

Published monthly
Annual subscription:
190 Swiss francs
Each monthly issue:
24 Swiss francs

Geneva
2nd Year – No. 10
October 1996

(Industrial Property
35th Year – No. 10)

(Copyright
32nd Year – No. 10)

Industrial Property and Copyright

Monthly Review of the
World Intellectual Property Organization

Contents

NOTIFICATIONS CONCERNING TREATIES ADMINISTERED BY WIPO

WIPO Convention. Accession: Mozambique	318
Rome Convention. Accession: Slovenia	318
Trademark Law Treaty. Ratification: Netherlands	318

NORMATIVE ACTIVITIES OF WIPO

Committee of Experts on the Settlement of Intellectual Property Disputes Between States. Eighth Session (Geneva, July 1 to 5, 1996)	319
Committee of Experts on Well-Known Marks. Second Session (Geneva, October 28 to 31, 1996)	320

REGISTRATION SYSTEMS ADMINISTERED BY WIPO

Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT)	325
Madrid Union	325

WIPO ARBITRATION AND MEDIATION CENTER

326

ACTIVITIES OF WIPO SPECIALLY DESIGNED FOR DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

Africa	326
Arab Countries	327
Asia and the Pacific	328
Latin America and the Caribbean	329
WIPO Medals	331

[Continued overleaf]

WIPO 1996

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.

ACTIVITIES OF WIPO SPECIALLY DESIGNED FOR COUNTRIES IN TRANSITION TO MARKET ECONOMY.....	332
CONTACTS OF THE INTERNATIONAL BUREAU OF WIPO WITH OTHER COUNTRIES AND WITH INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS.....	332
MISCELLANEOUS NEWS.....	333
RECENT WIPO PUBLICATIONS.....	334
CALENDAR OF MEETINGS.....	335

**INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY LAWS AND TREATIES
(INSERT)**

Editor's Note

CHINA

Regulations on the Protection of Intellectual Property Rights by Customs
(Decree No. 179, of July 5, 1995)..... Text 1-001

JAPAN

Trademark Law (Law No. 127 of April 13, 1959, as last amended by Law
No. 116 of 1994) (*This text replaces the one previously published under the
same code number.*) Text 3-001

Design Law (Law No. 125 of April 13, 1959, as last amended by Law
No. 116 of 1994) (*This text replaces the one previously published under the
same code number.*) Text 4-001

NEW ZEALAND

An Act to Provide for the Protection of Layout Designs for Integrated Cir-
cuits (No. 116 of November 25, 1994) Text 1-001

The Layout Designs (Eligible Countries) Order 1995 (No. 78 of April 10,
1995)..... Text 1-002

REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA

Law on Trademarks and Appellations of Origin (No. 588-XIII of Sep-
tember 22, 1995) Text 3-001

SWITZERLAND

Federal Law on Industrial Designs (of March 30, 1900, as last amended on
March 24, 1995) (*This text replaces the one previously published under the
same code number.*) Text 4-001

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Semiconductor Chip Protection Act of 1984 (Title III of Public Law 98-620 of November 8, 1984, as last amended by Public Law 102-563, Sec. 3(c) of October 28, 1992) (*This text replaces the one previously published under the same code number.*)

Text 1-001

**COPYRIGHT AND NEIGHBORING RIGHTS LAWS AND TREATIES
(INSERT)**

Editor's Note

QATAR

Law No. 25 of 1995 Concerning the Protection of Works of the Intellect and Authors' Rights

Text 1-01

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

United States Code, Title 17—Copyrights (Copyright Law of 1976 (Public Law 94-553 of October 19, 1976), as last amended by Public Law 104-39 of November 1, 1995) (*This text replaces the one previously published under the same code number.*)

Text 1-01

Notifications Concerning Treaties Administered by WIPO

WIPO Convention

Accession

MOZAMBIQUE

The Government of Mozambique deposited, on September 23, 1996, its instrument of accession to the Convention Establishing the World Intellectual Property Organization, signed at Stockholm on July 14, 1967.

The said Convention will enter into force, with respect to Mozambique, on December 23, 1996.

WIPO Notification No. 186, of September 23, 1996.

Rome Convention

Accession

SLOVENIA

The Government of Slovenia deposited, on July 9, 1996, its instrument of accession to the International Convention for the Protection of Performers, Producers of Phonograms and Broadcasting Organizations done at Rome on October 26, 1961.

The instrument contains the following reservations:

“1. In respect of Article 5, paragraph 1(c) and in accordance with Article 5, paragraph 3

of the Convention, the Republic of Slovenia will not apply the criterion of publication;

2. In accordance with Article 16, paragraph 1(a)(i) of the Convention, the Republic of Slovenia will not apply the provisions of Article 12 until 1 January 1998.” (*Original: English*)

In accordance with its Article 25.2, the Convention entered into force for Slovenia three months after the date of deposit of the instrument, i.e. on October 9, 1996.

Trademark Law Treaty

Ratification

NETHERLANDS

The Government of the Netherlands deposited, on September 19, 1996, its instrument of ratification of the Trademark Law Treaty, done at Geneva on October 27, 1994, for the Kingdom in Europe, the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba.

The Netherlands being a Member State of the Benelux Trademark Office, the Trademark Law Treaty will enter into force, with respect to the Netherlands, three months after the date on which the instruments of ratification of the other two Member States of the Benelux Trademark Office, Belgium and Luxembourg, have been deposited.

TLT Notification No. 10, of September 19, 1996.

Normative Activities of WIPO

Committee of Experts on the Settlement of Intellectual Property Disputes Between States

Eighth Session
(Geneva, July 1 to 5, 1996)

The following 61 States and one intergovernmental organization participated in the meeting of the Committee: Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Lesotho, Malawi, Mali, Mexico, Monaco, Morocco, Netherlands, Nigeria, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Senegal, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom, United States of America, Uruguay, Viet Nam, Commission of the European Communities (CEC).

The Committee worked on the basis of a revised draft Treaty on the Settlement of Disputes Between States in the Field of Intellectual Property. The revised version of the draft Treaty was the result of the discussions held in the Committee since its first session in 1990.

The Committee of Experts considered, in particular, the following four issues: the relationship between the dispute settlement system of the proposed Treaty and other dispute settlement systems; the scope of participation in the panel procedure for entities not party to or bound by the source treaty under which the dispute arises; the relationship between the number of contracting parties required for a quorum, for the adoption by the WIPO General Assembly and for the accep-

tance by contracting parties of amendments to the proposed Treaty and for the entry into force of the proposed Treaty; whether a contracting party may seek, through the procedures established by the proposed Treaty, a declaration or opinion as to whether an obligation exists or has been breached by that party.

As concerns future work, the Acting Chairman of the Committee of Experts concluded that a sizable majority of the delegations were in favor of avoiding further work by the Committee of Experts on the draft Treaty. He noted that there did not appear to be a similar majority in size but a majority nevertheless that the diplomatic conference should be held near the end of 1997, or in the first half of 1998, and concluded that, under the circumstances, the most practical approach would be for the Committee of Experts not to make a recommendation on the date of the diplomatic conference but to leave it to the WIPO General Assembly at its September-October 1996 session to decide, in the light of the views expressed in the present session of the Committee of Experts and in that session of the WIPO General Assembly, when the diplomatic conference should take place.

In view of the above, it was proposed that the WIPO General Assembly decide whether a Diplomatic Conference for the Conclusion of a Treaty on the Settlement of Disputes Between States in the Field of Intellectual Property should be convened and if so, whether it should be held in the period near the end of 1997 and the first half of 1998, or otherwise.

Committee of Experts on Well-Known Marks

Second Session
(Geneva, October 28 to 31, 1996)

PROTECTION OF WELL-KNOWN MARKS

*Memorandum prepared by the
International Bureau*

1. The 1996-97 Program of WIPO (Item 03(5)) (document AB/XXVI/2) provides for the following:

“Well-Known and Famous Marks

“The International Bureau will study, with the help of a committee of experts meeting once in each year of the biennium, all questions of relevance to the correct application of Article 6bis of the Paris Convention [for the Protection of Industrial Property] (e.g., whether that Article applies also where the well-known mark is not actually used in the country in which its protection is claimed). It will also study the conditions and scope of protection, in particular, in respect of famous marks, against dilution and/or undue exploitation of the goodwill acquired by such marks. Moreover, it will study the feasibility of setting up, under the aegis of WIPO, a voluntary international information network for the exchange of information among countries concerning marks that one or more of them considers to be well-known or famous.

“Any proposal for action, beyond the study, will be put before the General Assembly of WIPO.”

2. The WIPO Committee of Experts on Well-Known Marks (hereinafter referred to as the “Committee of Experts”) was convened for its first session from November 13 to 16, 1995, to consider the results of a study by the International Bureau on the protection of well-known marks and prospects for improvement of the existing situation (see document WKM/CE/I/2)¹. In accordance with the program item referred to in the preceding paragraph, the Committee of Experts is convened

for its second session, to consider the (present) document prepared by the International Bureau in line with the views expressed by the Committee of Experts at its first session (see document WKM/CE/I/3). It is to be noted that, since the idea of setting up, under the aegis of WIPO, a voluntary international information network for the exchange of information among countries concerning marks that one or more of them considers to be well-known or famous (see paragraph 1, above) appears not to be realistic, this idea is no longer pursued.

3. The study which was conducted by WIPO in preparation of the first session of the Committee of Experts had revealed a certain number of issues which are relevant for the international protection of well-known marks. Those issues concern, *inter alia*, the significance of Article 6bis of the Paris Convention and the definition of well-known marks.

4. Following the Committee of Experts’ conclusions, the present document suggests a flexible definition of the term “well-known,” based on a number of criteria which were referred to at the first session (see document WKM/CE/I/3, paragraph 69). It includes a provision to the effect that protection is to be afforded to a well-known mark regardless of whether the mark is used or registered in respect of the territory in which protection is sought. Furthermore, suggestions are made for more effective protection of well-known marks and for the enforcement of that protection.

5. The suggestions contained in the present document are drafted in the form of treaty provisions (see the Annex to this document). However, it is recalled that, as was already pointed out by the International Bureau with respect to the future work of the Committee of Experts (see document WKM/CE/I/3, paragraph 100), the question of whether the conclusions of the study of the International Bureau could be adopted in the form of a recommendation of the WIPO General Assembly or the Assembly of the Paris Union or in the form of a Protocol to the Trademark Law Treaty would be considered once sufficient agreement had been reached on such conclusions. Therefore, while the present document uses the term “draft provisions,”

¹ See *Industrial Property and Copyright*, 1995, p. 356.

it is left open whether those draft provisions would be adopted in the form of a recommendation of the said bodies or in the form of an international instrument such as a Protocol to the Trademark Law Treaty. It is expected that the eventual form of the implementation of the draft provisions will be decided at the 1997 session of the WIPO Governing Bodies.

6. The Committee of Experts is invited to express its views as regards the draft provisions referred to in paragraphs 3 to 5, above, and contained in the Annex of this document.

ANNEX

Draft Provisions

List of Provisions

Article 1: Definitions

Article 2: Conditions of Protection

Article 3: Contents of Protection

Article 1 Definitions

For the purposes of these Provisions:

(i) "Party" means a State or an intergovernmental organization which maintains an Office in which marks may be registered with effect in the territory of that organization;

(ii) "Office" means any agency entrusted by a Party with the registration of marks or other business identifiers;

(iii) "territory" means, in the case of a State, the territory of that State and, in the case of an intergovernmental organization, the territory in which the constituting treaty of that intergovernmental organization applies;

(iv) "business identifier" means a mark, a trade name or a business symbol, emblem or logo.

Article 2 Conditions of Protection

(1) [*Protection Without Registration or Use*] For the purposes of determining whether a mark is to be protected as a well-known mark, registration or use of the mark in, or in respect of, the territory in which it is to be protected as a well-known mark may not be required.

(2) [*Territory in Which and Persons by Whom the Mark Is to Be Well Known*] For the purposes of determining whether a mark is to be protected as a well-known mark, it shall suffice that the mark be well known by the relevant sector of the public in the territory in which it is to be protected as a well-known mark.

(3) [*Criteria*] For the purposes of determining whether a mark is to be protected as a well-known mark, at least the following shall be taken into account:

(i) the potential customers of the goods and/or services to which the mark applies;

(ii) the channels of distribution of the goods and/or services to which the mark applies;

(iii) the duration, extent and geographical area of any use of the mark;

(iv) the duration, extent and geographical area of any advertising of the mark;

(v) the market share, in the territory in which the mark is to be protected as a well-known mark and in other territories, of the goods and/or services to which the mark applies.

Article 3 Contents of Protection

(1) [*Conflict with the Well-Known Mark*] (a) The protection of a well-known mark shall be granted against any mark or other business identifier which is in conflict with the well-known mark.

(b) A mark or other business identifier shall be deemed to be in conflict with a well-known mark where that mark or other business identifier, or an essential part thereof, constitutes a reproduction, an imitation or a translation, liable to create confusion, of the well-known mark and is used, filed for registration or registered in respect of goods and/or services which are identical or similar to those goods and/or services to which the well-known mark applies.

(c) Notwithstanding subparagraph (b), a mark or other business identifier shall also be deemed to be in conflict with a well-known mark where that mark or other business identifier, or an essential part thereof, constitutes a reproduction, an imitation or a translation, liable to create confusion, of the well-known mark and is used, filed for registration or registered in respect of goods and/or services which are not identical or similar ("dissimilar goods and/or services") to those to which the well-

known mark applies, where at least one of the following conditions applies:

(i) use in relation to dissimilar goods and/or services would indicate a connection between the owner of the well-known mark and those goods and/or services;

(ii) use in relation to dissimilar goods and/or services is likely to impair the distinctive character of the well-known mark;

(iii) use in relation to dissimilar goods and/or services would take unfair advantage of the distinctive character of the well-known mark or is otherwise likely to damage the interests of the owner of the said mark.

(2) [*Refusal of Registration*] The Office shall refuse any application for the registration of a mark or other business identifier which is in conflict with a well-known mark.

(3) [*Opposition Procedures*] If third parties may oppose the registration of a mark or other business identifier, a conflict with a well-known mark shall constitute a ground for opposition.

(4) [*Invalidation Procedures*] (a) The owner of a well-known mark shall be entitled to request, at any time, the invalidation, by a decision of the Office or by a decision of a court, of the registration of a mark or other business identifier which is in conflict with the well-known mark.

(b) If the registration of a mark or other business identifier may be invalidated *ex officio* by an Office or a court, a conflict with a well-known mark shall be a ground for invalidation of the said registration.

(5) [*Prohibition of Use*] The owner of a well-known mark shall be entitled to request, at any time, the prohibition, by a decision of a court, of the use of a mark or other business identifier which is in conflict with the well-known mark.

Notes on the Draft Provisions

Notes on Article 1

1.1 *Item (i)* will have to be redrafted once it is known whether the provisions take the form of a binding international instrument or of a recommendation of the WIPO General Assembly or the Assembly of the Paris Union.

1.2 *Item (ii)*. If a Party only provides for the registration of marks, Article 3(2) to (4) will not apply to business identifiers other than marks.

1.3 *Item (iii)* has been drafted along the lines of Article 2(vi) of the Treaty on Intellectual Property in Respect of Integrated Circuits adopted at Washington on May 26, 1989.

1.4 *Item (iv)* seems to be self-explanatory.

Notes on Article 2

2.1 *Paragraph (1)* prevents Parties from requiring either use or registration of an alleged well-known mark within their territory as a condition for the protection to be granted in accordance with Article 3.

2.2 The effect of *paragraph (2)* is twofold. First, it provides that a Party must consider a mark to be well known if the mark is well known by the relevant sector of the public. Consequently, Parties are not allowed to apply a more stringent test such as, for example, knowledge of the mark by the public at large. It goes without saying that Parties are free to adopt a lower threshold for determining whether a mark is well known, for example, knowledge of the mark by the relevant business circles.

2.3 The second effect of that paragraph is that, in order to confer on a mark protection as a well-known mark, it is sufficient if the mark is well known by persons within the territory in which it is to be protected. Again, this standard is a maximum requirement and Parties are free to afford protection to marks that are only known (but not well known) in the territory in which protection is sought but are well known outside that territory.

2.4 *Paragraph (3)* contains a list of criteria for the evaluation of a mark as a well-known mark. The words “at least” indicate that the list is not exhaustive.

2.5 *Item (i)*. Since the nature of the goods or services to which a mark is applied can vary considerably, potential customers can be different in each case. Groups of potential customers may be identified with the help of parameters such as the target group for the goods and services in relation

to which the mark is used or the group of actual purchasers. It follows that, for example, in order to establish whether a mark which is used for sophisticated perfume is well known, potential customers of such perfume should be surveyed rather than, for example, all potential buyers of cosmetic products in general.

2.6 *Item (ii)*. Depending on the nature of the goods and services, the channels of distribution may differ considerably. Certain goods are sold in supermarkets and are easily obtainable for consumers. On the other hand, there are different ways of marketing, such as distribution through accredited dealers or through sales agents direct to a customer's business or home. This means, for example, that a survey among consumers who exclusively shop in supermarkets is not a good indication for establishing whether a mark which is used exclusively on goods sold by mail order is well known.

2.7 *Item (iii)*. The duration, extent and geographical area of any use of the mark are highly relevant indicators as to the determination whether or not a mark is well known in a given territory. "Use" is different from advertising (see item (iv)) because it requires sale or offer for sale. "Extent" means the quantitative use of the mark, i.e., the extent to which the goods or services to which the mark applies are put on the market. "Geographical area" is not limited to the territory in which the mark is to be protected as a well-known mark. In this context, it is recalled that, according to paragraph (1), actual use of a mark in the territory in which it is to be protected as a well-known mark cannot be required. However, use in neighboring territories, in territories in which the same language or languages are spoken, in territories which are covered by the same media (television or printed press) or in territories which have close trade relations may be relevant for establishing the knowledge of a given mark in a given territory. For example, a mark which appears on a German satellite television channel and is well known in Germany is also likely to be well known in (German-speaking) Austria (where the television channel can also be received), whereas a mark appearing in a Danish magazine is less likely to be well known in Venezuela (assuming that the Danish magazine is not distributed in Venezuela).

2.8 *Item (iv)*. In order to determine whether a mark is well known, the duration, extent and geographical area of any advertising of the mark constitute relevant indicators. In times where an ever increasing number of competing goods and/or services are on the market, knowledge among the public of a given mark, especially as regards new goods and/or services, is mostly due to advertising.

2.9 *Item (v)*. The market share of the goods and/or services to which the mark applies should also be taken into account for determining whether a mark is well known. It would be logical to assume that a mark that is used in respect of goods and/or services which occupy a large market share is likely to be well known. In this connection, it is important to consider not only the market share in the territory in which the mark is to be protected as a well-known mark but also the market share in other territories because, in view of the increasing globalization of trade, the mark may become well known in a given territory through massive sale or offer for sale in other territories.

Notes on Article 3

3.1 *Paragraph (1)* defines the conditions under which a mark or other business identifier (see Article 1(iv)) is to be deemed to be in conflict with a well-known mark and, consequently, may be subject to the procedures set out in paragraphs (2) to (5). There are two different cases which are dealt with in subparagraphs (b) and (c).

3.2 *Subparagraph (b)* is applicable in situations where a mark or other business identifier, or an essential part thereof, is identical or similar to, or constitutes a translation of, a well-known mark and is liable to create confusion, and the goods and/or services concerned are identical or similar. Where the conditions of that subparagraph are met, the remedies provided for in paragraphs (2) to (5) are applicable.

3.3 *Subparagraph (c)* deals with situations in which the conflicting mark or other business identifier concerns dissimilar goods and/or services. In those cases, the remedies provided for in paragraphs (2) to (5) are only available if at least one of the conditions set out in items (i) to (iii) is met. All three items refer to "use" in relation to dissimilar goods and/or services. However, where pro-

tection is to be granted against the registration of, for example, a conflicting mark which has not yet been used, the conditions of items (i) to (iii) have to be applied as if the conflicting mark had been used, as indicated by the words “would” and “is likely to be.”

3.4 *Item (i)*. This item is applicable in cases where use in relation to goods and/or services which are not similar to those to which the well-known mark applies (“dissimilar goods and/or services”) would indicate a connection between the owner of the well-known mark and those goods and/or services. Such connection may be indicated, for example, if the impression is created that the owner of the well-known mark is involved in the production of the dissimilar goods, or the offering of the dissimilar services.

3.5 *Item (ii)*. Under this item, a well-known mark is to be protected in relation to dissimilar goods and/or services if use for such goods and/or services is likely to impair the distinctive character of the well-known mark, for example, its unique position on the market.

3.6 *Item (iii)*. Under this item, a well-known mark is to be protected in relation to dissimilar goods and/or services if use for such goods and/or services would take unfair advantage of the distinctive character of the well-known mark or is otherwise likely to damage the interests of the owner of the well-known mark. This case differs from the cases covered by items (i) and (ii) in that no confusion exists as to the real source of the goods and/or services (item (i)), and the value of the well-known mark has not diminished in the eyes of the public (item (ii)), but the use in question would, for example, amount to a free ride on the goodwill of the well-known mark for the person who uses a conflicting mark or other business identifier. The reference to “unfair advantage” in that item is intended to give Parties flexibility in the application of this criterion rather than to create an exhaustive catalogue of cases. An example of another damage to the interests of the owner of the well-known mark would be the situation where the reputation of the well-known mark suffers because of use in relation to goods and/or services of an inferior quality or of an immoral or obscene nature.

3.7 *Paragraph (2)* obliges an Office to grant protection to well-known marks at the earliest

stage in the registration procedure, namely, the examination of an application. It is to be noted that this provision is applicable even where an *ex officio* examination as to conflicts with prior rights is not carried out. However, paragraph (2) does not concern business identifiers if a Party does not provide for the registration of business identifiers other than marks (see Note 1.2, above).

3.8 The objective of *paragraph (3)* is to ensure that, where procedures for opposing the registration of a mark or other business identifier (where such other business identifier can be registered) exist, owners of well-known marks are entitled to oppose the registration of a mark or other business identifier which would be in conflict with their well-known marks. Consequently, owners of well-known marks are to be given the possibility of taking action against the registration of a conflicting mark or other business identifier as early as possible, in particular, where the *ex officio* examination referred to in paragraph (2) did not reveal the existence of a conflicting well-known mark.

3.9 *Subparagraph (a) of paragraph (4)* sets out that the owner of a well-known mark always has the right to initiate procedures for the invalidation of the registration of a mark or other business identifier (either before an Office or a court) if the latter is in conflict with the well-known mark. This provision goes beyond Article 6*bis*(2) of the Paris Convention, in that no time limits may be fixed for requesting the cancellation of marks which are conflicting with well-known marks but were registered in good faith.

3.10 *Subparagraph (b)*. If procedures for the invalidation of the registration of a mark or other business identifier can be initiated *ex officio* by an office or a court, a conflict with a well-known mark must be treated as a ground for invalidation, without any time limit for such invalidation (see preceding Note).

3.11 *Paragraph (5)* provides the owner of a well-known mark with a further remedy, namely, the right to request a court order to prohibit the use of a conflicting mark or other business identifier. Similar to the right to request invalidation procedures under paragraph (4), the right to request a court order to prohibit the use of a conflicting mark or other business identifier is not subject to any time limit. It follows that the prohibition of

use of a mark or other business identifier which is in conflict with a well-known mark may be re-

quested at any time, even where such use is made in good faith.

Registration Systems Administered by WIPO

Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT)

Training and Promotion Meetings for PCT Users

Cuba. In July 1996, two government officials from the National Office of Inventions, Technical Information and Marks (ONIITEM) were given training in receiving Office procedures under the PCT at WIPO's headquarters, and had discussions on various PCT matters with WIPO officials.

United States of America. In July 1996, a WIPO official visited the United States Patent and Trade-

mark Office (USPTO) in Washington, D.C., to discuss with its officials the possible supply to and publication by that Office of WIPO industrial property statistical data in electronic form.

Computerization Activities

United States of America. In July 1996, a university professor from the Chicago Kent College of Law, Illinois Institute of Technology, was briefed by WIPO officials in Geneva on the use of the PCT.

Madrid Union

Training and Promotion Meetings for Users of the Madrid System

United Kingdom. In July 1996, a WIPO official spoke on the Madrid Protocol and the proposed link

with the Community trade mark at a trademark seminar organized by a conference-planning company in London. That seminar was attended by some 90 participants, mostly solicitors, trademark agents in private practice, and representatives of companies.

WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center

China. In July 1996, Mr. Xiao Zhiming, Chairman, Shenzhen Commission of the China International Economic and Trade Arbitration Commission (CIETAC), and four other officials from the said Commission had discussions with WIPO officials in Geneva on various questions concerning arbitration.

Union of Authors and Composers of Greece (EMSE). In July 1996, a representative of that Union was briefed by WIPO officials in Geneva on WIPO's activities in the field of arbitration and mediation.

Activities of WIPO Specially Designed for Developing Countries

Africa

Training Courses, Seminars and Meetings

WIPO/Islamic Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (ISESCO) Regional Meeting to Increase Awareness of the Importance of Copyright and Neighboring Rights for Member States of ISESCO (Mali). From July 10 to 12, 1996, WIPO organized that Meeting in Bamako in cooperation with ISESCO and the Government of Mali. It was attended by 11 participants from Benin, Burkina Faso, Chad, Comoros, Djibouti, Gabon, Guinea, Mauritania, Morocco, Niger and Senegal. In addition, some 120 local participants, mostly government officials, writers, representatives from authors' and composers' associations, judges, attorneys and customs and police officials, also attended the Meeting. Presentations were made by three WIPO consultants from Burkina Faso, Egypt and Morocco, an official from ISESCO, a government official from Mali and two WIPO officials. The subjects covered, *inter alia*, the relevant provisions of the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS Agreement).

WIPO Regional Seminar on the Protection and Use of Geographical Indications in Trade (Cameroon). From July 23 to 25, 1996, WIPO organized that Seminar in Yaoundé in cooperation with the Government of Cameroon. The Seminar was attended by 16 government officials from Benin, Burkina Faso, the Central African Republic, Chad, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Senegal, Togo and Zaire, as well as 35 participants from Cameroon. Presentations were made by three WIPO consultants from France and the Benelux Trademark Office (BBM), a government official from Cameroon and two WIPO officials. The subjects covered included, *inter alia*, the relevant provisions of the TRIPS Agreement.

Assistance with Training, Legislation and Modernization of Administration

Angola. In July 1996, two government officials undertook a WIPO-organized study visit to Lisbon and to WIPO in Geneva, where they held discus-

sions with WIPO officials on the possible revision of Angola's industrial property legislation.

Cape Verde. In July 1996, two government officials undertook a WIPO-organized study visit to Lisbon and to WIPO in Geneva, where they held discussions with WIPO officials on possible changes to Cape Verde's industrial property legislation.

Côte d'Ivoire. In July 1996, a WIPO official undertook a visit to Abidjan to discuss with government officials organizational arrangements for the WIPO Sub-Regional Seminar on Intellectual Property for Magistrates of French-Speaking Africa, to be held in August 1996.

Gambia. In July 1996, the International Bureau prepared and sent to the government authorities, at their request, revised draft Regulations and draft Schedules of Fees and Forms under the Industrial Property Act, 1989.

Guinea-Bissau. In July 1996, two government officials undertook a WIPO-organized study visit to Lisbon and to WIPO in Geneva, where they held discussions with WIPO officials on the possible revision of Guinea-Bissau's industrial property legislation.

Also in July 1996, a WIPO official held discussions in Bissau with government leaders, and government and United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) officials on the possibility of Guinea-Bissau acceding to the Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT) and the Madrid Agreement Concerning the International Registration of Marks and on the strengthening of cooperation between Guinea-Bissau and WIPO, in particular in modernizing the country's industrial property legislation in the light of the TRIPS Agreement.

Malawi. In July 1996, the International Bureau prepared and sent to the government authorities, at their request, a draft study on the compatibility of the country's industrial property legislation with the relevant provisions of the TRIPS Agreement and the Trademark Law Treaty (TLT).

Nigeria. In July 1996, a WIPO official participated in the Workshop on Industrial Property Law and Economic Development, organized in Lagos by the Industrial Property Law Interest Group (IPLIG) in association with the Government of Nigeria. It was attended by some 250 local participants from government departments, the legal profession, enterprises and academia.

African Intellectual Property Organization (OAPI). In July 1996, an official from OAPI was briefed by WIPO officials in Geneva on the activities of WIPO, with particular emphasis on its international registration activities.

Organization of African Unity (OAU). In July 1996, two WIPO officials attended the 32nd session of the OAU Assembly of Heads of State and Government held in Yaoundé. On that occasion, they also discussed with Mr. Salim A. Salim, Secretary General of the OAU, cooperation between the two Organizations, especially in the field of promotion of inventions and innovations.

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). In July 1996, two WIPO officials held discussions with UNDP officials in New York on cooperation in favor of African countries, and in particular a possible UNDP-financed regional project for strengthening intellectual property in Africa, to be executed by WIPO.

Arab Countries

Assistance with Training, Legislation and Modernization of Administration

Jordan. In July 1996, a government official held discussions with WIPO officials in Geneva on initiatives taken to revise the Jordanian industrial property legislation and automate the Directorate of Trade Registration and Industrial Property

Protection and WIPO's possible assistance in this respect, as well as on a draft UNDP-financed country project document prepared by WIPO for strengthening Jordan's industrial property system.

Also in July 1996, two WIPO officials undertook a mission to Amman to discuss with government and UNDP officials the details of the said

draft project document. General cooperation between Jordan and WIPO was also reviewed.

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). In July 1996, a UNDP official visited

WIPO to discuss the objectives and budget for a possible UNDP-financed regional project for Arab countries in the field of intellectual property.

Asia and the Pacific

Training Courses, Seminars and Meetings

WIPO Regional Training Course on Intellectual Property for Developing Countries of Asia and the Pacific (Sri Lanka). From July 22 to August 2, 1996, WIPO organized that Course in Negombo, in cooperation with the Government of Sri Lanka and the Sri Lanka Foundation, and with the assistance of UNDP. The Course was attended by 20 government officials from Bangladesh, Bhutan, Cambodia, China, Fiji, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Laos, Maldives, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nepal, Pakistan, the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, Singapore, Thailand, Tonga and Viet Nam. There were also 21 participants from government and business circles in Sri Lanka. Papers were presented by eight WIPO consultants from Australia, China, Finland, Germany, India, Malaysia and the United States of America, as well as by an official from Sri Lanka and an official from the World Trade Organization (WTO). Two WIPO officials participated, one as a speaker. The subjects covered included, *inter alia*, the TRIPS Agreement.

WIPO National Colloquium on the Judiciary and the Intellectual Property System (Sri Lanka). On July 27, 1996, WIPO organized that Colloquium in Colombo, in cooperation with the Judges' Institute of Sri Lanka. The Colloquium was attended by 20 senior judges of Sri Lanka. Papers were presented by four WIPO consultants from Finland, Germany, India and the United States of America and a local speaker. The subjects covered included, *inter alia*, the relevant provisions of the TRIPS Agreement.

Assistance with Training, Legislation and Modernization of Administration

China. In July 1996, three government officials from the Chinese Patent Office (CPO) and

the State Administration for Industry and Commerce (SAIC) visited WIPO and held discussions with WIPO officials on matters of cooperation.

India. In July 1996, three government officials held discussions with WIPO officials in Geneva concerning the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property and India's patent legislation.

Also in July 1996, two government officials held discussions with WIPO officials in Geneva on the PCT and the advantages for India of adhering to it.

Still in July 1996, a WIPO computer consultant from Australia undertook a mission to the Trade Marks Registry in Mumbai and its branch office in Madras to monitor the work which had been completed under the UNDP-financed country project on the modernization of the trademark administration.

In the same month, a UNDP official discussed with WIPO officials in Geneva the possibility of WIPO's participation in future UNDP-financed activities in India.

Indonesia. In July and August 1996, two WIPO consultants from Belgium and the United States of America undertook a three-week mission to the University of Indonesia in Jakarta to conduct teaching seminars and classes on intellectual property law, under the UNDP-financed country project to strengthen the country's intellectual property system.

Iran (Islamic Republic of). In July 1996, a UNDP official discussed with WIPO officials in Geneva WIPO's possible assistance to the country in the field of intellectual property, including in respect of the TRIPS Agreement.

Also in July 1996, a government official held discussions with WIPO officials in Geneva on the country's possible accession to the WIPO Convention and other WIPO-administered treaties.

Laos. In July 1996, the International Bureau prepared and sent to the government authorities, at their request, an updated draft industrial property law, with a commentary, as well as a draft law, with commentaries, respectively, on the protection of geographical indications and the protection of layout-designs (topographies) of integrated circuits.

Thailand. In July 1996, a government official discussed with WIPO officials in Geneva Thailand's possible accession to the PCT.

Vanuatu. In July 1996, three government officials discussed with WIPO officials in Geneva Vanuatu's possible accession to the WIPO Convention and other WIPO-administered treaties.

Hong Kong. In July 1996, Mr. Stephen Selby, Director, Intellectual Property Department, Trade Marks and Patent Office, and two other government officials visited WIPO and had discussions with WIPO officials on the protection of intellectual property in Hong Kong.

Japan. In July 1996, two government officials from the Japanese Patent Office (JPO) discussed

and finalized with WIPO officials in Geneva the draft plan of activities of the funds-in-trust arrangement concluded between the Government of Japan and WIPO for the period April 1996 to March 1997. The plan consisted of various development cooperation activities for the benefit of developing countries in Asia and the Pacific.

Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN). In July 1996, two consultants appointed by the European Commission (EC) held discussions with WIPO officials in Geneva as part of the review and evaluation of the EC-ASEAN Patents and Trademarks Program funded by the EC and executed by WIPO and the European Patent Office (EPO) for the benefit of the member countries of ASEAN.

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). In July 1996, a WIPO official attended two meetings organized by UNDP on the re-designing of the UNDP-financed inter-country program entitled "Strengthening Capacities for Growth Through Trade and Investment". The meetings were held in Bentota (Sri Lanka) and Hanoi.

Latin America and the Caribbean

Training Courses, Seminars and Meetings

WIPO Regional Training Course on New Tendencies in the International Protection of Copyright and Neighboring Rights for Latin America (Dominican Republic). From July 15 to 23, 1996, WIPO organized that Course in Santo Domingo, in cooperation with the National Copyright Office (ONDA) and with the assistance of the General Authors' and Publishers' Society (SGAE) of Spain. It was attended by 37 government officials from Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay and Venezuela. In addition, there were 21 participants from the post-graduate course at the University of Los Andes in Mérida (Venezuela), among them three were recipients of WIPO long-term fellowships from Cuba and Ecuador. Also present were

25 observers from Colombia, Cuba, Haiti, Peru, Spain, Switzerland, Uruguay and Venezuela, and 20 local participants. In total, 150 participants attended the Course. Presentations were made by 15 WIPO consultants from Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Peru, Spain, Switzerland, Uruguay, Venezuela and the International Association of Broadcasting Organizations of Uruguay, as well as by a government official from the Dominican Republic and two WIPO officials. The subjects covered included, *inter alia*, the relevant provisions of the TRIPS Agreement.

WIPO National Workshop on Intellectual Property and its Legal Regulation at the International Level as the Twenty-First Century Approaches (Cuba). On July 12, 1996, WIPO organized that Workshop in Havana for the Professors of the Faculty of Law of the University of Havana, in cooperation with the Cuban Copyright Center

(CENDA). The Workshop was attended by 20 professors. Presentations were made by three WIPO consultants from Argentina and Venezuela and a WIPO official. The subjects covered included, *inter alia*, the relevant provisions of the TRIPS Agreement.

WIPO National Seminar on Industrial Property for Judges (Argentina). On July 1 and 2, 1996, WIPO organized that Seminar in Buenos Aires, in cooperation with the National Institute of Industrial Property (INPI). The Seminar was attended by 30 local participants from the judiciary and INPI. Papers were presented by two WIPO consultants from Spain and the United States of America and six local speakers. The subjects covered included, *inter alia*, the relevant provisions of the TRIPS Agreement.

WIPO National Seminar on Industrial Property (Argentina). On July 4 and 5, 1996, WIPO organized that Seminar in Cordoba, in cooperation with INPI. The Seminar was attended by 30 local participants including government officials, academics, lawyers, entrepreneurs and university students. Lectures were given by eight local speakers and a WIPO official. The subjects covered included, *inter alia*, the relevant provisions of the TRIPS Agreement.

WIPO National Workshop on Collective Administration of Copyright and Neighboring Rights (Cuba). On July 10, 1996, WIPO organized that Workshop in Havana, in cooperation with CENDA and with the assistance of SGAE. The Workshop was attended by 30 participants, among them the senior and technical staff of the Cuban Agency for Administration of Copyright in Musical Works (ACDAM). Presentations were made by five WIPO consultants from Brazil, Chile, Spain, Switzerland and Uruguay and a WIPO official. The subjects covered included, *inter alia*, the relevant provisions of the TRIPS Agreement.

WIPO National Workshop on Copyright and Neighboring Rights for the Union of Cuban Journalists and Writers (UPEC) (Cuba). On July 10, 1996, WIPO organized that Workshop in Havana, in cooperation with CENDA. The Workshop was attended by 15 participants and members of UPEC. Three WIPO consultants from Argentina and Venezuela and a WIPO official participated in the Workshop as panelists. The subjects covered included, *inter*

alia, the relevant provisions of the TRIPS Agreement.

WIPO National Course on Copyright and Neighboring Rights in the New International Context (Cuba). From July 10 to 12, 1996, WIPO organized that Course in Havana, in cooperation with CENDA, with the sponsorship of the Faculty of Law of the University of Havana and the assistance of SGAE. Some 100 participants attended the Course. Presentations were made by eight WIPO consultants from Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Spain, Switzerland, Uruguay and Venezuela, four government officials from Cuba and two WIPO officials. The subjects covered included, *inter alia*, the relevant provisions of the TRIPS Agreement.

WIPO National Workshop on Copyright and Neighboring Rights for Writers and Artists (Cuba). On July 11, 1996, WIPO organized that Workshop in Havana, in cooperation with CENDA and the National Union of Cuban Writers and Artists (UNEAC). The Workshop was attended by 20 members of UPEC representing the different sectors of Cuban literary and artistic activities. Presentations were made by three WIPO consultants from Argentina and Switzerland and a WIPO official. The subjects covered included, *inter alia*, the relevant provisions of the TRIPS Agreement.

WIPO/SGAE National Workshop on Collective Administration of Copyright and Neighboring Rights (Dominican Republic). From July 17 to 19, 1996, WIPO organized that Workshop in Santo Domingo in cooperation with SGAE. The Workshop was attended by 30 participants, among them the directors and the staff of the General Society of Dominican Authors, Composers and Publishers (SGACEDOM). Presentations were made by six WIPO consultants from Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Spain, Switzerland and Uruguay. The subjects covered included, *inter alia*, the relevant provisions of the TRIPS Agreement.

WIPO National Seminar on the Recent International Evolution of the Protection of Copyright and Neighboring Rights (Haiti). On July 25 and 26, 1996, WIPO organized that Seminar in Port-au-Prince, in cooperation with the Government of Haiti. It was attended by 100 participants, most of them lawyers and government officials as well as members of the National Association of Authors

and Performers. Presentations were made by a WIPO consultant from Switzerland, a local speaker and two WIPO officials. The subjects covered included, *inter alia*, the relevant provisions of the TRIPS Agreement.

Assistance with Training, Legislation and Modernization of Administration

Argentina. In July 1996, a government official visited WIPO and received information on WIPO's collection of laws available in CD-ROM form (IPLEX), as well as material on the protection of undisclosed information.

Bolivia. In July 1996, a WIPO consultant from Chile undertook a mission to the National Industrial Property Office in La Paz to evaluate and make recommendations about the Office's computer equipment needs.

Colombia. In late July and early August 1996, a WIPO consultant from Venezuela undertook a mission to the Directorate General of Industry and Commerce in Santa Fe de Bogotá to provide on-the-job training to the staff in the examination of pending trademark opposition cases, and to conduct a training workshop based on the *Trademark Registration Manual for Andean Countries* which had been written by that consultant on an assignment from WIPO.

Haiti. In July 1996, a WIPO official and a WIPO consultant from Switzerland visited Port-au-Prince and were received by the President of the Republic, Mr. René Prével, and government leaders. They held discussions concerning a mid-

term cooperation program with WIPO in the development of the protection of intellectual property in Haiti.

Honduras. In late July and early August 1996, two WIPO consultants from Chile and Venezuela undertook a mission to the Industrial Property Registry in Tegucigalpa to provide assistance in the installation of the new equipment purchased under the UNDP-financed country project for the modernization of the said Registry and to give advice on the adaptation of the automated system for trademark operations, which had been installed in the Registry under the said project, to the requirements of the Protocol of Amendment to the Central American Agreement for the Protection of Industrial Property (Trademarks and Other Distinctive Signs).

Paraguay. In July 1996, a WIPO consultant from Argentina undertook, under the country project for the modernizing of the intellectual property system, a mission to Asunción to give advice and training on the processing of patent applications to the staff of the Directorate of Industrial Property.

Peru. In late June and July 1996, a WIPO consultant from Cuba undertook a mission to the National Institute for the Defense of Competition and Intellectual Property Protection (INDECOPI) in Lima to provide assistance in relation to the organization and improvement of the patent information services of that Institute.

Trinidad and Tobago. In July 1996, a WIPO official visited Port of Spain and gave advice to members of the ad hoc Intellectual Property Committee concerning the draft law on copyright and neighboring rights, which was to be considered by the Parliament of that country.

WIPO Medals

In July 1996, three WIPO medals were awarded to the winners of the best invention and the best student's invention (one at college level

and one at high-school level) at the 17th Science and Technology Fair and National Invention Contest, held in Manila.

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

National Activities

Lithuania. In July 1996, the International Bureau prepared and sent to the government authorities, at their request, a draft law on copyright and neighboring rights.

Slovenia. In July 1996, Professor Andrej Umek, Minister for Science and Technology, Professor Joze Osterz, Minister for Agriculture, and Mr. Bojan Pretnar, Director, Slovenian Intellectual Property Office, accompanied by two other government officials, visited WIPO's headquarters and had discussions with the Director General and other WIPO officials on Slovenia's possible accession to the Protocol Relating to the Madrid Agreement Concerning the International Registration of Marks and the

Budapest Treaty on the International Recognition of the Deposit of Microorganisms for the Purposes of Patent Procedure, and on questions concerning the protection of geographical indications in Slovenia.

Uzbekistan. In July 1996, Mr. Pulat K. Khabibullaev, Chairman, State Committee for Science and Technology, and Mr. Akil A. Azimov, Director, State Patent Office, undertook a WIPO-organized study visit to the Czech Patent Office in Prague to study the structure and functions of the latter Office. They also visited WIPO's headquarters where they had discussions with the Director General and other WIPO officials concerning, in particular, the proposed setting up of an institute for teaching and research in the field of industrial property in their country.

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

National Contacts

Andorra. In July 1996, the International Bureau prepared and sent to the government authorities, at their request, a draft law on copyright and neighboring rights.

Germany. In July 1996, Professor Edzard Schmidt-Jortzig, Minister for Justice, accompanied by two other government officials, visited WIPO's headquarters. He met with the Director General and other WIPO officials and discussed matters of cooperation between Germany and WIPO.

Also in July 1996, a WIPO official attended in Munich a meeting organized by the German Patent Office to discuss a proposal for the re-

publication of corrected patent documents, which would be considered at the forthcoming (October 1996) meeting of WIPO's Working Group on General Information of the Permanent Committee on Industrial Property Information (PCIPI/GI).

United States of America. In July 1996, the Director General, accompanied by four other WIPO officials, participated in the Intellectual Property Conference of the Americas, which was organized in Los Angeles by the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO). The Director General delivered a speech at the opening and two other WIPO officials acted as moderators in panel discussions. The Conference was attended by some 400 participants from the coun-

tries of North and South America, who were mainly senior government officials and representatives of the private sector.

United Nations

Joint United Nations Information Committee (JUNIC). In July 1996, a WIPO official attended the 22nd session of JUNIC, held in Geneva.

Intergovernmental Organizations

Commission of the European Communities (CEC). In July 1996, a WIPO official attended as an observer a meeting organized in Newport by the United Kingdom Patent Office in the framework of the MIPLEX (*Message Based Industrial Property Information EXchange*) project under the CEC's Telematics Applications Programme. The main purpose of that cooperation project is to develop a system for the electronic exchange of information between industrial property offices.

World Customs Organization (WCO). In July 1996, at WIPO's initiative, cooperation between WIPO and WCO was formalized through an exchange of letters between the Director General of WIPO and the Secretary General of WCO, Mr. J.W. Shaver. Such cooperation would be on the basis of an exchange of relevant information,

documentation and publications, as well as periodic consultations between the two Organizations to establish a schedule of activities of common interest, mainly in respect of assistance to developing countries relating to the TRIPS Agreement.

World Trade Organization (WTO). In July 1996, two WIPO officials attended as observers a meeting of the Council for TRIPS of the WTO, held in Geneva.

Also in July 1996, a WIPO official attended as an observer a meeting of the General Council of the WTO, held in Geneva.

Still in July 1996, two WIPO officials made presentations on WIPO in general, its latest norm-setting activities, and the cooperation activities under the WIPO-WTO Agreement, at an information meeting for members of the WTO Appellate Body, organized by the WTO at WIPO's headquarters.

Other Organizations

Canadian Association of Photographers and Illustrators in Communications (CAPIC). In July 1996, a representative of CAPIC visited WIPO to collect information on the protection of photographic works at the international level and on the preparatory work on a possible Protocol to the Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works.

Miscellaneous News

National Laws

Armenia. The Law on Copyright and Neighboring Rights of May 13, 1996, entered into force on June 4, 1996.

Cuba. Resolution No. 66/96 of July 15, 1996, concerning the rules for the application of the

Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT) in the Republic of Cuba, entered into force on July 16, 1996.

Germany. The Law of July 19, 1996, amending the Trade Mark Reform Law of October 25, 1994, will enter into force on January 1, 1999, in respect of its section 1.2, and on July 25, 1996, in respect of its other sections.

Japan. Law No. 68 of June 12, 1996, amending the Trademark Law and other laws, will enter into force on April 1, 1997 (except for the provisions concerning payment of fees in cash, and the provisions concerning national classification and interna-

tional classification, which will enter into force on October 1, 1996, and April 1, 1998, respectively).

Kazakstan. The Law on Copyright and Neighboring Rights of June 10, 1996, entered into force on June 17, 1996.

Recent WIPO Publications

The following new publications¹ were issued by WIPO in July 1996:

International Classification for Industrial Designs (Locarno Classification)—Sixth Edition (in German/French), No. 501(GF), 328 pages, 100 Swiss francs.

Model Provisions on Protection Against Unfair Competition (in French and Spanish), No. 832(F)(S), 68 pages, 15 Swiss francs.

WIPO Asian Regional Round Table on the Strengthening of the Industrial Property System in View of Recent International Developments,

Manila, January 17 to 19, 1996, No. 749(E), 183 pages, 50 Swiss francs.

¹ WIPO publications may be obtained from the Publications Sales and Distribution Section, WIPO, 34, chemin des Colombettes, CH-1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland (telex: 412 912 OMPI CH; fax: (41-22) 733 5428; telephone: (41-22) 730 9111).

Orders should indicate: (a) the number or letter code of the publication desired, the language (E for English, F for French, G for German, S for Spanish), the number of copies; (b) the full address for mailing; (c) the mail mode (surface or air). Prices cover surface mail.

Bank transfers should be made to WIPO account No. 487080-81 at the Swiss Credit Bank, 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland.

Calendar of Meetings

WIPO Meetings

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

1996

- November 4 to 8 (Geneva)** **Committee of Experts on the Development of the Hague Agreement (Sixth Session)**
 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.
Invitations: As members, States members of the Hague Union; as observers, States members of the Paris Union not members of the Hague Union and certain organizations.
- November 18 to 22 (Geneva)** **Committee of Experts on the Patent Law Treaty (Third Session)**
 The Committee of Experts will continue to examine a draft Patent Law Treaty with draft Regulations and draft Model International Forms. The third session will examine texts dealing with the following aspects of patent procedure: application; filing date; validity of patent (revocation); extension of time limits; belated claiming of priority. The aim of the planned Treaty is to achieve a simplification of the formalities required in patent procedures.
Invitations: As members, States members of the Paris Union or WIPO; as observers, other States members of the United Nations and certain organizations.
- November 22 (a.m.) (Geneva)** **Information Meeting for Non-Governmental Organizations on Industrial Property**
 Participants in this informal meeting will be informed about the recent activities and future plans of WIPO in the field of industrial property and their comments on the same will be invited and heard.
Invitations: Certain non-governmental organizations.
- December 2 to 20 (Geneva, CICC¹)** **WIPO Diplomatic Conference on Certain Copyright and Neighboring Rights Questions**
 The Diplomatic Conference will adopt one or more multilateral treaties.
Invitations: As delegations, (i) States members of WIPO and (ii) the European Communities; as observers, States not members of WIPO but members of the United Nations, and certain organizations.
- December 6 (a.m.) (Geneva, CICC¹)** **Information Meeting for Non-Governmental Organizations on Copyright and Neighboring Rights Questions**
 Participants in this informal meeting will be informed about the recent activities and future plans of WIPO in the field of copyright and their comments on the same will be invited and heard.
Invitations: Certain non-governmental organizations.

¹ CICC: International Conference Center Geneva/Centre International de Conférences Genève.

1997

January 20 to 23 (Geneva)

Working Group on Business Identifiers and Names and Emblems of Non-Profit Organizations

The Working Group will discuss the legal aspects concerning protection of business identifiers (such as marks, brand names, slogans, logos, etc.) and names and emblems of non-profit organizations and possible improvements of the protection of business identifiers and of such names and emblems.

Invitations: States members of WIPO and certain organizations.

February 17 to 20 (Geneva)

Committee of Experts on Trademark Licensing (First Session)

The Committee will study questions concerning the formalities and other legal aspects of trademark licensing.

Invitations: As members, (i) States members of WIPO and (ii) the European Communities; as observers, certain organizations.

March 18 and 19 (Geneva)

WIPO Coordination Committee (Thirty-Seventh Session)

The Committee will meet in its extraordinary session in order to nominate a new Director General and possibly also to deal with certain staff questions.

Invitations: States members of the WIPO Coordination Committee and, as observers, States members of WIPO not members of that Committee.

March 21 (New York)

WIPO Arbitration Conference

The Conference will provide a detailed review of the arbitration of intellectual property disputes under the WIPO Arbitration and Expedited Arbitration Rules. Representatives of WIPO, legal scholars and private practitioners will make presentations and conduct discussions on all important aspects of the said Rules, under the following headings: arbitration of intellectual property disputes and arbitration in the age of high technology; the arbitration clause; constituting the panel; interim relief; the conduct of the proceedings; the award; and the costs of arbitration.

Participation: Any person, against payment of a registration fee.

April 8 to 10 (Phuket, Thailand)

Unesco/WIPO Worldwide Forum on the Protection of Folklore

The Worldwide Forum—organized by Unesco and WIPO in cooperation with the Government of Thailand—will review all the important aspects of the protection of folklore. It will also deal with the question of what legal measures may be envisaged in this field at the national and international levels.

Invitations: States members of Unesco and/or WIPO, selected intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations and—against payment of a registration fee—any person.

April 14 and 15 (Geneva)

WIPO Budget Committee (Sixteenth Session) and WIPO Premises Committee (Seventh Session)

The two Committees will continue to consider, in a joint session, matters concerning WIPO's needs for new premises.

Invitations: States members of the Committees and, as observers, other States members of WIPO.

April 16 to 18 (Geneva)

WIPO Budget Committee (Seventeenth Session)

The Committee will consider the draft program and budget for the 1998-99 biennium.

Invitations: States members of the Committee and, as observers, other States members of WIPO.

April 28 to 30 (Manila)

WIPO World Symposium on Broadcasting, New Communication Technologies and Intellectual Property

The World Symposium—organized in cooperation with the Government of the Philippines—will review the present status and possible improvement of the legal regulation of the rights and obligations of those organizations (broadcasters, cable distributors, Internet, etc.) which make available to the public programs containing protected works, broadcasts, performances and phonograms.

Invitations: States members of WIPO, selected intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations and—against payment of a registration fee—any person.

- September 22 to October 1 (Geneva)** **Governing Bodies of WIPO and the Unions Administered by WIPO (Thirtieth Series of Meetings)**
All the Governing Bodies of WIPO and the Unions administered by WIPO will meet in ordinary session.
They will, *inter alia*, review and evaluate WIPO's activities undertaken since July 1996, decide the program and budget of WIPO for the 1998-99 biennium and appoint the new Director General.
Invitations: States members of WIPO and/or the United Nations; certain organizations.

UPOV Meetings

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

1997

- April 29 and 30 (Geneva)** **Consultative Committee (Fifty-Third Session)**
Invitations: Member States of UPOV.
- October 27 (Geneva)** **Administrative and Legal Committee**
Invitations: Member States of UPOV and, as observers, certain non-member States and intergovernmental organizations.
- October 28 (Geneva)** **Consultative Committee (Fifty-Fourth Session)**
Invitations: Member States of UPOV.
- October 29 (Geneva)** **Council (Thirty-First Ordinary Session)**
Invitations: Member States of UPOV and, as observers, certain non-member States and intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations.

