Published monthly
Annual subscription:
Sw.fr. 140.-
Each monthly issue:
Sw.fr. 14.-

Industrial Property

23rd Year - No. 12
December 1984

Monthly Review of the
World Intellectual Property Organization

Contents

ISSN 0019-8625

Notifications

WIPO Convention

Entry Into Force of Amendments to Articles 6(2)(iv), 6(4)(a), 7(2)(ii) and (iii) and 8(3)

CORRIGENDUM

The date of May 25, 1984, indicated in WIPO Notification No. 128 of May 24, 1984,[1] as the date of entry into force of the amendments to the Convention Establishing the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), is replaced by the date of June 1, 1984.

WIPO Notification No. 128 (Corrigendum), of November 20, 1984.

[1] See *Industrial Property*, 1984, p. 238.

Nice Agreement

Ratification of the Geneva Act (1977)

BELGIUM

The Government of Belgium deposited, on August 9, 1984, its instrument of ratification of the Geneva Act of May 13, 1977, of 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 Geneva Act (1977) of the said Agreement entered into force, with respect to Belgium, on November 20, 1984.

Nice Notification No. 61, of August 20, 1984.

Trademark Registration Treaty (TRT)

Entry Into Force of Amendment to Article 32(7)(a)

CORRIGENDUM

The date of June 30, 1984, indicated in TRT Notification No. 8 of July 10, 1984,[1] as the date of entry into force of the amendment to the Trademark Registration Treaty (TRT), is replaced by the date of June 3, 1984.

TRT Notification No. 8 (Corrigendum), of November 20, 1984.

[1] See *Industrial Property*, 1984, p. 240.

WIPO Meetings

WIPO/Supreme People's Court of the People's Republic of China

Course on the Judicial Aspects of Industrial Property

(Beijing, August 13 to 17, 1984)

NOTE*

At the invitation of the Supreme People's Court of the People's Republic of China, WIPO organized a Course on the Judicial Aspects of Industrial Property in Beijing from August 13 to 17, 1984. Although 11 courses or seminars had been organized by WIPO in China since 1979, this Course was the first to deal specifically with the role of legal proceedings in the enforcement of industrial property rights, a subject of great topical importance in China in view of the adoption, on March 12, 1984, of the first Chinese Patent Law. The Course was one of the preparatory steps to be taken prior to April 1, 1985, when the Chinese Patent Law will enter into force.

The Course was opened by the Honorable Ren Jianxin, Vice-President of the Supreme People's Court, in the presence of the Deputy Secretary-General of the State Council. Dr. Arpad Bogsch, Director General of WIPO, delivered opening observations. The Course was attended by more than 200 government officials from the economic courts of the Higher People's Courts from 29 provinces, autonomous regions and municipalities directly under the Central Government and from the relevant central departments.

The purpose of the Course, as explained by the Honorable Ren Jianxin in his opening address, was to examine the judicial aspects of industrial property in three countries, the Federal Republic of Germany, France and the United States of America, in order to "help us understand the patent litigation systems and judicial practice in these countries and [to] guide us when it becomes our turn in due course to hear patent cases in accordance with the Patent Law of the People's Republic of China."

The Course was organized in the form of lectures followed by discussions between each lecturer and the participants. The enforcement of industrial property rights under the judicial system of the United States of America was the subject of lectures by the Honorable Howard T. Markey, Chief Judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit. The Honorable Wilfried Neuhaus, President of the Intellectual Property Senate of the Court of Appeal in Düsseldorf presented lectures on industrial property litigation in the courts of the Federal Republic of Germany. *Maître* Paul Mathély, an attorney at the Court of Paris, lectured on the application of industrial property legislation by the Courts of France. Patent infringement proceedings in United States and German Courts were the subject of lectures by Jack C. Goldstein, Esq., and Dr. Ulrich Krieger, attorneys-at-law practicing in Houston, Texas, and Düsseldorf.

* Prepared by the International Bureau of WIPO.

WIPO Permanent Committee on Patent Information (PCPI)

Eighth Session

(Geneva, September 18 to 21, 1984)

NOTE*

The WIPO Permanent Committee on Patent Information (hereinafter referred to as "the Permanent Committee") held its eighth session in Geneva from September 18 to 21, 1984.

Twenty-five members of the Permanent Committee were represented at the session (Australia, Austria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany (Federal Republic of), Japan, Kenya, Madagascar, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Soviet Union, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom, United States of America, Viet Nam, European Patent Office (EPO)). The Commission of the European Communities (CEC), the International Organization for Standardization (ISO), the International Patent Documentation Center (INPADOC) and the Patent Documentation Group (PDG) were represented by observers. The list of participants follows this Note.

* Prepared by the International Bureau.

Among the topics discussed by the Permanent Committee were the following:

PCPI Documentation and Presentation of Proposals as Project Files

The Permanent Committee noted the compilation of project files which was attached to an explanatory note on PCPI documents and identification codes used on those documents, and entrusted the International Bureau to issue every year an updated compilation which was felt indispensable for reference purposes. The Permanent Committee, in giving this task to the International Bureau asked also that a compilation be included of all documents issued so far in respect of sessions of the PCPI and its Working Groups.

Consideration of Tasks Assigned to the International Bureau in 1984

The Permanent Committee approved the report prepared by the International Bureau on the various tasks assigned to it in 1984. Taking note of the Annual Technical Reports for 1983 prepared by 26 PCPI members and submitted in 1984, the Permanent Committee encouraged its members to continue their efforts to submit such reports also in 1985, at the same time adhering to the Guidelines which it had formulated in that respect.

In respect of the CAPRI System (the Computerized Administration of Patent Documents Reclassified According to the International Patent Classification), the Permanent Committee noted that the total of subclasses covered was 590 out of a total of 614, and that, in view of further commitments taken, the said project might be brought to a successful conclusion by the end of 1985.

Furthermore, the Permanent Committee took note of the interest expressed by some of its members in the *General Information Brochure on the IPC* and asked the International Bureau to update and publish the existing Brochure in accordance with the fourth edition of the IPC.

Consideration of the Reports of Sessions of the PCPI Working Groups in 1984

The Permanent Committee reviewed the activities of its Working Groups in 1984 on the basis of the reports of their sessions held in 1984. The Permanent Committee approved the actions taken by its Working Groups on the tasks that it had assigned to them, and congratulated the Working Groups for the work that they had done.

Recommendations to the Permanent Committee Formulated by the PCPI Working Groups in 1984

The Permanent Committee reviewed the recommendations made by the PCPI Working Groups in 1984 and took action on them. Those recommendations concerned the carrying out of the tasks assigned to the PCPI under its program for the 1984-1985 biennium.

Revision of the PCPI Program for the 1984-1985 Biennium

The Permanent Committee adopted the revised PCPI Program for the 1984-1985 biennium. That program contains a total of 42 tasks.

Furthermore, the Committee decided that the five Working Groups established for 1984 be continued in 1985 with unchanged mandates and distributed the tasks under the revised program among the five Working Groups. The five Working Groups and their mandates are as follows:

(a) the *Working Group on Planning* with the mandate as follows:

1st assignment: planning of tasks,

2nd assignment: coordination and supervision of the work of the PCPI in general and of the Working Groups in particular; for this purpose, the Working Group on Planning may be called upon to undertake certain preliminary studies in case a new task is concerned or a supplementary study in case the task is of a high policy nature,

3rd assignment: in exceptional circumstances only, and when not falling within the mandate of any other Working Group, tasks of a substantive nature;

(b) the *Working Group on Special Questions* with the mandate to deal with tasks of an urgent and important nature;

(c) the *Working Group on Search Information* with the mandate to deal with tasks concerning search file organization and maintenance, including IPC revision matters and search system development;

(d) the *Working Group on Patent Information for Developing Countries* with the mandate to deal with tasks concerning the identification of needs of developing countries in the field of patent information and to make proposals on ways and means of meeting such needs;

(e) the *Working Group on General Information* with the mandate to deal with tasks, such as those concerning standards, and other matters not appropriate to the Working Groups referred to under (b), (c) and (d), above.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS*

I. Member States

Australia: N. Young. **Austria:** J. Fichte. **Canada:** L.B. Kirsh. **Czechoslovakia:** M. Kopča; M. Fortőva. **Denmark:** H.I. Rasmussen;

* A list containing the titles and functions of the participants may be obtained from the International Bureau.

S.T. Simonsen. **Finland:** E. Häkli. **France:** A. de Pastors. **German Democratic Republic:** H. Konrad. **Germany (Federal Republic of):** A. Wittmann; M. Voegtel. **Japan:** T. Hashimoto. **Kenya:** J.N. King'Arui. **Madagascar:** E. Jaona. **Netherlands:** J.C.H. Perizonius. **Norway:** P.E. Lillejordet. **Poland:** Z. Sobczyk. **Portugal:** R. Serrão. **Soviet Union:** V. Kukolev; Y. Gyrdymov. **Spain:** R. Vazquez de Parga y Pardo. **Sudan:** S.Y.A. Mahmoud. **Sweden:** L.G. Björklund; J.-E. Bodin; K. Bergström. **Switzerland:** E. Caussignac; M. Leuthold. **United Kingdom:** V.S. Dodd. **United States of America:** W.S. Lawson; T.F. Lomont. **Viet Nam:** Vu Huy Tan.

II. Member Organization

European Patent Office (EPO): A. Vandecasteele; R. Barré.

III. Observer Organizations

Commission of the European Communities (CEC): H. Bank. **International Organization for Standardization (ISO):** E.J. French. **International Patent Documentation Center (INPADOC):** G. Quarda. **Patent Documentation Group (PDG):** P. Ochsenbein.

IV. Officers

Chairman: V.S. Dodd (United Kingdom). *Vice-Chairmen:* N. Young (Australia); Z. Sobczyk (Poland). *Secretary:* P. Claus (WIPO).

V. International Bureau of WIPO

L.E. Kostikov *(Deputy Director General);* P. Claus *(Director, Patent Information and Classification Division);* B. Hansson *(Head, Patent Classification Section, Patent Information and Classification Division);* P. Higham *(Head, Patent Information Section, Patent Information and Classification Division);* R. Blumstengel *(Head, Developing Countries Section (Patent Information);* G. Negouliaev *(Patent Information Officer, Patent Information Section).*

WIPO Permanent Program for Development Cooperation Related to Industrial Property

Permanent Committee

Ninth Session
(Geneva, September 18 to 21, 1984)

NOTE*

The WIPO Permanent Committee for Development Cooperation Related to Industrial Property (hereinafter referred to as "the Permanent Committee") held its ninth session in Geneva from September 18 to 21, 1984. Fifty-six of the 84 member States of the Permanent Committee,[1] nine non-member States, four intergovernmental organizations and six international non-governmental organizations were represented. The list of participants follows this Note.

Review and Evaluation of the Activities under the Permanent Program

The Permanent Committee engaged in an in-depth review and evaluation of the activities under the Permanent Program for Development Cooperation Related to Industrial Property (hereinafter referred to as "the Permanent Program") since the last session of the Permanent Committee in September 1982. Most delegations noted with satisfaction the expansion of development cooperation activities carried out under the Permanent Program, stressed the capital importance they attached to those activities and congratulated the International Bureau of WIPO for its action in that field.

A number of delegations expressed their deep satisfaction with the fact that the Governing Bodies of WIPO had shown themselves attentive, at their September 1983 sessions, to the recommendations expressed by the Permanent Committee at its eighth session, particularly as regards the increase in resources devoted to the Organization's development cooperation activities in order to reduce the gap between the requests for development cooperation and the resources available to the International Bureau in order to satisfy them. Various delegations saw in that decision a positive example of the spirit of multilateral cooperation that was a feature of the Permanent Program. A number of delegations also noted with satisfaction that the budget approved by the Governing Bodies of WIPO for the 1984-1985 biennium included a meeting of the Permanent Committee in each of those two years and welcomed that decision since it would enable the Permanent Committee to play its evaluation and planning role to the full; the number of delegations present at the ninth session of the Permanent Committee and the level of debates bore witness to the importance that the governments concerned attached to the Permanent Committee.

Moreover, a number of delegations expressed their gratitude to the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the governments and organizations of industrialized and developing countries that had cooperated in and contributed to the Permanent Program for the assistance that their countries had received. Among the countries that had contributed to the Program, the Delegations of Australia, Austria, Brazil, Bulgaria, France, the German Democratic Republic, Germany (Federal Republic of), Japan, the

* Prepared by the International Bureau of WIPO.

[1] In the period between the preceding session of the Permanent Committee in September 1982 (see *Industrial Property*, 1982, p. 336) and the end of the present session, nine additional States became members of the Committee (Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras, New Zealand, Panama, Rwanda, Sri Lanka, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam).

Netherlands, Portugal, the Soviet Union, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom and the United States of America, together with the Delegation of the EPO, expressed their wish to continue and, if possible, increase their contributions.

Numerous delegations expressed their satisfaction with the approach adopted by the International Bureau in its development cooperation activities within the framework of the Permanent Program, as reflected in the documents submitted to the Permanent Committee, particularly the fact that those activities were not to be conceived as a one-way flow of aid or assistance from a group of industrialized countries towards a group of developing countries, but rather as effective cooperation in which each side took an active part and that, in fact, cooperation in the field of industrial property was in the interests of the whole international community. Numerous delegations likewise stressed the fact that the establishment, updating and strengthening of industrial property systems was not to be considered an end in itself, but that industrial property had implications for technological, industrial and commercial development and that an industrial property system had to be designed as a tool in the development strategy of the countries concerned, as defined by those countries themselves. Those delegations felt that the above considerations should be reflected in the formulation and implementation of WIPO's development cooperation programs and projects, and that they called for the formulation, at the national, subregional and regional levels, in close cooperation with the International Bureau, of detailed medium-term plans and projects centering on clearly defined objectives. In addition, it was felt that the above considerations called for an increase in cooperation between the developing countries themselves, as a supplement to cooperation between industrialized countries and developing countries; consequently, numerous delegations stressed the advantage of using experts from developing countries under development cooperation projects and expressed the wish that greater use be made of such experts.

A number of delegations stressed the special needs of the least developed countries and expressed the wish that WIPO pay special attention to those countries and, in consultation with them, put in hand cooperation activities that allowed for their level of development in the field of industrial property and for their most pressing needs.

Several delegations also expressed the wish that a larger number of group training activities, as well as evaluation and planning meetings, be organized by WIPO in Africa at national, subregional and regional levels, in order to achieve a better balance between regions as regards the organization of such meetings.

Medium-Term Planning, 1985-1991

The Permanent Committee reviewed *in extenso* the medium-term planning under the Permanent Program for the period from 1985 to 1991.

As regards the Permanent Program as a whole, a number of delegations suggested that the possibility of obtaining increased resources should be studied, as should the possibility of improving the channeling and coordination of the various efforts undertaken to achieve the objectives of the Permanent Program, in accordance with the orientations defined by the Permanent Committee. Some delegations also noted that due account should be taken of programs of other organizations and agencies in areas relevant to the Permanent Program in order to achieve a comprehensive and coordinated system of development cooperation.

In respect of training programs in the field of industrial property organized under the Permanent Program, numerous delegations supported the suggestions submitted by the International Bureau in order to add more specialized courses on specific subjects of industrial property, particularly in the field of licensing and the acquisition of technology, and to restructure the training program to meet the new needs of the countries for which the program was intended, while continuing to provide general courses and introductory courses on the main aspects of industrial property. A number of delegations also suggested that emphasis should be placed on the training of trainers and supported the proposal by the International Bureau to increase the number of courses held in the developing regions themselves.

A number of delegations also gave their support to gradually expanding training courses to include the legal profession (patent attorneys, industrial property agents), the judiciary and officials concerned with industry, research and development, the application of technology and the promotion of inventive and innovative activity.

Numerous delegations felt that a further priority task of WIPO, in the medium term, was that of development cooperation activities in the promotion of domestic inventive and innovative activities as well as in the field of licensing; they also reiterated the interest of the developing countries in cooperation activities in the field of patent information and documentation.

Finally, in respect of cooperation among developing countries, several delegations noted with satisfaction that such cooperation was already a major component of the Permanent Program (two of the major projects in Africa, namely, the Patent Documentation Center of OAPI and the Patent Documentation and Information Center of ESARIPO, being cited as good examples thereof), and pointed out that cooperation among developing countries complemented the provision of technical expertise from the industrialized countries. It was said that, whenever possible, the engagement of consultants and lecturers from developing countries was desirable as they were generally familiar with the conditions prevailing in other developing countries. Furthermore, it was suggested by some delegations that

the International Bureau should explore the possibility of assisting in the establishment of services for the exchange among developing countries of information on patented indigenous technology.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS*

I. States

Algeria[1]: M. Sadou. **Argentina**[1]: J. Pereira. **Australia**[1]: P.A. Smith. **Austria**[1]: J. Fichte. **Brazil**[1]: P. Nogueira Batista; A. Gurgel de Alencar; E. Cordeiro; P.R. Franca. **Bulgaria**[1]: P. Sirakov; G. Gantchev. **Burkina Faso**[1]: M.B. Bado. **Cameroon**[1]: N. Fomekong; W. Eyambe. **Canada**[1]: P. Trépanier. **Chile**[1]: J. Bustos; R. Espinosa. **China**: Tang Zhongshun; Deng Shaoxi; Ma Yaobuan. **Colombia**[1]: H. Charry Samper; C. Arevalo Yepes. **Cuba**[1]: M. Jiménez Aday. **Czechoslovakia**[1]: M. Slamova. **Egypt**[1]: S. Elfarargi; I.F. Salem; M. Daghash; A.G.M. Fouad. **El Salvador**[1]: A. González; C.A. Barabona Rivas. **France**[1]: M. Hiance; F. Chaperon. **German Democratic Republic**[1]: D. Schack. **Germany (Federal Republic of)**[1]: J. Schade. **Guatemala**[1]: N. de Contreras; R.M. Valverde. **Guinea**[1]: F. Bangoura. **Honduras**[1]: J.M. Maldonado Muñoz; J.M. Ritter Arita; A. Ariza. **India**[1]: L. Puri. **Indonesia**[1]: I. Darsa; R. Tanzil; M. Jalaluddin; B.S. Moniaga. **Iran**: A. Hacbemi; H. Salhi; M. Mostafavi Tafresbi; H. Ronanghi. **Iraq**[1]: I. Mahboub; M. Hussain. **Ivory Coast**[1]: K.F. Ekra. **Japan**[1]: N. Saida; S. Ono. **Kenya**[1]: J.N. King'Arui. **Lesotho**: K.R. Hlalele. **Madagascar**: P. Verdoux; J. Emile. **Malaysia**: H. Siraj; W.A. Sepwan. **Malawi**[1]: M.H.Chirambo. **Mexico**[1]: R. Beltrán. **Morocco**[1]: M. Rmiki. **Netherlands**[1]: W. Neervoort. **Niger**[1]: I. Foukori. **Norway**[1]: O. Os. **Pakistan**[1]: M. Ahmad; R. Mahdi; K. Niaz. **Panama**[1]: J. Medrano; I. Aizpurúa Pérez. **Peru**[1]: R. Villarán Koechlin; A. Thornberry; S. Vegas. **Philippines**[1]: A.L. Catubig. **Portugal**[1]: J. Mota Maia; R. Serrão. **Republic of Korea**[1]: S.-J. Hong; J.-U. Chae; T.-C. Choi. **Saudi Arabia**: S. Al-Mubarak; S. Al-Shayea. **Senegal**[1]: A. Sène; M.M. Ndiaye. **Somalia**[1]: M.H. Abby. **Soviet Union**[1]: V.F. Zubarev. **Spain**[1]: C. Garcia-Gallo; L. Padial Martín. **Sri Lanka**[1]: N. Ranasinghe; H.M.G.S. Palihakkara. **Sudan**[1]: S.Y.A. Mahmoud. **Sweden**[1]: L. Björklund; K. Bergström; E. Nyren. **Switzerland**[1]: R. Kämpf; J.-M. Souche. **Syria**: F. Salim; F. Chahine. **Thailand**: K. Kittisataporn. **Trinidad and Tobago**: L.E. Williams; H. Robertson. **Tunisia**[1]: M. Blanco; H. Boufares. **Turkey**[1]: E. Apakan; S. Erkula. **United Arab Emirates**: J. Alfardan. **United Kingdom**[1]: S. Elton. **United Republic of Tanzania**[1]: E.E.E. Mtango; S.J. Asman. **United States of America**[1]: M.K. Kirk; H.J. Winter. **Uruguay**[1]: C. Fernández Ballesteros. **Viet Nam**[1]: Vu Huy Tan. **Zaire**[1]: Esaki Ekanga Kabeya; Osil Gnok.

II. United Nations Organizations

Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP): P. Strunk. **United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)**: E. Bonev.

III. Other Intergovernmental Organizations

Commonwealth Secretariat: S. Hyne. **European Patent Organisation (EPO)**: G. Giroud.

IV. International Non-Governmental Organizations

Center for the International Study of Industrial Property (CEIPI): P. Nuss. **European Association of Industries of Branded Products (AIM)**: G. Kunze. **International Association for the Advancement of Teaching and Research in Intellectual Property (ATRIP)**: E. Aracama Zorraquin; J. Szwaja. **International Chamber of Commerce (ICC)**: A. Degen; P. Johnson; B. Wurm; J.M.W. Buraas. **International Federation of Inventors' Associations (IFIA)**: C.P. Feldman; E. Nyren. **Licensing Executives Society (International) (LES)**: C.G. Wickham.

V. Officers

Chairman: R. Mahdi (Pakistan). *Vice-Chairmen:* D. Scback (German Democratic Republic); P.A. Smith (Australia). *Secretary:* B. Machado (WIPO).

VI. International Bureau of WIPO

A. Bogsch *(Director General)*; M. Porzio *(Deputy Director General)*; L. Kadirgamar *(Director, Development Cooperation and External Relations Bureau for Asia and the Pacific)*; E. Pareja *(Director, Development Cooperation and External Relations Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean)*; I. Thiam *(Director, Development Cooperation and External Relations Bureau for Africa and Western Asia)*; B. Machado *(Head, Development Cooperation Support Unit)*.

* A list containing the titles and functions of the participants may be obtained from the International Bureau.

[1] State member of the WIPO Permanent Committee for Development Cooperation Related to Industrial Property.

WIPO

Patent Information Fair

(Geneva, September 26 and 27, 1984)

NOTE*

There are few aspects of life today that are not being affected by the technological revolution brought about by the development of microelectronics. The power of the electronic computer has provided the possibility of fast and reliable access to information, whether that information is stored in the next room or thousands of kilometers away. The world of industrial property—and particularly that of patents and patent documentation—has benefited greatly from progress in information technology.

In order to provide up-to-date information and guidance in searching through the treasure house of technological information contained in patent documents, WIPO organized the first Patent Information Fair in Geneva, at the International Conference Center, on September 26 and 27, 1984. The theme of the Fair was the on-line retrieval of patent information using computer data bases.

* Prepared by the International Bureau.

The exhibitors consisted of eight industrial property offices—those of Brazil, France, Germany (Federal Republic of), Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom and the United States of America—and of the following 10 organizations in addition to WIPO: Carl Heymanns Verlag, Chemical Abstracts Service, Derwent Publications Ltd., Japan Institute of Invention and Innovation, Japan Patent Information Center, Mead Data Central Corp., Pergamon Infoline, Research Publications Inc., Télésystèmes-Questel and Télésystèmes-Darc, and Walter Rentsch S.A.

More than 400 visitors attended the Fair. The visitors were able to use computer data bases located in several European countries, in the United States of America and in Japan to retrieve information concerning virtually any technical subject and were able to discuss with the world's leading experts the role that information services can play in their own fields of interest.

Paris Union

Committee of Experts on Biotechnological Inventions and Industrial Property

First Session
(Geneva, November 5 to 9, 1984)

NOTE*

Convened by the Director General of the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) as part of the 1984/85 program of the International (Paris) Union for the Protection of Industrial Property, the Committee of Experts on Biotechnological Inventions and Industrial Property (hereinafter referred to as the "Committee of Experts") met in Geneva from November 5 to 9, 1984.

Twenty-three States members of WIPO or of the International (Paris) Union for the Protection of Industrial Property participated in the session. Five intergovernmental organizations and 13 international non-governmental organizations participated in the meeting as observers. The list of participants follows this Note.

The Committee of Experts had been convened in order to give advice on a study to be prepared by the International Bureau of WIPO on the existing situation concerning the protection, by patents or by other means, of inventions in the field of biotechnology (including "genetic engineering") and possible means of providing for industrial property protection for such inventions, both at the national and the international levels. In order to prepare that study, the International Bureau of WIPO had issued a memorandum (contained in document BioT/CE/I/2) outlining the questions to be examined in the study. Tbat memorandum deals with the question of the definition of biotechnology, with technological developments in this field (in particular the emergence of genetic engineering methods, in addition to the traditional methods of plant and animal breeding and isolation of microorganisms) with the categories of biotechnological inventions, and with questions concerning the legal protection of such inventions (in particular the application of the concept of invention, the exclusion of patentability of certain sectors of biotechnology, the application of the conditions of patentability, special considerations concerning the disclosure of biotechnological inventions for the purposes of patent procedure and the rights conferred by titles of protection in respect of biotechnological inventions). The memorandum also presents suggestions on the possible purpose of the WIPO study, in particular whether it should make recommendations concerning the improvement of the existing protection of biotechnological inventions, both at the national and international levels.

The Committee of Experts discussed in detail the questions raised in the memorandum.

The report of the session is contained in document BioT/CE/I/3, which will be published together with the above-mentioned memorandum in a forthcoming issue of this review.

The Committee of Experts concluded that all kinds of biotecbnological inventions (including plant varieties, for which a special system of protection had been established in a number of countries) should be covered by the study that WIPO should make. In the course of that study, all aspects of industrial property protection of biotechnological inventions should be examined, including the question whether the special system of protection for plant varieties should be an exclusive one or whether it should be possible for certain cases, for example, plants created by genetic engineering, to obtain patent protection, either in addition to special plant variety protection or as an alternative to that protection.

The Committee of Experts also considered the requirement of deposit of microorganisms for the purposes of supplementing the description contained in a patent application, and dealt in particular with inventions involving biological material such as cell lines and plasmids, which are not living organisms as such but which may nevertheless have to be deposited for the purposes of patent procedure.

The Committee of Experts recommended that the International Bureau should prepare a guide for depositors under the Budapest Treaty on the International Recognition of the Deposit of Microorganisms for the

* Prepared by the International Bureau.

Purposes of Patent Procedure. Finally, the Committee of Experts recommended that the WIPO study should not only analyze the existing situation, but also explore all possibilities of improving that situation, and should deal with various possibilities of how such an improvement could be achieved.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS*

I. States

Austria: K. Wolf. **Belgium:** H. Nolard; A.-M. Prieels; J.M. Poswick. **Brazil:** P.R. Franca. **China:** Hu Zuo Chao; Song Da Kang; Yao Bao Ching. **Denmark:** H. Skov. **Dominican Republic:** A. Bonetti. **Egypt:** M. Hilal; M. Daghash. **Finland:** H.I. Lommi. **France:** M. Hiance; P. Guerin. **Germany (Federal Republic of):** A. Schaefers; K. Bruchhausen; F.P. Goebel; H. Kunhardt; J. Utermann. **Hungary:** I. Ivanyi; E. Parragh. **Indonesia:** R. Tanzil. **Italy:** A. Mathis; G. Orlando; M. Bellenghi. **Japan:** T. Fukuda; S. Uemura; S. Ono. **Madagascar:** P. Verdoux. **Netherlands:** J.C.H. Perizonius; M.S.M. Groenendijk; K.A. Fikkert. **Philippines:** E.A. Manalo. **Saudi Arabia:** N. Al-Otibi; S. Al-Mubarak; A.S. Ibrahcem; M. Al-Raiyes; A. Zidan. **Spain:** E. Rua Benito; F. Ferrandiz Garcia; J.M. Elena Rossello; J.R. Prieto. **Soviet Union:** V. Dementjev; M. Makarov. **Sweden:** E. Tersmeden; R. Walles. **Switzerland:** J.-L. Comte; S. Pürro. **United Kingdom:** C.G.M. Hoptroff. **United States of America:** M.K. Kirk; T.G. Wiseman.

II. Intergovernmental Organizations

United Nations (UN): United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD): A. Kouznetsov; R. Dhanjee. **World Health Organization (WHO):** T.S.R. Topping. **Commission of the European Communities (CEC):** A. Brun; A. Saint-Remy. **European Patent Organisation (EPO):** L. Gruszow; C. Gugerell. **International Union for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants (UPOV):** H. Mast; A. Wheeler; K. Shioya.

III. International Non-Governmental Organizations

Association of Plant Breeders of the European Economic Community (COMASSO): J. Winter; R.C.F. Macer. **Committee of National Institutes of Patent Agents (CNIPA):** A.H. Laird; M. Ruff; E. von Pechmann. **European Federation of Agents of Industry in Industrial Property (FEMIPI):** E. Thouret-Lemaitre; B. Martin. **Institute of Professional Representatives Before the European Patent Office (EPI):** G. Bressand; A. Gallochat. **International Association for the Advancement of Teaching and Research in Intellectual Property (ATRIP):** J. Straus. **International Association for the Protection of Industrial Property (AIPPI):** A.H. Laird. **International Association of Plant Breeders for the Protection of Plant Varieties (ASSINSEL):** H.H. Leenders. **International Chamber of Commerce (ICC):** J.M.W. Buraas. **International Federation of Industrial Property Attorneys (FICPI):** J.E. Helgerud; W. Dost. **International Federation of the Seed Trade (FIS):** J.A.C. Veglio. **Union of Industries of the European Community (UNICE):** A. Hüni. **Union of European Practitioners in Industrial Property (UEPIP):** F. Antony. **World Federation for Culture Collections (WFCC):** B. Brandon; I. Bousfield.

IV. Officers

Chairman: J.-L. Comte (Switzerland). *Vice-Chairmen:* I. Ivanyi (Hungary); P. Verdoux (Madagascar). *Secretary:* F. Balleys (WIPO).

V. International Bureau of WIPO

A. Bogsch *(Director General)*; K. Pfanner *(Deputy Director General)*; L. Baeumer *(Director, Industrial Property Division)*; F. Balleys *(Head, Industrial Property Law Section, Industrial Property Division)*; A. Ilardi *(Senior Legal Officer, Industrial Property Law Section)*.

* A list containing the titles and functions of the participants may be obtained from the International Bureau.

Activities of Other Organizations

Center for the International Study of Industrial Property (CEIPI)

20th Anniversary Symposium and Ceremony

(Strasbourg, October 3, 1984)

NOTE*

The Center for the International Study of Industrial Property (CEIPI) celebrated its 20th anniversary with a symposium and anniversary ceremony on October 3, 1984, in Strasbourg.

CEIPI was founded in 1964, on the initiative of the University of Strasbourg and of French industry, in order to provide a high-level source of teaching and research in the field of industrial property, particularly at the international level.[1] Professor R. Bastian was the Center's first Director General. In 1971, he was succeeded by Professor J.J. Burst. Under their scholarly leadership, and with an eminent faculty composed of both academics and practitioners, CEIPI has master-

* Prepared by the International Bureau of WIPO.

[1] For a more detailed description of CEIPI, see J.J. Burst, "The Center for the International Study of Industrial Property (CEIPI)," *Industrial Property*, 1981, p. 211.

fully fulfilled its role as a provider of specialized training and purveyor of knowledge.

CEIPI constitutes a Teaching and Research Unit of the University of Strasbourg III and is made up of three components, a French Industrial Property Teaching Section (SEFPI), an International Teaching Section (SIPIT) and a Research Section (SERPI).

The French Section is responsible for the training of French industrial property specialists who work in national and international organizations, in industry and in the offices of patent attorneys. In particular, the Section prepares students for the qualifying examinations that are a prerequisite to exercising the profession of patent attorney in France, and contributes to the ongoing training and continuing education of all French industrial property specialists. The course of study in the French Section is divided into two branches and leads to a diploma either in international patent studies or in international trademark and industrial design studies.

The International Section has a dual object: it trains French and foreign professionals in the methodology and legal, economic, fiscal and financial rudiments of licensing and the transfer of technology; and it provides instruction on European patent law and procedure for future European patent agents and specialists who already possess a solid knowledge of their national legal systems. A candidate who successfully completes a course of study in the International Section is awarded a certificate of international industrial property studies.

The Research Section of CEIPI is responsible for coordinating industrial property research undertaken in French university and professional circles as well as for developing and advancing French legal thought on all aspects of industrial property and licensing.

The symposium marking the 20th anniversary of CEIPI was dedicated to the theme "New Frontiers in Intellectual Property at the Dawn of the 21st Century." Following a welcoming address by Professor J.P. Jacqué, President of the University of Strasbourg III, country reports were delivered on the following topics of ever-increasing importance: the protection of computer software; the protection of inventions in the field of biotechnology; and the duration of the effective life of patents. The speakers were H.P. Kunz-Hallstein, on German law, G. Frayne, on United States law, J. Ellis, on United Kingdom law, and M. de Haas, on French law.

The anniversary ceremony followed the symposium and consisted of speeches by Professor J.P. Jacqué, J.C. Combaldieu, Director of the French National Institute of Industrial Property (INPI), F. Savignon, Honorary Director of INPI and Professor Emeritus at the University of Strasbourg III, P. Mathély, Attorney at Law and Professor at CEIPI, and Professor J.J. Burst.

Dr. A. Bogsch, Director General of WIPO, represented the World Intellectual Property Organization.

International Association for the Advancement of Teaching and Research in Intellectual Property (ATRIP)

Assembly and Annual Meeting

(Geneva, September 17 and 18, 1984)

NOTE*

The International Association for the Advancement of Teaching and Research in Intellectual Property (ATRIP) held the fourth session[1] of its Assembly and its annual meeting at the headquarters of WIPO in Geneva in September 1984.

WIPO provided conference facilities and financial support for the travel expenses of some members from developing countries. Fifty-five professors and researchers from 26 countries participated in the meeting. WIPO was represented by an observer.

The Director General of WIPO, Dr. Arpad Bogsch, in welcoming the participants to the headquarters of WIPO, congratulated the Association on its effective role in promoting understanding of intellectual property law and its development, and expressed the hope that the Association would continue, together with other international non-governmental organizations, to make a contribution to the objectives of securing the protection of intellectual property throughout the world.

The Assembly of ATRIP noted with satisfaction the reports on the activities and accounts of the Association, presented by its President, Professor E.D. Aracama Zorraquín (Argentina), and Treasurer, Professor Alberto Bercovitz (Spain), respectively. Reports were also presented by the Chairmen of the Working Committees: by Professor Aracama Zorraquin, on curriculum materials for the teaching of intellectual property law; by Professor Glen E. Weston (United States of America) on graduate study fellowships and teacher exchange programs; by Professor Bercovitz on the administration and exploitation of university research results.

The Assembly considered and referred to the Executive Committee proposals for the program of activities for 1985. Those proposals dealt, *inter alia*, with the continuation of the Working Committees, the preparation of a resolution on the use by universities and research institutions of works protected by copyright, the collection and dissemination of information on that subject and courses of instruction on the various subjects of intellectual property. In addition, the

* Prepared by the International Bureau of WIPO.

[1] For a note on the third session of the Assembly, see *Industrial Property*, 1983, p. 308.

Assembly expressed its satisfaction that the membership of ATRIP had grown from 69 in July 1981, when the Association was founded, to 225 as of the beginning of the 1984 meeting (from 43 countries, including 49 members from 16 developing countries).

At the annual meeting, papers were presented by Professor Friedrich-Karl Beier on a "Curriculum for the Teaching of Intellectual Property," by Professor Umesh Kumar on "The Teaching of Intellectual Property in Lesotho," and by Professor André Bouju on "Recent Development in France on Patent Infringement." Furthermore, three working sessions were held at which reports were presented by the Chairmen of the sessions and comments were made by various members on the following topics: the role and functions of teaching and research institutes in the development of the law of intellectual property; the organization and administration of industrial property rights of universities and research institutes; the use of copyright protected works for teaching or instructional activities. The chairmen of the three working sessions were Professor J.A. Gomez Segade (Spain), Professor Alberto Bercovitz (Spain) and Professor Gunnar Karnell (Sweden).

General Studies

Filing Patent Applications in Digital Form: the Implications for the Practitioner and Possible Legal Problems

A.H. DUNCAN*

1. Introduction

Historically, patent specifications were originally filed in handwritten form and then, with the advent of the typewriter, were generally typed, although many patent offices have been exceptionally tolerant in accepting handwritten documents up until very recently; indeed, some still do so, in order to demonstrate that they do not discriminate in any way against the lone inventor of limited means.

The typewritten document is the one that is treated from the start as the authentic text and, generally speaking, can be amended by way of correction, or restriction, but not by adding new matter. Where pages are retyped to incorporate the amendments, these new pages have to be checked carefully by the examiner against the original text, and on acceptance there is, in the patent offices of most of the advanced countries, an accepted text which is open to public inspection and is regarded as the authentic text in the event of any dispute over the wording.

Traditionally, in "examination" countries, it was only when the wording had been amended to the satisfaction of the patent office and accepted as being suitable for grant that the typewritten (or handwritten) specification was handed over to printers who would set it up in type for the production of the typeset, i.e., printed patent specification.

What are the reasons for printing in typeset form? First and foremost, it is traditional for the publications of government departments to be printed, even relatively short-term and ephemeral papers; this is a matter of maintaining "standards," and in the past it has been widely understood that it is only the less industrially developed and poorer countries which have been unable to publish the specifications of their granted patents in printed form. Many years ago, when labor was cheap and storage was no great problem, a substantial number of copies of each granted patent was printed and put into store, being drawn upon from time to time as copies were sold to the public. There would anyway always be a substantial number needed for supplying to the libraries of other patent offices, usually on an exchange basis, and, although practice varied from country to country, copies were generally supplied free to a substantial number of technical libraries within the country of origin.

In more recent years, instead of printing a fixed number of copies of each specification, it has been the practice to adjust the printing run to match the subject matter, i.e., to make a judgment from past experience of how many copies are likely to be sold. The enormous advances made in photocopying achieved with the introduction of reprography have had two consequences in this regard: first, it matters little if the print requirements have been underestimated, since photocopies can be reproduced relatively easily on demand from a master; second, and less happy for the publisher

* European patent attorney, Birmingham, United Kingdom.

of the originally printed copies, it is much easier than before for libraries elsewhere, i.e., in the foreign patent offices and local technical libraries, to produce photocopies on demand from their own printed copies, thus accelerating the fall in the demand for original printed copies.

This, combined with high wage rates in the typesetting industry raises the question in some minds as to whether patent specifications should be printed in typeset form at all. However, there are strong arguments against departing from the present practice of typesetting, not least that of bulk, a subject I shall return to later. The strongest argument is simply that of quality; printed specifications are the main product of a patent office, the product by which it is judged in the outside world, and only typesetting can give that clarity, compactness and attractiveness in appearance that meets this need.

Given that this is so, it may seem strange at first sight that nowadays, although typeset specifications of granted patents are still published, the class of specifications that are published in the largest number, namely, published applications, are not typeset. The reasons for this are historical and can be traced back to the Netherlands Patent Office, which was the first to introduce delayed examination and, with it, early publication. This early-published document (nowadays called the "A" publication) was produced by an offset-litho process from the typewritten pages, and that is where the rot set in. In due course, the Federal Republic of Germany followed suit, then some other countries, and finally the European Patent Office. In each case the "A" publication was by a litho process from the typewritten pages, but, after amendment (if necessary) and grant, the granted patent (the "B" document) was set up in type.

The thought behind this behavior was that the early publication was only for the purpose of letting third parties know without excessive delay what was "in the pipeline," whereas it was only when the patent was granted that a true "patent" document, deserving of typesetting, came into existence. The behavior was an extension of a practice that had existed 60 years earlier in some countries, of making Convention specifications "open to public inspection" 18 months from the priority date.

Yet this is illogical and wrong, for the following reason. The first publication, the "A" document, is what matters from the searching point of view and is in fact the only one that really interests librarians and searchers. The ratio of actual sales is between three and four to one, that is to say, experience shows that between three and four times as many "A" publications as "B" publications are sold by patent offices and libraries. Examiners in their searches cite first publications; indeed there is a feeling amongst patent practitioners that the original purpose of a patent, to define a monopoly, is almost being forgotten in the concentration by librarians and searchers on their use as disclosures.

We next come to the question of bulk. A specification of a given typical number of words and an average number of drawings is approximately three and a half times as bulky in offset-litho form (quite apart from being far less legible and far less attractive to handle) as the same specification in the form of a typeset document, even assuming the offset-litho version is printed on both sides of the paper. When we consider a photocopy made (on only one side of the paper) from that photo-litho version, the ratio becomes even more startling.

So a library stocking patent specifications (even if it takes only the "A" publication and not the "B" as well) has to allow at least three and a half times as much shelf space as it did before the days of early publication. Every patent attorney's file is that much thicker, and his store cupboards that much fuller, as a consequence of this same fact.

Moreover, the financial cost of making copies from an offset-litho document, based on the typewritten pages, is correspondingly higher than that of copying a typeset document of the same number of words, that is to say, around three and a half times, again simply because of the increased number of pages involved.

The questions of comparison in legibility and general quality hardly need to be discussed. Although technical developments over the past 20 years have led to enormous improvements in the quality and layout of typing, including variable spacing, automatic line numbering, and justification of the right-hand margin, whilst at the same time the quality of typesetting has deteriorated (oddly, it has become fashionable no longer to justify the right-hand margin), it remains true that a typeset document remains in a different class; one only has to hold side by side a German *Offenlegungsschrift* and the corresponding *Patentschrift*.

2. An Answer

What is the solution? The solution is to set up in print, i.e., to typeset) not the "B" publication but (or, better, in addition to the "B" publication) the "A" publication. When the United Kingdom Patent Office took this bold step in 1978, on the introduction of their harmonized law that included early publication, there was surprise even amongst United Kingdom practitioners, yet this can be seen now to have been absolutely the right decision. They saw that this is the only publication that is seen by the vast majority of readers (many searchers, and almost all librarians, never have cause to look at a *granted* patent), and they acted accordingly.

It might be argued that this is wasteful, since it involves setting up in print matter that may in due

course be cancelled before grant, and the even larger waste of setting up in print applications that never proceed to grant at all. Such an argument, however, is based on a false premise, namely, that granted patents are the only ones that matter. The opposite is the truth, and from the disclosure point of view, every application, however unlikely to lead to grant, is just as important as another that may in due course be granted, and every phrase and paragraph is important, even though it may be cancelled at the first official letter stage.

It is true that typesetting of the "A" publication leads to a greater total amount of typesetting work than if this step is confined to granted patents, but the proportion is surprisingly small, and, although it varies obviously from country to country, in practice the increase in work needed to cover all applications is only of the order of 20%.

The procedure is straightforward; after about 16 months from the priority date, the patent office sends the duplicate copy of the typewritten (or handwritten) specification to outside printing contractors, whose typesetters read the document and operate typesetting machines which may be of any one of a number of known different kinds. In the majority, the operation of the keyboard results in a punched or magnetic tape which is used to produce a proof. This is then "proof-read" for errors, which are marked on the proof by hand and then the tape is corrected, before editing and the addition of the coded instructions necessary to provide the appropriate columns and line numbers, and also, in a substantial proportion of the cases, to incorporate chemical formulae and mathematical equations at the required points in the text. The front page and abstract may be set up by hand (using "scissors-and-paste" techniques) or with the use of modern computer techniques on a screen.

Despite the care taken, even the best of printers make errors, so many practitioners make a practice of "proof-reading" printed specifications (and this applies equally to the printing of granted patents), and write to their patent offices to demand correction of the errors they spot. As a consequence, most patent offices have to produce "erratum slips" for attachment to an appreciable number of the printed specifications they publish. However, it is established in the patent law and practice of the industrialized countries that typeset their specifications that the printed text is *not* the authentic text. The authentic text is the typewritten master copy which is on the files of the patent office and which, after publication of the printed document, is open to public inspection.

Thus, no legal problems arise. In the event of litigation over the granted patent, the parties and the courts generally ignore trivial errors; major errors are corrected by the plaintiffs. Prudent defendants check the printed version with the authentic text.

3. A Logical Further Step

The introduction of typesetting of the "A" publication in addition to the "B" publication only serves to highlight an existing step which, in the light of modern technology, can be seen to be wasteful, namely, the employment of skilled operators to "keyboard" the text in the printers' premises in order to produce the tape for printing, when the probability is that a tape or at least a diskette, containing the text in digital form already exists in the office of the patent attorney who wrote the specification. By using that already-created digital information directly, the patent office could not only save the cost of the second "keyboarding" step but also at one blow eliminate the possible errors introduced by that step.

It is for this reason that the European Patent Office is well on its way to introducing a plan giving the freedom for applicants and their attorneys to obtain a reduction in their filing fees by filing, with their typewritten applications, diskettes containing the text of the specification in digital form. An alternative way of achieving the reduction in cost, also to be offered, will be for the applicant to file the application in an entirely normal way, with no additional material, but typed in a specific type face, namely, OCR-B; this typeface has been specifically designed for easy and reliable reading by automatic optical character recognition ("OCR") equipment, yet it is not significantly different from the typefaces already used on typewriters and word processors.

Both of these solutions are attractive to practitioners, provided the financial incentive by way of reduced filing fees is adequate. Surveys have shown that over 50% of European practitioners already have word-processing equipment that uses floppy disks ("diskettes") or tapes and, of the remainder, almost all are actively considering them. Moreover, it is the ones who do already have such equipment who represent those most active in filing European applications. Thus, the great majority of applications filed at the European Patent Office (and at the patent offices of the other major countries or communities) originate from offices of practitioners already using word-processing equipment. The only added cost to the practitioner in adopting this proposal is that of the duplicate diskette itself.

The alternative solution of OCR-B typeface involves virtually no expenditure at all; it is simply a matter of buying an appropriate golf-ball or daisy wheel, at a cost of a few pounds, for one's existing typewriter, and it can be adopted by even the smallest one-man practice.

It goes without saying that the European Patent Office intends to continue into the indefinite future to accept applications filed in the present manner, and that adoption of one or the other of the above courses is entirely at the choice of the applicant.

Up to the time of writing, no other patent office has declared an intention of following the lead of the European Patent Office. From the practitioner's point

of view, this is a pity, as one of the significant items in his filing costs which he has to pass on to his client and which forms part of the overall cost of obtaining patent protection, is that of meeting the varying requirements of the different patent offices with regard to layout, line numbering, margins and so on. This does not cause a problem where the specification has to be translated anyway, but the area where harmonization of procedure and layout is particularly important is between countries which use the same language; if each of the countries that accepts text in English could agree on format, there would be a significant saving to their customers, the ultimate users of the patent system.

4. The Difficulties

What are the drawbacks? These can be put under three headings:

(1) for the applicant (or his attorney);
(2) for the patent office;
(3) from the legal aspect.

(1) For the Applicant

As indicated above, for the applicant the problems are minimal. For the "diskette" solution, he is likely to be required to provide a diskette or tape of only one of a limited range of make and format. Unfortunately, there seems to be little movement towards standardization between manufacturers. However, it is expected that the range which the European Patent Office will be prepared to accept will cover the vast majority of those currently in use in attorney's offices, and for those not yet equipped with word processors it is likely that they will have no problem provided they stick to the major manufacturers, or to systems using diskettes matching the standards of the major manufacturers. There will be the need to make a duplicate diskette of each specification to send to the patent office, since, although the European Patent Office intends to return the diskettes to the applicants or their attorneys in due course, when they have prepared the tape for the printer, it is unlikely that attorneys will be prepared to do without the master diskette for several weeks.

The drawbacks of the OCR-B solution, as far as the attorney is concerned, lie only in the need to maintain a high standard of correction-free type, with the lines evenly spaced and parallel to the top edge of the paper (and to one another). Margins must be maintained rigidly and, unless a special paper with a printed colored outline "box" is used, nothing must be written in the margins. There are likely to be a few rules to observe, such as not starting a line with a full stop (period) (but who wants to do that anyway?), and avoiding creases. Also, it will be necessary to achieve a high degree of clarity, i.e., either a top copy or a very good high-contrast photocopy on good-quality white paper. It is likely that justification of right-hand margins cannot be employed, since machine-reading relies on uniform spacing between characters.

Surprisingly, in neither solution will the applicant or his attorney have to make any compromises, or take special steps, with regard to chemical formulae, mathematical equations or tables of experimental results.

(2) For the Patent Office

When it receives the diskette, along with the typewritten specification, the patent office will need first to identify its format and, then, using a program suited to that format, check it by displaying its contents on a screen in order, at least, to see that it is the right diskette and at least at first glance matches the typewritten text. Conversion to a standard format for the printer's tape is then necessary, at which point signals must be inserted for calling up any formulae, tables or equations, i.e., non-digitized material, for the printer to place by hand in the final layout.

When it receives a specification in OCR-B typescript, the patent office will need to translate it into digital form by passing it through a reader; there are several different readers on the market, some very fast with an automatic paper feed but a high error rate, others slower (and some needing the pages to be fed in one by one by hand) but more accurate. Some make reading errors of a kind in which they substitute a wrong character for the one read; others are better, when encountering difficulty in reading a character, at signalling the fact by inserting an asterisk or calling the operator.

There is also the problem, even with the normally universal OCR-B typeface, of slightly different formats as between one language and another. *Umlauts* in German, slashed letters used in the Scandinavian languages, and certain accents used in other languages, can give rise to difficulty, as well as the problem of discriminating between "0" (zero) and "O" (the alphabetical letter). Nevertheless, even taking these difficulties into account, tests have shown that they can be overcome and the initial error rate, even on a first scan, and before proofreading and correction, can be consistently lower than in typesetting by human operators.

It is worth mentioning here that the United States Patent and Trademark Office, in its very ambitious and far-reaching Automation Plan, costing up to $320 million over the next years, does not expect to have to ask the applicants to alter significantly their filing procedures. The United States Office is confident that it can digitize by optical character recognition from a wide range of standard type faces, making filing in OCR-B unnecessary.

(3) The Legal Problem

It is not difficult to see a number of potential submerged rocks in the path of the smooth sailing of this digital printing project, for example:

(a) what happens if the diskette does not match the typewritten text?

(b) what happens if the diskettc, through faults in reading it, introduces significant errors?

(c) what happens if the diskette is damaged or wiped clean by a strong electrostatic field in the post?

(d) what happens if the specification is filed in OCR-B, and with a reduced filing fee, but turns out to be of inadequate quality for satisfactory machine-reading?

I believe I can show that none of these potential problems is insoluble, or is indeed any greater than the problems which arise in current filing practice. Already in current practice things can go wrong, e.g., in the post, or through inadvertently omitting a paragraph, or even a whole page, in the text of a typewritten document, or inadvertently omitting a sheet of drawings. All tbese are problems with which tbe practitioner is familiar. There are provisions in tbe patent laws, rules and practice of all countries to take account of these, some more stringent than others, the fundamental principle behind them being that the applicant must not add any significant or not already clearly obvious material at a date after the date he is seeking to hold.

When considering the above theoretically possible difficulties, the important thing to remember is that the authentic original text will still be the typewritten text as filed, and matter disclosed in that is regarded as disclosed, whether or not it is in the accompanying diskette. As the two are filed simultaneously, there can be no danger of a less-than-honest applicant trying surreptitiously to insert material into his diskette version that is not present in his typed version, since there is nothing to gain by such a course of action, and on the contrary he is likely to be penalized, since it will be surprising if patent offices which are prepared to accept filings in this form do not put onto tbe applicant the onus of ensuring that the information on his diskette or tape agrees throughout with that on the typewritten pages.

What about amendments during prosecution and after early publication? In the case of the OCR solution, there is no great problem since the applicants can file retyped pages which can then be re-scanned by the automatic reader and incorporated in an amended tape. At all events, on acceptance, the patent office can aim to end up with a tape for sending to the printer and a copy of the specification stored on this tape can be run out in typewritten form and sent to the applicants for checking and approval if necessary, which is no more than is already done by at least the European and German Patent Offices at present.

In the "diskette" solution (i.e., the applicant accompanies the original typewritten document on filing with the same information stored digitally on tape or diskette), the amendments will have to be agreed between the examiner and applicants in typewritten form as at present, and then the patent office or their outside printing contractors will have to incorporate these amendments by re-keyboarding to produce an amended tape for the final printing of the "B" specification. As before, a print-out can be sent to the applicants for checking and approval before the typeset document is produced.

5. Errors

As indicated above, tbe onus is likely to be put on applicants to see that their diskette or tape agrees with the typewritten text. But suppose an error is introduced, either through faulty reading in an automatic OCR reader, or through an electronic fault in the reading or conversion of the digital information on the diskette. If the error is an obvious one, and if furthermore it is readily apparent what the intended wording, figure or formula should be, then there is no problem in correction, even after acceptance or grant, or even in the course of litigation, as at present. What is more worrying is tbe possibility of an error, in particular in a chemical formula (e.g., reference to an amide instead of an amine) or in a digit (e.g., a temperature of 30°C is printed as 80°C), which is overlooked both by the applicants and by the examining patent office and only comes to light, perbaps some years after grant, in the course of litigation, and where furthermore the nature of the intended figure or formula is not apparent from the text. This situation can arise in present practice where an error is made by the keyboard operator wbo sets the specification up in type for printing of the granted patent, and where tbe error is overlooked in proof-reading and is not spotted by the applicant at the time. Thus, the introduction of digitalized bandling of text will introduce no new problem in this regard.

6. The Future

As indicated above, at present the chemical formulae, the more complex mathematical equations and the drawings have to be handled separately in any digital treatment of patent specifications; in some of the more esoteric chemical specifications, this can make the digital treatment hardly worthwhile. However, a substantial amount of work is currently being done on digitalizing formulae and drawings, and, indeed, such tcchniques are already possible at the expense of a high demand on memory space, so high as to be unacceptable in practice at present. Techniques continue to improve, and in the not too distant future it should be possible to handle an entire specification, text, formulae, symbols, drawings and all, as one single continuous string of digital information on tape, which will considerably simplify the printing, and reduce the labor-intensive part of it.

It is not out of place to mention in this context that the United States Patent and Trademark Office is already well advanced in its program for storing, wholly digitally, something approaching half a million trademarks, including device and symbol marks as well as word marks, and they are classified in a manner that allows searching in many different ways.

A theoretical possibility for the future in the filing of patent applications is direct transmission in digital form from the applicant or his attorney to the patent office by a telephone line or other transmission link. Even today, there is no technical obstacle to the filing of a specification in a patent office halfway round the world in a matter of seconds. The legal obstacles, however, are formidable, as are the practical handling problems, both for patent offices and for attorneys. First, there is the problem of only a garbled text being received; it would be necessary for the text received to be re-transmitted immediately back to the sender for checking, a step the patent office would not welcome. It would be necessary for the filing to be followed rapidly by a hard-copy typewritten version, and this would need to be checked for agreement, thus making for more, not less work. Security raises another issue, since it is not unknown for unauthorized access to be obtained to the transmission facilities of a large organization; this could be serious not so much on the initial filing but in subsequent handling during which, for example, unauthorized changes in the text might be introduced without the applicant being aware. At present, most patent offices require a written signature from the applicant or his attorney, and this could be a problem in filing by telephone, albeit a problem capable of being overcome by the use of secret authorizing codes known only to the applicant and the patent office; yet, against this, such codes seldom remain secret for long, bearing in mind that employees within an industry may move from one organization to a competitor.

Facsimile has little place in the future of patent application; the freedom to file by direct facsimile transmission might be welcomed by applicants and their attorneys, especially as the chemical formulae and the drawings are no more difficult to transmit than the text. However, the drawback of facsimile is that it provides no help toward obtaining the text in digital form, which is the prime aim for keeping down the cost of printing; only if, in the future, it will be possible to merge, in one transmission, the text in digital form and the formulae and text in facsimile form, will there be scope in this direction.

7. Conclusions

I believe that it will be clear from what has been said above that it is the first publications (the "A" documents) of patent specifications that should logically be looked upon as the most important ones to print by typesetting, not the granted patents. Regardless of whether it is the "A" document or the "B" document that is typeset (and, preferably, they should both be typeset), a significant economy in printing costs can be achieved by making use of the information already existing in digital form in the offices of practitioners, or at least by facilitating the digitizing of the filed texts by filing them in a particular typeface. This despite the fact that the drawings, and also the chemical formulae and equations embedded in the text, must, in the present state of the art, still be handled separately.

It will also be apparent, I believe, that the difficulties over disconformities, introduced errors and other potential legal problems are, when one looks into it in detail, in no way different from those which exist already with typewritten documents and manual typesetting methods. This is not the position, however, when one looks at filing in digital form over transmission links.

Activities of Industrial Property Offices

Legislative Developments in the Field of Industrial Property in 1983

The following survey of selected countries summarizes national legislative developments in the field of industrial property during the year 1983. It includes references to legislation that was enacted during the survey year or, in some cases, that was proposed and/or discussed. The information for the survey was gathered from annual reports of industrial property offices for 1983 as well as from other data communicated to the International Bureau of WIPO by industrial property offices.

Australia. Two sets of patent regulations were promulgated in 1983. The first is Statutory Rules 1983, No. 48, entitled Patents Regulations (Amendment). These rules amend the Patents Regulations and provide in particular that an application for a standard patent, by virtue of Section 191(3) of the Statute Law (Miscellaneous Amendments) Act (No. 1) 1982 must be in accordance with form 1AA; the rules also insert a new form 1AA in the First Schedule of the Regulations.

The second set consists of Statutory Rules 1983, No. 49, entitled Statute Law (Miscellaneous Amendments) (Patents) Regulations. These rules comprise regulations made under the Statute Law (Miscellaneous Amendments) Act (No. 1) 1982. They relate to transitional provisions in respect of the repeal of Section 49A of the Patents Act 1952.

Austria. A draft amendment to the Patent Law was discussed in expert circles in 1983 following completion of the expert opinion procedure. The results of those decisions were incorported in the final draft, which subsequently was submitted to parliamentary procedure.

An amendment to the Law on Patent Attorneys, which primarily incorporates a more detailed statutory definition of the power of patent attorneys and creates more stringent requirements for the training of potential patent attorneys, was adopted by the Parliament and entered into force on March 23, 1983.

A new draft of the Federal Law on Unfair Competition was prepared for re-promulgation in 1983 in compliance with a May 1983 decision of the Federal Government requiring the re-promulgation of important statutory material that had become too complex.

Documentation was compiled in 1983 for the purpose of amending the legislation on patent and trademark fees. It is expected that the amendment will result approximately in a 10% increase in all patent and trademark fees, with the exception of patent search fees and the term of protection fee for trademarks. In order to promote innovation, a reduction in patent search fees was proposed. The expected result of this reduction is to facilitate the use by small and medium-sized undertakings of the patent search procedure, which has proven to be of great significance in innovation projects. The term of protection fee for trademarks was expected to be increased fairly significantly on the grounds that the fee has not recently borne any relation to the extent of protection granted and to the necessary administrative work load involved.

During 1983 expert discussions took place on the enactment of a new Law on the Protection of Designs. The main provisions of the draft Law include: extension of the maximum term of protection from the current three years to 15 years; publication of designs in an official designs gazette; conversion of the central designs archive into a designs register modeled after the patent register; limitation of design protection to those goods contained in the classification; *ex officio* declaration of nullity for designs that are manifestly not new; abolition of the novelty examination upon deposit of a design; and the reform of design law proceedings and their concentration in the Austrian Patent Office.

China. On March 10, 1983, the State Council of the People's Republic of China promulgated Implementing Regulations under the Trademark Law of August 23, 1982.[1] The Regulations deal, *inter alia*, with applications for the registration of a trademark, trademarks for pharmaceutical products, the register of trademarks established by the Trademark Office, the refusal of registration of a trademark, trademark disputes, trademark licensing, violations of the rights of trademark registrants, appeals from decisions of the Trademark Office and foreign applicants.

Cuba. On May 14, 1983, Cuba enacted Decree-Law No. 68 on Inventions, Scientific Discoveries, Industrial Designs, Marks and Appellations of Origin.[2] The Decree-Law consists of 12 titles and provides, *inter alia*, the following: inventions may be protected by means of patent certificates, which have a duration of 10 years extendable for an additional five years, patent certificates of addition, inventors' certificates, which are of

[1] See *Industrial Property Laws and Treaties*, CHINA — Text 3-002.

[2] *Ibid.*, CUBA — Text 1-001.

unlimited duration, or inventors' certificates of addition; patent certificates may be the subject of *ex officio* as well as compulsory licenses; scientific discoveries, the determination of which is within the competence of the Acadamy of Science of Cuba, may be recognized by the grant of a scientific discovery certificate; industrial designs may be protected by the grant of an industrial designer's certificate or by an industrial design patent certificate, which has a term of validity of five years renewable for an additional term of five years, provided that the industrial design is being exploited; trademarks and service marks may be registered for a duration of 10 years, renewable for successive periods of 10 years; organs of the Central Administration of the State, enterprises, institutions and local organs of the People's Authority that make use of a foreign mark to market national goods or services are under the obligation to couple that mark with a national mark; trade names, business styles and advertising slogans may be registered under certain circumstances; appellations of origin and indications of source may be registered by the organs of the Central Administration of the State, enterprises, the provincial and municipal organs of the People's Autbority, small farmers and agricultural and livestock cooperatives, and foreign appellations of origin or indications of source enjoy protection in Cuba; and agreements for the transfer of technology involving inventions, industrial designs and marks are to be analyzed and evaluated to guarantee that they contain no violation of third-party rights, that due account is taken of rights acquired and that no clauses are included tbat would impose restrictions having direct or indirect adverse effects on the economy.

Regulations under the Decree-Law in the form of Resolutions of the Acadamy of Science of Cuba were also promulgated in 1983 (Resolution No. 999 of June 13, 1983, as amended by Resolution No. 1046 of September 9, 1983,[3] and Resolution No. 1100 of November 8, 1983[4]).

Democratic People's Republic of Korea. On May 2, 1983, the Democratic Peoplc's Republic of Korea promulgated Statute No. 0093 on Marks and Industrial Designs.[5] That Statute, which entered into force on June l, 1983, also includes provisions on appellations of origin and replaced the previous Law on Trademarks and Industrial Designs of January 1, 1968. One of the provisions under the new Statute provides tbat foreign organizations, enterprises or individuals applying for the registration of a trademark or service mark in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea must submit their applications in the Korean language but may also do so in Russian, English or French. Applications for the registration of marks, industrial designs and appellations of origin are filed with the Office for Inventions of the Democratic People's Republic of Korca.

France. On August 3, 1983, a program of "20 measures" for the promotion of industrial property was proposed by tbe Ministry of Industry and Research and presented to the Council of Ministers. The "20 measures" contained in the global plan of improvement may be grouped according to the following general topics:

- making patents more accessible and less costly;
- providing better protection for the exploitation of patents and making such exploitation fiscally more attractive;
- dcveloping information about, and making researchers and enterprises aware of, the advantages of patents and of industrial property;
- improving the diffusion of technical information contained in patent documents.

The texts and reports containing concrete proposals based on those measures were presented at the end of 1983.

As part of the "20 measures," a new draft industrial designs law, elaborated in consultation with the Council for Industrial Property, was proposed to replace the Law of July 14, 1909, currently in force.

Discussions within the Council for Industrial Property also took place in 1983 with the aim of preparing new draft trademark legislation. Tbe principal new proposal would consist in the introduction of an opposition procedure.

Another proposal resulting from the "20 measures" consisted in extending the powers of patent restoration granted to the Director of INPI under the 1978 Patent Law, in particular in cases of illness of the patentee, of insolvency of the patent agent, of bankruptcy, of unemployment and where there had been an error in the calculation of the grace period for late payment of maintenance fees. The decisions taken by the Director of INPI are subject to appeal before thc Court of Appeal.

Also within thc framework of the "20 measures," a Working Group established under the auspices of INPI issued a report analyzing and proposing a system of legal protection for the creators of computer software.

German Democratic Republic. The German Democratic Rcpublic promulgated new patent legislation in 1983, the Law on the Legal Protection of Inventions — Patent Law (of October 27, 1983).[6] Among the innovations in the new Law are a refinement of the concept and definition of invention and the grant of patent protection to microbiologicial processes. As in the

[3] *Ibid.*, Text 1-002.

[4] *Ibid.*, Text 1-003.

[5] *Ibid.*, DEMOCRATIC PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF KOREA — Text 1-001.

[6] *Ibid.*, GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC — Text 2-001.

previous legislation, two types of patents may be granted in the German Democratic Republic: exclusive patents; and economic patents, which must be applied for and are granted in all cases where an invention was made during the course of the inventor's activity in a socialist enterprise.

In addition to the new Patent Law, a new Ordinance on Procedures before the Office for Inventions and Patents for Obtaining Legal Protection for Inventions of November 10, 1983, which deals primarily with the filing of patent applications, was issued in 1983.

Hungary. The Law on the Protection of Inventions by Patents (No. 2 of 1969) was amended in 1983 by Decree-Law No. 5.[7] Furthermore, a consolidated version of the Law, including the pertinent regulations promulgated by the Joint Decree Relating to the Execution of the Law on the Protection of Inventions by Patents (No. 4/1969, as amended by Decree No. 4/1983 of the Minister of Justice)[8] and the Decree of the Minister of Justice Concerning Court Proceedings in Patent Matters (No. 9/1969),[9] was issued.

Ireland. Rules were issued in 1983 under the 1963 Trademarks Act and the 1964 Patents Act in order to provide for increases in trademark and patent fees. Those rules are the following: Trademarks Rules, 1963 (Amendment) Rules, 1983 (SI No. 199 of 1983); Patents (Amendment) Rules, 1983 (SI No. 198 of 1983).

Monaco. During 1983 Monaco enacted new legislation on trademarks and service marks. The principal legislative text is Law No. 1058 of June 10, 1983, which entered into force on October 1, 1983.[10] That Law replaced the previous legislation on trademarks, Law No. 608 of June 20, 1955. Accompanying the new Trademark Law is a series of regulations also promulgated in 1983: Sovereign Ordinance No. 7801 of September 21, 1983, Laying Down the Implementing Conditions for Law No. 1058;[11] Sovereign Ordinance No. 7802 of September 21, 1983, on the Classification of Goods and Services to Which Trademarks and Service Marks Apply,[12] which adopts the International Classification of Goods and Services established by the Nice Agreement; and Ministerial Order No. 83-448 of September 21, 1983, Laying Down the Implementing Regulations under Law No. 1058.[13] The Ordinances and the Order also entered into force on October 1, 1983.

Soviet Union. The Statute on Trademarks adopted by the USSR State Committee for Inventions and Discoveries on January 8, 1974, was amended in 1983 by Decree No. 2(5) of April 14. The amendments concern, *inter alia,* the application for the registration of a trademark and the grant of a trademark certificate, which must by filed with the USSR Scientific Research Institute (which acts under the authority of the USSR State Committee for Inventions and Discoveries), the examination and grant procedure in respect of trademark certificates, the appeals procedure in the event of the refusal of a trademark certificate, and the prolongation of the validity of a trademark certificate.

Sweden. The Patents Act (No. 837 of 1967) and the Decree on Patent Formalities (No. 383 of 1967) were both amended in 1983, the Patents Act by Act No. 433 of 1983[14] and the Decree on Patent Formalities by Decree No. 435 of 1983.[15] One of the purposes of the amendments was to make provision for international deposits of microorganisms under the Budapest Treaty on the International Recognition of the Deposit of Microorganisms for the Purposes of Patent Proceedure, which Sweden ratified in 1983.

Switzerland. Legislative activity during 1983 was concentrated in the fields of indications of source and trademarks. A draft of a new decree on the use of the Swiss name for watches and on the official quality control for watches, drawn up by the Federal Intellectual Property Office, was under consideration. The preparation of a new trademark law continued: the revised draft law was being submitted to a group of external experts for consultation.

United Kingdom. The Patents Rules 1982 were amended twice in 1983. The first amendment occurred in March in order to correct an omission in the 1982 Rules by applying certain provisions to patents granted, and patent applications filed, under the 1949 Act, which was replaced, in 1977, for the purpose of new applications by a new Act. The second amendment occurred in May in order to increase patent fees so as to recover the full deficit on the printing of patents and to compensate for inflation.

United States of America. During the close of the 97th Congress and the beginning of the first session of the 98th Congress, many significant industrial property legislative initiatives were dealt with and the President signed into law two acts to amend Title 35 (Patents) of the United States Code. PL 97-414, entitled the Orphan Drug Act, was signed into law on January 4, 1983, and added a new Section 155 to Title 35 of the US Code. The

[7] *Ibid.*, HUNGARY — Text 2-006.

[8] *Ibid.*, Text 2-007.

[9] *Ibid.*, Text 2-008.

[10] *Ibid.*, MONACO — Text 3-001.

[11] *Ibid.*, Text 3-002.

[12] *Ibid.*, Text 3-003.

[13] *Ibid.*, Text 3-004.

[14] *Ibid.*, SWEDEN — Text 2-001.

[15] *Ibid.*, Text 2-002.

new Section provides for extensions of the term of certain patents covering inventions which, after having been approved for sale, were subject to a stay of approval under the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act. The extensions are equal to the length of time from the date on which the stay was imposed to the date of reinstatement of approval for commercial marketing.

PL 97-127, the Federal Anti-Tampering Act, was signed into law on October 13, 1983. It includes a provision adding a new Section 155A to Title 35 of the US Code. The provision extends the terms of certain specific new drug patents where Government approval to market or produce the product was delayed.

In addition, legislation was proposed but not enacted in 1983 on the following measures: generally to extend the terms of patents subject to Federal pre-marketing regulatory review (S 1306, HR 3502); to provide a method for an inventor to retain the unrestricted right to practice an invention without obtaining a patent by means of a Statutory Invention Disclosure (S 1538, HR 2610); to combine the US Patent Office's Board of Appeals and Board of Patent Interferences; to impose criminal and heavy civil sanctions for international trademark piracy (S 875, HR 2447); and to amend the antitrust and patent laws to promote joint research and development ventures, to encourage the competitive aspect of intellectual property licensing and to afford further product protection for the holders of US process patents with the aim of enhancing the productivity and competitiveness of US industry in international markets (S 1841, HR 3878).

European Patent Office. At its June 1983 meeting the Administrative Council of the European Patent Organisation approved the report of the Working Party on National Law, which had the task of examining the possibilities of harmonizing the national law of Contracting States relating to European patent applications and patents. The Council also adopted a resolution on the harmonization of certain provisions of national law. Although several recommendations of the Working Party will require a change in the law of certain Contracting States, which will involve some delay, several of the changes recommended by the Working Party have already been implemented by administrative action. The objective of this exercise was to reduce the multiplicity of formal requirements which the owner of a European patent must fulfill in the different Contracting States.

News from Industrial Property Offices

EGYPT

President of the Patent Office

We have been informed that Professor Mohamed Hilal has been appointed President of the Patent Office.

ITALY

Director, Central Patent Office

We have been informed that Mrs. Maria-Grazia Del Gallo-Rossoni has been appointed Director of the Central Patent Office.

Book Reviews

Europäisches Patentübereinkommen; Münchner Gemeinschaftskommentar, by F.-K. Beier, K. Haertel and G. Schricker. Carl Heymanns Verlag KG, Munich, 1984.—4 volumes to date.

The Convention on the Grant of European Patents (European Patent Convention), which was concluded at a Diplomatic Conference in Munich (Federal Republic of Germany) in 1973 which entered into force five years later, established a regional patent system to which 11 countries (Austria, Belgium, France, Germany (Federal Republic of), Italy, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom) have so far become party. Accepted right from the outset by prospective applicants for patents, the European patent system now represents one of the important patent systems of the world. Applicants come both from the countries party to the European Patent Convention and from other countries. They have to know how the provisions of the European Patent Convention are to be interpreted. In order to meet this need, a group of 18 eminent experts, all based in Munich, have undertaken to publish an in-depth commentary on the European Patent Convention, four volumes of which have been published to date, all of them during 1984.

The authors of the commentary are prominent officials of the European Patent Office, members of the Max-Planck Institute for International Intellectual Property Law and a professor of the Technical University of Munich. The coordination of this impressive work and the final editing of the text are being carried out by three renowned scholars: Dr. Kurt Haertel, former President of the German Patent Office, who played an important role in the preparation of the European Patent Convention, in particular as chairman of the preparatory conference, of the Main Committee of the Munich Conference and of the Interim Committee charged with the preparation of the entry into force of the Convention; Professor Friedrich-Karl Beier, Managing Director of the Max-Planck Institute for International Intellectual Property Law; and Professor Gerhard Schricker, Director of the same Institute.

The first four installments contain a general introduction to the European Patent Convention with a description of its historical development, a commentary on Article 14 of the Convention dealing with the languages to be used by the European Patent Office and in proceedings before that Office, and an analysis of the provisions (contained in Articles 90 to 98 of the Convention) concerning the procedure for granting a European patent; also included are tables of court decisions, subdivided in accordance with the countries where they were rendered, and of decisions of the Board of Appeal of the European Patent Office, as well as a bibliography of about 800 publications dealing with questions concerning the European patent system.

The first four installments, which will be followed by about a dozen others, already demonstrate the monumental size as well as the outstanding quality of this publication. The fact that the authors have significant experience with the European Patent Convention—and this is especially true for Dr. Haertel—makes this publication particularly interesting. Doubtlessly all practitioners will use this commentary with great benefit, and it is hoped that the remaining installments will be published in the near future.

LB

Calendar of Meetings

WIPO Meetings

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

1985

January 21 to 25 (Geneva) – International Patent Classification (IPC) Union: Committee of Experts

February 4 to 8 (Geneva) – Permanent Committee for Development Cooperation Related to Copyright and Neighboring Rights

February 11 to 15 (Geneva) – Committee of Experts on the International Registration of Marks

February 25 to March 1 (Geneva) – Group of Experts on Copyright Protection of Computer Software (convened jointly with Unesco)

March 11 to 15 (Geneva) – Permanent Committee on Patent Information (PCPI): Working Group on General Information

March 18 to 22 (Paris) – Group of Experts on Copyright Problems in the Field of Direct Broadcasting Satellites (convened jointly with Unesco)

April 22 to 26 (Paris) – Joint Unesco-WIPO Consultative Committee on the Access by Developing Countries to Works Protected by Copyright (convened jointly with Unesco)

May 6 to 17 (Geneva) – Permanent Committee on Patent Information (PCPI): Working Group on Search Information

June 3 to 7 (Geneva) – Nice Union: Committee of Experts

June 6 to 14 (Geneva) – Permanent Committee on Patent Information (PCPI): Working Groups on Planning and on Special Questions

June 17 to 25 (Paris) – Berne Union: Executive Committee (Extraordinary Session) (sitting together, for the discussion of certain items, with the Intergovernmental Committee of the Universal Copyright Convention)

June 26 to 28 (Paris) – Rome Convention: Intergovernmental Committee (Ordinary Session)(convened jointly with ILO and Unesco)

September 11 to 13 (Geneva) – Permanent Committee on Patent Information (PCPI): Working Group on Patent Information for Developing Countries

September 16 to 20 (Geneva) – Permanent Committee on Patent Information (PCPI) and PCT Committee for Technical Cooperation (PCT/CTC)

September 23 to October 1 (Geneva) – Governing Bodies (WIPO General Assembly, Conference and Coordination Committee; Assemblies of the Paris, Madrid, Hague, Nice, Lisbon, Locarno, IPC, PCT, Budapest, TRT and Berne Unions; Conferences of Representatives of the Paris, Hague, Nice and Berne Unions; Executive Committees of the Paris and Berne Unions; Committee of Directors of the Madrid Union; Council of the Lisbon Union)

October 7 to 11 (Geneva) – Permanent Committee on Patent Information (PCPI): Working Group on General Information

November 18 to 22 (Geneva) – Permanent Committee on Patent Information (PCPI): Working Groups on Special Questions and on Planning

November 25 to December 6 (Geneva) – Permanent Committee on Patent Information (PCPI): Working Group on Search Information

UPOV Meetings

1985

March 27 and 28 (Geneva) – Administrative and Legal Committee

March 29 (Geneva) – Consultative Committee

May 8 to 10 (Wageningen) – Technical Working Party on Automation and Computer Programs

June 4 to 7 (Hanover) – Technical Working Party for Agricultural Crops, and Subgroup

June 18 to 21 (Aarslev) – Technical Working Party for Fruit Crops, and Subgroup

June 24 to 27 (Aars and Aarslev) – Technical Working Party for Ornamental Plants and Forest Trees, and Subgroups

July 8 to 12 (Cambridge) – Technical Working Party for Vegetables, and Subgroup

October 14 (Geneva) – Consultative Committee

October 15 and 16 (Geneva) – Meeting with International Organizations

October 17 and 18 (Geneva) – Council

November 12 and 13 (Geneva) – Technical Committee

November 14 and 15 (Geneva) – Administrative and Legal Committee

Other Meetings Concerned with Industrial Property

1985

Center for the International Study of Industrial Property — January 28 to February 1 (Strasbourg) — Seminar on Legal Problems Concerning the European Patent Convention, the Paris Convention, the Patent Cooperation Treaty and the Community Patent Convention

European Patent Organisation — June 10 to 14 and December 4 to 7 (Munich) — Administrative Council

Hungarian Group of the International Association for the Protection of Industrial Property and the Hungarian Association for the Protection of Industrial Property — September 2 to 6 (Budapest) — Sixth International Conference on "New Technical Tendencies and Industrial Property Protection"

International Association for the Protection of Industrial Property — May 13 to 19 (Rio de Janeiro) — Executive Committee

International Federation of Industrial Property Attorneys — June 3 to 7 (Augsburg) — World Congress

Japanese Government — April 18 and 19 (Tokyo) — Celebration and Symposium Commemorating the Centenary of the Japanese Industrial Property System

1986

International Association for the Protection of Industrial Property — June 8 to 13 (London) — XXXIII Congress