. They had discussions with government officials on cooperation between Seychelles and both WIPO and ARIPO. The mission was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project.

*Swaziland.* In July, two WIPO officials and a WIPO consultant from Sweden undertook a mission to Mbabane. They had discussions with government officials on the training and equipment needs of the Registrar General's Office as well as on the draft Implementing Regulations to the Trade Marks Act 1981, prepared by WIPO. The mission was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project and by SIDA.

*Togo.* In March, a WIPO official visited Lomé and had discussions with government officials. It was decided that a joint WIPO and OAPI Subregional Workshop on Drafting of Patent Claims and Specifications would be organized in Lomé in the second half of 1988. The visit was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project.

*Zaire.* In September, a WIPO official visited Kinshasa and discussed industrial property legislation with government officials. He also had talks on the modernization, in the framework of a proposed UNDP-financed country project, of the industrial property system of Zaire as well as on the holding of an industrial property seminar in Kinshasa. The mission was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project.

*Zimbabwe.* In November and December, two WIPO officials undertook a mission to Harare to evaluate the possibility of computerizing the trademark operations of the Office of the Controller of Patents, Trade Marks and Industrial Designs. They also held discussions with government and UNDP officials regarding the possibility of formulating a UNDP-financed country project for the said computerization. The mission was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project.

In December, a government official visited WIPO and had discussions with the Director General and WIPO officials on the said computerization and on the possibility of increasing membership in ARIPO whose headquarters is in Harare.

#### *Arab Countries: Intercountry*

*Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf (GCC).* In February, an official of the GCC had discussions with WIPO officials in Geneva on the draft Uniform Patent Law prepared by WIPO for the GCC countries, as well as future plans concerning the establishment of a regional patent office for the same group of countries. Subsequently, WIPO prepared and sent to the GCC Secretariat an "Introductory Memorandum for the Proposed Patent System of the Countries Members of the GCC."

*Federation of Arab Scientific Research Councils (FASRC).* In December, a WIPO official participated in the Twelfth Session of the FASRC Council, in Baghdad.

*United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).* In March, a WIPO official participated in the UNDP Inter-Governmental Meeting on the Fourth Regional Programme for Arab States (1988-92), held in Casablanca.

In December, WIPO organized, in Amman, in cooperation with the Government of Jordan, a Policy Planning Meeting on Industrial Property for Arab Countries. The meeting was attended by the Director General. Thirty-two government officials from 14 countries (Algeria, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, Yemen) and two participants from the League of Arab States Documentation and Information Center (Tunis) (ALDOC) and FASRC, attended the meeting. The main purpose of the meeting

was to assess the activities carried out so far by WIPO in the Arab region and to arrive at some broad conclusions concerning the activities to be carried out within the framework of WIPO's development cooperation program, through a UNDP-financed regional project covering the period from 1989 to 1992, in order to upgrade the industrial property systems in Arab countries. The meeting was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project.

#### *Individual Arab Countries*

*Egypt.* In December, a WIPO official participated in Cairo in the Tripartite Review Meeting of the UNDP-financed country project for the strengthening of the patent system, and, with government and UNDP officials, established a plan of action for the said project in 1989 and 1990.

*Democratic Yemen.* In September, a WIPO official undertook a mission to Aden and had discussions with government and UNDP officials in order to finalize a UNDP-financed country project for the strengthening of the patent system of that country.

*Jordan.* In July, a WIPO official visited Amman and discussed with government officials preparations for the Policy Planning Meeting on Industrial Property for Arab Countries, which took place in Amman from December 3 to 5. The mission was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project.

In September, a WIPO official and a WIPO consultant from the United Kingdom visited Amman and discussed with government officials plans for the strengthening of the industrial property system in Jordan. The mission was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project.

*Morocco.* In March, a WIPO official visited Casablanca and discussed with government officials plans for the strengthening of the industrial property system in Morocco and the formulation of a UNDP-financed country project.

*Saudi Arabia.* In June, two WIPO officials visited Riyadh and had discussions with government officials concerning a proposal for the computerization of the trademark office in Saudi Arabia.

In September, a WIPO official and a WIPO consultant from the United Kingdom undertook a mission to Riyadh and discussed with government and UNDP officials plans for a proposed UNDP-financed country project for the establishment of a patent system in Saudi Arabia. The mission was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project.

*Syria.* In July, two government officials undertook a study visit to the Office for Inventions and Patents, in

Berlin. The mission was funded by the UNDP-financed country project.

*United Arab Emirates.* In June, two WIPO officials and a WIPO consultant from Malaysia visited Dubai and had discussions with government officials concerning the means for combating trade in counterfeit goods.

#### *Asia and the Pacific: Intercountry*

*Intercountry Project for Asia and the Pacific.* During the period under review, WIPO continued to execute the UNDP-financed regional project for the UNDP Fourth Cycle (1987-91).

During the period under review, four issues of the publication *Intellectual Property in Asia and the Pacific* were published as an activity under the UNDP-financed regional project.

#### *Individual Countries in Asia and the Pacific*

*Bangladesh.* In August, a government official undertook a study visit to WIPO headquarters. He had discussions with the Director General and WIPO officials on a proposed UNDP-financed country project for modernizing and strengthening the national industrial property administration and cooperation between the Government and WIPO in the field of industrial property.

*China.* In March, six government officials undertook a study visit to the United States of America on the legal protection of computer software and integrated circuits. The study visit was partly financed through funds made available to WIPO by the Government of the United States of America.

Also in March, WIPO organized a study visit, for three government officials, to the BBM and to WIPO, on computerized administration of trademarks, and on the Nice Agreement Concerning the International Classification of Goods and Services for the Purposes of the Registration of Marks.

In May, an official from the Chinese Patent Office (CPO) participated as a speaker in a symposium on patent information which was organized as part of the Permanent Committee on Development Cooperation Related to Industrial Property.

Also in May, WIPO organized a study attachment of two officials of the Beijing branch of the NTD (Novel Technology Development) Patent Agency Ltd., a Chinese patent agency, to acquire experience in patent agency work; one official went to the Federal Republic of Germany and the other to the United States of America.

In May and June, two government officials visited WIPO and had discussions with the Director General and WIPO officials on matters of cooperation between

WIPO and the CPO in the field of patents. The Chinese officials, accompanied by a WIPO official, also visited the Swiss Federal Intellectual Property Office in Berne.

Also in May and June, a WIPO official undertook a mission to Beijing to provide advice and to give lectures on the International (Nice) Classification and the Vienna Classification of Figurative Elements of Marks.

In July and August, a professor had consultations, after participation in the ATRIP annual meeting in Washington, in the United States of America on matters relating to the protection of integrated circuits and computer programs with various governmental and non-governmental institutions in the United States of America. The visits were financed from funds made available to WIPO by the Government of the United States of America.

In August, a government official undertook a study visit to WIPO to study the Patent Cooperation Treaty.

Also in August, five government officials visited WIPO and had discussions with the Director General and WIPO officials on questions of mutual interest.

In September, government officials had discussions, in Geneva, with the Director General on cooperation between WIPO and the Chinese Patent Office.

Also in September, government officials had discussions, in Geneva, with the Director General and WIPO officials, on cooperation between WIPO and the Chinese Trademark Office.

In October, the Director General, during his presence in Beijing for the WIPO-IFIA Symposium on Creativity and the Promotion of Inventive Activities, had discussions with Mr. Wang Zhen, Vice-President of the People's Republic of China, and attended the closing ceremony of the Beijing International Exhibition of Inventions. The Director General presented three WIPO gold medals to three Chinese inventors at that closing ceremony.

Also in October, the Director General had discussions in Beijing with leading Chinese personalities and senior officials of the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress, the Chinese Political Consultative Conference, the Supreme People's Court, the Bureau of Legal System of the State Council, the State Science and Technology Commission, the Chinese Patent Office, the State Administration for Industry and Commerce, the National Copyright Administration of China, the Economic Research Center of the State Council, the China Council for the Promotion of International Trade and the China Association of Inventions. The discussions covered cooperation between WIPO and China in the field of intellectual property.

*India.* In April, a WIPO consultant from India visited New Delhi to discuss with government and UNDP officials arrangements for a national Seminar on Licensing and Other Technology Transfer Arrange-

ments, to be held in New Delhi in November 1988. The mission was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project.

In June, a Deputy Director General visited New Delhi and had discussions with government and UNDP officials on development cooperation matters and other questions of mutual interest.

*Indonesia.* In April, a WIPO consultant from Australia undertook a mission to Jakarta to provide advice and assistance to government officials on questions of patent and industrial design law and administration as well as of patent information and documentation. The mission was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project.

In September, a WIPO official had discussions with government and UNDP officials on cooperation between WIPO and Indonesia in the field of industrial property, in particular the implementation of the UNDP-financed country project.

*Iran (Islamic Republic of).* In August, a WIPO official visited Teheran and discussed with government and UNDP officials the present industrial property situation and possible development cooperation between WIPO and the Government.

In September, government officials had discussions, in Geneva, with the Director General, a Deputy Director General and other WIPO officials on the follow-up of the above-mentioned mission to Teheran.

*Laos.* In February, WIPO organized a study visit for the President of the Ministry of Science and Technology (SCST) and another official of SCST, at WIPO, for discussions with the Director General and WIPO officials on possible WIPO assistance in drafting national industrial property legislation, in the setting-up of the necessary administrative infrastructure, training of Lao officials, and the organizing of a seminar on industrial property in Vientiane. WIPO also arranged for the Lao officials to visit INPI (France) in Paris. The study visit was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project.

In October, two government officials undertook a study visit to the headquarters of WIPO to discuss the draft industrial property law which WIPO had sent to the Government in August, and to study the different activities of the International Bureau, including the international trademark registration services of WIPO.

*Malaysia.* In March, a WIPO consultant from Australia undertook a mission to provide advice and assistance to the Registry of Trade Marks and Patents and the Patent Information and Documentation Center (PIDC) on the protection of industrial designs and on the administration of the patent system. The mission was funded by the UNDP-financed country project on patent administration.

In March and April, a WIPO consultant from the United Kingdom undertook a mission to the Registry of Trade Marks and Patents to provide advice and assistance in relation to trademark law and administration, in particular, advice and training in relation to opposition hearings in trademark applications and search and examination of trademark applications. The mission was funded by the UNDP-financed country project on trademarks.

In May, a WIPO official visited Kuching (Sarawak) for discussions with officials of the Invention and Design Association of Sarawak on the activities being undertaken by WIPO in the promotion of inventive and innovative activities. The mission was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project.

In June, a WIPO consultant from India had discussions in Kuala Lumpur with government and UNDP officials on ongoing and future activities under the UNDP-financed country projects for strengthening the patent and trademark services, respectively.

In July and August, a WIPO official and a WIPO consultant from Australia had discussions in Kuala Lumpur with government officials on the legislative and administrative aspects of a proposed independent system for the registration of industrial designs in the country.

From August to October, a WIPO consultant from the United Kingdom undertook a mission to the Registry of Trade Marks and Patents and the PIDC, in Kuala Lumpur, to guide and supervise patent examiners on search and examination functions, give in-service training on granting and post-grant procedures, assess the present patent system and practices, and to review the proposed amendments to the patent law. The mission was funded by the UNDP-financed country project.

From October to December, a WIPO consultant from the United States of America undertook a mission to the Registry of Trade Marks and Patents, in Kuala Lumpur, to advise on trademark search and examination procedures, reorganization of search material, general office administration and to give on-the-job training. The mission was funded by the UNDP-financed country project.

In November, a WIPO consultant from the United Kingdom undertook a mission to the Registry of Trade Marks and Patents, in Kuala Lumpur, to provide training on the conduct of opposition hearings in trademark applications and the examination of trademark applications, as well as to begin the preparation of an office manual for use by the trademark examiners. This mission was funded by the UNDP-financed country project.

In December, a WIPO official and a consultant from India participated in a tripartite review, in Kuala Lumpur, of the two UNDP-financed country projects, one dealing with patents and the other with trademarks. The WIPO official and the consultant also discussed with government officials the convening in Kuala

Lumpur, in 1989, of a patent agents training course and a seminar on the promotion of innovative activity.

*Mongolia.* In May and June, a government official undertook a visit to WIPO to study the functioning of the Madrid Agreement for the International Registration of Marks and of the registration services of WIPO under that Agreement.

*Pakistan.* In April, a WIPO official discussed with government and UNDP officials in Islamabad and Karachi a possible UNDP-financed country project to strengthen the national patent system, including the establishment of patent information services. Also discussed were possible activities, including a seminar on trademarks in Karachi, under the UNDP-financed regional project. In Karachi, the official discussed with the Marketing Association of Pakistan (MAP) the possible holding of the said seminar in Karachi in December 1988. The official also visited Lahore to discuss the possible introduction of intellectual property law teaching in universities.

In October, a WIPO official had discussions with government officials, in Karachi, on the proposed UNDP-financed country project.

Also in October, in Karachi, the WIPO official had discussions with officials of MAP on arrangements related to the Seminar on Trademarks and Marketing which would be organized by WIPO in cooperation with MAP, in Karachi, in 1989.

*Philippines.* In February, a WIPO consultant from Australia visited the Bureau of Patents, Trademarks and Technology Transfer (BPTTT) in Manila to advise on the revision of the Philippine Patent Law. The mission was funded by the UNDP-financed country project.

In April, three government officials visited the Australian Patent, Trade Marks and Designs Office for a study program on managing the computerization of industrial property administration. The study was organized jointly by WIPO and the Government of Australia and was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project.

Also in April, two WIPO officials visited the BPTTT to provide advice on the computerization of trademark administration. The mission was funded by the UNDP-financed country project.

In July, a government official undertook a study visit to the USPTO and the Copyright Office in Washington, the State Committee for Inventions and Discoveries in Moscow and WIPO in Geneva, in connection with the possible restructuring of the intellectual property laws and system of the Philippines. The study visit was funded by the UNDP-financed country project.

In August, a WIPO official visited Manila and discussed with government and UNDP officials the establishment of a computerized system for trademark

administration under the UNDP-financed country project.

In November, a WIPO official visited Manila and participated in a tripartite review of the UNDP-financed country project for the Philippines, and held discussions with government and UNDP officials on a possible extension of the UNDP-financed country project and on activities planned under the UNDP-financed regional project for Asia and the Pacific.

*Republic of Korea.* In June, two WIPO officials and two WIPO consultants from the United Kingdom and the United States of America visited Seoul and had discussions with government officials on plans for the computerization of their administration. The missions were funded by the UNDP-financed regional project.

In June and July, two consultants from the United Kingdom and the United States of America, and two WIPO officials, undertook a mission to the Korea Industrial Property Office (KIPO) in Seoul, to provide advice in respect of the long-term computerization plans of KIPO. The mission was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project.

In October, two government officials and a representative of Korean private industry visited WIPO to discuss the subject of the patent protection of Korean chemical products.

Also in October, a government official undertook a study visit to WIPO and the EPO in Munich, on the subject of international agreements in the field of industrial property. The study visit was funded by the UNDP-financed country project.

In November, a WIPO consultant from Japan undertook a mission to the International Intellectual Property Training Institute, Seoul, and presented lectures on the registration of industrial designs. The mission was funded by the UNDP-financed country project.

In November and December, an official from EPO undertook a mission to KIPO on the examination of patent applications in the field of electronics. The mission was funded by the UNDP-financed country project.

Also in November and December, a government official had a study attachment at the Japanese Patent Office on industrial design law and trial procedures. The attachment was funded by the UNDP-financed country project.

In December, two WIPO officials visited Seoul and participated in the tripartite review of the UNDP-financed country project, and held discussions with government and UNDP officials on activities to be undertaken under the UNDP-financed regional project for Asia and the Pacific.

*Singapore.* In February, a WIPO official undertook a mission to the Singapore Institute of Standards and Industrial Research (SISIR) to provide advice and assistance in relation to the patent information and docu-



mentation collection of SISIR and the provision of technological information services based on patent information. The mission was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project.

In April, a WIPO official had discussions with government officials on legal and administrative questions related to the proposed new patent system and the attachment of a WIPO consultant on patent information to SISIR.

In September, a WIPO official visited Singapore and had discussions with government officials on the organization of a regional symposium on patent documentation and information to be held in 1989 in Singapore and to be financed through funds made available to WIPO by the Government of Japan. The official also had discussions on cooperation between WIPO and Singapore.

*Thailand.* In January, a WIPO consultant from Australia continued his mission to the Department of Commercial Registration (DCR) in Bangkok to provide advice and assistance on industrial property administration, in particular the processing of patent applications. The mission was funded by the UNDP-financed country project.

In February, a WIPO consultant from Japan undertook a mission to the DCR in Bangkok in the field of patent examination. The mission was financed through funds made available to WIPO by the Government of Japan.

Also in February, a WIPO official and a WIPO consultant from Australia visited the DCR, in Bangkok, to provide advice on the proposed computerization of trademark administration. The mission was funded by the UNDP-financed country project.

In May, a Thai government official visited the BPTTT in Manila for a study program on managing the computerization of industrial property administration. The mission was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project.

Also in May, a WIPO official visited the DCR, in Bangkok, to provide advice on the computerization of trademark administration being undertaken under the UNDP-financed country project.

The same WIPO official also visited the Asian Institute of Technology in Bangkok to discuss the possible organization of a regional training course on computerization of industrial property administration for Asian countries to be undertaken under the UNDP-financed country project.

In July, a WIPO official visited the DCR in Bangkok in connection with the establishment of a computerized system for trademark administration under the UNDP-financed country project.

Also in July, two officials of the DCR held discussions with the Director General and WIPO officials on the proposal of the Government to extend the on-going UNDP-financed country project.

In October and November, a WIPO consultant from the Federal Republic of Germany undertook a mission to the DCR to provide advice and on-the-job training on the use of the Nice International Classification of Goods and Services. The mission was funded by the UNDP-financed country project.

In December, a WIPO official and a WIPO consultant from Australia undertook a mission to the DCR in connection with the computerization of trademark administration. The mission was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project.

*Viet Nam.* In May, the WIPO official who was participating in the Seminar on Industrial Designs and the Promotion of Innovative Activity, discussed with government and UNDP officials the program for the implementation of the recently approved UNDP-financed country project for the establishment of a patent documentation center.

In June, a WIPO official undertook a mission to Hanoi and had discussions with government and UNDP officials on the proposed program for implementation of the UNDP project for the establishment of a patent documentation center (within the National Office on Inventions). The mission was funded by the UNDP-financed country project.

In July, a WIPO official had discussions in Hanoi with government and UNDP officials on the implementation of the UNDP-financed country project.

In November, a WIPO official visited Hanoi and had discussions with government and UNDP officials on cooperation between WIPO and the National Office on Inventions, particularly in the context of the UNDP-financed country project. The WIPO official also attended a ceremony marking the opening of the new premises of the said National Office by the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of Viet Nam.

*Hong Kong.* In July, a WIPO official visited Hong Kong to advise the Hong Kong Productivity Centre on the improvement of its patent documentation collection and patent information services.

#### *Latin America and the Caribbean: Intercountry*

*Intercountry Project for Latin America and the Caribbean.* During the period under review, the UNDP-financed regional project (1987 to 1989) entitled "Support of Industrial Property Systems," continued to be executed by WIPO.

From February to December, a WIPO consultant from Chile adapted automated systems for the processing of industrial property applications, originally developed in Venezuela for the needs of the industrial property offices of other countries of the region, and instructed government officials in various countries of the region on their implementation. The mission was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project.

From April to December, a WIPO consultant from Argentina undertook several studies and surveys related to the industrial property systems of the countries in the region. This activity was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project.

In May, a WIPO official discussed with UNDP officials, in New York, the work plan for 1988 and a possible increase in resources approved in 1988 for the UNDP-financed regional project.

Also in May, an *ad hoc* Evaluation and Planning Meeting regarding the regional project for Latin America and the Caribbean was organized in Geneva, with the participation of government officials from 16 countries from the region, as well as officials from the Latin American Economic System (SELA) and the UNDP Office in Geneva. The 16 countries were: Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Paraguay, Peru, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay, Venezuela. The Meeting expressed its support for the said regional project and adopted a number of recommendations as regards the implementation of that project.

In June, a Regional Seminar on Intellectual Property for Latin American Judges was organized by WIPO, in cooperation with the Venezuelan School for the Judiciary and the Industrial Property Registry, in Caracas.

*Board (Junta) of the Cartagena Agreement (JUNAC).* In April, a WIPO official visited JUNAC headquarters in Lima and had preliminary discussions on joint development cooperation activities to be undertaken by both organizations within the framework of the UNDP-financed regional project.

In June, a WIPO official visited JUNAC headquarters in Lima to discuss a new JUNAC/WIPO draft cooperation agreement and a program of possible activities that could be undertaken jointly by the two organizations for the benefit of the five Andean countries in the industrial property field. The WIPO official also led the first leg of a mission composed of a WIPO consultant from Uruguay and another WIPO consultant from Chile who were visiting JUNAC and the industrial property offices of the five Andean countries. The purpose of the mission was to study the feasibility of a simple information system which would allow the exchange of data on industrial property among the five industrial property offices and to provide with ease statistical reports which are regularly required to be produced by these offices. The mission was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project.

In July and August, a WIPO consultant from the Federal Republic of Germany visited JUNAC headquarters in Lima and the industrial property offices of Bolivia, Colombia, Peru and Venezuela. The purpose of the mission was to collect information for the preparation of a patent manual for the five countries of the Andean Group. The mission was financed through

funds made available to WIPO by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany.

In November, a new cooperation agreement between WIPO and JUNAC was signed.

*Institute of Nutrition of Central America and Panama (INCAP).* During a one-month assignment to the headquarters of INCAP in Guatemala City in June, a WIPO consultant (a national of Guatemala) assisted that Institute within the framework of a program aimed at promoting industrial property protection and dissemination of technological information generated by that Institute in the field of nutrition. The assignment was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project.

*International Center for Patent Documentation in Spanish (CIPLC).* In December, the second meeting of the Preparatory Council took place in Buenos Aires. The Council took a number of decisions concerning the functions and decentralized operations of the Center. The Meeting was attended by all Spanish-speaking countries of the region with the exception of Ecuador, Panama and Venezuela. Brazil and JUNAC participated as observers. Two WIPO officials attended the meeting. The Secretariat presented a survey on the availability and organization of patent document collections in the region. The meeting adopted guidelines for the establishment, on a provisional basis, of pilot units of the future center in industrial property offices of those Latin American countries which expressed interest in hosting such a pilot unit.

*Latin-American Association for Integration (ALADI).* In April, an ALADI official visited WIPO and had preliminary discussions on the joint work program to be implemented in 1988 under the WIPO/ALADI Cooperation Agreement.

During the period covered by this report, two technical profiles were elaborated by two WIPO consultants from Mexico, for the use of the Secretariat of ALADI, on the basis of state-of-the-art search reports prepared under the WIPO program for state-of-the-art searches for developing countries.

In June, a WIPO official visited ALADI headquarters in Montevideo to elaborate details of a joint work program to be implemented in 1988 and 1989.

In August and September, a WIPO consultant from Spain provided training to officials of the Directorate of Industrial Property of Paraguay as well as to officials from Argentina and Uruguay, in the classification of the figurative elements of trademarks. This training was organized in the framework of the WIPO/ALADI program of cooperation with Argentina, Chile, Paraguay and Uruguay and was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project.

In October, an ALADI official visited the industrial property offices of Argentina, Brazil, Mexico and Venezuela to acquaint himself with the patent examination

procedures and technical information services offered by those offices.

In November, the Sixth Meeting of Directors of Industrial Property Offices of Argentina, Chile, Paraguay and Uruguay was held in Buenos Aires. The Meeting was organized by WIPO in cooperation with the Government of Argentina, the ALADI Secretariat and UNDP. The meeting was attended by observers of the Government of Spain, the EPO, the national associations of industrial property agents of the four countries, and the Inter-American Association of Industrial Property (ASIPI). The participation of the government officials was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project.

*Latin American Economic System (SELA).* In March, two WIPO officials visited the headquarters of the Secretariat of SELA in Caracas to attend the third SELA Latin American Consultative Meeting on Multilateral Trade Negotiations of the Uruguay Round as well as a seminar on "New Issues on the Uruguay Round."

Also in March, the Permanent Secretary of SELA visited WIPO and had discussions with the Director General and WIPO officials on questions of mutual interest.

In May, an official of SELA participated in the *ad hoc* Evaluation and Planning Meeting.

In June, on the occasion of the Seminar on Intellectual Property for Latin American Judges, a WIPO official visited SELA in order to discuss the forthcoming WIPO/SELA meeting of experts on industrial property matters.

In September, a WIPO official visited Caracas to participate in the second preparatory stage of the Fourteenth Regular Meeting of the Latin American Council. On this occasion, he also discussed with the Secretariat of SELA the organization of a WIPO/SELA meeting to be held in Caracas in 1989.

Also in September, the Permanent Secretary of SELA visited WIPO and had discussions with the Director General and WIPO officials on cooperation between the two organizations.

*Permanent Secretariat of the General Treaty on Central American Economic Integration (SIECA).* In April, a WIPO official visited SIECA headquarters in Guatemala City and discussed joint development cooperation activities that could lead to the revision of the industrial property system of the countries of the Central American Isthmus, in accordance with the decisions adopted by the Vice-Ministers of the six countries of the Isthmus in their last meeting in Managua in November 1987.

In June, the Secretary General of SIECA visited WIPO and had discussions with the Director General and WIPO officials on questions of mutual interest.

Also in June, an official of SIECA visited WIPO and discussed with WIPO officials the plan of cooperation

between WIPO and SIECA for the second half of 1988.

In August, two WIPO officials visited SIECA to discuss a draft protocol for the amendment of the 1968 Central American Convention which deals with marks and other distinctive signs. It also discussed a draft convention on inventions and industrial designs.

In October and November, the First Meeting of Government Experts on the Revision of the Legal Framework for Industrial Property of the Countries of the Central American Isthmus and the Eighth Meeting of Heads of Industrial Property Offices were held in San Salvador, organized by WIPO in cooperation with the Government of El Salvador and UNDP. The Meeting of Heads of Industrial Property Offices endorsed the recommendations of the meeting of government experts and decided to further develop the draft texts and discuss them at a second meeting of experts. Government officials from Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua and Panama, observers from national associations of industrial property agents members of ASIPI, representatives from the SIECA Secretariat and two WIPO officials attended the Meetings in addition to the participants from El Salvador. The participation of the government officials was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project.

*United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC).* In August, a WIPO consultant from France visited the Patent Information and Documentation Unit of the Caribbean Documentation Center of ECLAC in Port of Spain to advise as a follow-up of previous expert missions on the building-up and maintenance of patent collections, the establishment of patent information services and on a Caribbean Patent Information Network. The mission was financed through funds made available to WIPO by the Government of France.

In September, a WIPO official undertook a mission to Port of Spain and discussed with officials from the ECLAC Office for the Caribbean forthcoming activities under the regional project, especially the strengthening of the Patent Information and Documentation Unit and the proposals made by WIPO concerning intergovernmental cooperation in the field of patent information for the English-speaking Caribbean countries, Haiti and Suriname. This mission was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project.

#### *Individual Countries in Latin America and the Caribbean*

*Argentina.* From January to September, three national WIPO consultants continued developing automated systems related to, *inter alia*, trademark and patent searching, administrative procedures and control in the fields of patents, trademarks and industrial designs and patent information and official publications. Two of these national consultants continued to

work under the project also from October to December. This activity was funded by the UNDP-financed country project.

From January to December, a national WIPO consultant continued his work on organization and management in the National Directorate of Industrial Property (DNPI), under the UNDP-financed country project.

In March, a WIPO official visited Buenos Aires to discuss technical matters relating to the continuation of the UNDP-financed country project.

In June, a WIPO official visited Buenos Aires to discuss matters relating to the implementation of the UNDP-financed country project as well as of the UNDP-financed regional project.

Also in June, three WIPO consultants from the EPO visited the DNPI to assist in the modernization of the patent examination procedures and patent search files of that office. The mission was funded by the EPO and the UNDP-financed regional project.

In October, an ALADI official visited the DNPI in order to acquaint himself with the patent examination procedures and technical information services offered by that office.

In November, two government officials from Panama visited Buenos Aires to study the computerized systems developed in the Argentinian industrial property office. The mission was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project.

Also in November, the Sixth Meeting of Directors of Industrial Property Offices of Argentina, Chile, Paraguay and Uruguay was held in Buenos Aires with the cooperation of the Government of Argentina, the ALADI Secretariat and UNDP. The Meeting reviewed and discussed two draft manuals on the examination of patent applications and on the administrative and technical processing of trademark applications, as well as the progress being made in the four national industrial property offices in the building of patent search files and computerization of industrial property operations. The Meeting decided to carry out a number of specific development cooperation activities during 1989. The Meeting was attended by the heads of the industrial property offices of the four countries and about 10 other government officials of those countries, by representatives of national groups of industrial property agents, ASIPI, the ALADI Secretariat, UNDP, and one WIPO official. The participation of the six government officials from Chile, Paraguay and Uruguay and the WIPO official was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project.

On the same occasion, a WIPO official met with government officials and UNDP to evaluate current project activities and attended the tripartite review meeting for the UNDP-financed country project.

*Bolivia.* In June, a WIPO consultant from Uruguay and a WIPO consultant from Chile visited the Industrial Property Department of Bolivia. The purpose of

the mission was to study the feasibility of a simple information system which would allow the exchange of data on industrial property among the five industrial property offices of the Andean Group and to provide with ease statistical reports which are regularly required to be produced by these offices. The mission was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project.

In August, a WIPO consultant from the Federal Republic of Germany visited the Industrial Property Department of Bolivia. The purpose of the mission was to collect information for the preparation of a patent manual for the five countries of the Andean Group. The mission was financed through funds made available to WIPO by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany.

*Brazil.* In February, a WIPO consultant from the EPO visited the National Institute for Industrial Property (INPI) in Rio de Janeiro and discussed with government officials a program of activities to be undertaken in the field of patent documentation and information under the new UNDP-financed country project. The mission was financed by the EPO.

In February and March, two government officials visited the industrial property offices and other institutions dealing with patent information matters of France, Germany (Federal Republic of), Japan, the Netherlands and Sweden, as well as the EPO in The Hague and Munich, to study the latest policies and technology applied by those institutions as regards the storage and dissemination of patent information and the management of the corresponding information services rendered to the public. The two Brazilian officials also visited WIPO in Geneva. The mission was funded by the UNDP-financed country project.

In March, a new Cooperation Agreement between the Government of Brazil and WIPO was signed in Geneva. The Agreement provides for joint activities to be organized for the benefit of developing countries.

In May, an official of INPI in Rio de Janeiro participated as a speaker in a symposium on patent information which was organized as part of the Permanent Committee on Development Cooperation Related to Industrial Property.

From June to December, a WIPO consultant from the EPO advised INPI on patent information and documentation matters, under the UNDP-financed country project.

In October, an ALADI official visited INPI in Rio de Janeiro in order to acquaint himself with the patent examination procedures and technical information services offered by that office.

In December, the President of INPI visited WIPO and discussed with the Director General and WIPO officials matters relating to the implementation of the UNDP-financed country project.

*Chile.* In January, a government official visited the DNPI of Argentina to receive advice regarding the

development of computerized systems for the processing and search of trademark applications to be used by that office under the UNDP-financed country project of Chile.

From January to December, two national WIPO consultants continued their assignment, under the UNDP-financed country project, at the DNPI in the processing of patent and trademark applications.

In May, a WIPO consultant from Argentina undertook a mission to advise on the development and implementation of mechanized systems for the operations of the Industrial Property Department. This mission was funded by the UNDP-financed country project.

In June, a WIPO official had discussions with government and UNDP officials on the modalities of implementation of the UNDP-financed country project.

In July and August, three WIPO consultants from the EPO visited the DNPI to assist in the modernization of the patent examination procedures and patent search files of that office. The mission was funded by the EPO and the UNDP-financed regional project.

In November, two WIPO consultants from Argentina and Uruguay undertook a mission to complete and implement a computerized system for the administrative procedures and searching of trademarks at the DNPI. One of the consultants returned for a brief visit in December to complete the installation and to check the operation of the systems. The mission was funded by the UNDP-financed country project.

Also in November, the head of the DNPI and one other government official took part in the Sixth Meeting of Directors of Industrial Property Offices of Argentina, Chile, Paraguay and Uruguay, in Buenos Aires. The participation of the two officials was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project.

*Colombia.* In March, a WIPO consultant from Argentina undertook a mission to Colombia to advise on the selection of computer equipment and the development of software to facilitate the operations of the Industrial Property Division. This mission was funded by the UNDP-financed country project.

In June, a WIPO official visited Bogota to discuss with government and UNDP officials the possibilities of extending the UNDP-financed country project.

Also in June, a WIPO consultant from Uruguay and a WIPO consultant from Chile visited the industrial property office of Colombia. The purpose of the mission was to study the feasibility of a simple information system which would allow the exchange of data on industrial property among the five industrial property offices of the Andean Group and to provide with ease statistical reports which are regularly required to be produced by those offices. The mission was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project.

In July, a WIPO consultant from the Federal Republic of Germany visited the Industrial Property

Division to collect information for the preparation of a patent manual for the five countries of the Andean Group. The mission was financed through funds made available to WIPO by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany.

In August, a WIPO consultant from Spain undertook a mission to Bogota to advise the technical staff of the Industrial Property Division on the processing and classification of the figurative elements of trademarks. This mission was funded by the Government of Spain and the UNDP-financed country project.

In October, a WIPO consultant from France undertook a mission to Bogota to assist the authorities and staff of the Industrial Property Division on the organization of a meeting of national inventors together with a seminar and fair on national innovations. The mission was financed through funds made available to WIPO by the Government of France.

In December, a WIPO official participated in Bogota in a tripartite review meeting on the UNDP-financed country project.

*Costa Rica.* In June, a WIPO official visited San José to discuss with government and UNDP officials the possibility of a UNDP-financed country project to enable the modernization of the functions of the Industrial Property Registry (RPI).

In July, three WIPO consultants from El Salvador, Germany (Federal Republic of) and Guatemala visited the RPI. They advised and assisted in the classification of patent documents.

In August and September, a WIPO consultant from Chile visited the RPI to advise on the design and development of automated systems for the processing of patent and trademark applications as well as on the purchase of computer equipment. The mission was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project.

In October and November, two government officials took part in the Eighth Meeting of Heads of Industrial Property Offices and in the First Meeting of Governmental Experts on the Revision of the Legal Framework for Industrial Property of the Countries of the Central American Isthmus, which was held in San Salvador.

*Ecuador.* In June, a WIPO consultant from Uruguay and a WIPO consultant from Chile visited the industrial property office of Quito. The purpose of the mission was to study the feasibility of a simple information system which would allow the exchange of data on industrial property among the five industrial property offices of the Andean Group and to provide with ease statistical reports which are regularly required to be produced by these offices. The mission was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project.

*El Salvador.* From January to December, the national WIPO consultant continued to coordinate the activities under the UNDP-financed country project.

In June, a WIPO consultant from Chile visited San Salvador to assist in the recruitment of a local analyst-programmer and in the purchase of additional computer equipment under the UNDP-financed country project.

In July and August, a government official from El Salvador visited the industrial property offices of Honduras, Costa Rica and Panama in order to assist them in the classification of patent documents. The mission was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project.

In October, a WIPO consultant from Chile undertook a mission to San Salvador to advise government officials responsible for technical information services and industrial property matters on the introduction of computerized systems. This mission was funded by the UNDP-financed country project.

Also in October, an official from the Department of Trademark, Patent, Copyright, Name and Commercial Sign Registration undertook a study visit to Caracas in order to acquaint himself with the computerized systems developed in the Industrial Property Registry of Venezuela.

In October and November, the Eighth Meeting of Heads of Industrial Property Offices and the First Meeting of Governmental Experts on the Revision of the Legal Framework for Industrial Property in the Countries of the Central American Isthmus took place in San Salvador, organized by WIPO in cooperation with the Government of El Salvador and UNDP. The participation of two government officials each from Costa Rica, Honduras, Nicaragua and Panama and three from Guatemala, as well as that of one WIPO official was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project.

Also in October and November, two government officials took part in the Eighth Meeting of Heads of Industrial Property Offices and in the First Meeting of Governmental Experts on the Revision of the Legal Framework for Industrial Property of the Countries of the Central American Isthmus, which was held in San Salvador.

In November, a WIPO consultant from Mexico visited San Salvador in order to advise the staff of the Department of Trademark, Patent, Copyright, Name and Commercial Sign Registration on the processing and examination of trademark applications. The mission was funded by the UNDP-financed country project.

Also in November, a WIPO official participated in San Salvador in a tripartite review meeting on the UNDP-financed country project.

In December, the Vice Minister responsible for industrial property visited the Registry of Industrial Property of Spain and WIPO headquarters to discuss matters in relation to the UNDP-financed country project. The mission was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project.

*Guatemala.* From January to December, under the UNDP-financed country project, the national WIPO consultant continued to advise on office management and organization and to coordinate and supervise the project activities in the Registry of Industrial Property.

In March, a WIPO consultant from Chile undertook a mission to advise government officials on the development and implementation of computerized systems for the operation of the Registry of Industrial Property. This mission was funded by the UNDP-financed country project.

In April, a WIPO official visited Guatemala City and discussed with government and UNDP officials the 1988 work program under the UNDP-financed country project.

In May, a WIPO consultant from Venezuela visited Guatemala City to assist in the implementation of the above-mentioned computerized systems. This mission was funded by the UNDP-financed country project.

In June, a WIPO consultant from Guatemala assisted INCAP in the framework of a program aimed at promoting protection and dissemination of technological information generated by that Institute in the field of nutrition. The assignment was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project.

In July and August, the same WIPO consultant from Guatemala assisted the industrial property offices of Costa Rica and Panama in the classification of patent documents. The mission was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project.

In October, a WIPO official together with two WIPO consultants from Spain and Chile undertook a mission to Guatemala City to continue giving advice on the implementation of mechanized programs for the administrative control and searching of patent and trademark applications. This mission was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project.

*Haiti.* In July and August, a WIPO consultant from France visited the Industrial Property Office in Port-au-Prince to advise on matters relating to the processing of patent and trademark applications. The mission was financed through funds made available to WIPO by the Government of France.

*Honduras.* In July, three WIPO consultants from El Salvador, the Federal Republic of Germany and Guatemala visited the Industrial Property Registry. They advised and assisted in the classification of patent documents.

In October and November, three government officials took part in the Eighth Meeting of Heads of Industrial Property Offices and in the First Meeting of Governmental Experts on the Revision of the Legal Framework for Industrial Property of the Countries of the Central American Isthmus, which was held in San Salvador.

*Mexico.* In April and August, a WIPO consultant from Argentina undertook missions to advise the staff of the Directorate General of Inventions, Marks and Technological Development (DGIMDT) on the design, development and implementation of computerized systems to improve the operations of that office. The missions were funded by the UNDP-financed country project.

From August to December, a WIPO national consultant provided advice to DGIMDT on the establishment, organization and maintenance of patent documentation collections and their use for technological information services.

In September, three WIPO consultants from the EPO undertook a joint mission in Mexico City to assist and advise on the search and examination of Mexican patent applications. These missions were financed by the EPO.

Also in September, a WIPO consultant from Spain undertook a mission to Mexico City to advise on the application of the International Classification of Goods and Services relating to Marks and to instruct national experts in its practical introduction. This mission was funded by the Government of Spain.

*Nicaragua.* In March, a WIPO official and two WIPO consultants from Chile and Sweden visited Managua to discuss with government and UNDP officials the country's needs and requirements in the field of industrial property administration. The mission of the two experts was financed by SIDA.

In October and November, two government officials took part in the Eighth Meeting of Heads of Industrial Property Offices and in the First Meeting of Governmental Experts on the Revision of the Legal Framework for Industrial Property of the Countries of the Central American Isthmus, which was held in San Salvador.

*Panama.* In June, a WIPO official visited Panama to discuss with government and UNDP officials the possibility of a UNDP-financed country project to enable the modernization of the functions of the Industrial Property Registry. The mission was financed from funds made available by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany and by the UNDP-financed regional project.

In August, three WIPO consultants from El Salvador, Germany (Federal Republic of) and Guatemala visited the Directorate General of the Industrial Property Registry. They advised and assisted in the classification of patent documents. The mission was financed from funds made available to WIPO by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany and by the UNDP-financed regional project.

In August and September, a WIPO consultant from Chile visited the Directorate General of the Industrial Property Registry to advise on the design and development of automated systems for the processing of patent and trademark applications as well as on the

purchase of computer equipment. The mission was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project.

In October and November, two government officials took part in the Eighth Meeting of Heads of Industrial Property Offices, and the First Meeting of Governmental Experts on the Revision of the Legal Framework for Industrial Property of the Countries of the Central American Isthmus, which was held in San Salvador.

In November and December, two government officials of the Directorate General of the Industrial Property Registry undertook a study mission to the industrial property offices of Argentina, Uruguay and Venezuela in order to study the computerized systems developed in those offices. The mission was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project.

*Paraguay.* From January to December, the national WIPO consultant continued his assignment to advise on legal and administrative matters and to coordinate project activities under the UNDP-financed country project.

In February, a WIPO official undertook a mission to Asuncion to discuss with government officials and interested circles a possible law on the promotion of inventive activities and innovations. The mission was funded by the UNDP-financed country project.

In March, a WIPO consultant from Argentina undertook a mission to Asuncion to advise the Directorate of Industrial Property on the implementation of computerized systems in the field of trademark processing and search, administrative control and industrial property publications. This mission was funded by the UNDP-financed country project.

In April, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Paraguay visited WIPO and had discussions with the Director General and WIPO officials on recent developments in the field of industrial property in Paraguay.

In June, three WIPO consultants from the EPO visited the Directorate of Industrial Property to assist in the modernization of the patent examination procedures and patent search files of that office. The mission was funded by the EPO and the UNDP-financed regional project.

In October, a WIPO consultant from Mexico advised officials from the Directorate of Industrial Property on the use of patent documents as a source of technological information. The mission was funded by the UNDP-financed country project.

In November, three government officials took part in the Sixth Meeting of Directors of Industrial Property Offices of Argentina, Chile, Paraguay and Uruguay, in Buenos Aires. The participation of the three officials was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project.

In December, a WIPO official participated in Asuncion in a tripartite review meeting on the UNDP-financed country project.

Also in December, a WIPO consultant from Chile visited the Directorate of Industrial Property in order to advise on the implementation of computerized systems.

The mission was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project.

*Peru.* In April, a WIPO official visited JUNAC to discuss possible activities in Peru under the UNDP-financed regional project. On that occasion, the same official visited the Institute for Industrial Technological Research and Technical Standards (ITINTEC) to discuss WIPO assistance to the Industrial Property Directorate of ITINTEC.

In June, a WIPO official visited Lima to discuss with ITINTEC and other government and UNDP officials the possibility of a technical cooperation program to assist in the modernization of the Industrial Property Division of ITINTEC.

Also in June, a WIPO consultant from Uruguay and a WIPO consultant from Chile visited ITINTEC in Lima. The purpose of the mission was to study the feasibility of a simple information system which would allow the exchange of data on industrial property among the five industrial property offices of the Andean Group and to provide with ease statistical reports which are regularly required to be produced by these offices. The mission was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project.

In August, a WIPO consultant from the Federal Republic of Germany visited ITINTEC in Lima to collect information for the preparation of a patent manual for the five countries of the Andean Group. The mission was financed through funds made available to WIPO by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany.

In October, a WIPO consultant from the EPO visited Lima to advise the technical staff of ITINTEC on state-of-the-art searches and examination. The mission was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project.

*Uruguay.* From January to December, a national WIPO consultant continued to work in Montevideo on the design, development and implementation of computer programs. This task was funded by the UNDP-financed country project.

Also from January to December, two national WIPO consultants continued their assignments and provided in-service training in the fields of classification and processing of patent applications. These assignments were funded by the UNDP-financed country project.

Also from January to December, another national WIPO expert continued his assignment in the inputting of data on patent and trademark operations needed for the implementation of the computerized systems developed under the UNDP-financed country project.

In March, a WIPO consultant from Argentina visited Montevideo to design and initiate a training program under the UNDP-financed country project and to discuss with government and UNDP officials other matters of project coordination.

In May, the same WIPO consultant from Argentina visited Montevideo to supervise the training program mentioned above and to discuss with government and UNDP officials new proposals to be included in the 1988 program of activities under the UNDP-financed country project.

Also in May, a government official visited the DNPI of Argentina in Buenos Aires to receive advice regarding the development of computerized systems for industrial property operations. The mission was funded by the UNDP-financed project of Uruguay.

In June, a WIPO official and a WIPO consultant from Argentina discussed with government and UNDP officials the progress made with the UNDP-financed country project and a possible extension of it into 1989.

In July, three WIPO consultants from the EPO visited the National Industrial Property Center (CNPI) in Montevideo to assist in the modernization of the patent examination procedures and patent search files of that office. The mission was funded by the EPO and the UNDP-financed regional project.

In July, August, September and October, the same WIPO consultant from Argentina visited CNPI in Montevideo to continue the supervision of the ongoing project activities, assure the follow-up of recommendations made and discuss a project revision extending the project into 1989 with a contribution from the private sector.

In November, two government officials participated in the Sixth Meeting of Directors of Industrial Property Offices of Argentina, Chile, Paraguay and Uruguay, in Buenos Aires. The participation of the two officials was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project.

In December, a WIPO official and a WIPO consultant from Argentina participated in a tripartite review meeting on the UNDP-financed country project in Montevideo. An extension of the project until December 1989 was decided, to be financed jointly by UNDP, the Government and the private sector. The mission was funded by the UNDP-financed country project.

Also in December, a WIPO consultant from Chile visited CNPI to advise on the implementation of computerization. The mission was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project.

Also in December, two government officials from Panama visited Montevideo in order to study the computerized systems developed in CNPI. The mission was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project.

*Venezuela.* From January to December, a WIPO consultant from Chile continued to supervise and coordinate the activities under the UNDP-financed country project.

From February to November, a WIPO consultant from Denmark undertook a mission to provide advice and training in patent classification, search and examination in the mechanical field to the staff of the Indus-



trial Property Registry. This mission was funded by the UNDP-financed country project.

In March, two WIPO officials visited the Industrial Property Registry and discussed details related to the implementation of the UNDP-financed country project.

In June, a WIPO official visited the Industrial Property Registry to discuss pending matters of the UNDP-financed country project.

Also in June, a WIPO consultant from Uruguay and a WIPO consultant from Chile visited the Industrial Property Registry. The purpose of the mission was to study the feasibility of a simple information system which would allow the exchange of data on industrial property among the five industrial property offices of the Andean Group and to provide with ease statistical reports which are regularly required to be produced by these offices. The mission was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project.

In August, a WIPO consultant from the Federal Republic of Germany visited Caracas to collect information for the preparation of a patent manual for the five countries of the Andean Group. The mission was financed through funds made available to WIPO by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany.

In October, a WIPO official and a WIPO consultant from Spain visited Caracas to advise on the computerized systems developed under the UNDP-financed country project.

In November, a WIPO consultant from the EPO provided on-the-job training to the staff of the Industrial Property Registry in Caracas in patent search and examination in the field of chemistry. The mission was funded by the UNDP-financed country project.

Also in November, a WIPO official participated in a tripartite review meeting of the UNDP-financed country project in Caracas.

Also in November, two government officials from Panama visited Caracas to study the computerized systems developed in the Industrial Property Registry of Venezuela. The mission was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project.

In December, a government official, accompanied by the project consultant from Chile, visited WIPO to discuss matters relating to the project's activities in 1989 and beyond. The visit was funded by the UNDP-financed country project.

#### *Interregional Sectoral Adviser*

UNDP continued to fund the employment by WIPO of an Interregional Sectoral Adviser who was fully under the instructions of WIPO.

From January to December, missions under the Interregional Sectoral Adviser project were undertaken to Argentina, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, the Democratic Yemen, Panama and Senegal.

#### *Development of the Effective Use of the Intellectual Property System for the Benefit of Inventors, Authors, the Industry and the Commerce of Developing Countries*

WIPO medals for inventors have been awarded since 1979. The purpose of the awards is to promote inventive and innovative activities, particularly in developing countries or for their benefit. The medals are awarded at exhibitions or contests organized by national or international institutions. The criteria for selecting the recipients are established by the requesting institutions, and WIPO does not intervene in the selection. From the start of the program to December 31, 1988, a total of 162 medals were awarded to inventors and promoters of inventive activity from 42 countries. In 1988 alone, a total of 29 WIPO medals were awarded to inventors from 18 countries.

In February, a Deputy Director General presented a WIPO medal to a young inventor in Moscow.

In March, two WIPO medals were awarded to the two young winners of the third *Weekly Reader* National Invention Contest in Washington, and one WIPO medal was awarded at the 46th "All-Japan Exhibition of School Children's Inventions" in Tokyo.

In April, a WIPO medal was awarded at the exhibition "Invented in Sofia," two WIPO medals were awarded to the best inventor and the best invention presented at the "National Exhibition of Inventions" in Pyongyang, and two WIPO medals were awarded at the "Geneva International Exhibition of Inventions and New Technologies" to a woman inventor and to an inventor from a developing country.

In May, a WIPO official presented two WIPO medals to the inventor of the best invention in 1987 and to the best woman inventor of Yugoslavia at a special ceremony near Dubrovnik.

Also in May, two WIPO medals were awarded to young inventors at the "Canada-Wide Science Fair," in Ottawa.

Also in May, a WIPO official presented a special WIPO medal to an African inventor from Niger for his pioneering work in the field of solar energy, at a ceremony organized in the framework of the OAU Conference of Heads of State and Government of Africa on the occasion of the celebration of the 25th anniversary of the OAU in Addis Ababa.

In June, a Deputy Director General presented a WIPO medal to a team of Soviet inventors at a ceremony in Moscow for the best invention of particular use in developing countries.

Also in June, a WIPO official presented a WIPO medal to a young inventor of Côte d'Ivoire at a special award ceremony of the fourth competition for young inventors in Abidjan.

In September, two WIPO medals were awarded to two teams of Syrian inventors for the best inventions at the "Damascus International Fair."

In October, the Director General awarded three WIPO medals, on the occasion of the "Beijing International Exhibition of Inventions," to three Chinese inventors, namely, for the best invention and to the best woman inventor and the best young inventor.

Also in October, two WIPO medals were awarded to the best invention and the best young inventor at the "First Meeting of National Inventors" held in Bogota, Colombia; two other WIPO medals were awarded at the "International Exhibition of Inventions, Technical Novelties, Know-How and Software INVEX '88" held in Brno (Czechoslovakia) to a Czechoslovak inventor and to a team of inventors from the Soviet Union; and one WIPO medal was awarded to the best invention exhibited at the "Technology Fair '88" held in Rowa (Zimbabwe).

In December, a WIPO medal was awarded for the best invention with practical application in developing countries at the Thirty-Seventh World Exhibition of Inventions "BRUSSELS EUREKA," held in Brussels; and one WIPO medal was awarded to an Iraqi inventor, at the Central Organization for Standardization and Quality Control (COSQC) Week ceremony, held in Baghdad; two WIPO medals were awarded to Mongolian inventors at a special ceremony in Ulan Bator.

Also in December, a WIPO official discussed with government officials in Cotonou the holding of an exhibition and a workshop on the promotion of technological innovation.

*Others.* In January, a WIPO official visited the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) headquarters in Nairobi to discuss, together with the President of the Union of African Journalists (UAJ), the modalities for a joint UNEP-WIPO-UAJ award scheme for the best African inventions useful for the protection of the environment.

In February, a WIPO official discussed with government officials in Niamey the holding of a national seminar and exhibition for inventions as well as other measures aimed at the promotion of inventive and innovative activities in Niger.

Also in February, a WIPO official discussed with government officials in Abidjan the preparations for the African Conference on the Promotion of Innovation, held in Abidjan in June. Discussions also took place on the same subject with the President of the Côte d'Ivoire Association for the Promotion of Invention and Innovation.

In March, a WIPO official discussed with officials of the African Regional Center of Technology (ARCT), in Dakar, a proposed WIPO-ARCT Award for African inventors.

In April, a Deputy Director General and another WIPO official attended the seventh Congress of the All-Union Society of Inventors and Rationalizers (VOIR), in Moscow.

Also in April, the Director General and WIPO officials had discussions at WIPO headquarters with representatives of the China Association of Inventions on the preparations for the Symposium on Creativity and the Promotion of Inventive Activities to be held in Beijing, in October.

In June, an *African Conference on the Promotion of Innovation* was organized by WIPO with the financial support of SIDA and UNDP, in Abidjan.

Sixty-six participants, representing government authorities, research and development institutions and associations of inventors from 23 countries, attended this Conference, namely: Algeria, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Sudan, Swaziland, Tunisia, United Republic of Tanzania, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe, as well as officials from ARCT, ARIPO, OAPI and UNEP.

The various topics were presented by WIPO consultants from France, Germany (Federal Republic of), Senegal, Sudan, Sweden and Zaire, as well as by representatives of ARIPO and OAPI and two WIPO officials. The participation of the WIPO consultants from France, Germany (Federal Republic of) and Sweden was financed through funds made available to WIPO by the Governments of France, Germany (Federal Republic of) and Sweden, respectively.

In October, the Director General and three WIPO officials attended a Symposium on Creativity and the Promotion of Inventive Activities, in Beijing which was organized jointly by WIPO and IFIA, in cooperation with the State and Technology Commission of China and the China Association of Inventions, and with the financial support of UNDP. The Symposium was attended by 125 participants.

Also in October, a WIPO official attended the General Assembly of the International Federation of Inventors' Associations (IFIA) held in Beijing.

Also in October, a Training Course on the Promotion of Inventive and Innovative Activities was organized in Varna (Bulgaria) by WIPO and the Government of Bulgaria.

In November, a *Symposium on Appellations of Origin and Indications of Source*, organized jointly by WIPO and INPI (France), took place in Bordeaux (France).

The Symposium dealt with questions related to the national and international protection of appellations of origin and indications of source and their relevance to internal and external trade, in particular as far as developing countries were concerned. The Symposium considered, in particular, questions arising in connection with natural products (wine, cheese, coffee, tea, tobacco, etc.).

The Director General of WIPO addressed the Symposium. Lectures were delivered by the Director

General of INPI (France), officials from Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, France, India, the International Vine and Wine Office (IWO), and by a WIPO official.

About 90 participants from 18 countries and five organizations (International Association for the Protection of Industrial Property (AIPPI), CEIPI, Commission of the European Communities (CEE), International Federation of Industrial Property Attorneys (FICPI), General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT)) attended the Symposium. The Symposium was partly financed through funds made available to WIPO by the Government of France.

In December, a national Seminar on the Promotion of Innovation was organized in Ouagadougou by WIPO and the Government of Burkina Faso. There were about 25 participants. Three WIPO consultants from Côte d'Ivoire, Niger and Senegal and two WIPO officials participated. The Seminar was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project.

*Acquisition by Developing Countries,  
on Improved Terms, of Foreign Technology  
Protected by Industrial Property  
Rights (Licensing)*

In April, a *Group of Experts on Patent Management and Licensing Operations of Research and Development Institutions in Developing Countries* met in Geneva. Experts from the following six developing countries participated, in their personal capacity, in the discussions: Argentina, China, Egypt, Ghana, India, Zimbabwe. One intergovernmental organization (ALADI) and one non-governmental organization (Licensing Executives Society (International) (LES)) also participated as observers.

The experts considered draft guidelines, prepared by the International Bureau of WIPO, with the assistance of a WIPO consultant from the Federal Republic of Germany, entitled "Guidelines for the Management and Exploitation of Patented Inventions of Research and Development Institutions in Developing Countries."

The experts endorsed the draft guidelines and concluded that they would be valuable and useful to government authorities and research and development institutions in developing countries in particular, and to research and development institutions in general. The project was financed through funds made available to WIPO by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany.

In November, a Seminar on Licensing and Technology Transfer Arrangements was organized jointly by WIPO and the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry (FICCI) with the financial support of UNDP in New Delhi.

*Development, in Developing Countries,  
of Access to the Technological Information  
Contained in Patent Documents and its  
Dissemination*

*State-of-the-Art Search Program and Related Services.* Since 1975, WIPO has been operating the program to provide governmental institutions and individuals in developing countries with free-of-charge state-of-the-art search reports under agreements concluded between contributing industrial property offices in developed countries and WIPO.

From January 1 to December 31, 1988, 415 search requests were received from users in 37 developing countries: Algeria, Argentina, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Chile, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, El Salvador, Guatemala, India, Iraq, Libya, Malaysia, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Republic of Korea, Senegal, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Uganda, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe, and two intergovernmental organizations on behalf of their member countries: ARCT, ARIPO. In the same period, 447 search reports were delivered to developing countries. They were prepared by Australia (10), Austria (37), Finland (41), the German Democratic Republic (51), Germany (Federal Republic of) (70), Japan (73), the Soviet Union (26), Sweden (31), Switzerland (59) and the International Bureau of WIPO (49).

From the start of the program, in 1975, to December 31, 1988, 3,974 search requests were received from 80 developing countries: Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syria, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe; and 10 intergovernmental organizations on behalf of users in their member countries: Arab Industrial Development Organization (AIDO), ALADI, ARCT, ARIPO, Caribbean Documentation Centre (CDC), United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (ECA), Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP), FASRC, OAPI, United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO).

From 1975 to December 31, 1988, 3,683 search reports were delivered. Ninety-five of the search reports were provided by Australia, 1,233 by Austria, 129 by Finland, 324 by the German Democratic Republic, 592 by Germany (Federal Republic of), 256 by Japan, 159 by the Soviet Union, 355 by Sweden, 83 by Switzerland, three by the United Kingdom and 38 by the EPO. In 416 cases, the International Bureau was able to provide search reports itself, mainly by using its own access to computerized data bases by courtesy of INPI (France), Derwent Publications Ltd. and Pergamon ORBIT InfoLine.

In cooperation with the industrial property offices of several donor countries, WIPO continued to supply, upon request by developing countries, free copies of specific patent documents. France, Switzerland and the United States of America contributed to this service by providing free copies of the requested patent documents whenever available in their collections of national and foreign patent documents. Australia, Czechoslovakia, India, the Soviet Union, Spain and the United Kingdom contributed to this service by providing free copies of their national patent documents. Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China, Finland, the German Democratic Republic, Germany (Federal Republic of), Hungary, Japan, Norway, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Sweden, Thailand, Yugoslavia, and the EPO occasionally provided free copies of their patent documents which were not obtainable from the above contributing offices.

From January 1 to December 31, 1988, 356 requests for copies of patent documents were received from 28 developing countries: Algeria, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, El Salvador, Ghana, Guatemala, India, Iraq, Malaysia, Mexico, Peru, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe and, on behalf of their member States, from two inter-governmental organizations: ARIPO, FASRC. A total of 4,330 copies of patent documents were requested and the International Bureau was able to satisfy virtually all the requests.

From January 1986, the date on which the International Bureau started to establish a statistical survey on this service, to December 31, 1988, a total of 876 requests for copies of patent documents were received from 40 developing countries: Algeria, Argentina, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, El Salvador, Ghana, Guatemala, India, Iraq, Jamaica, Libya, Malaysia, Mexico, Morocco, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Paraguay, Peru, Singapore, Sudan, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe and, on behalf of their member States, from two intergovernmental organizations: ARIPO, FASRC. Out of the 876 requests, 201 requests originated from a follow-up to a search

report on the state-of-the-art and 675 requests were submitted directly by the users. A total of 11,213 copies of patent documents were requested and the International Bureau was able to satisfy virtually all the requests. Only in very few cases was information on the legal status of patent documents requested by institutions from developing countries and the International Bureau was able to provide the information with the help of the patent offices contributing to the program.

*Assistance in Examining ARIPO Patent Applications.* From January 1 to December 31, 1988, assistance in examining patent applications pending with ARIPO was requested in 34 cases. During the same period, 14 search and examination reports, prepared by Canada (4), Germany (Federal Republic of) (8), and the Soviet Union (2) were sent to ARIPO. Since the start of the program in 1984, a total of 51 search and examination reports have been provided by Canada (17), Germany (Federal Republic of) (20), the Soviet Union (11), Sweden (1) and by the EPO (2).

*International Cooperation in the Search and Examination of Inventions (ICSEI).* In the period covered by this report, WIPO received 23 search and examination requests from Libya, Malaysia and Mauritius under the ICSEI program. During the same period, 12 search and examination reports were provided by Austria (9) and the Soviet Union (3), and forwarded to the requesting offices. Since the establishment of the program in December 1983, a total of 48 search and examination reports have been furnished. They were prepared by Austria (20), Finland (2), Germany (Federal Republic of) (4), the Soviet Union (19), Sweden (1) and the EPO (2).

*Development, in Developing Countries,  
of the Profession of Intellectual Property  
Lawyer and Agent*

In April, a WIPO official discussed with government officials of Pakistan, in Lahore, the possible introduction of intellectual property law teaching in universities.

From May to December, two officials of the NTD (Novel Technology Development) Patent Agency Ltd., a Chinese patent agency, went on study attachments to the Federal Republic of Germany and the United States of America. The participation of one of the officials was partly financed through funds made available to WIPO by the Government of the United States of America.

In July, WIPO issued a publication "*Background Reading Material on Intellectual Property.*" The publication, funded by the UNDP-financed regional project for Asia and the Pacific, was intended primarily for university teachers and students of intellectual property.

Also in July, the seventh annual meeting of the International Association for the Advancement of Teaching and Research in Intellectual Property (ATRIP) took place in Washington. Ninety-three participants from 27 countries attended the meeting. In addition, the WIPO/ATRIP Working Group on Teaching Materials met during the same period. The travel and subsistence expenses of nine professors from China, India, Jordan, Lesotho, Nigeria, Peru, Sri Lanka and Sudan were borne by WIPO.

In August, a university professor from Sri Lanka undertook a study visit to WIPO to collect and prepare teaching materials for the introduction of intellectual property courses at the University of Colombo. The study visit was funded by the UNDP-financed regional project for Asia and the Pacific.

In October and November, a university professor from Pakistan undertook study visits to universities in London and Lausanne (Switzerland) and to WIPO to collect and prepare teaching materials for the possible introduction of intellectual property law courses at the University of Punjab. The study visits were funded by the UNDP-financed regional project for Asia and the Pacific.

#### *WIPO Permanent Committee for Development Cooperation Related to Industrial Property*

The Permanent Committee consists of all States members of WIPO which have informed the Director General of their desire to be members. In 1988, Chad, Guinea-Bissau, Swaziland and Zimbabwe became members of the Permanent Committee. Those recent accessions brought the number of States party to the Permanent Committee to 102. They were the following: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Egypt, El Salvador, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany (Federal Republic of), Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Lesotho, Libya, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Somalia, Soviet Union, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

In May, the Permanent Committee held its twelfth session in Geneva. The following 71 member States of the Permanent Committee and two non-member States were represented: Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Benin, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, France, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany (Federal Republic of), Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Lesotho, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, Niger, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Soviet Union, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia. In addition, representatives of eight intergovernmental organizations (ARIPO, EPO, General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), League of Arab States (LAS), OAPI, OAU, SELA, UNDP) and three international non-governmental organizations (AIPPI, CEIPI, International Chamber of Commerce (ICC)) were represented.

In accordance with the Program and Budget for the 1988-89 biennium, WIPO covered the travel and subsistence expenses of one member of the delegation of each of those countries members of the Permanent Committee which were regarded, pursuant to the relevant decisions of the United Nations, as belonging to the least developed among the developing countries or were to be granted similar treatment, as well as of each of 12 other developing countries members of the Permanent Committee.

The Permanent Committee reviewed the development cooperation activities undertaken as part of the Permanent Program since its last session in May 1987 and, in re-affirming the importance of industrial property as a dynamic instrument for technological and economic development, (i) noted with satisfaction the activities carried out under the Permanent Program since its previous session; (ii) expressed its support of the orientations for the development of activities under the Permanent Program as outlined in the documentation prepared by the International Bureau for the session, and invited the International Bureau to pursue the expansion of the Permanent Program along those lines, with special emphasis on training, advice on legislation and support for the strengthening of national and regional institutions, including patent documentation services; and (iii) expressed its gratitude to the numerous governments and organizations, and, among the latter, in particular UNDP, which made contributions to the Permanent Program, and noted with appreciation the statements made by the representatives of several of those governments and organizations that

they intended to continue or, as the case might be, increase such contributions.

The Permanent Committee also expressed its concern regarding the adverse impact of the exchange rate of the U.S. dollar vis-à-vis the Swiss franc on the program support capacity of WIPO as far as the UNDP-funded projects were concerned, and asked the Director General of WIPO to bring that concern to the attention of UNDP.

With reference to statements by several delegations from Arab countries, expressing the hope that a UNDP-financed regional project on industrial property for the Arab countries would soon be approved by UNDP, the representative of UNDP mentioned that UNDP had already committed U.S.\$ 500,000 for such a project and was about to authorize the immediate use of U.S. \$100,000, pending the finalization of the project document.

As regards the development of human resources in the field of industrial property, most delegations noted with satisfaction the progress made during the period under review in the implementation of the recommendations made by the Permanent Committee at its eleventh session, in May 1987, particularly on the further diversification and regionalization of the training program.

In that respect, numerous delegations expressed the wish that, in addition to training provided for the traditional circle of officials of industrial property administrations, increasing attention continue to be given to such programs for the training of, in particular, the judiciary, industrial property lawyers and agents and university professors, and to the teaching of industrial property in universities. The need to bring the industrial property system closer to actual and potential users both in the private and public sectors, and to promote the knowledge of industrial property amongst those in charge of the establishment and enforcement of industrial property legislation in developing countries was also stressed.

With reference to the diversification of the training program in terms of subject matter covered by it, the wish was expressed that increasing emphasis continue to be attached to training in specialized areas such as patent information and documentation, the transfer of patented technology, patent drafting and patent agency work.

Finally, the efforts made by the International Bureau to organize an increasing number of training courses in the developing countries themselves and to continue improving the information on available training opportunities were noted with satisfaction.

Many delegations underlined the important role of inventive activity in the process of technological and economic development of a country and the Permanent Committee expressed its satisfaction with the activities undertaken by the International Bureau of WIPO in the implementation of its program for the promotion of

inventive and innovative activity, and invited it to pursue that program.

Particular attention was paid to the WIPO Award program, to the desirability of assisting the developing countries in organizing exhibitions and competitions for inventions as a useful means of upgrading the public image of national inventors, and to the need for continued assistance on the part of the International Bureau in organizing national or regional associations for inventors in developing countries.

As regards cooperation among developing countries, several delegations drew attention to various modalities of technical cooperation between developing countries which were taking place under the Permanent Program, making special reference to activities involving the sharing of experience and to the benefits to be derived from the pooling of resources through regional or subregional cooperation. The view was also expressed that the utilization of experts and lecturers from developing countries should be further expanded.

Several delegations stressed the importance that they attached to the development cooperation activities of WIPO in the field of patent information and documentation and their appreciation of the way in which those activities were developing.

As decided by the Permanent Committee at its eleventh session (May 1987), the Permanent Committee devoted one day of its twelfth session to the examination of patent information and documentation matters in the framework of the "Symposium on Patent Information and Documentation: Perspectives and Realities." Lectures were delivered by speakers from Brazil, China, the Netherlands, the United States of America and ARIPO and a WIPO official. On the basis of the discussions that took place in the Symposium, the Permanent Committee requested the International Bureau to undertake a study of the technically and economically most relevant solutions for patent information activities in developing countries, in the light of the present and expected evolution of electronic data processing (EDP) technology. The solutions should be appropriate to the needs and financial possibilities of each country and emphasis should be placed on the constant updating of the patent information systems, taking into account the changing technologies and needs. The International Bureau stated that it would do so, within available resources.

As invited by the Permanent Committee on Industrial Property Information (PCIPI), the Permanent Committee also agreed to the priority of certain tasks of special relevance to developing countries on the work program of the PCIPI, subject, as regards one of those tasks, to the conduct of a survey to determine the actual use being made by developing countries of the *Journal of Patent Associated Literature* (JOPAL).

#### IV. Governing Bodies

##### *Madrid Union Assembly and Committee of Directors*

In April, the Assembly and the Committee of Directors of the Madrid Union for the International Registration of Marks met in extraordinary session. The following 23 States were represented: Algeria, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany (Federal Republic of), Hungary, Italy, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, Portugal, Romania, Soviet Union, Spain, Sudan, Switzerland, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia. Denmark participated in an observer capacity. In addition, representatives of one intergovernmental organization (BBM) and eight non-governmental organizations (International Association for the Protection of Industrial Property (AIPPI), French Association of Practitioners in Trademark and Design Law (APRAM), Benelux Association of Trademark and Design Agents (BMM), European Communities Trade Mark Practitioners' Association (ECTA), ICC, International Organization for Standardization (ISO), Institute of Trade Mark Agents (ITMA), Union of European Practitioners in Industrial Property (UEPIP)) participated in an observer capacity.

Discussions were based on draft Regulations under the Madrid Agreement Concerning the International Registration of Marks, prepared by the International Bureau, which were the result of a complete recasting of the Regulations in force (text of June 21, 1974, as last revised on December 15, 1983) in order to improve their form and content.

After a general debate and a rule-by-rule examination, the Assembly and the Committee of Directors approved the draft Regulations, subject to a number of amendments. The date of entry into force of the revised Regulations was set at January 1, 1989.

##### *WIPO Coordination Committee (extraordinary session)*

In May, the Coordination Committee decided to give its approval to the appointment of Mr. Shahid Alikhan to the vacant post of Deputy Director General. The Committee also gave favorable advice to the Director General in respect of his intention to appoint Mr. Carlos A. Fernández-Ballesteros to the post of Director, Developing Countries (Copyright) Division, with the grade of D.1.

##### *Working Group on Staff Regulation 3.1bis*

In June, a Working Group, which had been convened by the Director General pursuant to the

decision of the WIPO Coordination Committee, at its eighteenth ordinary session in September 1987, to set up such a working group composed of representatives of the same States as were members of the Budget Committee, met in Geneva to examine Staff Regulation 3.1bis ("take-home pay differential") in all its aspects. The following 11 States, members of the WIPO Budget Committee, were represented: Brazil, Cameroon, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, France, Germany (Federal Republic of), India, Japan, Soviet Union, Switzerland, United States of America. The Working Group conducted a full discussion and examination of Staff Regulation 3.1bis and adopted a report for submission to the WIPO Coordination Committee at its ordinary session in September 1988.

##### *Governing Bodies of WIPO and the Unions Administered by WIPO*

From September 26 to October 3, 1988, the Governing Bodies of WIPO and the Unions administered by WIPO held their nineteenth series of meetings in Geneva. Delegations from 88 States, 13 intergovernmental organizations and 10 non-governmental international organizations participated in the meetings.

This year the following six Governing Bodies met in ordinary or extraordinary sessions:

- WIPO General Assembly, tenth session (2nd extraordinary session);
- WIPO Coordination Committee, twenty-fifth session (19th ordinary session);
- Paris Union Assembly, thirteenth session (5th extraordinary session);
- Paris Union Conference of Representatives, fifteenth session (7th extraordinary session);
- Paris Union Executive Committee, twenty-fourth session (24th ordinary session);
- Berne Union Executive Committee, twenty-ninth session (19th ordinary session).

The main agenda items and the main decisions covered the following points:

*Activities from July 1, 1987, to June 30, 1988.* The reports on those activities were considered and noted. In their statements the delegations, without exception, made special reference to the activities of the International Bureau in the field of development cooperation for the benefit of developing countries in the period under review.

The delegations of developing countries which spoke expressed satisfaction with the assistance, which many delegations described, that their countries had received from WIPO under its development cooperation program and which had permitted them to develop their intellectual property systems appropriately. In particular, they highlighted the benefits obtained from the development of human resources, advice on legislation, institution-building, computerization of admin-

istrative procedures, the provision of patent documentation and searches, and the encouragement of regional and subregional cooperation. They expressed the wish that the International Bureau would continue and increase its development cooperation activities. They also expressed appreciation of the support received from the donor countries, both industrialized and developing, and organizations, especially from UNDP, and called for the continuation and expansion of such support.

The delegations of industrialized countries which spoke referred to the assistance which they extended to developing countries through WIPO and pledged its continuation and, where feasible, its expansion. Such assistance took the form, among others, of training either through study visits, special courses in the donor countries or on the job, the dispatch of experts or speakers as WIPO consultants and the provision of equipment and documentation.

Several delegations commended the International Bureau on the initiatives and activities carried out in relation to intellectual property issues of topical interest and in the field of industrial property information. They referred in particular to the activities concerning the protection of intellectual property rights in emerging technologies such as integrated circuits, biotechnological inventions and direct broadcasts by satellite, the harmonization of certain legal provisions for the protection of inventions, as well as the work undertaken in the framework of the PCIPI.

The Director General drew the attention of the delegations to the special exhibition on the theme of intellectual property and peace, which was on display in the lobby of the WIPO building and was organized in accordance with the program of the current biennium.

*Questions Concerning the Revision of the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property.* The Assembly of the Paris Union was informed that the fifth Consultative Meeting on the Revision of the Paris Convention was held in September 1988. In that meeting, 10 representatives from each of the following Groups participated: Group of Developing Countries, Group B (industrialized market economy countries), Group D (industrialized socialist countries), and a representative of China.

During that meeting, the Group of Developing Countries and Group D made proposals for amendments to Articles 1 (on the definition of industrial property), 5A (on compulsory licenses in respect of patents for inventions) and *Squater* (on importation of products manufactured by a process patented in the importing country) of the Paris Convention; Group B neither accepted those proposals nor made any counterproposals.

During the meeting of the Assembly of the Paris Union, Group B undertook to make such counterproposals. Following a discussion on the developments

during the fifth Consultative Meeting, the Assembly of the Paris Union agreed on the following statement:

"The Assembly, in the light of the commitment undertaken by Group B that it would communicate, through its Spokesman, by June 15, 1989, written counterproposals to the written and oral proposals in respect of Articles 1, 5A and *Squater* made for or during the fifth Consultative Meeting on the Revision of the Paris Convention (September 19 to 23, 1988), decided that the sixth Consultative Meeting will take place from September 18 to 22, 1989, and that the continuation of the work of the revision of the Paris Convention, including the question of the continuation of the Diplomatic Conference, will be on the agenda of the next ordinary session of the Assembly of the Paris Union (September 25 to October 4, 1989).

It was understood that the said counterproposals need not be subscribed to by the totality of Group B and that their contents are not predetermined.

It was also understood that WIPO would bear the travel costs of up to 10 participants from the Group of Developing Countries and one participant from China in the sixth Consultative Meeting."

*Establishment of an International Register of Audiovisual Works.* In its sessions held in September 1987, the competent Governing Bodies decided that WIPO would attempt the creation of an international register of audiovisual works and that a diplomatic conference for the adoption of a treaty be convened during the 1988-89 biennium—a treaty that would secure the evidentiary value of the international register—and also that the register be self-supporting; at no time would States be required to pay contributions to the Union created by the treaty.

In his memorandum to the 1988 session of the General Assembly of WIPO, the Director General indicated that the Diplomatic Conference—which had already been decided upon in principle at the 1987 session of the Governing Bodies—was scheduled to take place during the first half of 1989 and would be preceded by a meeting of a Committee of Experts for the preparation of that Diplomatic Conference to be convened in November 1988. The Director General also reported to the Assembly on the various possibilities existing for the initial financing of the International Register either at the headquarters of WIPO in Geneva or, with the assistance of the Government of Austria, in Vienna.

The General Assembly approved the proposals by the Director General concerning the convocation of the Diplomatic Conference and of the Committee of Experts and, as far as the financing of the International Register is concerned, decided to await the outcome of the discussions between the Director General and the Government of Austria.

*Staff Matters.* The Coordination Committee gave favorable advice on the intent of the Director General to



promote Mr. Rubén Beltrán (a national of Mexico) and Mr. Daniel Bouchez (a national of France) to grade D.1 and to appoint Mr. S. Ramaiah (a national of India) to the post of Director, Development Cooperation and External Relations Bureau for Asia and the Pacific. Mr. Ramaiah took up his duties on January 1, 1989.

## V. Staff and Support Activities

*Missions.* During the period under review, the Director General undertook missions to or attended meetings held in Austria, China, France, Jordan, Hungary, the Soviet Union, Sri Lanka, Switzerland and the United States of America.

Missions were undertaken by Deputy Directors General to Australia, France, Germany (Federal Republic of), India, Japan, Jordan, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom and the United States of America.

In addition to the missions referred to above, the following countries were visited by other officials or by consultants of WIPO: Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gambia, Germany (Federal Republic of), Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Laos, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Singapore, Soviet Union, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zimbabwe, Hong Kong.

*Headquarters Buildings.* In June, the construction of an additional floor (which will be the fifth floor) and other changes in the so-called "BIRPI Building" were started.

*United Nations.* The Director General and other officials of WIPO participated in the work of a number of intersecretariat bodies of the United Nations system established for the purpose of facilitating coordination of the policies and activities of the organizations of the system. Those bodies included the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination (ACC), composed of the executive heads of all the organizations and programs of the system under the chairmanship of the Secretary-

General of the United Nations, which met in Geneva in April and in New York in October, the Organizational Committee and the Consultative Committee on Substantive Questions (Operations) (CCSQ (OPS)) and on Administrative Questions (Finance and Budget) and (Personnel) (CCAQ (FB) and CCAQ (PER)) of the ACC which met in New York in September and July, respectively, as well as the ACC Task Force on Science and Technology for Development. WIPO officials participated in Rome, in March, and in Montreal, in May, in meetings of the International Civil Service Commission (ICSC) and its subsidiary organ (Advisory Committee on Post Adjustment Questions (ACPAQ)). In May, a WIPO official participated in the eighth interagency consultation on the least developed countries, which was held in Geneva.

In July, WIPO was represented at the Second Regular Session of 1988 of the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) in Geneva.

Also in July, a WIPO official participated in the Interagency Consultation on Ocean Affairs, and in the ACC-CPC (Co-ordination and Programme Committee) meeting in Geneva.

In August, WIPO was represented at a solemn meeting organized by the United Nations for Namibia in commemoration of Namibia Day, in New York.

In September, a Deputy Director General had discussions with UN officials in New York on the possible declaration of an International Inventors Day and the possible issuance of special postage stamps on the theme of intellectual property and peace. As far as the issuance of stamps was concerned, it was agreed that discussions would continue early in 1989. In regard to the International Inventors Day, it was decided that further action on the proposal be deferred in view of the already long list of proposed Days that await action by the General Assembly of the United Nations.

In October, WIPO was represented at the meeting organized by the United Nations Council for Namibia to commemorate the Week of Solidarity with the People of Namibia and their Liberation Movement, the South West African People's Organization (SWAPO), in New York.

In November, WIPO was represented at a special meeting to commemorate the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People, in Geneva.

Also in November, a WIPO official participated, in Tokyo, in an International Training Course organized jointly by the United Nations Asia Far East Institute for the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders (UNAFEI) and the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA).

In response to requests from the Secretariat of the United Nations, WIPO provided information on its activities for inclusion in reports concerning, among others, implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, assistance to the front-line States, the implementation of various resolutions of the United Nations

General Assembly concerning the policy of apartheid in South Africa, the implementation of the Nairobi Forward-Looking Strategies for the Advancement of Women, the Role of Women in Technical Cooperation Among Developing Countries (TCDC), the measures taken in favor of Least Developed Countries (LDC), WIPO's information services, the implementation of the Vienna Program of Action (end-of-decade-review) and with respect to activities in new and emerging fields of science and technology.

*International Computing Centre (ICC).* In March, a WIPO official participated in a meeting of the ICC, in Paris.

In September, two WIPO officials participated in the annual meeting of the ICC, in New York.

*United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD).* In April and May and in September, WIPO was represented at the 34th and 35th sessions of UNCTAD's Trade and Development Board, in Geneva.

In October, WIPO officials participated in UNCTAD's 1988 Enterprise Symposium on "Transfer of Technology for Efficiency and Growth—the Entrepreneur's Perspective," in Geneva.

*United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).* In February, a WIPO official participated in a UNDP Interagency Working Group on Evaluation, in Geneva.

In March, a WIPO official attended a UNDP Intergovernmental Meeting on the Fourth UNDP Regional Programme for Arab States in Casablanca.

In June and July, a Deputy Director General and other WIPO officials attended the 35th session of the UNDP Governing Council in Geneva.

In September, a Deputy Director General had discussions with the Administrator of UNDP and other UNDP officials in New York.

In December, a WIPO official attended an Inter-Agency Consultative Meeting (IACM) convened by UNDP in New York.

*General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT).* In March, May, July, September, October and November, WIPO officials attended meetings of the GATT Negotiating Group on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights, Including Trade in Counterfeit Goods, in Geneva. At the invitation of the Negotiating Group,

the International Bureau prepared a *document* referring to provisions of existing international conventions providing protection in the following fields of intellectual property: patents, copyright and neighboring rights, trademarks, appellations of origin and geographical indications, and industrial designs. Subsequently, again at the invitation of the Negotiating Group, the International Bureau prepared a *study*, in three documents totalling about 120 pages, on the existence, scope and form of generally internationally accepted and applied standards and norms for the protection of intellectual property for each of the following seven subjects: patents, copyright, trademarks, layout-designs of integrated circuits, industrial designs, geographical indications, and neighboring rights. That study covers the existing standards and norms provided in international treaties and guidelines, the current WIPO activities and the commonly applied national provisions and practices as regards the following topics: (i) subject matter to which the right applies/does not apply, (ii) criteria for obtaining protection, (iii) duration/cost of procedures for obtaining the right, (iv) scope of the right conferred, (v) duration of the right, (vi) cost of procedures for maintaining the right, (vii) compulsory licensing, (viii) procedures available for enforcement of rights and remedies/sanctions in cases of infringement, (ix) international dispute settlement mechanisms. In addition, *written information* on WIPO activities was furnished to the Negotiating Group through documents prepared by the GATT Secretariat in consultation with the International Bureau. Other *information* was provided *orally* and replies given to questions raised by various delegations during the meetings of that Group. In December, two WIPO officials attended the GATT Trade Negotiations Committee Meeting at ministerial level which was held in Montreal.

*United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP).* In January, a WIPO official had discussions with UNEP officials in Nairobi on matters of common interest.

*United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO).* In September, a WIPO official participated in the first ordinary session of the Intergovernmental Committee of the World Decade for Cultural Development, in Paris.

In November, a Deputy Director General participated in the seventh session of the Intergovernmental Council for the General Information Programme, in Paris.

## Studies

### The North-South Imbalance in Europe

A. DE ELZABURU\*

The bold title given to these reflections is intended to highlight the inequality that has developed between the prosperous North and the deprived South in that forward-looking union of European countries known as the European Economic Community.

The institutions that give life to the Community, its Parliament, its Court of Justice, its governing bodies, are all in Northern Europe. Perhaps there are reasons for this, as Nature herself seems to have been more generous to the North in virtually every country of Europe. And yet that geopolitical reality now has to be adjusted to the considerations of solidarity and cohesion that inspire the highly progressive Community regulations. Those are the ideas that can and indeed must form the foundation for the construction of what remains to be built in Europe in connection with the creative protection of industrial property.

The North of Europe contains the World Intellectual Property Organization and the ever more impressive premises of the European Patent Office (with a constantly-growing staff that is already in excess of 3,000), the latter being the body which in the future will issue Community patents. It is in the North of Europe that English and German are spoken, the two languages that predominate in technological progress and in which almost 95% of European patent applications originating in other countries are filed and processed. It is also to the North of Europe that most of the officials who administer the great industrial property establishment belong. All these factors—which, however, are not really all the factors, because our reflections cannot be exhaustive—are highly significant and indeed decisive for those who are aware of the importance of industrial property as an intangible asset in the economic framework of Europe. The present state of affairs regarding the administration of these intangible assets is one in which the favored countries of the North of Europe enjoy a wealth of benefits of all kinds which are not difficult to identify and evaluate. London, Munich,

Berlin and The Hague are particularly favored for the control of legal-technical business resulting from the ever more numerous European patents (more than 90% passes through their hands).

The most favored languages in turn become the principal repositories of worldwide technology, so it becomes indispensable to engage in additional reflection on this subject too, and to take the appropriate positions immediately, with a view to saving those countries less favored geographically and linguistically (and especially their smaller industrial undertakings) from being denied the possibility of keeping pace, in their own languages, with the constant development of technology.

The reflections in this work should already be clear and acceptable to those who are familiar with the complex world of industrial property. They will, however, be still clearer to all, and in particular to the authorities of Europe which have so many other difficult situations to deal with, if they are summarized in the following practical ideas.

In order to prevent a further increase in the North-South imbalance, which undeniably does exist, the European authorities can and should arrange for the siting in the South of Europe of the bodies that will administer the new unified systems for the protection of industrial property, such as the Community Trade Mark Office, or others that may be created in the future, such as a possible Community Designs and Models Office. As far as the location of the Community Trade Mark Office is concerned, everything points to the designation of Madrid as a constructive solution that will have a corrective effect on the North-South imbalance, and the same shift of emphasis towards the South should prevail in subsequent initiatives for Community unification.

Another factor of imbalance is the language problem, which is the root cause of discrimination in the immense wealth of technological information contained in patents (it has been calculated that around 60,000 European patent applications will be filed at the European Patent Office in 1989).

There is no doubt that, to prevent a further worsening of the present problem of imbalance between

\* President of Honour of the International Federation of Industrial Property Attorneys (FICPI) and Member of Honour of the International Association for the Protection of Industrial Property (AIPPI).

the various Community countries in the field of technological information, it will be indispensable to have the information contained in future Community patents disseminated in all the languages of the Community.

It is also evident that the exact correspondence of the translations of Community patents to the original text is essential, not only for the proprietor of the patent but also for the third parties who have to respect it; it is a matter of public interest.

On this point, it is fitting and relevant to reproduce verbatim the enlightening words of Dr. Bogsch addressed to the World Congress of the FICPI, held in Cannes in June 1988:

"The patent agent's task as a translator cannot reasonably be exercised by anyone other than a qualified patent agent or attorney because the translation has to be done and checked by someone who fully understands the invention and who does not, so to speak, translate words mechanically but rather makes sure that the technological and legal implications of each word in the translation are the same as in the original."

The two stipulations set forth above, technological dissemination in all the Community languages and the qualification of professionals to produce perfectly matching translations, form part of a school of thought that is evolving in Europe according to which it is necessary that the final text of the Convention on the Community Patent include a provision requiring the

filing, within a preclusive time limit, of a translation into one of the official languages of each signatory State, made by a qualified local professional. Such a provision would be not only the best safeguard for the machinery that ensures an equivalent level, in all the Community countries, of the technological information that forms the basis of the research and development work of local industry, but also an indispensable and urgent corrective measure to redress the worrying imbalance also created by the European Patent Convention in the professional field, the effect of which is that three countries are unduly favored and nine prejudiced. This is serious, not so much in relation to the albeit worthy interests of a qualified professional group, but above all because it is liable to bring about the gradual, but inevitable disappearance of professionals who are and have proved themselves to be essential to balanced industrial activity. This anomaly has been publicly denounced by a person as far removed from group interests as the current President of the European Patent Office, Mr. Braendli.

The foregoing reflections are intended to be a constructive, but nonetheless anxious appeal to the designers of a united Europe, as the forthcoming Community decisions will have a decisive influence on the action to be taken to correct the present North-South imbalance in that vitally important sector of intangible assets which is industrial property.

## Industrial Property Protection for Advanced Biotechnological Processes and Products

E. HÄUSSER\*

### 1. Which Biotechnological Innovations Are Patentable Under Present Law in the Field of Plants, Animals, Microorganisms, Genes and Gene Products, Together with the Processes for Their Manufacture, and Which Are Eligible for Plant Protection in the Case of Plants? Which Innovations Do Not Qualify for Such Protection?

The current version of the Patent Law, in force since January 1, 1981,<sup>1</sup> excludes the grant of patents in respect of living matter for those inventions that are explicitly mentioned in Section 2, item 2, and Section 5(2). Those provisions stipulate that patents may not be granted for:

- plant varieties of which the species is included in the list of species annexed to the Law on the Protection of Plant Varieties;
- animal varieties;
- essentially biological processes for the production of plants or animals;
- methods for treatment of the human or animal body by surgery or therapy;
- diagnostic methods practiced on the human or animal body.

Whereas variety protection can be obtained, in place of patent protection, for plant varieties of which the species is included in the list of species under the Plant Variety Protection Law, for the other subject matter referred to above, it is not generally possible to obtain industrial property protection either under patent law or under other statutory provisions.

The following subject matter is eligible for patent protection in the Federal Republic of Germany since they are either not subject to the exceptions to patentability or are explicitly excepted therefrom:

#### (a) In the Area of Plants

- plant varieties of which the species is not included in the list of species under the Plant Variety Protection Law;
- plants that possess no characteristics specific to a plant variety (e.g., because their characteristics only concern a given plant of the variety or their characteristics are typical of more than just one plant variety);

- parts of plants;
- cultures of plant tissue;
- plant cell lines and cells;
- essentially non-biological processes (e.g., genetic engineering) for the development of new plants;
- products obtained by the means of such essentially non-biological processes.

#### (b) In the Area of Animals

- essentially non-biological processes (e.g., genetic engineering) for the breeding of animals;
- products obtained by means of such processes (e.g., animal cells, cell lines or even animals that do not possess characteristics specific to an animal variety).

#### (c) In the Area of Microbiology

Inventions in the field of microbiology are generally eligible for patent protection (Section 2(2), second sentence, of the Patent Law).

The area of microbiology within the meaning of Section 2(2), second sentence, of the Patent Law, covers all living matter below the categories of plant or animal.

The following, in particular, are patentable:

- microorganisms;
- plasmids;
- viruses;
- genes;
- products obtained by means of the above-mentioned material;
- microbiological processes.

### *Which Innovations of This Kind Can Be Protected Under the European Patent Convention?*

The following possibilities and exclusions from protection for living matter exist under the European Patent Convention (EPC):<sup>2</sup>

#### (a) In the Area of Plants

Plant varieties are altogether excluded from patentability (Article 53(b) of the EPC).

Otherwise, there are no differences from the legal situation in the Federal Republic of Germany as regards the plant matter that can be protected.

\* President of the German Patent Office.

<sup>1</sup> See *Industrial Property Laws and Treaties*, GERMANY (FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF)—Text 2-002.

<sup>2</sup> See *Industrial Property Laws and Treaties*, MULTILATERAL TREATIES—Texts 2-008 and 2-009.

*(b) In the Area of Animals*

There are no differences between the EPC and the current legal situation in the Federal Republic of Germany.

*(c) In the Area of Microbiology*

Under the EPC, inventions in the field of microbiology are eligible for patent protection in the same way as under German patent law (Article 53(b), second half of the sentence, of the EPC).

## 2. Does a Need Exist to Extend the Provisions of Patent Law or of Variety Protection Law with Respect to Biotechnological Innovations, Particularly Genetic Engineering?

The question of a need for extended patent and/or variety protection for advanced biotechnological processes primarily concerns those inventors and undertakings active in the field of biotechnology.

Without wishing to anticipate the voicing of a need by the inventors and undertakings concerned, I nevertheless feel that I can confirm the basic existence of a need to extend patent protection to technical fields that have so far been excluded, if only due to the extended technical possibilities that have become available to biotechnological research in recent years.

*(a) Is There a Need to Extend Patent Protection to New Varieties of Plants and Animals?*

In view of the above-mentioned, considerably extended technical possibilities for generating new forms of living matter and for describing them, it is to be assumed that the inventors working with these methods have a need for the patentability of genetically-engineered plant and animal varieties.

The fact that plant varieties were excluded at the time from patentability and that a new form of protection, plant breeders' rights, was established was justified in great part—as was the exclusion of animal varieties from patentability—by the fact that it was as a rule not possible to meet patent law requirements, particularly the disclosure of a repeatable method of new breeding. The problem of satisfying the patentability requirements no longer exists to the same extent in the case of new plant and animal varieties that are genetically engineered, that is to say, produced by essentially technical processes. Thus, one essential reason for the exclusion of plant and animal varieties from patentability and, as far as plant varieties are concerned, the partial introduction of industrial protection rights for varieties, no longer applies.

Now that the plant and animal breeders who utilize genetic engineering are also increasingly in a position to

satisfy the statutory requirements for patentability, I hold it necessary to consider the deletion, or at least amendment, of the exclusion provisions in Section 2(2), first sentence, and Section 5(2) of the Patent Law.

The United States of America has already taken a big step in this direction by opening up, in spring 1987, the possibility of granting patents for animal varieties.

There is no justification for ethical or moral objections to the patenting of genetically-engineered animal varieties, in my view, since it does not restrict the availability of the animal varieties occurring in nature. Likewise, the objections that have been voiced in public on occasion that the introduction of patent protection for animal varieties would at the same time constitute a first step towards the promotion of ethically dubious methods and results does not hold water in my opinion. Patent law requires that the application documents, and therefore the invention, be published in every case 18 months after the day of first filing and therefore makes it possible, in addition to early enrichment of the general technical knowledge possessed by society, for the media and the official supervisory bodies to exercise additional control over genetic engineering research. It must therefore be in the interest of all those who wish to achieve the maximum control over the field of genetic engineering that the possibilities offered by patent protection should be opened up to the greatest possible extent in this field.

For those reasons, but also, not least of all, because research and development in genetic engineering demands considerable financial investment, I am in favor of providing the possibility of patent protection in future for plant and animal varieties that have been produced by means of advanced biotechnological methods.

*(b) Is There a Need to Define New Criteria for the Distinction Between "Essentially Biological Processes" and "Microbiological Processes" for the Purposes of Patent Protection?*

As far as the German Patent Office is concerned, there exists no need for a statutory distinction between "essentially biological processes" and "microbiological processes," quite apart from the fact that it is doubtful whether a precise delimitation is possible at all. The distinction should continue to be made in the individual case and therefore be left to the courts, that have already developed practicable criteria. Any more detailed distinction, for example, by listing the biological processes on the one side and the microbiological processes on the other, would run the risk of short-term obsolescence in view of the rapid development of new processes.

Instead of a more detailed distinction between "essentially biological processes" and "microbiological processes," it would appear desirable in view of the advantages already mentioned that would result from eligibility for patent protection—early dissemination of

technical knowledge and creation of an additional control—to admit patentability in future also for “essentially biological processes.”

(c) *What Difficulties Arise in Patenting Advanced Biotechnological Processes (e.g., Genetic Engineering Processes, Cell Culture Techniques, Hybridoma Techniques) or the Results of Microbiological Research (e.g., Cell Lines, Monoclonal Antibodies, Plasmids, Genes)?*

There are no problems in the patenting of advanced biotechnological processes and products that are any greater than those that also occur in other technical fields. The tried-and-trusted arsenal of patent law would appear to be suited without reservation to provide appropriate protection at the appropriate time for the results of research of the inventors and undertakings working in the field of advanced biotechnological processes.

(d) *Are There Any Difficulties in the Deposit of Microorganisms and Other Plant and Animal Material to Secure the Reproducibility of Biotechnological Inventions?*

The German Patent Office is not aware of any difficulties with the deposit of microorganisms by applicants that has already existed for some time now.

Plant material can also be deposited without problem in the form of seed or callous tissue. It would also appear possible to deposit animal material, for instance in the form of hybridoma cells.

However, it would appear urgently necessary to adopt a statutory provision in order to prevent abusive use of a deposited microorganism by stipulating that even before grant of patent protection samples may not be furnished to any applicant (as under current law) but, if so wished by the depositor, only to a neutral expert (as under the expert solution in Rule 28(4) and (5) of the Implementing Regulations under the EPC).

*Is It Necessary to Deposit Microorganisms, Cells or Cell Components That Have Been Genetically Marked?*

In its “*Lactobacillus bavaricus*” decision, fully supported by the German Patent Office, the Federal Patent Court held that the deposit of genetically marked microorganisms in cells was not necessary as long as the microorganisms themselves could be reproducibly manufactured.

*What Dangers Can Arise in the Release of Microorganisms? Is There a Need for Regulations*

Samples of a released microorganism must normally be furnished to any third party by the depositary authorities. This also applies to samples of pathogenic

microorganisms where not prohibited by statutory provisions on epidemic diseases. The free availability of a deposited microorganism currently offered by the Patent Law to any third party once the patent application has been published carries with it a safety risk. Above all, it is impossible to exclude the unintentional release of a microorganism by a recipient who is not familiar with the safety requirements.

A possible legislative measure to reduce the risk involved in release would be at least to limit the furnishing of samples of potentially hazardous microorganisms to those specialists who are familiar with the relevant safety provisions. Such a ruling could be used to achieve limited access to such microorganisms and thereby extensively remove the risk involved in release. This would also satisfy the need for safety and also the public need for information and control. As far as the inventors would be concerned, there would be no drawbacks of the sort involved if secrecy provisions were to be introduced.

(e) *Do the Current Possibilities for Depositing the Innovative Products of Microbiological Research (e.g., Hybridoma Cells, rDNA) Suffice in the Federal Republic of Germany?*

The depositary possibilities that exist in the Federal Republic of Germany may basically be considered adequate. As far as the German Patent Office is aware, the only problems that arise concern the deposit of highly pathogenic organisms since these are not accepted by all the depositary bodies that exist in the Federal Republic of Germany and, on the other hand, cannot be sent to depositary authorities abroad for public health reasons.

**3. Can It Be Recommended That Existing Industrial Property Protection Should Be Amended to Adapt It to the New Type of Requirements of Advanced Biotechnology? Should Any Basic Changes Be Proposed?**

The Patent Law provisions have proved their worth, as far as the general requirements of patentability are concerned, even in the case of advanced biotechnological processes and products. There is no basic need for changes in this respect. It is only the problem of safety when making available samples of deposited microorganisms to third parties, already mentioned, that gives reason to propose a statutory provision to limit the category of persons entitled to receive samples of potentially hazardous microorganisms.

As far as the term and scope of patents granted for biotechnological inventions are concerned, no problems have come to the notice of the German Patent Office that would require the proposing of amendments.

One basic change in patent law would indeed seem necessary in order that biotechnologically-created plant and animal varieties should in future also have access to patent protection. The possibility of patent protection for biological processes for producing living matter should also be provided. For the numerous grounds that advocate in favor of opening up patent protection in this way, may I refer to my answers to question 2.

(a) *Should the Differing Principles on Which the Systems of Protection Are Based, Including Their Scope and the Prohibition of Dual Protection, Be Maintained or Relinquished?*

The scope of protection afforded by the Patent Law should also be maintained for patents granted for biotechnological processes and products. No substantive reason can be seen for restricting the scope of such patents. There is therefore no justification for granting lesser rights to inventors and undertakings active in the field of advanced biotechnology than to persons working in other fields. For the same reasons, it is necessary, in my view, to make it possible for inventors that are willing and able to satisfy the special requirements of patentability for all inventions in the field of living matter, with the exception of human beings, to decide themselves which is the most appropriate way of obtaining optimum protection.

(b) *Would It Be Recommendable to Extend Either the Variety Protection System or Patent Law to Animal Varieties? Or Should a Specific System Be Established for the Protection of New Varieties of Animals?*

Current patent law would appear suitable, as shown by experience with the patenting of plants and microorganisms, both as regards requirements and also the scope of protection for the patenting of living matter in general. I therefore consider it both possible and desirable to extend patent law to cover animal varieties.

Apart from the fact that genetic engineering, that is to say technical methods, will become more and more frequent in the field of animal breeding and is likely in future to constitute the majority of inventions, to open up a possibility of patenting animal varieties in this ethically and morally disputed area would, from the very beginning, ensure that both specialists and public opinion receive regular information on processes and the results of them. Such a guarantee cannot be offered by the plant variety system since it provides for publication neither of the filed products nor of the processes for their manufacture.

Likewise, there would not seem much point in establishing a *sui generis* system of protection for the results of animal breeding processes, at least for as long as no compelling reasons are put forward by the animal breeders against inclusion in the proven system of patent law.

#### 4. Are There or Have There Been Applications for Patenting of Processes for the Analysis of Human and Animal Genomes?

No applications concerning processes for human and animal genome analysis are or were to be found at the German Patent Office.

*Do Such Processes Have Anything in Common with the Diagnostic Methods under Section 5(2) of the Patent Law Even if They Are not Directly Applied "on the Body?"*

Genome analysis bears a similarity to diagnostic methods under Section 5(2) of the Patent Law to the extent that the basis is a part—although removed—of the human body. Whether or not this fact justifies inclusion of genome analysis amongst the diagnostic methods practiced on the human or animal body has not so far been fully examined either in the courts or in practice. Bruchhausen holds the view that diagnostic methods practiced outside the human body, for example, on liquids taken from the body, such as blood or urine or samples of tissue, have been declared not to be not industrially applicable. In a decision from 1924, the Patent Office also established the industrial applicability of a "method for diagnosing malignant tumors" where the diagnosis was applied outside the human body after the taking of blood, since it was in the nature of an analytical chemistry process that could be utilized in an industrial undertaking, that is to say, in medical and technical laboratories.<sup>3</sup> Taking into account the above-mentioned criteria, it is most probable that processes for genome analysis would be held by the German Patent Office not to be "diagnostic methods practiced on the human or animal body."

*Can Problems Arise in Respect of Healing Methods or Problems of an Ethical Nature?*

No problems are expected for methods of healing. It would seem ensured that genome analytical processes would be available at all times. Apart from the fact that the inventor or the undertaking obtaining a patent for a genome analytical process will normally have an interest in its most extensive marketing or in granting licenses in order to cover the costs incurred in developing the process, patent law also provides a kind of last means by granting a compulsory license in the public interest (Section 24 of the Patent Law).

Whether problems of an ethical nature would arise in relation to the patenting of genome analytical processes cannot be said with any certainty. Should ethical problems arise on account of the nature of the genome analytical process for which a patent is sought, Section 2, item 1, of the Patent Law can be effectively applied in serious cases since it stipulates that patents will not be granted for inventions whose publication or exploitation would be contrary to public policy or morality.

<sup>3</sup> Benkard, *Patentgesetz/Gebrauchsmustergesetz*, 7th ed. 1981, Art. 5 PatG Rdn. 12.1



## News Items

### DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

*"Director del Registro de Propiedad  
Industrial y Comercio"*

We have been informed that Mr. Nelson Acosta Figuerero has been appointed *Director del Registro de Propiedad Industrial y Comercio*.

### ECUADOR

*National Director of Industrial Property*

We have been informed that Mr. Carlos Helou Cevallos has been appointed National Director of Industrial Property.

### GRENADA

*Registrar, Ministry of Legal Affairs*

We have been informed that Mr. Christian St. Louis has been appointed Registrar, Ministry of Legal Affairs.

## Calendar of Meetings

### WIPO Meetings

(Not all WIPO meetings are listed. Dates are subject to possible change.)

1989

- May 8 to 26 (Washington)**      **Diplomatic Conference for the Conclusion of a Treaty on the Protection of Intellectual Property in Respect of Integrated Circuits**  
 The Diplomatic Conference will negotiate and should adopt a Treaty on the protection of layout-designs of integrated circuits.  
*Invitations:* States members of WIPO or the Paris or Berne Unions and, as observers, States members of the United Nations not members of WIPO or the Paris or Berne Unions and certain organizations.
- May 29 to June 2 (Geneva)**      **WIPO Permanent Committee for Development Cooperation Related to Industrial Property (Thirteenth Session)**  
 The Committee will review and evaluate the activities undertaken under the WIPO Permanent Program for Development Cooperation Related to Industrial Property since the Committee's last session (May 1988) and make recommendations on the future orientation of the said Program.  
*Invitations:* States members of the Committee and, as observers, States members of the United Nations not members of the Committee and certain organizations.
- June 12 to 28 (Madrid)**      **Diplomatic Conference for the Conclusion of a Protocol Relating to the Madrid Agreement Concerning the International Registration of Marks**  
 The Diplomatic Conference will negotiate and should adopt a Protocol Relating to the Madrid Agreement Concerning the International Registration of Marks.  
*Invitations:* States members of the Madrid Union, Denmark, Greece, Ireland, the United Kingdom and, as observers, the other States members of the Paris Union as well as certain organizations.
- June 26 to July 3 (Paris)**      **Berne Union for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works: Executive Committee (Extraordinary Session)** (sitting together, for the discussion of certain items, with the Intergovernmental Committee of the Universal Copyright Convention)  
 The Committee will mainly review the activities undertaken and the meetings held since the Committee's last session (June 1987) as far as substantive issues of copyright protection are concerned.  
*Invitations:* States members of the Executive Committee of the Berne Union and, as observers, other States party to the Berne Convention and certain organizations.
- July 5 to 7 (Geneva)**      **Rome Convention for the Protection of Performers, Producers of Phonograms and Broadcasting Organizations: Intergovernmental Committee (Ordinary Session)** (convened jointly with ILO and Unesco)  
 The Committee will review the status of the international protection of neighboring rights under the Rome Convention.  
*Invitations:* States members of the Intergovernmental Committee and, as observers, other States members of the United Nations and certain organizations.
- September 25 to October 4 (Geneva)**      **Governing Bodies of WIPO and the Unions Administered by WIPO (Twentieth Series of Meetings)**  
 All the Governing Bodies of WIPO and the Unions administered by WIPO meet in ordinary sessions every two years in odd-numbered years.  
 In the sessions in 1989, the Governing Bodies will, *inter alia*, review and evaluate activities undertaken since July 1988, and consider and adopt the draft program and budget for the 1990-91 biennium.  
*Invitations:* States members of WIPO and the Unions and, as observers, other States members of the United Nations and certain organizations.
- September 26 (Geneva)**      **Permanent Committee on Industrial Property Information (PCIPI) (Second Session)**  
 The Committee will discuss its main activities and plans for the future.  
*Invitations:* States and organizations members of the Committee and, as observers, certain other States and organizations.

- October 9 to 13 (Moscow)** **International Forum on the Role of Industrial Property in Economic Cooperation Arrangements** (organized jointly with the State Committee for Inventions and Discoveries of the Soviet Union)
- The Forum will deal with questions of industrial property in joint ventures (among capitalist and socialist countries) and other cooperative economic arrangements (among capitalist and socialist countries), particularly in the field of the transfer of high technology, trade in goods bearing trademarks and franchizing of services.
- Invitations:* The Forum will be open to the public. Participants, other than representatives of governments, will be requested to pay a registration fee.
- November 1 and 2 (Beijing)** **Worldwide Symposium on the International Patent System in the 21st Century** (organized jointly with the Chinese Patent Office)
- The Symposium will be conducted in three half-day sessions, each dealing with one of the following three topics: internationalization of the patent system; computerization of the patent system; patent documentation, search and examination.
- Invitations:* States members of WIPO, certain intergovernmental organizations and non-governmental organizations having observer status in WIPO.
- November 6 to 10 (Geneva)** **Committee of Experts on Model Provisions for Legislation in the Field of Copyright (Second Session)**
- The Committee will continue to consider proposed standards in the field of literary and artistic works for the purposes of national legislation on the basis of the Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works.
- Invitations:* States members of the Berne Union or WIPO and, as observers, certain organizations.
- November 13 to 24 (Geneva)** **Committee of Experts on the Harmonization of Certain Provisions in Laws for the Protection of Inventions (Seventh Session)**
- The Committee will continue to examine a draft treaty on the harmonization of certain provisions in laws for the protection of inventions.
- Invitations:* States members of the Paris Union and, as observers, States members of WIPO not members of the Paris Union and certain organizations.

## UPOV Meetings

(Not all UPOV meetings are listed. Dates are subject to possible change.)

### 1989

- October 16 (Geneva)** **Consultative Committee (Fortieth Session)**
- The Committee will prepare the twenty-third ordinary session of the Council.
- Invitations:* Member States of UPOV.
- October 17 and 18 (Geneva)** **Council (Twenty-third Ordinary Session)**
- The Council will examine the program and budget for the 1990-91 biennium, the reports on the activities of UPOV in 1988 and the first part of 1989.
- Invitations:* Member States of UPOV and, as observers, certain non-member States and intergovernmental organizations.

## Other Meetings Concerned with Industrial Property

### 1989

- June 4 to 10 (Amsterdam)** International Association for the Protection of Industrial Property (AIPPI): Congress
- July 10 to 12 (Geneva)** International Association for the Advancement of Teaching and Research in Intellectual Property (ATRIP): Annual Meeting
- December 5 to 9 (Munich)** European Patent Organisation (EPO): Administrative Council

