

Published monthly
Annual subscription:
fr.s. 115.—
Each monthly issue:
fr.s. 12.—

Copyright

18th year - No. 2
February 1982

Monthly Review of the
World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO)

Contents

WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION	
— The World Intellectual Property Organization in 1981	31
— Governing Bodies of WIPO and the Unions Administered by WIPO. Twelfth Series of Meetings (Geneva, November 16 to 24, 1981)	62
BERNE UNION	
— Executive Committee. Nineteenth Session (7 th extraordinary) (Geneva, November 30 to December 7, 1981)	65
NATIONAL LEGISLATION	
— Australia	
I. Copyright (International Protection) Regulations (Amendments) (S.R. No. 276, of September 17, 1980)	78
II. Copyright (International Protection) Regulations (Amendment) (S.R. No. 74, of April 9, 1981)	80
GENERAL STUDIES	
— Private Copying: A New Exploitation Mode for Works (Patrick Masouyé)	81
CALENDAR OF MEETINGS	91

World Intellectual Property Organization

The World Intellectual Property Organization in 1981*

Introduction

The following introduction by the Director General to his report on activities presented to the Governing Bodies in November 1981 is reproduced in full.

"The last session of the General Assembly of WIPO took place two years ago, and I shall try, in a few words, to give an overall picture of the main events that took place within the framework of the International Bureau during that period.

"There are various ways of classifying those events.

"In my present introductory remarks, I shall distinguish between three groups of events: those relating to the treaties administered by WIPO, those of primary interest to developing countries and those of general interest to all countries.

"Naturally, this grouping of the events is not perfect since there is a considerable degree of overlap among the three groups.

"First, then, let me mention the events concerning our treaties.

"As far as treaty-making is concerned, the most important events were the two sessions of the Diplomatic Conference on the Revision of the Paris Convention. The first took place in Geneva in February and March 1980, the second took place in Nairobi in September and October 1981. The goals of the Diplomatic Conference are novel in their nature, and it is not surprising that at least one more session will be needed to complete the work. The goals are novel because—instead of making international obligations more stringent, as has been the aim of all the revisions during the last hundred years—the goal now is to introduce special measures for the benefit of developing countries and provisions of interest to the Soviet Union and some other Socialist countries. If one considers that the very notion of developing country originated in the sixties and that the Soviet Union became a member of the Paris Union in 1965, it is obvious that the problems to be solved now were unknown to all the previous conferences of revision and were barely perceptible on the horizon of the Stockholm Conference of 1967. The number of the member States has also more than doubled since the Second World War, which, in itself, makes consensus more difficult and more cumbersome.

In other words, the stresses are far greater than before, and it would be unfair to compare the task of previous revision conferences with the task of the revision conference now in progress. But if the latter succeeds, as we all hope, membership in the Paris Union will be particularly important. The cohesion of the Union, if not its continuance in the long run, is at stake, and it is obviously in the interest of all States, developed or developing, market economy or Socialist, that the vitality of the Union be secured for the future.

"Turning now to treaties other than the Paris Convention, the past two years saw the entry into force of two new treaties concluded in the seventies: the Budapest Treaty and the Trademark Registration Treaty. The former has already 12 members and is undoubtedly viable. The latter has so far only five members and its viability is still in doubt. It would require ratification by the United States of America, the prime promoter of the conclusion of the TRT, or Japan, or one of the major Western European countries, to bring the TRT out of its prolonged incubation period.

"The success of the Patent Cooperation Treaty and the Madrid Agreement is to be measured also by the number of cases in which each of them is used. The number of international patent applications under the PCT shows a constant but relatively modest increase, and the absolute figure—approximately 300 applications per month at the present time—is but a small fraction of the number of cases in which the PCT is undoubtedly useful and should be used. What is the reason for not using it more frequently? I think it is mainly unfamiliarity with the system and/or fear of anything new. One of the most urgent tasks of the International Bureau is to convince potential users of the PCT to use it. We shall continue to make as much publicity for the PCT as our financial resources and our imagination permit.

"The number of international trademark registrations showed a slight increase in each of the two years over the preceding year and is around 1,000 per month. It is still below the record year of the early seventies but substantial increases are unlikely as long as the number of the member States remains stationary.

"That completes what I wanted to say about our treaties, and I come now to our activities of primary interest to developing countries.

"The volume of these activities was at least 50% above the volume in the preceding biennium. The reason for which such a very considerable increase was

* This article describes the main activities of WIPO as such (as distinguished from those of the Unions administered by WIPO) in 1981. The main activities of the Unions will be covered in articles to be published in the March issues of *Industrial Property* and *Copyright*.

possible is the fact that we received more direct aid given by ten or so developed countries and that we had more access to UNDP funding than in earlier years. The result, when compared with the size of WIPO, is quite impressive. During the said two-year period we gave advice to some 65 countries, at their own request, on modernizing existing or drafting new industrial property or copyright legislation. During the same period, we provided fellowships for more than 350 nationals of developing countries and organized or cosponsored some 50 training courses and seminars for such persons. The funds for those fellowships, courses and seminars come from our budget or from outside sources or from a combination of both.

"There are also other forms of direct service to developing countries. Among them are the establishment of patent documentation centers, modernizing of the administration of intellectual property laws, furnishing search reports on the state of the art for a given technical problem, teaching intellectual property law, affording easier access to works protected by copyright, protecting works of folklore.

"We try to satisfy every request for technical assistance we receive. For budgetary reasons, our assistance is not always as substantial as it should be, but so far no request from any developing country has remained unanswered, although—in some instances—the answer was incomplete.

"The continuation of this activity is absolutely essential for the survival and extension of orderly international relations in our field. Many developing countries have very little experience in the fields of patents and copyright. Without training, without information, without advice—generously given, whenever requested—the prospects for worldwide protection would be bleak indeed.

"And now a few words about our activities of general interest to all our member States. Such activities extend to the fields of both industrial property and copyright.

"In the field of industrial property, there are the so-called 'registration activities'—activities primarily under the PCT and the Madrid Agreement—and the so-called 'international classification activities.' The latter are concerned with inventions, goods and services for the purposes of registration of marks, figurative elements of marks and industrial designs. In order to remain meaningful, these classifications are under constant review, failing which they would rapidly become out of date.

"Then, still in the field of industrial property, there are all the activities that concern patent information and patent documentation. Here, too, keeping up with technological and scientific development is an obvious necessity. These activities secure close contact, exchange of up-to-date information and practical cooperation among patent offices. The manifold tasks of the Permanent Committee on Patent Information illustrate my point.

"Then there are the studies and discussions which are intended to keep intellectual property legislation—both in the field of industrial property and in the field of copyright—responsive to changing needs and new technologies. The studies and discussions include protection of computer software; piracy of records, books, industrial designs; rights of owners of copyright in connection with cable television; protection of works of folklore; the role of trademarks in connection with consumer protection; rights in inventions created in the framework of international joint ventures.

"If WIPO were to abdicate its role in those fields, it would not mean that the contemporary problems, caused mainly by new technological developments, would disappear. Neither would WIPO's abdication mean that solutions would not be found to such problems. What abdication on the part of WIPO would mean is that such solutions would be found outside WIPO, without any attempt to coordinate and harmonize progress of national legislation and international treaties or with attempts by other international organizations, less knowledgeable about, and frequently hostile to, intellectual property. This could only lead to a decline in the protection of intellectual property.

"The studies, discussions and meetings—with governments and/or private circles—organized by WIPO are aimed at keeping intellectual property institutions up to date and instilling into those institutions the youth and vigor that is indispensable for their usefulness to society and, indeed, for their very survival."

I. Membership of WIPO

Costa Rica and Zimbabwe deposited instruments of accession to the Convention Establishing the World Intellectual Property Organization in March and September 1981, respectively. At the end of the year, the number of members of WIPO was 97 (Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Egypt, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany (Federal Republic of), Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Holy See, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Libya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, Niger, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Senegal, South Africa, Soviet Union, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe). Of these, 14

States are members of WIPO alone (Barbados, Byelorussian SSR, China, Colombia, El Salvador, Gambia, Jamaica, Mongolia, Peru, Qatar, Sudan, Ukrainian SSR, United Arab Emirates, Yemen).

In addition, 20 States, which have not yet become members of WIPO, are members of one or more of the Unions administered by WIPO (Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, Haiti, Iceland, Iran, Lebanon, Madagascar, Mali, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Panama, Paraguay, San Marino, Syria, Tanzania, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago).

Therefore the total number of States which are members of WIPO or party to treaties administered by WIPO was, at the end of 1981, 117.*

Acceptance of Treaty Amendments. In 1979, the Governing Bodies concerned decided to change from the then existing system of triennial and annual programs and budgets to a system of biennial programs and budgets for WIPO and the nine Unions which have independent budgets. The said change was effected by the unanimous adoption of the necessary amendments to the relevant administrative provisions of the treaties concerned and of a resolution providing for the provisional application of the said amendments pending their entry into force. They will enter into force one month after written notifications of acceptance have been received from three-fourths of the States entitled to vote. By the end of 1981, the following 41 States had notified their acceptance of the amendments: Australia, Bahamas, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany (Federal Republic of), Greece, Holy See, Hungary, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Kenya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Mexico, Monaco, Norway, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Soviet Union, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United States of America, Upper Volta, Zambia. Similar amendments adopted by the Assemblies of the Budapest and TRT Unions in 1980 have not yet been accepted by any State.

II. Governing Bodies

The *WIPO Budget Committee* held its fourth session in Geneva in April and an extraordinary session in June 1981. All of the 14 members designated by the Coordination Committee were represented at the fourth session, and 12 of them at the extraordinary session. At its fourth session, the Budget Committee considered documents presented by the Director General concerning the distribution of posts of Deputy Directors General, contribution systems and the draft program and budget for

1982 and 1983 and medium-term plan for 1984 to 1987. It was agreed that the first of the questions mentioned above should be discussed and decided by the WIPO General Assembly; the second was referred to the extraordinary session. In the discussion of the program and budget and medium-term plan, the Director General noted various points on which he would furnish additional information to the Governing Bodies; the Budget Committee made a number of recommendations concerning the content or presentation of certain items of the draft program and plan.

At its extraordinary session, the Budget Committee considered possible reforms of the contribution systems; in view of the complexity of the problems, it did not find it possible to make any specific recommendation. Consequently, the Committee decided to refer the documents to the competent Governing Bodies, the more so as the question involves important political considerations for which the directives of the said Bodies would be necessary.

The *Governing Bodies of WIPO and of the Unions administered by WIPO* held their twelfth series of meetings in Geneva in November 1981. The following 22 Governing Bodies held sessions:

WIPO General Assembly, sixth session (5th ordinary),
 WIPO Conference, fifth session (5th ordinary),
 WIPO Coordination Committee, fifteenth session (12th ordinary),
 Paris Union Assembly, sixth session (5th ordinary),
 Paris Union Conference of Representatives, eighth session (5th ordinary),
 Paris Union Executive Committee, seventeenth session (17th ordinary),
 Berne Union Assembly, fifth session (5th ordinary),
 Berne Union Conference of Representatives, fifth session (5th ordinary),
 Berne Union Executive Committee, eighteenth session (12th ordinary),
 Madrid Union Assembly, eleventh session (4th ordinary),
 Madrid Union Committee of Directors, eleventh session (4th ordinary),
 Hague Union Assembly, sixth session (3rd ordinary),
 Hague Union Conference of Representatives, sixth session (3rd ordinary),
 Nice Union Assembly, sixth session (5th ordinary),
 Nice Union Conference of Representatives, fifth session (5th ordinary),
 Lisbon Union Assembly, fourth session (4th ordinary),
 Lisbon Union Council, eleventh session (11th ordinary),
 Locarno Union Assembly, sixth session (4th ordinary),

* Detailed lists were published in the January issue of this review.

IPC [International Patent Classification] Union Assembly, fourth session (3rd ordinary),
 PCT [Patent Cooperation Treaty] Union Assembly, eighth session (3rd ordinary),
 TRT [Trademark Registration Treaty] Union Assembly, second session (2nd ordinary),
 Budapest Union Assembly, third session (1st ordinary).

Delegations of 89 States participated in the meetings. Twelve intergovernmental organizations and five international non-governmental organizations were represented by observers. The list of participants appears in this issue under "WIPO Meetings."

Accounts and Activities. The Governing Bodies reviewed and approved reports by the Director General on the financial accounts for 1979 and 1980 and on the activities of WIPO from September 1979 to November 1981. A number of delegations expressed satisfaction with the accomplishments of the International Bureau since the 1979 sessions of the Governing Bodies, and underlined the constant increase in the activities, particularly in the field of development cooperation for the benefit of developing countries. Several delegations expressed the intention of their countries to continue and, if possible, to increase their contribution to the development cooperation activities of WIPO. Attention was drawn in particular to the usefulness of training activities carried out in developing regions and countries, of cooperation among developing countries through the provision by such countries of facilities and experts, and of systematic evaluation and planning.

United Nations Resolutions. The WIPO General Assembly took note of resolutions and decisions of the General Assembly of the United Nations, of the Economic and Social Council and of two United Nations Conferences relevant to the work of WIPO. It adopted suggestions by the Director General concerning activities in respect of the said resolutions and decisions. In the course of the discussion, several delegations, noting that some such resolutions and decisions affected in a direct way the role of intellectual property in political, economic and social life, expressed the hope that WIPO would reinforce its contribution in order to redress an equilibrium much unbalanced by the negative attitude of certain other organizations. The Director General said that such a reinforced contribution was provided for in the draft program of activities presented to the Governing Bodies.

Continuation of the Diplomatic Conference on the Revision of the Paris Convention. As requested by the Diplomatic Conference on the Revision of the Paris Convention at its second session, held in Nairobi in September and October 1981, the Paris Union Assembly took the measures necessary for the continuation of the work of the Conference. The Assembly decided, the Conference of Representatives of the Paris Union ex-

pressing its favorable view, that the third session of the Diplomatic Conference will be held in Geneva and will last four weeks during a period in October and November 1982.*

Program and Budget, Medium-Term Plan. The Governing Bodies approved the program and budget of WIPO for the 1982 to 1983 biennium and a plan for the medium term of 1984 to 1987. The budget for the biennium amounts to 71,781,000 Swiss francs. About half of the amount is covered from contributions by member States and half by fees paid by applicants for international registrations and applicants filing international patent applications under the Patent Cooperation Treaty.

The main "program" activities for the biennium approved by the Governing Bodies fall under the following headings. In the field of *industrial property*: industrial property and patent information activities of particular interest to developing countries; study of special industrial property questions of a legal nature; international cooperation for the verification of patentability; information and teaching in the field of industrial property; promotion of patent information and development of patent classification; development of trademark classification; development of industrial designs classification; cooperation with States and various institutions in matters concerning industrial property. In the fields of *copyright* and *neighboring rights*: copyright and neighboring rights activities of particular interest to developing countries; study of special copyright and neighboring rights questions of international interest; information and teaching in the fields of copyright and neighboring rights; cooperation with States and various institutions in matters concerning copyright and neighboring rights. In the field of *intellectual property* generally: promotion of the worldwide recognition of and respect for intellectual property, including promotion of accessions to WIPO and to the treaties administered by WIPO.

It was decided to accept, with thanks, an invitation extended by the Delegation of India, in the name of its Government, to hold the next session of the WIPO Permanent Committee for Development Cooperation Related to Copyright and Neighboring Rights in India.

The Assembly of the Madrid Union agreed that the Director General should convene a working group consisting of representatives of the States members of the Madrid Union and of States members of the European Communities not members of the Madrid Union in order to study ways and means so that the future Community Trademark Regulations should be compatible with the Madrid Agreement (and also with the Trademark Registration Treaty) and so that, in particular, any

* The period from October 4 to 30, 1982, was subsequently fixed, after consultations, for the third session of the Diplomatic Conference.

Community trademark could (possibly after the corresponding amendment of the Regulations under the Madrid Agreement) serve as a basis of an international registration under the Madrid Agreement, and any international registration under the Madrid Agreement could have the same effect in respect of a Community trademark as it has today in respect of national marks of countries members of the Madrid Union.

Appointment of Deputy Director General. The WIPO Coordination Committee approved the proposal of the Director General to appoint as one of the three Deputy Directors General Mr. Lev Efremovich Kostikov (Soviet Union).

Election of the Members of the Executive Committees of the Paris and Berne Unions, of the Ad Hoc Members of the WIPO Coordination Committee and of the WIPO Budget Committee. The Assembly and Conference of Representatives of the Paris Union and the Assembly and Conference of Representatives of the Berne Union elected, each as far as it was concerned, the members of the Executive Committees of the Paris and Berne Unions, the WIPO Conference designated the ad hoc members of the WIPO Coordination Committee and the WIPO Coordination Committee elected the members of the WIPO Budget Committee. The resulting membership of those four Committees is as follows.

Paris Union Executive Committee

Ordinary Members: Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Brazil, Cuba, Egypt, Germany (Federal Republic of), Ghana, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Soviet Union, Switzerland (*ex officio*), Uganda, United Kingdom, United States of America, Uruguay (21).

Associate Members: Lebanon, Nigeria, Tanzania (3).

Berne Union Executive Committee

Ordinary Members: Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cameroon, * Canada, Chile, Congo, Czechoslovakia, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, India, Ivory Coast, Mexico, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Switzerland (*ex officio*), Tunisia (18).

Associate Member: Turkey (1).

Ad hoc Members of the WIPO Coordination Committee

China, ** Mongolia, Qatar, Sudan (4).

* With effect from the date on which the number of members of the Berne Union Assembly becomes 68.

** With effect from the date on which the number of members of WIPO, not members of any of the Unions, becomes 16.

WIPO Coordination Committee

Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cameroon, * Canada, Chile, China, ** Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany (Federal Republic of), Ghana, Hungary, India, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Kenya, Lebanon, Mexico, Mongolia, Nigeria, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Senegal, Soviet Union, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Switzerland, Tanzania, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom, United States of America, Uruguay (46).

WIPO Budget Committee

Brazil, Cameroon, Canada, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, France, Germany (Federal Republic of), India, Iraq, Japan, Soviet Union, Switzerland, United States of America (14).

III. Development Cooperation Activities

Summary

Tables summarizing participation in the WIPO development cooperation programs in the fields of industrial property and copyright and neighboring rights for the period between the meetings of the Governing Bodies in 1979 and 1981 appear at the end of this article.

A. Industrial Property and Patent Information Activities

Objective

The objective of the activities provided for in the approved program of WIPO is to be useful to developing countries in seven different respects:

- (i) training specialists;
- (ii) creating or modernizing domestic legislation;
- (iii) creating or modernizing governmental institutions;
- (iv) stimulating inventive activity;
- (v) stimulating transfer of technology;
- (vi) creating a corps of practitioners;
- (vii) exploiting technological information contained in patent documents.

Activities

Development, in Developing Countries, of General Awareness and Knowledge of the Law and Practical Implications of Industrial Property (Training)

In 1981, WIPO received 310 applications for training in industrial property from 99 developing countries,

two territories, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA) and the African Intellectual Property Organization (OAPI). One hundred and thirty-six of these applications, from the following 73 developing countries and one territory, from UNHCR, UNRWA and OAPI, were accepted: Afghanistan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Congo, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kiribati, Kuwait, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Senegal, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syria, Tanzania, Thailand, Tonga, Uganda, Uruguay, Upper Volta, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe, Cook Islands. Applications were received and accepted also from Bulgaria and Portugal.

The training program in 1981 took the following forms:

(a) for 14 trainees, a Specialized Training Course on the Law and Administration of Trade Marks and their Role in Commercial and Economic Development, in *Canberra* in March and April 1981, organized by WIPO and the Government of Australia; the participants came from Bangladesh, Bhutan, China, Cook Islands, Fiji, Kiribati, Nepal, Pakistan, Philippines, Samoa, Thailand, Tonga and Vanuatu. The lectures were given by officials of the Australian Patent Office and officials of WIPO;

(b) for 17 trainees, a Specialized Training Course in the Use of Patent Documentation as a Source of Technological Information, in *Vienna* in August and September 1981, organized jointly by WIPO and the Austrian Government; the participants came from Botswana, Ghana, Jordan, Kuwait, Mongolia, Nepal, Nigeria, Republic of Korea, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tanzania and Zambia. The lectures were given by officials of the Austrian Patent Office, the German Patent Office, the European Patent Office (EPO) and WIPO;

(c) for 16 trainees, a Training Course on Patent Information and Documentation, in *Moscow* in August 1981, organized by WIPO and the USSR State Committee for Inventions and Discoveries; the participants came from Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bulgaria, China, Cyprus, Iraq, Mongolia, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Sudan, Syria and UNRWA; observers from the German Democratic Republic also attended the course. The lectures were given by officials of the USSR State Committee for Inventions and Discoveries, the African Regional Centre for Technology and WIPO, and by the

Director General of the National Board of Patents and Registration of Finland. The Course was opened by the Chairman of the State Committee for Inventions and Discoveries of the Soviet Union and the Director General of WIPO;

(d) for 49 trainees, an introductory seminar on general aspects of industrial property at WIPO in *Geneva*, immediately preceding the seminar and the course referred to in (e) and (f), below. The participants came from the Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bolivia, Central African Republic, Congo, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, El Salvador, Gabon, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, Nicaragua, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Senegal, Swaziland, Syria, Tanzania, Uganda, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Viet Nam, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe, UNHCR and OAPI. The lectures were given by officials of WIPO and an official of the EPO;

(e) for 21 trainees, a seminar organized at *The Hague* in September 1981 by WIPO, the EPO and the Commission of the European Communities (CEC) under the title "Technical Information as an Aid to Industrial Development: Patent Documents"; the participants came from Bangladesh, Bolivia, Congo, El Salvador, Gabon, Iraq, Malawi, Mali, Mexico, Nicaragua, Niger, Pakistan, Peru, Republic of Korea, Senegal, Swaziland, Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay and Viet Nam. The lectures were given by officials of the EPO and WIPO;

(f) for 28 trainees, a General Introductory Course in the Field of Industrial Property, in *Strasbourg* in September 1981, organized by WIPO and the Center for the International Study of Industrial Property (CEIPI) with the cooperation of the National Institute of Industrial Property (INPI) of France; the participants came from the Bahamas, Barbados, Benin, Central African Republic, Congo, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Liberia, Madagascar, Mali, Morocco, Oman, Papua New Guinea, Qatar, Rwanda, Syria, Uganda, Uruguay, Viet Nam, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe, UNHCR and OAPI. The lectures were given by the Director General of CEIPI and professors, lawyers and patent attorneys of or associated with CEIPI, an official of the Government of Tunisia, the Registrar of Patents, Trademarks and Business Names of Zambia, the Director General of OAPI and officials of WIPO and the EPO. This course was followed, for most of those concerned, by practical training in the industrial property offices of the following countries and organizations: Czechoslovakia, Egypt, France, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Netherlands, Switzerland, United Kingdom, United States of America, and OAPI;

(g) for nine trainees, a Training Course on the Theoretical and Practical Aspects of Industrial Property organized by WIPO and the Industrial Property Registry of Spain; the participants came from El Salvador,

Mexico, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay and Venezuela. The Course was held in *Madrid* in November and December 1981; lectures were given by officials of WIPO and the Spanish Office; the Government of Spain agreed to contribute the full amount of the travel and subsistence expenses of the trainees;

(h) for 21 trainees, a practical training course in the industrial property office of one of the following countries: Belgium, Canada, Germany (Federal Republic of), Israel, Poland, Soviet Union, Sweden;

(i) for six trainees, study tours comprising visits to and discussions at the institutions of three to four of the following countries and at WIPO: Brazil, Canada, France, Germany (Federal Republic of), Sweden, United Kingdom, United States of America;

(j) for four trainees in charge of "national structures" for liaison with OAPI, special training comprising visits to and discussions at the industrial property office of France, the EPO (The Hague), and WIPO, and also their participation in a Seminar at *Brazzaville* in June and July 1981, organized in cooperation between WIPO and OAPI (see under "Legislation and Institutions: OAPI," below).

The following 17 countries, three intergovernmental organizations and one study center contributed in full or in part to the payment of the travel expenses and subsistence allowances for some or all of the trainees concerned:

(i) full payment: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, France, Germany (Federal Republic of), Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom, United States of America, CEC, EPO, European Development Fund, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP);

(ii) part payment: Austria, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Israel, Netherlands, Poland, Soviet Union, CEIPI.

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

Taking together the training program in the field of industrial property and that in the fields of copyright and neighboring rights (see below), the total number of applications received in 1981 was 380 from 103 countries and two territories, from UNHCR, from UNRWA, from OAPI and from the African National Congress (ANC), as compared with 280 applications in 1980 from 89 countries and one territory, UNRWA, the Industrial Development Center for Arab States (IDCAS), from OAPI, from the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and from the Panafricanist Congress of Azania (PAC). In 1981, a total of 173 applications were accepted from 82 countries and one territory, UNHCR, UNRWA, OAPI and ANC; in 1980, 163 applications were accepted from 74 countries and one territory, UNRWA, OAPI, and PAC. In 1981, 53 applications were accepted (30.6% of total acceptances) from 26 countries regarded as least developed among the developing countries (or in respect of which the General Assembly of the United Nations has invited similar or special treatment) and 41 applications were accepted

(23.7% of total acceptances) in respect of women. In 1981, eight developing countries (Algeria, Argentina, Brazil, Congo, Egypt, Israel, Mexico, Senegal) and OAPI contributed to promoting cooperation among developing countries by receiving 20 trainees.

A *Sudanese national seminar on industrial property* was organized in *Khartoum* in February 1981 by WIPO and the Department of Commercial Registration, Attorney General's Office. The seminar had two objectives: to improve knowledge and awareness, in official and private circles, of the role of intellectual property in economic and social development, and to provide training opportunities for the officials directly and indirectly concerned with the administration of industrial property laws.

The seminar was organized in five separate steps: a formal opening meeting on the first day at the Attorney General's Office, followed by substantive lectures on industrial property (and also on copyright) legislation, attended by about 40 officials; three working sessions at the Department of Commercial Registration, mainly for training purposes, attended by about 25 officials; a meeting at the Chamber of Commerce, basically addressed to the business community, with two talks on matters related to trademarks and the transfer of technology, attended by about 20 participants; a meeting at the Engineers' Club addressed specially to engineers and scientists, with four talks on matters related to inventions and the transfer of technology, attended by about 40 participants; two panel discussions on television, each one with four participants, the first on trademarks, the second on inventions.

All the proceedings were conducted in Arabic. The lectures were given, and the discussions were led, by a team composed of one WIPO official, three WIPO consultants (two from Egypt, one from Syria), three Sudanese law professors, the Director General of the Estate Bank of Sudan and a Sudanese inventor. Interviews were given to the press and radio.

Teaching aids for training in the field of industrial property include the texts of lectures prepared for particular training courses and also the WIPO *Industrial Property Glossary*. The Glossary was published in Chinese, English and French in April 1981, having been previously published in Arabic, English, French and Spanish, in English, French and Russian, and in English, French and Portuguese. A further teaching aid, an *Industrial Property Manual for Developing Countries*, is under preparation.

Development, in Developing Countries, of Legislative Activities in the Field of Industrial Property

A *Group of Consultants on Questions Relating to Trademarks and Developing Countries* met in Geneva in July 1981. The consultants, invited by the Director General, came from the following 12 countries: Argentina, China, France, Germany (Federal Republic of),

Hungary, Israel, Japan, Mexico, Nigeria, Soviet Union, Tunisia, United States of America. Half of the consultants were government officials, and half were from the private sector.

The consultants examined documents containing three draft memoranda prepared by WIPO on "The Role of Trademarks in the Economic Development of Developing Countries," on "Trademark Licensing and Developing Countries" and on "Industrial Property Aspects of Consumer Protection." The first two documents are to be revised and expanded on the basis of the views expressed by the consultants; once finalized, they could assist developing countries in establishing their legislative and administrative policy concerning trademarks and trademark licensing, and serve as guidelines for WIPO's development cooperation activities in this field. The third document had been submitted to governments and interested organizations with a request for comments by the end of 1981; comments made by members of the Group of Consultants will also be taken into account.

The Group of Consultants gave advice on revising and expanding the draft memoranda, particularly as regards additional emphasis to be given to certain subjects (for example, the quality function of trademarks and their function in industrialization, assistance in marketing abroad, legislative and administrative systems, desirable systems of examination, international registration). In relation to measures which might be adopted to prevent the disadvantages of trademark licensing, the Group of Consultants was of the opinion that it would be most useful for the International Bureau to analyze the alternative approaches available to developing countries, examining in particular whether trademark license contracts should be subject to government control and, if so, in what manner and to what extent, and whether trademark license contracts between a foreign licensor and a national licensee should be governed by a different legal regime than trademark license contracts concluded between nationals.

The Group of Consultants agreed that it was in the interests of developing countries to have an effective trademark system, which stimulated local production and promoted the rationalization and modernization of commercial and marketing practices in developing countries. Such a system in developing countries was considered important for enterprises of such countries not only in order to facilitate the commercialization of their products and services on the domestic market but also because adequate trademark protection in one's own country constituted a first step in securing such protection abroad, which was essential for exporting such products and services. The Group also considered that trademark licensing constituted one of the most important aspects of the role of trademarks in the economic development of developing countries.

Referring to the desirability of giving wide publicity to the documents, when finalized after revision and expansion, and possibly combined in some respects, the

Group of Consultants was in general agreement that trademarks played an ever increasingly important role in the economic development of developing countries. It was, therefore, of utmost importance for developing countries to better understand the role trademarks played in the development process so as to be in a better position to formulate adequate policies and establish effective trademark systems that would not only be consistent with but also, and most importantly, contribute to the development objectives of those countries.

Legislation and Institutions

WIPO continued to cooperate, on request, with governments or groups of governments of developing countries on the adoption of new laws and regulations, or the modernization of existing ones, in the field of industrial property, and the creation or modernization of industrial property institutions.

In the period covered by this report, such cooperation was pursued with the following countries and regional institutions, including their patent documentation and information services:

Africa

Algeria. In June 1981, WIPO organized jointly with the national office a national seminar on licensing, attended by 130 participants (see under "Acquisition of Technology; Licensing," below).

Benin. The report of a joint mission by a WIPO consultant from France and an OAPI official, undertaken in September and October 1980 to advise on the creation of a national structure for industrial property and technological information, within the context of the CADIB project of OAPI (see below), was sent to the Government in March 1981. A WIPO consultant from France, accompanied by an official of OAPI, undertook a mission in October and November 1981 to assist in the establishment of the said national structure, which was inaugurated in December 1981; WIPO was represented at the inauguration.

Burundi. In April 1981, the Government provided comments on the report (including draft legislation) of a WIPO mission which visited Bujumbura in September 1980 to advise on the modernization of the industrial property laws and administration so as to contribute to the country's development objectives. New proposals, taking the said comments into account, were sent in June 1981, and a revised draft of new industrial property legislation was prepared by WIPO and sent in August 1981, with an offer to assist in the preparation of draft regulations and forms.

Central African Republic. The report of a joint mission by a WIPO consultant from France and an OAPI official, undertaken in October and November 1980 to

advise on the creation of a national structure for industrial property and technological information, within the context of the CADIB project of OAPI (see below), was sent to the Government in March 1981.

Chad. WIPO organized a study tour, beginning in June 1981, for the government official responsible for the national structure for industrial property and technological information within the context of the CADIB project of OAPI (see below).

Congo. The report of a joint mission by a WIPO consultant from France and an OAPI official, undertaken in October 1980 to advise on the creation of a national structure for industrial property and technological information, within the context of the CADIB project of OAPI (see below), was sent to the Government in March 1981. A further mission by a WIPO consultant from France took place in June 1981 to assist in the preparation of a seminar to be held on the occasion of the inauguration of the national structure. The said inauguration took place in July 1981, in the presence of the participants in an Industrial Property Seminar for Users of CADIB organized in Brazzaville by WIPO and OAPI as part of the said project (see below). WIPO was represented at the inauguration.

Gabon. The report of a joint mission by a WIPO consultant from France and an OAPI official, undertaken in October 1980 to advise on the creation of a national structure for industrial property and technological information, within the context of the CADIB project of OAPI (see below), was sent to the Government in March 1981. WIPO organized a study tour, beginning in June 1981, for the government official responsible for the national structure.

Ghana. A WIPO consultant from the Federal Republic of Germany undertook a mission in January 1981 to advise on the administrative requirements of proposed new industrial property legislation; the Federal Republic of Germany paid the expenses of the consultant. The report of the mission was sent to the Government in June 1981, following discussions at WIPO in May 1981 with the head of the industrial property office during a study tour of European offices organized by WIPO and financed by the United Kingdom.

Ivory Coast. In April 1981, following discussions in Geneva with the government official responsible for the national structure for industrial property and technological information, within the context of the CADIB project of OAPI (see below), the report of a joint mission by WIPO and OAPI in 1980 was completed by further proposals. WIPO organized a study tour, beginning in June 1981, for the said official. A WIPO consultant from France and an official of OAPI undertook a mission in August and September 1981 to assist in the establishment of the national structure, which was inaugurated in November 1981; WIPO was represented at the inauguration.

Mauritania. The report of a mission undertaken by a WIPO consultant from France in November and December 1980 to advise on the creation of a national structure for industrial property and technological information, within the context of the CADIB project of OAPI (see below), was sent to the Government in March 1981. WIPO organized a study tour, beginning in June 1981, for the government official responsible for the national structure.

Morocco. A WIPO official and a WIPO consultant from Belgium undertook a mission in March 1981 to advise on the modernization of the industrial property system. The report of the mission was sent to the Government in May 1981. In July 1981, the Government replied positively to the proposals contained in the said report; amendments, requested by the Government, to the parts of a new draft industrial property law relating to marks and industrial designs were prepared by WIPO and discussed with a government official in Geneva in September 1981. In November and December 1981, WIPO officials and consultants from France and the EPO provided preparatory assistance in the fields of patents and trademarks, and prepared, in discussions with the Government authorities, a draft project document for financing by the UNDP.

Niger. The report of a joint mission by a WIPO consultant from France and an OAPI official, undertaken in September 1980 to advise on the creation of a national structure for industrial property and technological information, within the context of the CADIB project of OAPI (see below), was sent to the Government in March 1981.

Rwanda. The report, including proposals for new legislation, of a WIPO mission which visited Kigali in September 1980 to advise on the modernization of the industrial property laws and administration so as to contribute to the country's development objectives, was sent to the Government in March 1981.

Senegal. The report of a joint mission by a WIPO consultant from France and an OAPI official, undertaken in November 1980 to advise on the creation of a national structure for industrial property and technological information, within the context of the CADIB project of OAPI (see below), was sent to the Government in March 1981.

Sudan. In February 1981, WIPO organized jointly with the national office a seminar on industrial property for participants from government and private circles (see under "Development, in Developing Countries, of General Awareness and Knowledge of the Law and Practical Implications of Industrial Property (Training)," above). After the adoption of regulations under the patent law, drafted with the assistance of WIPO, the head of the industrial property office undertook a study tour, organized and financed by WIPO, to Sweden, the United Kingdom, the United States of America and

WIPO. WIPO undertook the translation into English of the Sudanese laws on patents and industrial designs, and, in September 1981, the printing of the Arabic and English texts of the patent law and regulations.

Togo. The report of a joint mission by a WIPO consultant from France and an OAPI official, undertaken in September 1980 to advise on the creation of a national structure for industrial property and technological information, within the context of the CADIB project of OAPI (see below), was sent to the Government in March 1981. A WIPO consultant from France undertook a mission in November and December 1981 to assist in the establishment of the said national structure, which was inaugurated in December 1981. WIPO was represented at the inauguration.

Zimbabwe. The report of a WIPO mission in 1980 to assist in the drawing up of a plan of action for reorganizing industrial property procedures and staff training was sent to the Government in June 1981, following discussions in Geneva in May 1981 with the head of the industrial property office, during a study tour of European industrial property offices organized and financed by WIPO. A draft project document, for funding by the UNDP, was prepared by WIPO and discussed with the Government authorities in Salisbury in December 1981.

African Intellectual Property Organization (OAPI). WIPO continued to act as the executing agency for the UNDP project for the establishment of a patent documentation and information center (CADIB) within the framework of OAPI. In addition to financing from UNDP, the project is receiving support in the form of financing, expert services, training and equipment from the Governments of France, Germany (Federal Republic of) and Switzerland and from the European Patent Office.

The third tripartite review of the project was held in Yaoundé in July 1981, with participation by WIPO, OAPI and UNDP; satisfaction was expressed with the progress of the project, particularly because nearly all of the objectives set for 1981 had already been achieved or would be achieved by the end of the year. It was agreed to recommend an extension of the project for one year (1982) in order to provide further assistance in the establishment of national structures for CADIB in the member States. Missions to OAPI member States to assist in the establishment of national structures for CADIB are reported above under the names of the countries concerned. A draft of a detailed manual for use by the national structures was completed by a WIPO consultant from France in August 1981.

Within the framework of the CADIB project, a *Seminar on Industrial Property as a Factor of Economic, Scientific and Technical Development* was organized in cooperation between WIPO, OAPI and the Government of the Congo in Brazzaville in July 1981, with financial support from the Federal Republic of Ger-

many and the UNDP. The Seminar was held on the occasion of the inauguration of the Congolese national structure for CADIB. About 80 participants attended the Seminar from the following 12 African countries: Benin, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo, Gabon, Ivory Coast, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Senegal and Togo. Lectures (followed by discussions) were given by the heads of the industrial property offices of Sweden and Switzerland, by the Director General of OAPI and a Vice-President of the EPO, and by experts from Austria, Cameroon Congo, France, Germany (Federal Republic of), Senegal, WIPO and OAPI. At the conclusion of the discussions, the participants adopted recommendations, addressed primarily to OAPI and its member States, concerning cooperation at the international and national levels, information and training, the establishment and operation of national structures for CADIB and the implementation of the Lagos Plan of Action for the economic development of Africa.

WIPO was represented in an observer capacity at the 20th session of the Administrative Council of OAPI at Lomé in December 1981. Among other decisions, the Council approved the budget of CADIB for 1982, as part of the OAPI budget, took note with satisfaction of the progress of the project, and in particular of the actions taken by the Director General of OAPI in co-operation with the Director General of WIPO for the implementation of the program of action for the establishment of the national structures for liaison with OAPI, within the framework of the project, and thanked the UNDP, WIPO, as well as France, Germany (Federal Republic of) and Switzerland for their contribution to the project. Furthermore, the Council approved a resolution authorizing filings in the English language as well as the publication of such filings in the original language of filing. Finally, the Director General of OAPI informed the Council that Mauritania had deposited its instrument of ratification of the Bangui Agreement on December 8, 1981. This being the eighth instrument deposited, the Bangui Agreement will enter into force on February 8, 1982.

African Regional Center for Technology (ARCT). WIPO was represented at sessions of the Executive Board and Council of ARCT held in Dakar in February 1981.

Industrial Property Organization for English-Speaking Africa (ESARIPO). Jointly with the Secretariat of the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (ECA), WIPO continued to act as the Interim Secretariat of ESARIPO, until the first Director of the Office of ESARIPO took up his duties in June 1981. In association with the ECA, WIPO continued to execute the preparatory assistance phase, financed by the UNDP, of the project for the establishment of ESARIPO's Patent Documentation and Information Centre (ESAPADIC). In December 1981, the UNDP approved the budget of the project for 1982.

Before taking up his duties, the Director of the ESARIPO Office visited WIPO in March 1981 for the briefing necessary to ensure an efficient continuation of the Secretariat and handing over of responsibilities. In June 1981, the Director undertook a study tour to the industrial property offices of Germany (Federal Republic of), Sweden and the United Kingdom, to the EPO and to WIPO. At WIPO, he had discussions with, among others, the designated Chief Technical Adviser of the ESAPADIC project and a consultant engaged for the said project. The Chief Technical Adviser took up his duties in September 1981, after a study tour to the Swedish Patent Office, the EPO and WIPO. In November 1981, WIPO provided the services of a consultant and a staff member to assist in administrative and financial matters.

In September 1981, the Government of Zambia informed WIPO of the deposit by Somalia of its instrument of ratification of the Lusaka Agreement on the Creation of ESARIPO, bringing the membership to ten States.

The fifth session of the *Council* of ESARIPO was held in Nairobi in September 1981. Eight States members of ESARIPO (Ghana, Kenya, Malawi, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Uganda, Zambia and Zimbabwe) and six observer States (Botswana, Ethiopia, Mauritius, Nigeria, Swaziland and Tanzania) were represented. The session of the Council was preceded by a Seminar (with participation from the States referred to above).

The said *Seminar* was organized by ESARIPO and WIPO in the context of the UNDP preparatory assistance for the ESAPADIC project and with the further financial assistance of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany. The topics discussed were the framework for international cooperation in the field of industrial property, the role of patent information in technological development, the role of the International Patent Classification (IPC) in the searching procedures of an industrial property office, the role of a national patent office in the dissemination of patent information, and the strengthening of linkages between the industrial property system and other development sectors and users of patent information at the national level. These topics were introduced by officials of the industrial property offices of Canada, Germany (Federal Republic of) and the United Kingdom, of the EPO and of WIPO.

The *Council* of ESARIPO approved for 1982 a program of activities, the corresponding budget (US dollars 281,200) and contributions to be paid by member States; it approved also a working agreement with WIPO (signed in July 1981 by the Director General of WIPO and the Director of the ESARIPO Office, subject to the approval of the WIPO Coordination Committee and the ESARIPO Council) and authorized the Director to pursue negotiations for working agreements with the ECA, OAPI and ARCT. The Council approved staff rules and amendments to the staff regulations, proposals for staff social security benefits and medical insur-

ance, and financial regulations (on the basis of drafts prepared by a consultant for the ESAPADIC project during a mission to Nairobi in July 1981). The Council noted that the Director of the Office had applied for, and obtained, observer status for ESARIPO in the WIPO Permanent Committees on Patent Information (PCPI) (in July 1981) and for Development Cooperation Related to Industrial Property (in August 1981); it adopted a resolution supporting the draft Nairobi Treaty on the Protection of the Olympic Symbol, and selected, from a number of applicants, a candidate for appointment as Head of the Patent Information and Documentation Centre.

In connection with the final location of the headquarters of ESARIPO, and taking into account the immediate, medium-term and long-term needs of space for its premises as well as the eventual construction of a building as the permanent headquarters of the Organization, the Council, after negotiations among all member States present, decided to establish the ESARIPO headquarters in Salisbury, Zimbabwe, from January 1982. An official of WIPO, the Director of the ESARIPO Office and the Chief Technical Adviser of the project for the establishment of ESARIPO's Patent Documentation and Information Centre visited Salisbury in October 1981 in order to discuss practical arrangements for the establishment of the headquarters of ESARIPO in Zimbabwe.

A *Seminar on Patent Information and Documentation* for member and potential member States of ESARIPO was organized by WIPO and the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), and financed by CIDA, in Salisbury in December 1981. Thirty-five participants attended the Seminar, nominated by eight States members of ESARIPO (Ghana, Kenya, Malawi, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Uganda, Zambia and Zimbabwe) and five observer States (Botswana, Ethiopia, Nigeria, Swaziland and Tanzania). The topics discussed were the nature and content of patent documents, classification of patents, "state-of-the-art" searches based upon patent search files, and the effective use of patent information as a support to research and development activity.

Asia and the Pacific

Bangladesh. A WIPO official visited Dacca in March 1981 for discussions with government officials on the progress of preparing new patent and trademark laws, first drafts of which had been submitted by WIPO and discussed in Geneva. In September 1981, WIPO transmitted comments, requested by the Government, on draft new trademark legislation prepared on the basis of the first draft submitted by WIPO.

A fact-finding mission, carried out in November and December 1981 by an official of WIPO and a WIPO consultant from the United Kingdom, visited Bangladesh for discussions with the Government authorities

on international cooperation in the strengthening of industrial property systems. The mission was financed by the UNDP within the framework of a regional project.

Burma. A fact-finding mission, carried out in November and December 1981 by an official of WIPO and a WIPO consultant from the United Kingdom, visited Burma for discussions with the Government authorities on international cooperation in the strengthening of industrial property systems. The mission was financed by the UNDP within the framework of a regional project.

China. WIPO organized in Beijing in February and March 1981 a Patent Agency Course (see under "Development of the Industrial Property Profession..." below), and in October 1981 a Seminar on Patent Documentation (see under "Development, in Developing Countries, of Access to the Technological Information Contained in Patent Documents," below).

In May and June 1981, WIPO organized a study tour for four officials of the China Council for the Promotion of International Trade; the travel and subsistence expenses of the four officials were financed by WIPO and by the UNDP. The officials visited WIPO and the industrial property offices of Germany (Federal Republic of), Switzerland and the United States of America, and also patent agents and patent departments of enterprises in the said countries. In November and December 1981, two Chinese officials undertook training in trademark procedures at the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO), financed by funds provided to WIPO by the United States of America.

In June 1981, the Acting Deputy Director General of the Patent Office of the People's Republic of China spent a week at WIPO's headquarters and had conversations with the Director General about cooperation between WIPO and the Chinese Patent Office in order to facilitate the gradual building up of the latter. In July 1981, officials of the General Administration Bureau for Industry and Commerce of China visited WIPO for discussions on cooperation in the field of trademarks, including preparations for a national training course on trademarks, planned to be held in Beijing in 1982.

In September 1981, a collection of patent documents issued by the USPTO was made available to the Patent Office of China under arrangements made by WIPO with the USPTO and partly financed by funds provided to WIPO by the United States of America.

Democratic People's Republic of Korea. Government officials visited Geneva in June 1981 for discussions on a draft UNDP project document for the modernization of the industrial property system, prepared by WIPO and submitted to the Government in advance of the said discussions. In July 1981, two WIPO officials and an expert from the German Democratic Republic conducted in Pyongyang training workshops for national officials on procedures under the Patent Cooperation

Treaty and the Madrid Agreement Concerning the International Registration of Marks.

Fiji. A fact-finding mission, carried out in November 1981 by an official of WIPO and a WIPO consultant from Sweden, visited Fiji for discussions with the Government authorities on international cooperation in the strengthening of industrial property systems. The mission was financed by the UNDP within the framework of a regional project.

India. A fact-finding mission, carried out in November and December 1981 by officials of WIPO and a WIPO consultant from the United Kingdom, visited India for discussions with the Government authorities on international cooperation in the strengthening of industrial property systems. The mission was financed by the UNDP within the framework of a regional project.

Indonesia. A fact-finding mission, carried out in November and December 1981 by officials of WIPO and WIPO consultants from Canada and the Federal Republic of Germany, visited Indonesia for discussions with the Government authorities on international cooperation in the strengthening of industrial property systems. The mission was financed by the UNDP within the framework of a regional project.

Malaysia. Two Government officials worked with WIPO staff members in Geneva for four weeks in June 1981 in order to familiarize themselves with the work of WIPO and the treaties administered by it and to discuss possible plans for cooperation in the modernization of the industrial property system, and in the strengthening of national scientific and technological information services by incorporating patent information.

A fact-finding mission, carried out in November and December 1981 by officials of WIPO and WIPO consultants from Canada and the Federal Republic of Germany, visited Malaysia for discussions with the Government authorities on international cooperation in the strengthening of industrial property systems. The mission was financed by the UNDP within the framework of a regional project. WIPO has been requested to prepare a draft law on patents and designs.

Maldives. A fact-finding mission, carried out in November and December 1981 by a WIPO consultant from the United Kingdom, visited Maldives for discussions with the Government authorities on international cooperation in the strengthening of industrial property systems. The mission was financed by the UNDP within the framework of a regional project.

Nepal. Following a WIPO mission and the preparation of draft laws in 1980, two draft project documents for the modernization of the industrial property system and for the holding of an introductory course for least developed countries of the sub-region were submitted to the Government and the UNDP in March 1981.

A fact-finding mission, carried out in November and December 1981 by an official of WIPO and a WIPO consultant from the United Kingdom, visited Nepal for discussions with the Government authorities on international cooperation in the strengthening of industrial property systems. The mission was financed by the UNDP within the framework of a regional project.

Pakistan. An official of the industrial property office undertook a four-week study tour, organized and financed by WIPO, to industrial property offices in Europe, in October and November 1981, following attendance at a training seminar in The Hague. A government official worked with WIPO staff members in Geneva for two weeks in March 1981.

A fact-finding mission, carried out in November and December 1981 by an official of WIPO and a WIPO consultant from the United Kingdom, visited Pakistan for discussions with the Government authorities on international cooperation in the strengthening of industrial property systems. The mission was financed by the UNDP within the framework of a regional project.

Papua New Guinea. A fact-finding mission, carried out in November 1981 by an official of WIPO and a WIPO consultant from Sweden, visited Papua New Guinea for discussions with the Government authorities on international cooperation in the strengthening of industrial property systems. The mission was financed by the UNDP within the framework of a regional project.

Philippines. Comments on a revised draft Science and Technology Code, including industrial property and copyright legislation, were sent by WIPO in July 1981.

A fact-finding mission, carried out in November and December 1981 by officials of WIPO and WIPO consultants from Canada and the Federal Republic of Germany, visited the Philippines for discussions with the Government authorities on international cooperation in the strengthening of industrial property systems. The mission was financed by the UNDP within the framework of a regional project.

Republic of Korea. Preparatory assistance, partly funded by the UNDP, continued in the modernization of the Korean patent office and in the carrying out of searches and examinations. Draft project documents for 1981 and for 1982 to 1984, prepared by WIPO in January 1981, were approved by the Government and submitted to the UNDP.

During an official visit by the Director General to the Republic of Korea in May 1981, further discussions were held on the continuation of the project.

In August 1981, the UNDP approved the financing of a project for cooperation in 1981 for the modernization of the industrial property system. The project began to be implemented in October and November 1981; five officials began training at WIPO, in Germany (Federal Republic of), in Japan and at the EPO; four WIPO

experts, from Japan and from the EPO, began assistance to the Office of Patents Administration of the Republic of Korea in the examination procedures for patents, trademarks and industrial designs.

In addition, three officials of the Republic of Korea began a study tour relating to PCT procedures at WIPO, the EPO and the United States Patent and Trademark Office; this study tour is financed by WIPO and the EPO.

Samoa. A fact-finding mission, carried out in November 1981 by an official of WIPO and a WIPO consultant from Sweden, visited Samoa for discussions with the Government authorities on international cooperation in the strengthening of industrial property systems. The mission was financed by the UNDP within the framework of a regional project.

Singapore. A fact-finding mission, carried out in November and December 1981 by officials of WIPO and WIPO consultants from Canada and the Federal Republic of Germany, visited Singapore for discussions with the Government authorities on international cooperation in the strengthening of industrial property systems. The mission was financed by the UNDP within the framework of a regional project.

Four government officials visited WIPO in December 1981 to study the work of WIPO and legislation and administration in the field of industrial property.

Solomon Islands. A fact-finding mission, carried out in November 1981 by an official of WIPO and a WIPO consultant from Sweden, visited Solomon Islands for discussions with Government authorities on international cooperation in the strengthening of industrial property systems. The mission was financed by the UNDP within the framework of a regional project.

Sri Lanka. In February 1981, the report of the mission undertaken in 1980 by a WIPO consultant from the Philippines, on institutional arrangements for the support of national inventors, was sent to the Government.

A fact-finding mission, carried out in November and December 1981 by an official of WIPO and a WIPO consultant from the United Kingdom, visited Sri Lanka for discussions with the Government authorities on international cooperation in the strengthening of industrial property systems. The mission was financed by the UNDP within the framework of a regional project.

Thailand. In May 1981, the head of the Thai Government department responsible for industrial property visited WIPO to discuss further cooperation in modernizing the industrial property administration and establishing a patent information unit. At the request of the Government, WIPO organized, with the financial assistance and cooperation of the Government of Canada, an expert mission to advise on the establishment of a patent information unit, the use of computer systems for the storage, retrieval and dissemination of patent information and the computerization of trademark opera-

tions. The mission was composed of three officials of the Government of Canada and one official of WIPO; it carried out its work in Bangkok in August 1981. In its report, which was accepted by the Government, the mission recommended specific study tours, seminars and training, and examined the possibilities of building upon the existing documentation, information and computer capacities in Thailand.

In August and September 1981, four Thai officials received training in the industrial property Office of Canada, financed by the Government of Canada.

In October 1981, agreement was reached for the provision of a collection of patent documents of the United States of America by the United Kingdom to Thailand, WIPO contributing to the cost of the transfer.

A fact-finding mission, carried out in November and December 1981 by officials of WIPO and WIPO consultants from Canada and the Federal Republic of Germany, visited Thailand for discussions with the Government authorities on international cooperation in the strengthening of industrial property systems. The mission was financed by the UNDP within the framework of a regional project.

Vanuatu. A fact-finding mission, carried out in November 1981 by an official of WIPO and a WIPO consultant from Sweden, visited Vanuatu for discussions with the Government authorities on international cooperation in the strengthening of industrial property systems. The mission was financed by the UNDP within the framework of a regional project.

Viet Nam. In January 1981, a WIPO official visited Hanoi for discussions with government officials concerning the preparation of a plan for the improvement of the industrial property system. Two officials of the State Committee for Science and Technology began a study tour, organized and financed by WIPO, in November 1981 to WIPO, Austria, France and Switzerland.

In April 1981, Viet Nam confirmed its membership of WIPO, the Paris Union and the Madrid Union (Marks).

Latin America and the Caribbean

Barbados. WIPO continued to carry out a project for the modernization of the industrial property system of Barbados, with the financial assistance of the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA). A study tour to Canada, Sweden and the United Kingdom was organized in April 1981. The new industrial property legislation, which was drafted with the assistance of WIPO, was passed by the legislature in December 1981.

Bolivia. During a WIPO mission in March 1981, discussions took place in order to identify priorities for cooperation in the modernization of the industrial property administration.

Brazil. WIPO continued to carry out the UNDP project for the modernization of the Brazilian patent system, with the assistance, during the period covered by this report, of experts from the industrial property offices of Austria, Australia, Denmark, Germany (Federal Republic of), Israel, Japan, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom, United States of America and the EPO. The final tripartite review of the project was held in November 1981, with participation by the Brazilian Government, UNDP and WIPO; satisfaction was expressed with the completion of the original project, which began in 1973. It was noted that in total 204 patent examiners had been trained, 140 of whom constituted now the patent examining staff of the National Institute of Industrial Property (INPI), that in 1981 50% of the basic patent training had been carried out by Brazilian instructors and that future training courses could be carried out fully by INPI's own staff. Patent appeal training was given in 1981 to 42 technical and seven legal INPI staff. It was further noted that INPI's patent bank contained more than 14 million patent documents, 4.4 million of which are classified according to the International Patent Classification, and that the patent bank was serving to an increasing degree circles outside INPI. In November 1981, proposals for a second phase of the project were submitted by WIPO; the said proposals concern the further development of INPI's services to industrial enterprises and research institutes.

As part of the UNDP project, a *Seminar on the Setting Up of Patent Departments for Industrial Enterprises* was organized in São Paulo in November 1981. About 150 participants, mainly from the top and middle management levels and from research and development departments of Brazilian industrial firms, attended the Seminar. The lecturers were officials of WIPO and of the Brazilian National Institute for Industrial Property (INPI), and managers of industrial firms and associations as well as patent experts from industry and the independent profession in Brazil, France, Germany (Federal Republic of), Japan, the United Kingdom and the United States of America. The subjects discussed were the services of INPI, the organization and functions of patent departments in industry, qualifications of patent specialists and the usefulness of the patent system for industry. Among the written materials available to the participants was an issue of the WIPO Newsletter containing an article summarizing the history of the project.

In March and April 1981, WIPO organized, jointly with INPI, and in association with the *Junta del Acuerdo de Cartagena* (JUNAC), a Seminar in Rio de Janeiro on the Technical Functions of Industrial Property Offices, with participation from the five countries of the Andean Group and from Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Paraguay and Uruguay.

In October 1981, agreement was reached in principle on the continuation of the 1979 cooperation agreement between Brazil and WIPO and on an outline of the

activities to be carried out from 1982 for the benefit of other developing countries.

Chile. At the request of the Government, a mission composed of officials of WIPO and the EPO visited Santiago in September 1981 to assist in the evaluation of the requirements of a modernization of the industrial property administration. The report of the mission was sent to the Government in November 1981.

Colombia. During a WIPO mission in April 1981, discussions took place in order to identify priorities for cooperation in the modernization of the industrial property administration.

Dominica. At the request of the Government, draft new legislation on industrial property was prepared by WIPO and transmitted in May 1981.

Dominican Republic. In the course of a mission undertaken in November 1981, a WIPO official discussed with the competent authorities progress in preparing new industrial property legislation with assistance from WIPO.

Ecuador. During a WIPO mission in April 1981, discussions took place in order to identify priorities for cooperation in the modernization of the industrial property administration.

Grenada. At the request of the Government, draft new legislation on industrial property was prepared by WIPO and transmitted in May 1981.

Honduras. In March 1981, WIPO provided, at the request of the Government, advice on certain questions relating to trademarks.

Panama. The draft of a new industrial property law, requested by the Government, was sent by WIPO in September 1981.

Peru. During a WIPO mission in March 1981, discussions took place in order to identify priorities for cooperation in the modernization of the industrial property administration.

Saint Vincent and the Grenadines. At the request of the Government, draft new legislation on industrial property was prepared by WIPO, transmitted in May 1981 and discussed with a senior government official during a mission, financed by WIPO, to Geneva in December 1981.

Suriname. Following a WIPO mission in February 1981, the Government requested, in April 1981, assistance in the modernization of the intellectual property system, including the preparation of draft legislation. The draft was sent by WIPO in July 1981. In November 1981, two WIPO officials visited Suriname to discuss the draft intellectual property laws and a program for the implementation of those laws after their enactment.

Trinidad and Tobago. During a WIPO mission in June 1981, scheduling of activities was discussed under the project requested by the Government and approved by the UNDP in December 1980. In November 1981, two WIPO officials undertook a mission to discuss further activities under the project.

Uruguay. The report of a WIPO mission in December 1980 and a draft project document for the modernization of industrial property legislation and administration, to be funded by the UNDP, were sent to the Government in February 1981 and discussed during a WIPO mission in April 1981.

Venezuela. Following a WIPO mission in May 1981, the Government requested, in June 1981, assistance in the planning of cooperation in the modernization of the industrial property administration. A mission composed of officials of WIPO, the industrial property office of Spain and the Institute for Iberoamerican Cooperation visited Caracas in September 1981 to provide the said assistance. The report of the mission, with a draft project document for the modernization of the industrial property legislation, was transmitted to the Government in October 1981.

Andean Group. In July 1981, WIPO was represented at a meeting in Lima convened by JUNAC to discuss a project for the establishment of an Andean Technological Information System (SAIT), with components relating to industrial property and patent information.

Caribbean Office of ECLA and CARICOM. Following consultations with the Office for the Caribbean of the Economic Commission for Latin America (ECLA) and the Secretariat of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM), a project was prepared for the strengthening of the industrial property systems, including patent documentation and information services as a contribution to the Caribbean Documentation Centre (CDC), of the English-speaking countries of the Caribbean (Bahamas, Barbados, Dominica, Grenada, Guyana, Jamaica, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Suriname, and Trinidad and Tobago). In September 1980, CIDA had agreed to provide financial assistance. The first phase of the project, carried out in 1980 and the first half of 1981, was the assessment of the situation of the countries concerned in the field of industrial property and patent documentation and information services; all of the said countries were visited between November 1980 and February 1981 by a mission composed of a WIPO official and a representative of CIDA; officials of Barbados, Trinidad and Tobago and ECLA also took part in the mission during visits to different countries.

The second phase of the project consisted of the holding of a seminar on industrial property and related matters for government officials and other interested circles of the said countries, in order to draw conclusions from

the work carried out in the first phase and, possibly, to prepare proposals for future action.

The Seminar was held in Barbados in May 1981. It was organized by WIPO, the Office for the Caribbean of ECLA and the CARICOM Secretariat, with the cooperation and financial assistance of CIDA. The 31 participants were experts delegated by the Governments of the Bahamas, Barbados, Jamaica and Trinidad and Tobago, representatives of the Caribbean Development Bank and of the Caribbean Industrial Research Institute and a number of persons from industrial and commercial enterprises and from the legal profession.

The participants adopted recommendations concerning the modernization of industrial property laws and administration at the national level, cooperation at the regional level and assistance from the sponsoring organizations, including the holding of further seminars.

At the request of the Office for the Caribbean of ECLA, proposals were sent in October 1981 for a project to establish a patent documentation and information unit in the Caribbean Documentation Centre. The said proposals, and the recommendations adopted at the Barbados Industrial Property Seminar, were discussed at a meeting, at which WIPO was represented, of the Caribbean Development Cooperation Committee in Grenada in November 1981.

United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America (ECLA). Discussions were held at the headquarters of ECLA in Santiago in September 1981 between an official of WIPO and officials of ECLA on proposals for a joint study on industrial property and technological development in the region, within the context of the Programme of Action adopted by the United Nations Conference on Science and Technology for Development.

Central American Countries. After a series of WIPO missions to Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua and Panama, undertaken in the context of the survey of industrial property in Latin America, meetings of their Permanent Representatives in Geneva were held at WIPO headquarters in February, April and June 1981 to establish a program of action for cooperation in the modernization and harmonization of the industrial property systems of the said countries. In June 1981, a questionnaire was sent to governments to obtain information for the preparation of a Central American sub-regional program, to be submitted to meetings of heads of industrial property offices and of competent Vice-Ministers.

A WIPO official undertook missions in October and November 1981 to the six countries concerned to assist in the preparation of the said meeting.

The said meetings were held on the joint invitation of the Government of Honduras and WIPO, in Tegucigalpa in December 1981. The two meetings were at-

tended by officials and by Vice-Ministers responsible for industrial property in Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua and Panama. The Dominican Republic was also represented, on special invitation. The UNDP, the Organization of American States (OAS) and the Permanent Secretariat of the Central American Economic Integration Treaty (SIECA) were represented by observers.

After a full discussion, in which there was an exchange of information and experience concerning the industrial property situation in the countries of the region, the meeting of officials approved the draft program prepared by WIPO and adopted a report containing recommendations concerning the implementation of the said program. The meeting of Vice-Ministers endorsed the report of the officials' meeting, urged the countries not yet members of WIPO to become members and formally requested WIPO to assist in the modernization and harmonization of national legislation on patents, trademarks and control of transfer of technology, with a view to revising the Central American Convention on Marks and to preparing a uniform codification of industrial property legislation.

Latin American Economic System (SELA). In March 1981, the Council of SELA decided to invite WIPO regularly to its meetings as an observer. In May 1981, a WIPO official visited the headquarters of SELA in Caracas for discussions on practical measures of cooperation. In September 1981, WIPO was represented at a meeting in Rio de Janeiro of the Action Committee of SELA for the establishment of the Latin American Technological Information Network (RITLA). Also in September 1981, an official of WIPO undertook a mission to Caracas for discussions with officials of SELA on possible cooperation in the field of industrial property. WIPO attended a meeting of the Council of RITLA, established within SELA, in Rio de Janeiro in May 1981; in December 1981, a WIPO official visited the RITLA Secretariat, at their request, for advice on the industrial property aspects for inclusion in their project for technical assistance to be submitted to the United Nations Interim Fund for Science and Technology for Development (UNCSTD).

Western Asia

United Arab Emirates. In April 1981, draft laws on patents, trademarks and industrial designs, prepared by WIPO, were transmitted to the Government.

Yemen. A WIPO official undertook a mission to Sanaa in May 1981 to discuss assistance in the preparation of a patent law and regulations under the trademark law. At the request of the Government, WIPO prepared and sent, in August 1981, draft regulations and forms under the trademark law.

Federation of Arab Scientific Research Councils (FASRC). A project document for preparatory assistance for the creation of a patent information and documentation unit within the Arab Center for Scientific and Technological Documentation of FASRC was sent to FASRC in March and to the UNDP in April 1981. An intersecretariat meeting between WIPO and FASRC took place in Geneva in September 1981 to prepare for the implementation of the said project. In October 1981, the UNDP approved preparatory assistance, to be carried out by WIPO, for the establishment of the said unit within the Arab Center for Scientific and Technological Documentation of FASRC. WIPO was represented at a meeting of the Council of FASRC in Tangier in October 1981, at which additional resources for the establishment of the said unit were approved and funds were allocated for the translation into Arabic of the International Patent Classification. In November 1981, a senior official of FASRC, in charge of the patent information and documentation unit, undertook a period of training at WIPO, the EPO and the Swiss Intellectual Property Office.

Inventors, Industry and Commerce

WIPO medals for inventors were awarded at exhibitions and competitions held in India in March 1981, in the Philippines in April 1981 and in Geneva in November 1981.

In accordance with recommendations of the WIPO Permanent Committee for Development Cooperation Related to Industrial Property, a *Working Group on the Establishment of a Guide on the Organization of Industrial Property Activities of Enterprises in Developing Countries* was convened in Geneva in March 1981.

Experts designated by the following States participated in the Working Group: Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Egypt, France, Germany (Federal Republic of), Madagascar, Mexico, Netherlands, Republic of Korea, Soviet Union, United Kingdom, United States of America, Venezuela. An observer from Zaire also participated. Five international non-governmental organizations were represented by observers.

Discussions were based on a draft of the proposed Guide, prepared by WIPO, on a questionnaire and the replies thereto received from governments, and on supplementary documentation and information, supplied by several of the experts, concerning the role and functioning of industrial property departments of enterprises, the treatment of inventions made by employees, the regulation of license and technology transfer contracts, and other relevant topics. The experts underlined the usefulness and importance of the Guide, expressed their general agreement with the contents of the draft and made suggestions as to how it could be improved. They recommended that a revised version of the draft Guide be prepared by WIPO on the basis of their sug-

gestions and, if considered necessary, be submitted to a second session of the Working Group. They recommended also that follow-up measures should be undertaken in order to ensure that the principles contained in the Guide are put into practice in developing countries. In particular, a wide distribution of the Guide should be assured, an appropriate follow-up program and evaluation should be organized and a training program to assist in the development of industrial property departments in enterprises in developing countries should be established.

WIPO assisted the Yugoslav Association of Innovators and Authors of Technological Improvements (SPATUJ) in organizing in *Belgrade* in November 1981 an *International Conference on Inventive Activity as a Factor for Development of Technology in the Developing Countries*. The Director General, who was the guest of the Government of Yugoslavia during his stay, made a statement at the opening ceremony in the presence of some 350 participants from Yugoslavia (including several ministers) and from 50 other developing countries. An exhibition of inventions was organized at the time of the Conference by the Yugoslav Association, and a commemorative stamp was issued containing the emblems of WIPO and the Association.

About 200 participants attended regularly the working sessions of the Conference. Statements and national reports were made by participants from the following 13 countries: Bangladesh, China, Egypt, India, Iraq, Mexico, Philippines, Romania, Sudan, Tanzania, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Yugoslavia. A representative of the International Federation of Inventors' Associations (IFIA) also made a statement. WIPO contributed to the travel expenses of some of the experts and delegates.

The discussions in the working sessions were based on two main documents, prepared by WIPO and by the Yugoslav Association. At the conclusion of the Conference, a final document was adopted in which the participants noted, among other things, positive developments in international cooperation through WIPO in the revision of the Paris Convention, access to technological information contained in patent documents, and publicity measures or other similar incentives (particularly prizes) to encourage inventive activity in developing countries.

Acquisition of Technology; Licensing

In June 1981, WIPO and the Algerian industrial property office organized in *Algiers* a national *Seminar on Licensing and Technology Transfer Agreements in the Field of Industrial Property*. Lectures, leading to extensive questions and discussions, were given by a WIPO official and by two experts on licensing from France and Switzerland. The 130 participants came from government departments, including the industrial property office, and state enterprises.

Development of the Industrial Property Profession and Teaching in Universities

At the invitation of the China Council for the Promotion of International Trade, WIPO organized a two-week *Patent Agency Course* in Beijing in February and March 1981. The purpose of the Course was to contribute to the professional training of the staff of the China Council for the Promotion of International Trade and the staff of other Chinese agencies and institutions which, by reason of their responsibilities in relation to research, development and industrial production, are potential users of the future Chinese patent system.

One hundred and twenty Chinese officials participated in the Course. Twenty lectures were given by the Director General and two other officials and a consultant of WIPO, and by three experts invited by WIPO from the private sector from Western countries. The texts of the lectures, as well as a glossary of the terms of the law of patents, were translated into Chinese and distributed to the participants in advance. Each lecture was followed by a discussion between the lecturer and his audience.

The final texts of the lectures given in the course were published by WIPO in May 1981.

A *Round Table of University Professors on Teaching and Research in Intellectual Property Law* was organized by WIPO in Geneva in July 1981. Sixty-eight professors specializing in intellectual property law from universities in the following 30 countries took part (the number from each country is shown in brackets): Argentina (2), Barbados (1), Belgium (3), Brazil (4), Canada (1), China (2), Colombia (1), Finland (2), France (6), Germany (Federal Republic of) (4), Greece (1), Hungary (1), India (1), Israel (1), Italy (3), Japan (1), Mexico (2), Netherlands (1), Nigeria (1), Peru (1), Philippines (1), Poland (4), Soviet Union (1), Spain (3), Sweden (2), Switzerland (5), Tunisia (1), United Kingdom (4), United States of America (5), Yugoslavia (3).

The Round Table was the follow-up of an earlier such meeting, organized by WIPO in October 1979, at which university professors in the field of industrial property law had a first exchange of views on the role that teaching and research have in that field, and on how international contacts between university professors could contribute to improving and facilitating teaching and research. At the 1981 Round Table, the following topics were discussed, on the basis of papers prepared by participants: the present status of teaching and research in the law of intellectual property, the purposes and methods of teaching and research in intellectual property and their relationship with the objectives of its protection, the influence of teaching and research in intellectual property on the growth of the law of intellectual property and its role in economic, scientific, cultural and social development, the scope and content of courses and whether the courses should be separate, teaching in institutions other than universities, cooperation among

universities, between universities and international organizations and between universities and professional associations, the special problems of teaching and research in developing countries, the protection of the results of research by professors or at universities, orientation programs for teaching and research and an exchange of information on visiting professorships. Each topic was introduced by a discussion leader, who chaired the subsequent discussions.

On the occasion of the Round Table referred to above, the *International Association for the Advancement of Teaching and Research in Intellectual Property (ATRIP)* was created. Sixty-nine professors and researchers signed the Constitution of ATRIP and became its founding members; in addition, 67 professors who were invited but unable to attend sent their best wishes for the success of the new Association. This support came from many of the countries listed above and also from Algeria, Australia, Austria, Cameroon, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, the German Democratic Republic, Romania and Thailand. The Assembly of ATRIP, at its first session, held at WIPO headquarters, elected its President (from the Federal Republic of Germany), its President-Elect (from Argentina), four Vice-Presidents (from India, Poland, the United Kingdom and the United States of America) and its Treasurer (from France). These officers also form the Executive Committee of the Association.

Development, in Developing Countries, of Access to the Technological Information Contained in Patent Documents

State-of-the-Art Search Program. Since 1975, WIPO has been operating a program to provide institutions and individuals in developing countries with free-of-charge state-of-the-art search reports under agreements concluded between contributing industrial property offices in developed countries and the International Bureau of WIPO. The program has increased both in the scope of services offered and in the contributions made, in response to increasing numbers of requests from developing countries.

During 1981, 342 search requests were submitted by 36 countries (Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Brazil, Cameroon, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guatemala, Ivory Coast, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Mauritania, Mexico, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Singapore, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam).

Thirteen of the said requests were submitted through the Industrial Inquiry Services of UNIDO under an agreement of cooperation concluded in 1979 between the Austrian authorities, WIPO and UNIDO. In the same period, 196 search reports were delivered to devel-

oping countries, most of them prepared by the Austrian (116), the Swedish (39), the European (17) and the Finnish (15) Offices.

Under an agreement with WIPO signed in February 1980, the USSR State Committee for Inventions and Discoveries also joined the program. The contribution of the Soviet Union is specially intended to assist the examination of patent applications for inventions made in developing countries as to novelty and inventive step; nine examination reports were delivered during the period covered by this report.

The Swiss Intellectual Property Office contributed to the program by furnishing free of charge copies of patent documents. During the period covered by this report, copies of more than 700 patent documents were furnished by that Office.

The Australian Patent Office agreed in July 1981 to join the program and to prepare during 1982, on an experimental basis, 12 to 15 reports for developing countries mainly of the Asian and Pacific Region.

The Finnish Patent and Registration Office informed the International Bureau, in September 1981, that an additional grant provided by the Finnish Ministry of Foreign Affairs for the benefit of the program would allow 20 to 25 additional searches to be performed in 1981.

The National Industrial Property Office of France offered, in September 1981, to contribute to the program by providing copies of patent documents, legal status information and arrangements for access to certain data bases containing bibliographic information.

In November 1981, the Federal Republic of Germany signed an agreement with WIPO for the preparation and delivery of up to 100 search reports a year.

In November 1981, the German Democratic Republic signed an agreement with WIPO for the provision of up to 60 search reports a year.

In May 1981, a new circular was sent to governments of and institutions in developing countries drawing attention to the program.

An analysis of over 200 search requests processed and reports furnished showed that over 80% of requests were made for the purpose of determining the state of the art for the solution of given problems, as an input to research and development activities.

From the start of the program, in 1975, to the end of 1981, the cumulative situation is as follows: a total of 1,317 search requests has been received from 57 countries and four international organizations. During the same period, 1,029 search reports have been furnished to 57 developing countries (Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Cameroon, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Senegal,

Singapore, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Syria, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zaire) and to four international organizations (ECA, former IDCAS, OAPI, UNIDO). Seven hundred and ninety-three of the search reports were provided by Austria, 104 by Sweden, 38 by the EPO, 35 by the Federal Republic of Germany, 25 by Finland, nine by the Soviet Union and three by the United Kingdom. In 22 cases the International Bureau was able to provide search reports itself. Seventy requests were withdrawn, while for 15 search requests additional information is awaited from the requestor. Two hundred and three requests are pending in the procedure. This very high number is mainly due to a steep increase in requests during the last two months of 1981.

The November 1981 issue of the WIPO Newsletter contained an article describing and summarizing the progress of the search program.

WIPO continued to organize and participate in national and regional *Training Seminars* on patent information. In January 1981, WIPO, in cooperation with the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP) and the Swedish International Development Authority (SIDA), organized two national seminars on patent information in *Bangkok* and in *Chiangmai* (Thailand), attended by 52 and 17 participants, respectively. Also in January 1981, a WIPO official gave lectures in a seminar on the role of patent information in the transfer of technology organized in *Manila* by the Philippines Patent Office with the Intellectual Property Association of the Philippines.

At the invitation of the Chinese Patent Office, WIPO organized in *Beijing* a one-week *Seminar on Patent Documentation* in October 1981. The purpose of the Seminar was to contribute to the professional training of the staff of the Patent Office by surveying existing systems of patent documentation in other patent offices and in organizations and enterprises. About one hundred Chinese officials participated in the Seminar; lectures were given by officials of WIPO, of the patent offices of Germany (Federal Republic of), Japan and the United States of America, and of the EPO, and by representatives of the International Patent Documentation Center (INPADOC), the Japan Patent Information Center (JAPATIC), Derwent Publications Ltd. and Pergamon International Information Corporation; the lectures were issued as a publication immediately before the Seminar. Following the Seminar, the WIPO official who had participated in it held detailed discussions, lasting for a week, with a group of Chinese officials on the setting up of the patent documentation and information system, including the organization of classified files, of the Chinese Patent Office.

Users' Guides to the IPC. In cooperation with UNIDO and the EPO, *Users' Guides to the IPC* were prepared for agro-industries and for agricultural machinery and implements. Two other Guides already pre-

pared (iron and steel, fertilizers) were revised and adapted to the third edition of the IPC.

Patent Document Collections. WIPO continued its activity of arranging, and seeking to arrange, for collections of patent documents and related material to be made available and to be received by developing countries requesting them. Documents were given by Austria, Bulgaria, the Soviet Union, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom and the United States of America. Among the recipients were the industrial property offices of China, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Thailand and Yugoslavia.

The *PCPI Working Group on Patent Information for Developing Countries* held its third session in Geneva in September 1981. Twenty-one States and one intergovernmental organization, members of the Working Group, were represented; one intergovernmental organization and two other organizations were represented by observers.

The Working Group noted with appreciation the contributions made, and offered for the future, to the WIPO State-of-the-Art Search Program (see, under "Development, in Developing Countries, of Access to the Technological Information Contained in Patent Documents," above) by many industrial property offices, and endorsed the intention of WIPO to improve the existing evaluation questionnaires and to extend their application. Noting that sufficient detailed work in identifying users of patent information and their needs had now been carried out by the Australian, Brazilian and Canadian Offices and by OAPI, the Working Group requested WIPO to prepare a summary of that work so as to permit detailed conclusions to be drawn at its next session. It decided that the four Users' Guides to the IPC, prepared in cooperation with UNIDO and the EPO, revised in accordance with recommendations made at its last session and published by UNIDO, should be regarded as test guides, and that the reactions of readers in developing countries should be taken into account if further guides were to be established. Two draft curricula for patent information training courses were, after modification, agreed and recommended to the PCPI. The Working Group requested WIPO to prepare the first draft of an IPC manual for developing countries, and to conduct a test study leading to the identification of key patent documents in two technical fields of importance to developing countries (new and renewable sources of energy, food production and storage). The Working Group also requested the updating of a list of technical periodicals available to developing countries free of charge or on favorable conditions, recommended to the PCPI the tasks to be assigned to it in 1982 and 1983, and considered that cooperation with UNIDO should continue at the Secretariat level, particularly in relation to Users' Guides to the IPC, the IPC manual for developing countries and the state-of-the-art search program.

WIPO Permanent Committee for Development Cooperation Related to Industrial Property

The Permanent Committee consists of all States members of WIPO which have informed the Director General of their desire to be members. On December 31, 1981, the members were Algeria, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Benin, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Egypt, El Salvador, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany (Federal Republic of), Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Libya, Malawi, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, Niger, Norway, Pakistan, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Senegal, Soviet Union, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United States of America, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia (69).

No session of the Permanent Committee was held in the period covered by this report. The next (eighth) session will be held in 1982.

B. Copyright and Neighboring Rights Activities

Objective

The objective is to be useful to developing countries in five different respects:

- (i) training specialists;
- (ii) creating or modernizing domestic legislation;
- (iii) establishing or developing appropriate infrastructure;
- (iv) stimulating creative activity;
- (v) facilitating access to foreign works protected by copyright owned by foreigners.

Activities

Development, in Developing Countries, of General Awareness and Knowledge of the Law and the Practical Implications of Copyright and Neighboring Rights (Training)

In 1981, WIPO received 70 applications for training in the fields of copyright and neighboring rights from 37 developing countries, from UNRWA and from the African National Congress (ANC). Thirty-seven of these applications, from the following 26 developing countries, from UNRWA and from ANC, were accepted: Algeria, Barbados, Bolivia, Burundi, Central African Republic, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Guinea, India, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mexico, Philippines, Rwanda, Somalia,

Tanzania, Thailand, Togo, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Zambia.

In 1981 the training program took the following forms:

(a) for 10 trainees, a practical course in copyright administration, in *Zurich* in May 1981, organized by WIPO in collaboration with the Swiss Society for Authors' Rights in Musical Works (SUISA); the participants came from Algeria, Burundi, the Congo, Guinea, Madagascar, Mali, Mexico, Togo, Upper Volta, and Uruguay. The lectures were given by officials of SUISA. This course was followed by a visit to WIPO headquarters and, for some of the trainees, practical training in the copyright offices of Algeria and Senegal;

(b) for six trainees, a specialized training course in the administration of copyright and neighboring rights, in *Zurich* in June 1981, organized by WIPO in collaboration with SUISA; the participants came from India, the Philippines, Thailand, Zambia and the ANC. The lectures were given by officials of SUISA, WIPO and the Federal Office of Intellectual Property of Switzerland, by the Director General of the Hungarian Bureau for the Protection of Authors' Rights (ARTISJUS) and by representatives of two international and two national non-governmental organizations. This course was followed by a visit to WIPO headquarters;

(c) for 12 trainees, a General Introductory Course on Copyright and Neighboring Rights, in *London* in September and October 1981, organized by WIPO in co-operation with the Industrial Property and Copyright Department of the Department of Trade (UK Government), the British Copyright Council (BCC) and the International Federation of Producers of Phonograms and Videograms (IFPI); the participants were nominated by the Governments of Barbados, Bolivia, China, India, Liberia, Malawi, Mexico, Somalia, Tanzania and Zambia and by the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA). The lectures were given by officials of the United Kingdom Government, of WIPO, of the IFPI, of the BCC and of the International Federation of Musicians (FIM), by invited lecturers from Germany (Federal Republic of), Hungary, India and Sweden, and by United Kingdom specialists representing publishers, authors, performers, producers of phonograms and broadcasting organizations. The course was followed by practical training in authors' organizations in Germany (Federal Republic of), Hungary, the Netherlands or Switzerland and by a visit to WIPO. The United Kingdom Government, the BCC, the IFPI and the authors' organizations referred to above contributed in part to the costs of travel and subsistence of the trainees; the remainder of the cost was borne by WIPO;

(d) for nine trainees, practical training in copyright and neighboring rights in one of the following countries: Argentina, Austria, Belgium, France, German Democratic Republic, Italy, Mexico.

The following 11 countries and three organizations contributed in full or in part to the cost of travel and

subsistence of trainees: Algeria, Austria, Belgium, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany (Federal Republic of), Hungary, Italy, Mexico, Netherlands, United Kingdom, BCC, IFPI, SUISA.

The remainder of the cost was borne by the budget of the WIPO Legal and Technical Assistance Program.

For a general analysis of the applications for training accepted in 1981, see the section of this report, above, on training in the field of industrial property.

Seminars

A WIPO official gave lectures at a *national seminar on copyright and neighboring rights* organized by the National Copyright Council of *Brazil* (Ministry of Education and Culture) in Rio de Janeiro in April 1981.

The second *Continental Conference on Copyright* was organized by the Inter-American Copyright Institute (IIDA) jointly with WIPO and the Argentinian Center of IIDA, under the auspices of the Government of Argentina, in *Buenos Aires* in April 1981. The first such Conference had been held in São Paulo in 1977.

About 100 persons from Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Paraguay, Uruguay and Venezuela, including experts invited by and at the expense of WIPO, took part in the Conference; the discussions concerned, among other questions, illegal copying, plagiarism, unauthorized public performance, legal remedies and unfair competition; a number of detailed recommendations, prepared by working groups, formed the conclusions of the Conference.

A *Regional Seminar on Copyright for English-Speaking Caribbean States* was convened by WIPO and Unesco at *Kingston* in October 1981, at the invitation and with the close cooperation of the Government of Jamaica. Nine experts, invited as suggested by their Governments, attended the Seminar from the following countries: Barbados, Belize, Dominica, Eastern Caribbean Group (St. Kitts), Guyana, Jamaica, Saint Lucia, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago. Twenty observers participated, from two States, one intergovernmental organization and five international non-governmental organizations. The Seminar, the first such meeting on copyright questions in the Region, was inaugurated by the Minister of Education of the Government of Jamaica; all the participants took an active part in the debates, which were conducted at a particularly high level and were widely covered by the press and by television.

The discussions were based on papers presented by WIPO, Unesco, the Caribbean Community Secretariat (CARICOM) and the International Confederation of Societies of Authors and Composers (CISAC), a statement by the IFPI and country reports presented by each of the experts.

The experts adopted a number of recommendations concerning the need for appropriate and up-to-date national copyright and neighboring rights legislation,

taking into account the development of new technologies, the study of the protection of expressions of folklore, adherence to the international copyright conventions, national and regional infrastructures, measures to counter acts of piracy, informing the public on the role of copyright, legal-technical assistance, including training, and the Joint International Unesco-WIPO Service for Access by Developing Countries to Works Protected by Copyright.

In November 1981, WIPO organized at Conakry, in cooperation with the Government of Guinea, a *Training Course on Copyright and Neighboring Rights*. The participants (about 100) were members of the staff of the Copyright Office of Guinea and national authors, composers, professors, lawyers and other persons invited by the said Office from Conakry and other parts of the country. Three Ministers of the Government took part in the opening session. Lectures were given by officials of WIPO, copyright experts invited, at the expense of WIPO, from the Ivory Coast, Mali and Senegal and a representative of SUIISA, which contributed also to the financing. The course was given full radio and television coverage. The representative of the Director General of WIPO and the invited experts were received by the President of the Republic.

Legislation

WIPO continued to cooperate, on request, with governments or groups of governments of developing countries on the adoption of new laws and regulations, or the modernization of existing ones, in the fields of copyright and neighboring rights. In the period covered by this report, such cooperation was pursued with the following countries:

Barbados. Comments on a new draft copyright law were provided by WIPO in April 1981. The new law was passed by the legislature in December 1981.

Burundi. A revised text of a draft decree on which the Government had requested the comments of WIPO, was handed over by the International Bureau to representatives of the Government of Burundi in Gisenyi, in March 1981 on the occasion of the seminar of the countries of the "Grands Lacs" on the harmonization of their copyright legislation (see below). The draft decree, and its annex, concern copyright and neighboring rights.

Chile. Comments on a draft decree on the revision of the copyright law were submitted by WIPO to the Government in February 1981.

Costa Rica. A new law on copyright and neighboring rights, taking into consideration comments submitted by WIPO, was approved by Parliament in July 1981.

Dominica. At the request of the Government, WIPO prepared, and transmitted in June 1981, draft legislation on copyright and neighboring rights.

Grenada. At the request of the Government, WIPO prepared, and transmitted in June 1981, draft legislation on copyright and neighboring rights. Discussions on the draft took place during a WIPO mission in November 1981.

Jamaica. In April 1981, the Government requested the comments of WIPO with regard to the planned revision of the existing copyright legislation. The comments were sent by WIPO in July 1981.

Saint Vincent and the Grenadines. At the request of the Government, WIPO prepared, and transmitted in June 1981, draft legislation on copyright and neighboring rights. A senior government official discussed the draft in Geneva in December 1981, and requested the preparation of a program of activities for the modernization of the copyright system.

Suriname. At the request of the Government, WIPO prepared, and transmitted in September 1981, draft legislation on copyright and neighboring rights. The draft was discussed during a mission by a WIPO official in November 1981.

Yemen. A WIPO official undertook a mission to Sanaa in May 1981 to discuss assistance in the preparation of legislation on copyright and neighboring rights.

Economic Community of the Countries of the "Grands Lacs" (CEPGL). In March 1981, WIPO organized jointly with the Secretariat of the CEPGL a *Seminar in Gisenyi (Rwanda)* on harmonization of policies and coordination of legislation relating to copyright and neighboring rights in the member countries of the Community (Burundi, Rwanda, Zaire). Nine experts nominated by the Governments, seven members of the CEPGL Secretariat and two WIPO officials participated. The participation of two experts from each country concerned was financed by WIPO. The Seminar examined existing legislation and draft laws in the member countries, and the relationship between them and international conventions in this field; harmonization of draft texts was achieved in respect of seven major aspects of the law of copyright and neighboring rights and in respect of three major aspects of the statutes of organizations for the administration of rights; finally the Seminar adopted recommendations to the Governments concerning the enactment of the harmonized texts, accessions to relevant conventions and the establishment in the Secretariat of the CEPGL of a service responsible for copyright and neighboring rights.

Development, in Developing Countries, of Easier Access to Works Protected by Copyright Owned by Foreigners

The *Joint Unesco/WIPO Consultative Committee on the Access by Developing Countries to Works Protected by Copyright* held its first session in Paris in September

1981. The 12 members of the Committee, appointed in a personal capacity by the Directors General of Unesco and WIPO, are leading figures in the fields of publishing, education and copyright and neighboring rights from Algeria, Argentina, China, Egypt, France, India, Mexico, Nigeria, Senegal, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, and the United States of America. Eleven members attended the first session, with observers from 18 States, four intergovernmental organizations and eight international non-governmental organizations.

The purpose of the meeting was to make recommendations on the preparation and implementation of the activities of the Joint International Unesco-WIPO Service for Access by Developing Countries to Works Protected by Copyright.

A general discussion brought out the importance to the developing countries of access to works protected by copyright and the need for arrangements whereby those countries could use foreign intellectual works on preferential terms. With reference to the 1971 revisions of the Berne Convention and the Universal Copyright Convention concerning compulsory licenses for translation and reproduction, it was noted that the compulsory licensing system had not been used, a fact which demonstrated that copyright as such did not constitute an impediment to the circulation of works of the mind: the role of the Joint Service was further to facilitate access by developing countries to protected works, and the long-term goal was to establish, in the developing countries, viable graphic industries by enabling them to produce locally such works as they required, rather than importing them.

After consideration of a plan of action for 1981 and 1982, prepared by the Secretariats, the Committee made recommendations and requests concerning the collection and dissemination of data, the establishment of recommended standards, a study of arrangements and machinery designed to operate in realistic economic conditions (including an illustrative schedule of scales of fees and royalties), procedures for settling disputes between users of works in developing countries and foreign copyright owners, and intellectual, technical and financial assistance to developing countries.

The *WIPO Permanent Committee for Development Cooperation Related to Copyright and Neighboring Rights* consists of all States members of WIPO which have informed the Director General of their desire to be members. In July and October 1981, respectively, the Philippines and Belgium became members of the Permanent Committee, bringing the membership to 53 States (Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, Congo, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Egypt, El Salvador, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany (Federal Republic of), Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, India, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Kenya, Malawi, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Niger, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Po-

land, Portugal, Romania, Senegal, Soviet Union, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Togo, United Kingdom, United States of America, Upper Volta, Yemen).

The Permanent Committee held its fourth session in Geneva in March 1981. Thirty-nine States, members of the Permanent Committee, were represented; 18 other States, six intergovernmental organizations and 13 international non-governmental organizations were represented by observers.

As provided in the approved budget of WIPO, travel and subsistence expenses were paid by WIPO for one delegate from each of the countries represented at the session which are members of the Permanent Committee and are regarded as being among the least developed of the developing countries.

The Permanent Committee reviewed past and current activities and plans for future activities under the Permanent Program for Development Cooperation Related to Copyright and Neighboring Rights.

In a discussion on adherence to the international *conventions on copyright and neighboring rights*, a number of delegations indicated the possibility of adherence by their countries to particular conventions. It was suggested that WIPO might consider publishing a Guide to the Madrid Multilateral Convention for the Avoidance of Double Taxation of Copyright Royalties, in order to facilitate a better understanding of its significance and to promote adherence.

The Permanent Committee noted with satisfaction reports on activities concerning *regional and national meetings and seminars*, and on plans for 1981.

In its review of activities concerning *training*, the Permanent Committee expressed its thanks to the countries and organizations which had received WIPO trainees in 1979 and 1980, and noted that general introductory training courses were proposed to be organized in 1981 in London, with the Government of the United Kingdom, the BCC and the IFPI, in 1982 in Budapest, with the Government of Hungary and ARTISJUS and in 1983 with the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Foundation for International Development (DSE), and specialized courses in 1981 and, perhaps, 1982 in Zurich, with SUISA, and in 1982 in Stockholm, with the Government of Sweden and SIDA.

Several delegations expressed satisfaction with the advice and assistance provided by WIPO in *legislation, institutions and related matters*. Concerning model statutes for authors' organizations it was suggested that a regional meeting be organized in Africa on questions related to the adaptation of the model statutes for institutions administering authors' rights in developing countries, as adopted at a meeting in June 1980, to the needs of these countries, that assistance should be given also to existing authors' societies in overcoming the difficulties faced by them, and that the legal basis of the establishment of public institutions to administer the

rights of national authors might also be further clarified.

The Permanent Committee discussed the results of the second meeting of the Working Group on the Intellectual Property Aspects of *Folklore* Protection, on the basis of information on the most important features of the Model Provisions for National Laws on the Protection of Expressions of Folklore adopted by the Working Group. The importance was stressed of dealing also with aspects of the assignment of fees, with special regard to possible claims to ownership, and continuing the efforts to provide international protection of expressions of folklore.

The Permanent Committee also reviewed activities and plans concerning the *support of national authors and performers, a survey on the application and administration of laws on copyright and neighboring rights, and cooperation among developing countries*. At the conclusion of a discussion of proposals for *new activities* within the framework of the Permanent Program, a study of the problems of home taping and private copying of recordings and private recordings of broadcasts was strongly recommended, as well as the convocation by WIPO of a worldwide meeting for the purpose, and the wish was expressed that the problems posed by reprography of works protected by copyright might also be taken up for study in the future program of WIPO.

IV. Cooperation with States and the United Nations, Management and Supporting Activities

Missions and Visits to WIPO

In 1981, the Director General undertook missions to Argentina, Austria, Canada, China, Egypt, France, Germany (Federal Republic of), Hungary, Italy, Kenya, the Republic of Korea, the Soviet Union, Thailand, the United Kingdom, the United States of America and Yugoslavia. The missions to Egypt, Hungary, the Republic of Korea and Yugoslavia were formal "official visits," the Director General being the guest of the Government and received by the Head of State and/or by several Government Ministers.

Missions were undertaken by Deputy Directors General to Austria, Barbados, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Congo, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany (Federal Republic of), Honduras, Hungary, India, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Luxembourg, Morocco, the Netherlands, Philippines, Poland, Republic of Korea, the Soviet Union, Spain, Sweden, the United Kingdom, Venezuela and Viet Nam.

In addition to the missions referred to above, the same and the following other countries were visited by other officials or by consultants of WIPO: Algeria, Aus-

tralia, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Benin, Bolivia, Burma, Cameroon, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, France, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Indonesia, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Malaysia, Maldives, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe.

During the period covered by this report, officials of the following governments worked with WIPO officials at the International Bureau for several days or weeks: Belgium, Bulgaria, China, Germany (Federal Republic of), India, Malaysia, Netherlands, Pakistan, Republic of Korea, Singapore, Soviet Union. In most cases, the purpose of their stay at WIPO was to familiarize themselves with the work of WIPO in general or on particular questions. The list does not include officials visiting WIPO for very short periods, for specific negotiations or discussions, e.g., on draft legislation, or only in the context of the training programs.

Cooperation

United Nations. The Director General and other officials of WIPO participated in the work of a number of intersecretariat bodies of the United Nations system established for the purpose of facilitating coordination of the policies and activities of the organizations of the system. These bodies included the Administrative Committee on Coordination (ACC), composed of the executive heads of all the organizations and programs of the system under the chairmanship of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, which met in Geneva in April and June and in New York in October 1981, its Organizational Committee, its Consultative Committees on Substantive Questions (Programme) and (Operations) (CCSQ (Prog) and CCSQ (Ops)) and on Administrative Questions (CCAQ), and other subsidiary bodies of the ACC, working groups and interagency meetings convened to deal with various matters of common interest, including procurement of goods and services, periodicals, fellowships, consumer protection, peaceful uses of outer space, environmental law, public information, science and technology, and preparations for the UN Conferences on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, on the Least Developed among the Developing Countries and on Assistance to African Refugees. WIPO participated in the work of the UN Joint Staff Pension Board, and in an International Civil Service Commission Workshop on Classification in New York

in January 1981. In July 1981, a meeting of CCSQ(Ops) was held at WIPO in Geneva.

WIPO was represented at various meetings of United Nations bodies at which questions of direct interest to WIPO were discussed, including the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly, held from September to December 1981 in New York, and the session of the Economic and Social Council held in July 1981 in Geneva. Other United Nations meetings attended by WIPO included a "Synthesis Group" convened in New York in February 1981 for the Preparatory Committee for the UN Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, the Conference on Assistance to African Refugees held in Geneva in April 1981, a ceremony on the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination held in Geneva in March 1981, and preparatory meetings for the UN Conference on the Least Developed among the Developing Countries (review meetings in Vienna in March, in The Hague in May and in Geneva in June 1981, and the Preparatory Committee for the Conference in Geneva in June 1981), the United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, held in Geneva in August 1981, and the UN Conference on the Least Developed among the Developing Countries held in Paris in September 1981. The Director General addressed the latter Conference in plenary session. WIPO attended a session of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ), a subsidiary body of the General Assembly, in New York in September 1981.

WIPO contributed to the UN Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy by providing monographic surveys on the state of the art, as reflected in patent documents, in the fields of Wind Motors (prepared by the EPO), Ocean Kinetics and Geothermal Energy (prepared by the US Patent and Trademark Office).

WIPO was also represented at a session of the UN Conference on the International Code of Conduct on the Transfer of Technology, convened by the UN Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) in Geneva in March and April 1981, at sessions of the Trade and Development Board of UNCTAD in Geneva in March, September, October and November 1981, at a Working Party on UNCTAD's future programme budget and medium-term plan in Geneva in May 1981, and at a Working Group on the Medium-Term Plan of UNCTAD in October 1981.

WIPO was represented at sessions of the Permanent Committee and the Industrial Development Board of UNIDO in Vienna in May 1981. One of the documents presented to the Permanent Committee by the UNIDO Secretariat contained proposals for the medium-term plan of activities of UNIDO for the period 1984-1989. Under the heading "Industrial Studies and Research," the document listed "Units with which significant joint activities are expected," including "WIPO in respect of the legal and commercial aspects of technology transfer and acquisition, information on patents, and the revi-

sion of the Paris Convention." The Director General requested clarification of this proposal and consultations on it before the proposals for UNIDO's medium-term plan are revised for submission in 1982 to the Committee for Programme and Coordination (a subsidiary body of the United Nations General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council).

WIPO was represented at the following meetings of the UN Development Programme (UNDP): Intergovernmental Meeting of Aid Coordinators in Asia and the Pacific in New Delhi in February and March 1981; Inter-Agency Meetings on the African and on the Latin American Regional Programmes in Addis Ababa in April and in Montevideo in May 1981, respectively; Intergovernmental Consultation on the Regional Programme for Europe; High Level Committee on the Review of Technical Cooperation among Developing Countries in New York in June 1981; Governing Council in New York in June 1981. In July 1981, a meeting of the UNDP Inter-Agency Task Force, at which WIPO was represented, was held at WIPO in Geneva.

WIPO continued to cooperate with the Regional Commissions of the UN, and was represented at the Seventh Meeting of the Economic Commission for Africa (ECA) Conference of Ministers responsible for economic development and planning in Africa, held at Freetown in April 1981, at the sessions of the Executive Board and Council of the African Regional Centre for Technology (ARCT) in Dakar in February 1981 and at a meeting of the Intergovernmental Committee of Experts for Science and Technology Development (African Region) held in Addis Ababa in November 1981. WIPO was also represented at a meeting, convened by the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP), of an advisory committee on the program of the Regional Centre for Transfer of Technology (RCTT) in Bangalore in April 1981, at an RCTT Workshop on Technology Transfer in Colombo in December 1981, and at the annual meetings of the Economic Commission for Latin America (ECLA) in Montevideo and of the Economic Commission for Western Asia (ECWA) at Sanaa, both in May 1981.

WIPO contributed to reports prepared for various UN bodies and organs on such subjects as: science and technology, consumer protection, new and renewable sources of energy, least developed countries, implementation of the Lagos Plan of Action for the economic development of Africa, higher education for Palestinian refugees, the involvement of women in development, utilization of conference resources, technical cooperation among developing countries, assistance to newly independent countries, the peaceful uses of outer space, UNDP regional programs.

The Director General was represented at a commemorative meeting of the United Nations Council for Namibia in New York in October 1981.

Public Information, Publications, Library, Headquarters Building, Meetings

Lectures on WIPO and its activities, in general or related to particular topics, were given by WIPO officials, often in conjunction with visits by organized groups to WIPO headquarters.

Interviews were given to newspaper and radio correspondents. WIPO officials participated in the regular press briefings given in the United Nations Office in Geneva. WIPO was represented at the regular meetings in Geneva of the Circle of International Information Officers; its representative was re-elected Chairman for 1981. A press conference was organized in Geneva, with the participation of a representative of the International Olympic Committee, before the Diplomatic Conferences of Nairobi.

Updated versions of the WIPO General Information brochure were published in English and French in March, in Chinese in October and in German in November 1981. A leaflet, "WIPO—what it is, what it does" first published in 1979 in English and French, was published in updated versions in Arabic, German, Portuguese, Russian and Spanish in March, and in English in September 1981. A revised catalogue of WIPO publications was issued in April 1981. Newsletters were published in May, September and November 1981 (in Arabic, English, French, Portuguese, Russian and Spanish).

WIPO publications were exhibited at book fairs held in Leipzig in March, in Mexico City in April, in Warsaw in May, in Moscow in September and in Frankfurt in October 1981, at the International Fair of Milan in April, and at the trade fair "Technology for the People" in Mexico City in November 1981.

The WIPO specialized library continued to provide services for visitors and for the staff, on the basis of an increasing collection of books, periodicals and documents relating to intellectual property and international cooperation. In 1981, there were 2,028 visits to the reading room. During the same year, 807 books and 15 periodicals were added to the collection, bringing the total stocks to 33,454 and 1,042, respectively.

During 1981, gifts for the WIPO headquarters building were received from Egypt, France and the International Federation of Industrial Property Attorneys (FICPI).

A list of meetings organized by WIPO during the period covered by this report appears at the end of this report.

Decorations

The President of Senegal and the President of the Republic of Korea conferred on the Director General

the following decorations, respectively: "Commandeur de l'Ordre national du Lion"; "Order of Diplomatic Service Merit (Gwangha Medal)." The Director General also received from the International Olympic Committee the Silver Medal of the Olympic Order.

Development Cooperation Activities, 1979 to 1981: Summary Tables

The report by the Director General to the Governing Bodies in 1981 on the activities of WIPO contained an annex summarizing, in two tables, the development cooperation activities of WIPO since the last sessions of the WIPO Conference and General Assembly in September 1979. The said tables are reproduced below.

TABLE I

Country, Organization, Territory	Training Programs	National Seminars	Regional Seminars	Advice and Assis- tance: Le- gislation, Institution Building	State-of- the-art Search Pro- gram
AFRICA					
Algeria	•	•	•	•	•
Angola	•		•	•	
Benin	•		•	•	
Botswana	•		•		•
Burundi	•		•	•	
Cameroon	•		•	•	•
Cape Verde	•		•		
Central African Republic	•		•	•	
Chad	•		•	•	
Comoros			•		
Congo	•		•	•	
Egypt	•		•	•	•
Ethiopia	•		•		•
Gabon	•		•	•	
Gambia	•		•	•	
Ghana	•		•	•	
Guinea	•		•	•	
Guinea-Bissau	•		•	•	

Country, Organization, Territory	Training Programs	National Seminars	Regional Seminars	Advice and Assis- tance: Le- gislation, Institution Building	State-of- the-art Search Pro- gram
Ivory Coast			•	•	•*
Kenya	•		•		
Lesotho	•		•		
Liberia	•		•		
Madagascar	•		•	•	
Malawi	•		•		•
Mali	•		•	•	•*
Mauritania	•		•	•	•
Mauritius	•		•		•
Morocco			•	•	
Niger	•		•	•	
Nigeria	•		•		•
Rwanda	•		•	•	•
Senegal	•		•	•	•*
Seychelles	•				
Sierra Leone	•		•		
Somalia	•		•		
Sudan	•	•	•	•	
Swaziland	•		•	•	
Tanzania	•		•		
Togo	•		•	•	
Tunisia	•		•		•
Uganda	•		•		•
Upper Volta	•		•	•	
Zaire	•		•	•	•
Zambia	•		•		
Zimbabwe	•		•	•	
OAPI	•		•	•	•
ESARIPO	•		•	•	

Country, Organization, Territory	Training Programs	National Seminars	Regional Seminars	Advice and Assis- tance: Le- gislation, Institution Building	State-of- the-art Search Pro- gram
--	----------------------	----------------------	----------------------	--	--

ASIA AND THE PACIFIC

Afghanistan	•		•		
Bangladesh	•		•	•	
Bhutan	•		•		
China	•	•	•	•	
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	•	•		•	•
Fiji	•		•		
India	•		•	•	•
Indonesia	•		•	•	•
Kiribati	•				
Malaysia	•		•	•	
Mongolia	•		•		
Nepal	•		•	•	
Pakistan	•		•	•	•
Papua New Guinea	•		•		
Philippines	•		•	•	•
Republic of Korea	•		•	•	•
Samoa	•				
Singapore	•	•	•	•	•
Sri Lanka	•		•	•	•
Thailand	•	•	•	•	•
Tonga	•		•		
Vanuatu	•				
Viet Nam	•	•	•	•	•
Cook Islands	•				
Hong Kong	•		•		

EUROPE

Cyprus	•				
Romania	•		•		
Turkey					•

* Requests submitted via OAPI.

Country, Training National Regional Advice State-of-
Organization, Programs Seminars Seminars and the-art
Territory Search
Assistance: Le- Pro-
Institution gram
Building

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

Argentina	•		•		•
Bahamas			•		
Barbados	•	•	•	•	
Belize			•		
Bolivia	•		•	•	
Brazil	•	•	•	•	•
Chile	•		•	•	•
Colombia	•		•	•	•
Costa Rica	•		•		•
Cuba	•				•
Dominica			•	•	
Dominican Republic	•			•	
Ecuador	•		•	•	•
El Salvador	•				
Grenada	•			•	
Guatemala	•				•
Guyana			•		
Haiti	•				
Honduras	•			•	
Jamaica	•		•	•	
Mexico	•		•	•	•
Nicaragua	•				•
Panama	•			•	
Paraguay	•		•		
Peru	•		•	•	•
Saint Kitts			•		
Saint Lucia			•		
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines				•	
Suriname	•		•	•	
Trinidad and Tobago			•	•	•
Uruguay	•		•	•	•

Country, Training National Regional Advice State-of-
Organization, Programs Seminars Seminars and the-art
Territory Search
Assistance: Le- Pro-
Institution gram
Building

Venezuela	•		•	•	•
Andean Group			•	•	

WESTERN ASIA

Bahrain	•				
Democratic Yemen	•				
Iran	•				
Iraq	•		•	•	•
Jordan	•				
Kuwait	•				•
Oman	•				
Qatar	•				
Syria	•				
United Arab Emirates		•		•	
Yemen				•	
FASRC				•	
Totals					
121	104	10	91	68	44
(Totals from September 1979 to September 1980)					
(85)	(73)	(3)	(44)	(35)	(28)
[Totals from September 1980 to November 1981]					
[113]	[82]	[10]	[62]	[54]	[30]

TABLE II

Country, Project Training Trainees' Experts, State-of- Organization Financing Facilities Expenses Lecturers the-art Search Program					
Algeria		•			
Argentina		•			
Australia		•	•	•	
Austria		•	•	•	•
Belgium		•	•	•	
Brazil		•	•	•	

Country, Organization	Project Financing	Training Facilities	Trainees' Expenses	Experts, Lecturers	State-of- the-art Search Program
Cameroon				•	
Canada	•	•	•	•	
Congo		•		•	
Czecho- slovakia		•	•	•	
Denmark				•	
Egypt		•		•	
Finland				•	•
France	•	•	•	•	
German Democratic Republic		•	•	•	
Germany (Federal Republic of)	•	•	•	•	•
Ghana				•	
Hungary		•	•		
Israel		•	•	•	
Japan		•		•	
Mexico		•	•		
Netherlands			•	•	

Country, Organization	Project Financing	Training Facilities	Trainees' Expenses	Experts, Lecturers	State-of- the-art Search Program
Norway				•	
Philippines			•		
Poland		•	•		
Senegal		•		•	
Soviet Union		•	•	•	•
Spain		•	•		
Syria				•	
Sweden	•	•	•	•	•
Switzerland	•	•	•	•	•
Tunisia				•	
United Kingdom	•	•	•	•	•
United States of America	•	•	•	•	
Zambia				•	
CEC			•		
EPO		•	•	•	•
OAPI		•		•	
UNDP	•		•		

LIST OF WIPO MEETINGS IN 1981

<i>Title of Meeting</i>	<i>Month</i>	<i>Place</i>	<i>Organized with</i>
Budapest Union (Microorganisms) Assembly (Extraordinary Session)	January	Geneva	
Thai National Patent Documentation Seminars	January	Bangkok & Chiangmai	
Permanent Committee on Patent Information (PCPI)—Working Group on Search Information	January	Geneva	
PCT Seminars	January	Canada	
Permanent Committee on Patent Information (PCPI)—Working Group on Planning	February	Rijswijk	
Working Group on Intellectual Property Aspects of Folklore Protection	February	Paris	Unesco
National Seminar on Industrial Property	February	Khartoum	Government of Sudan
National Patent Agency Course	February/ March	Beijing	Government of China
PCT Seminar	March	Budapest	
Regional Seminar (Countries of the <i>Grands Lacs</i>) on Copyright and Neighboring Rights	March	Gisenyi (Rwanda)	CEPGL

<i>Title of Meeting</i>	<i>Month</i>	<i>Place</i>	<i>Organized with</i>
Revision of the Paris Convention: Preparatory Meeting	March	Geneva	
Permanent Committee on Patent Information (PCPI)— Summit & ICSEI	March	Geneva	
Permanent Committee for Development Cooperation Re- lated to Copyright and Neighboring Rights	March	Geneva	
Working Group on the Establishment of a Guide on the Organization of Industrial Property Activities of Enterprises in Developing Countries	March	Geneva	
Trademark Training Course	March/ April	Canberra	Government of Australia
Worldwide Forum on Piracy of Sound and Audiovisual Recordings	March	Geneva	
Seminar on Technical Functions of Industrial Property Of- fices	March/ April	Rio de Janeiro	INPI, JUNAC
PCT Budget and Management Consultants	April	Geneva	
PCT Seminar	April	Bucharest	
Continental Conference on Copyright	April	Buenos Aires	IIDA
Permanent Committee on Patent Information (PCPI)— Working Group on General Information	April	Geneva	
PCT Seminar	April	Milan	
WIPO Budget Committee	April	Geneva	
PCT Seminar	May	Geneva	
Copyright Training Course (Francophone)	May	Zurich	SUISA
Permanent Committee on Patent Information (PCPI)— Working Group on Search Information, Subgroup E	May	Munich	
Group of Independent Experts on Cable Television	May	Geneva	Unesco
PCT International Meeting	May	Tokyo	Japanese Patent Office
Caribbean Regional Seminar on Industrial Property	May	Bridgetown	ECLA, CARI- COM & CIDA
Copyright Training Course (Anglophone)	June	Zurich/ Geneva	SUISA
National Licensing Seminar	June	Algiers	Government of Algeria
PCT Seminar	June	Tel Aviv	
Permanent Committee on Patent Information (PCPI)— Working Group on Search Information	June	Geneva	
Joint Inventive Activity: Consultants	June	Geneva	
WIPO Budget Committee	June	Geneva	
Group of Consultants on Questions Relating to Trademarks and Developing Countries	July	Geneva	
Seminar on Industrial Property as a Factor of Economic, Scientific and Technical Development	July	Brazzaville	Government of Congo, OAPI
Round Table of University Professors on Teaching and Research in Intellectual Property Law	July	Geneva	
International Association for the Advancement of Teaching and Research in Intellectual Property (ATRIP)	July	Geneva	
Patent Documentation Training Course	August/ September	Vienna	Government of Austria

<i>Title of Meeting</i>	<i>Month</i>	<i>Place</i>	<i>Organized with</i>
Patent Documentation Training Course	August/ September	Moscow	Government of Soviet Union
General Industrial Property Seminar	September	Geneva	
Joint Consultative Committee on Access to Works Protected by Copyright	September	Paris	Unesco
Permanent Committee on Patent Information (PCPI)— Working Group for Developing Countries	September	Geneva	
Patent Documentation Seminar	September	The Hague	EPO, CEC
Industrial Property Training Course	September	Strasbourg	CEIPI
Permanent Committee on Patent Information (PCPI)— Working Group on Planning	September	Geneva	
PCT Users' Meeting	September	Geneva	
Diplomatic Conference on the Protection of the Olympic Symbol	September	Nairobi	
Diplomatic Conference on the Revision of the Paris Conven- tion: second session	September/ October	Nairobi	
Copyright Training Course	September/ October	London	Government of United Kingdom, BCC, IFPI
Patent Documentation Seminar	October	Beijing	
Folklore Regional Committee of Experts	October	Bogotá	Unesco
Nice Union Preparatory Working Group	October	Geneva	
Caribbean Regional Seminar on Copyright	October	Kingston	Government of Jamaica, Unesco
Training Course on Copyright and Neighboring Rights	November	Conakry	Government of Guinea
International Conference on Inventive Activity as a Factor for Development of Technology in the Developing Countries	November	Belgrade	Government of Yugoslavia
Seminar on Patent Departments for Industrial Enterprises	November	São Paulo	INPI, UNDP
Intergovernmental Committee of the Rome Convention	November	Geneva	ILO/Unesco
Industrial Property Training Course	November/ December	Madrid	Government of Spain
WIPO Governing Bodies	November	Geneva	
Permanent Committee on Patent Information (PCPI)—Sum- mit	November	Geneva	
Permanent Committee on Patent Information (PCPI)— Working Group on Search Information, Subgroup F	November	London	
Berne Union Executive Committee (Copyright Commit- tees)	November/ December	Geneva	Unesco
International Patent Classification (IPC) Union—Committee of Experts	December	Geneva	
Permanent Committee on Patent Information/PCT Commit- tee for Technical Cooperation	December	Geneva	
Seminar on Patent Information and Documentation	December	Salisbury	CIDA
Meetings with International Non-Governmental Organiza- tions	December	Geneva	
Central American Industrial Property Meeting	December	Tegucigalpa	Government of Honduras

Governing Bodies of WIPO and the Unions Administered by WIPO

Twelfth Series of Meetings

(Geneva, November 16 to 24, 1981)

The twelfth series of meetings of the Governing Bodies of the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) and the Unions administered by WIPO took place in Geneva from November 16 to 24, 1981.

The list of the 22 Governing Bodies which held meetings, the main items discussed and the decisions taken are reported on in "The World Intellectual Property Organization in 1981" (see above).

The list of participants in the Governing Bodies appears below.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**

I. States

Algeria 1,2,3,4,6,10,14,16: M. Mati.
Argentina 1,2,3,4,7,9: F. Jiménez Dávila; J.T. Pereira.
Australia 1,2,3,4,6,7,14,19,20: F.J. Smith; K.R. Widdows.
Austria 1,2,3,4,7,9,10,14,19,20: O. Leberl; W. Howadt.
Belgium 1,2,3,4,7,9,10,12,14,19: L. Salpéteur; P. Ceuninck; J.J.H. De Bock.
Brazil 1,2,3,4,6,7,19,20: A. Gurgel de Alencar; E. Cordeiro.
Bulgaria 1,2,3,4,6,7,16,22: T. Ivanov; V. Dimitrova; I. Kotzev.
Byelorussian SSR²: V.V. Grekov; S.N. Chilovitch.
Cameroon 1,2,3,4,7,9,20: F.-X. Ngoubeyou.
Canada 1,2,3,4,7,9: J.H.A. Gariépy; R. Théberge; J. Lynch.
Chile 1,2,7: P. Carvajal Prado; C. Bustos Díaz; L. Gillet Bebin; R. Plaza Ducco; V. García-Huidobro Amunátegui; R. Babul.
China²: Liao Derong; Kung Hsi.
Congo 1,2,4,7,16,20,21: E. Kouloufoua; G. Kaya; D. Ganga-Bidie; B. Mouaya.
Costa Rica 1,2,7: M.E. Odio-Benito.
Cuba 1,3,4,6,16: N.M. Núñez; G. Luis Varona; J. Sivila de la Torre.
Cyprus^{5,8}: A.C. Pouyours; A.N. Papadopoulos.
Czechoslovakia 1,2,3,4,7,9,10,14,16,18,19: M. Bělohávek; J. Prošek; M. Slámová.
Democratic People's Republic of Korea 1,2,4,10,20: Kim Ung Ho; Pak Se Rong; Kim Dok Kil; Hwang Yong Hwan; Jo Gyoung Won.
Denmark 1,2,4,7,14,18,19,20: K. Skjødt; R. Carlsen; D. Simonsen; B.V. Linstow.
Dominican Republic⁵: H.L. Hernández.
Egypt 1,2,3,4,6,7,10,13,19: S.A. Salem; A.G.M. Fouad; M. Daghash.
El Salvador^{2,3}: J.L. Lovo Castelar; C.A. Barahona Rivas.
Finland 1,2,3,4,6,7,14,18,19,20: E. Wuori; A.-R. Ketokoski.
France 1,2,3,4,6,7,10,12,14,16,18,19,20,22: G. Vianès; L. Nicodème; R. Leclerc; J.-C. Combaldieu; R. Yung; A. Françon; A. Némó; J.-F. Terral.
Gabon 1,2,4,7,16,20,21: T. Moussounda; C. Matotou; P.J. N'Gouyou; R. N'Gouyou.
German Democratic Republic 1,2,3,4,7,9,10,13,14,18,19: J. Hemmerling; D. Schack; M. Förster; H.-W. Mattern.

Germany (Federal Republic of) 1,2,3,4,6,7,10,12,14,19,20,22: A. Krieger; U.C. Hallmann; B. Ziese; J. Wenzl; B. Bockmair.
Ghana 1,2,4: A.J.B. McCarthy.
Greece 1,2,4,7: G. Pilavachi; G. Koumantos; A. Mitsialis.
Guinea 1,2,7: F.M. Camara.
Holy See 1,2,4,7,13: O.J. Roullet.
Hungary 1,2,3,4,7,9,10,14,16,18,20,22: G. Pusztai; G. Vékás; M. Ficsor; P. Gyertyánfy.
India 1,2,3,7,9: C.S. Jha; S.R. Sathyam; L. Puri.
Indonesia 1,2,4,13: N.S. Sastradidjaya; H. Reksodiputro.
Iran⁵: J. Zahernia.
Iraq 1,2,4: H.A.R.A. Razak; G.A. Rafik; E. Khoury.
Ireland 1,2,4,7,14,18,19: P. Slavin; P. McDonagh.
Israel 1,2,4,7,14,16,19: I. Eliashiv.
Italy 1,2,3,4,6,7,10,14,16,18,19: G.L. Milesi Ferretti; R. Brunetti; S. Samperi; G. Catalini; G. Armento.
Ivory Coast 1,2,3,4,6,7: B.T. Aka; K.F. Ekra.
Japan 1,2,3,4,6,7,19,20,22: I. Shamoto; T. Kitahashi; Y. Oyama; S. Maruyama; H. Hayashida; S. Uemura; K. Shimizu; Y. Kumamaru; K. Ishimaru.
Jordan 1,2,4: K. Abdul-Rahim.
Kenya 1,2,4: D.J. Coward.
Lebanon^{5,8,15}: T. Badawi.
Libya 1,4,7: A. Sergiwa.

*Prepared by the International Bureau.

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

¹ WIPO General Assembly.

² WIPO Conference.

³ WIPO Coordination Committee.

⁴ Paris Union Assembly.

⁵ Paris Union Conference of Representatives.

⁶ Paris Union Executive Committee.

⁷ Berne Union Assembly.

⁸ Berne Union Conference of Representatives.

⁹ Berne Union Executive Committee.

¹⁰ Madrid Union Assembly.

¹¹ Madrid Union Committee of Directors.

¹² Hague Union Assembly.

¹³ Hague Union Conference of Representatives.

¹⁴ Nice Union Assembly.

¹⁵ Nice Union Conference of Representatives.

¹⁶ Lisbon Union Assembly.

¹⁷ Lisbon Union Council.

¹⁸ Locarno Union Assembly.

¹⁹ IPC Union Assembly.

²⁰ PCT Union Assembly.

²¹ TRT Union Assembly.

²² Budapest Union Assembly.

Liechtenstein 1, 2, 4, 7, 10, 12, 14, 20, 22: A.F. de Gerliczy-Burian.
Luxembourg 1, 2, 4, 7, 10, 12, 14, 19, 20: F. Schlessler.
Madagascar 4, 8, 15: S. Rabearivelo.
Mexico 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 9, 17: X. Díez de Urdanivia; J.A. Sastré Buil.
Monaco 1, 2, 4, 7, 10, 12, 14, 19, 20: E. Franzi; C. Orecchia.
Mongolia 2, 3: M. Dash; N. Gankhuyag.
Morocco 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 13, 14: A. Kandil; A. Bojji.
Netherlands 1, 2, 4, 7, 10, 12, 14, 18, 19, 20: J. Dekker; J.J. Bos; W. de Boer.
New Zealand 5, 8: R.M. Richards.
Nigeria 3, 5, 6: H.O. Ajomale.
Norway 1, 2, 4, 7, 14, 18, 19, 20: A.G. Gerhardsen; S.H. Røer; J. Smith.
Pakistan 1, 2, 7: S. Bashir.
Panama 1: L.E. Martínez Cruz.
Peru 2: F. Valdivieso; A.E. Thornberry.
Philippines 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7: H.J. Brillantes; O.A. Gonzales; F.F. Santos; C.V. Espejo.
Poland 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 15: J. Szomański; J. Zawalonka; E.M. Szelchaz.
Portugal 1, 2, 4, 7, 11, 15, 17, 19: J. Mota Maia; R. Morais Serrão; A.M. Pereira.
Qatar 2: Y. Al-Sayed; M. Harake.
Republic of Korea 1, 2, 4: B.-K. Lee; C.-J. Shin; S.-C. Cho; S.-H. Kim.
Romania 1, 2, 4, 7, 10, 20: G. Filipas.
Senegal 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 20: A. Sène; N. NDiaye; A.N. Niang.
Somalia 1: F. Eno-Hassan.
Soviet Union 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 10, 14, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22: I. Nayashkov; L. Kostikov; V. Zubarev; S. Birioulev; S. Gorlenko; A. Ruban; V. Poliakov.
Spain 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 9, 10, 13, 14, 18, 19, 22: J. Fernández de Ybarra y Moreno; J. Delicado Montero-Rios; L. Padial Martín; C. Ribed y Nieulant; L. Nagore San Martín.
Sri Lanka 1, 2, 4, 7, 9: S. Paliakkara.
Sudan 2, 3: K.E.T. Idris.
Sweden 1, 2, 4, 7, 14, 18, 19, 20: G. Borggård; I. Schalin; B. van der Giessen; H. Olsson.
Switzerland 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 14, 18, 19, 20, 22: P. Braendli; J.-L. Marro; J.J. Manz; J.-M. Salamolard.
Syria 5: M. Sayadi.
Tanzania 5: G.B. Liundi.
Thailand 7: S. Dhirakaosal.
Tunisia 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 16: K. Seffen; M. Ben Slama.
Turkey 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 9: O. Aksoy; M. Cetin; N. Yosmaoğlu; A. Yalgin; N.Y. Turantan.
Uganda 1, 2, 4: J.K.N. Katende.
Ukrainian SSR 2: V.G. Batiouk.
United Arab Emirates 2: A.A.-J. Al-Bakri.
United Kingdom 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 9, 14, 19, 20, 22: T.W. Sage; A. Holt; J. Richards.
United States of America 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 14, 18, 19, 20, 22: G.J. Mossinghoff; H.J. Winter; M.K. Kirk; L. Schroeder; G.T. Dempsey.
Upper Volta 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 9, 16, 21: B.I. Bakyono; O.D. Ouedraogo.
Uruguay 1, 2, 4, 6, 7: C.A. Fernández-Ballesteros; A. Moerzinger.
Viet Nam 1, 4, 10, 13: Tran Tri; Nguyen Van Vien.
Yugoslavia 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 14, 18: D. Bošković; D. Čemalović; B. Branković.
Zaire 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 9: Mbongo Ka Litho Sombo.
Zimbabwe 1, 2, 4, 7: R.P. Moul.

II. Intergovernmental Organizations

United Nations (UN): S.-P. Padolecchia; M. Allen. **International Labour Organisation (ILO)**: G. Bohère. **United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)**: A. Amri. **World Meteorological Organization (WMO)**: H. Fontijn. **Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization (IMCO)**: F.D. Masson. **Benelux Trademark Office/Benelux Designs Office (BBM)**: L.J.M. van Bauwel. **Interim Committee for the Community Patent**: J. Huber.

Commission of the European Communities (CEC): B. Harris; W.M. Hauschild. **Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA)**: I. Tcherviakov. **African Intellectual Property Organization (OAPI)**: D. Ekani. **Organization of American States (OAS)**: S. Donovan. **European Patent Organisation (EPO)**: J.C.A. Staehelin.

III. International Non-Governmental Organizations

International Association of Conference Interpreters (AICC): A. Chaves-Rivier. **International Association for the Protection of Industrial Property (IAPIP)**: H. Wichmann. **International Chamber of Commerce (ICC)**: J. L'Huillier. **International Publishers Association (IPA)**: J.A. Koutchoumow. **Licensing Executives Society (International) (LES)**: J.A. Gay; K. Payne.

IV. Officers

WIPO General Assembly

Chairman: G. Pusttai (Hungary). *Vice-Chairmen*: K. F. Ekra (Ivory Coast); T.W. Sage (United Kingdom).

WIPO Conference

Chairman: C.S. Jha (India). *Vice-Chairmen*: Liao Derong (China); G.J. Mossinghoff (United States of America).

WIPO Coordination Committee

Chairman: J. Fernández de Ybarra y Moreno (Spain). *First Vice-Chairman*: D. Bošković (Yugoslavia). *Second Vice-Chairman*: J. Hemmerling (German Democratic Republic).

Paris Union Assembly

Chairman: D.J. Coward (Kenya). *Vice-Chairmen*: G. Pusttai (Hungary); P. Braendli (Switzerland).

Paris Union Conference of Representatives

Chairman: R.M. Richards (New Zealand). *Vice-Chairmen*: G.B. Liundi (Tanzania); (Trinidad and Tobago).

Paris Union Executive Committee

Chairman: J. Szomański (Poland). *Vice-Chairmen*: F.J. Smith (Australia); H.J. Brillantes (Philippines).

Berne Union Assembly

Chairman: A. Krieger (Germany (Federal Republic of)). *Vice-Chairmen*: T. Ivanov (Bulgaria); X. Díez de Urdanivia (Mexico).

Berne Union Conference of Representatives

Chairman: T. Badawi (Lebanon). *Vice-Chairmen*: E.M. Szelchaz (Poland); O. Aksoy (Turkey).

Berne Union Executive Committee

Chairman: F. Jiménez Dávila (Argentina). *Vice-Chairmen*: J.H.A. Gariépy (Canada); J. Hemmerling (German Democratic Republic).

Madrid Union Assembly

Chairman: J. Prošek (Czechoslovakia). *Vice-Chairmen*: G.L. Milesi Ferretti (Italy); G. Filipas (Romania).

Madrid Union Committee of Directors

Chairman: K. Seffen (Tunisia). *Vice-Chairmen:* J. Mota Maia (Portugal); (....).

Hague Union Assembly

Chairman: L. Salpéteur (Belgium). *Vice-Chairmen:* P. Braendli (Switzerland); E. Franzi (Monaco).

Hague Union Conference of Representatives

Chairman: J. Hemmerling (German Democratic Republic). *Vice-Chairmen:* S.A. Salem (Egypt); A. Bojji (Morocco).

Nice Union Assembly

Chairman: M. Mati (Algeria). *Vice-Chairmen:* E. Wuori (Finland); I. Nayashkov (Soviet Union).

Nice Union Conference of Representatives

Chairman: J. Mota Maia (Portugal). *Vice-Chairmen:* K. Seffen (Tunisia); (....).

Lisbon Union Assembly

Chairman: E. Kouloufoua (Congo). *Vice-Chairmen:* G. Vianès (France); G. Pusztai (Hungary).

Lisbon Union Council

Chairman: X. Díez de Urdanivia (Mexico). *Vice-Chairmen:* (Haiti); (....).

Locarno Union Assembly

Chairman: G. Vianès (France). *Vice-Chairmen:* A.G. Gerhardsen (Norway); I. Nayashkov (Soviet Union).

IPC Union Assembly

Chairman: G.J. Mossinghoff (United States of America). *Vice-Chairmen:* M. Bělohávek (Czechoslovakia); (Suriname).

PCT Union Assembly

Chairman: G. Borggård (Sweden). *Vice-Chairmen:* A. Gurgel de Alencar (Brazil); G. Pusztai (Hungary).

TRT Union Assembly

Chairman: P.J. N'Gouyou (Gabon). *Vice-Chairmen:* I. Nayashkov (Soviet Union); B.I. Bakyono (Upper Volta).

Budapest Union Assembly

Chairman: I. Shamoto (Japan). *Vice-Chairmen:* T. Ivanov (Bulgaria); H.J. Brillantes (Philippines).

V. International Bureau of WIPO

A. Bogsch (*Director General*); K. Pfanner (*Deputy Director General*); M. Porzio (*Deputy Director General*); C. Masouyé (*Director, Public Information and Copyright Department*); S. Alikhan (*Director, Developing Countries Division (Copyright)*); P. Claus (*Director, Classifications and Patent Information Division*); R. Harben (*Director, Public Information Division*); G. Ledakis (*Legal Counsel*); I. Thiam (*Director, External Relations Division*); G. Boytha (*Head, Copyright Law Division*); F. Curchod (*Acting Director, PCT Division*); T. Keefer (*Acting Director, Administrative Division*); P. Maugué (*Head, Trademark and Industrial Designs Registration Division*); I. Pike-Wanigasekara (*Senior Assistant, Office of the Director General*); M. Qayoom (*Head, Conferences and Common Services Section*); H. Rossier (*Head, Mail and Documents Section*).

Berne Union

Executive Committee of the International Union for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works (Berne Union)

Nineteenth Session (7th extraordinary)

(Geneva, November 30 to December 7, 1981)

Report

prepared by the Secretariat and adopted by the Committee

Introduction

Opening of the session

1. The Executive Committee of the Berne Union (hereinafter referred to as "the Committee"), convened by the Director General of the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), met in extraordinary session at the WIPO headquarters in Geneva from November 30 to December 7, 1981.
2. Fifteen of the Committee's 18 member States were represented: Australia, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Czechoslovakia, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, India, Mexico, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Tunisia, Turkey (15).
3. The following member States of the Berne Union were represented by observers: Austria, Brazil, Denmark, Egypt, Germany (Federal Republic of), Greece, Holy See, Hungary, Israel, Italy, Japan, Lebanon, Libya, Madagascar, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, United Kingdom, Zaire, Zimbabwe (25).
4. As the Committee held joint meetings with the Intergovernmental Copyright Committee set up under the Universal Copyright Convention, the following delegations, which were taking part in the session held concurrently by the Intergovernmental

Copyright Committee, also attended the Committee's meetings: Algeria, Andorra, Colombia, Cuba, El Salvador, Soviet Union, United States of America (7). In addition, the following States attended as observers: Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Indonesia, Republic of Korea, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda (8).

5. Five intergovernmental organizations and 19 international non-governmental organizations were represented by observers.

6. The list of participants is annexed to this report.

7. The session was opened by Dr. Arpad Bogsch, the Director General of WIPO, who welcomed all the participants in the sessions of the two Committees to WIPO's headquarters. He informed the delegates of the composition of the Executive Committee as it was elected by the Assembly and Conference of Representatives of the Berne Union at the recent meeting of the Governing Bodies of WIPO held in Geneva from November 16 to 24, 1981.

8. The representative of the Director-General of Unesco cordially thanked the Director General of WIPO for acting as host to the current session of the Intergovernmental Copyright Committee.

Part I: Items concerning the Committee alone

Election of officers

9. On a proposal by the delegation of India, seconded by the delegation of Australia, the Committee unanimously elected as Chairman Mr. NDéné NDiaye (Senegal), and as Vice-Chairmen Mr. André

Kerever (France) and Mrs. Karin Götz (German Democratic Republic).

Adoption of the agenda

10. The agenda proposed in document B/EC/XIX/1. Rev. 1 was adopted.

Developments regarding the Paris Act (1971) of the Berne Convention

11. The Committee took note of the information contained in document B/EC/XIX/2 to which was added the fact that Zimbabwe had notified that its Government considers itself bound by the Rome Act (1928) of the Berne Convention, and had also deposited on September 29, 1981, its instrument of accession to the Paris Act (1971) of the said Convention with a declaration that it shall not apply to Articles 1 to 21 and the Appendix. Thus the number of States which had accepted the said Act was 52 and the number of those that had accepted the administrative reform adopted by the Stockholm Diplomatic Conference in 1967 was 66 out of the 73 member States of the Berne Union.

12. The Committee endorsed the suggestion made by the delegation of India that, in order to enable a larger number of countries especially from among the Third World to join this important Convention, the Director General of WIPO might consider sending a letter to all States that are not yet party to the Berne Convention, indicating its basic principles, its scope, its essential objectives, and the main advantages of adhering to the Convention.

13. The Director General of WIPO confirmed that the International Bureau will most certainly comply with this suggestion and, in response to the observer from Portugal, said that such a circular will also be sent out in the Portuguese language to the States concerned. He also pointed out that the Assembly of the Berne Union had, at its recent meeting in Geneva during the previous week, decided to accept the kind invitation of the Government of India to hold the next session of the WIPO Permanent Committee for Development Cooperation Related to Copyright and Neighboring Rights in New Delhi in 1983.

Legal and technical assistance to States including in establishing or strengthening the national infrastructure for copyright protection

14. The Committee noted with appreciation and considerable satisfaction the report of the International Bureau of WIPO contained in document B/EC/XIX/3 concerning what the Committee considered to be a wide and impressive range and record of activities of WIPO in the field of legal and technical assistance to developing countries, including establishing or strengthening the national infrastructure of copyright protection.

15. A large number of delegations expressed appreciation of the variety of training facilities provided in the field of copyright and neighboring rights which had been found to be of considerable benefit for

their officials concerned; they hoped that WIPO will continue providing such training facilities; the delegation of India and the observers from Pakistan, the Philippines and Madagascar, in particular, wished the grant of fellowships to their officials in the field of copyright and neighboring rights to be continued.

16. A number of delegations also expressed appreciation of the high quality and usefulness of the guides published by WIPO and other WIPO publications brought out in different languages as also the assistance rendered in the formulation or revision of their legislation in this area.

17. Concerning training programs, the Committee noted the statement of the delegation of France that certain administrative steps were under way which could also enable its country to cooperate with and through WIPO in this area; currently such assistance was provided by it direct to certain developing countries on a bilateral basis; also that of the observer from Portugal concerning the training facilities it had provided direct to a certain Portuguese-speaking African country; the Committee also noted that, in addition to the countries and organizations that had assisted and contributed in the training programs as shown in the document, Italy had also done so. The delegation of the Soviet Union also offered its facilities in training of developing country personnel.

18. The representatives of a number of developing countries, in particular of Chile, Colombia, Madagascar and Sri Lanka, thanked WIPO for the assistance given to them in the formulation of their copyright legislation; the observer from Madagascar indicated that its new copyright law was about to be adopted.

19. Concerning publications, the delegation of India thanked the Director General of WIPO for the publication of the Hindi version of the Guide to the Berne Convention, on the basis of the translation provided by its Government. The delegation of Japan informed the Committee of arrangements being made by its authorities for publishing the Guide to the Rome and to the Phonograms Conventions in the Japanese language. The observer from Portugal mentioned that a Portuguese translation of the Copyright Glossary had recently been sent to the International Bureau of WIPO.

20. As for assistance in establishing the necessary infrastructure for copyright protection, the delegation of the German Democratic Republic expressed its willingness to associate and assist in this activity.

21. A number of delegations expressed their appreciation for the well organized WIPO Worldwide Forum on the Piracy of Sound and Audiovisual Recordings convened in Geneva in March 1981 and of the results of its deliberations. They felt it was an

important meeting and considered that a similar forum should be organized in connection with piracy of books and magazines, of music and of radio and television broadcasts.

22. The Director General of WIPO expressed satisfaction at the considerable interest shown by the Committee during the discussion on these activities of the Organization and thanked the various countries and organizations for their contributions to the training program of WIPO and noted the offer of certain delegations to continue receiving WIPO trainees; the Director General in particular thanked most warmly the Governments of Germany (Federal Republic of), Sweden and the United Kingdom for having hosted training courses jointly organized by WIPO during 1980 and 1981 with these Govern-

ments; he also thanked the Governments of Hungary and Sweden for their offer to host training courses in 1982. He thanked all governments and the concerned non-governmental organizations, as also the Swiss Society for Authors' Rights in Musical Works (SUISA), which had offered training facilities, within the training program of WIPO, during 1980, 1981 and 1982 to nationals of developing countries. Finally, his thanks were also extended to the Governments of Jamaica and Togo for having accepted to co-sponsor, with WIPO and Unesco in the former case and with WIPO, ILO and Unesco in the latter, regional seminars respectively for the English-speaking Caribbean States in Kingston and for African States in Lomé. He also noted the requests of several countries for continuance of grant of fellowships to their officials.

Part II: Items concerning both the Committee and the Intergovernmental Copyright Committee

Application of the International Convention for the Protection of Performers, Producers of Phonograms and Broadcasting Organizations (Rome Convention)

23. Discussions were based on document B/EC/XIX/4-IGC (1971)/IV/8.

24. The Committees also noted the results of the deliberations of the Eighth Ordinary Session of the Intergovernmental Committee established under Article 32 of the Rome Convention which had met in Geneva from November 11 to 13, 1981, and had expressed its concern that, since the last session of that Committee as well as the present Committees in October 1979, there had been no ratifications or accessions to the Rome Convention. The Committees were also informed that, at the Intergovernmental Committee of the Rome Convention, the delegation of Japan had advised that its country was studying the possibility of ratifying the Rome Convention; and that the delegation of France had reported that its Government was considering legislation on the protection of performers, producers of phonograms and broadcasting organizations and that, in this context, it was examining the advisability of adhering to the Rome Convention.

25. The Committees were also informed that the Intergovernmental Committee of the Rome Convention had, at its recent meeting referred to above, felt that the Secretariat should bring the recommendations of its Subcommittee again to the notice of such States as are eligible to accede to the Rome Convention, viz. those which are party either to the Berne Convention or the Universal Copyright Convention but had not yet adhered to the Rome Convention;

that this might be accompanied by a very brief questionnaire to enquire about the status in each of these countries of the provision of necessary legislation to protect performers, producers of phonograms and broadcasting organizations and the possible thinking in regard to their international protection.

26. A number of delegations and observers indicated the present status in their countries; the delegation of Israel mentioned that its country attached great significance to the protection of performers and a decision had been taken to proceed with the necessary legislation for the purpose which could thereafter enable it to consider ratification of the Convention; the observer from Portugal indicated that its Government was envisaging a draft code on copyright which contemplated provision and protection also for the beneficiaries of neighboring rights; the delegation of Mexico indicated that a draft law against piracy had been prepared in its country and its Government had invited all performers, producers of phonograms and broadcasting organizations for their comments thereon.

27. As to the proposal of the Intergovernmental Committee of the Rome Convention brought to the notice of the Committees in connection with circulation of the report of the Subcommittee of the Intergovernmental Committee of that Convention together with a brief questionnaire, the delegations of Brazil and the Soviet Union and the observer from Portugal felt that the Secretariats should also prepare and circulate a paper indicating the scope and objectives of the Rome Convention and advantages in adhering to it; it might, *inter alia*, also include reference to the practice and current position in various States.

28. The delegations of Brazil and Israel wondered whether the existing provisions of the Convention were adequate to ensure suitable international protection.

29. The Secretariats mentioned — and in this they were joined by the observer of the International Labour Office which, together with Unesco and WIPO, constitutes the Secretariat of the Intergovernmental Committee of the Rome Convention — that the recommendations of the Subcommittee of the Intergovernmental Committee of the Rome Convention, mentioned earlier, were based on the study of a detailed document prepared by the Secretariat of the said Committee on the basis of a thorough study presented to the said Subcommittee in 1979 indicating in detail the legislation and practical experience in a number of States, including the legislative and regulatory solutions adopted, the mechanisms for collecting and distributing royalties, collective agreements, etc., in a document of about 220 pages; thus a considerable amount of spadework had already gone into the formulation of the recommendations by the Subcommittee. Thereafter WIPO has also brought out recently the Guide to the Rome Convention and to the Phonograms Convention which was intended to present as simply and as clearly as possible an account of the origin, aims, nature and scope of the provisions of the Conventions concerned. However, the Secretariats informed the Committees that together with the ILO they would also prepare a paper for circulation to the States party to the Berne Convention and the Universal Copyright Convention on the lines as indicated by the Committees.

30. As for the question of possible revision of the Convention, the Secretariats informed the Committees that this matter was within the competence only of the Intergovernmental Committee of the Rome Convention which would meet next in 1983.

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

31. Discussions were based on document B/EC/XIX/5-IGC (1971)/IV/9.

32. The Committees were informed that at its recent meeting in Geneva, already referred to earlier, the Intergovernmental Committee of the Rome Convention had reviewed the comparatively stagnant position in respect of adherences to the Phonograms Convention and directed the Secretariat to renew the recommendation to the States which had earlier been sent in February 1980 together with a text of an explanatory note indicating the background and objectives of the said Convention as also done on the

last occasion, drawing attention to the developments during the interim period, particularly to the resolutions passed at the WIPO Worldwide Forum on the Piracy of Sound and Audiovisual Recordings held in Geneva in March 1981. The Secretariat was asked also, in particular, to draw the attention of States to the fact that commercial piracy stifles efforts undertaken to safeguard and promote national cultures, and that it constitutes a grave prejudice to the economy and to employment in countries affected by it. The Intergovernmental Committee of the Rome Convention had also called for wide dissemination of the discussions at and the resolutions adopted by the Worldwide Forum on the Piracy of Sound and Audiovisual Recordings held in Geneva in March 1981.

33. The delegation of the United States of America congratulated WIPO on its initiative in organizing the above-mentioned World Forum on Piracy of Sound and Audiovisual Recordings and stated that legislation was pending in its country that would substantially increase penalties for criminal infringements of sound recordings and motion pictures and was hopeful that such legislation would be adopted during 1982.

34. The observer from the International Federation of Producers of Phonograms and Videograms (IFPI) felt that there was no cause for pessimism; that States whose legislation permitted adherence to the Phonograms Convention had mostly acceded to it; other States needed to legislate first before adhering. She greatly welcomed the convocation by WIPO of the Worldwide Forum on the Piracy of Sound and Audiovisual Recordings at Geneva in March 1981 and stated that the Forum, the aim of which was to alert public opinion and government authorities to the extent of piracy and to encourage those that did not have appropriate national legislation to so legislate and adhere to the Convention, had to a large extent provided the necessary impetus. The said observer felt that the Forum had achieved its objective, that her organization had been approached by a number of governments on the subject since March 1981 and had every reason to believe that the Forum had acted as a catalyst for promotion of the Convention and hoped more States would adhere to it during the next years; and stated that the experience of her organization would also be made available to such States as wished to seek its advice in this connection.

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

35. The discussion was based on document B/EC/XIX/6-IGC (1971)/IV/10.

36. Several delegations appraised the comprehensiveness of the analysis of comments received from States and interested organizations on the Model Provisions for the implementation of the Satellites Convention, adopted by the Committee of Governmental Experts in 1979, and commended the Secretariats for its preparation.

37. As regards applicability of the two sets of Model Provisions (the first providing for a special right of broadcasting organizations based on private international law, the second containing administrative and penal measures based on public international law), the delegations of Algeria, France, Israel, the Netherlands and the observers from Hungary, the International Confederation of Societies of Authors and Composers (CISAC), the International Federation of Producers of Phonograms and Videograms (IFPI) and the International Writers Guild (IWG) stressed their preferences for the second set of Model Provisions, considering that the grant of a special right to broadcasting organizations would deviate from the public international law concept of the Satellites Convention. In this context the delegations of Finland, France, Senegal and the observer from CISAC emphasized that such a special right should be recognized only in countries where broadcasting organizations already enjoy an exclusive right to authorize rebroadcasting of their programs.

38. The delegations of Finland and Sweden, referred to the Rome Convention which appears to cover also the distribution by radio waves — and, if the applicable national law so provides, also by cable — of programme-carrying signals transmitted by satellite. In the opinion of the delegation of Finland the Rome Convention also applies to broadcasting via satellite for direct reception by the general public, an act which is not governed by the Satellites Convention.

39. As regards interaction between a new special right proposed to be granted to broadcasting organizations in the framework of the first set of Model Provisions, on the one hand, and the authors' rights so far recognized, on the other hand, the observers from CISAC and IWG referred to the proposals made in favor of the authors by the Paris Committee of Experts in 1972, as Alternative A to Article IV of its text, which should always be considered by national legislators when providing for a system recognizing a special right of broadcasting organizations relating to the distribution of their programme-carrying signals transmitted by satellite. The observer from CISAC also referred to the agreement it reached with the European Broadcasting Union (EBU), providing, among others, for the possibility of authors preventing the broadcast by satellite of their works.

40. Concerning interpretation of paragraph 79 of the General Report of the Brussels Conference (1974), which states that "Contracting States are left completely free to implement the basic requirement of the Convention in any way they see fit," the delegation of Sweden and the observer from Austria felt that this paragraph reflects that the implementation of the Convention through a neighboring right stands on an equal footing with the implementation through penal law, administrative and other measures.

41. The delegation of France referred to the "safeguard clause" of the Convention according to which it cannot be interpreted so as to prejudice the protection secured to authors and beneficiaries of neighboring rights; this clause should also serve as admonition to national legislators implementing the Convention by statutory provisions.

42. The observer from EBU informed the Committee of the actual utilization of satellites over about 15 years and stressed that during this period the transmission of programme-carrying signals by satellite has not significantly affected authors' rights. The delegation of France referred to the European Agreement for the Protection of Television Broadcasts, the implementation of which did not cause difficulties as regards the protection of authors' rights, either.

43. With regard to the scope of the proposed provisions, the delegations of Algeria and Senegal as well as the observer from IFPI emphasized that it was not intended that these provisions go beyond the minimum protection granted to broadcasting organizations by the Satellites Convention; thus, the Model Provisions should be interpreted accordingly.

44. With respect to the legal nature of the Model Provisions, the delegation of Japan considered them a helpful guide to national legislation. The delegation of Mexico expressed the view that both sets of Model Provisions should be considered together, as a joint source of guidance to national legislators as regards substance as well as terminology; the differences between them being rather of technical character. The observer from Austria did not see substantial differences between the two versions, either. The delegation of Israel felt that the Model Provisions should in any case be considered by national legislators so as to promote adherence to the Satellites Convention.

45. In conclusion, the Committees noted the Model Provisions adopted by the Committee of Governmental Experts in 1979, stressing that they should not be considered as obligatory models. The Committees were of the opinion that the first set of Model Provisions, granting a right to broadcasting organizations to authorize the distribution of pro-

gramme-carrying signals, should be considered only by countries in which broadcasting organizations already have a special right in their broadcasts. The Committees requested the Secretariats to send the text of Model Provisions to the States and interested organizations, accompanied by an appropriate explanatory note.

Adoption of the Multilateral Convention for the Avoidance of Double Taxation of Copyright Royalties

46. Discussion was based on document B/EC/XIX/7-IGC (1971)/IV/11.

47. The members of the Committees were informed that, since preparation of the above-mentioned document, the Government of Czechoslovakia has deposited on September 24, 1981, its instrument of ratification of the Convention and its instrument of accession to the Additional Protocol related to neighboring rights.

48. The Committees were also informed that, while at the end of the deliberations the Conference of States had adopted at Madrid the text of the said Multilateral Convention in Arabic, English, French, Russian and Spanish, the official texts in Italian and Portuguese are in preparation thanks to the cooperation of the competent authorities of the countries concerned.

49. A number of delegations and observers indicated the status of their consideration of acceptance of this Convention.

50. The delegations of India and Israel and the observers from Hungary, Italy and Portugal stated that adherence by their Governments to the Madrid Multilateral Convention was under active consideration; in Hungary, the country's adherence has been recommended to, and was being considered by, the Ministries of Culture and Foreign Affairs; in India, the necessary administrative process had been set in motion for the purpose; in Israel, it was under the active consideration of the Ministry of Justice; in Italy, the Foreign Office had been approached for adherence; in Portugal, the draft of the Convention had been translated into the Portuguese language and adherence was expected soon.

51. The observer from Colombia felt that the Convention was the result of a need felt at the international level and would certainly provide encouragement to authors and to cultural works.

52. The observer from CISAC suggested that active steps be taken by the Secretariats for promoting this Convention.

53. The International Bureau of WIPO informed the Committees that, in so far as the WIPO Permanent Committee for Development Cooperation Related to Copyright and Neighboring Rights was concerned, it had, at its last meeting in Geneva in March 1981, suggested that, because of their importance from the point of view of authors as well as that of the developing countries, the guiding principles and objectives of this Convention should be made available in clear and concise form to all States in order to facilitate a better understanding of its significance and to promote adherence to the Convention, and the publication of a guide to the Madrid Multilateral Convention on the same pattern as the Guide to the Berne Convention and the Guide to the Rome and Phonograms Conventions be considered.

54. The Secretariats further informed the Committees that an international symposium would be organized jointly by Unesco and WIPO in 1983, with a view to promoting the acceptance of the Convention.

Application of the revised Paris texts of 1971 of the Berne Convention and of the Universal Copyright Convention in respect of developing countries: Working Group on the Formulation of Guiding Principles Covering the Problems Posed by the Practical Implementation of the Licensing Procedures for Translation and Reproduction under the Copyright Conventions

55. Discussion was based on document B/EC/XIX/8-IGC (1971)/IV/12.

56. A number of delegations and observers paid tribute to the result of the deliberations of the Working Group and felt that the guiding principles that emerged from the lengthy but constructive debate by the said Working Group represented a practical and solid basis for implementation of the concerned provisions in the Conventions; these were useful not only to publishers and users in developing countries but also to copyright owners in developed countries. Some delegations pointed out that these guidelines represented essentially a compromise and were meant for orientation purposes and not for interpretation of the Conventions.

57. After discussion, in which many delegations participated, the Committees felt that a third session of the Working Group which formulated these guidelines is necessary in order to further clarify certain aspects and to finalize the text which, in the view of delegations whose experts had been members of the Working Group, needed one more session of the said Group for the purpose. The Committees recommended that this session be convened as soon as possible.

58. The delegation of Mexico declared that its Government would be glad to host the said session in Mexico and that an invitation to this effect would be sent shortly to the Directors General of Unesco and WIPO. The Secretariats expressed the gratitude of their respective Organizations and informed the Committees that they would study the possibilities of convening this meeting in Mexico.

59. The Committee further requested that the Secretariats should, upon finalization of the Guiding Principles by the Working Group, circularize these for the information of all States members of the Berne Union and party to the Universal Copyright Convention. To this end, the Secretariats should make the necessary arrangements in order to have the Guiding Principles available in various languages, including Portuguese as suggested by the observer from Portugal.

Problems arising from the use of electronic computers

60. The Committees were presented with the report adopted by the Committee of Governmental Experts on Copyright Problems Arising from the Use of Computers for Access to or the Creation of Works which had met at Unesco headquarters in Paris from December 15 to 19, 1980 (document B/EC/XIX/9-IGC(1971)/IV/13).

61. The Committees noted in this respect that the Committee of Governmental Experts had considered that:

- (i) the use of computers for access to protected works should be governed by the general principles of copyright protection as defined in the international conventions and in the relevant national laws;
- (ii) the use of computers for the creation of works did not, for the moment, need amendments to be made to the current concepts of copyright as defined in the international conventions and in national copyright laws;
- (iii) the problems arising from such use were complex and, when looking for solutions, the States should take into consideration both the legitimate interests of the owners of copyright and those of the users of protected works in order to stimulate the creativity of authors and so as not to hinder the diffusion of works by data processing means.

62. The Committees were also informed that the Committee of Governmental Experts, at the end of its discussions, had reached the conclusion that it was not able, within the limited time available to it, to formulate detailed preliminary recommendations for national lawmakers but that it had entrusted to the Secretariats the task of drawing up a draft text,

in consultation with the Chairman, the two Vice-Chairmen and the Rapporteur of the Committee, based on the conclusions of the Working Group that met on the same subject in May 1979 and whose report had been communicated to the Committees at their meetings in October 1979, and on its own report.

63. Once the draft recommendations had been drawn up, they would be immediately transmitted to the States and the international organizations for their comments. In the light of comments received, the Secretariats would revise their draft and submit it for examination by a second Committee of Governmental Experts to meet at Unesco headquarters in Paris from June 7 to 11, 1982.

64. The delegations of Algeria, Finland, France, the German Democratic Republic, Sweden and the United States of America, together with the observers from Austria, Hungary and from the Council of Europe, in turn stressed the importance of this matter and the absolute necessity, in view of the development of data processing technology, to adopt recommendations for the settlement of the problems arising, in respect of copyright, from the storage and retrieval of protected works. In this respect, one delegation drew the attention of the Committees to the question of protecting compilations of data or data bases whose elements were not protected as such but where the result could require protection.

65. As regards the protection of works created by means of computers, several delegations, although not feeling that the matter had the same degree of urgency, expressed their wish to see the study carried out in parallel with the work undertaken in respect of storage and retrieval of works protected by copyright.

66. Certain delegations, without however wishing to prejudice the possible outcome of the work of the Second Committee of Governmental Experts in 1982, raised the question whether protection of software should not rather be sought within the framework of copyright legislation.

67. In this respect, the delegation of the United States of America advised the Committees that its copyright law had been revised in 1980 and that a provision had been inserted to include computer programs in the category of protected literary and artistic works. Moreover, a court decision at federal level had specifically asserted that a computer program enjoyed protection under copyright.

68. As regards the studies carried out by the International Bureau of WIPO, within the framework of the Paris Union for the Protection of Industrial Property, on the subject of protection of software, a number of delegations felt that coordination was

desirable with those undertaken by Unesco and WIPO in respect of storage and retrieval of copyrighted works.

69. Furthermore, a number of delegations were of the opinion that links existed between software protection, whatever legal form it might take, and the storage of data. Consequently, they considered that it was necessary to study the matters together in order to avoid divergent conclusions and propose that this matter be added to the agenda for the 1982 Committee of Governmental Experts. The Committees observed that, in any event, the matter of software protection was a problem that concerned them even if specific protection machinery had to be envisaged which fell within neither the Universal Copyright Convention nor the Berne Convention, nor even the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property.

70. The representative of the Director General of WIPO, after having recalled the publication by WIPO of Model Provisions on the Protection of Computer Software for the use of national legislators, gave information on the progress of a study undertaken by this Organization on the usefulness and feasibility of drawing up an international treaty protecting software against unauthorized exploitation. He added that this study would extend to the question whether it would be possible to set up a system of international deposit of computer programs and, if so, whether such deposit could be considered as simply establishing a date for the purposes of evidence, or as generating specific rights.

71. He observed that the program recently adopted by the Assembly of the Berne Union for 1982-1983 only provided, in the terms of reference of the 1982 Committee of Governmental Experts, for the study of copyright problems arising from the use of computers for access to works or for the creation of works.

72. He also explained that the hypothesis under which software protection could be provided through patents or through copyright could not be put aside because that depended exclusively on the domestic legislation of the States.

73. The representative of the Director-General of Unesco informed the Committees of that Organization's concern for the protection of computer programs, particularly since the Secretariat had had occasion to prepare software, particularly in the field of education and science.

74. The said representative informed the Committees of Unesco's intention of joining in the efforts undertaken to find solutions to this problem wherever copyright was involved and stated that it favored this matter being entered on the agenda of the 1982 Committee of Governmental Experts.

75. The Committees felt that it was indeed an important matter which deserved studying from a copyright point of view in due course.

Problems arising from the transmission by cable of television programs

76. Discussions were based on document B/EC/XIX/10-IGC (1971)/IV/14. The Secretariats also informed the Committees of the relevant decisions taken by the Intergovernmental Committee of the Rome Convention during its Eighth Ordinary Session held in Geneva, from November 11 to 13, 1981.

77. The Committees decided to constitute themselves as respective subcommittees, which would meet with the Subcommittee of the Intergovernmental Committee of the Rome Convention, established by that Committee during its session mentioned above, in order to discuss, in 1982, a new working paper on the impact of cable diffusion in the sphere of copyright and neighboring rights. The working paper should be prepared by the Secretariats, in cooperation with the International Labour Office, according to the wish expressed by the Group of Independent Experts on the Impact of Cable Television in the Sphere of Copyright and Neighboring Rights, adopted by the Group during its Second Session held in Geneva, from May 25 to 27, 1981.

78. The mandate of the Subcommittees should extend, *inter alia*, to the consideration of the desirability and feasibility of arriving at internationally applicable principles and possible model provisions, the consideration of both principles and rights, on the one hand, and methods of exercising or administering the rights, on the other hand, as well as the relationship between direct satellite broadcasting and cable diffusion, as decided also by the Intergovernmental Committee of the Rome Convention during its session referred to above.

79. The delegations of Canada, Germany (Federal Republic of) and the United Kingdom and the observers from Austria and Denmark expressed reservations concerning the statement adopted by the Group of Independent Experts in 1980. Furthermore, the delegation of Germany (Federal Republic of) expressed the wish that the attention of the Subcommittees might be drawn to the criteria of service area and direct reception zone when dealing with problems of transmission of copyrighted works by cable.

80. The Committees decided to refer discussion of all substantive questions to the meeting of the Subcommittees in 1982 and not to deal with them in the present session.

81. The delegations of the Netherlands and the United States of America and the observer from

Hungary informed the Committees about recent developments of relevant case law in their respective countries. The delegation of the United States of America also reported on legislative activities in its country, aiming at strengthening copyright protection in the field of cable television. The delegation of France also drew attention to recent court decisions in certain countries (Austria, Belgium, Germany (Federal Republic of), the Netherlands and Switzerland), as well as to relevant provisions of the new copyright law in Austria, and suggested that detailed information on this be included in the documentation to be prepared for the Subcommittees. The observer from the International Confederation of Societies of Authors and Composers (CISAC) stressed that, whilst the judgments of the courts of Austria, Belgium, the Netherlands, Switzerland and of the Court of Justice of the European Communities are in full harmony both with each other, the Berne Convention and the principles adopted by the Group of Independent Experts in 1980, the provisions concerning distribution by cable of works broadcast as contained in the copyright laws of the United Kingdom (1956) and Austria (1980) appear to be discordant with them. The observer from Austria mentioned that the statement of CISAC was not convincing. The Committees referred the analysis of the court decisions and national legislations to the Subcommittees mentioned above.

82. The delegations of France and the Netherlands and the observers from Hungary and CISAC underlined the importance of observing the provisions of Article 11^{bis} of the Berne Convention according to which any communication to the public by wire of the broadcast of the work is subject to authorization when this communication is made by an organization other than the original one. CISAC also stressed that according to that Article legislation in the countries of the Union can determine the conditions of the exercise of the relevant authors' rights only without prejudice to the right of the author to obtain just remuneration.

83. The delegation of Switzerland suggested to also analyze the composition of programs distributed by cable in view of possible differentiation in the indemnities to be paid for the distribution by cable of programs emitted within the so-called service zone to be covered by the broadcasting organization, on the one hand, and outside it, on the other hand. The delegation of Switzerland also suggested that the Subcommittees take a pragmatic approach and pay more attention to the practical implementation of the relevant provisions of laws and court decisions.

84. The Secretariats noted the information and suggestions received from the Committees and will consider them when preparing the working paper to be submitted to the Subcommittees in November 1982.

Copyright problems faced by certain categories of the handicapped

Application of the Berne Convention and the Universal Copyright Convention to material specially intended for the blind

Examination of problems of those suffering from auditory handicaps

85. On a proposal by the Secretariats and in view of the similarity of the activities which could be undertaken to seek ways and means of fostering the free flow of works intended specially for handicapped persons, it was decided to examine documents B/EC/XIX/12-IGC(1971)/IV/15 and B/EC/XIX/13-IGC(1971)/IV/16, concerning those suffering from visual handicaps and those suffering from auditory handicaps, respectively, together.

86. The Secretariats explained that the first discussions by the Committees on the matter of material intended for persons suffering from visual handicaps had taken place at their sessions in 1977, when the delegation of Brazil had raised the matter.

87. During their 1979 sessions, the Committees had noted a report drawn up on this subject by the World Council for the Welfare of the Blind (WCWB) and had requested their respective Secretariats to transmit the document to the States for their comments.

88. The comments received from 15 States and from the Panamanian Institute for Social Rehabilitation had been analyzed, on behalf of the Secretariats, by the Copyright Office of the United States of America.

89. The Committees were also informed that within the framework of the International Year of the Handicapped a number of activities in favor of such persons had been undertaken by the Unesco Secretariat.

90. An international seminar on "Data processing and Braille," organized in September 1981 at Toulouse by the Collège de France, the Paul Sabatier University and the Institute for Research into the Improvement of Working Conditions (IRACT), with the cooperation of Unesco, after having taken cognizance of a study drawn up by the Secretariat on access for blind persons or persons having visual or physical handicaps to works protected by copyright, requested that the Organization continue "the steps undertaken to facilitate access for handicapped persons to works protected by copyright" (resolution 4.4).

91. Furthermore, the Director-General of Unesco sent a letter to the member States of the Organization on June 19, 1981, stressing the irreplaceable part played for handicapped persons by printed material and audiovisual means and requesting their aid in securing that the owners of copyright in works in

braille or in audiovisual material intended for handicapped persons assign the rights of reproduction, translation or adaptation to publishers in the developing countries on the most advantageous conditions possible.

92. The delegation of Brazil, after having listed the difficulties faced by handicapped persons wishing to have access to material needed to satisfy their educational and cultural needs, submitted to the Committees a number of suggestions for facilitating the circulation of such materials both nationally and internationally.

93. At national level, the delegation of Brazil drew the attention of the Committees to the possibility of using the exceptions provided in the international copyright conventions. The provisions already inserted in national laws could be given as large a distribution as possible, in order to make them better known, by Unesco and WIPO, in the hope that such transmission would encourage the responsible authorities in other countries to take appropriate legislative steps.

94. The delegation of Brazil also expressed the view that the Committees might ask their Secretariats to draft, for consideration by States, sample model legislation containing special provisions governing the access by handicapped persons to copyrighted works.

95. The delegation of Brazil wished to see the matter progress rapidly at the international level towards the working out of a licensing system specifically for handicapped persons, either within the framework of bilateral agreements or in the form of additional protocols to the international copyright conventions.

96. The delegation of Australia informed the Committees that the Bill for the amendment of the Australian Copyright Act, which had been transmitted to the Secretariats in the course of the survey carried out on the subject, had been effectively adopted by the Australian Parliament and had come into force on August 1, 1981.

97. The delegation of the United States of America endorsed the suggestions of the delegation of Brazil, and further considered that a working group might usefully be entrusted with preparing a draft of model national legislation.

98. The delegation of the United States of America also stressed the importance of the task that would thereby be entrusted to the working group, which would consist among other things in identifying the type of material necessary for the different categories of handicapped persons, evaluating the implications of international instruments other than the interna-

tional copyright conventions on the content of any provisions that might be drafted, and the role that could be given to the collections available in libraries with a view to the free dissemination of material intended for handicapped persons.

99. The delegations of Algeria, Chile, India, Japan, the Netherlands, Sweden and the United Kingdom and the observers from Italy and Portugal considered that the work done by the Secretariats, with the assistance of the US Copyright Office, was extremely useful, and they endorsed the request made by the delegations of Brazil and of the United States of America, namely, that a working group be set up to consider all the problems relating to the free circulation of material protected by copyright that was specially intended for handicapped persons.

100. The delegation of the German Democratic Republic emphasized that the States should, above all, take measures for the handicapped so as to ensure their participation in social life and free access to protected material, without necessarily resorting to a working group.

101. The observer from the World Council for the Welfare of the Blind (WCWB) congratulated the Secretariats in its turn for the action they had taken in favor of handicapped persons since 1977.

102. After having noted with satisfaction that the survey carried out by the Secretariats had given very encouraging results, the observer from the WCWB stated that it was essential to look for a solution at both national and international levels to the problems that confronted handicapped persons with regard to access to the material they needed. In that connection she endorsed the proposals made by the delegations of Brazil and of the United States of America, at the same time calling the Committees' attention to the concepts of justice and equity that militated in favor of the involvement of handicapped persons in daily life and their participation in international cultural activities.

103. The observer from the International Publishers Association (IPA), for his part, said that his organization would get in touch with WCWB in order to draft a model request for granting rights which would take into consideration the practice of the publishing trade and for putting appropriate material at the disposal of the blind as expeditiously as possible.

104. In conclusion, the Committees recommended the setting up of a working group that would consider all the questions raised in the course of the discussion of the agenda item concerned and, on a proposal by their Chairman, they invited the WCWB and the IPA to form part of the group in an advisory capacity.

Protection of folklore

105. In presenting document B/EC/XIX/14-IGC (1971)/IV/17, which related to this item of the agenda, the Secretariats pointed out that, at their meetings held in November/December 1977, the Committees had decided that "studies on this subject shall be pursued by the Unesco Secretariat on an interdisciplinary basis within the framework of an overall approach, but that WIPO should be associated in the examination of any copyright aspects involved." It was also mentioned that, at their meetings held in February 1979, the Committees had noted that, with regard to the "intellectual property aspects of folklore protection," model provisions for national legislation would be drawn up.

106. The document submitted to the Committees provided them with the text of the model provisions drawn up by two Working Groups that met in January 1980 and in February 1981. That text, and the commentary on it, would be submitted to a Committee of Governmental Experts to be convened jointly by Unesco and WIPO in Geneva from June 28 to July 2, 1982.

107. The Committees' attention was also drawn to the recommendations of the January 1980 Working Group, according to which it was considered advisable that the Secretariats endeavor to make a survey of the possibilities for folklore protection at the regional level.

108. In this connection the Committees were informed that, in response to the above wish, a Group of Experts for the Latin American region had met in Bogotá from October 14 to 16, 1981, at the kind invitation of the Government of Colombia. The convening of similar regional Groups of Experts for Africa and Asia and for the Arab States was also provided for in the programs and budgets of Unesco and WIPO.

109. The Committees also noted that one of the recommendations made by the 1981 Working Group concerned the international protection of the intellectual aspects of expressions of folklore.

110. With regard to the studies carried out by Unesco in the course of an interdisciplinary, overall approach to the whole set of cultural, social and legal aspects of folklore, the Committees were informed that a survey had been made among the member States of the Organization, and that the results of the survey would be submitted to a Committee of Governmental Experts convened by Unesco from February 22 to 26, 1982.

111. The Committees finally noted resolution 21 C/5/03 of the General Conference of Unesco, adopted at its 21st session, which considered it "de-

sirable that measures designed to safeguard the existence and development of folklore and to protect it against the risk of distortion should be laid down in international regulations," and invited the Director-General to report to it on the question at its 22nd session.

112. The delegation of Mexico, after having commended the Secretariats on the work done, suggested that the Committee of Governmental Experts that was to meet in June 1982 should have at its disposal, apart from the documents drawn up in the course of the study, the results of the work achieved by the Group of Experts that met in Bogotá in October 1981.

113. The delegations of Algeria, Australia, France, India, Israel, Sweden and the United States of America approved of the activities undertaken by the Secretariats, and declared themselves in favor of continuing to organize regional groups of experts. They also endorsed the proposal by the delegation of Mexico that the suggestions regarding the protection of folklore made by the Bogotá Group of Experts, and also those made by any other group that might meet before the Committee of Governmental Experts, should be conveyed to the latter Committee.

114. The delegation of France noted that the protection of folklore in the framework of the literary property was only one of the aspects of the safeguarding of the cultural heritage. It expressed the view that priority should be given to the search for protection at the international level, in spite of the difficulties that the implementation of such protection would not fail to cause. In that respect it expressed the hope that the work of the Committee of Governmental Experts entrusted with analyzing the various aspects of folklore on an interdisciplinary basis within the framework of an overall approach, which had been convened by Unesco to meet in February 1982, might contribute to the working out of a solution at that level, and also expressed the wish that that Committee might succeed in devising an international definition of folklore. The French delegation, therefore, considered that the results of the work of that Committee of Governmental Experts would be very useful to the Unesco/WIPO Committee of Governmental Experts in June 1982.

115. The delegation of Sweden emphasized the importance of studying also the interaction of a specific protection of the expression of folklore with the protection of other rights related to these expressions.

116. The delegation of Australia informed the Committees of the recent completion of a new study on the protection of Aboriginal folklore, which was to be released after approval by the Australian authorities.

117. The delegation of India considered it equitable that a clause be included in national legislation to provide for the use of all income derived from the exploitation of folklore for the socio-economic benefit of the communities which or whose ancestors contributed to the creation of the cultural heritage concerned.

118. The observer from the International Federation of Musicians (FIM) drew attention to the fact that the work being done should make due allowance for the contribution made by performers, especially singers, musicians and dancers, and expressed the wish that the model provisions for national legislation on the protection of folklore might take account of the share in that protection that should accrue to performers.

119. At the end of their discussions on the above subject, the Committees asked their respective Secretariats to study the most suitable means of informing the June 1982 Committee of Governmental Experts on the work in progress, and also of conveying to it any advice and suggestions that might be provided at various levels, both national and regional, on the subject of folklore protection. Meanwhile, they considered that the study of the intellectual property aspects of folklore protection at the international level was important and deserved to be undertaken.

Establishment of the Joint International Unesco-WIPO Service for Access by Developing Countries to Works Protected by Copyright

120. The Committees noted with satisfaction the establishment of the Joint International Unesco-WIPO Service for Access by Developing Countries to Works Protected by Copyright and the Unesco/WIPO Joint Consultative Committee to advise the Directors General of the two Organizations on the preparation and implementation of the activities of the Service (document B/EC/XIX/15-IGC (1971)/IV/18).

121. The Committees were also informed that the first session of the Joint Consultative Committee had been held in Paris in September 1981 and that the said Committee had examined the activities of the Service planned for 1981-1982.

Rental of Videograms

122. The delegation of the United States of America, referring to the problems posed by the use of videograms particularly in respect of their rental, suggested that the Secretariats should undertake a comparative study of national legislations and submit to the next sessions of the Committees in 1983 the results of such study.

123. This proposal was supported by the delegations of Canada, Germany (Federal Republic of), Sweden and the United Kingdom and the observers from Austria and Hungary. In addition the delegation of Sweden drew the attention of the Committees to the usefulness of examining these problems also in the context of the links of economic cooperation existing between certain countries.

124. The observer from the International Union of Cinematograph Exhibitors (UIEC) stated that he agreed in principle with what was mentioned by the delegation of the United States of America, but thought that the hiring of a film from a film distributor to a cinema owner is not comparable to the rental of a videogram to a single person for the latter's use.

125. The observer from the International Federation of Producers of Phonograms and Videograms (IFPI), after having briefly explained the said problems from the viewpoint of his organization, offered to assist the Secretariats in their task in this respect, and suggested that perhaps the International Labour Office should also be associated in the study.

126. Following a remark made by the observer from the International Confederation of Societies of Authors and Composers (CISAC), the Committees discussed the question of whether such a study should be limited to videograms or should embrace rights relating to other material supports and their distribution.

127. In conclusion the Committees decided to put the question of the right of distribution on the agenda of their next sessions and entrusted the Secretariats to undertake the appropriate studies on the relevant problems.

Part III: Other items concerning the Committee alone

Date and place of the next session to be held jointly with the Intergovernmental Copyright Committee

128. Participants were reminded that, since the present session was being held at the WIPO headquarters, the next session of the Committee at which joint meetings will be held with the Intergovernmental Copyright Committee should, as was customary, take place in 1983 at the headquarters of Unesco in Paris.

Adoption of the report

129. The Committee unanimously adopted Part I of this report under the chairmanship of Mrs. Karin

Götz, Vice-Chairman, in the absence of the Chairman. The Committee also unanimously adopted Part II of this report under the chairmanship of Mr. Inam Rahman (India), elected as ad hoc Chairman for the adoption of this part in his capacity as ad hoc Chairman of the Intergovernmental Copyright Committee for the last two meetings of that Committee.

Closing of the session

130. After the usual thanks, the Vice-Chairman declared the session closed.

List of Participants

I. States Members of the Committee

Australia: C.C. Creswell. **Bulgaria:** T. Ivanov; V. Dimitrova. **Canada:** B. Couchman. **Chile:** C. Bustos; R. Babul. **Czechoslovakia:** L. Černá. **Finland:** J. Lienes; F. Forsberg. **France:** A. Kerever; A. Françon; A. Bourdalé Dufau; A. Gendron; J. Myard. **German Democratic Republic:** K. Götz; H.-W. Mattern. **India:** I. Rahman; L. Puri. **Mexico:** J.M. Terán Contreras; X. Diez de Urdanivia; F. Savinon-Plaza; V. Blanco Labra. **Senegal:** N. NDiaye. **Sri Lanka:** S. Palihakkara. **Switzerland:** J.-L. Marro. **Tunisia:** M. Ben Slama; A. Ben Jeddou; S. Zarrouk. **Turkey:** A. Yalgin.

II. Observer States Members of the Berne Union

Austria: R. Ditttrich. **Brazil:** E. Cordeiro. **Denmark:** J. Nørup-Nielsen. **Egypt:** I. Ghattas; M. Daghash. **Germany (Federal Republic of):** M. Möller. **Greece:** A. Mitsialis. **Holy See:** O. Rouillet. **Hungary:** M. Ficsor. **Israel:** M. Gabay; R. Kedar. **Italy:** R. Brunetti; G. Aversa. **Japan:** Y. Oyama; H. Hayashida. **Lebanon:** T. Badawi. **Libya:** A. El-Atrash. **Madagascar:** M. Zafera; S. Rabearivelo. **Netherlands:** M. Reinsma; R.J. Mulder; F. Klaver. **Norway:** H. Sønneland; A.M. Lund. **Pakistan:** S. Bakhir. **Philippines:** H.J. Brillantes; F.F. Santos; C.V. Espejo. **Portugal:** A.M. Pereira. **Spain:** A. Sahagun Pool. **Sweden:** A.H. Olsson. **Thailand:** V. Bhinyoying; S. Dhirakaosal. **United Kingdom:** D.F. Carter; A. Holt; J.W.B. Richards. **Zaire:** M. Ngonda. **Zimbabwe:** R.P. Moul.

III. Other States

Algeria: S. Abada; A. Bencheneb. **Andorra:** A. Pintat; M.-A. Canturri Montanya. **Byelorussian SSR:** V. Grekov. **Cape Verde:** V. Duarte Martins. **Colombia:** A. Gomez Merlano. **Cuba:** J. Siliva. **El Salvador:** M. Gonzalez Dubon; C.A. Barahona Rivas. **Indonesia:** S. Suryodarmojo; H. Reksodiputro. **Republic of Korea:** S.-C. Cho. **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines:** G.C. Isaacs. **Saudi Arabia:** N.S. Kanaan; M.A. Al-Arifi. **Soviet Union:** B. Pankin; I.A. Baderko; R. Gorelik; E. Dapkounas; A. Protassenya. **Trinidad and Tobago:** V.D. Lasse; M.G.A. Lashley. **Uganda:** P. Birungi. **United States of America:** D.L. Ladd; D. Schrader; L. Flacks; C.L. Greenwood.

IV. Intergovernmental Organizations (Observers)

International Labour Office (ILO): G. Bohère. **United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO):** M.-C. Dock; A. Amri. **Arab States Broadcasting Union (ASBU):** A. Chakroun. **Council of Europe (CE):** F. Hondius. **Organization of African Unity (OAU):** C.Y. Afanou.

V. International Non-Governmental Organizations (Observers)

European Broadcasting Union (EBU): W. Rumphorst. **International Alliance for Diffusion by Wire (AID):** G. Moreau. **International Bureau of Societies Administering the Rights of Mechanical Recording and Reproduction (BIEM):** J.-A. Ziegler. **International Confederation of Societies of Authors and Composers (CISAC):** J.-A. Ziegler. **International Copyright Society (INTERGU):** G. Halla; P. Banki. **International Council of Archives (ICA):** O. Gauye. **International Federation of Actors (FIA):** Y. Burckhardt. **International Federation of Associations of Film Distributors (FIAD):** G. Grégoire. **International Federation of Film Producers Associations (FIAPF):** A. Brisson; B. Norris. **International Federation of Musicians (FIM):** R. Leuzinger; Y. Burckhardt. **International Federation of Producers of Phonograms and Videograms (IFPI):** G. Davies; E. Thompson. **International Federation of Translators (FIT):** J. Goetschalckx. **International Group of Scientific, Technical and Medical Publishers (STM):** J.A. Koutchoumow. **International Literary and Artistic Association (ALAI):** J.-A. Ziegler. **International Organisation of Hotel and Restaurant Associations (HoReCa):** F.J. Feichtenberger. **International Publishers Association (IPA):** J.A. Koutchoumow. **International Union of Cinematograph Exhibitors (UIEC):** J. Handl. **International Writers Guild (IWG):** R. Fernay. **World Council for the Welfare of the Blind (WCWB):** D. de Gouvea Nowill.

VI. Secretariat

World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO)

A. Bogsch (*Director General*); C. Masouyé (*Director, Public Information and Copyright Department*); S. Alikhan (*Director, Developing Countries Division (Copyright)*); G. Boytha (*Head, Copyright Law Division*).

National Legislation

AUSTRALIA

I

Copyright (International Protection) Regulations (Amendments)

(S.R. No. 276, of September 17, 1980) *

Interpretation

1. Regulation 3 of the Copyright (International Protection) Regulations is amended—

- (a) by omitting paragraph (a) of sub-regulation (4) and substituting the following paragraph:
 - “(a) the overseas Departments and Territories of France shall be deemed to form part of the territory of France;”;
- (b) by inserting after paragraph (b) of that sub-regulation the following paragraph:
 - “(ba) the Netherland Antilles shall be deemed to form part of the territory of the Netherlands;”;
- (c) by omitting paragraph (d) of that sub-regulation and substituting the following paragraph:
 - “(d) the overseas Provinces of Portugal shall be deemed to form part of the territory of Portugal;”;
- (d) by omitting from paragraph (e) of that sub-regulation “, the British Solomon Islands Protectorate”; and
- (e) by omitting from paragraph (f) of that sub-regulation “, the Panama Canal Zone”.

Application of Certain Provisions of Act to Certain Overseas Works

2. Regulation 9 of the Copyright (International Protection) Regulations is amended by omitting sub-regulations (2) and (3) and substituting the following sub-regulations:

“(2) Where a work was first published before the commencement of the Act in a country specified in Part I of Schedule 1, section 210 of the Act applies to the work as if, for the purpose of determining, for the purpose of that section, whether copyright subsisted in a work under the Copyright Act, 1911 immediately before the commencement of the Act, the work was first published in Australia.

“(3) Where, in relation to a work that was made before 1 July 1912—

- (a) the work was first published or performed in; or
- (b) the author of the work was, at a material time, a national, citizen or resident of,

a country specified in Part I of Schedule 1, Division 5 of Part XI of the Act applies to the work as if—

- (c) the work was first published or performed in Australia; or
- (d) the author of the work was, at a material time, an Australian citizen or a resident of Australia.”.

Schedules

3. The First and Second Schedules to the Copyright (International Protection) Regulations are repealed and the Schedule set out in Schedule 1 substituted.

Third Schedule

4. The Third Schedule to the Copyright (International Protection) Regulations is amended by omitting “Third Schedule” and substituting “Schedule 3”.

Further Amendments

5. The Copyright (International Protection) Regulations are further amended as set out in Schedule 2.

* Published in the *Commonwealth of Australia Gazette* on September 25, 1980. The basic Regulations appeared in *Copyright*, 1975, pp. 203 *et seq.*

SCHEDULE 1

Regulation 3

Schedule to be inserted in the Copyright (International Protection) Regulations

SCHEDULE 1

Regulations 3, 4, 8, 9, 10 and 11

PART I

Arab Republic of Egypt	Greece	Norway
Argentina	Holy See	Pakistan
Austria	Hungary	Philippines
Bahamas	Iceland	Poland
Belgium	India	Portugal
Benin	Ireland	Romania
Brazil	Israel	Senegal
Bulgaria	Italy	South Africa
United Republic of Cameroon	Ivory Coast	Spain
Canada	Japan	Sri Lanka
Central African Republic	Lebanon	Surinam
Chad	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	Sweden
Chile	Liechtenstein	Switzerland
Congo	Luxembourg	Thailand
Costa Rica	Madagascar	Togo
Cyprus	Mali	Tunisia
Czechoslovakia	Malta	Turkey
Denmark	Mauritania	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Fiji	Mexico	Upper Volta
Finland	Monaco	Uruguay
France	Morocco	Yugoslavia
Gabon	Netherlands	Zaire
German Democratic Republic	New Zealand	
Germany, Federal Republic of	Niger	

PART II

Algeria	Guatemala	Nigeria
Andorra	Haiti	Panama
Bangladesh	Kenya	Paraguay
Columbia	Lao People's Democratic Republic	Peru
Cuba	Liberia	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Democratic Kampuchea	Malawi	United States of America
Ecuador	Mauritius	Venezuela
El Salvador	Nicaragua	Zambia
Ghana		

SCHEDULE 2

Regulation 5

Provision amended	Amendments
Sub-regulation 3 (1)	Omit "the First Schedule to these Regulations" (wherever occurring) from the definition of "the country of origin", substitute "Schedule 1".
Sub-regulation 4 (1)	Omit "the First Schedule to these Regulations", substitute "Schedule 1".
Sub-regulation 4 (2)	Omit "the First Schedule to these Regulations", substitute "Schedule 1".
Sub-regulation 4 (3)	Omit "the First Schedule to these Regulations", substitute "Schedule 1".
Sub-regulation 4 (4)	Omit "the First Schedule to these Regulations", substitute "Schedule 1".
Sub-regulation 4 (5)	Omit "the First Schedule to these Regulations", substitute "Schedule 1".
Regulation 6	Omit "the Third Schedule" (wherever occurring), substitute "Schedule 3".
Sub-regulation 7 (1)	Omit "the Third Schedule" (wherever occurring), substitute "Schedule 3".
Regulation 8	Omit "the First Schedule to these Regulations" (wherever occurring), substitute "Schedule 1".
Paragraph 9 (1) (a)	Omit "the First Schedule to these Regulations", substitute "Schedule 1".
Sub-regulation 10 (2)	Omit "the First Schedule to these Regulations", substitute "Schedule 1".
Sub-regulation 11 (2)	Omit "the First Schedule", substitute "Schedule 1".
Sub-regulation 11 (3)	Omit "the First Schedule", substitute "Schedule 1".

II

Copyright (International Protection) Regulations (Amendment)

(S.R. No. 74, of April 9, 1981) *

SCHEDULE 3

Schedule 3 to the Copyright (International Protection) Regulations is repealed and the following Schedule substituted:

SCHEDULE 3

Regulations 6 and 7

**Countries where Copyright in a Recording Includes the Right to Cause
the Recording to be Heard in Public or to Broadcast the Recording**

Argentina	Iceland	Philippines
Austria	India	Poland
Bahamas	Ireland	Romania
Bangladesh	Israel	Spain
Brazil	Italy	Sri Lanka
Czechoslovakia	Japan	Sweden
Denmark	Liechtenstein	Thailand
Federal Republic of Germany	Mauritius	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Fiji	New Zealand	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Finland	Norway	
German Democratic Republic	Pakistan	

* Published in the *Commonwealth of Australia Gazette* on April 15, 1981. The basic Regulations appeared in *Copyright*, 1975, pp. 203 *et seq.* See also above.

General Studies

Private Copying: A New Exploitation Mode for Works

Patrick MASOUYÉ *

Calendar

WIPO Meetings

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

1982

- March 15 and 16 (Geneva) — Madrid Union (Marks) — Users' Meeting**
- April 1 and 2 (Geneva) — International Patent Cooperation (PCT) Union — Meeting with Non-Governmental Organizations (with the participation of National Patent Offices of PCT Contracting States)**
- April 19 to 23 (Geneva) — Permanent Committee on Patent Information (PCPI) — Working Group on Planning**
- April 19 to 23 (Geneva) — Permanent Committee on Patent Information (PCPI) — Working Group on Special Questions**
- April 26 to 30 (Geneva) — Berne Union — Working Group on the "domaine public payant" (convened jointly with Unesco)**
- May 3 to 7 (Geneva) — Permanent Committee on Patent Information (PCPI) — Working Group on General Information**
- May 10 to 14 (Vienna) — International Patent Classification (IPC) — Advanced Seminar**
- May 24 to 28 (Geneva) — Nice Union — Committee of Experts**
- June 7 to 11 (Paris) — Berne Union — Committee of Governmental Experts on Problems Arising from the Use of Computers for Access to or the Creation of Works (convened jointly with Unesco)**
- June 7 to 18 (Geneva) — Permanent Committee on Patent Information (PCPI) — Working Group on Search Information**
- June 14 to 18 (Geneva) — Development Cooperation — Working Group on the Establishment of a Guide on the Organization of Industrial Property Activities of Enterprises in Developing Countries**
- June 21 to 24 (Geneva) — International Patent Cooperation (PCT) Union — Assembly (Extraordinary Session)**
- June 28 to July 2 (Geneva) — Committee of Governmental Experts on Model Provisions for the Protection of Expressions of Folklore (convened jointly with Unesco)**
- September 1 to 3 (Geneva) — Working Group on the Rights of Employed or Salaried Authors (convened jointly with ILO and Unesco)**
- September 6 to 10 (Geneva) — International Patent Cooperation (PCT) Union — Committee for Administrative and Legal Matters**
- September 20 to 23 (Geneva) — Permanent Committee on Patent Information (PCPI) — Working Group on Patent Information for Developing Countries**
- September 23 to October 1 (Geneva) — Permanent Committee on Patent Information (PCPI) — Working Group on Planning**
- September 23 to October 1 (Geneva) — Permanent Committee on Patent Information (PCPI) — Working Group on Special Questions**
- September 27 to 30 (Geneva) — Permanent Committee for Development Cooperation Related to Industrial Property**
- October 4 to 30 (Geneva) — Revision of the Paris Convention — Diplomatic Conference**
- October 25 to 27 (Paris) — Berne Union — Working Group on Copyright Questions Connected with the Use of Works by Persons with Defective Hearing or Sight (convened jointly with Unesco)**
- November 8 to 12 (Geneva) — Working Group on Model Contracts for Licensing or Transferring Copyright (convened jointly with Unesco)**
- November 22 to 26 (Geneva) — Governing Bodies (WIPO Coordination Committee; Executive Committees of the Paris and Berne Unions)**
- November 29 to December 3 (Geneva) — Permanent Committee on Patent Information (PCPI) and PCT Committee for Technical Cooperation (PCT/CTC)**
- December 6 to 10 (Geneva) — International Patent Classification (IPC) — Committee of Experts**
- December 6 to 10 (Paris) — Berne Union, Universal Convention and Rome Convention — Subcommittees of the Executive Committee of the Berne Union, of the Intergovernmental Copyright Committee and of the Intergovernmental Committee of the Rome Convention, respectively, on Copyright and Neighboring Rights Problems in the Field of Cable Television (convened jointly with ILO and Unesco)**

UPOV Meetings

1982

April 26 and 27 (Geneva) — Administrative and Legal Committee

April 28 and 29 (Geneva) — Consultative Committee

May 11 to 13 (Salerno) — Technical Working Party for Vegetables

May 18 (Madrid) — Technical Working Party for Agricultural Crops — Subgroup

May 19 to 21 (Madrid) — Technical Working Party for Agricultural Crops

September 28 (Faversham) — Technical Working Party for Fruit Crops — Subgroup

September 29 to October 1 (Faversham) — Technical Working Party for Fruit Crops

October 5 to 7 (Cambridge) — Technical Working Party for Ornamental Plants and Forest Trees

October 12 (Geneva) — Consultative Committee

October 13 to 15 (Geneva) — Council

November 15 and 16 (Geneva) — Administrative and Legal Committee

November 17 (Geneva) — Information Meeting with International Non-Governmental Organizations

November 18 and 19 (Geneva) — Technical Committee

Other Meetings in the Field of Copyright and/or Neighboring Rights

1982

Intergovernmental Organizations

Council of Europe

Committee of Legal Experts in the Media Field — October 12 to 15 (Strasbourg)

Non-Governmental Organizations

International Literary and Artistic Association (ALAI)

Study Session — May 16 to 20 (Amsterdam)

International Confederation of Societies of Authors and Composers (CISAC)

Executive Bureau and Administrative Council — March 17 to 19 (Geneva)

Legal and Legislation Committee — May 10 to 12 (Vienna)

Congress — October 3 to 8 (Rome)

International Federation of Actors (FIA)

Congress — September 27 to October 1 (Paris)

International Federation of Musicians (FIM)

Seminar on the administration of performers' rights — May 3 and 4 (Geneva)

Executive Committee — May 5 to 7 (Geneva)