

Published monthly
Annual subscription:
210 Swiss francs
Each monthly issue:
26 Swiss francs

Geneva
1st Year – No. 1
January 1995

(Industrial Property
34th Year – No. 1)

(Copyright
31st Year – No. 1)

Industrial Property and Copyright

Monthly Review of the
World Intellectual Property Organization

Contents

EDITOR'S NOTE

Announcement: Merger of WIPO Reviews, *Industrial Property* and *Copyright* 5

TREATIES (Status on January 1, 1995)

Convention Establishing the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) 6

Other Treaties Administered by WIPO:

Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property	10
Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works	14
Madrid Agreement for the Repression of False or Deceptive Indications of Source on Goods	18
Madrid Agreement Concerning the International Registration of Marks	19
Hague Agreement Concerning the International Deposit of Industrial Designs	21
Nice Agreement Concerning the International Classification of Goods and Services for the Purposes of the Registration of Marks	22
Lisbon Agreement for the Protection of Appellations of Origin and their International Registration	23
International Convention for the Protection of Performers, Producers of Phonograms and Broadcasting Organisations	24
Locarno Agreement Establishing an International Classification for Industrial Designs . . .	25
Patent Cooperation Treaty	26
Strasbourg Agreement Concerning the International Patent Classification	27
Convention for the Protection of Producers of Phonograms Against Unauthorized Duplication of Their Phonograms	28
Vienna Agreement Establishing an International Classification of the Figurative Elements of Marks	29
Convention Relating to the Distribution of Programme-Carrying Signals Transmitted by Satellite	29
Budapest Treaty on the International Recognition of the Deposit of Microorganisms for the Purposes of Patent Procedure	30
Nairobi Treaty on the Protection of the Olympic Symbol	31
Treaty on the International Registration of Audiovisual Works	31
Treaty on Intellectual Property in Respect of Integrated Circuits	32
Protocol Relating to the Madrid Agreement Concerning the International Registration of Marks (1989)	32
Trademark Law Treaty	32

[Continued overleaf]

WIPO 1995

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

International Convention for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants	33
Contribution Classes of States Members of WIPO and/or the Paris and/or Berne Unions	34
Treaties in the Field of Industrial Property Not Administered by WIPO:	
African Intellectual Property Organization	35
African Regional Industrial Property Organization	35
Benelux Trademark Office/Benelux Designs Office	35
Council of Europe	36
European Patent Organisation	36
Treaties in the Field of Copyright and Neighboring Rights Not Administered by WIPO:	
Universal Copyright Convention	37
European Agreement Concerning Programme Exchanges by Means of Television Films ..	38
European Agreement for the Prevention of Broadcasts Transmitted from Stations Outside National Territories	38
European Agreement on the Protection of Television Broadcasts	38
 GOVERNING BODIES OF WIPO, OF THE UNIONS ADMINISTERED BY WIPO AND THEIR (PERMANENT) COMMITTEES AND OF THE ROME CONVENTION (Status on January 1, 1995)	
WIPO	39
Paris Union	40
Berne Union	40
Madrid Union (Marks)	41
Hague Union	41
Nice Union	41
Lisbon Union	41
Locarno Union	41
PCT [Patent Cooperation Treaty] Union	41
IPC [International Patent Classification] Union	41
Vienna Union	41
Budapest Union	42
Intergovernmental Committee of the Rome Convention	42
FRT Union	42
Under Other Treaties:	
Intergovernmental Committee of the Universal Copyright Convention	42
 HIGH OFFICIALS OF WIPO (Status on January 1, 1995)	42
 HIGH OFFICIALS OF UPOV (Status on January 1, 1995)	42
 NOTIFICATIONS CONCERNING TREATIES ADMINISTERED BY WIPO	
Berne Convention. Accession: Russian Federation	43
Hague Agreement. The Hague Act (1960) and the Stockholm (Complementary) Act (1967). Accession: Slovenia	43
Phonograms Convention. Accession: Russian Federation	43
Budapest Treaty	
I. Extension of the List of Kinds of Microorganisms: National Bank for Industrial Microorganisms and Cell Cultures (NBIMCC) (Bulgaria)	43
II. Depositary Institutions Having Acquired the Status of International Depositary Authority (Status on January 1, 1995)	44
 NOTIFICATIONS CONCERNING THE UPOV CONVENTION	
International Convention for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants (UPOV). Accession: Argentina	56

ACTIVITIES OF WIPO

The World Intellectual Property Organization in 1994—An Overview of Activities and Developments	56
---	----

NORMATIVE ACTIVITIES OF WIPO

Paris Union. Diplomatic Conference for the Conclusion of the Trademark Law Treaty (Geneva, October 10 to 28, 1994)	62
Permanent Committee on Industrial Property Information (PCIPI). PCIPI Working Group on General Information (PCIPI/GI). Thirteenth Session (Geneva, October 3 to 7, 1994)	

REGISTRATION SYSTEMS ADMINISTERED BY WIPO

Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT)	68
Madrid Union	69
Hague Union	70

WIPO ARBITRATION CENTER

WIPO Arbitration Rules (Effective from October 1, 1994)	70
---	----

ACTIVITIES OF WIPO SPECIALLY DESIGNED FOR DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

Africa	87
Arab Countries	88
Asia and the Pacific	88
Latin America and the Caribbean	90
Development Cooperation (in General)	91

ACTIVITIES OF WIPO SPECIALLY DESIGNED FOR COUNTRIES IN TRANSITION TO MARKET ECONOMY

92

OTHER CONTACTS OF THE INTERNATIONAL BUREAU OF WIPO WITH GOVERNMENTS AND INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

93

MISCELLANEOUS NEWS

95

CALENDAR OF MEETINGS

96

INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY LAWS AND TREATIES
(INSERT)

Editor's Note

CROATIA

Announcement on the Extension of the Time Limit for the Refiling in Croatia of Industrial Property Applications Filed With the Former Federal Patent Office of Yugoslavia (of December 14, 1994)	Text I-001
--	------------

[Continued overleaf]

MULTILATERAL TREATIES**World Intellectual Property Organization**

Trademark Law Treaty (adopted at Geneva on October 27, 1994) Text 3-010

Regulations Under the Trademark Law Treaty (adopted at Geneva on October 27, 1994). Text 3-011

CUMULATIVE INDEX (of legal texts published from February 1976 to December 1994 as an annex to *Industrial Property*)**COPYRIGHT AND NEIGHBORING RIGHTS LAWS AND TREATIES
(INSERT)**

Editor's Note

BELGIUM

Law on Copyright and Neighboring Rights (of June 30, 1994) Text 1-01

Law Transposing to Belgian Law the European Directive of May 14, 1991, on the Legal Protection of Computer Programs (of June 30, 1994). Text 2-01

ESTONIACopyright Law (of November 11, 1992) (*Replacement sheet*) Text 1-01**CUMULATIVE INDEX (of legal texts published from January 1980 to December 1994 as an annex to *Copyright*)**

Editor's Note

ANNOUNCEMENT

Merger of WIPO Reviews, *Industrial Property* and *Copyright*

As of the present (January 1995) issue, the monthly reviews of the World Intellectual Property Organization, *Industrial Property* and *Copyright*, have been merged into a single monthly review under the title *Industrial Property and Copyright*. The annual subscription rate for the new review is 210 Swiss francs for Europe and outside Europe by surface mail, and 300 Swiss francs outside Europe by airmail.

As far as the legislative texts inserted in the former reviews are concerned, all subscribers to the new review will receive both sets of *Industrial Property Laws and Treaties* and *Copyright and Neighboring Rights Laws and Treaties*. It will no longer be possible to subscribe separately to the legislative texts only; the new review and the legislative inserts relating to the two fields of intellectual property will only be available as a single subscription.

It is, however, to be noted that, since April 1994, the International Bureau has been issuing a new CD-ROM product, entitled "IPLEX," which contains the texts of international treaties and regional and national legislation in the field of intellectual property. Information on subscription rates for IPLEX may be obtained from WIPO.

Treaties

(Status on January 1, 1995)

Convention Establishing the World Intellectual Property Organization

WIPO Convention (1967), amended in 1979

State	Date on which State became member of WIPO	Member also of Paris Union (P) and/or Berne Union (B) ¹	
Albania	June 30, 1992	-	B
Algeria	April 16, 1975	P	-
Andorra	October 28, 1994	-	-
Angola	April 15, 1985	-	-
Argentina	October 8, 1980	P	B
Armenia	April 22, 1993	P	-
Australia	August 10, 1972	P	B
Austria	August 11, 1973	P	B
Bahamas	January 4, 1977	P	B
Bangladesh	May 11, 1985	P	-
Barbados	October 5, 1979	P	B
Belarus	April 26, 1970	P	-
Belgium	January 31, 1975	P	B
Benin	March 9, 1975	P	B
Bhutan	March 16, 1994	-	-
Bolivia	July 6, 1993	P	B
Bosnia and Herzegovina	March 6, 1992	P	B
Brazil	March 20, 1975	P	B
Brunei Darussalam	April 21, 1994	-	-
Bulgaria	May 19, 1970	P	B
Burkina Faso	August 23, 1975	P	B
Burundi	March 30, 1977	P	-
Cameroon	November 3, 1973	P	B
Canada	June 26, 1970	P	B
Central African Republic	August 23, 1978	P	B
Chad	September 26, 1970	P	B
Chile	June 25, 1975	P	B
China	June 3, 1980	P	B
Colombia	May 4, 1980	-	B
Congo	December 2, 1975	P	B
Costa Rica	June 10, 1981	-	B
Côte d'Ivoire	May 1, 1974	P	B
Croatia	October 8, 1991	P	B
Cuba	March 27, 1975	P	-
Cyprus	October 26, 1984	P	B
Czech Republic	January 1, 1993	P	B
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	August 17, 1974	P	-
Denmark	April 26, 1970	P	B
Ecuador	May 22, 1988	-	B
Egypt	April 21, 1975	P	B

State	Date on which State became member of WIPO	Member also of Paris Union (P) and/or Berne Union (B) ¹	
El Salvador	September 18, 1979	P	B
Estonia	February 5, 1994	P	B
Fiji	March 11, 1972	-	B
Finland	September 8, 1970	P	B
France	October 18, 1974	P	B
Gabon	June 6, 1975	P	B
Gambia	December 10, 1980	P	B
Georgia	December 25, 1991	P	-
Germany	September 19, 1970	P	B
Ghana	June 12, 1976	P	B
Greece	March 4, 1976	P	B
Guatemala	April 30, 1983	-	-
Guinea	November 13, 1980	P	B
Guinea-Bissau	June 28, 1988	P	B
Guyana	October 25, 1994	P	B
Haiti	November 2, 1983	P	-
Holy See	April 20, 1975	P	B
Honduras	November 15, 1983	P	B
Hungary	April 26, 1970	P	B
Iceland	September 13, 1986	P	B
India	May 1, 1975	-	B
Indonesia	December 18, 1979	P	-
Iraq	January 21, 1976	P	-
Ireland	April 26, 1970	P	B
Israel	April 26, 1970	P	B
Italy	April 20, 1977	P	B
Jamaica	December 25, 1978	-	B
Japan	April 20, 1975	P	B
Jordan	July 12, 1972	P	-
Kazakhstan	December 25, 1991	P	-
Kenya	October 5, 1971	P	B
Kyrgyzstan	December 25, 1991	P	-
Laos	January 17, 1995	-	-
Latvia	January 21, 1993	P	-
Lebanon	December 30, 1986	P	B
Lesotho	November 18, 1986	P	B
Liberia	March 8, 1989	P	B
Libya	September 28, 1976	P	B
Liechtenstein	May 21, 1972	P	B
Lithuania	April 30, 1992	P	B
Luxembourg	March 19, 1975	P	B
Madagascar	December 22, 1989	P	B
Malawi	June 11, 1970	P	B
Malaysia	January 1, 1989	P	B
Mali	August 14, 1982	P	B

State	Date on which State became member of WIPO	Member also of Paris Union (P) and/or Berne Union (B) ¹	
Malta	December 7, 1977	P	B
Mauritania	September 17, 1976	P	B
Mauritius	September 21, 1976	P	B
Mexico	June 14, 1975	P	B
Monaco	March 3, 1975	P	B
Mongolia	February 28, 1979	P	-
Morocco	July 27, 1971	P	B
Namibia	December 23, 1991	-	B
Netherlands	January 9, 1975	P	B
New Zealand	June 20, 1984	P	B
Nicaragua	May 5, 1985	-	-
Niger	May 18, 1975	P	B
Nigeria	April 9, 1995	P	B
Norway	June 8, 1974	P	B
Pakistan	January 6, 1977	-	B
Panama	September 17, 1983	-	-
Paraguay	June 20, 1987	P	B
Peru	September 4, 1980	P	B
Philippines	July 14, 1980	P	B
Poland	March 23, 1975	P	B
Portugal	April 27, 1975	P	B
Qatar	September 3, 1976	-	-
Republic of Korea	March 1, 1979	P	-
Republic of Moldova	December 25, 1991	P	-
Romania	April 26, 1970	P	B
Russian Federation	April 26, 1970 ²	P	B
Rwanda	February 3, 1984	P	B
Saint Lucia	August 21, 1993	-	B
San Marino	June 26, 1991	P	-
Saudi Arabia	May 22, 1982	-	-
Senegal	April 26, 1970	P	B
Sierra Leone	May 18, 1986	-	-
Singapore	December 10, 1990	P	-
Slovakia	January 1, 1993	P	B
Slovenia	June 25, 1991	P	B
Somalia	November 18, 1982	-	-
South Africa	March 23, 1975	P	B
Spain	April 26, 1970	P	B
Sri Lanka	September 20, 1978	P	B
Sudan	February 15, 1974	P	-
Suriname	November 25, 1975	P	B
Swaziland	August 18, 1988	P	-
Sweden	April 26, 1970	P	B
Switzerland	April 26, 1970	P	B
Tajikistan	December 25, 1991	P	-

State	Date on which State became member of WIPO	Member also of Paris Union (P) and/or Berne Union (B) ¹	
Thailand	December 25, 1989	-	B
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	September 8, 1991	P	B
Togo	April 28, 1975	P	B
Trinidad and Tobago	August 16, 1988	P	B
Tunisia	November 28, 1975	P	B
Turkey	May 12, 1976	P	B
Uganda	October 18, 1973	P	-
Ukraine	April 26, 1970	P	-
United Arab Emirates	September 24, 1974	-	-
United Kingdom	April 26, 1970	P	B
United Republic of Tanzania	December 30, 1983	P	B
United States of America	August 25, 1970	P	B
Uruguay	December 21, 1979	P	B
Uzbekistan	December 25, 1991	P	-
Venezuela	November 23, 1984	-	B
Viet Nam	July 2, 1976	P	-
Yemen	March 29, 1979	-	-
Yugoslavia	October 11, 1973	P	B
Zaire	January 28, 1975	P	B
Zambia	May 14, 1977	P	B
Zimbabwe	December 29, 1981	P	B

(Total: 151 States)

¹ "P" means that the State is also a member of the International Union for the Protection of Industrial Property (Paris Union), founded by the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property.

"B" means that the State is also a member of the International Union for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works (Berne Union), founded by the Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works.

² Date of ratification of the Soviet Union, continued by the Russian Federation as from December 25, 1991.

Other Treaties Administered by WIPO

Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property

Paris Convention (1883), revised at Brussels (1900), Washington (1911), The Hague (1925),
London (1934), Lisbon (1958) and Stockholm (1967), and amended in 1979

(Paris Union)

State	Date on which State became party to the Convention	Latest Act ¹ of the Convention to which State is party and date on which State became party to that Act
Algeria	March 1, 1966	Stockholm: April 20, 1975 ²
Argentina	February 10, 1967	Lisbon: February 10, 1967 Stockholm, Articles 13 to 30: October 8, 1980
Armenia	December 25, 1991	Stockholm: December 25, 1991 ²
Australia	October 10, 1925	Stockholm, Articles 1 to 12: September 27, 1975 Stockholm, Articles 13 to 30: August 25, 1972
Austria	January 1, 1909	Stockholm: August 18, 1973
Bahamas	July 10, 1973	Lisbon: July 10, 1973 Stockholm, Articles 13 to 30: March 10, 1977
Bangladesh	March 3, 1991	Stockholm: March 3, 1991 ²
Barbados	March 12, 1985	Stockholm: March 12, 1985
Belarus	December 25, 1991	Stockholm: December 25, 1991 ²
Belgium	July 7, 1884	Stockholm: February 12, 1975
Benin	January 10, 1967	Stockholm: March 12, 1975
Bolivia	November 4, 1993	Stockholm: November 4, 1993
Bosnia and Herzegovina	March 6, 1992	Stockholm: March 6, 1992
Brazil	July 7, 1884	Stockholm, Articles 1 to 12: November 24, 1992 Stockholm, Articles 13 to 30: March 24, 1975 ²
Bulgaria	June 13, 1921	Stockholm, Articles 1 to 12: May 19 or 27, 1970 ³ Stockholm, Articles 13 to 30: May 27, 1970
Burkina Faso	November 19, 1963	Stockholm: September 2, 1975
Burundi	September 3, 1977	Stockholm: September 3, 1977
Cameroon	May 10, 1964	Stockholm: April 20, 1975
Canada	June 12, 1925	London: July 30, 1951 Stockholm, Articles 13 to 30: July 7, 1970
Central African Republic	November 19, 1963	Stockholm: September 5, 1978
Chad	November 19, 1963	Stockholm: September 26, 1970
Chile	June 14, 1991	Stockholm: June 14, 1991
China	March 19, 1985	Stockholm: March 19, 1985 ²
Congo	September 2, 1963	Stockholm: December 5, 1975
Côte d'Ivoire	October 23, 1963	Stockholm: May 4, 1974
Croatia	October 8, 1991	Stockholm: October 8, 1991
Cuba	November 17, 1904	Stockholm: April 8, 1975 ²
Cyprus	January 17, 1966	Stockholm: April 3, 1984
Czech Republic	January 1, 1993	Stockholm: January 1, 1993
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	June 10, 1980	Stockholm: June 10, 1980
Denmark ⁴	October 1, 1894	Stockholm, Articles 1 to 12: April 26 or May 19, 1970 ³ Stockholm, Articles 13 to 30: April 26, 1970
Dominican Republic	July 11, 1890	The Hague: April 6, 1951
Egypt	July 1, 1951	Stockholm: March 6, 1975 ²
El Salvador	February 19, 1994	Stockholm: February 19, 1994
Estonia	August 24, 1994 ⁵	Stockholm: August 24, 1994
Finland	September 20, 1921	Stockholm, Articles 1 to 12: October 21, 1975 Stockholm, Articles 13 to 30: September 15, 1970
France ⁶	July 7, 1884	Stockholm: August 12, 1975

State	Date on which State became party to the Convention	Latest Act ¹ of the Convention to which State is party and date on which State became party to that Act
Gabon	February 29, 1964	Stockholm: June 10, 1975
Gambia	January 21, 1992	Stockholm: January 21, 1992
Georgia	December 25, 1991	Stockholm: December 25, 1991 ²
Germany	May 1, 1903	Stockholm: September 19, 1970
Ghana	September 28, 1976	Stockholm: September 28, 1976
Greece	October 2, 1924	Stockholm: July 15, 1976
Guinea	February 5, 1982	Stockholm: February 5, 1982
Guinea-Bissau	June 28, 1988	Stockholm: June 28, 1988
Guyana	October 25, 1994	Stockholm: October 25, 1994
Haiti	July 1, 1958	Stockholm: November 3, 1983
Holy See	September 29, 1960	Stockholm: April 24, 1975
Honduras	February 4, 1994	Stockholm: February 4, 1994
Hungary	January 1, 1909	Stockholm, Articles 1 to 12: April 26 or May 19, 1970 ³ Stockholm, Articles 13 to 30: April 26, 1970 ²
Iceland	May 5, 1962	Stockholm, Articles 1 to 12: April 9, 1995 Stockholm, Articles 13 to 30: December 28, 1984
Indonesia	December 24, 1950	London: December 24, 1950 Stockholm, Articles 13 to 30: December 20, 1979 ²
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	December 16, 1959	Lisbon: January 4, 1962
Iraq	January 24, 1976	Stockholm: January 24, 1976 ²
Ireland	December 4, 1925	Stockholm, Articles 1 to 12: April 26 or May 19, 1970 ³ Stockholm, Articles 13 to 30: April 26, 1970
Israel	March 24, 1950	Stockholm, Articles 1 to 12: April 26 or May 19, 1970 ³ Stockholm, Articles 13 to 30: April 26, 1970
Italy	July 7, 1884	Stockholm: April 24, 1977
Japan	July 15, 1899	Stockholm, Articles 1 to 12: October 1, 1975 Stockholm, Articles 13 to 30: April 24, 1975
Jordan	July 17, 1972	Stockholm: July 17, 1972
Kazakhstan	December 25, 1991	Stockholm: December 25, 1991 ²
Kenya	June 14, 1965	Stockholm: October 26, 1971
Kyrgyzstan	December 25, 1991	Stockholm: December 25, 1991 ²
Latvia	September 7, 1993 ⁷	Stockholm: September 7, 1993
Lebanon	September 1, 1924	London: September 30, 1947 Stockholm, Articles 13 to 30: December 30, 1986 ²
Lesotho	September 28, 1989	Stockholm: September 28, 1989 ²
Liberia	August 27, 1994	Stockholm: August 27, 1994
Libya	September 28, 1976	Stockholm: September 28, 1976 ²
Liechtenstein	July 14, 1933	Stockholm: May 25, 1972
Lithuania	May 22, 1994	Stockholm: May 22, 1994
Luxembourg	June 30, 1922	Stockholm: March 24, 1975
Madagascar	December 21, 1963	Stockholm: April 10, 1972
Malawi	July 6, 1964	Stockholm: June 25, 1970
Malaysia	January 1, 1989	Stockholm: January 1, 1989
Mali	March 1, 1983	Stockholm: March 1, 1983
Malta	October 20, 1967	Lisbon: October 20, 1967 Stockholm, Articles 13 to 30: December 12, 1977 ²
Mauritania	April 11, 1965	Stockholm: September 21, 1976
Mauritius	September 24, 1976	Stockholm: September 24, 1976
Mexico	September 7, 1903	Stockholm: July 26, 1976
Monaco	April 29, 1956	Stockholm: October 4, 1975
Mongolia	April 21, 1985	Stockholm: April 21, 1985 ²
Morocco	July 30, 1917	Stockholm: August 6, 1971
Netherlands ⁸	July 7, 1884	Stockholm: January 10, 1975

State	Date on which State became party to the Convention	Latest Act ¹ of the Convention to which State is party and date on which State became party to that Act
New Zealand ⁹	July 29, 1931	London: July 14, 1946 Stockholm, Articles 13 to 30: June 20, 1984
Niger	July 5, 1964	Stockholm: March 6, 1975
Nigeria	September 2, 1963	Lisbon: September 2, 1963
Norway	July 1, 1885	Stockholm: June 13, 1974
Paraguay	May 28, 1994	Stockholm: May 28, 1994
Peru	April 11, 1995	Stockholm: April 11, 1995
Philippines	September 27, 1965	Lisbon: September 27, 1965 Stockholm, Articles 13 to 30: July 16, 1980
Poland	November 10, 1919	Stockholm: March 24, 1975
Portugal	July 7, 1884	Stockholm: April 30, 1975
Republic of Korea	May 4, 1980	Stockholm: May 4, 1980
Republic of Moldova	December 25, 1991	Stockholm: December 25, 1991 ²
Romania	October 6, 1920	Stockholm, Articles 1 to 12: April 26 or May 19, 1970 ³ Stockholm, Articles 13 to 30: April 26, 1970 ²
Russian Federation	July 1, 1965 ¹⁰	Stockholm, Articles 1 to 12: April 26 or May 19, 1970 ^{3, 10} Stockholm, Articles 13 to 30: April 26, 1970 ^{2, 10}
Rwanda	March 1, 1984	Stockholm: March 1, 1984
Saint Kitts and Nevis	April 9, 1995	Stockholm: April 9, 1995
San Marino	March 4, 1960	Stockholm: June 26, 1991
Senegal	December 21, 1963	Stockholm, Articles 1 to 12: April 26 or May 19, 1970 ³ Stockholm, Articles 13 to 30: April 26, 1970
Singapore	February 23, 1995	Stockholm: February 23, 1995
Slovakia	January 1, 1993	Stockholm: January 1, 1993
Slovenia	June 25, 1991	Stockholm: June 25, 1991
South Africa	December 1, 1947	Stockholm: March 24, 1975 ²
Spain	July 7, 1884	Stockholm: April 14, 1972
Sri Lanka	December 29, 1952	London: December 29, 1952 Stockholm, Articles 13 to 30: September 23, 1978
Sudan	April 16, 1984	Stockholm: April 16, 1984
Suriname	November 25, 1975	Stockholm: November 25, 1975
Swaziland	May 12, 1991	Stockholm: May 12, 1991
Sweden	July 1, 1885	Stockholm, Articles 1 to 12: October 9, 1970 Stockholm, Articles 13 to 30: April 26, 1970
Switzerland	July 7, 1884	Stockholm, Articles 1 to 12: April 26 or May 19, 1970 ³ Stockholm, Articles 13 to 30: April 26, 1970
Syria	September 1, 1924	London: September 30, 1947
Tajikistan	December 25, 1991	Stockholm: December 25, 1991 ²
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	September 8, 1991	Stockholm: September 8, 1991
Togo	September 10, 1967	Stockholm: April 30, 1975
Trinidad and Tobago	August 1, 1964	Stockholm: August 16, 1988
Tunisia	July 7, 1884	Stockholm: April 12, 1976 ²
Turkey	October 10, 1925	Stockholm, Articles 1 to 12: February 1, 1995 Stockholm, Articles 13 to 30: May 16, 1976
Uganda	June 14, 1965	Stockholm: October 20, 1973
Ukraine	December 25, 1991	Stockholm: December 25, 1991 ²
United Kingdom ¹¹	July 7, 1884	Stockholm, Articles 1 to 12: April 26 or May 19, 1970 ³ Stockholm, Articles 13 to 30: April 26, 1970
United Republic of Tanzania	June 16, 1963	Lisbon: June 16, 1963 Stockholm, Articles 13 to 30: December 30, 1983
United States of America ¹²	May 30, 1887	Stockholm, Articles 1 to 12: August 25, 1973 Stockholm, Articles 13 to 30: September 5, 1970

State	Date on which State became party to the Convention	Latest Act ¹ of the Convention to which State is party and date on which State became party to that Act
Uruguay	March 18, 1967	Stockholm: December 28, 1979
Uzbekistan	December 25, 1991	Stockholm: December 25, 1991 ²
Viet Nam	March 8, 1949	Stockholm: July 2, 1976 ²
Yugoslavia	February 26, 1921	Stockholm: October 16, 1973
Zaire	January 31, 1975	Stockholm: January 31, 1975
Zambia	April 6, 1965	Lisbon: April 6, 1965
		Stockholm, Articles 13 to 30: May 14, 1977
Zimbabwe	April 18, 1980	Stockholm: December 30, 1981

(Total: 129 States)

¹ "Stockholm" means the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property as revised at Stockholm on July 14, 1967 (Stockholm Act); "Lisbon" means the Paris Convention as revised at Lisbon on October 31, 1958 (Lisbon Act); "London" means the Paris Convention as revised at London on June 2, 1934 (London Act); "The Hague" means the Paris Convention as revised at The Hague on November 6, 1925 (Hague Act).

² With the declaration provided for in Article 28(2) of the Stockholm Act relating to the International Court of Justice.

³ These are the alternative dates of entry into force which the Director General of WIPO communicated to the States concerned.

⁴ Denmark extended the application of the Stockholm Act to the Farøe Islands with effect from August 6, 1971.

⁵ Estonia acceded to the Paris Convention (Washington Act, 1911) with effect from February 12, 1924. It lost its independence on August 6, 1940, and regained it on August 20, 1991.

⁶ Including all Overseas Departments and Territories.

⁷ Latvia acceded to the Paris Convention (Washington Act, 1911) with effect from August 20, 1925. It lost its independence on July 21, 1940, and regained it on August 21, 1991.

⁸ Ratification for the Kingdom in Europe, the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba.

⁹ The accession of New Zealand to the Stockholm Act, with the exception of Articles 1 to 12, extends to the Cook Islands, Niue and Tokelau.

¹⁰ Date of adherence of the Soviet Union, continued by the Russian Federation as from December 25, 1991.

¹¹ The United Kingdom extended the application of the Stockholm Act to the territory of Hong Kong with effect from November 16, 1977, and to the Isle of Man with effect from October 29, 1983.

¹² The United States of America extended the application of the Stockholm Act to all territories and possessions of the United States of America, including the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, as from August 25, 1973.

Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works

Berne Convention (1886), completed at Paris (1896), revised at Berlin (1908), completed at Berne (1914), revised at Rome (1928), at Brussels (1948), at Stockholm (1967) and at Paris (1971), and amended in 1979

(Berne Union)

State	Date on which State became party to the Convention	Latest Act ¹ of the Convention to which State is party and date on which State became party to that Act
Albania	March 6, 1994	Paris: March 6, 1994
Argentina	June 10, 1967	Brussels: June 10, 1967 Paris, Articles 22 to 38: October 8, 1980
Australia	April 14, 1928	Paris: March 1, 1978
Austria	October 1, 1920	Paris: August 21, 1982
Bahamas	July 10, 1973	Brussels: July 10, 1973 Paris, Articles 22 to 38: January 8, 1977 ²
Barbados	July 30, 1983	Paris: July 30, 1983
Belgium	December 5, 1887	Brussels: August 1, 1951 Stockholm, Articles 22 to 38: February 12, 1975
Benin	January 3, 1961 ³	Paris: March 12, 1975
Bolivia	November 4, 1993	Paris: November 4, 1993
Bosnia and Herzegovina	March 6, 1992	Paris: March 6, 1992 ⁴
Brazil	February 9, 1922	Paris: April 20, 1975
Bulgaria	December 5, 1921	Paris: December 4, 1974
Burkina Faso	August 19, 1963 ⁵	Paris: January 24, 1976
Cameroon	September 21, 1964 ³	Paris, Articles 1 to 21: October 10, 1974 Paris, Articles 22 to 38: November 10, 1973 Rome: August 1, 1931 Stockholm, Articles 22 to 38: July 7, 1970
Canada	April 10, 1928	Paris: September 3, 1977
Central African Republic	September 3, 1977	Brussels: November 25, 1971 ^{6,7} Stockholm, Articles 22 to 38: November 25, 1971
Chad	November 25, 1971	Paris: July 10, 1975
Chile	June 5, 1970	Paris: October 15, 1992 ⁸
China	October 15, 1992	Paris: March 7, 1988
Colombia	March 7, 1988	Paris: December 5, 1975
Congo	May 8, 1962 ³	Paris: June 10, 1978
Costa Rica	June 10, 1978	Paris, Articles 1 to 21: October 10, 1974 Paris, Articles 22 to 38: May 4, 1974
Côte d'Ivoire	January 1, 1962	Paris: October 8, 1991 ⁴
Croatia	October 8, 1991	Paris: July 27, 1983 ⁴
Cyprus	February 24, 1964 ³	Paris: January 1, 1993
Czech Republic	January 1, 1993	Paris: June 30, 1979
Denmark	July 1, 1903	Paris: October 9, 1991
Ecuador	October 9, 1991	Paris: June 7, 1977 ^{2,8}
Egypt	June 7, 1977	Paris: February 19, 1994
El Salvador	February 19, 1994	Paris: October 26, 1994
Estonia	October 26, 1994 ⁹	Brussels: December 1, 1971 Stockholm, Articles 22 to 38: March 15, 1972
Fiji	December 1, 1971 ³	Paris: November 1, 1986
Finland	April 1, 1928	Paris, Articles 1 to 21: October 10, 1974 Paris, Articles 22 to 38: December 15, 1972
France	December 5, 1887	Paris: June 10, 1975
Gabon	March 26, 1962	Paris: March 7, 1993
Gambia	March 7, 1993	Paris, Articles 1 to 21: October 10, 1974 ¹⁰ Paris, Articles 22 to 38: January 22, 1974
Germany	December 5, 1887	

State	Date on which State became part to the Convention	Latest Act ¹ of the Convention to which State is party and date on which State became party to that Act
Ghana	October 11, 1991	Paris: October 11, 1991
Greece	November 9, 1920	Paris: March 8, 1976
Guinea	November 20, 1980	Paris: November 20, 1980
Guinea-Bissau	July 22, 1991	Paris: July 22, 1991
Guyana	October 25, 1994	Paris: October 25, 1994
Holy See	September 12, 1935	Paris: April 24, 1975
Honduras	January 25, 1990	Paris: January 25, 1990
Hungary	February 14, 1922	Paris, Articles 1 to 21: October 10, 1974 Paris, Articles 22 to 38: December 15, 1972
Iceland	September 7, 1947	Rome: September 7, 1947 ⁴ Paris, Articles 22 to 38: December 28, 1984
India	April 1, 1928	Paris, Articles 1 to 21: May 6, 1984 ^{8,11,12} Paris, Articles 22 to 38: January 10, 1975 ²
Ireland	October 5, 1927	Brussels: July 5, 1959 Stockholm, Articles 22 to 38: December 21, 1970
Israel	March 24, 1950	Brussels: August 1, 1951 Stockholm, Articles 22 to 38: January 29 or February 26, 1970 ¹³
Italy	December 5, 1887	Paris: November 14, 1979
Jamaica	January 1, 1994	Paris: January 1, 1994 ⁸
Japan	July 15, 1899	Paris: April 24, 1975
Kenya	June 11, 1993	Paris: June 11, 1993
Lebanon	September 30, 1947	Rome: September 30, 1947
Lesotho	September 28, 1989	Paris: September 28, 1989 ^{2,8}
Liberia	March 8, 1989	Paris: March 8, 1989 ^{2,8}
Libya	September 28, 1976	Paris: September 28, 1976 ²
Liechtenstein	July 30, 1931	Brussels: August 1, 1951 Stockholm, Articles 22 to 38: May 25, 1972
Lithuania	December 14, 1994	Paris: December 14, 1994 ²
Luxembourg	June 20, 1888	Paris: April 20, 1975
Madagascar	January 1, 1966	Brussels: January 1, 1966
Malawi	October 12, 1991	Paris: October 12, 1991
Malaysia	October 1, 1990	Paris: October 1, 1990 ⁸
Mali	March 19, 1962 ³	Paris: December 5, 1977
Malta	September 21, 1964	Rome: September 21, 1964 Paris, Articles 22 to 38: December 12, 1977 ²
Mauritania	February 6, 1973	Paris: September 21, 1976
Mauritius	May 10, 1989	Paris: May 10, 1989 ^{2,8}
Mexico	June 11, 1967	Paris: December 17, 1974 ⁸
Monaco	May 30, 1889	Paris: November 23, 1974
Morocco	June 16, 1917	Paris: May 17, 1987
Namibia	March 21, 1990	Paris: December 24, 1993
Netherlands	November 1, 1912	Paris, Articles 1 to 21: January 30, 1986 ¹⁴ Paris, Articles 22 to 38: January 10, 1975 ¹⁵
New Zealand	April 24, 1928	Rome: December 4, 1947
Niger	May 2, 1962 ³	Paris: May 21, 1975
Nigeria	September 14, 1993	Paris: September 14, 1993
Norway	April 13, 1896	Brussels: January 28, 1963 ¹⁰ Paris, Articles 22 to 38: June 13, 1974
Pakistan	July 5, 1948	Rome: July 5, 1948 ⁶ Stockholm, Articles 22 to 38: January 29 or February 26, 1970 ¹³
Paraguay	January 2, 1992	Paris: January 2, 1992
Peru	August 20, 1988	Paris: August 20, 1988

State	Date on which State became party to the Convention	Latest Act ¹ of the Convention to which State is party and date on which State became party to that Act
Philippines	August 1, 1951	Brussels: August 1, 1951
Poland	January 28, 1920	Paris, Articles 22 to 38: July 16, 1980 Paris, Articles 1 to 21: October 22, 1994 Paris, Articles 22 to 38: August 4, 1990
Portugal	March 29, 1911	Paris: January 12, 1979 ¹⁶
Romania	January 1, 1927	Rome: August 6, 1936 ⁶ Stockholm, Articles 22 to 38: January 29 or February 26, 1970 ^{2,13}
Russian Federation	March 13, 1995	Paris: March 13, 1995
Rwanda	March 1, 1984	Paris: March 1, 1984
Saint Kitts and Nevis	April 9, 1995	Paris: April 9, 1995
Saint Lucia	August 24, 1993	Paris: August 24, 1993 ²
Senegal	August 25, 1962	Paris: August 12, 1975
Slovakia	January 1, 1993	Paris: January 1, 1993
Slovenia	June 25, 1991	Paris: June 25, 1991 ⁴
South Africa	October 3, 1928	Brussels: August 1, 1951 Paris, Articles 22 to 38: March 24, 1975 ²
Spain	December 5, 1887	Paris, Articles 1 to 21: October 10, 1974 Paris, Articles 22 to 38: February 19, 1974
Sri Lanka	July 20, 1959 ³	Rome: July 20, 1959 Paris, Articles 22 to 38: September 23, 1978
Suriname	February 23, 1977	Paris: February 23, 1977
Sweden	August 1, 1904	Paris, Articles 1 to 21: October 10, 1974 Paris, Articles 22 to 38: September 20, 1973
Switzerland	December 5, 1887	Paris: September 25, 1993
Thailand	July 17, 1931	Berlin: July 17, 1931 ¹⁷ Paris, Articles 22 to 38: December 29, 1980 ²
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	September 8, 1991	Paris: September 8, 1991 ⁴
Togo	April 30, 1975	Paris: April 30, 1975
Trinidad and Tobago	August 16, 1988	Paris: August 16, 1988
Tunisia	December 5, 1887	Paris: August 16, 1975 ²
Turkey	January 1, 1952	Brussels: January 1, 1952 ⁴
United Kingdom	December 5, 1887	Paris: January 2, 1990 ¹⁰
United Republic of Tanzania	July 25, 1994	Paris: July 25, 1994 ^{2,8}
United States of America	March 1, 1989	Paris: March 1, 1989
Uruguay	July 10, 1967	Paris: December 28, 1979
Venezuela	December 30, 1982	Paris: December 30, 1982 ²
Yugoslavia	June 17, 1930	Paris: September 2, 1975 ⁴
Zaire	October 8, 1963 ³	Paris: January 31, 1975
Zambia	January 2, 1992	Paris: January 2, 1992
Zimbabwe	April 18, 1980	Rome: April 18, 1980 Paris, Articles 22 to 38: December 30, 1981

(Total: 111 States)

¹ "Paris" means the Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works as revised at Paris on July 24, 1971 (Paris Act); "Stockholm" means the said Convention as revised at Stockholm on July 14, 1967 (Stockholm Act); "Brussels" means the said Convention as revised at Brussels on June 26, 1948 (Brussels Act); "Rome" means the said Convention as revised at Rome on June 2, 1928 (Rome Act); "Berlin" means the said Convention as revised at Berlin on November 13, 1908 (Berlin Act).

² With the declaration provided for in Article 33(2) relating to the International Court of Justice.

³ Date on which the declaration of continued adherence was sent, after the accession of the State to independence.

⁴ Subject to the reservation concerning the right of translation.

⁵ Burkina Faso, which had acceded to the Berne Convention (Brussels Act) as from August 19, 1963, denounced the said Convention as from September 20, 1970. Later on, Burkina Faso acceded again to the Berne Convention (Paris Act); this accession took effect on January 24, 1976.

⁶ This State deposited its instrument of ratification of (or of accession to) the Stockholm Act in its entirety; however, Articles 1 to 21 (substantive clauses) of the said Act have not entered into force.

⁷ In accordance with the provision of Article 29 of the Stockholm Act applicable to the States outside the Union which accede to the said Act, this State is bound by Articles 1 to 20 of the Brussels Act.

⁸ Pursuant to Article I of the Appendix of the Paris Act, this State availed itself of the faculties provided for in Articles II and III of the said Appendix. The relevant declaration was effective until October 10, 1994.

⁹ Estonia acceded to the Berne Convention (Berlin Act, 1908) with effect from June 9, 1927. It lost its independence on August 6, 1940, and regained it on August 20, 1991.

¹⁰ This State has declared that it admits the application of the Appendix of the Paris Act to works of which it is the State of origin by States which have made a declaration under Article VI(1)(i) of the Appendix or a notification under Article I of the Appendix. The declarations took effect on October 18, 1973, for Germany, on March 8, 1974, for Norway and on September 27, 1971, for the United Kingdom.

¹¹ This State declared that its ratification shall not apply to the provisions of Article 14*bis* (2)(*b*) of the Paris Act (presumption of legitimation for some authors who have brought contributions to the making of the cinematographic work).

¹² This State notified the designation of the competent authority provided by Article 15(4) of the Paris Act.

¹³ These are the alternative dates of entry into force which the Director General of WIPO communicated to the States concerned.

¹⁴ Ratification for the Kingdom in Europe.

¹⁵ Ratification for the Kingdom in Europe. Articles 22 to 38 of the Paris Act apply also to the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba.

¹⁶ Pursuant to the provisions of Article 14*bis* (2)(*c*) of the Paris Act, this State has made a declaration to the effect that the undertaking by authors to bring contributions to the making of a cinematographic work must be in a written agreement. This declaration was received on November 5, 1986.

¹⁷ Subject to reservations concerning works of applied art, conditions and formalities required for protection, the right of translation, the right of reproduction of articles published in newspapers or periodicals, the right of performance, and the application of the Convention to works not yet in the public domain at the date of its coming into force.

Madrid Agreement for the Repression of False or Deceptive Indications of Source on Goods

Madrid Agreement (Indications of Source) (1891), revised at Washington (1911), The Hague (1925), London (1934) and Lisbon (1958), and supplemented by the Additional Act of Stockholm (1967)

State	Date on which State became party to the Agreement	Latest Act of the Agreement to which State is party and date on which State became party to that Act (see, however, for some States, the Additional Act of Stockholm)	Date on which State became party to the Additional Act of Stockholm
Algeria	July 5, 1972	Lisbon: July 5, 1972	July 5, 1972
Brazil	October 3, 1896	The Hague: October 26, 1929	-
Bulgaria	August 12, 1975	Lisbon: August 12, 1975	August 12, 1975
Cuba	January 1, 1905	Lisbon: October 11, 1964	October 7, 1980
Czech Republic	January 1, 1993	Lisbon: January 1, 1993	January 1, 1993
Dominican Republic	April 6, 1951	The Hague: April 6, 1951	-
Egypt	July 1, 1952	Lisbon: March 6, 1975	March 6, 1975
France ¹	July 15, 1892	Lisbon: June 1, 1963	August 12, 1975
Germany	June 12, 1925	Lisbon: June 1, 1963	September 19, 1970
Hungary	June 5, 1934	Lisbon: March 23, 1967	April 26, 1970
Ireland	December 4, 1925	Lisbon: June 9, 1967	April 26, 1970
Israel	March 24, 1950	Lisbon: July 2, 1967	April 26, 1970
Italy	March 5, 1951	Lisbon: December 29, 1968	April 24, 1977
Japan	July 8, 1953	Lisbon: August 21, 1965	April 24, 1975
Lebanon	September 1, 1924	London: September 30, 1947	-
Liechtenstein	July 14, 1933	Lisbon: April 10, 1972	May 25, 1972
Monaco	April 29, 1956	Lisbon: June 1, 1963	October 4, 1975
Morocco	July 30, 1917	Lisbon: May 15, 1967	-
New Zealand	July 29, 1931	London: May 17, 1947	-
Poland	December 10, 1928	The Hague: December 10, 1928	-
Portugal	October 31, 1893	London: November 7, 1949	-
San Marino	September 25, 1960	Lisbon: June 26, 1991	June 26, 1991
Slovakia	January 1, 1993	Lisbon: January 1, 1993	January 1, 1993
Spain	July 15, 1892	Lisbon: August 14, 1973	August 14, 1973
Sri Lanka	December 29, 1952	London: December 29, 1952	-
Sweden	January 1, 1934	Lisbon: October 3, 1969	April 26, 1970
Switzerland	July 15, 1892	Lisbon: June 1, 1963	April 26, 1970
Syria	September 1, 1924	London: September 30, 1947	-
Tunisia	July 15, 1892	London: October 4, 1942	-
Turkey	August 21, 1930	London: June 27, 1957	-
United Kingdom	July 15, 1892	Lisbon: June 1, 1963	April 26, 1970

(Total: 31 States)

¹ Including all Overseas Departments and Territories.

Madrid Agreement Concerning the International Registration of Marks

Madrid Agreement (Marks) (1891), revised at
Brussels (1900), Washington (1911),
The Hague (1925), London (1934), Nice (1957) and Stockholm (1967), and amended in 1979
(Madrid Union)

State ¹	Date on which State became party to the Agreement	Date on which State became party to the Stockholm Act (1967)
Algeria	July 5, 1972	July 5, 1972
Armenia	December 25, 1991	December 25, 1991
Austria	January 1, 1909	August 18, 1973
Belarus	December 25, 1991	December 25, 1991
Belgium ²	July 15, 1892	February 12, 1975
Bosnia and Herzegovina	March 6, 1992	March 6, 1992
Bulgaria	August 1, 1985	August 1, 1985
China ³	October 4, 1989	October 4, 1989
Croatia	October 8, 1991	October 8, 1991
Cuba ³	December 6, 1989	December 6, 1989
Czech Republic	January 1, 1993	January 1, 1993
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	June 10, 1980	June 10, 1980
Egypt	July 1, 1952	March 6, 1975
France ⁵	July 15, 1892	August 12, 1975
Germany	December 1, 1922	September 19, or December 22, 1970 ⁴
Hungary	January 1, 1909	September 19, or December 22, 1970 ⁴
Italy	October 15, 1894	April 24, 1977
Kazakhstan	December 25, 1991	December 25, 1991
Kyrgyzstan	December 25, 1991	December 25, 1991
Latvia	January 1, 1995	January 1, 1995
Liechtenstein	July 14, 1933	May 25, 1972
Luxembourg ²	September 1, 1924	March 24, 1975
Monaco	April 29, 1956	October 4, 1975
Mongolia ³	April 21, 1985	April 21, 1985
Morocco	July 30, 1917	January 24, 1976
Netherlands ^{2,6}	March 1, 1893	March 6, 1975
Poland ³	March 18, 1991	March 18, 1991
Portugal	October 31, 1893	November 22, 1988
Republic of Moldova	December 25, 1991	December 25, 1991
Romania	October 6, 1920	September 19, or December 22, 1970 ⁴
Russian Federation	July 1, 1976 ⁷	July 1, 1976 ⁷
San Marino	September 25, 1960	June 26, 1991
Slovakia	January 1, 1993	January 1, 1993
Slovenia	June 25, 1991	June 25, 1991
Spain	July 15, 1892	June 8, 1979
Sudan	May 16, 1984	May 16, 1984
Switzerland	July 15, 1892	September 19, or December 22, 1970 ⁴
Tajikistan	December 25, 1991	December 25, 1991
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	September 8, 1991	September 8, 1991
Ukraine	December 25, 1991	December 25, 1991
Uzbekistan	December 25, 1991	December 25, 1991
Viet Nam	March 8, 1949	July 2, 1976
Yugoslavia	February 26, 1921	October 16, 1973

(Total: 43 States)

¹ All the States have declared, under Article 3*bis* of the Nice or Stockholm Act, that the protection arising from international registration shall not extend to them unless the proprietor of the mark so requests.

² As from January 1, 1971, the territories in Europe of Belgium, Luxembourg and the Netherlands are, for the application of the Madrid Agreement (Marks), to be deemed a single country.

³ In accordance with Article 14(2), this State declared that the application of the Stockholm Act was limited to marks registered from the date on which accession entered into force: China: October 4, 1989; Cuba: December 6, 1989; Mongolia: April 21, 1985; Poland: March 18, 1991.

⁴ These are the alternative dates of entry into force which the Director General of WIPO communicated to the States concerned.

⁵ Including all Overseas Departments and Territories.

⁶ The instrument of ratification of the Stockholm Act was deposited for the Kingdom in Europe.

⁷ Date of accession by the Soviet Union, continued by the Russian Federation as from December 25, 1991.

Hague Agreement Concerning the International Deposit of Industrial Designs

Hague Agreement (1925), revised at London (1934) and The Hague (1960),¹ supplemented by the Additional Act of Monaco (1961),² the Complementary Act of Stockholm (1967) and the Protocol of Geneva (1975),³ and amended in 1979

(Hague Union)

State	Date on which State became party to the Agreement	Date on which State became party to the London Act	Date on which State became party to the Hague Act ¹	Date on which State became party to the Complementary Act of Stockholm
Belgium ^{4,5}	April 1, 1979	-	August 1, 1984	May 28, 1979
Benin.....	November 2, 1986	November 2, 1986	November 2, 1986	January 2, 1987
Côte d'Ivoire.....	May 30, 1993	May 30, 1993	May 30, 1993	May 30, 1993
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	May 27, 1992	-	May 27, 1992	May 27, 1992
Egypt.....	July 1, 1952	July 1, 1952	-	-
France ⁶	October 20, 1930	June 25, 1939	August 1, 1984	September 27, 1975
Germany	June 1, 1928	June 13, 1939	August 1, 1984	September 27, 1975
Holy See	September 29, 1960	September 29, 1960	-	-
Hungary ⁷	April 7, 1984	April 7, 1984	August 1, 1984	April 7, 1984
Indonesia.....	December 24, 1950	December 24, 1950	-	-
Italy.....	June 13, 1987	-	June 13, 1987	August 13, 1987
Liechtenstein.....	July 14, 1933	January 28, 1951	August 1, 1984	September 27, 1975
Luxembourg ⁵	April 1, 1979	-	August 1, 1984	May 28, 1979
Monaco	April 29, 1956	April 29, 1956	August 1, 1984	September 27, 1975
Morocco	October 20, 1930	January 21, 1941	-	-
Netherlands ^{4,5}	April 1, 1979	-	August 1, 1984 ⁸	May 28, 1979 ⁸
Republic of Moldova	March 14, 1994	-	March 14, 1994	March 14, 1994
Romania	July 18, 1992	-	July 18, 1992	July 18, 1992
Senegal	June 30, 1984	June 30, 1984	August 1, 1984	June 30, 1984
Slovenia	January 13, 1995	-	January 13, 1995	January 13, 1995
Spain	June 1, 1928	March 2, 1956	-	-
Suriname.....	November 25, 1975	November 25, 1975	August 1, 1984	February 23, 1977
Switzerland.....	June 1, 1928	November 24, 1939	August 1, 1984	September 27, 1975
Tunisia	October 20, 1930	October 4, 1942	-	-
Yugoslavia	December 30, 1993	-	December 30, 1993	December 30, 1993

(Total: 25 States)

¹ The Protocol to the Hague Act (1960) is not yet in force. It has been ratified by or acceded to by the following States: Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Liechtenstein, Monaco, Netherlands, Switzerland.

² The Additional Act of Monaco (1961) is in force in respect of the following States as from the dates indicated: France (December 1, 1962), Germany (December 1, 1962), Liechtenstein (July 9, 1966), Monaco (September 14, 1963), Netherlands (as far as the Netherlands Antilles is concerned) (September 14, 1963), Spain (August 31, 1969), Suriname (November 25, 1975) and Switzerland (December 21, 1962). See also footnote 4.

³ The Protocol of Geneva (1975), in accordance with Article 11(2)(a) thereof, ceased to have effect as of August 1, 1984; however, as provided by Article 11(2)(b), States bound by the Protocol (Belgium (as from April 1, 1979), France (as from February 18, 1980), Germany (as from December 26, 1981), Hungary (as from April 7, 1984), Liechtenstein (as from April 1, 1979), Luxembourg (as from April 1, 1979), Monaco (as from March 5, 1981), Netherlands (as from April 1, 1979), Senegal (as from June 30, 1984), Suriname (as from April 1, 1979) and Switzerland (as from April 1, 1979)) are not relieved of their obligations thereunder in respect of industrial designs whose date of international deposit is prior to August 1, 1984.

⁴ Belgium had withdrawn from the Hague Union with effect from January 1, 1975. The Netherlands had denounced, in respect of the Kingdom in Europe and with effect from January 1, 1975, the Hague Agreement (1925) and the subsequent Acts to which the Netherlands had adhered, specifying that the said Agreement and Acts – London Act (1934) and Additional Act of Monaco (1961) – would remain in force in respect of the Netherlands Antilles and Suriname. As a result of their ratification of the Protocol of Geneva (1975) and its entry into force on April 1, 1979, Belgium and the Netherlands became, again, as from that date, members of the Hague Union.

⁵ The territories in Europe of Belgium, Luxembourg and the Netherlands are, for the application of the Hague Agreement, to be deemed a single country.

⁶ Including all Overseas Departments and Territories.

⁷ With the declaration that Hungary does not consider itself bound by the Protocol annexed to the Hague Act (1960).

⁸ Ratification for the Kingdom in Europe.

Nice Agreement Concerning the International Classification of Goods and Services for the Purposes of the Registration of Marks

Nice Agreement (1957), revised at Stockholm (1967) and at Geneva (1977), and amended in 1979

(Nice Union)

State	Date on which State became party to the Agreement	Latest Act of the Agreement to which State is party and date on which it became party to that Act
Algeria	July 5, 1972	Stockholm: July 5, 1972
Australia	April 8, 1961	Geneva: February 6, 1979
Austria	November 30, 1969	Geneva: August 21, 1982
Barbados	March 12, 1985	Geneva: March 12, 1985
Belgium	June 6, 1962	Geneva: November 20, 1984
Benin	February 6, 1979	Geneva: February 6, 1979
Bosnia and Herzegovina	March 6, 1992	Geneva: March 23, 1994
China	August 9, 1994	Geneva: August 9, 1994
Croatia	October 8, 1991	Geneva: October 29, 1992
Czech Republic	January 1, 1993	Geneva: January 1, 1993
Denmark ¹	November 30, 1961	Geneva: June 3, 1981
Finland	August 18, 1973	Geneva: February 6, 1979
France ²	April 8, 1961	Geneva: April 22, 1980
Germany	January 29, 1962	Geneva: January 12, 1982
Hungary	March 23, 1967	Geneva: August 21, 1982
Iceland	April 9, 1995	Geneva: April 9, 1995
Ireland	December 12, 1966	Geneva: February 6, 1979
Israel	April 8, 1961	Stockholm: November 12, 1969, or March 18, 1970 ³
Italy	April 8, 1961	Geneva: February 19, 1983
Japan	February 20, 1990	Geneva: February 20, 1990
Latvia	January 1, 1995	Geneva: January 1, 1995
Lebanon	April 8, 1961	Nice: April 8, 1961
Liechtenstein	May 29, 1967	Geneva: February 14, 1987
Luxembourg	March 24, 1975	Geneva: December 21, 1983
Monaco	April 8, 1961	Geneva: May 9, 1981
Morocco	October 1, 1966	Stockholm: January 24, 1976
Netherlands ⁴	August 20, 1962	Geneva: August 15, 1979
Norway	July 28, 1961	Geneva: July 7, 1981
Portugal	April 8, 1961	Geneva: July 30, 1982
Russian Federation	July 26, 1971 ⁵	Geneva: December 30, 1987 ⁵
Slovakia	January 1, 1993	Geneva: January 1, 1993
Slovenia	June 25, 1991	Geneva: September 30, 1992
Spain	April 8, 1961	Geneva: May 9, 1979
Suriname	December 16, 1981	Geneva: December 16, 1981
Sweden	July 28, 1961	Geneva: February 6, 1979
Switzerland	August 20, 1962	Geneva: April 22, 1986
Tajikistan	December 25, 1991	Geneva: December 25, 1991
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	September 8, 1991	Geneva: October 26, 1993
Tunisia	May 29, 1967	Nice: May 29, 1967
United Kingdom	April 15, 1963	Geneva: July 3, 1979
United States of America	May 25, 1972	Geneva: February 29, 1984
Yugoslavia	August 30, 1966	Stockholm: October 16, 1973

(Total: 42 States)

¹ Denmark extended the application of the Stockholm Act to the Farøe Islands with effect from October 28, 1972.

² Including all Overseas Departments and Territories.

³ These are the alternative dates of entry into force which the Director General of WIPO communicated to the States concerned.

⁴ The Netherlands had extended the application of the Geneva Act to Aruba with effect from November 8, 1986, but on February 20, 1994, suspended that application retroactively as from that date for an indefinite period. The said suspension was terminated with effect on February 28, 1994.

⁵ Date of adherence of the Soviet Union, continued by the Russian Federation as from December 25, 1991.

**Lisbon Agreement for the Protection of Appellations of Origin and
their International Registration**

Lisbon Agreement (1958), revised at Stockholm (1967), and amended in 1979

(Lisbon Union)

State	Date on which State became party to the Agreement	Latest Act of the Agreement to which State is party and date on which it became party to Act
Algeria	July 5, 1972	Stockholm: October 31, 1973
Bulgaria	August 12, 1975	Stockholm: August 12, 1975
Burkina Faso	September 2, 1975	Stockholm: September 2, 1975
Congo	November 16, 1977	Stockholm: November 16, 1977
Cuba	September 25, 1966	Stockholm: April 8, 1975
Czech Republic	January 1, 1993	Stockholm: January 1, 1993
France ¹	September 25, 1966	Stockholm: August 12, 1975
Gabon	June 10, 1975	Stockholm: June 10, 1975
Haiti	September 25, 1966	Lisbon: September 25, 1966
Hungary	March 23, 1967	Stockholm: October 31, 1973
Israel	September 25, 1966	Stockholm: October 31, 1973
Italy	December 29, 1968	Stockholm: April 24, 1977
Mexico	September 25, 1966	Lisbon: September 25, 1966
Portugal	September 25, 1966	Stockholm: April 17, 1991
Slovakia	January 1, 1993	Stockholm: January 1, 1993
Togo	April 30, 1975	Stockholm: April 30, 1975
Tunisia	October 31, 1973	Stockholm: October 31, 1973

(Total: 17 States)

¹ Including all Overseas Departments and Territories.

**International Convention for the Protection of Performers,
Producers of Phonograms and Broadcasting Organisations***

Rome Convention (1961)

State	Date on which State became party to the Convention	State	Date on which State became party to the Convention
Argentina	March 2, 1992	Iceland ¹	June 15, 1994
Australia ¹	September 30, 1992	Ireland ¹	September 19, 1979
Austria ¹	June 9, 1973	Italy ¹	April 8, 1975
Barbados	September 18, 1983	Jamaica	January 27, 1994
Bolivia	November 24, 1993	Japan ¹	October 26, 1989
Brazil	September 29, 1965	Lesotho ¹	January 26, 1990
Burkina Faso	January 14, 1988	Luxembourg ¹	February 25, 1976
Chile	September 5, 1974	Mexico	May 18, 1964
Colombia	September 17, 1976	Monaco ¹	December 6, 1985
Congo ¹	May 18, 1964	Netherlands ^{1,2}	October 7, 1993
Costa Rica	September 9, 1971	Niger ¹	May 18, 1964
Czech Republic ¹	January 1, 1993	Nigeria ¹	October 29, 1993
Denmark ¹	September 23, 1965	Norway ¹	July 10, 1978
Dominican Republic	January 27, 1987	Panama	September 2, 1983
Ecuador	May 18, 1964	Paraguay	February 26, 1970
El Salvador	June 29, 1979	Peru	August 7, 1985
Fiji ¹	April 11, 1972	Philippines	September 25, 1984
Finland ¹	October 21, 1983	Slovakia ¹	January 1, 1993
France ¹	July 3, 1987	Spain ¹	November 14, 1991
Germany ¹	October 21, 1966	Sweden ¹	May 18, 1964
Greece	January 6, 1993	Switzerland ¹	September 24, 1993
Guatemala	January 14, 1977	United Kingdom ¹	May 18, 1964
Honduras	February 16, 1990	Uruguay	July 4, 1977
Hungary	February 10, 1995		

Total: 47 States)

* The secretarial tasks relating to this Convention are performed jointly with the International Labour Office and Unesco.

¹ The instruments of ratification or accession deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations by the following States contain declarations made under the articles mentioned hereafter (with reference to publication in *Le Droit d'auteur (Copyright)* for the years 1962 to 1964 and in *Copyright* since 1965):

Australia, Articles 5(3) (concerning Article 5(1)(c)), 6(2), 16(1)(a)(i) and (1)(b) [1992, p. 301];

Austria, Article 16(1)(a)(iii) and (iv) and (1)(b) [1973, p. 67];

Czech Republic, Article 16(1)(a)(iii) and (iv) [1964, p. 110];

Congo, Articles 5(3) (concerning Article 5(1)(c)) and 16(1)(a)(i) [1964, p. 127];

Denmark, Articles 6(2), 16(1)(a)(ii) and (iv) and 17 [1965, p. 214];

Fiji, Articles 5(3) (concerning Article 5(1)(b)), 6(2) and 16(1)(a)(i) [1972, pp. 88 and 178];

Finland, Articles 16(1)(a)(i), (ii) and (iv) and 17 [1983, p. 287 and 1994, p. 152];

France, Articles 5(3) and 16(1)(a)(iii) and (iv) [1987, p. 184];

Germany, Articles 5(3) (concerning Article 5(1)(b)) and 16(1)(a)(iv) [1966, p. 237];

Iceland, Articles 5(3) (concerning Article 5(1)(b)), 6(2) and 16(1)(a)(i), (ii), (iii) and (iv) [1994, p. 152];

Ireland, Articles 5(3) (concerning Article 5(1)(b)), 6(2) and 16(1)(a)(ii) [1979, p. 218];

Italy, Articles 6(2), 16(1)(a)(ii), (iii) and (iv), 16(1)(b) and 17 [1975, p. 44];

Japan, Articles 5(3) (concerning Article 5(1)(c)) and 16(1)(a)(ii) and (iv) [1989, p. 288];

Lesotho, Article 16(1)(a)(ii) and (1)(b) [1990, p. 95];

Luxembourg, Articles 5(3) (concerning Article 5(1)(c)), 16(1)(a)(i) and (1)(b) [1976, p. 24];

Monaco, Articles 5(3) (concerning Article 5(1)(c)), 16(1)(a)(i) and (1)(b) [1985, p. 422];

Netherlands, Article 16(1)(a)(iii) and (iv) [1993, p. 253];

Niger, Articles 5(3) (concerning Article 5(1)(c)) and 16(1)(a)(i) [1963, p. 155];

Nigeria, Articles 5(3) (concerning Article 5(1)(c)), 6(2) and 16(1)(a)(ii), (iii) and (iv) [1993, p. 253];

Norway, Articles 6(2) and 16(1)(a)(ii), (iii) and (iv) [1978, p. 133; in respect of Article 16(1)(a)(ii) modified: 1989, p. 288];

Slovakia, Article 16(1)(a)(iii) and (iv) [1964, p. 110];

Spain, Articles 5(3) (concerning Article 5(1)(c)), 6(2) and 16(1)(a)(iii) and (iv) [1991, p. 221];

Sweden, Article 16(1)(b) [1962, p. 138; 1986, p. 382];

Switzerland, Articles 5(3) (concerning Article 5(1)(b)) and 16(1)(a)(iii) and (iv) [1993, p. 254];

United Kingdom, Articles 5(3) (concerning Article 5(1)(b)), 6(2) and 16(1)(a)(ii), (iii) and (iv) [1963, p. 244]; the same declarations were made for Gibraltar and Bermuda [1967, p. 36; 1970, p. 108].

² Accession for the Kingdom in Europe.

Locarno Agreement Establishing an International Classification for Industrial Designs

Locarno Agreement (1968), amended in 1979

(Locarno Union)

State	Date on which State became party to the Agreement	State	Date on which State became party to the Agreement
Austria	September 26, 1990	Netherlands ²	March 30, 1977
Bosnia and Herzegovina	March 6, 1992	Norway	April 27, 1971
Croatia	October 8, 1991	Russian Federation	December 15, 1972 ³
Czech Republic	January 1, 1993	Slovakia	January 1, 1993
Denmark	April 27, 1971	Slovenia	June 25, 1991
Finland	May 16, 1972	Spain	November 17, 1973
France ¹	September 13, 1975	Sweden	April 27, 1971
Germany	October 25, 1990	Switzerland	April 27, 1971
Hungary	January 1, 1974	Tajikistan	December 25, 1991
Iceland	April 9, 1995	The former Yugoslav	
Ireland	April 27, 1971	Republic of Macedonia	September 8, 1991
Italy	August 12, 1975	Yugoslavia	October 16, 1973

(Total: 23 States)

¹ Including all Overseas Departments and Territories.

² The Netherlands extended the application of the Locarno Agreement to Aruba with effect from November 8, 1986.

³ Date of ratification of the Soviet Union, continued by the Russian Federation as from December 25, 1991.

Patent Cooperation Treaty

PCT (Washington, 1970), amended in 1979 and modified in 1984

(PCT Union)

State	Date on which State became party to the Treaty	State	Date on which State became party to the Treaty
Armenia ¹	December 25, 1991	Liechtenstein ⁴	March 19, 1980
Australia	March 31, 1980	Lithuania	July 5, 1994
Austria	April 23, 1979	Luxembourg	April 30, 1978
Barbados	March 12, 1985	Madagascar	January 24, 1978
Belarus ¹	December 25, 1991	Malawi	January 24, 1978
Belgium	December 14, 1981	Mali	October 19, 1984
Benin	February 26, 1987	Mauritania	April 13, 1983
Brazil	April 9, 1978	Mexico	January 1, 1995
Bulgaria	May 21, 1984	Monaco	June 22, 1979
Burkina Faso	March 21, 1989	Mongolia	May 27, 1991
Cameroon	January 24, 1978	Netherlands ⁵	July 10, 1979
Canada	January 2, 1990	New Zealand	December 1, 1992
Central African Republic	January 24, 1978	Niger	March 21, 1993
Chad	January 24, 1978	Norway ²	January 1, 1980
China	January 1, 1994	Poland ⁶	December 25, 1990
Congo	January 24, 1978	Portugal	November 24, 1992
Côte d'Ivoire	April 30, 1991	Republic of Korea	August 10, 1984
Czech Republic	January 1, 1993	Republic of Moldova ¹	December 25, 1991
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	July 8, 1980	Romania ¹	July 23, 1979
Denmark	December 1, 1978	Russian Federation ¹	March 29, 1978 ⁷
Estonia	August 24, 1994	Senegal	January 24, 1978
Finland ²	October 1, 1980	Singapore	February 23, 1995
France ^{1,3}	February 25, 1978	Slovakia	January 1, 1993
Gabon	January 24, 1978	Slovenia	March 1, 1994
Georgia ¹	December 25, 1991	Spain ⁴	November 16, 1989
Germany	January 24, 1978	Sri Lanka	February 26, 1982
Greece ⁴	October 9, 1990	Sudan	April 16, 1984
Guinea	May 27, 1991	Swaziland	September 20, 1994
Hungary ¹	June 27, 1980	Sweden ²	May 17, 1978
Iceland	March 23, 1995	Switzerland ⁴	January 24, 1978
Ireland	August 1, 1992	Tajikistan ¹	December 25, 1991
Italy	March 28, 1985	Togo	January 24, 1978
Japan	October 1, 1978	Trinidad and Tobago	March 10, 1994
Kazakhstan ¹	December 25, 1991	Uganda	February 9, 1995
Kenya	June 8, 1994	Ukraine ¹	December 25, 1991
Kyrgyzstan ¹	December 25, 1991	United Kingdom ⁸	January 24, 1978
Latvia	September 7, 1993	United States of America ^{9,10}	January 24, 1978
Liberia	August 27, 1994	Uzbekistan ¹	December 25, 1991
		Viet Nam	March 10, 1993

(Total: 77 States)

¹ With the declaration provided for in Article 64(5).

² With the declaration provided for in Article 64(2)(a)(ii).

³ Including all Overseas Departments and Territories.

⁴ With the declaration provided for in Article 64(1)(a).

⁵ Ratification for the Kingdom in Europe, the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba.

⁶ With the declaration provided for in Article 64(2)(a)(i) and (ii). The declaration provided for in Article 64(2)(a)(i) was withdrawn with effect from March 1, 1994.

⁷ Date of ratification of the Soviet Union, continued by the Russian Federation as from December 25, 1991.

⁸ The United Kingdom extended the application of the PCT to the territory of Hong Kong with effect from April 15, 1981, and to the Isle of Man with effect from October 29, 1983.

⁹ With the declarations provided for in Article 64(3)(a) and (4)(a).

¹⁰ Extends to all areas for which the United States of America has international responsibility.

INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITIES UNDER ARTICLE 16 OF THE PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

The Patent Offices of Australia, Austria, China, Japan, the Russian Federation, Spain, Sweden, the United States of America, and the European Patent Office.

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITIES UNDER ARTICLE 32 OF THE PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

The Patent Offices of Australia, Austria, China, Japan, the Russian Federation, Sweden, the United Kingdom (in respect of demands for international preliminary examination made on or before May 28, 1993), the United States of America, and the European Patent Office.

Strasbourg Agreement Concerning the International Patent Classification

Strasbourg Agreement (1971), amended in 1979

(IPC Union)

State	Date on which State became party to the Agreement	State	Date on which State became party to the Agreement
Australia ¹	November 12, 1975	Luxembourg ²	April 9, 1977
Austria	October 7, 1975	Monaco ²	June 13, 1976
Belgium ²	July 4, 1976	Netherlands ³	October 7, 1975
Brazil	October 7, 1975	Norway ¹	October 7, 1975
Canada	January 11, 1996	Portugal	May 1, 1979
Czech Republic	January 1, 1993	Russian Federation	October 3, 1976 ⁴
Denmark	October 7, 1975	Slovakia	January 1, 1993
Egypt	October 17, 1975	Spain ^{1,2}	November 29, 1975
Finland ¹	May 16, 1976	Suriname	November 25, 1975
France ²	October 7, 1975	Sweden	October 7, 1975
Germany	October 7, 1975	Switzerland	October 7, 1975
Ireland ¹	October 7, 1975	Tajikistan	December 25, 1991
Israel	October 7, 1975	United Kingdom ¹	October 7, 1975
Italy ²	March 30, 1980	United States of America	October 7, 1975
Japan	August 18, 1977		

(Total: 29 States)

¹ With the reservation provided for in Article 4(4)(i).

² With the reservation provided for in Article 4(4)(ii).

³ Ratification for the Kingdom in Europe, the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba.

⁴ Accession by the Soviet Union, continued by the Russian Federation as from December 25, 1991.

**Convention for the Protection of Producers of Phonograms
Against Unauthorized Duplication of Their Phonograms**

Phonograms Convention (Geneva, 1971)

State	Date on which State became party to the Convention	State	Date on which State became party to the Convention
Argentina	June 30, 1973	Israel	May 1, 1978
Australia	June 22, 1974	Italy ¹	March 24, 1977
Austria	August 21, 1982	Jamaica	January 11, 1994
Barbados	July 29, 1983	Japan	October 14, 1978
Brazil	November 28, 1975	Kenya	April 21, 1976
Burkina Faso	January 30, 1988	Luxembourg	March 8, 1976
Chile	March 24, 1977	Mexico	December 21, 1973
China	April 30, 1993	Monaco	December 2, 1974
Colombia	May 16, 1994	Netherlands ²	October 12, 1993
Costa Rica	June 17, 1982	New Zealand	August 13, 1976
Cyprus	September 30, 1993	Norway	August 1, 1978
Czech Republic	January 1, 1993	Panama	June 29, 1974
Denmark	March 24, 1977	Paraguay	February 13, 1979
Ecuador	September 14, 1974	Peru	August 24, 1985
Egypt	April 23, 1978	Republic of Korea	October 10, 1987
El Salvador	February 9, 1979	Russian Federation	March 13, 1995
Fiji	April 18, 1973	Slovakia	January 1, 1993
Finland ¹	April 18, 1973	Spain	August 24, 1974
France	April 18, 1973	Sweden	April 18, 1973
Germany	May 18, 1974	Switzerland	September 30, 1993
Greece	February 9, 1994	Trinidad and Tobago	October 1, 1988
Guatemala	February 1, 1977	United Kingdom	April 18, 1973
Holy See	July 18, 1977	United States of America	March 10, 1974
Honduras	March 6, 1990	Uruguay	January 18, 1983
Hungary	May 28, 1975	Venezuela	November 18, 1982
India	February 12, 1975	Zaire	November 29, 1977

(Total: 52 States)

¹ This State has declared, in accordance with Article 7(4) of the Convention, that it will apply the criterion according to which it affords protection to producers of phonograms solely on the basis of the place of first fixation instead of the criterion of the nationality of the producer.

² Accession for the Kingdom in Europe.

Vienna Agreement Establishing an International Classification of the Figurative Elements of Marks

Vienna Agreement (1973), amended in 1985

(Vienna Union)

State	Date on which State became party to the Agreement	State	Date on which State became party to the Agreement
France	August 9, 1985	Sweden	August 9, 1985
Luxembourg	August 9, 1985	Tunisia	August 9, 1985
Netherlands ¹	August 9, 1985		

(Total: 5 States)

¹ Ratification for the Kingdom in Europe.

Convention Relating to the Distribution of Programme-Carrying Signals Transmitted by Satellite

Satellites Convention (Brussels, 1974)

State	Date on which State became party to the Convention	State	Date on which State became party to the Convention
Armenia	December 13, 1993	Morocco	June 30, 1983
Australia	October 26, 1990	Nicaragua	August 25, 1979
Austria	August 6, 1982	Panama	September 25, 1985
Bosnia and Herzegovina	March 6, 1992	Peru	August 7, 1985
Croatia	October 8, 1991	Russian Federation	January 20, 1989 ²
Germany ¹	August 25, 1979	Slovenia	June 25, 1991
Greece	October 22, 1991	Switzerland	September 24, 1993
Italy ¹	July 7, 1981	United States of America	March 7, 1985
Kenya	August 25, 1979	Yugoslavia	August 25, 1979
Mexico	August 25, 1979		

(Total: 19 States)

¹ With a declaration, pursuant to Article 2(2) of the Convention, that the protection accorded under Article 2(1) is restricted in its territory to a period of 25 years after the expiry of the calendar year in which the transmission by satellite has occurred.

² Date of accession by the Soviet Union, continued by the Russian Federation as from December 25, 1991.

Budapest Treaty on the International Recognition of the Deposit of Microorganisms for the Purposes of Patent Procedure

Budapest Treaty (1977), modified in 1980

(Budapest Union)

State	Date on which State became party to the Treaty	State	Date on which State became party to the Treaty
Australia	July 7, 1987	Netherlands ¹	July 2, 1987
Austria	April 26, 1984	Norway	January 1, 1986
Belgium	December 15, 1983	Philippines	October 21, 1981
Bulgaria	August 19, 1980	Poland	September 22, 1993
Cuba	February 19, 1994	Republic of Korea	March 28, 1988
Czech Republic	January 1, 1993	Republic of Moldova	December 25, 1991
Denmark	July 1, 1985	Russian Federation	April 22, 1981 ²
Finland	September 1, 1985	Singapore	February 23, 1995
France	August 19, 1980	Slovakia	January 1, 1993
Germany	January 20, 1981	Spain	March 19, 1981
Greece	October 30, 1993	Sweden	October 1, 1983
Hungary	August 19, 1980	Switzerland	August 19, 1981
Iceland	March 23, 1995	Tajikistan	December 25, 1991
Italy	March 23, 1986	Trinidad and Tobago	March 10, 1994
Japan	August 19, 1980	United Kingdom	December 29, 1980
Latvia	December 29, 1994	United States of America	August 19, 1980
Liechtenstein	August 19, 1981	Yugoslavia	February 25, 1994
(Total: 34 States)			

¹ Ratification for the Kingdom in Europe, the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba.

² Date of ratification of the Soviet Union, continued by the Russian Federation as from December 25, 1991.

DECLARATIONS OF ACCEPTANCE FILED UNDER ARTICLE 9(1)(a) OF THE BUDAPEST TREATY BY INTERGOVERNMENTAL INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATIONS

Organization	Effective date
European Patent Organisation (EPO)	November 26, 1980

INTERNATIONAL DEPOSITARY AUTHORITIES UNDER ARTICLE 7 OF THE BUDAPEST TREATY¹

Institution	Country	Date status acquired
All-Union Scientific Centre of Antibiotics (VNIIA)	Russian Federation	August 31, 1987
Agricultural Research Service Culture Collection (NRRL)	United States of America	January 31, 1981
American Type Culture Collection (ATCC)	United States of America	January 31, 1981
Australian Government Analytical Laboratories (AGAL)	Australia	September 30, 1988
Belgian Coordinated Collections of Microorganisms (BCCM)	Belgium	March 1, 1992
Centraalbureau voor Schimmelcultures (CBS)	Netherlands	October 1, 1981
Colección Española de Cultivos Tipo (CECT)	Spain	May 31, 1992
Collection Nationale de Cultures de Micro-organismes (CNCM)	France	August 31, 1984
Culture Collection of Algae and Protozoa (CCAP)	United Kingdom	September 30, 1982
Culture Collection of Yeasts (CCI)	Slovakia	August 31, 1992
Czech Collection of Microorganisms (CCM)	Czech Republic	August 31, 1992
DSM – Deutsche Sammlung von Mikroorganismen und Zellkulturen GmbH (DSM)	Germany	October 1, 1981
European Collection of Animal Cell Cultures (ECACC)	United Kingdom	September 30, 1984
International Mycological Institute (IMI)	United Kingdom	March 31, 1983
Korean Cell Line Research Foundation (KCLRF)	Republic of Korea	August 31, 1993
Korean Collection for Type Cultures (KCTC)	Republic of Korea	June 30, 1990
Korean Culture Center of Microorganisms (KCCM)	Republic of Korea	June 30, 1990
National Bank for Industrial Microorganisms and Cell Cultures (NBIMCC)	Bulgaria	October 31, 1987
National Collection of Agricultural and Industrial Microorganisms (NCAIM)	Hungary	June 1, 1986
National Collection of Food Bacteria (NCFB)	United Kingdom	February 28, 1990
National Collection of Type Cultures (NCTC)	United Kingdom	August 31, 1982
National Collection of Yeast Cultures (NCYC)	United Kingdom	January 31, 1982
National Collections of Industrial and Marine Bacteria Limited (NCIMB)	United Kingdom	March 31, 1982
National Institute of Bioscience and Human-Technology (NIBH)	Japan	May 1, 1981
Russian Collection of Microorganisms (VKM)	Russian Federation	August 31, 1987
Russian National Collection of Industrial Microorganisms (VKPM), GNII Genetika	Russian Federation	August 31, 1987
(Total: 26 Authorities)		

¹ A list of the kinds of microorganisms that may be deposited with, and the amount of fees charged by, the international depositary authorities appears under "Notifications Concerning Treaties Administered by WIPO" in *Industrial Property and Copyright*, 1995, pp. 44-55.

Nairobi Treaty on the Protection of the Olympic Symbol

Nairobi Treaty (1981)

State	Date on which State became party to the Treaty	State	Date on which State became party to the Treaty
Algeria	August 16, 1984	Italy	October 25, 1985
Argentina	January 10, 1986	Jamaica	March 17, 1984
Barbados	February 28, 1986	Kenya	September 25, 1982
Belarus	December 25, 1991	Mexico	May 16, 1985
Bolivia	August 11, 1985	Morocco	November 11, 1993
Brazil	August 10, 1984	Oman	March 26, 1986
Bulgaria	May 6, 1984	Qatar	July 23, 1983
Chile	December 14, 1983	Republic of Moldova	December 25, 1991
Congo	March 8, 1983	Russian Federation	April 17, 1986 ¹
Cuba	October 21, 1984	San Marino	March 18, 1986
Cyprus	August 11, 1985	Senegal	August 6, 1984
Egypt	October 1, 1982	Sri Lanka	February 19, 1984
El Salvador	October 14, 1984	Syria	April 13, 1984
Equatorial Guinea	September 25, 1982	Tajikistan	December 25, 1991
Ethiopia	September 25, 1982	Togo	December 8, 1983
Greece	August 29, 1983	Tunisia	May 21, 1983
Guatemala	February 21, 1983	Uganda	October 21, 1983
India	October 19, 1983	Uruguay	April 16, 1984

(Total: 36 States)

¹ Date of ratification by the Soviet Union, continued by the Russian Federation as from December 25, 1991.

Treaty on the International Registration of Audiovisual Works

Film Register Treaty (Geneva, 1989)

(FRT Union)

State	Date on which State became party to the Treaty	State	Date on which State became party to the Treaty
Argentina	July 29, 1992	Czech Republic	January 1, 1993
Austria	February 27, 1991	France	February 27, 1991
Brazil	June 26, 1993	Mexico	February 27, 1991
Burkina Faso	February 27, 1991	Peru	July 27, 1994
Chile	December 29, 1993	Senegal	April 3, 1994
Colombia	May 9, 1994	Slovakia	January 1, 1993

(Total: 12 States)

Treaty on Intellectual Property in Respect of Integrated Circuits*

(Washington, 1989)

Signatory States

China, Egypt, Ghana, Guatemala, India, Liberia, Yugoslavia, Zambia (8)

Ratification

Egypt (1).

* This instrument is not yet in force.**Protocol Relating to the Madrid Agreement
Concerning the International Registration of Marks (1989)****Signatory States*

Austria, Belgium, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Senegal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom, Yugoslavia (27).

*Ratification*Spain,
Sweden (2).

* This instrument is not yet in force.**Trademark Law Treaty***

(Geneva, 1994)

Signatory States

Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Indonesia, Israel, Italy, Kenya, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Senegal, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Swaziland, Switzerland, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States of America, Uruguay (39).

* This instrument, which is open for signature until October 27, 1995, is not yet in force.

International Convention for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants*

UPOV Convention (1961), as revised at Geneva (1972, 1978 and 1991¹)

State	Date on which State became party to the Convention	No. of contribution units	Date on which State became party to the Convention of 1961	Date on which State became party to the 1978 Act
Argentina	December 25, 1994	0.2	-	December 25, 1994
Australia	March 1, 1989	1.0	-	March 1, 1989
Austria	July 14, 1994	1.5	-	July 14, 1994
Belgium ^{2,3}	December 5, 1976	1.5	December 5, 1976	-
Canada	March 4, 1991	1.0	-	March 4, 1991
Czech Republic	January 1, 1993	0.5	-	January 1, 1993
Denmark ^{2,4}	October 6, 1968	1.5	October 6, 1968	November 8, 1981
Finland	April 16, 1993	1.0	-	April 16, 1993
France ^{2,3,5}	October 3, 1971	5.0	October 3, 1971	March 17, 1983
Germany ²	August 10, 1968	5.0	August 10, 1968	April 12, 1986
Hungary	April 16, 1983	0.5	-	April 16, 1983
Ireland	November 8, 1981	1.0	-	November 8, 1981
Israel ²	December 12, 1979	0.5	December 12, 1979	May 12, 1984
Italy ²	July 1, 1977	2.0	July 1, 1977	May 28, 1986
Japan	September 3, 1982	5.0	-	September 3, 1982
Netherlands ²	August 10, 1968	3.0	August 10, 1968	September 2, 1984 ⁶
New Zealand	November 8, 1981	1.0	-	November 8, 1981
Norway	September 13, 1993	1.0	-	September 13, 1993
Poland	November 11, 1989	0.5	-	November 11, 1989
Slovakia	January 1, 1993	0.5	-	January 1, 1993
South Africa ²	November 6, 1977	1.0	November 6, 1977	November 8, 1981
Spain ^{2,7}	May 18, 1980	1.5	May 18, 1980	-
Sweden ²	December 17, 1971	1.5	December 17, 1971	January 1, 1983
Switzerland ²	July 10, 1977	1.5	July 10, 1977	November 8, 1981
United Kingdom ²	August 10, 1968	5.0	August 10, 1968	September 24, 1983
United States of America ⁸	November 8, 1981	5.0	-	November 8, 1981
Uruguay	November 13, 1994	0.2	-	November 13, 1994

(Total: 27 States)

* UPOV is an independent intergovernmental organization having legal personality. Pursuant to an agreement concluded between WIPO and UPOV, the Director General of WIPO is the Secretary-General of UPOV and WIPO provides administrative and financial services for UPOV.

¹ The 1991 Act is not yet in force. It was signed by the following States: Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Netherlands, New Zealand, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom, United States of America (16).

² The Additional Act of 1972 is in force in respect of the following States as from the dates indicated hereafter: Belgium (February 11, 1977); Denmark (February 11, 1977); France (February 11, 1977); Germany (February 11, 1977); Israel (December 12, 1979); Italy (July 1, 1977); Netherlands (February 11, 1977); South Africa (November 6, 1977); Spain (May 18, 1980); Sweden (February 11, 1977); Switzerland (July 10, 1977); United Kingdom (July 31, 1980).

³ With a notification under Article 34(2) of the 1978 Act.

⁴ With a declaration that the Convention of 1961, the Additional Act of 1972 and the 1978 Act do not bind Greenland and the Farøe Islands.

⁵ With a declaration that the 1978 Act applies to the territory of the French Republic, including the Overseas Departments and Territories.

⁶ Ratification for the Kingdom in Europe. The Netherlands extended the application of the 1978 Act to Aruba with effect from November 8, 1986.

⁷ With a declaration that the Convention of 1961 and the Additional Act of 1972 apply to the entire territory of Spain.

⁸ With a notification under Article 37(1) and (2) of the 1978 Act.

CONTRIBUTION CLASSES OF STATES MEMBERS OF WIPO
AND/OR THE PARIS AND/OR BERNE UNIONS*

Albania	IX	Guinea	Ster	Peru	S
Algeria	VII	Guinea-Bissau	Ster	Philippines	S
Andorra	IX	Guyana	Sbis	Poland	VI
Angola	Ster			Portugal	IVbis
Argentina	VIbis	Haiti	Ster		
Armenia	IX	Holy See	VIII	Qatar	S
Australia	III	Honduras	Sbis		
Austria	IVbis	Hungary	VI	Republic of Korea	VII
				Republic of Moldova	IX
Bahamas	S	Iceland	VIII	Romania	VIbis
Bangladesh	Ster	India	VIbis	Russian Federation	IV
Barbados	Sbis	Indonesia	VII	Rwanda	Ster
Belarus	IX	Iran (Islamic Republic of)	VII	Saint Kitts and Nevis	Sbis
Belgium	III	Iraq	IX	Saint Lucia	Sbis
Benin	Ster	Ireland	IV	San Marino	IX
Bhutan	Ster	Israel	VIbis	Saudi Arabia	VII
Bolivia	Sbis	Italy	III	Senegal	Sbis
Bosnia and Herzegovina	VIII			Sierra Leone	Ster
Brazil	VIbis	Jamaica	Sbis	Singapore	IX
Brunei Darussalam	S	Japan	I	Slovakia	V
Bulgaria	VIbis	Jordan	Sbis	Slovenia	VII
Burkina Faso	Ster			Somalia	Ster
Burundi	Ster	Kazakhstan	IX	South Africa	IVbis
		Kenya	Sbis	Spain	IV
Cameroon	Sbis	Kyrgyzstan	IX	Sri Lanka	Sbis
Canada	IV			Sudan	Ster
Central African Republic	Ster	Laos	Ster	Suriname	Sbis
Chad	Ster	Latvia	IX	Swaziland	Sbis
Chile	S	Lebanon	Sbis	Sweden	III
China	IVbis	Lesotho	Ster	Switzerland	III
Colombia	IX	Liberia	Ster	Syria	S
Congo	Sbis	Libya	VIbis		
Costa Rica	Sbis	Liechtenstein	VIII	Tajikistan	IX
Côte d'Ivoire	Sbis	Lithuania	IX	Thailand	IX
Croatia	VIII	Luxembourg	VII	The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	VIII
Cuba	S			Togo	Ster
Cyprus	S	Madagascar	Ster	Trinidad and Tobago	S
Czech Republic	V	Malawi	Ster	Tunisia	S
		Malaysia	VIII	Turkey	VIbis
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	S	Mali	Ster		
Denmark	IV	Malta	Sbis	Uganda	Ster
Dominican Republic	Sbis	Mauritania	Ster	Ukraine	IX
		Mauritius	Sbis	United Arab Emirates	IX
Ecuador	S	Mexico	IVbis	United Kingdom	I
Egypt	S	Monaco	VII	United Republic of Tanzania	Ster
El Salvador	Sbis	Mongolia	Sbis	United States of America	I
Estonia	IX	Morocco	S	Uruguay	S
				Uzbekistan	IX
Fiji	Sbis	Namibia	Sbis		
Finland	IV	Netherlands	III	Venezuela	IX
France	I	New Zealand	VI	Viet Nam	Sbis
		Nicaragua	Sbis		
Gabon	Sbis	Niger	Ster	Yemen	Ster
Gambia	Ster	Nigeria	VII	Yugoslavia	VIbis
Georgia	IX	Norway	IV		
Germany	I			Zaire	Ster
Ghana	Sbis	Pakistan	S	Zambia	Ster
Greece	VI	Panama	Sbis	Zimbabwe	Sbis
Guatemala	S	Paraguay	Sbis		

(Total: 155 States)

* The unitary contribution system established with effect from January 1, 1994, replaces the separate contribution systems of WIPO and the six Contribution-financed Unions, that is, each State pays one contribution, irrespective of whether it is a member of WIPO or of one or more of the Contribution-financed Unions. Under the unitary contribution system, there are the following classes corresponding to the units of contribution indicated between parentheses: I (25), II (20), III (15), IV (10), IVbis (7.5), V (5), VI (3), VIbis (2), VII (1), VIII (1/2), IX (1/4), S (1/8), Sbis (1/16) and Ster (1/32).

Treaties in the Field of Industrial Property Not Administered by WIPO

AFRICAN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION (OAPI)

Libreville Agreement (1962), as revised at Bangui (1977)

State	Latest Act of the Agreement to which State is party and date on which State became party to that Act
Benin	Bangui: March 19, 1983
Burkina Faso	Bangui: June 1, 1983
Cameroon	Bangui: February 8, 1982
Central African Republic	Bangui: February 8, 1982
Chad	Bangui: November 5, 1988
Congo	Bangui: February 8, 1982
Côte d'Ivoire	Bangui: February 8, 1982
Gabon	Bangui: February 8, 1982
Guinea	Bangui: January 13, 1990
Mali	Bangui: September 30, 1984
Mauritania	Bangui: February 8, 1982
Niger	Bangui: February 8, 1982
Senegal	Bangui: February 8, 1982
Togo	Bangui: February 8, 1982

(Total: 14 States)

AFRICAN REGIONAL INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION (ARIPO)*

Lusaka Agreement on the Creation of the African Regional Industrial Property Organization (1976)

State	Date on which State became party to the Agreement
Botswana	February 6, 1985
Gambia	February 15, 1978
Ghana	February 15, 1978
Kenya	February 15, 1978
Lesotho	July 23, 1987
Malawi	February 15, 1978
Sierra Leone	December 5, 1980
Somalia	March 10, 1981
Sudan	May 2, 1978
Swaziland	December 17, 1987
Uganda	August 8, 1978
United Republic of Tanzania	October 12, 1983
Zambia	February 15, 1978
Zimbabwe	November 11, 1980

(Total: 14 States)

Harare Protocol on Patents and Industrial Designs Within the Framework of the African Regional Industrial Property Organization (1982)

State	Date on which State became party to the Protocol
Botswana	May 6, 1985
Gambia	January 16, 1986
Ghana	April 25, 1984
Kenya	October 24, 1984
Lesotho	October 23, 1987
Malawi	April 25, 1984
Sudan	April 25, 1984
Swaziland	March 17, 1988
Uganda	April 25, 1984
Zambia	February 26, 1986
Zimbabwe	April 25, 1984

(Total: 11 States)

BENELUX TRADEMARK OFFICE (BBM) BENELUX DESIGNS OFFICE (BBDM)

Benelux Convention on Marks (1962)

State	Date on which State became party to the Convention
Belgium	July 1, 1969
Luxembourg	July 1, 1969
Netherlands	July 1, 1969

(Total: 3 States)

Benelux Designs Convention (1966)

State	Date on which State became party to the Convention
Belgium	January 1, 1974
Luxembourg	January 1, 1974
Netherlands	January 1, 1974

(Total: 3 States)

* Formerly "Industrial Property Organization for English-Speaking Africa (ESARIPO)."

COUNCIL OF EUROPE

**European Convention relating to the Formalities
required for Patent Applications (1953)**

State	Date on which State became party to the Convention
South Africa ¹	December 1, 1957
Spain	July 1, 1967
Turkey	November 1, 1956
(Total: 3 States)	

¹ Not member of the Council of Europe.

**Convention on the Unification of Certain Points of
Substantive Law on Patents for Invention (1963)**

State	Date on which State became party to the Convention
Denmark	December 30, 1989
France	August 1, 1980
Germany	August 1, 1980
Ireland	August 1, 1980
Italy	May 18, 1981
Liechtenstein	August 1, 1980
Luxembourg	August 1, 1980
Netherlands	December 3, 1987
Sweden	August 1, 1980
Switzerland	August 1, 1980
United Kingdom	August 1, 1980
(Total: 11 States)	

EUROPEAN PATENT ORGANISATION (EPO)

**Convention on the Grant of European Patents (1973)
(European Patent Convention)**

State	Date on which State became party to the Convention
Austria	May 1, 1979
Belgium	October 7, 1977
Denmark	January 1, 1990
France	October 7, 1977
Germany	October 7, 1977
Greece	October 1, 1986
Ireland	August 1, 1992
Italy	December 1, 1978
Liechtenstein	April 1, 1980
Luxembourg	October 7, 1977
Monaco	December 1, 1991
Netherlands	October 7, 1977
Portugal	January 1, 1992
Spain	October 1, 1986
Sweden	May 1, 1978
Switzerland	October 7, 1977
United Kingdom	October 7, 1977
(Total: 17 States)	

**Agreements on Extending the Protection
Conferred by European Patents
(Extension Agreements)**

State	Date on which Extension Agreement entered into force
Lithuania	July 5, 1994
Slovenia	March 1, 1994
(Total: 2 States)	

Treaties in the Field of Copyright and Neighboring Rights Not Administered by WIPO¹

Universal Copyright Convention

Adopted at Geneva (1952), revised at Paris (1971)

State	Date on which State became party to the Convention		State	Date on which State became party to the Convention	
	Text of 1952	Text of 1971		Text of 1952	Text of 1971
Algeria ²	August 28, 1973	July 10, 1974	Monaco	September 16, 1955	December 13, 1974
Andorra	September 16, 1955	–	Morocco	May 8, 1972	January 28, 1976
Argentina	February 13, 1958	–	Netherlands	June 22, 1967	November 30, 1985
Australia	May 1, 1969	February 28, 1978	New Zealand	September 11, 1964	–
Austria	July 2, 1957	August 14, 1982	Nicaragua	August 16, 1961	–
Bahamas	December 27, 1976	December 27, 1976	Niger	May 15, 1989	May 15, 1989
Bangladesh ²	August 5, 1975	August 5, 1975	Nigeria	February 14, 1962	–
Barbados	June 18, 1983	June 18, 1983	Norway	January 23, 1963	August 7, 1974
Belarus	May 27, 1973	–	Pakistan	September 16, 1955	–
Belgium	August 31, 1960	–	Panama	October 17, 1962	September 3, 1980
Belize	December 1, 1982	–	Paraguay	March 11, 1962	–
Bolivia	March 22, 1990	March 22, 1990	Peru	October 16, 1963	July 22, 1985
Bosnia and Herzegovina	May 11, 1966	July 10, 1974	Philippines	November 19, 1955	–
Brazil	January 13, 1960	December 11, 1975	Poland	March 9, 1977	March 9, 1977
Bulgaria	June 7, 1975	June 7, 1975	Portugal	December 25, 1956	July 30, 1981
Cambodia	September 16, 1955	–	Republic of Korea ²	October 1, 1987	October 1, 1987
Cameroon	May 1, 1973	July 10, 1974	Russian Federation	May 27, 1973	March 9, 1995
Canada	August 10, 1962	–	Rwanda	November 10, 1989	November 10, 1989
Chile	September 16, 1955	–	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	April 22, 1985	April 22, 1985
China ²	October 30, 1992	October 30, 1992	Saudi Arabia	July 13, 1994	July 13, 1994
Colombia	June 18, 1976	June 18, 1976	Senegal	July 9, 1974	July 10, 1974
Costa Rica	September 16, 1955	March 7, 1980	Slovakia	January 6, 1960	April 17, 1980
Croatia	May 11, 1966	July 10, 1974	Slovenia	May 11, 1966	July 10, 1974
Cuba	June 18, 1957	–	Spain	September 16, 1955	July 10, 1974
Cyprus	December 19, 1990	December 19, 1990	Sri Lanka	January 25, 1984	January 25, 1984
Czech Republic	January 6, 1960	April 17, 1980	Sweden	July 1, 1961	July 10, 1974
Denmark	February 9, 1962	July 11, 1979	Switzerland	March 30, 1956	Septembre 21, 1993
Dominican Republic	May 8, 1983	May 8, 1983	Tajikistan	May 27, 1973	–
Ecuador	June 5, 1957	June 6, 1991	Trinidad and Tobago	August 19, 1988	August 19, 1988
El Salvador	March 29, 1979	March 29, 1979	Tunisia ²	June 19, 1969	June 10, 1975
Fiji	October 10, 1970	–	Ukraine	May 27, 1973	–
Finland	April 16, 1963	November 1, 1986	United Kingdom	September 27, 1957	July 10, 1974
France	January 14, 1956	July 10, 1974	United States of America	September 16, 1955	July 10, 1974
Germany	September 16, 1955	July 10, 1974	Uruguay	April 12, 1993	April 12, 1993
Ghana	August 22, 1962	–	Venezuela	September 30, 1966	–
Greece	August 24, 1963	–	Yugoslavia	May 11, 1966	July 10, 1974
Guatemala	October 28, 1964	–	Zambia	June 1, 1965	–
Guinea	November 13, 1981	November 13, 1981			
Haiti	September 16, 1955	–			
Holy See	October 5, 1955	May 6, 1980			
Hungary	January 23, 1971	July 10, 1974			
Iceland	December 18, 1956	–			
India	January 21, 1958	January 7, 1988			
Ireland	January 20, 1959	–			
Israel	September 16, 1955	–			
Italy	January 24, 1957	January 25, 1980			
Japan	April 28, 1956	October 21, 1977			
Kazakhstan	May 27, 1973	–			
Kenya	September 7, 1966	July 10, 1974			
Laos	September 16, 1955	–			
Lebanon	October 17, 1959	–			
Liberia	July 27, 1956	–			
Liechtenstein	January 22, 1959	–			
Luxembourg	October 15, 1955	–			
Malawi	October 26, 1965	–			
Malta	November 19, 1968	–			
Mauritius	March 12, 1968	–			
Mexico ²	May 12, 1957	October 31, 1975			

(Total: 95 States)

¹ According to the information received by the International Bureau.

² Pursuant to Article *Vbis* of the Convention as revised in 1971, this State has availed itself of the exceptions provided for in Articles *Vter* and *Vquater* in favor of developing countries.

Editor's Note: The three Protocols annexed to the Convention were ratified, accepted or acceded to separately; they concern: (1) the application of the Convention to the works of stateless persons and refugees, (2) the application of the Convention to the works of certain international organizations, and (3) the effective date of instruments of ratification or acceptance of or accession to the Convention. For detailed information in this respect, and as to notifications made by governments of certain Contracting States concerning the territorial application of the Convention and the Protocols, see *Copyright Bulletin*, quarterly review published by Unesco.

**European Agreement
Concerning Programme Exchanges by Means
of Television Films**

(Paris, December 15, 1958)

State	Date on which State became party to the Agreement
Belgium	April 8, 1962
Cyprus	February 20, 1970
Denmark	November 25, 1961
France	July 1, 1961
Greece	February 9, 1962
Ireland	April 4, 1965
Israel	February 15, 1978
Luxembourg	October 31, 1963
Netherlands	March 5, 1967
Norway	March 15, 1963
Spain	January 4, 1974
Sweden	July 1, 1961
Tunisia	February 22, 1969
Turkey	March 28, 1964
United Kingdom	July 1, 1961

(Total: 15 States)

**European Agreement for the Prevention
of Broadcasts Transmitted from Stations
Outside National Territories**

(Strasbourg, January 22, 1965)

State	Date on which State became party to the Agreement
Belgium	October 19, 1967
Cyprus	October 2, 1971
Denmark	October 19, 1967
France	April 6, 1968
Germany	February 28, 1970
Greece	August 14, 1979
Ireland	February 23, 1969
Italy	March 19, 1983
Liechtenstein	February 14, 1977
Netherlands	September 27, 1974
Norway	October 17, 1971
Portugal	September 7, 1969
Spain	March 11, 1988
Sweden	October 19, 1967
Switzerland	September 19, 1976
Turkey	February 17, 1975
United Kingdom	December 3, 1967

(Total: 17 States)

European Agreement on the Protection of Television Broadcasts

Agreement

(Strasbourg, June 22, 1960)

State	Date on which State became party to the Agreement
Denmark *	November 27, 1961
France	July 1, 1961
Germany *	October 9, 1967
Norway *	August 10, 1968
Sweden **	July 1, 1961
United Kingdom *	July 1, 1961

(Total: 6 States)

Protocol

(Strasbourg, January 22, 1965)

State	Date on which State became party to the Protocol
Denmark	March 24, 1965
France	March 24, 1965
Germany	October 9, 1967
Norway	August 10, 1968
Sweden	March 24, 1965
United Kingdom	March 24, 1965

(Total: 6 States)

Additional Protocol

(Strasbourg, March 21, 1983)

The Additional Protocol entered into force on January 1, 1985, with respect to all States party to the European Agreement on the Protection of Television Broadcasts and the Protocol to the said Agreement.

* The instruments of ratification were accompanied by reservations in accordance with Article 3, paragraph 1, of the Agreement. As to Denmark, see *Le Droit d'auteur*, 1961, p. 360; as to Germany, see *Copyright*, 1967, p. 217; as to Norway, see *ibid.*, 1968, p. 191; as to the United Kingdom, see *Le Droit d'auteur*, 1961, p. 152.

** Sweden has availed itself of the reservations contained in subparagraphs (b), (c) and (f) of paragraph 1 of Article 3 of the Agreement.

Governing Bodies of WIPO, of the Unions Administered by WIPO and Their (Permanent) Committees and of the Rome Convention (Status on January 1, 1995)

WIPO

General Assembly: Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Holy See, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria (as from April 9, 1995), Norway, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, San Marino, Senegal, Singapore (as from February 23, 1995), Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe (137).

Conference: The same States as above, with Andorra, Angola, Bhutan, Brunei Darussalam, Guatemala, Laos (as from January 17, 1995), Nicaragua, Panama, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Somalia, United Arab Emirates, Yemen (151).

Coordination Committee: Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Egypt, El Salvador, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Lebanon, Malawi, Mexico, Morocco, Namibia, Netherlands, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Republic of Korea,

Romania, Russian Federation, Singapore, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Syria, Togo, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela (58).

WIPO Budget Committee: Algeria, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, China, France, Germany, Guinea, India, Japan, Netherlands, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Russian Federation, Switzerland (*ex officio*), United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay (21).

WIPO Premises Committee: Argentina, Brazil, China, Egypt, France, Germany, India, Nigeria, Russian Federation, Switzerland, United States of America (11).

WIPO Permanent Committee for Development Cooperation Related to Industrial Property: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Benin, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Slovenia, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe (116).

WIPO Permanent Committee for Development Cooperation Related to Copyright and Neighboring Rights: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Central African

Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Egypt, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Latvia, Lesotho, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Slovenia, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe (105).

WIPO Permanent Committee on Industrial Property Information (PCIPI): Algeria, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Estonia, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland (as from March 23, 1995), Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Senegal, Singapore (as from February 23, 1995), Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia, African Intellectual Property Organization, African Regional Industrial Property Organization, Benelux Designs Office, Benelux Trademark Office, European Patent Organisation (105).

Paris Union

Assembly: Algeria, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon,

Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Holy See, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Paraguay, Peru (as from April 11, 1995), Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis (as from April 9, 1995), San Marino, Senegal, Singapore (as from February 23, 1995), Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe (125).

Conference of Representatives: Dominican Republic, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Nigeria, Syria (4).

Executive Committee: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Cuba, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Malawi, Morocco, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Slovenia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Syria (associate member), Togo, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States of America, Uruguay (29).

Berne Union

Assembly: Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Holy See, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Morocco, Namibia, Netherlands, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation (as from March 13, 1995), Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis (as from April 9, 1995), Saint Lucia, Senegal, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain,

Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe (107).

Conference of Representatives: Lebanon, Madagascar, New Zealand, Turkey (4).

Executive Committee: Argentina, Cameroon, Canada, Colombia, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, India, Ireland, Kenya, Lebanon (associate member), Mexico, Namibia, Netherlands, Nigeria, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Romania, Spain, Switzerland, Venezuela (26).

Madrid Union (Marks)

Assembly: Algeria, Armenia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, China, Croatia, Cuba, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sudan, Switzerland, Tajikistan, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia (43).

Hague Union

Assembly: Belgium, Benin, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Senegal, Slovenia (as from January 13, 1995), Suriname, Switzerland, Yugoslavia (19).

Conference of Representatives: Egypt, Holy See, Indonesia, Morocco, Spain, Tunisia (6).

Nice Union

Assembly: Algeria, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, China, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Iceland (as from April 9, 1995), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Monaco, Morocco, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom, United States of America, Yugoslavia (40).

Conference of Representatives: Lebanon, Tunisia (2).

Lisbon Union

Assembly: Algeria, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Congo, Cuba, Czech Republic, France, Gabon, Hungary, Israel, Italy, Portugal, Slovakia, Togo, Tunisia (15).

Council: Haiti, Mexico (2).

Locarno Union

Assembly: Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Iceland (as from April 9, 1995), Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Yugoslavia (23).

PCT Union

Assembly: Armenia, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guinea, Hungary, Iceland (as from March 23, 1995), Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Senegal, Singapore (as from February 23, 1995), Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda (as from February 9, 1995), Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States of America, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam (77).

IPC Union

Assembly: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada (as from January 11, 1996), Czech Republic, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, United Kingdom, United States of America (29).

Vienna Union

Assembly: France, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Sweden, Tunisia (5).

Budapest Union

Assembly: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cuba, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland (as from March 23, 1995), Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Netherlands, Norway, Philippines, Poland, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Singapore (as from February 23, 1995), Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Trinidad and Tobago, United Kingdom, United States of America, Yugoslavia (34).

Intergovernmental Committee of the Rome Convention

Argentina, Burkina Faso, Chile, Colombia, Finland, France, Germany, Japan, Mexico, Sweden, United Kingdom, Uruguay (12).

FRT Union

Assembly: Argentina, Austria, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Chile, Colombia, Czech Republic, France, Mexico, Peru, Senegal, Slovakia (12).

Under Other Treaties**Intergovernmental Committee of the Universal Copyright Convention**

Algeria, Australia, Austria, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, France, Germany, India, Israel, Japan, Mexico,

Portugal, Russian Federation, Senegal, Tunisia, United Kingdom, United States of America (18).

High Officials of WIPO (Status on January 1, 1995)

Director General:	Arpad Bogsch
Deputy Directors General:	François Curchod Kamil Idris
Assistant Directors General:	Carlos Fernández Ballesteros Mihály Ficsor Gust Ledakis

High Officials of UPOV (Status on January 1, 1995)

Secretary-General:	Arpad Bogsch
Vice Secretary-General:	Barry Greengrass

INTERNATIONAL DEPOSITARY AUTHORITY	KINDS OF MICROORGANISMS THAT MAY BE DEPOSITED	FEES
AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE CULTURE COLLECTION (NRRL) (Continued)	<i>Treponema</i> (all species); <i>Vibrio</i> (all species); <i>Yersinia</i> (all species). b. <i>Blastomyces</i> (all species); <i>Coccidioides</i> (all species); <i>Cryptococcus neoformans</i>; <i>Cryptococcus uniguttulatus</i>; <i>Histoplasma</i> (all species); <i>Paracoccidioides</i> (all species). c. All viral, Rickettsial, and Chlamydial agents. d. Agents which may introduce or disseminate any contagious or infectious disease of animals, humans or poultry and which require a permit for entry and/or distribution within the United States of America. e. Agents which are classified as plant pests and which require a permit for entry and/or distribution within the United States of America. f. Mixtures of microorganisms. g. Fastidious microorganisms which require (in the view of the Curator) more than reasonable attention in handling and preparation of lyophilized material. h. Phages not inserted in microorganisms. i. Monoclonal antibodies. j. All cell lines. k. Plasmids not inserted in microorganisms. 2. Recombinant strains of microorganisms, strains containing recombinant DNA molecules, strains containing their own naturally occurring plasmid(s), strains containing inserted naturally occurring plasmid(s) from another host, strains containing inserted constructed plasmid(s), and strains containing viruses of any kind, excluding those already listed as nonacceptable, only if the deposit document accompanying the microbial preparation(s) includes a clear statement that progeny of the strain(s) can be processed at a Physical Containment Level of P1 or less and Biological Containment requirements meet all other criteria specified by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health <i>Guidelines for Research Involving Recombinant DNA Molecules</i>, December 1978 (<i>Federal Register</i>, Vol. 43, No. 247—Friday, December 22, 1978) and any subsequent revisions.	
ALL-UNION SCIENTIFIC CENTRE OF ANTIBIOTICS (VNIIA) Nagatinskaya Street 3-a Moscow 113105 Russian Federation (See <i>Industrial Property</i>, 1987, p. 250; 1992, p. 276.)	Bacteria (including actinomycetes) and microscopic fungi (including yeasts) for essentially medical purposes are accepted for deposit, to the exclusion of microorganisms that cause disease in man and animals and microorganisms that are toxicogenic for plants or require them to be quarantined.	(a) For the deposit of a micro-organism and its storage for 30 years RUR 800 (b) For each additional five-year period of storage 100 (c) For the furnishing of a sample of a deposited micro-organism 50 The above amounts do not include mailing charges, which are invoiced separately at cost. Additional information concerning fees is contained in the "Regulations on the Collection of Payments"; see <i>Industrial Property</i>, 1987, p. 250.

on November 28, 1994, by the Director General of WIPO under the Budapest Treaty on the International Recognition of the Deposit of Microorganisms for the Purposes of Patent Procedure:

The Permanent Mission of the Republic of Bulgaria to the United Nations Office and the Other International Organizations at Geneva presents its compliments to the Director General of the World Intellectual Property Organization and has the honour to notify him that in accordance with Rule 3.3 of the Regulations under the Budapest Treaty on the International Recognition of the Deposit of Microorganisms for the Purposes of Patent Procedure, the assurances furnished by the Republic of Bulgaria in respect

of the National Bank for Industrial Microorganisms and Cell Cultures (NBIMCC), will extend to the plant viruses group of microorganisms.

[End of text of the notification of the Government of Bulgaria]

The extended list of kinds of microorganisms accepted for deposit by NBIMCC will take effect as from January 31, 1995, the date of publication of the said notification in the present issue of *Industrial Property and Copyright*.

Budapest Notification No. 94 (this notification is the subject of Budapest Notification No. 134, of December 16, 1994).

II. Depositary Institutions Having Acquired the Status of International Depositary Authority (Status on January 1, 1995)

Pursuant to Rule 13.2(a) of the Regulations under the Budapest Treaty for the International Recognition of the Deposit of Microorganisms for the Purposes of Patent Procedure, the following is a list of international depositary authorities as on January 1, 1995, indicating the kinds of microorganisms that may be deposited with, and the amount of fees charged by, the said authorities.

INTERNATIONAL DEPOSITARY AUTHORITY	KINDS OF MICROORGANISMS THAT MAY BE DEPOSITED	FEES
AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE CULTURE COLLECTION (NRRL) 1815 North University Street Peoria, Illinois 61604 United States of America (See <i>Industrial Property</i>, 1981, pp. 22, 23 and 121; 1983, p. 248; 1987, p. 247.)	1. All strains of agriculturally and industrially important bacteria, yeasts, molds and <i>Actinomycetales</i>, EXCEPT: a. <i>Actinobacillus</i> (all species); <i>Actinomyces</i> (<i>anaerobic/microaerophilic</i>, all species); <i>Arizona</i> (all species); <i>Bacillus anthracis</i>; <i>Bartonella</i> (all species); <i>Bordetella</i> (all species); <i>Borrelia</i> (all species); <i>Brucella</i> (all species); <i>Clostridium botulinum</i>; <i>Clostridium chauvoei</i>; <i>Clostridium haemolyticum</i>; <i>Clostridium histolyticum</i>; <i>Clostridium novyi</i>; <i>Clostridium septicum</i>; <i>Clostridium tetani</i>; <i>Corynebacterium diphtheriae</i>; <i>Corynebacterium equi</i>; <i>Corynebacterium haemolyticum</i>; <i>Corynebacterium pseudotuberculosis</i>; <i>Corynebacterium pyogenes</i>; <i>Corynebacterium renale</i>; <i>Diplococcus</i> (all species); <i>Erysipelothrix</i> (all species); <i>Escherichia coli</i> (all enteropathogenic types);	Applicable to patent cultures deposited after October 30, 1983. No fee charged for cultures on deposit or received before that date. (a) Deposit of each strain USD 500 (payable at the time of deposit) (b) Distribution of all released cultures 20 Checks, in US dollars, should be made payable to the Agricultural Research Service, United States Department of Agriculture. United States Department of Agriculture laboratories and designated cooperators are exempt from payment of fees.

INTERNATIONAL DEPOSITORY AUTHORITY	KINDS OF MICROORGANISMS THAT MAY BE DEPOSITED	FEES
AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE CULTURE COLLECTION (NRRL) (Continued)	<i>Francisella</i> (all species); <i>Haemophilus</i> (all species); <i>Herellea</i> (all species); <i>Klebsiella</i> (all species); <i>Leptospira</i> (all species); <i>Listeria</i> (all species); <i>Mima</i> (all species); <i>Moraxella</i> (all species); <i>Mycobacterium avium</i>; <i>Mycobacterium bovis</i>; <i>Mycobacterium tuberculosis</i>; <i>Mycoplasma</i> (all species); <i>Neisseria</i> (all species); <i>Pasteurella</i> (all species); <i>Pseudomonas pseudomallei</i>; <i>Salmonella</i> (all species); <i>Shigella</i> (all species); <i>Sphaerophorus</i> (all species); <i>Streptobacillus</i> (all species); <i>Streptococcus</i> (all pathogenic species); <i>Treponema</i> (all species); <i>Vibrio</i> (all species); <i>Yersinia</i> (all species). b. <i>Blastomyces</i> (all species); <i>Coccidioides</i> (all species); <i>Cryptococcus neoformans</i>; <i>Cryptococcus uniguttulatus</i>; <i>Histoplasma</i> (all species); <i>Paracoccidioides</i> (all species). c. All viral, Rickettsial, and Chlamydial agents. d. Agents which may introduce or disseminate any contagious or infectious disease of animals, humans or poultry and which require a permit for entry and/or distribution within the United States of America. e. Agents which are classified as plant pests and which require a permit for entry and/or distribution within the United States of America. f. Mixtures of microorganisms. g. Fastidious microorganisms which require (in the view of the Curator) more than reasonable attention in handling and preparation of lyophilized material. h. Phages not inserted in microorganisms. i. Monoclonal antibodies. j. All cell lines. k. Plasmids not inserted in microorganisms. 2. Recombinant strains of microorganisms, strains containing recombinant DNA molecules, strains containing their own naturally occurring plasmid(s), strains containing inserted naturally occurring plasmid(s) from another host, strains containing inserted constructed plasmid(s), and strains containing viruses of any kind, excluding those already listed as nonacceptable, only if the deposit document accompanying the microbial preparation(s) includes a clear statement that progeny of the strain(s) can be processed at a Physical Containment Level of P1 or less and Biological Containment requirements meet all other criteria specified by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health <i>Guidelines for Research Involving Recombinant DNA Molecules</i>, December 1978 (<i>Federal Register</i>, Vol. 43, No. 247—Friday, December 22, 1978) and any subsequent revisions.	

INTERNATIONAL DEPOSITORY AUTHORITY	KINDS OF MICROORGANISMS THAT MAY BE DEPOSITED	FEES
ALL-UNION SCIENTIFIC CENTRE OF ANTIBIOTICS (VNIIA) Nagatinskaya Street 3-a 113105 Moscow Russian Federation (See <i>Industrial Property</i>, 1987, p. 250; 1992, pp. 276.)	Bacteria (including actinomycetes) and microscopic fungi (including yeasts) for essentially medical purposes are accepted for deposit, to the exclusion of microorganisms that cause disease in man and animals and microorganisms that are toxicogenic for plants or require them to be quarantined.	(a) For the deposit of a microorganism and its storage for 30 years RUR 800 (b) For each additional five-year period of storage 100 (c) For the furnishing of a sample of a deposited microorganism 50 The above amounts do not include mailing charges, which are invoiced separately at cost. Additional information concerning fees is contained in the "Regulations on the Collection of Payments"; see <i>Industrial Property</i>, 1987, p. 250.
AMERICAN TYPE CULTURE COLLECTION (ATCC) 12301 Parklawn Drive Rockville, Maryland 20852 United States of America (See <i>Industrial Property</i>, 1981, pp. 20 and 121; 1982, pp. 147 and 220; 1985, pp. 163; 1986, pp. 295 and 372; 1989, pp. 119; 1991, pp. 107; 1992, pp. 54.)	Algae, animal embryos, animal viruses, bacteria, cell lines, fungi, hybridomas, oncogenes, plant viruses, plasmids, plant tissue cultures, phages, protozoa, seeds, yeasts. The ATCC must be informed of the physical containment level required for experiments using the host vector system, as described in the 1980 National Institutes of Health <i>Guidelines for Research Involving Recombinant DNA Molecules</i> (i.e., P1, P2, P3 or P4 facility). The ATCC, for the time being, will accept only those hosts containing plasmids which can be worked in a P1 or P2 facility. Certain animal viruses may require viability testing in an animal host, which the ATCC may be unable to provide. In such case, the deposit cannot be accepted. Plant viruses which cannot be mechanically inoculated also cannot be accepted.	(a) Storage USD 930* – if the right under Rule 11.4(g) to be notified of the furnishing of samples is waived 600 (b) Issuance of a viability statement – bacteria (without plasmids) 100 – fungi (including yeast) 100 – protozoa 100 – algae 100 – animal cell cultures (including hybridoma lines) fee must be decided – animal and plant viruses on an individual basis – bacteria (with plasmids) individual basis (c) Furnishing of a sample under Rules 11.2 and 11.3 (per sample) <i>ATCC Cultures</i> Algae, bacteria, bacteriophages, fungi, plant tissues, plasmids, protozoa, vectors and yeasts – U.S. non-profit institutions 62 – Foreign non-profit institutions 62** – Other U.S. and foreign institutions 96 <i>ATCC Cell Lines, Embryos and Oncogenes</i> – U.S. non-profit institutions 75 – Foreign non-profit institutions 75*** – Other U.S. and foreign institutions 115 <i>ATCC Animal and Plant Viruses, Rickettsiae and Chlamydiae</i> – U.S. non-profit institutions 66 – Foreign non-profit institutions 66**** – Other U.S. and foreign institutions 100 Cell lines ordered in flasks, protozoa ordered in test tubes, and other deposits specially ordered in test tubes carry an additional fee of USD 35. The minimum invoice is USD 45. Orders received for lesser amounts will be invoiced at the minimum. * Subject to a freight charge to depositors for returning samples for verification of properties if a culture is deposited with ATCC as a test tube or flask culture. ** Subject to an additional USD 34 per culture handling and processing charge. *** Subject to an additional USD 40 per culture handling and processing charge. **** Subject to an additional USD 34 per culture handling and processing charge.

INTERNATIONAL DEPOSITORY AUTHORITY	KINDS OF MICROORGANISMS THAT MAY BE DEPOSITED	FEES
AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT ANALYTICAL LABORATORIES (AGAL) The New South Wales Regional Laboratory 1, Suakin Street Pymble, NSW 2073 Australia (See <i>Industrial Property</i>, 1988, p. 329; 1990, p. 99.)	Bacteria (including actinomycetes), yeasts and fungi other than known human and animal pathogens, that can be preserved without significant change to their properties by the methods of preservation in use (freezing and freeze-drying). Nucleic acid preparations and phages may be accepted if the depositor certifies that they pose no hazard when handled by normal labora- tory procedures and the depositor supplies suitable material for preservation. At present, AGAL does not accept for deposit animal, plant, algal and protozoal cultures, cultures of viral, rickettsial and chlamydial agents, microorganisms which may require, in the view of the curator, special attention to handling and preparation for storage.	(a) Storage AUD 750 (b) Issuance of a viability statement 90 (c) Furnishing of samples 60
BELGIAN COORDINATED COLLECTIONS OF MICROORGANISMS (BCCM) Prime Minister's Services Science Policy Office Rue de la Science 8 B-1040 Brussels Belgium <i>Collections</i> Institut d'Hygiène et d'Epidémiologie- Mycologie (IHEM) Rue J. Wytsman 14 B-1050 Brussels Belgium Laboratorium voor Moleculaire Biologie-Plasmidencollectie (LMBP) Universiteit Gent K.L. Ledeganckstraat 35 B-9000 Ghent Belgium Laboratorium voor Microbiologie- Bacteriënverzameling (LMG) Universiteit Gent K.L. Ledeganckstraat 35 B-9000 Ghent Belgium Mycothèque de l'Université Catholique de Louvain (MUCL) Place Croix du Sud 3 B-1348 Louvain-la-Neuve Belgium (See <i>Industrial Property</i>, 1992, pp. 49; 1993, pp. 214.)	IHEM: filamentous fungi and yeasts, includ- ing pathogenic fungi and yeasts that cause mycosis in man and animals, and actinomycetes; LMBP: plasmids as an isolated DNA prepara- tion or plasmids in an <i>Escherichia</i> <i>coli</i> (host)/plasmid combination; genetic material, whether recombinant or not—as plasmids, oncogenes and RNA, for example—in the form of an isolated material preparation or in a host; animal cell cultures, including human cell lines, genetically modified cell lines and hybridomas, which can be stored without particular deteriora- tion nor loss of their properties, by controlled freezing, followed by long- term storage in liquid nitrogen; cell cultures contaminated by microplasmas can only be accepted for deposit in exceptional cases; LMG: all bacterial strains, including actino- mycetes, but excepting pathogens belonging to a hazard group higher than Group 2 of the UK Advisory Committee on Dangerous Pathogens; MUCL: filamentous fungi and yeasts, including phytopathogens, but excepting pathogenic fungi causing mycosis in man and animals belonging to a hazard group higher than Group 2 of the UK Advisory Committee on Dangerous Pathogens. As a general rule, the BCCM collections accept only strains that can be placed in a culture under conditions technically feasible for the collection concerned and conserved, other than in continuous vegetative activity, without inducing significant changes in their character- istics. Exceptionally, the various BCCM collections may accept deposits that cannot be conserved other than by active culture, but acceptance of such a deposit will have to be decided, and the relevant fee determined, on a case-by-case basis after prior negotiation with the potential depositor. They may also exceptionally accept a deposit of mixtures of microorganisms, whereby non-defined or non-identifiable mixtures will be automatically excluded. The BCCM collections also reserve their right to refuse a deposit of biological material whose conservation involves hazards deemed to be excessive.	<i>All kinds of microorganisms except human and animal cells and hybridomas</i> (a) Storage (Rule 9.1) BEF 20,000 (b) Issue of a viability statement (Rule 10.2): – if the viability test is to be carried out 2,000 – based on the last viability test 800 (c) Furnishing of a sample (Rules 11.2 and 11.3) 2,000 (d) Communication of information under Rule 7.6 800 (e) Issue of an attestation of amendment of the scientific description and/or taxonomic designation of the micro- organism in accordance with Rule 8.2 800 <i>For human and animal cells and hybridomas, the same schedule of fees will apply, except:</i> (a) Storage (Rule 9.1) 45,000 (b) Issue of a viability statement (Rule 10.2): – if the viability test is to be carried out on a case- by-case basis 3,000 (mini- mum) – based on the last viability test 800 (c) Furnishing of a sample (Rules 11.2 and 11.3) 4,000 These prices do not include the cost of dispatch.

INTERNATIONAL DEPOSITARY AUTHORITY	KINDS OF MICROORGANISMS THAT MAY BE DEPOSITED	FEES												
BELGIAN COORDINATED COLLECTIONS OF MICROORGANISMS (BCCM) (Continued)	In the case of human and animal cell cultures and hybridomas, LMBP: – does not normally accept any deposit requiring a containment level beyond category 3 of the United Kingdom Advisory Committee on Genetic Manipulation (ACGM); – must be informed of the required containment level together with any other data (e.g., presence of oncogenes) required to assess the inherent hazards of the biological material to be deposited; – maintains its right to refuse acceptance for deposit of any material which, according to the curator, represents an unacceptable hazard or which is not suitable, for technical reasons, for manipulation. All deposits concerning the two categories of biological material referred to should be addressed directly to the LMBP Collection.													
CENTRAALBUREAU VOOR SCHIMMELCULTURES (CBS) Oosterstraat 1 Postbus 273 NL-3740 AG Baarn Netherlands (See <i>Industrial Property</i> , 1981, pp. 219 and 221; 1984, pp. 148; 1985, pp. 235; 1991, pp. 423.)	Fungi; yeasts; bacteria; plasmids in pure form or in a host of the kinds accepted by CBS and phages that can be maintained without significant modification during appropriate storage at low temperature, in liquid nitrogen or during storage in the lyophilized state. Strains requiring special cultural conditions can be accepted under special conditions and are subject to additional fees (on request). The following bacteria of pathogenic group I (PG I: World Health Organization (WHO)) are accepted only when they can be maintained by the Rijks Instituut voor Volksgezondheid en Milieuhygiene (RIVM), Centraal Diergeneeskundig Instituut (CDI) or the Royal Institute for Tropical Research: <i>Bordetella</i> (all species), <i>Brucella</i> (all species), <i>Erysipelothrix</i> (all species), <i>Leptospira</i> (all species), <i>Listeria</i> (all species), <i>Mycobacterium paratuberculosis</i>, <i>Pasteurella</i> (all species), <i>Treponema</i> (all species). The following bacteria of pathogenic group II (PG II (WHO)) are accepted only when they can be maintained by RIVM or CDI: <i>Bartonella</i> (all species), <i>Francisella</i> (all species), <i>Mycobacterium bovis</i>, <i>Mycobacterium tuberculosis</i>, <i>Pseudomonas mallei</i>, <i>Pseudomonas pseudomallei</i>. The following bacteria are not accepted: <i>Bacillus anthracis</i> and <i>Yersinia pestis</i>.	<table><tr><td>(a) Storage</td><td>NLG 2,000</td></tr><tr><td>– if the depositor waives the right under Rule 11.4(g) to be notified of the furnishing of samples</td><td>1,500</td></tr><tr><td>(b) Issuance of a viability statement</td><td>150</td></tr><tr><td>(c) Furnishing of a sample</td><td>175</td></tr><tr><td>(d) Communication of information under Rule 7.6</td><td>40</td></tr><tr><td>(e) Delivering of attestation pursuant to Rule 8.2</td><td>40</td></tr></table>	(a) Storage	NLG 2,000	– if the depositor waives the right under Rule 11.4(g) to be notified of the furnishing of samples	1,500	(b) Issuance of a viability statement	150	(c) Furnishing of a sample	175	(d) Communication of information under Rule 7.6	40	(e) Delivering of attestation pursuant to Rule 8.2	40
(a) Storage	NLG 2,000													
– if the depositor waives the right under Rule 11.4(g) to be notified of the furnishing of samples	1,500													
(b) Issuance of a viability statement	150													
(c) Furnishing of a sample	175													
(d) Communication of information under Rule 7.6	40													
(e) Delivering of attestation pursuant to Rule 8.2	40													
COLECCIÓN ESPAÑOLA DE CULTIVOS TIPO (CECT) Microbiology Department Biological Science Faculty University of Valencia 46100 Burjasot (Valencia) Spain (See <i>Industrial Property</i> , 1992, pp. 163.)	Bacteria, including actinomycetes, which may be preserved, without any significant alteration of their properties, by freezing or freeze-drying, and which belong to a Risk Group lower than 2 according to the definition of the UK Advisory Committee on Dangerous Pathogens (ACDP) 1984, <i>Categorisation of Pathogens according to Hazard and Categories of Containment</i> (HMSO, London, ISBN 0-11-883761-3). Filamentous fungi, including yeasts, with the exception of strains known to be human, plant and animal pathogens, which may be preserved by freezing or freeze-drying without any significant alteration of their properties. For the time being, the CECT does not accept the following biological material for deposit: anaerobic microorganisms (except <i>Clostridium</i>); algae and cyanobacteria; plasmids; embryos; protozoa; animal cell lines;	<table><tr><td>(a) Storage of:</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>– original deposits</td><td>ESP 70,000</td></tr><tr><td>– new deposits</td><td>10,000</td></tr><tr><td>(b) Issue of viability statement</td><td>10,000</td></tr><tr><td>(c) Furnishing of samples</td><td>6,000</td></tr><tr><td>(d) Communication of information under Rule 7.6</td><td>6,000</td></tr></table>	(a) Storage of:		– original deposits	ESP 70,000	– new deposits	10,000	(b) Issue of viability statement	10,000	(c) Furnishing of samples	6,000	(d) Communication of information under Rule 7.6	6,000
(a) Storage of:														
– original deposits	ESP 70,000													
– new deposits	10,000													
(b) Issue of viability statement	10,000													
(c) Furnishing of samples	6,000													
(d) Communication of information under Rule 7.6	6,000													

INTERNATIONAL DEPOSITARY AUTHORITY	KINDS OF MICROORGANISMS THAT MAY BE DEPOSITED	FEES
COLECCIÓN ESPAÑOLA DE CULTIVOS TIPO (CECT) (Continued)	plant cell lines; mycoplasma; plant seed; viruses; bacteriophages. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the CECT reserves the right to reject or accept for deposit any material which, in the opinion of the Director, represents a risk that is either unacceptable or too difficult to handle.	
COLLECTION NATIONALE DE CULTURES DE MICRO-ORGANISMES (CNCM) Institut Pasteur 28, rue du Dr Roux 75724 Paris Cedex 15 France (See <i>Industrial Property</i>, 1984, p. 240; 1989, p. 25.)	Bacteria (including actinomycetes), bacteria containing plasmids; filamentous fungi and yeasts, and viruses, EXCEPT: – cellular cultures (animal cells, including hybridomas and plant cells); – microorganisms whose manipulation calls for physical insulation standards of P3 or P4 level, according to the information provided by the National Institutes of Health <i>Guidelines for Research Involving Recombinant DNA Molecules</i> and <i>Laboratory Safety Monograph</i>; – microorganisms liable to require viability testing that the CNCM is technically not able to carry out; – mixtures of undefined and/or unidentifiable microorganisms. The CNCM reserves the possibility of refusing any microorganism for security reasons: specific risks to human beings, animals, plants and the environment. In the eventuality of the deposit of cultures that are not or cannot be lyophilized, the CNCM must be consulted, prior to the transmittal of the microorganism, regarding the possibilities and conditions for acceptance of the samples; however, it is advisable to make this prior consultation in all cases.	(a) Storage – bacteria, fungi and yeasts, lyophilized or lyophilizable FRF 4,000 – all other acceptable case-by-case fee (b) Furnishing of samples (except in specific cases) (plus cost of transport) 700 (c) Issuance of a viability statement: – requiring a viability test (except in specific cases) 700 – in other cases 120 (d) Communication of information or issue of an attestation 250 Fees are subject to Value Added Tax according to French provisions currently in force.
CULTURE COLLECTION OF ALGAE AND PROTOZOA (CCAP) INSTITUTE OF FRESHWATER ECOLOGY Windermere Laboratory Far Sawrey Ambleside, Cumbria LA22 0LP United Kingdom and DUNSTAFFNAGE MARINE LABORATORY P.O. Box 3 Oban, Argyll PA34 4AD United Kingdom (See <i>Industrial Property</i>, 1982, p. 239; 1986, p. 431; 1987, p. 175; 1990, p. 251.)	(i) Freshwater and terrestrial algae and free-living protozoa (Institute of Freshwater Ecology); and (ii) marine algae, other than large seaweeds (Dunstaffnage Marine Laboratory).	(a) Storage in accordance with the Treaty: – cryopreserved strains GBP 600 – other methods of fee to be maintenance decided on an individual basis (b) Issuance of a viability statement in those cases in which, in accordance with Rule 10.2, a fee may be charged 50 (c) Furnishing of a sample in accordance with Rule 11.2 or 11.3 (plus actual cost of carriage) 40 (d) Delivering an attestation in accordance with Rule 8.2 20 The fees are subject to Value Added Tax where applicable; for details concerning the Value Added Tax liability, see <i>Industrial Property</i>, 1987, p. 203.
CULTURE COLLECTION OF YEASTS (CCY) Slovak Academy of Sciences Dúbravská cesta 9 842 38 Bratislava Slovakia (See <i>Industrial Property</i>, 1992, pp. 211; 1993, p. 214.)	Yeasts which can be stored in liquid nitrogen or as active cultures without any substantial change in their properties. Yeasts whose storage can be accomplished by standard laboratory techniques without appreciable adapting during storage in liquid nitrogen or during storage on agar slant.	(a) Storage SKK 20,000 (b) Viability statement 1,000 (c) Furnishing of samples 1,200

INTERNATIONAL DEPOSITORY AUTHORITY	KINDS OF MICROORGANISMS THAT MAY BE DEPOSITED	FEES
CZECH COLLECTION OF MICROORGANISMS (CCM) Masaryk University ul. Tvrđého č. 14 602 00 Bno Czech Republic (See <i>Industrial Property</i>, 1992, pp. 211; 1993, p. 214.; 1994, pp. 167 and 393.)	Bacteria (including actinomycetes), filamentous fungi, yeast-like microorganisms, yeasts, accepted are those capable of long-term preservation without any substantial change of their initial properties, plasmids in a host. The CCM accepts for deposit only those bacteria, filamentous fungi, yeast-like microorganisms and yeasts which, pursuant to <i>Laboratory Biosafety Manual</i> (World Health Organization, Geneva, 1983), belong to hazard group I or II. Microorganisms having special requirements for cultivation which the CCM is not technically capable of carrying out, shall not be accepted. Cultures without scientific description as well as cultures which cannot be identified shall not be accepted. When depositing strains containing a plasmid, the CCM shall require information on the plasmid and its host strain in respect of their properties and classification (i.e., group P1, P2, P3 or P4). The CCM shall accept only plasmids belonging to group P1.	(a) Storage CZE 14,000 (b) Viability statement 400 (c) Furnishing of samples 1,000
DSM – DEUTSCHE SAMMLUNG VON MIKROORGANISMEN UND ZELLKULTUREN GmbH (DSM) Mascheroder Weg 1b D-38124 Braunschweig Germany (See <i>Industrial Property</i>, 1981, pp. 220 and 222; 1988, p. 139; 1990, pp. 71 and 249; 1991, pp. 108; 1994, pp. 68.)	Bacteria, fungi, including yeasts, bacteriophages, plasmids, plant viruses, plant cell cultures, human and animal cell cultures, murine embryos. The DSM accepts for deposit only those bacteria, fungi and cell cultures which, pursuant to the notices of the "Berufsgenossenschaft der chemischen Industrie" (German trade association of the chemical industry) on "<i>Sichere Biotechnologie, Eingruppierung biologischer Agenzien</i>" ("Safe technology, classification of biological agents") (bacteria B006, fungi B007, viruses B004, cell cultures B009), belong to hazard group I or 2. An English translation of the texts is also available. Similar restrictions likewise apply to murine embryos. If the relevant group is not known, information can be obtained from the DSM. It must be possible to process genetically manipulated bacteria, fungi, bacteriophages, isolated DNA, plant viruses and plant, human and animal cell cultures as well as murine embryos in accordance with safety levels 1 or 2 of the "<i>Gesetz zur Regelung von Fragen der Gentechnik</i>" [genetic engineering act], 1990, <i>BGBI</i> Part I, No. 28, Z. 5702 A, 20 June 1990. Plant viruses which cannot multiply through mechanical infection of plants cannot be accepted for deposit. Plant cell cultures can only be deposited in the form of callus or suspension cultures with non-differentiated growth. The material for deposit must be free from contamination by foreign organisms. Animal and human cell cultures cannot be accepted for deposit if they are contaminated with viruses of other foreign organisms (particularly mycoplasma). Please note that the DSM requires about two weeks for carrying out the necessary check for mycoplasma contamination. Before preservation of the embryos by the depositor and subsequent dispatch to the DSM information concerning the method to be used must be obtained from the DSM. The DSM reserves the right to refuse to accept for deposit material which in its view represents an unacceptable hazard or which it is not in a position to process.	<i>I. Bacteria, fungi, bacteriophages, plasmids, plant viruses</i> (a) Storage DEM 1,150 – conversion of a deposit made outside the Budapest Treaty into a deposit according to the Budapest Treaty 1,150 – prolongation of the duration of the storage over the one provided by Rule 9, per year 40 (b) Issuance of a viability statement – where a viability test is also requested 130 – on the basis of the last viability test 60 (c) Furnishing of a sample 130 (d) Communication of information under Rule 7.6 60 (e) Attestation referred to in Rule 8.2 60 <i>II. Plant cell cultures</i> (a) Storage 2,500 – conversion of a deposit made outside the Budapest Treaty into a deposit according to the Budapest Treaty 2,500 – prolongation of the duration of the storage over the one provided by Rule 9, per year 80 (b) Issuance of a viability statement – where a viability test is also requested 200 – on the basis of the last validity test 60 (c) Furnishing of a sample (plus current freight costs) 200 (d) Communication of information under Rule 7.6 60 (e) Attestation referred to in Rule 8.2 60

INTERNATIONAL DEPOSITARY AUTHORITY	KINDS OF MICROORGANISMS THAT MAY BE DEPOSITED	FEES
DSM – DEUTSCHE SAMMLUNG VON MIKROORGANISMEN UND ZELLKULTUREN GmbH (DSM) (Continued)	In all instances, it must be possible to preserve the deposited material by lyophilization or storage in liquid nitrogen or by some other method of long-term preservation without significant change. Plant viruses which cannot multiply through mechanical infection of plants cannot be accepted for deposit. Before being dispatched to DSM, depositor must ensure that animal and human cell cultures are free of viruses. DSM reserves the right to refuse to accept for deposit material which in its view represents an unacceptable hazard. In all instances, it must be possible to preserve the deposited material by lyophilization or storage in liquid nitrogen without significant change.	<i>III. Human and animal cell cultures, murine embryos</i> (a) Storage 2,400 – conversion of a deposit made outside the Budapest Treaty into a deposit according to the Budapest Treaty 2,400 – prolongation of the duration of the storage over the one provided by Rule 9, per year 80 (b) Issuance of a viability statement – where a viability test is also requested 200 – on the basis of the last validity test 60 (c) Furnishing of a sample (plus current freight costs) 200 (d) Communication of information under Rule 7.6 60 (e) Attestation referred to in Rule 8.2 60 As a general rule, the fees under points (a), (b), (d) and (e) (service provided within Germany) are subject to VAT, currently at the rate of 7%, which is also payable where samples are furnished to requesting parties in Germany. Turnover tax, again currently at the rate of 7%, must also be charged on EC orders not quoting a VAT registration number. A processing fee of DEM 40 to cover bank charges is payable on all foreign invoices.
EUROPEAN COLLECTION OF ANIMAL CELL CULTURES (ECACC) Vaccine Research and Production Laboratory Public Health Laboratory Service Centre for Applied Microbiology and Research Porton Down Salisbury, Wiltshire SP4 0JG United Kingdom (See <i>Industrial Property</i>, 1984, p. 271; 1985, pp. 163 and 299; 1987, p. 147; 1990, p. 373.)	Animal cell cultures, including human cell lines, genetically modified cell lines and hybridomas that can be preserved without significant change to or loss of their properties by freezing and long-term storage; viruses capable of assay in tissue culture; plant cell suspension cultures; eukaryotic and viral recombinant DNA as naked DNA or cloned in a host organism. A statement on their possible pathogenicity to man and/or animals is required at the time of deposit. Up to and including ACDP Category 3* can be accepted for deposit. * Advisory Committee on Dangerous Pathogens: <i>Categorisation of Pathogens according to Hazard and Categories of Containment</i>, ISBN 0-11-883761-3, HMSO, London.	<i>I. Cell lines, plant cell suspension cultures</i> (a) Storage GBP 750 (b) Issuance of a viability statement 35 (c) Furnishing of a sample (plus cost of carriage) 60 <i>II. Viruses</i> (a) Storage 850 (b) Issuance of a viability statement 150 (c) Furnishing of a sample 100 <i>III. Eukaryotic and viral recombinant DNA as naked DNA or cloned into a host organism</i> (a) Storage 400 (b) Issuance of a viability statement 35 (c) Furnishing of a sample (plus cost of carriage) 60 The fees, plus Value Added Tax where applicable, are payable to the Public Health Laboratory Service Board. For details concerning the Value Added Tax liability, see <i>Industrial Property</i>, 1987, p. 203.

INTERNATIONAL DEPOSITORY AUTHORITY	KINDS OF MICROORGANISMS THAT MAY BE DEPOSITED	FEES
INTERNATIONAL MYCOLOGICAL INSTITUTE (IMI) Bakeham Lane Englefield Green Egham, Surrey TW20 9TY United Kingdom (See <i>Industrial Property</i> , 1983, p. 83; 1989, pp. 51 and 171; 1992, p. 53.)	Fungal isolates (including yeasts) and bacteria (including actinomycetes), other than known human and animal pathogens that can be preserved without significant change to their properties by methods of preservation in use. Organisms up to and including ACDP Category 2* deposits are accepted by the Collection. Notwithstanding the foregoing, IMI reserves the right to refuse to accept any material for deposit which in the opinion of the Curator presents an unacceptable risk or is technically unsuitable to handle. IMI will accept organisms which do not significantly change after long-term nitrogen freezing or freeze-drying. A statement regarding potential pathogenicity and storage conditions is required when a deposit is made. * Advisory Committee on Dangerous Pathogens: <i>Categorisation of Pathogens according to Hazard and Categories of Containment</i>, ISBN 0-11-883761-3, HMSO, London.	(a) Storage of each isolate of microorganism GBP 575 (b) Issuance of a viability statement in those cases in which, in accordance with Rule 10.2, a fee may be charged 75 (c) Furnishing of a sample in accordance with Rule 11.2 or 11.3 45 (d) Delivering an attestation in accordance with Rule 8.2 15 Fees paid within the United Kingdom are subject to Value Added Tax at the current rate; for details concerning the Value Added Tax liability, see <i>Industrial Property</i>, 1987, p. 203.
KOREAN CELL LINE RESEARCH FOUNDATION (KCLRF) Cancer Research Institute Seoul National University College of Medicine 28 Yungon-dong, Chongno-gu Seoul 110-799 Republic of Korea (See <i>Industrial Property</i> , 1993, pp. 212.)	Cell lines (animal, plant and hybridomas), with the exception of: (a) cell lines having properties which are or may be hazardous to the health or natural environment; (b) cell lines which need special requirements for experiment.	(a) Storage – original deposit KRW 600,000 – new deposit 50,000 (b) Issuance of a viability statement – if the depositor requiring a viability statement has also requested a viability test 20,000 – in other cases 10,000 (c) Furnishing of a sample 50,000 (d) Issuance of an attestation under Rule 8.2 10,000 (e) Communication of information under Rule 7.6 10,000
KOREAN COLLECTION FOR TYPE CULTURES (KCTC) Genetic Engineering Research Institute Korea Institute of Science and Technology 305-333, 1 Oun-Dong Yusong-Gu Taejeon Republic of Korea (See <i>Industrial Property</i> , 1990, p. 135; 1991, p. 219.)	Algae, bacteria (including actinomycetes), bacteria containing plasmids, bacteriophages, cell cultures (including hybridoma lines), fungi (including yeasts), protozoa and animal and plant viruses, EXCEPT: (a) microorganisms having properties which are or may be dangerous to health or the environment; (b) microorganisms which need the special containment required for experiments.	(a) Storage: – original deposit KRW 600,000 – new deposit 50,000 (b) Issuance of a viability statement – if the depositor requiring a viability statement has also requested a viability test 20,000 – in other cases 10,000 (c) Furnishing of a sample 50,000 (d) Issuance of an attestation under Rule 8.2 10,000 (e) Communication of information under Rule 7.6 10,000
KOREAN CULTURE CENTER OF MICROORGANISMS (KCCM) College of Engineering Yonsei University Sodaemun gu Seoul 120-749 Republic of Korea (See <i>Industrial Property</i> , 1990, p. 135.)	Bacteria, actinomycetes, fungi, yeasts, plasmids, bacteria containing plasmids, viruses, bacteriophages, EXCEPT: – hybridomas, plant tissue cultures, rickettsiae; – microorganisms liable to require viability testing that the KCCM is technically not able to carry out; – mixtures of undefined and/or unidentifiable microorganisms. The KCCM reserves the right to refuse any microorganism for security reasons: specific risks to human beings, animals, plants and the environment. In cases where a microorganism cannot be lyophilized, the KCCM must be consulted in advance about the conditions for acceptance.	(a) Storage: – original deposit KRW 600,000 – new deposit 50,000 (b) Issuance of a viability statement – if the depositor requiring a viability statement has also requested a viability test 20,000 – in other cases 10,000 (c) Furnishing of a sample (plus cost of transport) 50,000 (d) Issuance of an attestation under Rule 8.2 10,000 (e) Communication of information under Rule 7.6 10,000

INTERNATIONAL DEPOSITORY AUTHORITY	KINDS OF MICROORGANISMS THAT MAY BE DEPOSITED	FEES
NATIONAL BANK FOR INDUSTRIAL MICROORGANISMS AND CELL CULTURES (NBIMCC) 125, Tsarigradskochaussee Blvd. Block 2 1113 Sofia Bulgaria (See <i>Industrial Property</i>, 1987, p. 363; 1993, p. 167; 1995, p. 43)	Bacteria, actinomycetes, microscopic fungi, yeasts, animal cell lines, animal and plant viruses, microorganisms containing plasmids.	The deposit of a microorganism in connection with the filing of an application for an authorship certificate is free of charge. The deposit of a microorganism in connection with the filing of a patent application is subject to the following fees: (a) For the initial deposit and 30 years' storage BGL 1,000 (b) Upon prolongation of the deposit for each additional five-year period 150 (c) For the furnishing of a sample of a deposited strain of microorganism 100
NATIONAL COLLECTION OF AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL MICROORGANISMS (NCAIM) Department of Microbiology and Biotechnology University of Horticulture and the Food Industry Somló út 14-16 H-1118 Budapest Hungary (See <i>Industrial Property</i>, 1986, pp. 203 and 432; 1993, p. 83.)	Bacteria (including <i>Streptomyces</i>) except obligate human pathogenic species (e.g., <i>Corynebacterium diphtheriae</i>, <i>Mycobacterium leprae</i>, <i>Yersinia pestis</i>, etc.). Fungi, including yeasts and molds, except some pathogens (<i>Blastomyces</i>, <i>Coccidioides</i>, <i>Histoplasma</i>, etc.), as well as certain basidiomycetous and plant pathogenic fungi which cannot be preserved reliably. Apart from the above-mentioned, the following may not, at present, be accepted for deposit: - viruses, phages, rickettsiae, - algae, protozoa, - cell lines, hybridomas.	(a) Storage of the microorganisms in accordance with Rule 9.1 HUF 24,000 (b) Issuance of an attestation in accordance with Rule 8.2 1,000 (c) Issuance of a viability statement, except in the cases provided for under Rule 10.2(e) 3,000 (d) Furnishing of a sample in accordance with Rule 11.2 or 11.3 (plus cost of transport) 4,000
NATIONAL COLLECTION OF FOOD BACTERIA (NCFB) AFRC Institute of Food Research Reading Laboratory Earley Gate Whiteknights Road Reading, Berkshire RG6 2EF United Kingdom (See <i>Industrial Property</i>, 1990, p. 55; 1994, p. 203.)	Bacteria, including actinomycetes, that can be preserved without significant change to their properties by liquid nitrogen freezing or by lyophilization, and which are allocated to a hazard group no higher than Group 2 as defined by the UK Advisory Committee on Dangerous Pathogens (ACDP) (1984). Plasmids, including recombinants, either (i) cloned into a bacterial or actinomycete host, or (ii) as naked DNA preparations. As regards (i), above, the hazard category of the host with or without its plasmid must be no higher than ACDP Group 2. As regards (ii), above, the phenotypic markers of the plasmid must be capable of expression in a bacterial or actinomycete host and must be readily detectable. In all cases, the physical containment requirements must not be higher than level II as defined by the UK Advisory Committee on Genetic Manipulation (ACGM), Guidance Note 15, and the deposited material must be capable of being preserved without significant change to its properties by liquid nitrogen freezing or lyophilization. Bacteriophages that have a hazard rating and containment requirements no greater than those cited above and which can be preserved without significant change to their properties by liquid nitrogen freezing or lyophilization. Bacteria of milk and milk products. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the NCFB reserves the right to refuse to accept any material for deposit which, in the opinion of the Curator, presents an unacceptable hazard or is technically too difficult to handle.	(a) Storage GBP 350 (b) Issuance of a viability statement 50 (c) Furnishing of a sample 30 (plus cost of carriage) Where applicable, charges are subject to Value Added Tax at the current rate. For details concerning the Value Added Tax liability, see <i>Industrial Property</i>, 1987, p. 203.

INTERNATIONAL DEPOSITARY AUTHORITY	KINDS OF MICROORGANISMS THAT MAY BE DEPOSITED	FEES
NATIONAL COLLECTION OF TYPE CULTURES (NCTC) Central Public Health Laboratory 61 Colindale Avenue London NW9 5HT United Kingdom (See <i>Industrial Property</i>, 1982, pp. 219 and 220.)	Bacteria that can be preserved without significant change to their properties by freeze-drying and which are pathogenic to man and/or animals.	(a) Storage GBP 250 (b) Issuance of a viability statement, where a fee may be charged 25 (c) Furnishing of a sample in accordance with Rule 11.2 or 11.3 40 Fees paid within the United Kingdom are subject to Value Added Tax at the current rate; for details concerning the Value Added Tax liability, see <i>Industrial Property</i>, 1987, p. 203.
NATIONAL COLLECTION OF YEAST CULTURES (NCYC) AFRC Institute of Food Research Norwich Laboratory Colney Lane Norwich NR4 7UA United Kingdom (See <i>Industrial Property</i>, 1982, pp. 24 and 26; 1988, p. 265; 1990, p. 25.)	Yeasts other than known pathogens that can be preserved without significant change to their properties by freeze-drying or, exceptionally, in active culture.	(a) Storage GBP 350 (b) Issuance of a viability statement, where a fee may be charged 50 (c) Furnishing of a sample in accordance with Rule 11.2 or 11.3 (plus cost for postage and packing for destinations outside the United Kingdom) 30 Fees paid within the United Kingdom are subject to Value Added Tax at the current rate; for details concerning the Value Added Tax liability, see <i>Industrial Property</i>, 1987, p. 203.
NATIONAL COLLECTIONS OF INDUSTRIAL AND MARINE BACTERIA LIMITED (NCIMB) 23 St. Machar Drive Aberdeen AB2 1RY Scotland United Kingdom (See <i>Industrial Property</i>, 1982, pp. 121, 122 and 275; 1985, p. 25; 1986, p. 371; 1988, pp. 39 and 293; 1989, p. 24; 1990, p. 25; 1991, p. 108.)	(a) Bacteria, including actinomycetes, that can be preserved without significant change to their properties by liquid nitrogen freezing or by freeze-drying (lyophilization), and which are allocated to a hazard group no higher than Group 2 as defined by the UK Advisory Committee on Dangerous Pathogens (ACDP). (b) Plasmids, including recombinants, either (i) cloned into a bacterial or actinomycete host, or (ii) as naked DNA preparations. As regards (i), above, the hazard category of the host with or without its plasmid must be no higher than ACDP Group 2. As regards (ii), above, the phenotypic markers of the plasmid must be capable of expression in a bacterial or actinomycete host and must be readily detectable. In all cases, the physical containment requirements must not be higher than level III as defined by the UK Advisory Committee on Genetic Manipulation (ACGM) and the properties of the deposited material must not be changed significantly by liquid nitrogen freezing or freeze-drying. (c) Bacteriophages that have a hazard rating and containment requirements no greater than those cited in (a) or (b), above, and which can be preserved without significant change to their properties by liquid nitrogen freezing or by lyophilization. (d) Yeasts (including those containing plasmids) that can be preserved without significant change to their properties by liquid nitrogen freezing or by freeze-drying, that are allocated to a hazard group no higher than ACDP Group 2, and which require physical containment no higher than level II ACGM. (e) Seeds that can be dried to a low moisture content and/or stored at low temperatures without excessive impairment of germination potential. The right is reserved to refuse the deposit of seeds where dormancy is exceptionally difficult to break. The acceptance of seeds by NCIMB and the furnishing of samples thereof are subject at all	(a) Storage GBP 400 (b) Issuance of a viability statement, where a fee may be charged 50 (c) Furnishing of a sample in accordance with Rule 11.2 or 11.3 (plus actual cost of carriage) 40 Where statutory provisions require NCIMB to obtain a license or certificate prior to accepting a deposit of seeds, the actual cost of obtaining any such license or certificate will be charged to the depositor. The fees are payable to the National Collections of Industrial and Marine Bacteria Limited. Charges paid by individuals or organizations within the United Kingdom are subject to Value Added Tax at the current rate for carriage charges only. For details concerning the Value Added Tax liability, see <i>Industrial Property</i>, 1987, p. 203.

INTERNATIONAL DEPOSITORY AUTHORITY	KINDS OF MICROORGANISMS THAT MAY BE DEPOSITED	FEES
NATIONAL COLLECTIONS OF INDUSTRIAL AND MARINE BACTERIA LIMITED (NCIMB) (Continued)	times to the provisions of the Plant Health (Great Britain) Order 1987, including any future amendments or revisions of that Order. NCIMB must be notified in advance of all intended deposits of seeds so that it may ensure that all relevant regulations are complied with. Any seeds received without prior notification may be destroyed immediately. Notwithstanding the foregoing, NCIMB reserves the right to refuse to accept any material for deposit which, in the opinion of the Curator, presents an unacceptable hazard or is technically too difficult to handle. In exceptional circumstances, NCIMB may accept deposits which can only be maintained in active culture, but acceptance of such deposits, and relevant fees, must be decided on an individual basis by prior negotiation with the prospective depositor.	
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF BIOSCIENCE AND HUMAN-TECHNOLOGY (NIBH) Agency of Industrial Science and Technology Ministry of International Trade and Industry 1-3, Higashi 1-chome Tsukuba-shi Ibaraki-ken 305 Japan (See <i>Industrial Property</i>, 1981, pp. 120 and 122; 1984, p. 114; 1987, p. 331; 1988, p. 139; 1989, pp. 51 and 172; 1993, pp. 27 and 83; 1994, p. 67.)	Fungi, yeasts, bacteria, actinomycetes, animal cell cultures and plant cell cultures, EXCEPT: - microorganisms having properties which are or may be dangerous to human health or the environment; - microorganisms which require the physical containment level P3 or P4 for experiments, as described in the <i>Prime Minister's Guidelines for Recombinant DNA Experiments of 1986</i>.	(a) Storage: - original deposit JPY 220,000 - new deposit 16,000 (b) Attestation referred to in Rule 8.2 2,000 (c) Issuance of a viability statement: - if the depositor, when requesting the issuance of a viability statement, also requests a viability test 10,000 - other cases 2,000 (d) Furnishing of a sample 11,000* (e) Communication of information under Rule 7.6 2,000
RUSSIAN COLLECTION OF MICROORGANISMS (VKM) Prospekt Naouki No. 5 142292 Puchino (Moscow Region) Russian Federation (See <i>Industrial Property</i>, 1987, p. 249; 1992, pp. 276; 1994, p. 317.)	Bacteria (including actinomycetes) and microscopic fungi (including yeasts), also if they are carriers of recombinant DNA, are accepted for deposit, to the exclusion of microorganisms that cause disease in man and animals and microorganisms that have a toxicogenic effect on plants or require them to be quarantined.	(a) Storage USD 300 (b) Issuance of viability statements 50 (c) Furnishing of a samples 50 The above amounts do not include mailing charges, which are invoiced separately at cost.
RUSSIAN NATIONAL COLLECTION OF INDUSTRIAL MICROORGANISMS (VKPM) GNII GENETIKA Dorozhny proezd, 1 Moscow 113545 Russian Federation (See <i>Industrial Property</i>, 1987, p. 248; 1992, pp. 276; 1994, pp. 276.)	Bacteria (including actinomycetes) and microscopic fungi (including yeasts) for essentially industrial and non-medical purposes are accepted for deposit, to the exclusion of microorganisms that cause disease in man and animals and microorganisms that have a toxicogenic effect on plants or require them to be quarantined.	(a) Storage USD 300 (b) Issuance of viability statements 50 (c) Furnishing of samples 50 The above amounts do not include mailing charges, which are invoiced separately at cost.

Notifications Concerning the UPOV Convention

International Convention for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants (UPOV)

Accession

ARGENTINA

The Government of Argentina deposited, on November 25, 1994, its instrument of accession to the International Convention for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants of December 2, 1961, as revised at Geneva on November 10, 1972, and on October 23, 1978.

Argentina has not heretofore been a member of the International Union for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants, founded by the said International Convention.

The said International Convention will enter into force, with respect to Argentina, on December 25, 1994. On that date, Argentina will become a member of UPOV.

For the purpose of determining its share in the total amount of the annual contributions to the budget of UPOV, one-fifth (0.2) of one contribution unit is applicable to Argentina.

UPOV Notification No. 46, of November 28, 1994.

Activities of WIPO

The World Intellectual Property Organization in 1994— An Overview of Activities and Developments

Introduction

At their meetings in September-October, the Governing Bodies of WIPO and the Unions administered by WIPO expressed their satisfaction as far as the activities of the International Bureau during the last year and a half were concerned, with the great quantity and the excellent quality of those activities

and the imagination and efficiency with which they were carried out and, as far as the reports on those activities were concerned, with their all-embracing coverage, transparency and clarity. They were of the view that the activities had attained their objectives and that the Director General and the staff of the International Bureau had once again demonstrated their capacity to respond with verve, flair and efficiency to the challenges brought about by the

changing world situation and the expectations of member States.

In 1994, a vigorous level of activities was attained in all three main areas of WIPO's activities: development cooperation, setting of norms and international registration. In the area of development cooperation, this was facilitated by the increased budgetary allocations in the 1994-95 biennium.

In the area of norm-setting, the Diplomatic Conference for the Conclusion of the Trademark Law Treaty successfully completed its work and adopted the said Treaty in October.

Also in October, the WIPO Arbitration Center for the Resolution of Intellectual Property Disputes became operational.

As for international registrations, there was an upsurge in membership of the Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT) Union, while the number of international applications increased by about 19%, 6% and 4.5% compared to the previous year for patents, trademarks and industrial designs, respectively.

The importance of international protection of intellectual property was further underlined by the increase in membership of the Organization and the Paris Union for the Protection of Industrial Property and the Berne Union for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works. During the period under review, the total of States members of WIPO increased from 143 to 150, of the Paris Union from 117 to 127, and of the Berne Union from 105 to 110.

The General Assembly decided, in October, to establish an *ad hoc* working group open to all Member States of WIPO to, *inter alia*, consider cooperation between WIPO, on the one hand, and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) and the World Trade Organization (WTO), on the other. The General Assembly also decided that the International Bureau should advise and give assistance to any State, at its request, on questions of compatibility of intellectual property legislation with international treaties, including the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights, Including Trade in Counterfeit Goods (TRIPS Agreement).

At a meeting in July, the WIPO Coordination Committee decided that, in view of the recent changes in South Africa, the decision taken at its 1977 session to exclude the then *Apartheid* regime of South Africa from all meetings of WIPO should cease to be applicable with immediate effect. That country has since participated in all the main meetings convened at the headquarters of WIPO in Geneva.

In October, the Coordination Committee decided, by consensus, to submit the name of Dr. Arpad Bogsch, the present Director General, to the General Assembly in 1995 with a view to his appointment for the continuation of his term of office as Director General of WIPO.

Development Cooperation Activities

During the period under review, WIPO received many requests for assistance from developing countries. As the outlook with regard to extra-budgetary funds from the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) further deteriorated, the high level of WIPO's assistance to developing countries could be sustained mainly because of the Organization's increased allocation from its own regular budget for such work.

A total of 108 developing countries, two territories and 12 intergovernmental organizations of developing countries benefited from WIPO's development cooperation program in the fields of industrial property and copyright and neighboring rights. One hundred and one courses, seminars or other meetings were held at the global, regional or national levels, giving training or information to some 9,000 men and women coming from the government and private sectors. The travel and living expenses of some 1,050 men or women were borne by WIPO, donor Member States of WIPO and intergovernmental organizations. Study visits were organized for 70 persons.

As for advisory missions relating to legislation and institution-building, 182 such missions were undertaken to 65 developing countries. The enactment of laws or the revision of existing ones remained the prime objective of missions dealing with legislation. As for institution-building, the missions focused mainly on the streamlining and computerization of procedures in industrial property offices and on the use of CD-ROM technology in disseminating and accessing industrial property information. A number of such advisory missions also gave on-the-spot training to government officials or supervised the installation of computer equipment and software. Each mission was composed of WIPO officials and/or specially recruited WIPO consultants. In total, 215 consultants were engaged either for advisory missions or as speakers in courses and seminars, with a significant proportion of those consultants, 32% of them, coming from developing countries.

The WIPO Academy conducted two sessions for middle- and senior-level government officials from developing countries of Asia and the Pacific, and of Latin America and the Caribbean, respectively. The aim of each session was to present current intellectual property issues in such a way as to highlight the policy considerations behind them and thereby enable the participants in the Academy, on their return to their countries, to better formulate appropriate policies for their governments.

The WIPO Permanent Committee for Development Cooperation Related to Copyright and Neighboring Rights (PC/CR) held its eleventh session in May and the WIPO Permanent Committee for

Development Cooperation Related to Industrial Property (PC/IP) held its sixteenth session in June. These two meetings were the occasion for the countries members of those Committees to review and evaluate the development cooperation activities carried out by WIPO since the last meetings of the said Committees, as well as to comment on the main orientations for those activities in 1994 and 1995. The PC/IP also requested the International Bureau to give advice to developing countries in connection with the TRIPS Agreement.

Cooperation with developing countries at the regional or subregional level was further strengthened, as shown by the closer dialogue and cooperation with such organizations as the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN), the Common Market of the Southern Cone (MERCOSUR), the Permanent Secretariat of the General Treaty on Central American Economic Integration (SIECA), the Board of the Cartagena Agreement (JUNAC), the African Regional Industrial Property Organization (ARIPO) and the African Intellectual Property Organization (OAPI).

In carrying out its development cooperation program, WIPO received financial support or support in kind from 68 countries, both developing and industrialized, and 10 intergovernmental organizations, foremost among the latter being UNDP, the European Patent Office (EPO) and the Commission of the European Community (CEC). The donor countries which provided general funds in trust for the program were France, Japan and Sweden.

Norm-Setting Activities

Regarding work on the setting of norms and the exploration of issues in possible need of norm-setting, the high-water mark was the unanimous adoption by the Diplomatic Conference, held in October in Geneva, of the Trademark Law Treaty (TLT). The Treaty, which contains 25 Articles and is accompanied by Regulations comprising eight Rules and eight Model International Forms, will greatly simplify and harmonize the procedures for the protection of trademarks, including service marks. It will save time and expenses for trademark owners and their representatives, and will, thereby, have a clearly positive impact in a global economic environment in which trademarks become increasingly important. The TLT is all the more necessary as important differences exist nowadays in the relevant laws in the various countries of the world. Harmonization of trademark law through the new Treaty will therefore benefit not only economic operators but also national and regional industrial property offices.

The Treaty's main features will bring about practical improvements in procedures before the trademark registry, such as the possibility of seeking

registration of goods and services belonging to several classes by filing a single application; the obligation for all Contracting Parties to accept applications for the registration of service marks; the prohibition of the requirement of the legalization of signatures; the possibility to obtain the recording of changes in registrations belonging to the same owner through a single request, even where the changes concern several hundred registered marks; the prohibition for trademark registries to require compliance with registration formalities not expressly mentioned in the "maximum list" of the Treaty; the possibility of dividing applications and registrations into two or more applications or registrations without losing the original filing date; the unification, to 10 years each, of the initial term of registration and each renewal term.

Any State member of WIPO and certain intergovernmental organizations may become party to the TLT. The Treaty may be revised by a diplomatic conference and such a conference may also adopt protocols for the further development of the harmonization of laws on marks.

The TLT was opened for signature on October 28, 1994, and will remain open for signature at WIPO until October 27, 1995. By the end of 1994, it had been signed by 39 States. The Trademark Law Treaty will enter into force three months after five States have deposited their instruments of ratification or accession with the Director General of WIPO who is the depositary of the Treaty.

In October, the WIPO General Assembly decided that the Committee of Experts for the Settlement of Intellectual Property Disputes Between States would meet again in 1995, before the September 1995 ordinary session of the WIPO General Assembly, and that the General Assembly, at that future session, would decide, *inter alia*, whether to hold a Diplomatic Conference for the Conclusion of a Treaty on the Settlement of Intellectual Property Disputes Between States and, if so, when. The text of the proposed Rules of Procedure for the Diplomatic Conference had been considered and approved in a Preparatory Meeting held in February.

The Committee of Experts on a Possible Protocol to the Berne Convention, which met in December, examined proposals for the inclusion in the Berne Protocol of provisions concerning the protection of computer programs, data bases and the right of distribution, including the rights of rental and importation. The Committee also considered proposals for the abolition of non-voluntary licenses for the sound recording of musical works and primary broadcasting and satellite communication, for the extension of the term of protection of photographic works, and for the inclusion of provisions on the enforcement of rights.

The Committee of Experts on a Possible Instrument for the Protection of the Rights of Performers

and Producers of Phonograms, which met immediately afterwards, based its discussions on a memorandum prepared by the International Bureau containing proposals intended to modernize the international rules of protection of performers and producers of phonograms, taking into account such recent technological developments as digital technology. Discussion focused on proposed new definitions of key terms such as "performers," "fixation" and "phonogram," followed by an exchange of views on the economic rights of performers in their performances fixed in phonograms, the economic rights of producers of phonograms in their phonograms and, finally, the moral rights of performers and the right of adaptation of performers and producers of phonograms. Because of the shortness of time, several issues were put aside for later discussion, including the economic rights of performers in their live performances, "home copying" and enforcement of rights.

It was agreed that a further session of the said two Committees would be held jointly. It will take place from September 4 to 12, 1995.

A Consultation Meeting was held in February on the possible establishment of a voluntary international numbering system for certain categories of literary and artistic works and for phonograms. The Consultation Meeting created four working groups on a possible numbering system for musical works and for phonograms, for computer programs, for printed works and for audiovisual works, respectively, all of which met and had useful discussions in the first half of 1994. Many participants felt that work on these issues should continue at the national and international levels.

Regarding the Patent Law Treaty (PLT), the Assembly of the Paris Union agreed in October that a Consultative Meeting for the Further Preparation of the Diplomatic Conference for the Conclusion of the Patent Law Treaty should be convened by the Director General of WIPO in the first half of 1995 in order to try to recommend solutions to the principal issues involved so that, in due course, the Diplomatic Conference could be reconvened. The results of the Consultative Meeting should be considered by the 1995 sessions of the Governing Bodies of WIPO. The proposed Treaty would no longer be referred to as a "Treaty Supplementing the Paris Convention as Far as Patents Are Concerned" but as the "Patent Law Treaty," with a view to de-linking it from the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property, that is, lifting the obligation of being a party to the Paris Convention as a condition for being a party to the proposed Treaty.

WIPO Arbitration Center

The WIPO Arbitration Center became operational on October 1, 1994. The commencement of opera-

tions was preceded by various preparatory steps culminating in the first Meeting of the WIPO Arbitration Council in September. At that meeting, the WIPO Arbitration Council, comprising 10 eminent international experts, discussed the WIPO Mediation, Arbitration and Expedited Arbitration Rules and the model WIPO contract clauses and submission agreements, which subsequently entered into force on October 1, 1994. It further considered the composition of the WIPO Arbitration Consultative Commission which was established by the Director General of WIPO. The Commission had 34 members on December 31, 1994.

Countries in Transition to a Market-Economy System

In 1994, WIPO's contacts with countries in transition to a market-economy system were primarily in connection with those countries' programs for upgrading their intellectual property systems. Government leaders and officials from several of those countries had discussions in Geneva with the Director General and studied the International Bureau's work, while WIPO officials visited the capitals of several of the countries concerned to give further advice. A number of officials were invited for study visits at WIPO and to various countries. The International Bureau assisted them, on request, in the preparation of laws dealing with one or more aspects of intellectual property and gave advice on adherence to WIPO-administered treaties (principally by depositing with the Director General a declaration of continued application). Advice was also given on the establishment of administrative structures to implement those laws, while assistance and training were extended in relation to accession to WIPO-administered treaties. Staff members of the International Bureau lectured in seminars and meetings to promote awareness of the importance of intellectual property in those countries as well as in special training courses.

The International Bureau also gave advice and assistance relating to the Interstate Council on the Protection of Industrial Property (ICPIC) (which groups nine States of the former Soviet Union, namely, Armenia, Belarus, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, the Republic of Moldova, the Russian Federation, Tajikistan, Ukraine and Uzbekistan) on a plan to set up a regional patent system under the Eurasian Patent Convention. That Convention was initialled in Geneva in February 1994, at the headquarters of WIPO, and signed by the plenipotentiary representatives of the said nine States in July in Minsk. The International Bureau participated actively in all the meetings that had taken place to draft and finalize that Convention.

Registration Activities

Compared to 1993, the number of registrations in the three international registration systems increased in 1994. Under the Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT), there were 34,104 international applications, representing a growth of 19.34% compared to 1993 (28,577). Of these, 447 international applications were filed directly with the International Bureau in its capacity as a receiving Office. That capacity started on January 1, 1994. As an average of 39 countries were designated per application, the 34,104 international applications were equivalent to 1,320,000 national applications.

In the Madrid trademark system, the total number of registrations was about 17,500, representing an increase of 6% compared to 1993 (16,498). As an average of 10 countries were designated per application, the some 17,500 international applications were equivalent to some 175,000 national applications. The total number of renewals, about 4,500, also represented an increase compared to the corresponding figure in 1993 (4,264).

In the Hague industrial design system, the combined total of industrial design deposits, renewals and prolongations was about 5,400, representing an increase of about 4.7% in relation to the 1993 figure (4,798).

In October, the Assembly of the PCT Union decided that the proposal to increase the maximum number of designation fees payable under the PCT or an alternative proposal for a general fee increase could be considered by the Assembly in 1995.

The Working Group on the Application of the Madrid Protocol, which met in May, agreed on a number of changes to the Rules and Forms under the draft Regulations under the Madrid Agreement Concerning the International Registration of Marks and the Protocol thereunder. Those changes were taken into account by the International Bureau for the preparation of a new version of the Regulations, which was circulated for comments. Following the receipt of those comments, a final draft of the Regulations will be prepared for submission to the Assembly of the Madrid Union once the required number of instruments of ratification or accession for the entry into force of the Protocol has been deposited.

The Committee of Experts on the Development of the Hague Agreement Concerning the International Deposit of Industrial Designs, which met in late January and early February, discussed in detail a draft new Act of the Hague Agreement containing solutions encouraging more accessions of States to the Agreement and making the new Act more attractive to users.

WIPO/GATT-WTO Cooperation

In October, the WIPO General Assembly adopted the following Resolution in respect of cooperation

between WIPO and the World Trade Organization (WTO):

“1. Having noted that the preamble of the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights states that the Members of the World Trade Organization desire to establish a mutually supportive relationship between the World Trade Organization and the World Intellectual Property Organization, the WIPO General Assembly hereby also expresses the desire to establish a mutually supportive relationship between the World Intellectual Property Organization and the World Trade Organization.

2. In accordance with its desire to establish a mutually supportive relationship between the World Intellectual Property Organization and the World Trade Organization, the WIPO General Assembly decides to establish an *ad hoc* working group open to all Member States of WIPO:

- (i) to advise and cooperate with the Director General of WIPO in his contacts with the competent organs of GATT/WTO;
- (ii) to discuss matters concerning possible cooperation between WIPO and WTO;
- (iii) to consider the establishment of an *ad hoc* informal WIPO/GATT-WTO Consultation Group on all matters concerning possible cooperation between WIPO and WTO.

3. The WIPO General Assembly decides that the International Bureau should be at the disposal of any State that expressly asks for advice on questions of compatibility of its existing or planned national intellectual property legislation not only with treaties administered by WIPO, but also with other international norms and trends, including the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights, and that the International Bureau should prepare studies on the implications of the said Agreement on the treaties administered by WIPO.”

It was noted that, as was the practice in WIPO, any such advice or studies would not constitute an official interpretation of any international agreement.

New Adherences to Treaties

In 1994, there was a marked increase in the number of States party to treaties administered by WIPO. The following States became party to, *inter alia*, the following treaties (the figures in brackets indicate the total number of States party to the treaties on December 31, 1994):

WIPO Convention: Andorra, Brunei Darussalam, Georgia, Guyana, Kyrgyzstan, Laos, Tajikistan (150);

Paris Convention: Armenia, Estonia, Georgia, Guyana, Kyrgyzstan, Liberia, Lithuania, Paraguay, Singapore, Tajikistan (127);

Berne Convention: Estonia, Guyana, Lithuania, Russian Federation, United Republic of Tanzania (110);

Budapest Treaty: Latvia, Republic of Moldova, Singapore, Tajikistan (33);

Rome Convention: Hungary, Iceland (47);

Geneva (Phonograms) Convention: Colombia, Russian Federation (52);

Brussels (Satellites) Convention: Bosnia and Herzegovina (19);

Nairobi Treaty: Republic of Moldova, Tajikistan (36);

Strasbourg Agreement: Tajikistan (28);

Nice Agreement: China, Latvia, Tajikistan (41);

Locarno Agreement: Tajikistan (22);

Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT): Armenia, Estonia, Georgia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Liberia, Lithuania, Mexico, Republic of Moldova, Singapore, Swaziland, Tajikistan, Uganda (76);

Madrid (International Registration of Marks) Agreement: Armenia, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Republic of Moldova, Tajikistan (43);

Hague Agreement: Republic of Moldova, Slovenia (25);

Film Register Treaty: Colombia, Peru, Senegal (12).

Staff

In October, the Coordination Committee decided, by consensus, to submit the name of Dr. Arpad Bogsch, the present Director General, to the General Assembly in 1995 with a view to his appointment for the continuation of his term of office at the head of WIPO, it being understood that the duration of the term of office starting on December 1, 1995, and any other conditions of the appointment would be fixed by the General Assembly in 1995.

Earlier, in July, the WIPO Coordination Committee unanimously approved the appointment of Mr. Kamil E. Idris, a national of Sudan, to the post of Deputy Director General of WIPO from August 1, 1994, to July 31, 2000. The same Committee gave favorable advice on the promotion of Mr. Jean-Luc Perrin, a national of France, and Mr. Yoshiyuki Takagi, a national of Japan, to grade D.1, as Director, Personnel Division, and Director, Industrial Property Information Division, respectively. Pursuant to similar advice, Mr. Giovanni Tagnani, a national of Italy, was promoted in October to grade D.1, as Director, Buildings Division.

Normative Activities of WIPO

Paris Union

Diplomatic Conference for the Conclusion of the Trademark Law Treaty

(Geneva, October 10 to 28, 1994)

OUTLINE

	<i>Paragraphs</i>
Introduction	1 – 4
Preparatory Work	5 – 10
Summary of the TLT	11 – 23
Significance of the TLT	24 – 28
Conditions for Becoming Party to the TLT	29 – 31
Signature	32 – 33
Entry Into Force	34
List of Participants	

Introduction

1. The Trademark Law Treaty, or TLT, was concluded on October 28, 1994, at the outcome of a Diplomatic Conference held by WIPO in Geneva, at its headquarters, from October 10 to 28, 1994, which was attended by representatives of 91 States, six intergovernmental organizations and 20 non-governmental organizations.

2. The Conference was opened by Dr. Arpad Bogesch, Director General of WIPO, who took part in all the meetings of the Plenary and of the Main Committee of the Conference.

3. Mr. Marcelo Vargas Campos (Mexico) was elected President of the Conference. The Main Committee of the Conference was chaired by Mr. Alec Sugden (United Kingdom), the Drafting Committee by Mr. Michael K. Kirk (United States of America) and the Credentials Committee by Mr. Ali Ahmed Sahlool (Sudan).

4. The lists of participants, officers and committees appears at the end of this note.¹

Preparatory Work

5. The TLT goes back to the adoption by the concerned Governing Bodies of WIPO and of the International Union for the Protection of Industrial Property (Paris Union) of a proposal made in 1987 by the Director General of WIPO to the Governing Bodies of the Organization to draw up a draft treaty on the harmonization of certain provisions of laws on marks.

6. The drafting of the treaty was undertaken by a Committee of Experts on the Harmonization of Laws for the Protection of Marks (hereinafter referred to as “the Committee of Experts”) set up by WIPO. Between 1989 and 1993, the Committee of Experts held six sessions: one in 1989, one in 1990, two in 1992 and two in 1993.²

7. The aim of the Committee at the outset of its work—and during the first two sessions (1989 and 1990)—was to achieve harmonization of substantive and procedural matters under trademark law. In approving the WIPO Program for the 1992-93 bien-nium, the Governing Bodies of the Organization approved a statement by the Director General of WIPO that the preparatory documents to be submitted by the International Bureau to the Committee of Experts would contain solely proposals for the simplification of formalities. The International Bureau therefore submitted to the third session of the Committee of Experts, held in June 1992, provisions for a draft treaty the scope of which was limited to the simplification of administrative proce-

¹ A full list of participants may be obtained on request from the International Bureau.

² For notes on the first, second, third, fourth, fifth and sixth sessions, see *Industrial Property*, 1990, pp. 101 and 375, 1992, p. 244, 1993, pp. 89 and 289, and 1994, p. 71, respectively. For the Treaty and the Regulations thereunder, see *Industrial Property Laws and Treaties*, MULTILATERAL TREATIES – Texts 3-010 and 3-011, respectively.

dures. These were defined as being procedures before a national or regional office dealing with the registration of marks and mainly relating to: the form and contents of an application for registration, the appointment of a representative, the form and contents of requests for the recording of changes in names and addresses, changes in ownership or corrections.

8. At its fourth, fifth and sixth sessions (November 1992, June 1993 and November/December 1993), the following additional matters were included in the draft TLT: kind and nature of the marks to which the treaty should apply, conditions to be met by an application in order to obtain a filing date, division of an application or of a registration, form and contents of requests for renewal.

9. The Committee of Experts further examined, as of its fifth session, a series of model international forms to be used for the application for registration and under other procedures, such as requests for recording a change of name and address and requests for recording a change in ownership.

10. The preparatory work for the Treaty was finalized by a preparatory meeting for the Diplomatic Conference, held in December 1993, which drew up the agenda and the rules of procedure to be proposed for the Diplomatic Conference, and which also took decisions on invitations and organizational matters concerning the conference.

Summary of the TLT

11. As adopted by the Diplomatic Conference, the TLT contains 25 Articles and is accompanied by Regulations comprising eight Rules and eight International Forms. The following description is not exhaustive, but simply highlights the main features of the Treaty.

12. The great majority of the TLT provisions concern procedure before the trademark offices. This procedure can be divided into three main phases: the application for registration, changes after registration, renewal.

13. For each phase, the TLT sets out clearly the most that the trademark offices may require of an applicant or the owner of a registration and gives examples of what it may not, therefore, require of them.

14. As far as the *first phase* is concerned, that is to say, the application phase, the TLT permits 17 types of element or particular to be required, in particular a request for registration, the name, address or other

particulars of the applicant or his representative, various particulars of the mark, as well as the classes of the goods and services according to the International Classification established by the Nice Agreement. It should be noted that a Contracting Party may require that the application be accompanied by a declaration of intention to use the mark, a requirement that is important for a number of States, particularly the United States of America.

15. During this application phase, no Contracting Party may require any formality other than those expressly permitted by the TLT. This general prohibition is accompanied by a number of examples. For instance, the applicant may not be required to furnish proof that he carries on an industrial or commercial activity or that he carries on an industrial or commercial activity relating to the goods or services for which the mark is to be used. Likewise, an applicant may not be required to furnish proof that his mark is already registered in another country, unless the applicant claims application of Article 6*quinquies* of the Paris Convention (registration of the mark "as it is").

16. A very significant innovation with respect to the application for registration is the fact that every Contracting Party must accept goods or services belonging to several classes of the international classification in one and the same application and that such application must lead to a single registration. This provision in the TLT will require amendments to the laws of a number of States having significant activity in trademarks when those States become party to the TLT.

17. The *second phase* of the procedure covered by the TLT concerns changes to names and addresses of the applicant or of the owner as also changes in ownership. Again in this case, the TLT lists exhaustively the formal conditions that may be required and also those that may not. It is noteworthy that all Contracting Parties must accept the submission of a single request in those cases where the same change affects a number of applications, a number of registrations, or one or more of both simultaneously. As for requests for the entry of a change in ownership, the TLT has introduced new features that will greatly facilitate the task of users. Forms are provided which will make it possible to carry out a transfer or to certify that a transfer has been made. Once such a form has been signed by both the transferer and the transferee and is accompanied by a request for recording, the transfer has to be recorded without further formality and without the need to furnish any further element of proof.

18. The *third phase* dealt with by the TLT is that of renewal. The initial term of registration and that of

each renewal has been standardized. It must be of 10 years in each Contracting Party. The TLT further gives an exhaustive list of the conditions that may be required when renewing a registration and prohibits all other conditions. In particular, a Contracting Party may not require a declaration or evidence as to use of the mark in connection with the renewal. Likewise, it may not require that a reproduction of the mark accompany the request for renewal.

19. Finally, two provisions under the TLT concern all three phases of the procedure before the trademark offices; one concerns representatives and the other signatures.

20. The TLT obliges all the Contracting Parties to accept powers of attorney that relate to more than one application or registration belonging to the same owner. It also provides that if the form for the power of attorney given in the TLT Regulations is used, it has to be accepted and no other condition may be required.

21. With respect to the signatures—that of the applicant, the owner or his representative—no Contracting Party may require an attestation, notarization, authentication, legalization or other certification, except if the law of the Contracting Party so provides, where signature concerns the surrender of a registration.

22. Finally, it should be noted that the TLT Regulations comprise eight Model International Forms, particularly as regards the presentation of the application and the appointment of a representative (power of attorney). All these Model International Forms must be accepted by all TLT Contracting Parties, insofar as they are in the language or one of the languages accepted by its Office.

23. A number of the TLT provisions will oblige certain Contracting Parties to make considerable amendments to their laws and to their administrative practices, and that may take some time. In view of that fact, the TLT contains transitional provisions which enable a State or an intergovernmental organization that becomes party to the TLT to be exempted, under certain conditions, from applying a number of the provisions of the TLT during a limited period of time.

Significance of the TLT

24. The TLT deals with practically all the formalities that have to be complied with in procedures concerning the registration, and the maintenance of registration, of a mark. The Model International

Forms cover all the permitted formalities and, if properly filled in by the applicant for or the holder of the registration, the national or regional Trademark Office is bound to take the action requested in the form.

25. In other words, the formalities are the same for each Contracting Party, whether a State or an intergovernmental organization. This fact means that the formalities are internationally standardized and the objective of the harmonization is achieved.

26. This standardization—as any standardization—means for all users of the trademark system order, clarity and simplicity. Order, because the TLT institutes a logical procedure; clarity, because the TLT spells out in detail and in easily understandable language what users of the system must do and what they may not be required to do. Simplicity, because if the user has to comply with the same requirements before all the Trademark Offices, his task becomes much simpler than if he has to fulfill requirements that are different in the various Offices.

27. Order, clarity and simplicity increase legal security, since they make it unlikely that procedural mistakes will be made by the users. They also mean a procedure that makes the expenses of the user less than in a non-standardized system, since compliance with non-standardized rules requires more intellectual and clerical work than compliance with standardized rules.

28. Thus, to sum up, the main significance of the TLT for users of the national and regional trademark systems is that it increases legal security and decreases expenses.

Conditions for Becoming Party to the TLT

29. Any State may become party to the TLT if it is a member of WIPO. An intergovernmental organization may also become party to the TLT if it maintains an office in which marks may be registered, which is soon to be the case of the European Communities (EC) and is already the case of the African Intellectual Property Organization (OAPI).

30. As far as the States are concerned, it should be noted that, to become party to the TLT, a State does not need to be party to the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property. However, since it is highly desirable that the provisions of the Paris Convention be applied uniformly by all the TLT Contracting Parties, it is provided that any State party to the TLT that is not party to the Paris Convention should apply all the provisions of the Paris Conven-

tion concerning marks, including those relating to the priority right.

31. The TLT further provides that the Contracting Parties should apply to service marks the provisions of the Paris Convention on trademarks. Finally, the TLT goes beyond the obligations under the Paris Convention since it obliges the Contracting Parties to register service marks.

Signature

32. The TLT was opened for signature on October 28, 1994, and has been signed to date by the following 36 States:

Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Hungary, Indonesia, Israel, Italy, Kenya, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Swaziland, Switzerland, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Ukraine, Uruguay, United Kingdom, United States of America.

33. The TLT will remain open for signature until October 27, 1995. By the end of November 1994, it had been signed by Germany, Greece and Senegal.

Entry Into Force

34. The Treaty will enter into force three months after five States have deposited their instruments of ratification or accession with the Director General of WIPO who is the depositary of the Treaty.

List of Participants

Member Delegations: *Algeria:* Anissa Bouabdallah (Mrs.); Dalila Belkheir (Ms.). *Argentina:* Manuel Julio Benitez, Ministro Plenipotenciario, Misión permanente, Ginebra; María Cristina Tosonotti (Srta.). *Australia:* Peter Michael Richards, Registrar of Trade Marks, Australian Industrial Property Organisation; Christopher Knott. *Austria:* Otmar Rafeiner, President, Austrian Patent Office; Helene Preglau (Ms.); Andreas Herdina; Ewald Glantschnig. *Belarus:* Pyotr Zeleny, Deputy Head, Belarus Patent Office; Boris Malashenko; Andrei O. Sannikov; Marina Moroshkina (Miss). *Belgium:* Lode Willems, ambassadeur, représentant permanent, Mission permanente à Genève; Walter Peeters; Gilles Heyvaert. *Bolivia:* Dalcý Cabrera Rios (Srta.), Consejera, Misión Permanente, Ginebra. *Bosnia and Herzegovina:* Mustafa Bijedić, Ambassador, Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission in Geneva. *Brazil:* Luiz Felipe Palmeira Lampreia, Ambassador, Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission in Geneva; Roberto Jaguaribe; Frederico Arruda; Sônia Ribeiro Maia (Mrs.). *Bulgaria:* Kristo Iliev, President, Patent Office; Vesselin Petrov; Shtiriana Valtchanova (Ms.). *Cameroon:* François-Xavier Ngoubeyou, ambassadeur, représen-

tant permanent, Mission permanente à Genève; Nathalie Abomo Belinga Zangha (Mme); Marie-Louise Dzietham (Mme); Mina Matibake Lobe; Alphonse Bombogo. *Canada:* Mart Leesti, Commissioner of Patents and Registrar of Trademarks, Canadian Intellectual Property Office, Department of Industry; Chris McDermott; Alan Troicuk; Carmel Anne Whelton (Ms.). *Chile:* Ernesto Tironi, Embajador, Representante Permanente, Misión Permanente, Ginebra; Pablo Romero; Alejandro Rogers. *China:* Liu Minxue, Director General, State Administration for Industry and Commerce; Cao Zhongqiang; Wan Jiaqing; Wang Tianxiang; Tian Lixiao. *Côte d'Ivoire:* Abdoulaye Touré, directeur de la technologie et des infrastructures industrielles, Ministère de l'industrie et du commerce. *Croatia:* Mimir Žužul, Ambassador, Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission in Geneva; Nikola Kopčić; Vesna Stilin (Mrs.); Slavica Matešić (Mrs.); Tomislav Thür. *Cuba:* José Pérez Novoa, Embajador, Representante Permanente, Misión Permanente, Ginebra; Mario Fernández Finalé; Adrián Delgado González. *Cyprus:* Nicolas D. Macris, Ambassador, Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission in Geneva; Loria Markides (Mrs.). *Czech Republic:* Ladislav Jakl, President, Industrial Property Office; Jana Marešová (Ms.). *Democratic People's Republic of Korea:* Ri Tcheul, Ambassador, Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission in Geneva; Pak Chang Rim; Kim Sung Ryen (Mrs.); Hyen Chun Hwa (Mrs.). *Denmark:* Niels Ravn, Deputy Director General, Danish Patent Office; Knud Wallberg; Jørgen Erik Carstad; Sanne Aakermann Østrup (Mrs.). *Dominican Republic:* Angelina Bonetti Herrera (Sra.), Ministro Consejero, Encargado de Negocios, Misión Permanente, Ginebra. *Egypt:* Mounir Zahran, Ambassador, Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission in Geneva; Badr El Sayed Badr Nassar; Wael Aboulmagd; Alaa Youssef. *El Salvador:* Carlos Ernesto Mendoza, Embajador, Representante Permanente, Misión Permanente, Ginebra; Margarita Escobar López (Srta.). *Estonia:* Urmas Kauler, Head of Trademarks Department, Estonian Patent Office. *Finland:* Martti J.J. Enäjärvi, Director General, National Board of Patents and Registration; Sira-Liisa Lahtinen (Mrs.); Timo Pearinen; Marja-Liisa Virtanen (Mrs.). *France:* Michel de Bonnacorse, ambassadeur, représentant permanent, Mission permanente à Genève; Daniel Hangard; Bruno Boval; Joëlle Roge (Mme); Gérard Borges; Jessica Norma Lewis (Mlle). *Germany:* Alois Jelonek, Ambassador, Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission in Geneva; Ernst Niederleithinger; Alfons Schäfers; Cornelia Rudloff-Schäffer (Mrs.); Matthias Winkler; Eckhard-Georg Miehe; Michael Reuss. *Ghana:* Franck Benneh, Minister Counsellor, Permanent Mission in Geneva. *Greece:* George Helmis, ambassadeur, représentant permanent, Mission permanente à Genève; John Boucaouris; Panayotis Geroulakos; Maria Koroneou (Mme); Emmanouel Manousakis. *Hungary:* Emő Szarka, President, National Office of Inventions; Gábor Bánrévy; György Szemző; Mihály Zoltán Ficsor. *Indonesia:* Nico Kansil, Director General of Copyrights, Patents and Trademarks, Department of Justice; Soemadi D.M. Brotodinigrat, Ambassador, Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission in Geneva; Agustiar Anwar; Leonardo Dos Reis. *Iran (Islamic Republic of):* Seyed Reza Zavareie, Deputy Head of the Judiciary and Head of Registration Organization of Deeds, Intellectual and Industrial Property; Nosratollah Dousty; Mohammad Hossein Moayedoddin; Eshrat Foroudi (Mrs.). *Iraq:* Mohammed Salman, First Secretary, Permanent Mission in Geneva; Mohammed Hussein; A.G. Al-Kaissi. *Ireland:* Vincent O'Reilly, Head of Intellectual Property Unit, Department of Enterprise and Employment; Páraig Hennessy. *Israel:* Michael Ophir, Commissioner of Patents, Designs and Trademarks, Patents, Designs and Trademarks Office, Ministry of Justice; Arnan Gabrieli; Vidal Pearlman (Mrs.). *Italy:* Tommaso Troise, ministre plénipotentiaire, Ministère des affaires étrangères; Pasquale Iannantuono; Sante Paparo; Andrea Meloni; Sabrina Michiorri (Mlle). *Japan:* Minoru Endo, Ambassador, Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission in Geneva; Tetsuo Ito; Hirotaka Kawamoto; Hitoshi Watanabe; Masayuki Koyanagi; Satoshi Moriyasu; Tomoyoshi Yahagi; Shigeo Tashiro; Yoshio Namba; Takanori

Tanaka: Akinori Yamaguchi. *Kenya*: John Ezekiel Kabue Muchae, Deputy Director, Kenya Industrial Property Office, Ministry of Research, Technical Training and Technology. *Latvia*: Zigrīds Aumeisters, Director, Patent Office; Sandra Kalniete (Ms.); Georgy Polyakov. *Lebanon*: Amine El Khazen, ambassadeur, représentant permanent, Mission permanente à Genève; Micheline Abi Samra (Mlle). *Lesotho*: 'Nyalleng 'Mabakuena Pii (Mrs.), Registrar General, Registrar General's Office, Law Office; Makhiba Raphuthing (Mrs.); Kojang Likoti (Mrs.). *Liechtenstein*: Norbert Frick, conseiller d'Ambassade. *Lithuania*: Rimvydas Naujokas, Director, State Patent Bureau; Narcizas Priekšaidis, Ambassador, Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission in Geneva. *Luxembourg*: Paul Peters, ambassadeur, représentant permanent, Mission permanente à Genève; P. Duhr; Fernand Schlessler; Claude Sahl. *Malawi*: Mzondi H. Chirambo, Registrar General, Department of the Registrar General, Ministry of Justice. *Malaysia*: Suboh M. Yassin, Minister Counsellor (Economic Affairs), Permanent Mission in Geneva. *Malta*: Michael Bartolo, Ambassador, Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission in Geneva; Anthony Camenzuli; Martin Valentino; Godwin Warr. *Mexico*: Jorge Amigo Castañeda, Director General, Instituto Mexicano de la Propiedad Industrial; Marcelo Vargas Campos, Embajador, Representante Permanente Altemo, Misión Permanente, Ginebra; Dolores Jiménez Hernández (Sra.); Federico Muñoz Rivera; Leticia Bonifaz Alfonso (Sra.). *Monaco*: Jean-Pierre Campana, directeur du commerce, de l'industrie et de la propriété industrielle, Département des finances et de l'économie; Elie Lindenfeld. *Mongolia*: Damdinsurengiin Demberel, Director, Mongolian Patent Office; Batjargal Tsoeg. *Morocco*: Mohamed Majdi, chargé d'affaires, Mission permanente à Genève; Fatima Baroudi (Mlle). *Netherlands*: Hans Rudolph Furstner, Member, Board of Appeal, Patent Office, Ministry of Economic Affairs; Wim van der Eijk; Jos L. Driesen; Wouter J. Lok. *New Zealand*: Noel McCauley, Assistant Commissioner of Trade Marks, Patent Office, Ministry of Commerce; David Walker. *Nigeria*: Festus Olaitan Femuyi, Acting Registrar, Registry of Trade Marks, Patents and Designs, Ministry of Commerce and Tourism. *Norway*: Jørgen Smith, Director General, Norwegian Patent Office; Ellen S. Helgesen (Ms.); Tone Tangevald-Jensen (Ms.); Jon-Aage Oyslebo. *Paraguay*: Rigoberto Gauto Vielman, Consejero, Encargado de Negocios a.i., Misión Permanente, Ginebra. *Philippines*: Lilia R. Bautista (Ms.), Ambassador, Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission in Geneva; Jaime J. Yambao; Aleli A. Quirino (Miss). *Poland*: Wiesław Kotarba, President, Patent Office; Joanna Bleszyńska-Wysocka (Mrs.). *Portugal*: Zózimo Da Silva, ambassadeur, représentant permanent, Mission permanente à Genève; José Mota Maia; Ruy Serrão; José Paulo Gomes Serrão; Jorge Pereira Da Cruz; Adriano Queirós Ferreira. *Republic of Korea*: Chang-Il Park, Ambassador, Deputy Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission in Geneva; Chang-Joon Shin; Joong-Hyo Kim; Yang-Sup Chung; Hwi Keon Cho. *Republic of Moldova*: Eugen M. Stashkov, Director General, State Agency on Industrial Property Protection. *Romania*: Alexandru Cristian Strenc, Deputy Director General, State Office for Inventions and Trademarks; Rodica Balas (Mrs.); Constanta Moraru (Ms.); Dalila Pitu (Mrs.). *Russian Federation*: Vitaly P. Rassokhin, Chairman, Committee of the Russian Federation for Patents and Trademarks; Valentin M. Oushakov; Mikhail P. Kirpichnikov; Alexandr Kortchaguine; Svetlana A. Gorlenko (Mrs.); Valentina A. Dmitriuk (Mrs.); Alexandre A. Borisssov. *Senegal*: Ibra Déguène Ka, ambassadeur, représentant permanent, Mission permanente à Genève; Ibrahim Fall. *Slovakia*: Peter Porubský, President, Industrial Property Office; Mária Krasnohorská (Ms.), Ambassador, Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission in Geneva; Peter Kollárik; Peter Muriň; Vladimír Dovica. *Slovenia*: Bojan Pretnar, Director, Industrial Property Protection Office, Ministry of Science and Technology; Andrej Logar; Andrej Piano. *South Africa*: J.A. Eksteen, Ambassador, Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission in Geneva; L.T.C. Harms; Johannes Theodorus Potgieter; Christo Janse van Noordwyk; Andrew Gordon Michie. *Spain*: Julián Alvarez

Alvarez, Director General, Oficina Española de Patentes y Marcas; Luis Fernando de Segovia y Rivacoba, Ministro Plenipotenciario, Representante Permanente Adjunto, Misión Permanente, Ginebra; Diego Agustín Carrasco Pradas; Jesús Gómez Montero; Jaime Cos Codina; Fernando Martínez Tejedor; Patricia Lopez Fernández de Corres (Sra.). *Sri Lanka*: Dissanayake M. Karunaratna, Registrar of Patents and Trade Marks, Registry of Patents and Trade Marks; Mahinda G. Hewage; Gomi Tharaka Senadhira. *Sudan*: Ali Ahmed Sahloul, Ambassador, Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission in Geneva; Alier Deng Ruai Deng. *Swaziland*: Maweni Mgobo Simelane, Minister for Justice, Ministry of Justice; Andrias Mlungisi Mathabela; Beatrice S. Shongwe (Mrs.); Esther Thoko Simelane (Mrs.). *Sweden*: Henry Olsson, Special Government Adviser, Ministry of Justice; Anders Feldt. *Switzerland*: Roland Grossenbacher, directeur de l'Office fédéral de la propriété intellectuelle; Jürg Simon; Martin Schneider. *The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia*: Gorgi Filipov, Director, Industrial Property Protection Office, Ministry of Development; Valentin Pepeljugin. *Togo*: Koakou Ata Kato, responsable de la Structure nationale de la propriété industrielle, Ministère de l'industrie et des sociétés d'Etat. *Trinidad and Tobago*: Trevor Spencer, Ambassador, Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission in Geneva; Annette Gonzales (Mrs.); Mazina Kadir (Ms.). *Tunisia*: Moncef Baati, conseiller, Mission permanente à Genève; Fatima Daboussi (Mme). *Turkey*: Erdogan Karaahmet, Vice-President, Turkish Patent Institute; Ayse Karanfil (Miss); Bayram Kacar. *Ukraine*: Olexandre Slipchenko, Ambassador, Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission in Geneva; Nina Moshynskaja (Mrs.); Victor Grynychyne. *United Kingdom*: Alec Sugden, Assistant Comptroller, The Patent Office; Nigel C.R. Williams; Alison Brimelow (Ms.); Malcolm Todd; Averil C. Waters (Miss); Flora Cheng (Mrs.); Yim Fun Mamie Chan (Miss); Timothy M.J. Simmons; Sarah C. Boardman (Ms.). *United Republic of Tanzania*: Elly Elikunda Elineeama Mtango, Ambassador, Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission in Geneva; Msuya W.I. Mangachi. *United States of America*: Michael K. Kirk, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Deputy Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce; Philip Hampton; Lynne G. Beresford (Mrs.); Robert Konrath; Paul Salmon; Carlisle Walters (Mrs.); Alec Wilczynski; Diane Donnelly (Ms.); Dolores K. Hanna (Ms.); Patrick Jay Hines; Louis T. Pirkey; Robert Sacoff. *Uruguay*: Miguel J. Berthet, Embajador, Representante Permanente, Misión Permanente, Ginebra; Graciela Road d'Imperio (Sra.); Carlos Amorin. *Viet Nam*: Doan Phuong, directeur de l'Office national des inventions; Vu Huy Tan. *Zambia*: Musesha Chitundu Joseph Kunkuta, Registrar of Patents, Trade Marks, Companies and Business Names, Ministry of Commerce, Trade and Industry. *Zimbabwe*: Judy Ndaona (Ms.).

Special Delegations: *African Intellectual Property Organization (OAPI)*: Papa Algaphe Thiam, directeur technique du Département de la documentation et de l'information en matière de brevets. *European Communities (EC)*: Hans Friedrich Beseler, directeur général adjoint de la Direction générale "Marché intérieur et services financiers," Commission des Communautés européennes; Jean-Pierre Leng; Bertold Schwab; Daniele Franzone; Rosamaria Gili (Mrs.); Alexander von Mühlendahl; Oreste Montalto; Hermann Kunhardt.

Observer Delegations: *Colombia*: Guillermo Alberto González, Embajador, Representante Permanente, Misión Permanente, Ginebra; Juan Carlos Espinosa. *Ecuador*: Germán Ortega. *Guatemala*: Federico Urruela Prado, Embajador, Representante Permanente, Misión Permanente, Ginebra; Nelson Rafael Olivero. *India*: T.S. Tirumurti; Gill Amandeep. *Pakistan*: Munir Ahmad, Minister Counsellor (Economic), Permanent Mission in Geneva; Asaf Ghafoor. *Peru*: Gonzalo Gutiérrez, Ministro-Consejero, Representante Permanente Altemo (asuntos económicos), Misión Permanente, Ginebra; Javier Prado. *Saudi Arabia*: Issam Hamed

Al-Mubarak, Attaché, Permanent Mission in Geneva. *Thailand*: Piroon Laismit. *Venezuela*: Thaimy Márquez (Sra.).

Intergovernmental Organizations: *Benelux Trademark Office (BBM)*: Edmond L. Simon, directeur adjoint, Application des lois, La Haye. *General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT)*: Matthijs Geuze, Counsellor, Policy Affairs Division, Geneva. *Organization of African Unity (OAU)*: Venant Wege-Nzomwita, observateur permanent adjoint, Délégation permanente, Genève.

International Non-Governmental Organizations: *Arab Society for the Protection of Industrial Property (ASPIP)*: Mohammad R. Doofesh. *Brazilian Association of Industrial Property (ABPI)*: José Antonio Faria Correa. *Committee of National Institutes of Patent Agents (CNIPA)*: Hans-Joachim Lippert; Susan Behrens (Mrs.). *European Association of Industries of Branded Products (AIM)*: Gerd F. Kunze; Dawn M. Franklin (Ms.). *European Communities Trade Mark Association (ECTA)*: Anne Keune (Ms.). *Federation of German Industry (BDI)*: Werner Bökel; Franz Winter; Helmut Pastor. *Hungarian Trademark Association (HTA)*: Gyula Pusztai. *Institute of Trade Marks Agents (ITMA)*, United Kingdom: Adrian Y. Spencer. *International Association for the Protection of Industrial Property (AIPPI)*: Gerd F. Kunze; Robert Harlé. *International Chamber of Commerce (ICC)*: John H. Kraus; Antonio L. de Sampaio. *International Federation of Industrial Property Attorneys (FICPI)*: Basile Catoméris; Jean-François Léger; Antonio de Sampaio. *International Trademark Association (INTA)*: Frederick W. Mostert; Gerd F. Kunze; Bruce J. MacPherson. *Japan Intellectual Property Association (JIPA)*: Hirohisa Suzuki. *Japan Patent Attorneys Association (JPAA)*: Toyoharu Higuchi; Hiromichi Aoki. *Japan Trademark Association (JTA)*: Yumiko Sugimoto (Miss); Hiroshi Nakagawa. *Max Planck Institute for Foreign and International Patent, Copyright and Competition Law (MPI)*: Eva-Marina Bastian (Mrs.). *Union of European Practitioners in Industrial Property (UEPIP)*: Sietse U. Ottevangers; Andrew J.A. Parkes; Rolf Wiclander. *Union of Industrial and Employers' Confederations of Europe (UNICE)*: Matthieu van Kaam.

Officers and Committees:

Conference: *President*: Marcelo Vargas Campos (Mexico). *Vice-Chairmen*: Alfons Schäfers (Germany); Peter Michael

Richards (Australia); Pablo Romero (Chile); Valentin M. Oushakov (Russian Federation); Martti J.J. Enäjärvi (Finland); Nico Kansil (Indonesia); Mzondi H. Chirambo (Malawi); Lilia R. Bautista (Ms.) (Philippines); Alexandru Cristian Strenc (Romania); Koakou Ata Kato (Togo). *Secretary*: François Curchod (WIPO).

Credentials Committee: *Members*: Denmark; Czech Republic; Iran (Islamic Republic of); Portugal; Republic of Korea; Sudan; Trinidad and Tobago. *Officers: Chairman*: Ali Ahmed Sahlool (Sudan). *Vice-Chairmen*: Mohammad Hossein Moayedoddin (Iran (Islamic Republic of)); José Mota Maia (Portugal); Annette Gonzales (Mrs.) (Trinidad and Tobago). *Secretary*: Gust Ledakis (WIPO).

Main Committee: *Chairman*: Alec Sugden (United Kingdom). *Vice-Chairmen*: Abdoulaye Touré (Côte d'Ivoire); Mario Fernández Finalé (Cuba). *Secretary*: Ludwig Baeumer (WIPO).

Drafting Committee: *Members*: Argentina; Brazil; Cameroon; Canada; China; Democratic People's Republic of Korea; Egypt; France; Japan; South Africa; Spain; United States of America; Ukraine; European Communities. *Ex officio*: The Chairman of the Main Committee. *Officers: Chairman*: Michael K. Kirk (United States of America). *Vice-Chairmen*: Nathalie Abomo Belinga Zangha (Mme) (Cameroon); Bruno Boval (France); Jesús Gómez Montero (Spain). *Secretary*: Pierre Mangué (WIPO).

Working Group on Article 17(4) of the Basic Proposal: *Members*: All the Member Delegations and the Special Delegations. *Officer: Chairman*: L.T.C. Harms (South Africa). *Secretary*: François Curchod (WIPO).

Steering Committee: *Ex officio*: The President of the Conference; The Vice-Presidents of the Conference; The Chairman of the Credentials Committee; The Chairman of the Main Committee; The Chairman of the Drafting Committee; The Chairman of the Working Group on Article 17(4) of the Basic Proposal. *Secretary*: François Curchod (WIPO).

International Bureau of the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO): Arpad Bogsch, Director General; François Curchod, Deputy Director General; Gust Ledakis, Assistant Director General and Legal Counsel; Ludwig Baeumer, Director, Industrial Property Law Department; Pierre Mangué, Head, Trademark and Industrial Design Law Section, Industrial Property Law Department; Bernard Ibos, Senior Legal Officer, Legal Section, International Registrations Division.

Permanent Committee on Industrial Property Information (PCIIPI)

PCIIPI Working Group on General Information (PCIIPI/GI)

Thirteenth Session
(Geneva, October 3 to 7, 1994)

The PCIIPI/GI held its thirteenth session in Geneva from October 3 to 7, 1994.³

The following 25 members of the Working Group were represented at the session: Austria, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Japan, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom, United States of America, European Patent Office (EPO). The Patent Documentation Group (PDG) was represented by observers.

The Working Group agreed on the final wording of draft WIPO Standard ST.50 (Guidelines for Issuing Corrections, Alterations and Supplements

³ For a note on the previous session, see *Industrial Property*, 1994, p. 281.

Relating to Patent Information) and completed the revision of WIPO Standards ST.14 (Recommendation for the Inclusion of References Cited in Patent Documents) and ST.16 (Standard Code for Identification of Different Kinds of Patent Documents). The Working Group further approved the Survey of Filing Procedures and Filing Requirements, As Well As of Examination Methods and Publication Procedures Relating to Industrial Designs. Draft Standard ST.50, revised Standards ST.14 and ST.16 and the said Survey were recommended for adoption by the PCIPI Executive Coordination Committee (PCIPI/EXEC) and publication in the *WIPO Handbook on Industrial Property Information and Documentation*.

The Working Group discussed the consequences of the year 2000 on industrial property information and documentation matters and agreed to inform the PCIPI/EXEC of the conclusions reached. The Working Group also agreed to recommend to the

said Committee the creation of a new task to elaborate a WIPO standard on a unique numbering system for industrial property rights.

The Working Group had a first discussion on the revision of WIPO Standard ST.9 (Recommendation Concerning Bibliographic Data on and Relating to Patent Documents) to allow for the use of existing and/or the elaboration of additional INID (Internationally Agreed Numbers for the Identification of Data) codes to identify data elements relating to Supplementary Protection Certificates.

Finally, the Working Group discussed action to be taken to complete the revision of WIPO Standard ST.32 (Generic Coding of the Text of Patent Documents Exchanged on a Machine-Readable Carrier), hopefully at the next session of the Working Group, and agreed on the procedure to be followed in respect of a project for the collection of information on, and the analysis of the use of, WIPO Standards and Recommendations.

Registration Systems Administered by WIPO

Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT)

Training and Promotion Meetings With PCT Users

(i) In October 1994, on the occasion of their participation in the sessions of the Governing Bodies of WIPO held in Geneva, officials from Egypt, Hungary and Trinidad and Tobago had discussions at the headquarters of WIPO as follows:

Egypt. In October 1994, a government official had discussions with WIPO officials in Geneva on a possible WIPO mission to Egypt on PCT matters and the possible organization of a seminar on the PCT in Egypt.

Hungary. In October 1994, two government officials had discussions on separate occasions with WIPO officials in Geneva on various PCT matters, including arrangements for the seminar on the PCT described below.

Trinidad and Tobago. In October 1994, a government official was given practical training in the administrative procedures under the PCT by WIPO officials in Geneva.

(ii) In October 1994, on the occasion of their participation in the Diplomatic Conference which adopted the Trademark Law Treaty in Geneva, offi-

cials from Israel, Lesotho and Malta had discussions at the headquarters of WIPO as follows:

Israel. In October 1994, Mr. Michael Ophir, Commissioner of Patents, Designs and Trademarks, had discussions with WIPO officials in Geneva on Israel's possible accession to the PCT.

Lesotho. In October 1994, Mrs. 'Nyalleng 'Mabakuena Pii, Registrar-General, and another government official were provided, by WIPO officials in Geneva, with detailed explanations on the basic principles of the PCT and its advantages for developing countries.

Malta. In October 1994, two government officials had discussions with WIPO officials in Geneva on the advantages for Malta of adhering to the PCT.

(iii) The following other activities also took place in October 1994:

France. In October 1994, two WIPO officials conducted a seminar on the PCT, organized in Paris by Forum Institut für Management GmbH, an enterprise in Heidelberg (Germany), for 15 participants from industry and law firms.

Hungary. In late October and early November 1994, a WIPO official conducted a seminar entitled "A National Patent Office as PCT Receiving Office,"

organized in Budapest by the European Patent Office (EPO) in the framework of the European Community's Regional Intellectual Property Programme for Countries of Eastern Europe (PHARE-RIPP) and the Government of Hungary.

Japan. In October 1994, a WIPO official visited the patent departments of regular PCT users from industry and patent attorney firms in Tokyo and Osaka to discuss the PCT and the promotion of its use in Japan.

Malaysia. In October 1994, two WIPO officials conducted a seminar on the PCT organized by the Malaysian Intellectual Property Association (MIPA) in cooperation with WIPO, in Kuala Lumpur, for 10 representatives of the legal profession and government officials.

Also in October 1994, the same two WIPO officials had discussions with government officials in Kuala Lumpur on the PCT and its importance for developing countries.

Computerization Activities

EASY (Electronic Application SYstem) Project. In October 1994, two WIPO officials attended a further WIPO/EPO/United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) meeting on the EASY project, held in New York.

Madrid Union

Training and Promotion Meetings With Users of the Madrid System

(i) In October 1994, on the occasion of their participation in the Diplomatic Conference which adopted the Trademark Law Treaty in Geneva, officials from Australia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Germany, Ukraine and the Office for Harmonization in the Internal Market (Trade Marks and Designs) (OHIM) had discussions at the headquarters of WIPO as follows:

Australia. In October 1994, a government official had discussions with WIPO officials in Geneva on the draft common Regulations under the Madrid Agreement Concerning the International Registration of Marks and the Madrid Protocol thereunder and Australia's possible accession to the said Protocol.

Bosnia and Herzegovina. In October 1994, Mr. Ismet Galijašević, Director of the Institute for

Standardization, Metrology and Patents, had discussions with WIPO officials in Geneva on the continuation of the effect of international trademark registrations under Rule 38 of the Madrid Regulations (concerning successor States) and the possible training of government officials in the administrative procedures under the Madrid Agreement in Geneva.

Democratic People's Republic of Korea. In October 1994, a government official had discussions with WIPO officials in Geneva on questions relating to the administrative procedures under the Madrid Agreement and the Hague Agreement Concerning the International Deposit of Industrial Designs.

Denmark. In October 1994, two government officials had discussions with WIPO officials in Geneva on Denmark's accession to the Madrid Protocol.

Germany. In October 1994, two government officials had discussions with WIPO officials in Geneva on the application of the Madrid Agreement.

Ukraine. In October 1994, a government official had discussions with WIPO officials in Geneva on questions relating to the administrative procedures under the Madrid and Hague Agreements.

Office for Harmonization in the Internal Market (Trade Marks and Designs) (OHIM). In October 1994, an OHIM official was given a presentation of the International Trademark Registry by WIPO officials in Geneva.

(ii) The following other activities also took place in October 1994:

Portugal. In October 1994, a government official was briefed by WIPO officials in Geneva on new developments at WIPO concerning the production of CD-ROM products for marks.

Hague Union

Russian Federation. In October 1994, a government official was briefed by WIPO officials in Geneva on the administrative procedures under the

Hague Agreement and discussed with them possible training of government officials in that respect.

WIPO Arbitration Center

WIPO Arbitration Rules (Effective from October 1, 1994)

CONTENTS

	Articles		
I. General Provisions.....	1 – 5	III. Composition and Establishment of the Tribunal	14 – 36
Abbreviated Expressions.....	1	Number of Arbitrators.....	14
Scope of Application of Rules	2 – 3	Appointment Pursuant to Procedure Agreed Upon by the Parties	15
Notices, Periods of Time	4	Appointment of a Sole Arbitrator	16
Documents Required to Be Submitted to the Center	5	Appointment of Three Arbitrators	17
II. Commencement of the Arbitration.....	6 – 13	Appointment of Three Arbitrators in Case of Multiple Claimants or Respondents ..	18
Request for Arbitration	6 – 10	Default Appointment.....	19
Answer to the Request.....	11 – 12	Nationality of Arbitrators	20
Representation	13	Communication Between Parties and Candidates for Appointment as Arbitrator ..	21
		Impartiality and Independence	22
		Availability, Acceptance and Notification ..	23
		Challenge of Arbitrators	24 – 29

Release from Appointment	30 – 32
Replacement of an Arbitrator	33 – 34
Truncated Tribunal	35
Pleas as to the Jurisdiction of the Tribunal	36
 IV. Conduct of the Arbitration	 37 – 58
Transmission of the File to the Tribunal ..	37
General Powers of the Tribunal	38
Place of Arbitration	39
Language of Arbitration	40
Statement of Claim	41
Statement of Defense	42
Further Written Statements	43
Amendments to Claims or Defense	44
Communication Between Parties and Tribunal	45
Interim Measures of Protection: Security for Claims and Costs	46
Preparatory Conference	47
Evidence	48
Experiments	49
Site Visits	50
Agreed Primers and Models	51
Disclosure of Trade Secrets and Other Confidential Information	52
Hearings	53
Witnesses	54
Experts Appointed by the Tribunal	55
Default	56
Closure of Proceedings	57
Waiver	58
 V. Awards and Other Decisions	 59 – 66
Laws Applicable to the Substance of the Dispute, the Arbitration and the Arbitration Agreement	59
Currency and Interest	60
Decision-Making	61
Form and Notification of Awards	62
Time Period for Delivery of the Final Award	63
Effect of Award	64
Settlement or Other Grounds for Termination	65
Correction of the Award and Additional Award	66
 VI. Fees and Costs	 67 – 72
Fees of the Center	67 – 68
Fees of the Arbitrators	69
Deposits	70
Award of Costs of Arbitration	71
Award of Costs Incurred by a Party	72
 VII. Confidentiality	 73 – 76
Confidentiality of the Existence of the Arbitration	73
Confidentiality of Disclosures Made During the Arbitration	74
Confidentiality of the Award	75
Maintenance of Confidentiality by the Center and Arbitrator	76
 VIII. Miscellaneous	 77 – 78
Exclusion of Liability	77
Waiver of Defamation	78
 Schedule of Fees	

I. GENERAL PROVISIONS

Abbreviated Expressions

Article 1

In these Rules:

“Arbitration Agreement” means an agreement by the parties to submit to arbitration all or certain disputes which have arisen or which may arise between them; an Arbitration Agreement may be in the form of an arbitration clause in a contract or in the form of a separate contract;

“Claimant” means the party initiating an arbitration;

“Respondent” means the party against which the arbitration is initiated, as named in the Request for Arbitration;

“Tribunal” includes a sole arbitrator or all the arbitrators where more than one is appointed;

“WIPO” means the World Intellectual Property Organization;

“Center” means the WIPO Arbitration Center, a unit of the International Bureau of WIPO;

Words used in the singular include the plural and vice versa, as the context may require.

Scope of Application of Rules

Article 2

Where an Arbitration Agreement provides for arbitration under the WIPO Arbitration Rules, these Rules shall be deemed to form part of that Arbitration Agreement and the dispute shall be settled in accordance with these Rules, as in effect on the date of the commencement of the arbitration, unless the parties have agreed otherwise.

Article 3

(a) These Rules shall govern the arbitration, except that, where any of these Rules is in conflict with a provision of the law applicable to the arbitration from which the parties cannot derogate, that provision shall prevail.

(b) The law applicable to the arbitration shall be determined in accordance with Article 59(b).

Notices, Periods of Time

Article 4

(a) Any notice or other communication that may be or is required to be given under these Rules shall

be in writing and shall be delivered by expedited postal or courier service, or transmitted by telex, telefax or other means of telecommunication that provide a record thereof.

(b) A party's last known residence or place of business shall be a valid address for the purpose of any notice or other communication in the absence of any notification of a change by that party. Communications may in any event be addressed to a party in the manner stipulated or, failing such a stipulation, according to the practice followed in the course of the dealings between the parties.

(c) For the purpose of determining the date of commencement of a time limit, a notice or other communication shall be deemed to have been received on the day it is delivered or, in the case of telecommunications, transmitted in accordance with paragraphs (a) and (b) of this Article.

(d) For the purpose of determining compliance with a time limit, a notice or other communication shall be deemed to have been sent, made or transmitted if it is dispatched, in accordance with paragraphs (a) and (b) of this Article, prior to or on the day of the expiration of the time limit.

(e) For the purpose of calculating a period of time under these Rules, such period shall begin to run on the day following the day when a notice or other communication is received. If the last day of such period is an official holiday or a non-business day at the residence or place of business of the addressee, the period is extended until the first business day which follows. Official holidays or non-business days occurring during the running of the period of time are included in calculating the period.

(f) The parties may agree to reduce or extend the periods of time referred to in Articles 11, 15(b), 16(b), 17(b), 17(c), 18(b), 19(b)(iii), 41(a) and 42(a).

(g) The Center may, at the request of a party or on its own motion, extend the periods of time referred to in Articles 11, 15(b), 16(b), 17(b), 17(c), 18(b), 19(b)(iii), 67(d), 68(e) and 70(e).

Documents Required to Be Submitted to the Center

Article 5

(a) Until the notification by the Center of the establishment of the Tribunal, any written statement, notice or other communication required or allowed under Articles 6 to 36 shall be submitted by a party to the Center and a copy thereof shall at the same time be transmitted by that party to the other party.

(b) Any written statement, notice or other communication so sent to the Center shall be sent in a number of copies equal to the number required to

provide one copy for each envisaged arbitrator and one for the Center.

(c) After the notification by the Center of the establishment of the Tribunal, any written statements, notices or other communications shall be submitted by a party directly to the Tribunal and a copy thereof shall at the same time be supplied by that party to the other party.

(d) The Tribunal shall send to the Center a copy of each order or other decision that it makes.

II. COMMENCEMENT OF THE ARBITRATION

Request for Arbitration

Article 6

The Claimant shall transmit the Request for Arbitration to the Center and to the Respondent.

Article 7

The date of commencement of the arbitration shall be the date on which the Request for Arbitration is received by the Center.

Article 8

The Center shall inform the Claimant and the Respondent of the receipt by it of the Request for Arbitration and of the date of the commencement of the arbitration.

Article 9

The Request for Arbitration shall contain:

- (i) a demand that the dispute be referred to arbitration under the WIPO Arbitration Rules;
- (ii) the names, addresses and telephone, telex, telefax or other communication references of the parties and of the representative of the Claimant;
- (iii) a copy of the Arbitration Agreement and, if applicable, any separate choice-of-law clause;
- (iv) a brief description of the nature and circumstances of the dispute, including an indication of the rights and property involved and the nature of any technology involved;
- (v) a statement of the relief sought and an indication, to the extent possible, of any amount claimed;
- (vi) any appointment that is required by, or observations that the Claimant considers useful in connection with, Articles 14 to 20.

Article 10

The Request for Arbitration may also be accompanied by the Statement of Claim referred to in Article 41.

Answer to the Request

Article 11

Within 30 days from the date on which the Respondent receives the Request for Arbitration from the Claimant, the Respondent shall address to the Center and to the Claimant an Answer to the Request which shall contain comments on any of the elements in the Request for Arbitration and may include indications of any counterclaim or setoff.

Article 12

If the Claimant has filed a Statement of Claim with the Request for Arbitration pursuant to Article 10, the Answer to the Request may also be accompanied by the Statement of Defense referred to in Article 42.

Representation

Article 13

(a) The parties may be represented by persons of their choice, irrespective of, in particular, nationality or professional qualification. The names, addresses and telephone, telex, telefax or other communication references of representatives shall be communicated to the Center, the other party and, after its establishment, the Tribunal.

(b) Each party shall ensure that its representatives have sufficient time available to enable the arbitration to proceed expeditiously.

(c) The parties may also be assisted by persons of their choice.

III. COMPOSITION AND ESTABLISHMENT OF THE TRIBUNAL

Number of Arbitrators

Article 14

(a) The Tribunal shall consist of such number of arbitrators as has been agreed by the parties.

(b) Where the parties have not agreed on the number of arbitrators, the Tribunal shall consist of a sole arbitrator, except where the Center in its discretion

determines that, in view of all the circumstances of the case, a Tribunal composed of three members is appropriate.

Appointment Pursuant to Procedure Agreed Upon by the Parties

Article 15

(a) If the parties have agreed on a procedure of appointing the arbitrator or arbitrators other than as envisaged in Articles 16 to 20, that procedure shall be followed.

(b) If the Tribunal has not been established pursuant to such procedure within the period of time agreed upon by the parties or, in the absence of such an agreed period of time, within 45 days after the commencement of the arbitration, the Tribunal shall be established or completed, as the case may be, in accordance with Article 19.

Appointment of a Sole Arbitrator

Article 16

(a) Where a sole arbitrator is to be appointed and the parties have not agreed on a procedure of appointment, the sole arbitrator shall be appointed jointly by the parties.

(b) If the appointment of the sole arbitrator is not made within the period of time agreed upon by the parties or, in the absence of such an agreed period of time, within 30 days after the commencement of the arbitration, the sole arbitrator shall be appointed in accordance with Article 19.

Appointment of Three Arbitrators

Article 17

(a) Where three arbitrators are to be appointed and the parties have not agreed upon a procedure of appointment, the arbitrators shall be appointed in accordance with this Article.

(b) The Claimant shall appoint an arbitrator in its Request for Arbitration. The Respondent shall appoint an arbitrator within 30 days from the date on which it receives the Request for Arbitration. The two arbitrators thus appointed shall, within 20 days after the appointment of the second arbitrator, appoint a third arbitrator, who shall be the presiding arbitrator.

(c) Notwithstanding paragraph (b), where three arbitrators are to be appointed as a result of the exercise of the discretion of the Center under Article 14(b), the Claimant shall, by notice to the Center and to the Respondent, appoint an arbitrator within

15 days after the receipt by it of notification by the Center that the Tribunal is to be composed of three arbitrators. The Respondent shall appoint an arbitrator within 30 days after the receipt by it of the said notification. The two arbitrators thus appointed shall, within 20 days after the appointment of the second arbitrator, appoint a third arbitrator, who shall be the presiding arbitrator.

(d) If the appointment of any arbitrator is not made within the applicable period of time referred to in the preceding paragraphs, that arbitrator shall be appointed in accordance with Article 19.

Appointment of Three Arbitrators in Case of Multiple Claimants or Respondents

Article 18

(a) Where

- (i) three arbitrators are to be appointed,
 - (ii) the parties have not agreed on a procedure of appointment, and
 - (iii) the Request for Arbitration names more than one Claimant,
- the Claimants shall make a joint appointment of an arbitrator in their Request for Arbitration. The appointment of the second arbitrator and the presiding arbitrator shall, subject to paragraph (b) of this Article, take place in accordance with Article 17(b), (c) or (d), as the case may be.

(b) Where

- (i) three arbitrators are to be appointed,
 - (ii) the parties have not agreed on a procedure of appointment, and
 - (iii) the Request for Arbitration names more than one Respondent,
- the Respondents shall jointly appoint an arbitrator. If, for whatever reason, the Respondents do not make a joint appointment of an arbitrator within 30 days after receiving the Request for Arbitration, any appointment of the arbitrator previously made by the Claimant or Claimants shall be considered void and two arbitrators shall be appointed by the Center. The two arbitrators thus appointed shall, within 30 days after the appointment of the second arbitrator, appoint a third arbitrator, who shall be the presiding arbitrator.

(c) Where

- (i) three arbitrators are to be appointed,
- (ii) the parties have agreed upon a procedure of appointment, and
- (iii) the Request for Arbitration names more than one Claimant or more than one Respondent,

paragraphs (a) and (b) of this Article shall, notwithstanding Article 15(a), apply irrespective of any contractual provisions in the Arbitration Agreement with respect to the procedure of appointment, unless those provisions have expressly excluded the application of this Article.

Default Appointment

Article 19

(a) If a party has failed to appoint an arbitrator as required under Articles 15, 17 or 18, the Center shall, in lieu of that party, forthwith make the appointment.

(b) If the sole or presiding arbitrator has not been appointed as required under Articles 15, 16, 17 or 18, the appointment shall take place in accordance with the following procedure:

(i) The Center shall send to each party an identical list of candidates. The list shall comprise the names of at least three candidates in alphabetical order. The list shall include or be accompanied by a brief statement of each candidate's qualifications. If the parties have agreed on any particular qualifications, the list shall contain only the names of candidates who satisfy those qualifications.

(ii) Each party shall have the right to delete the name of any candidate or candidates to whose appointment it objects and shall number any remaining candidates in order of preference.

(iii) Each party shall return the marked list to the Center within 20 days after the date on which the list is received by it. Any party failing to return a marked list within that period of time shall be deemed to have assented to all candidates appearing on the list.

(iv) As soon as possible after receipt by it of the lists from the parties or, failing this, after the expiration of the period of time specified in the previous subparagraph, the Center shall, taking into account the preferences and objections expressed by the parties, invite a person from the list to be the sole or presiding arbitrator.

(v) If the lists which have been returned do not show a person who is acceptable as arbitrator to both parties, the Center shall be authorized to appoint the sole or presiding arbitrator. The Center shall similarly be authorized to do so if a person is not able or does not wish to accept the Center's invitation to be the sole or presiding arbitrator, or if there appear to be other reasons precluding that person from being the sole or presiding arbitrator, and there does not remain on the lists a person who is acceptable as arbitrator to both parties.

(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (b), the Center shall be authorized to appoint the sole or presiding arbitrator if it determines in its discretion that the procedure described in that paragraph is not appropriate for the case.

Nationality of Arbitrators

Article 20

(a) An agreement of the parties concerning the nationality of arbitrators shall be respected.

(b) If the parties have not agreed on the nationality of the sole or presiding arbitrator, such arbitrator shall, in the absence of special circumstances such as the need to appoint a person having particular qualifications, be a national of a country other than the countries of the parties.

Communication Between Parties and Candidates for Appointment as Arbitrator

Article 21

No party or anyone acting on its behalf shall have any *ex parte* communication with any candidate for appointment as arbitrator except to discuss the candidate's qualifications, availability or independence in relation to the parties.

Impartiality and Independence

Article 22

(a) Each arbitrator shall be impartial and independent.

(b) Each prospective arbitrator shall, before accepting appointment, disclose to the parties, the Center and any other arbitrator who has already been appointed any circumstances that might give rise to justifiable doubt as to the arbitrator's impartiality or independence, or confirm in writing that no such circumstances exist.

(c) If, at any stage during the arbitration, new circumstances arise that might give rise to justifiable doubt as to any arbitrator's impartiality or independence, the arbitrator shall promptly disclose such circumstances to the parties, the Center and the other arbitrators.

Availability, Acceptance and Notification

Article 23

(a) Each arbitrator shall, by accepting appointment, be deemed to have undertaken to make available sufficient time to enable the arbitration to be conducted and completed expeditiously.

(b) Each prospective arbitrator shall accept appointment in writing and shall communicate such acceptance to the Center.

(c) The Center shall notify the parties of the establishment of the Tribunal.

Challenge of Arbitrators

Article 24

(a) Any arbitrator may be challenged by a party if circumstances exist that give rise to justifiable doubt as to the arbitrator's impartiality or independence.

(b) A party may challenge an arbitrator whom it has appointed or in whose appointment it concurred only for reasons of which it becomes aware after the appointment has been made.

Article 25

A party challenging an arbitrator shall send notice to the Center, the Tribunal and the other party, stating the reasons for the challenge, within 15 days after being notified of that arbitrator's appointment or after becoming aware of the circumstances that it considers give rise to justifiable doubt as to that arbitrator's impartiality or independence.

Article 26

When an arbitrator has been challenged by a party, the other party shall have the right to respond to the challenge and shall, if it exercises this right, send, within 15 days after receipt of the notice referred to in Article 25, a copy of its response to the Center, the party making the challenge and the arbitrators.

Article 27

The Tribunal may, in its discretion, suspend or continue the arbitral proceedings during the pendency of the challenge.

Article 28

The other party may agree to the challenge or the arbitrator may voluntarily withdraw. In either case, the arbitrator shall be replaced without any implication that the grounds for the challenge are valid.

Article 29

If the other party does not agree to the challenge and the challenged arbitrator does not withdraw, the decision on the challenge shall be made by the Center in accordance with its internal procedures. Such a decision is of an administrative nature and shall be final. The Center shall not be required to state reasons for its decision.

Release from Appointment

Article 30

At the arbitrator's own request, an arbitrator may be released from appointment as arbitrator either with the consent of the parties or by the Center.

Article 31

Irrespective of any request by the arbitrator, the parties may jointly release the arbitrator from appointment as arbitrator. The parties shall promptly notify the Center of such release.

Article 32

At the request of a party or on its own motion, the Center may release an arbitrator from appointment as arbitrator if the arbitrator has become *de jure* or *de facto* unable to fulfill, or fails to fulfill, the duties of an arbitrator. In such a case, the parties shall be offered the opportunity to express their views thereon and the provisions of Articles 26 to 29 shall apply *mutatis mutandis*.

Replacement of an Arbitrator

Article 33

(a) Whenever necessary, a substitute arbitrator shall be appointed pursuant to the procedure provided for in Articles 15 to 19 that was applicable to the appointment of the arbitrator being replaced.

(b) In the event that an arbitrator appointed by a party has either been successfully challenged on grounds which were known or should have been known to that party at the time of appointment, or has been released from appointment as arbitrator in accordance with Article 32, the Center shall have the discretion not to permit that party to make a new appointment. If it chooses to exercise this discretion, the Center shall make the substitute appointment.

(c) Pending the replacement, the arbitral proceedings shall be suspended, unless otherwise agreed by the parties.

Article 34

Whenever a substitute arbitrator is appointed, the Tribunal shall, having regard to any observations of the parties, determine in its sole discretion whether all or part of any prior hearings are to be repeated.

Truncated Tribunal

Article 35

(a) If an arbitrator on a three-person Tribunal, though duly notified and without good cause, fails to participate in the work of the Tribunal, the two other arbitrators shall, unless a party has made an application under Article 32, have the power in their sole discretion to continue the arbitration and to make any award, order or other decision, notwithstanding the failure of the third arbitrator to participate. In determining whether to continue the arbitration or to render any award, order or other decision without the participation of an arbitrator, the two other arbitrators shall take into account the stage of the arbitration, the reason, if any, expressed by the third arbitrator for such non-participation, and such other matters as they consider appropriate in the circumstances of the case.

(b) In the event that the two other arbitrators determine not to continue the arbitration without the participation of a third arbitrator, the Center shall, on proof satisfactory to it of the failure of the arbitrator to participate in the work of the Tribunal, declare the office vacant, and a substitute arbitrator shall be appointed by the Center in the exercise of the discretion defined in Article 33, unless the parties agree otherwise.

Pleas as to the Jurisdiction of the Tribunal

Article 36

(a) The Tribunal shall have the power to hear and determine objections to its own jurisdiction, including any objections with respect to form, existence, validity or scope of the Arbitration Agreement examined pursuant to Article 59(b).

(b) The Tribunal shall have the power to determine the existence or validity of any contract of which the Arbitration Agreement forms part or to which it relates.

(c) A plea that the Tribunal does not have jurisdiction shall be raised not later than in the Statement of Defense or, with respect to a counterclaim or a setoff, the Statement of Defense thereto, failing which any such plea shall be barred in the subsequent arbitral proceedings or before any court. A plea that the Tribunal is exceeding the scope of its authority shall be raised as soon as the matter alleged to be beyond the scope of its authority is raised during the arbitral proceedings. The Tribunal may, in either case, admit a later plea if it considers the delay justified.

(d) The Tribunal may rule on a plea referred to in paragraph (c) as a preliminary question or, in its sole discretion, decide on such a plea in the final award.

(e) A plea that the Tribunal lacks jurisdiction shall not preclude the Center from administering the arbitration.

IV. CONDUCT OF THE ARBITRATION

Transmission of the File to the Tribunal

Article 37

The Center shall transmit the file to each arbitrator as soon as the arbitrator is appointed.

General Powers of the Tribunal

Article 38

(a) Subject to Article 3, the Tribunal may conduct the arbitration in such manner as it considers appropriate.

(b) In all cases, the Tribunal shall ensure that the parties are treated with equality and that each party is given a fair opportunity to present its case.

(c) The Tribunal shall ensure that the arbitral procedure takes place with due expedition. It may, at the request of a party or on its own motion, extend in exceptional cases a period of time fixed by these Rules, by itself or agreed to by the parties. In urgent cases, such an extension may be granted by the presiding arbitrator alone.

Place of Arbitration

Article 39

(a) Unless otherwise agreed by the parties, the place of arbitration shall be decided by the Center, taking into consideration any observations of the parties and the circumstances of the arbitration.

(b) The Tribunal may, after consultation with the parties, conduct hearings at any place that it considers appropriate. It may deliberate wherever it deems appropriate.

(c) The award shall be deemed to have been made at the place of arbitration.

Language of Arbitration

Article 40

(a) Unless otherwise agreed by the parties, the language of the arbitration shall be the language of the Arbitration Agreement, subject to the power of the Tribunal to determine otherwise, having regard to any observations of the parties and the circumstances of the arbitration.

(b) The Tribunal may order that any documents submitted in languages other than the language of arbitration be accompanied by a translation in whole or in part into the language of arbitration.

Statement of Claim

Article 41

(a) Unless the Statement of Claim accompanied the Request for Arbitration, the Claimant shall, within 30 days after receipt of notification from the Center of the establishment of the Tribunal, communicate its Statement of Claim to the Respondent and to the Tribunal.

(b) The Statement of Claim shall contain a comprehensive statement of the facts and legal arguments supporting the claim, including a statement of the relief sought.

(c) The Statement of Claim shall, to as large an extent as possible, be accompanied by the documentary evidence upon which the Claimant relies, together with a schedule of such documents. Where the documentary evidence is especially voluminous, the Claimant may add a reference to further documents it is prepared to submit.

Statement of Defense

Article 42

(a) The Respondent shall, within 30 days after receipt of the Statement of Claim or within 30 days after receipt of notification from the Center of the establishment of the Tribunal, whichever occurs later, communicate its Statement of Defense to the Claimant and to the Tribunal.

(b) The Statement of Defense shall reply to the particulars of the Statement of Claim required pursuant to Article 41(b). The Statement of Defense shall be accompanied by the corresponding documentary evidence described in Article 41(c).

(c) Any counterclaim or setoff by the Respondent shall be made or asserted in the Statement of Defense or, in exceptional circumstances, at a later stage in the arbitral proceedings if so determined by the Tribunal. Any such counterclaim or setoff shall contain the same particulars as those specified in Article 41(b) and (c).

Further Written Statements

Article 43

(a) In the event that a counterclaim or setoff has been made or asserted, the Claimant shall reply to

the particulars thereof. Article 42(a) and (b) shall apply *mutatis mutandis* to such reply.

(b) The Tribunal may, in its discretion, allow or require further written statements.

Amendments to Claims or Defense

Article 44

Subject to any contrary agreement by the parties, a party may amend or supplement its claim, counterclaim, defense or setoff during the course of the arbitral proceedings, unless the Tribunal considers it inappropriate to allow such amendment having regard to its nature or the delay in making it and to the provisions of Article 38(b) and (c).

Communication Between Parties and Tribunal

Article 45

Except as otherwise provided in these Rules or permitted by the Tribunal, no party or anyone acting on its behalf may have any *ex parte* communication with any arbitrator with respect to any matter of substance relating to the arbitration, it being understood that nothing in this paragraph shall prohibit *ex parte* communications which concern matters of a purely organizational nature, such as the physical facilities, place, date or time of the hearings.

Interim Measures of Protection; Security for Claims and Costs

Article 46

(a) At the request of a party, the Tribunal may issue any provisional orders or take other interim measures it deems necessary, including injunctions and measures for the conservation of goods which form part of the subject matter in dispute, such as an order for their deposit with a third person or for the sale of perishable goods. The Tribunal may make the granting of such measures subject to appropriate security being furnished by the requesting party.

(b) At the request of a party, the Tribunal may, if it considers it to be required by exceptional circumstances, order the other party to provide security, in a form to be determined by the Tribunal, for the claim or counterclaim, as well as for costs referred to in Article 72.

(c) Measures and orders contemplated under this Article may take the form of an interim award.

(d) A request addressed by a party to a judicial authority for interim measures or for security for the claim or counterclaim, or for the implementation of any such measures or orders granted by the Tribu-

nal, shall not be deemed incompatible with the Arbitration Agreement, or deemed to be a waiver of that Agreement.

Preparatory Conference

Article 47

The Tribunal may, in general following the submission of the Statement of Defense, conduct a preparatory conference with the parties for the purpose of organizing and scheduling the subsequent proceedings.

Evidence

Article 48

(a) The Tribunal shall determine the admissibility, relevance, materiality and weight of evidence.

(b) At any time during the arbitration, the Tribunal may, at the request of a party or on its own motion, order a party to produce such documents or other evidence as it considers necessary or appropriate and may order a party to make available to the Tribunal or to an expert appointed by it or to the other party any property in its possession or control for inspection or testing.

Experiments

Article 49

(a) A party may give notice to the Tribunal and to the other party at any reasonable time before a hearing that specified experiments have been conducted on which it intends to rely. The notice shall specify the purpose of the experiment, a summary of the experiment, the method employed, the results and the conclusion. The other party may by notice to the Tribunal request that any or all such experiments be repeated in its presence. If the Tribunal considers such request justified, it shall determine the timetable for the repetition of the experiments.

(b) For the purposes of this Article, "experiments" shall include tests or other processes of verification.

Site Visits

Article 50

The Tribunal may, at the request of a party or on its own motion, inspect or require the inspection of any site, property, machinery, facility, production line, model, film, material, product or process as it deems appropriate. A party may request such an inspection at any reasonable time prior to any hearing,

and the Tribunal, if it grants such a request, shall determine the timing and arrangements for the inspection.

Agreed Primers and Models

Article 51

The Tribunal may, where the parties so agree, determine that they shall jointly provide:

- (i) a technical primer setting out the background of the scientific, technical or other specialist information necessary to fully understand the matters in issue; and
- (ii) models, drawings or other materials that the Tribunal or the parties require for reference purposes at any hearing.

Disclosure of Trade Secrets and Other Confidential Information

Article 52

(a) For the purposes of this Article, confidential information shall mean any information, regardless of the medium in which it is expressed, which is

- (i) in the possession of a party,
- (ii) not accessible to the public,
- (iii) of commercial, financial or industrial significance, and
- (iv) treated as confidential by the party possessing it.

(b) A party invoking the confidentiality of any information it wishes or is required to submit in the arbitration, including to an expert appointed by the Tribunal, shall make an application to have the information classified as confidential by notice to the Tribunal, with a copy to the other party. Without disclosing the substance of the information, the party shall give in the notice the reasons for which it considers the information confidential.

(c) The Tribunal shall determine whether the information is to be classified as confidential and of such a nature that the absence of special measures of protection in the proceedings would be likely to cause serious harm to the party invoking its confidentiality. If the Tribunal so determines, it shall decide under which conditions and to whom the confidential information may in part or in whole be disclosed and shall require any person to whom the confidential information is to be disclosed to sign an appropriate confidentiality undertaking.

(d) In exceptional circumstances, in lieu of itself determining whether the information is to be classified as confidential and of such nature that the absence of special measures of protection in the proceedings would be likely to cause serious harm

to the party invoking its confidentiality, the Tribunal may, at the request of a party or on its own motion and after consultation with the parties, designate a confidentiality advisor who will determine whether the information is to be so classified, and, if so, decide under which conditions and to whom it may in part or in whole be disclosed. Any such confidentiality advisor shall be required to sign an appropriate confidentiality undertaking.

(e) The Tribunal may also, at the request of a party or on its own motion, appoint the confidentiality advisor as an expert in accordance with Article 55 in order to report to it, on the basis of the confidential information, on specific issues designated by the Tribunal without disclosing the confidential information either to the party from whom the confidential information does not originate or to the Tribunal.

Hearings

Article 53

(a) If either party so requests, the Tribunal shall hold a hearing for the presentation of evidence by witnesses, including expert witnesses, or for oral argument or for both. In the absence of a request, the Tribunal shall decide whether to hold such a hearing or hearings. If no hearings are held, the proceedings shall be conducted on the basis of documents and other materials alone.

(b) In the event of a hearing, the Tribunal shall give the parties adequate advance notice of the date, time and place thereof.

(c) Unless the parties agree otherwise, all hearings shall be in private.

(d) The Tribunal shall determine whether and, if so, in what form a record shall be made of any hearing.

Witnesses

Article 54

(a) Before any hearing, the Tribunal may require either party to give notice of the identity of witnesses it wishes to call, as well as of the subject matter of their testimony and its relevance to the issues.

(b) The Tribunal has discretion, on the grounds of redundancy and irrelevance, to limit or refuse the appearance of any witness, whether witness of fact or expert witness.

(c) Any witness who gives oral evidence may be questioned, under the control of the Tribunal, by each of the parties. The Tribunal may put questions at any stage of the examination of the witnesses.

(d) The testimony of witnesses may, either at the choice of a party or as directed by the Tribunal, be submitted in written form, whether by way of signed statements, sworn affidavits or otherwise, in which case the Tribunal may make the admissibility of the testimony conditional upon the witnesses being made available for oral testimony.

(e) A party shall be responsible for the practical arrangements, cost and availability of any witness it calls.

(f) The Tribunal shall determine whether any witness shall retire during any part of the proceedings, particularly during the testimony of other witnesses.

Experts Appointed by the Tribunal

Article 55

(a) The Tribunal may, after consultation with the parties, appoint one or more independent experts to report to it on specific issues designated by the Tribunal. A copy of the expert's terms of reference, established by the Tribunal, having regard to any observations of the parties, shall be communicated to the parties. Any such expert shall be required to sign an appropriate confidentiality undertaking.

(b) Subject to Article 52, upon receipt of the expert's report, the Tribunal shall communicate a copy of the report to the parties, which shall be given the opportunity to express, in writing, their opinion on the report. A party may, subject to Article 52, examine any document on which the expert has relied in such a report.

(c) At the request of a party, the parties shall be given the opportunity to question the expert at a hearing. At this hearing, the parties may present expert witnesses to testify on the points at issue.

(d) The opinion of any expert on the issue or issues submitted to the expert shall be subject to the Tribunal's power of assessment of those issues in the context of all the circumstances of the case, unless the parties have agreed that the expert's determination shall be conclusive in respect of any specific issue.

Default

Article 56

(a) If the Claimant, without showing good cause, fails to submit its Statement of Claim in accordance with Article 41, the Tribunal shall terminate the proceedings.

(b) If the Respondent, without showing good cause, fails to submit its Statement of Defense in accordance with Article 42, the Tribunal may never-

theless proceed with the arbitration and make the award.

(c) The Tribunal may also proceed with the arbitration and make the award if a party, without showing good cause, fails to avail itself of the opportunity to present its case within the period of time determined by the Tribunal.

(d) If a party, without showing good cause, fails to comply with any provision of, or requirement under, these Rules or any direction given by the Tribunal, the Tribunal may draw the inferences therefrom that it considers appropriate.

Closure of Proceedings

Article 57

(a) The Tribunal shall declare the proceedings closed when it is satisfied that the parties have had adequate opportunity to present submissions and evidence.

(b) The Tribunal may, if it considers it necessary owing to exceptional circumstances, decide, on its own motion or upon application of a party, to reopen the proceedings it declared to be closed at any time before the award is made.

Waiver

Article 58

A party which knows that any provision of, or requirement under, these Rules, or any direction given by the Tribunal, has not been complied with, and yet proceeds with the arbitration without promptly recording an objection to such non-compliance, shall be deemed to have waived its right to object.

V. AWARDS AND OTHER DECISIONS

Laws Applicable to the Substance of the Dispute, the Arbitration and the Arbitration Agreement

Article 59

(a) The Tribunal shall decide the substance of the dispute in accordance with the law or rules of law chosen by the parties. Any designation of the law of a given State shall be construed, unless otherwise expressed, as directly referring to the substantive law of that State and not to its conflict of laws rules. Failing a choice by the parties, the Tribunal shall apply the law or rules of law that it determines to be appropriate. In all cases, the Tribunal shall decide having due regard to the terms of any relevant contract and taking into account applicable trade usages. The Tri-

bunal may decide as *amiable compositeur* or *ex aequo et bono* only if the parties have expressly authorized it to do so.

(b) The law applicable to the arbitration shall be the arbitration law of the place of arbitration, unless the parties have expressly agreed on the application of another arbitration law and such agreement is permitted by the law of the place of arbitration.

(c) An Arbitration Agreement shall be regarded as effective if it conforms to the requirements concerning form, existence, validity and scope of either the law or rules of law applicable in accordance with paragraph (a), or the law applicable in accordance with paragraph (b).

Currency and Interest

Article 60

(a) Monetary amounts in the award may be expressed in any currency.

(b) The Tribunal may award simple or compound interest to be paid by a party on any sum awarded against that party. It shall be free to determine the interest at such rates as it considers to be appropriate, without being bound by legal rates of interest, and shall be free to determine the period for which the interest shall be paid.

Decision-Making

Article 61

Unless the parties have agreed otherwise, where there is more than one arbitrator, any award, order or other decision of the Tribunal shall be made by a majority. In the absence of a majority, the presiding arbitrator shall make the award, order or other decision as if acting as sole arbitrator.

Form and Notification of Awards

Article 62

(a) The Tribunal may make preliminary, interim, interlocutory, partial or final awards.

(b) The award shall be in writing and shall state the date on which it was made, as well as the place of arbitration in accordance with Article 39(a).

(c) The award shall state the reasons on which it is based, unless the parties have agreed that no reasons should be stated and the law applicable to the arbitration does not require the statement of such reasons.

(d) The award shall be signed by the arbitrator or arbitrators. The signature of the award by a majority

of the arbitrators, or, in the case of Article 61, second sentence, by the presiding arbitrator, shall be sufficient. Where an arbitrator fails to sign, the award shall state the reason for the absence of the signature.

(e) The Tribunal may consult the Center with regard to matters of form, particularly to ensure the enforceability of the award.

(f) The award shall be communicated by the Tribunal to the Center in a number of originals sufficient to provide one for each party, the arbitrator or arbitrators and the Center. The Center shall formally communicate an original of the award to each party and the arbitrator or arbitrators.

(g) At the request of a party, the Center shall provide it, at cost, with a copy of the award certified by the Center. A copy so certified shall be deemed to comply with the requirements of Article IV(1)(a) of the Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards, New York, June 10, 1958.

Time Period for Delivery of the Final Award

Article 63

(a) The arbitration should, wherever reasonably possible, be heard and the proceedings declared closed within not more than nine months after either the delivery of the Statement of Defense or the establishment of the Tribunal, whichever event occurs later. The final award should, wherever reasonably possible, be made within three months thereafter.

(b) If the proceedings are not declared closed within the period of time specified in paragraph (a), the Tribunal shall send the Center a status report on the arbitration, with a copy to each party. It shall send a further status report to the Center, and a copy to each party, at the end of each ensuing period of three months during which the proceedings have not been declared closed.

(c) If the final award is not made within three months after the closure of the proceedings, the Tribunal shall send the Center a written explanation for the delay, with a copy to each party. It shall send a further explanation, and a copy to each party, at the end of each ensuing period of one month until the final award is made.

Effect of Award

Article 64

(a) By agreeing to arbitration under these Rules, the parties undertake to carry out the award without delay, and waive their right to any form of appeal or recourse to a court of law or other judicial authority.

insofar as such waiver may validly be made under the applicable law.

(b) The award shall be effective and binding on the parties as from the date it is communicated by the Center pursuant to Article 62(f), second sentence.

Settlement or Other Grounds for Termination

Article 65

(a) The Tribunal may suggest that the parties explore settlement at such times as the Tribunal may deem appropriate.

(b) If, before the award is made, the parties agree on a settlement of the dispute, the Tribunal shall terminate the arbitration and, if requested jointly by the parties, record the settlement in the form of a consent award. The Tribunal shall not be obliged to give reasons for such an award.

(c) If, before the award is made, the continuation of the arbitration becomes unnecessary or impossible for any reason not mentioned in paragraph (b), the Tribunal shall inform the parties of its intention to terminate the arbitration. The Tribunal shall have the power to issue such an order terminating the arbitration, unless a party raises justifiable grounds for objection within a period of time to be determined by the Tribunal.

(d) The consent award or the order for termination of the arbitration shall be signed by the arbitrator or arbitrators in accordance with Article 62(d) and shall be communicated by the Tribunal to the Center in a number of originals sufficient to provide one for each party, the arbitrator or arbitrators and the Center. The Center shall formally communicate an original of the consent award or the order for termination to each party and the arbitrator or arbitrators.

Correction of the Award and Additional Award

Article 66

(a) Within 30 days after receipt of the award, a party may, by notice to the Tribunal, with a copy to the Center and the other party, request the Tribunal to correct in the award any clerical, typographical or computational errors. If the Tribunal considers the request to be justified, it shall make the correction within 30 days after receipt of the request. Any correction, which shall take the form of a separate memorandum, signed by the Tribunal in accordance with Article 62(d), shall become part of the award.

(b) The Tribunal may correct any error of the type referred to in paragraph (a) on its own initiative within 30 days after the date of the award.

(c) A party may, within 30 days after receipt of the award, by notice to the Tribunal, with a copy to

the Center and the other party, request the Tribunal to make an additional award as to claims presented in the arbitral proceedings but not dealt with in the award. Before deciding on the request, the Tribunal shall give the parties an opportunity to be heard. If the Tribunal considers the request to be justified, it shall, wherever reasonably possible, make the additional award within 60 days of receipt of the request.

VI. FEES AND COSTS

Fees of the Center

Article 67

(a) The Request for Arbitration shall be subject to the payment to the Center of a registration fee, which shall belong to the International Bureau of WIPO. The amount of the registration fee shall be fixed in the Schedule of Fees applicable on the date on which the Request for Arbitration is received by the Center.

(b) The registration fee shall not be refundable.

(c) No action shall be taken by the Center on a Request for Arbitration until the registration fee has been paid.

(d) If a Claimant fails, within 15 days after a second reminder in writing from the Center, to pay the registration fee, it shall be deemed to have withdrawn its Request for Arbitration.

Article 68

(a) An administration fee, which shall belong to the International Bureau of WIPO, shall be payable by the Claimant to the Center within 30 days after the commencement of the arbitration. The Center shall notify the Claimant of the amount of the administration fee as soon as possible after receipt of the Request for Arbitration.

(b) In the case of a counterclaim, an administration fee shall also be payable by the Respondent to the Center within 30 days after the date on which the counterclaim referred to in Article 42(c) is made. The Center shall notify the Respondent of the amount of the administration fee as soon as possible after receipt of notification of the counterclaim.

(c) The amount of the administration fee shall be calculated in accordance with the Schedule of Fees applicable on the date of commencement of the arbitration.

(d) Where a claim or counterclaim is increased, the amount of the administration fee may be increased in accordance with the Schedule of Fees applicable under paragraph (c), and the increased amount shall be payable by the Claimant or the Respondent, as the case may be.

Budapest Treaty

Change in Fees Under Rule 12.2 of the Regulations Under the Budapest Treaty

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF BIOSCIENCE AND
HUMAN-TECHNOLOGY (NIBH)

(Japan)

The following notification addressed to the Director General of WIPO by the Government of Japan under Rule 12.2 of the Regulations under the Budapest Treaty on the International Recognition of the Deposit of Microorganisms for the Purposes of Patent Procedure was received on January 8, 1997, and is published by the International Bureau of WIPO pursuant to Rule 13.2(b) of the said Regulations.

Pursuant to Rule 12.2 of the Regulations under the Budapest Treaty on the International Recognition of the Deposit of Microorganisms for the Purposes of Patent Procedure the new schedule of fees of NIBH is as follows:

	Yen
(a) Storage:	
— original deposit.....	230,000
— new deposit.....	17,000
(b) Attestation referred to in Rule 8.2:.....	2,300
(c) Issuance of a viability statement:	
— if the depositor, when requesting the issuance of a viability statement, also requests a viability test.....	11,000
— other cases	2,300
(d) Furnishing of a sample:	12,000*
(e) Communication of information under Rule 7.6:	2,300

* When furnishing a sample to a foreign institution:

- additional 40,000 yen per package as cost of a special container is payable for animal cell cultures;
- additional 300 yen per package as cost of a special container is payable for other microorganisms.

Fees are expressed net of Value Added Tax according to Japanese provisions currently in force.

Effective date of modification of fees:
April 1, 1997.

[End of text of the notification
of the Government of Japan]

The fees set forth in the said notification will apply as from April 1, 1997, the date indicated in

the said notification (see Rule 12.2(a) and (c) of the Regulations under the Budapest Treaty), and will replace the fees which were published in the February 1994 issue of *Industrial Property*.¹

Budapest Notification No. 106 (this notification is the subject of Budapest Notification No. 151, of January 30, 1997).

Trademark Law Treaty

Ratifications

CYPRUS

The Government of Cyprus deposited, on January 17, 1997, its instrument of ratification of the Trademark Law Treaty, done at Geneva on October 27, 1994.

The Trademark Law Treaty will enter into force, with respect to Cyprus, on April 17, 1997.

TLT Notification No. 12, of January 17, 1997.

SWITZERLAND

The Government of Switzerland deposited, on February 1, 1997, its instrument of ratification of the Trademark Law Treaty, done at Geneva on October 27, 1994.

The Trademark Law Treaty will enter into force, with respect to Switzerland, on May 1, 1997.

TLT Notification No. 13, of February 1, 1997.

¹ See *Industrial Property*, February 1994, p. 67.

for enforcement of an award, no information concerning the existence of an arbitration may be unilaterally disclosed by a party to any third party unless it is required to do so by law or by a competent regulatory body, and then only

(i) by disclosing no more than what is legally required, and

(ii) by furnishing to the Tribunal and to the other party, if the disclosure takes place during the arbitration, or to the other party alone, if the disclosure takes place after the termination of the arbitration, details of the disclosure and an explanation of the reason for it.

(b) Notwithstanding paragraph (a), a party may disclose to a third party the names of the parties to the arbitration and the relief requested for the purpose of satisfying any obligation of good faith or candor owed to that third party.

Confidentiality of Disclosures Made During the Arbitration

Article 74

(a) In addition to any specific measures that may be available under Article 52, any documentary or other evidence given by a party or a witness in the arbitration shall be treated as confidential and, to the extent that such evidence describes information that is not in the public domain, shall not be used or disclosed to any third party by a party whose access to that information arises exclusively as a result of its participation in the arbitration for any purpose without the consent of the parties or order of a court having jurisdiction.

(b) For the purposes of this Article, a witness called by a party shall not be considered to be a third party. To the extent that a witness is given access to evidence or other information obtained in the arbitration in order to prepare the witness's testimony, the party calling such witness shall be responsible for the maintenance by the witness of the same degree of confidentiality as that required of the party.

Confidentiality of the Award

Article 75

The award shall be treated as confidential by the parties and may only be disclosed to a third party if and to the extent that

- (i) the parties consent, or
- (ii) it falls into the public domain as a result of an action before a national court or other competent authority, or
- (iii) it must be disclosed in order to comply with a legal requirement imposed on a party or in order to

establish or protect a party's legal rights against a third party.

Maintenance of Confidentiality by the Center and Arbitrator

Article 76

(a) Unless the parties agree otherwise, the Center and the arbitrator shall maintain the confidentiality of the arbitration, the award and, to the extent that they describe information that is not in the public domain, any documentary or other evidence disclosed during the arbitration, except to the extent necessary in connection with a court action relating to the award, or as otherwise required by law.

(b) Notwithstanding paragraph (a), the Center may include information concerning the arbitration in any aggregate statistical data that it publishes concerning its activities, provided that such information does not enable the parties or the particular circumstances of the dispute to be identified.

VIII. MISCELLANEOUS

Exclusion of Liability

Article 77

Except in respect of deliberate wrongdoing, the arbitrator or arbitrators, WIPO and the Center shall not be liable to a party for any act or omission in connection with the arbitration.

Waiver of Defamation

Article 78

The parties and, by acceptance of appointment, the arbitrator agree that any statements or comments, whether written or oral, made or used by them or their representatives in preparation for or in the course of the arbitration shall not be relied upon to found or maintain any action for defamation, libel, slander or any related complaint, and this Article may be pleaded as a bar to any such action.

Schedule of Fees

Fees of the Center

1. Registration Fee (Article 67, WIPO Arbitration Rules)

<i>Amount of Claim</i>	<i>Registration Fee</i>
Up to \$1,000,000	\$1,000
\$1,000,001 to \$10,000,000	\$2,000
Over \$10,000,000	\$3,000

Notes

1. Where the amount of the claim is not specified at the time of submitting the Request for Arbitration, a registration fee of \$1,000 shall be payable, subject to adjustment when the Statement of Claim is filed.

2. Where a claim is not for a monetary amount, a registration fee of \$1,000 shall be payable, subject to adjustment. The adjustment shall be made by reference to the registration fee that the Center, upon examination of the Request for Arbitration or the Statement of Claim, determines to be appropriate in the circumstances.

3. The amount of claims expressed in currencies other than United States dollars shall, for the purposes of calculating the registration fee, be converted to amounts expressed in United States dollars on the basis of the official United Nations exchange rate prevailing on the date of submission of the Request for Arbitration.

II. Administration Fee (Article 68, WIPO Arbitration Rules)

<i>Amount of Claim or Counterclaim</i>	<i>Administration Fee</i>
Up to \$100,000	\$1,000
\$100,001 to \$1,000,000	\$1,000 + 0.40% (of the amount above \$100,000)
\$1,000,001 to \$5,000,000	\$4,600 + 0.20% (of the amount above \$1,000,000)
\$5,000,001 to \$20,000,000	\$12,600 + 0.10% (of the amount above \$5,000,000)
Over \$20,000,000	\$27,600 + 0.05% (of the amount above \$20,000,000 up to a <i>maximum</i> administration fee of \$35,000)

Notes

1. Where a claim or counterclaim is not for a monetary amount, the Center shall determine an appropriate administration fee.

2. For the purpose of calculating the administration fee, the percentage figures are applied to each successive part of the amount of claim or counterclaim. For example, if the amount of claim is \$5,000,000, the administration fee would be calculated as follows:

\$100,000		\$1,000
\$900,000 (difference between \$100,000 and \$1,000,000)	0.40%	\$3,600
\$4,000,000 (difference between \$1,000,000 and \$5,000,000)	0.20%	\$8,000
<u>\$5,000,000</u>		<u>\$12,600</u>

3. The maximum administration fee payable is \$35,000.

4. The amounts of claims or counterclaims expressed in currencies other than United States dollars shall, for the purposes of calculating the admin-

istration fee, be converted to amounts expressed in United States dollars on the basis of the official United Nations exchange rate prevailing on the date of submission of the claim or of the counterclaim, respectively.

Arbitrators' Fees

(See Table, page 86)

Notes

1. For the purpose of calculating the amount of claims, the value of any counterclaim is added to the amount of the claim.

2. For the purpose of calculating the minimum and maximum amounts of the arbitrators' fees, the percentage figures are applied to each successive part of the whole amount of claims. For example, if the amount of claim is \$1,500,000, the minimum fees for a sole arbitrator would be calculated as follows:

\$100,000		\$2,000
\$400,000 (difference between \$100,000 and \$500,000)	2.00%	\$8,000
\$500,000 (difference between \$500,000 and \$1,000,000)	1.50%	\$7,500
\$500,000 (difference between \$1,000,000 and \$1,500,000)	1.00%	\$5,000
<u>\$1,500,000</u>		<u>\$22,500</u>

3. Where a claim or counterclaim is not for a monetary amount, the Center shall, in consultation with the arbitrators and the parties, determine an appropriate value for the claim or counterclaim for the purpose of determining the arbitrators' fees.

4. The amounts of claims or counterclaims expressed in currencies other than United States dollars shall, for the purpose of determining the arbitrators' fees, be converted to amounts expressed in United States dollars on the basis of the official United Nations exchange rate prevailing on the date of submission of the claim or of the counterclaim, respectively.

5. The amounts and percentage figures specified in the Table for a three-person Tribunal represent the total fees payable to such a Tribunal, and not the fees payable to each arbitrator. Such fees shall be distributed between the three persons in accordance with the unanimous decision of those three persons. In the absence of such a decision, the distribution shall be 40% for the presiding arbitrator, and 30% for each of the other two arbitrators.

6. Where, by the agreement of the parties, a number of arbitrators other than one or three is appointed to a Tribunal, the scale of minimum and maximum fees for the Tribunal in question shall be determined by the Center. That scale shall be so determined by multiplying the scale for a sole arbitrator by the number of arbitrators reduced by a factor that takes account of the sharing of work and responsibility among the arbitrators.

Arbitrators' Fees
(Article 69, WIPO Arbitration Rules)

<i>Amount of Claims</i>	<i>Fees</i>			
	<i>Minimum</i>		<i>Maximum</i>	
	<i>Sole Arbitrator</i>	<i>Three-person Tribunal</i>	<i>Sole Arbitrator</i>	<i>Three-person Tribunal</i>
Up to \$100.00	\$2,000	\$5,000	10.00%	25.00%
\$100.001 to \$500,000	\$2,000 + 2.00% (of the amount above \$100,000)	\$5,000 + 5.00% (of the amount above \$100,000)	\$10,000 + 4.00% (of the amount above \$100,000)	\$25,000 + 10.00% (of the amount above \$100,000)
\$500.001 to \$1,000,000	\$10,000 + 1.50% (of the amount above \$500,000)	\$25,000 + 3.75% (of the amount above \$500,000)	\$26,000 + 3.50% (of the amount above \$500,000)	\$65,000 + 8.75% (of the amount above \$500,000)
\$1,000.001 to \$2,000,000	\$17,500 + 1.00% (of the amount above \$1,000,000)	\$43,750 + 2.50% (of the amount above \$1,000,000)	\$43,500 + 2.00% (of the amount above \$1,000,000)	\$108,750 + 5.00% (of the amount above \$1,000,000)
\$2,000.001 to \$5,000,000	\$27,500 + 0.75% (of the amount above \$2,000,000)	\$68,750 + 1.90% (of the amount above \$2,000,000)	\$63,500 + 1.50% (of the amount above \$2,000,000)	\$158,750 + 3.75% (of the amount above \$2,000,000)
\$5,000.001 to \$10,000,000	\$50,000 + 0.50% (of the amount above \$5,000,000)	\$125,750 + 1.25% (of the amount above \$5,000,000)	\$108,500 + 1.00% (of the amount above \$5,000,000)	\$271,250 + 2.50% (of the amount above \$5,000,000)
\$10,000.001 to \$25,000,000	\$75,000 + 0.30% (of the amount above \$10,000,000)	\$188,250 + 0.75% (of the amount above \$10,000,000)	\$158,500 + 1.00% (of the amount above \$10,000,000)	\$396,250 + 2.50% (of the amount above \$10,000,000)
Over \$25,000,000	\$120,000 + 0.25% (of the amount above \$25,000,000)	\$300,750 + 0.65% (of the amount above \$25,000,000)	\$308,500 + 1.00% (of the amount above \$25,000,000)	\$771,250 + 2.50% (of the amount above \$25,000,000)

Activities of WIPO Specially Designed for Developing Countries

Africa

Training Courses, Seminars and Meetings

WIPO General Introductory Course on Industrial Property (Madagascar). From October 5 to 14, 1994, WIPO organized that Course in Antananarivo, in cooperation with the Government of Madagascar. The Course was attended by 15 government officials from Benin, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, the Central African Republic, Chad, the Congo, Gabon, Guinea, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Niger, Senegal, Togo, Tunisia, a representative of the International Federation of Inventors' Associations (IFIA) and 60 local participants from the private and public sectors. Two WIPO consultants from France, a government official from Madagascar and three WIPO officials made presentations.

Economic Commission for Africa (ECA): International Conference on the Uruguay Round of Multilateral Trade Negotiations. In October 1994, a WIPO official made a presentation at that Conference organized by the ECA in Tunis, which dealt, *inter alia*, with the implementation of the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights, Including Trade in Counterfeit Goods (TRIPS Agreement).

Assistance With Training, Legislation and Modernization of Administration

Liberia. In October 1994, the International Bureau prepared and sent to the government authorities, at their request, a draft industrial property law with a commentary.

Madagascar. In October 1994, three WIPO officials held discussions with government officials in Antananarivo on future cooperation between WIPO and the Malagasy Industrial Property Office (OMAPI).

Niger. In October 1994, a WIPO consultant on computerization from Burkina Faso undertook a mission to Niamey to install computer software for the use of officials of the Copyright Office and to train them in its use.

South Africa. In October 1994, three government officials had discussions with the Director General and other WIPO officials in Geneva on cooperation between South Africa and WIPO, in particular on the advantages for South Africa of acceding to various WIPO-administered treaties, the sending of a WIPO mission to that country, the training of government officials, the organization, in South Africa in 1995, of national seminars on industrial property and copyright and neighboring rights, as well as the implementation of the existing system of collective administration.

Swaziland. In October 1994, on the occasion of his participation in the sessions of the Governing Bodies of WIPO held in Geneva, Mr. Andrias Mlungisi Mathabela, Registrar General, held discussions with WIPO officials on Swaziland's possible accession to the Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works as well as on future training in copyright and neighboring rights for government officials in 1995.

Also in October 1994, the International Bureau prepared and sent to the government authorities, at their request, a draft law on copyright and neighboring rights.

Zambia. In October 1994, a government official visited WIPO in Geneva and held discussions with WIPO officials on the possible organization, in Lusaka in 1995, of a national seminar on copyright and neighboring rights for judges and customs officers as well as on training for government officials and staff of the authors' society of Zambia in 1995.

Arab Countries

Assistance With Training, Legislation and Modernization of Administration

Egypt. In October 1994, Dr. Badr El Sayed Badr Nassar, Chairman of the Administration of Commercial Registration, Ministry of Supply and Internal Trade, held discussions with WIPO officials in Geneva on his Administration's requirements for the modernization of its operations and the training of its staff.

Jordan. In October 1994, Mr. Mohammad A.A.R. Khreisat, Director of Trade Registration and Industrial Property Protection, held discussions with WIPO officials in Geneva on the revision of the Jordanian intellectual property legislation and Jordan's possible accession to the Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT) and the Madrid Agreement Concerning the International Registration of Marks.

Lebanon. In October 1994, the International Bureau prepared and sent to the government authorities, at their request, a draft law on industrial property, together with a commentary.

Morocco. In October 1994, a WIPO official visited Rabat and discussed with government offi-

cials ongoing activities under the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)-financed country project for Morocco as well as future cooperation between Morocco and WIPO.

Qatar. In October 1994, the International Bureau prepared and sent to the government authorities, at their request, a draft law on copyright and neighboring rights.

Sudan. In October 1994, Mr. Hussein Abu-Salih, Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Ibrahim Ahmed Omar, Minister for Education and Scientific Research, and other senior government officials visited WIPO and held discussions with the Director General and other WIPO officials on matters of mutual interest.

International Federation of Inventors' Associations (IFIA). In October 1994, the President of IFIA visited WIPO to discuss the possible areas of cooperation between WIPO and IFIA in promoting the creation of inventors' associations in the Arab countries.

Asia and the Pacific

Training Courses, Seminars and Meetings

WIPO/European Patent Office (EPO) National Colloquium for Judges on Intellectual Property (Philippines). From October 24 to 29, 1994, WIPO organized that Colloquium in Manila, jointly with the EPO and the Bureau of Patents, Trademarks and Technology Transfer (BPTTT) of the Philippines and with the assistance of the Commission of the European Communities (CEC). Seventy-six judges attended the Colloquium. Papers were presented by three WIPO consultants from Germany, Sweden and the United Kingdom, an EPO consultant from the United Kingdom, three speakers from the Philippines and a WIPO official.

WIPO/EPO National Seminar for Prosecutors and Lawyers on Intellectual Property (Philippines). On October 26, 1994, immediately after the above-mentioned Colloquium, WIPO organized the said National Seminar in Manila, jointly with the EPO and BPTTT, and with the assistance of the CEC.

Sixty prosecutors and 70 lawyers attended the Seminar. Papers were presented by three WIPO consultants from Germany, Sweden and the United Kingdom, an EPO consultant from the United Kingdom, three speakers from the Philippines and a WIPO official.

WIPO Workshop on the Use, Management and Enforcement of Industrial Property Rights in Small and Medium Enterprises (Sri Lanka). On October 3 and 4, 1994, WIPO organized that Workshop in Colombo, in cooperation with the Registry of Patents and Trade Marks, the Federation of Chambers of Commerce and Industries and the Ceylon National Chamber of Industries. The Workshop was attended by 48 representatives of small- and medium-sized enterprises, government officials, inventors, patent attorneys and agents. Papers were presented by two WIPO consultants from the United Kingdom and the United States of America, a WIPO official as well as two speakers from Sri Lanka. After the presentations, individual and group consultations were

conducted by the WIPO consultants with 14 representatives of small- and medium-sized enterprises on matters relating to the use and management of industrial property. This activity was organized under the UNDP-financed regional project for Asia and the Pacific.

WIPO Workshop on the Use, Management and Enforcement of Industrial Property Rights in Small and Medium Enterprises (Viet Nam). On October 6 and 7, 1994, WIPO organized that Workshop in Hanoi, in cooperation with the National Office of Industrial Property (NOIP) and the Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Viet Nam (VCCI). The Workshop was attended by some 120 representatives of small- and medium-sized enterprises, government officials and patent attorneys and agents. Papers were presented by two WIPO consultants from the United Kingdom and the United States of America and a WIPO official as well as two experts from Viet Nam. After the presentations, consultations were conducted by the WIPO consultants with representatives of small- and medium-sized enterprises on matters relating to the use and management of industrial property. This activity was undertaken under the said UNDP-financed regional project.

China. In October 1994, three WIPO officials conducted an advanced seminar on the PCT organized in Beijing by the Chinese Patent Office (CPO), in cooperation with WIPO, for over 60 participants, some 40 of whom were patent examiners of the CPO and some 20 local patent agents.

Also in October 1994, a WIPO official participated as a speaker in the "Beijing EP'94 Conference on Electronic Publishing," organized in Beijing by the Press and Publication Administration of China (PPA).

Hong Kong. In October 1994, three WIPO officials conducted an advanced seminar on the PCT organized in Hong Kong by the Chinese Patent Office (CPO) in cooperation with WIPO and with the assistance of China Patent Agent (Hong Kong) Limited, for some 50 participants, mainly representatives from the latter institution.

Assistance With Training, Legislation and Modernization of Administration

(i) In October 1994, on the occasion of their participation in the Diplomatic Conference which adopted the Trademark Law Treaty in Geneva, officials from Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Mongolia, Sri Lanka and Viet Nam had discussions at the headquarters of WIPO as follows:

Indonesia. In October 1994, Mr. Nico Kansil, Director General of Copyrights, Patents and Trade-marks, and another government official held discussions with WIPO officials in Geneva on cooperation between Indonesia and WIPO and the country's possible accession to the PCT.

Iran (Islamic Republic of). In October 1994, three government officials held discussions with the Director General and other WIPO officials in Geneva on matters of common interest, including the progress of the UNDP-financed country project for the modernization of the industrial property administration and its possible extension. They were also briefed by WIPO officials on the Madrid system for the international registration of marks.

Mongolia. In October 1994, two government officials held discussions with WIPO officials in Geneva on the possibility of organizing an industrial property seminar in Mongolia in 1995, and on other matters of cooperation.

Sri Lanka. In October 1994, Dr. D.M. Karunaratna, Registrar of Patents and Trade Marks, held discussions with WIPO officials in Geneva on the possible revision of the national intellectual property legislation.

Viet Nam. In October 1994, Dr. Doan Phuong, Director General of the National Office of Industrial Property (NOIP), held discussions with WIPO officials in Geneva on the strengthening of cooperation between Viet Nam and WIPO and on PCT implementation matters.

(ii) The following WIPO activities concerning assistance with training, legislation and modernization of administration also took place in October 1994:

India. In October 1994, Mr. Arjun Singh, Minister for Human Resources Development, and other government officials held discussions in Geneva with the Director General and other WIPO officials on future cooperation between India and WIPO.

Laos. In October 1994, Professor Dr. Souli Nanthavong, President of the Science, Technology and Environment Organization, and Mr. Nheune Sisavad, Director of the Department of Industrial Property, undertook a study visit to WIPO and held discussions with the Director General and other WIPO officials on future cooperation between Laos and WIPO, including the country's possible accession to various WIPO-administered treaties.

Malaysia. In October 1994, two government officials undertook a WIPO-organized study visit to the Australian Industrial Property Organisation (AIPO) in Canberra and Sydney to study the conduct of intellectual property hearings and related procedures. The study visit was organized under the UNDP-financed country project.

Also in October 1994, two WIPO officials had discussions with government officials in Kuala Lumpur on Malaysia's industrial property legislation. They also gave a short introductory seminar on the PCT to some 15 representatives from the private sector.

Philippines. In October 1994, a WIPO official held discussions with UNDP and government officials in Manila on current and future WIPO-sponsored activities in the Philippines.

Singapore. From October to December 1994, a WIPO consultant from Australia undertook a mission to the Registry of Trade Marks and Patents to help prepare for the implementation of the proposed Patents Act. The mission was financed from a funds-in-trust arrangement established by WIPO with contributions from the Government of Singapore.

Also in October 1994, the International Bureau prepared and sent to the government authorities, at their request, comments with regard to specific provisions of the bill for the said Patents Act.

Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN). In October 1994, two EPO officials held discussions with WIPO officials in Geneva on the coordination of their respective activities under the European Commission (EC)-ASEAN Patents and Trademarks Program financed by the EC.

Latin America and the Caribbean

Training Courses, Seminars and Meetings

Uruguay. In October 1994, a WIPO official made presentations at the locally organized third Training Course on Collective Administration of Copyright for staff members of Latin American authors' societies.

Also in October 1994, a WIPO official presented a paper at a workshop on copyright organized by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Assistance With Training, Legislation and Modernization of Administration

Argentina. In October 1994, a WIPO official visited Buenos Aires and held discussions with government officials and officials from the Copyright Office on the organization of a seminar on copyright for judges in Buenos Aires in 1995, as well as on other matters of mutual interest in the field of copyright and neighboring rights.

Chile. In September and October 1994, a WIPO consultant from the EPO undertook a mission to Santiago to advise the staff of the Industrial Property Department on the examination of patent applications in the fields of chemistry and biotechnology.

In October 1994, WIPO organized a study visit to the EPO and the German Federal Patent Court in Munich and WIPO in Geneva for a judge of the Industrial Property Tribunal of Chile. At WIPO, he was briefed, *inter alia*, on the administrative procedures under the PCT.

Cuba. In October 1994, a WIPO consultant from Chile undertook a mission to Havana to advise the National Office of Inventions, Technical Information and Marks (ONIITEM) on the computerization of its trademark operations. The consultant assisted ONIITEM particularly in the installation of a computerized system for search, retrieval and storage of the figurative elements of marks. This activity was organized under the UNDP-financed regional project.

Also in October 1994, Mr. Mario A. Fernández Finalé, Director of ONIITEM, who was attending the Diplomatic Conference which adopted the Trademark Law Treaty in Geneva, held discussions with the Director General and other WIPO officials on matters relating to cooperation between Cuba and WIPO in the field of industrial property, particularly the enhancement of the patent information system in that country.

Ecuador. In October 1994, a government official had discussions with WIPO officials in Geneva on the possible organization of a training course on copyright and neighboring rights and of the Xth International Congress on the Protection of Intellectual Rights in Quito in July 1995.

Guyana. In October 1994, the International Bureau prepared and sent to the government authorities, at their request, a draft industrial property law, with a commentary on its main provisions.

Mexico. In October 1994, Mr. Jorge Amigo Castañeda, Director General of the Mexican Institute

of Industrial Property (IMPI), and the Director General of WIPO signed a Technical Assistance Agreement between WIPO and IMPI at WIPO's headquarters in Geneva. The Agreement provides for the implementation by WIPO of a cooperation project to support IMPI's operations over a period of four years, with financing from a loan from the World Bank to the Government of Mexico. They discussed other cooperation activities as well.

Paraguay. In October 1994, Mr. Nicanor Duarte Frutos, Minister of Education, and two other government officials held discussions with the Director General and other WIPO officials in Geneva on the strengthening of the country's intellectual property system under the WIPO/Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) project for Paraguay.

Trinidad and Tobago. In October 1994, a Technical Cooperation Agreement was signed between the Government of Trinidad and Tobago and WIPO for the modernization and strengthening of the indus-

trial property system in Trinidad and Tobago over a period of two years, with financing from a loan from the IDB to the Government of Trinidad and Tobago.

Also in October 1994, a WIPO official and a WIPO consultant on computerization from Chile undertook a mission to Port of Spain to prepare a needs assessment report for the implementation of the above-mentioned project.

Uruguay. In October 1994, a WIPO official visited Montevideo and held discussions with government officials and with officials from the authors' society on cooperation activities in the field of copyright and neighboring rights in 1995.

Common Market of the Southern Cone (MERCOSUR). In October 1994, a WIPO official attended a meeting of a group of experts of MERCOSUR, in Montevideo, where guidelines for the harmonization of copyright legislation in the four countries of MERCOSUR (Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay, Uruguay) were discussed.

Development Cooperation (in General)

WIPO/ISESCO (Islamic Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) Meeting to Generate Awareness of the Importance of Copyright and Neighboring Rights in the Member Countries of ISESCO (Morocco). From October 5 to 7, 1994, WIPO organized that Meeting in Rabat jointly with ISESCO and with the cooperation of the Government of Morocco. This was the fourth such meeting organized by WIPO and ISESCO. Seven government officials from Burkina Faso, Djibouti, Jordan, Mali, Mauritania, Syria and Tunisia attended the Meeting as well as some 50 nationals of Morocco. Three WIPO consultants from Burkina Faso, Egypt, Tunisia, an ISESCO official as well as two WIPO officials made presentations.

WIPO Orientation Seminar on Copyright and Neighboring Rights (Geneva). From October 12 to 14, 1994, WIPO organized that Seminar, in English and French, in Geneva. Thirty-two participants, from the following 29 countries, who were either government officials or working in non-governmental copyright organizations, attended the Seminar: Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, China, Ecuador, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, India, Jamaica, Kenya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mongolia, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Republic of Korea, Senegal, Singapore, Sudan, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, United Arab Emirates, Zambia. In addition, 15 officials from 12 Permanent Missions to the United Nations Office and other international organizations

in Geneva attended. Presentations were made by six WIPO officials. The Seminar was followed by practical training courses as described in the three following paragraphs.

WIPO/Belgian Society of Authors, Composers and Publishers (SABAM) Training Course on Copyright and Neighboring Rights (Brussels). From October 17 to 28, 1994, WIPO organized that Course in Brussels, with the assistance of SABAM. Two officials from Guinea and Zaire attended the Course. Papers were presented by staff members of SABAM.

WIPO/France Training Course on Copyright and Neighboring Rights (Paris). From October 17 to 28, 1994, WIPO organized that Course in Paris, in cooperation with the Ministry of Culture and Francophonie and with the assistance of the Minister of Cooperation, the French Society of Authors, Composers and Music Publishers (SACEM) and the French Society of Authors and Composers of Dramatic Works (SACD). Ten government officials from Benin, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Guinea, Madagascar, Mali, Niger, Senegal and Togo attended the Course. Papers were presented by officials from France and by staff members of SACEM and SACD. Two WIPO officials also attended the Course.

WIPO/Hungarian Bureau for the Protection of Authors' Rights (ARTISJUS) Training Course on Copyright and Neighboring Rights (Budapest). From

October 17 to 28, 1994, WIPO organized that Course in Budapest, in cooperation with ARTISJUS. Twenty government officials from Botswana, China, Ecuador, the Gambia, Ghana, India, Jamaica, Kenya, Malawi, Mongolia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, the Republic of Korea, Singapore, Sudan, Swaziland, Thailand, the United Arab Emirates and Zambia attended the Course. Officials from Hungary, Sweden and Switzerland as well as representatives of three international non-governmental organizations and three WIPO officials made presentations.

Assistance With Training, Legislation and Modernization of Administration

Sweden. In October 1994, a WIPO official had discussions in Stockholm with officials of the Swedish International Development Authority (SIDA) and the Swedish Patent and Registration Office concerning the implementation of the funds-in-trust arrangement between Sweden and WIPO for development cooperation in the field of industrial property and its future extension.

Activities of WIPO Specially Designed for Countries in Transition to Market Economy

National Activities

(i) In October 1994, on the occasion of their participation in the Diplomatic Conference which adopted the Trademark Law Treaty in Geneva, officials from Bulgaria and Croatia had discussions at the headquarters of WIPO as follows:

Bulgaria. In October 1994, Mr. Kristo Iliev, President of the Patent Office, held discussions with WIPO officials in Geneva on the drafting of an industrial designs law and the computerization of the Bulgarian Office's trademark operations.

Croatia. In October 1994, Mr. Nikola Kopčić, Director of the State Patent Office, held discussions with WIPO officials on the draft trademark law.

(ii) The following other activities also took place in October 1994:

Czech Republic. In October 1994, the Director of the Institute for Copyright, Industrial Property Rights and Competition Law at the Charles University held

discussions with WIPO officials in Geneva on the organization of the WIPO/Czech Republic National Seminar on the Enforcement of Copyright, scheduled to be held on November 30, 1994, in Prague.

Kazakhstan. In October 1994, the International Bureau prepared and sent to the government authorities, at their request, comments in Russian on the draft copyright law.

Republic of Moldova. In October 1994, Mr. Michail Chush, Director of the State Copyright Agency, and another government official held discussions with the Director General and other WIPO officials in Geneva on the draft laws on copyright and neighboring rights, the country's possible accession to further WIPO-administered treaties in the field of copyright, the establishment of a collective administration system and WIPO's possible assistance in the training of copyright experts.

Slovenia. In October 1994, a government official held discussions with WIPO officials in Geneva on the Slovenian translation of the sixth edition of the

International Classification of Goods and Services for the Purposes of the Registration of Marks (Nice Classification).

Ukraine. In October 1994, three government officials visited WIPO to gather information on WIPO's

computer software and hardware equipment for administrative procedures under the Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT) and the Madrid Agreement Concerning the International Registration of Marks, with a view to developing similar systems at the State Patent Office.

Other Contacts of the International Bureau of WIPO with Governments and International Organizations

National Contacts

Andorra. In October 1994, an advisor to the Government on intellectual property affairs had discussions with WIPO officials in Geneva on the setting up of a national trademark office and the possibility of establishing an electronic filing system for trademarks. He was also briefed on the system used at WIPO in this respect.

Malta. In October 1994, the International Bureau prepared and sent to the government authorities, at their request, comments on the draft law on copyright and neighboring rights.

Spain. In October 1994, a WIPO official visited Madrid and had discussions with government officials on the preparation and organization of the Second Iberoamerican Congress on Copyright and Neighboring Rights, to be held in Santiago de Compostela in November 1994.

Turkey. In October 1994, on the occasion of their participation in the Diplomatic Conference which adopted the Trademark Law Treaty in Geneva, two government officials held discussions with WIPO officials on a forthcoming WIPO expert mission to Ankara and on Turkey's possible accession to the Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT).

United Nations

50th Anniversary of the United Nations. In October 1994, a WIPO official attended a meeting of the Geneva-based Working Group on Preparations for the 50th Anniversary Commemoration of the United Nations.

United Nations Information Fair (New York). In October 1994, WIPO participated in that Fair, organized by the United Nations Office in New York.

United Nations Ad Hoc Inter-Agency Meeting on Outer Space Activities. In October 1994, two WIPO officials attended, as speakers, the 16th annual sessions of the said Meeting, organized in Vienna by the Office for Outer Space Affairs (OOSA).

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). In October 1994, a WIPO official attended the third regular session for 1994 of the Executive Board of UNDP and of the United Nations Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA), held in New York.

United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). In October 1994, a WIPO official attended the first meeting of the Inter-Agency Environment Co-ordination Group (IAEG), convened by UNEP in Geneva.

Committee for Programme and Coordination (CPC) and Administrative Committee on Co-ordination (ACC). In October 1994, a WIPO official attended the 28th Series of Joint Meetings of the CPC and the ACC.

Information Systems Co-ordination Committee (ISCC). In October 1994, two WIPO officials attended the second session of the ISCC, held in Geneva.

Also in October 1994, a WIPO official attended an ISCC task force on document management systems, held in Geneva.

International Civil Service Commission (ICSC). In October 1994, a WIPO official attended the ICSC consultation meeting, held in New York.

Inter-Agency Meeting of Sales, Marketing and Publications Officers. In October 1994, a WIPO official attended that Meeting in Frankfurt/Main (Germany), as well as the informal meeting on sales and distribution of CD-ROM products in the UN system that preceded it.

International Computing Centre (ICC). In October 1994, 10 WIPO officials visited the ICC in Geneva which houses, among others, certain elements of WIPO's computer facilities.

Intergovernmental Organizations

European Commission (EC). In October 1994, a WIPO official attended, as a speaker, the Conference on Legal Aspects of Multimedia and Geographic Information Systems (GIS), organized by the EC in Lisbon.

European Patent Office (EPO). In October 1994, two WIPO officials attended the 36th meeting of the EPO's Working Party on Technical Information, held in Munich.

Also in October 1994, four WIPO officials attended, two of them as speakers, the EPO's EPIDOS User Meeting 1994, held in Barcelona (Spain), where they gave demonstrations of WIPO's CD-ROM products.

General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT)-World Trade Organization (WTO). In October 1994, four WIPO officials participated in the third and last meeting of the GATT-WTO Informal Contact Group on the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights, Including Trade in Counterfeit Goods (TRIPS Agreement), held in Geneva.

Also in October 1994, a group of 24 government officials from developing countries, who were attending the 78th GATT Training Program on

Policy, visited WIPO and were briefed by WIPO officials on WIPO's activities.

Islamic Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (ISESCO). In October 1994, Mr. Abdulaziz Othman Altwaijri, Director General, and two other ISESCO officials held discussions with the Director General and other WIPO officials in Geneva on future joint copyright activities for the benefit of member countries of ISESCO.

Also in October 1994, the International Bureau prepared and sent to the ISESCO Secretariat, at its request, a draft Islamic convention for the protection of copyright.

International Telecommunication Union (ITU). In October 1994, an ITU official held discussions with WIPO officials in Geneva on various questions related to an interface between copyright and telecommunications law.

Other Organizations

Agence pour la protection des dessins, modèles et marques textiles (APDMMT). In October 1994, a WIPO official participated, as a speaker, in a colloquium entitled "*La contrefaçon textile : prévenir et agir*," organized by APDMMT in Paris.

American Intellectual Property Law Association (AIPLA). In October 1994, a WIPO official and two WIPO consultants from the United States of America attended, one of the latter as a speaker, AIPLA's annual meeting, held in Arlington (Virginia).

Asian Patent Attorneys Association (APAA)/International Federation of Industrial Property Attorneys (FICPI). In October 1994, a WIPO consultant from the United Kingdom attended, as a speaker, a symposium jointly organized by APAA and FICPI in Niigata (Japan).

Canadian Intellectual Property Institute (CIPI). In October 1994, a WIPO official participated, as a speaker, in a conference entitled "Copyright in Transition: Enforcement, Fair Dealing, and Digital Developments," organized by CIPI in Ottawa.

European Communities Trade Mark Association (ECTA). In October 1994, a WIPO consultant from the United Kingdom attended a meeting of the ECTA Council, held in The Hague.

Institute of Trade Mark Agents (ITMA). In October 1994, a WIPO consultant from the United Kingdom made a presentation on the Protocol Relating to the Madrid Agreement Concerning the International Registration of Marks at the Jubilee

Meeting organized by ITMA, in London, on the occasion of its 60th anniversary.

International Association for the Protection of Industrial Property (AIPPI) (British Group). In October 1994, a WIPO official attended, as a speaker, the Annual General Meeting of the British Group of AIPPI, held in London.

International Confederation of Societies of Authors and Composers (CISAC). In October 1994, the Secretary General and another representative of CISAC held discussions with WIPO officials in Geneva on recent developments in the field of copyright.

Also in October 1994, a WIPO official attended the annual meeting of the CISAC African Committee for African authors' societies, held in Nairobi.

International Federation of the Phonographic Industry (IFPI). In October 1994, a representative of IFPI held discussions with WIPO officials in Geneva on WIPO's activities in the field of enforcement of copyright.

Japan Video Association (JVA). In October 1994, a delegation of 13 representatives of JVA was briefed by WIPO officials in Geneva on current issues regarding the protection of copyright and neighboring rights.

Middle East Technical University (METU) (Ankara). In October 1994, a WIPO official attended, as a speaker, the International Product Design Symposium, organized by METU in Ankara.

Pharmaceutical Trade Marks Group (PTMG). In October 1994, a WIPO official attended, as a speaker, the PTMG's 49th Conference, held in Monte Carlo.

The Chartered Institute of Arbitrators (CIArb). In October 1994, a WIPO official attended, as a speaker, the Annual Dinner of the European Branch of CIArb, held in Divonne (France).

Université Pierre Mendès-France (Grenoble, France). In October 1994, a professor at that University held discussions with WIPO officials in Geneva on copyright protection of multimedia works.

Miscellaneous News

National News

Ecuador. Decree No. 1738 of May 6, 1994, Amending the Implementing Regulations Under

Decision No. 344 of the Commission of the Cartagena Agreement [on Common Provisions on Industrial Property], entered into force on June 30, 1994.

Calendar of Meetings

WIPO Meetings

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

1995

- | | |
|---|--|
| April 5 and 6 (Melbourne, Australia) | <p>Symposium on the International Protection of Geographical Indications (organized by WIPO in cooperation with the Government of Australia)</p> <p>The Symposium will deal with the protection of geographical indications (appellations of origin and other geographical indications) both on the national and multilateral level and, in particular, with the coexistence of geographical indications and trademarks.</p> <p><i>Invitations:</i> Governments, selected intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations and any member of the public (against payment of the registration fee).</p> |
| May 8 to 12 (Geneva) | <p>Consultative Meeting for the Preparation of the Second Part of the Diplomatic Conference for the Conclusion of the Patent Law Treaty</p> <p>The meeting will discuss the preparation of the second part of the said Diplomatic Conference.</p> <p><i>Invitations:</i> States members of WIPO or the Paris Union and, as observers, certain organizations.</p> |
| May 29 to June 2 (Geneva) | <p>Committee of Experts on the Settlement of Intellectual Property Disputes Between States (Seventh Session)</p> <p>The Committee of Experts will continue the preparations for a possible treaty on the settlement of intellectual property disputes between States. In particular, the Committee of Experts will consider the question of the relationship between the dispute settlement system to be established by the proposed Treaty and other dispute settlement systems, including the dispute settlement system to be established as a result of the Uruguay Round of GATT.</p> <p><i>Invitations:</i> States members of WIPO or party to treaties administered by WIPO not members of WIPO and, as observers, certain organizations.</p> |
| June 12 to 16 (Geneva) | <p>Committee of Experts on the Development of the Hague Agreement (Fifth Session)</p> <p>The Committee will consider a revised draft new Act of the Hague Agreement Concerning the International Deposit of Industrial Designs intended to introduce into the Hague system provisions designed to encourage States not yet party to the Agreement to participate in the system and to facilitate greater use of the system by applicants.</p> <p><i>Invitations:</i> States members of the Hague Union, and, as observers, States members of the Paris Union or of WIPO not members of the Hague Union and certain organizations.</p> |
| September 25 to October 4 (Geneva) | <p>Governing Bodies of WIPO and the Unions Administered by WIPO (Twenty-Sixth Series of Meetings)</p> <p>All the Governing Bodies of WIPO and the Unions administered by WIPO meet in ordinary sessions every two years in odd-numbered years.</p> <p>In the sessions in 1995, the Governing Bodies will, <i>inter alia</i>, review and evaluate WIPO's activities undertaken since July 1994, and decide the program and budget of the International Bureau for the 1996-97 biennium.</p> <p><i>Invitations:</i> States members of WIPO and the Paris and Berne Unions and, as observers, other States members of the United Nations and certain organizations.</p> |

UPOV Meetings

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

1995

April 26 and 27 (Geneva)

Administrative and Legal Committee

Invitations: Member States of UPOV and, as observers, certain non-member States and inter-governmental organizations.

April 28 (Geneva)

Consultative Committee (Forty-Ninth Session)

Invitations: Member States of UPOV.

October 11 to 13 (Geneva)

Technical Committee

Invitations: Member States of UPOV and, as observers, certain non-member States and inter-governmental and non-governmental organizations.

October 16 and 17 (Geneva)

Administrative and Legal Committee

Invitations: Member States of UPOV and, as observers, certain non-member States and inter-governmental organizations.

October 18 (Geneva)

Consultative Committee (Fiftieth Session)

Invitations: Member States of UPOV.

October 19 (Geneva)

Council (Twenty-Ninth Ordinary Session)

Invitations: Member States of UPOV and, as observers, certain non-member States and inter-governmental organizations.

