

Advisory Committee on Enforcement

Twelfth Session

Geneva, September 4 to 6, 2017

SUMMARY BY THE CHAIR

adopted by the Committee

1. The twelfth session of the Advisory Committee on Enforcement (ACE) was held from September 4 to 6, 2017. The session was attended by 87 Member States, one Non-State Member and 20 Observers.
2. Under agenda item 1, Mr. Minelik Alemu Getahun, Assistant Director General of WIPO, opened the session by welcoming the Committee and thanking the Member States for their close engagement in the work of the Committee and building respect for intellectual property (IP) in general. He noted that over the previous year, numerous delegations had emphasized the importance they attached to balanced and effective enforcement, to awareness raising, to building respect for IP and to the work of the Committee in particular. He expressed the Secretariat's gratitude to the experts and panelists, coming from all regions of the world, who contributed to the work of the twelfth session.
3. Under agenda item 2, Mr. Héctor Manuel Balmaceda Godoy, Director General for Enforcement, National Directorate of Intellectual Property (DINAPI), Paraguay, was elected as Chair. Ms. Ana Gobechia, IP Advisor, Permanent Mission of Georgia to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva and Mr. Dae-Soon Jung, Counselor, Permanent Mission of the Republic of Korea to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva, were elected as Vice-Chairs.
4. Under agenda item 3, the Committee adopted the Agenda (document WIPO/ACE/12/1).
5. Under agenda item 4, the Chair noted that no requests for the admission as *ad-hoc* observers had been received.

6. The Committee heard Opening Statements by the Group of Latin American and Caribbean Countries (GRULAC), the African Group, the Group of Central European and Baltic States (CEBS), Group B, the Asia and Pacific Group, the Delegation of China, the Delegation of Iran (Islamic Republic of), the Delegation of Brazil, the Delegation of Côte d'Ivoire, the Delegation of Panama, the Delegation of Sri Lanka, the Delegation of Saudi Arabia, the Delegation of Mexico, the Delegation of the European Union (EU), the Representative of South Centre, the Representative of the World Customs Organization (WCO) and the Representative of the Computer & Communications Industry Association (CCIA).

7. The Delegation of Costa Rica, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, noted that the twelfth ACE session was of particular value because for the first time since the Committee's establishment in 2002 a representative of GRULAC chaired the discussions. The Group reiterated its commitment to continue to contribute constructively to advancing the work of the Committee. It recalled that IP enforcement had a scope going beyond simple protection. The different activities and initiatives that built respect for IP, which addressed different groups within society, required an important infrastructure and coordination between different national and regional entities. The main objective of these efforts was to promote creativity, innovation and technology transfer, while ensuring a balance between right holders and users. The Group also observed that during the twelfth ACE session the Committee would have a busy agenda with more than 30 presentations, which would make it possible to learn in more depth about IP enforcement systems and practices in different regions of the world. This would foster an exchange of information that should help delegates to agree on an ambitious road map for the future. The Group expressed its particular interest in the presentation of document WIPO/ACE/12/14, which explained the framework, scope and content of legislative assistance provided by WIPO in the area of IP enforcement. The Group trusted that delegates would continue to take advantage of the flexible format offered by the Committee to continue the exchange of experiences with the enforcement of IP rights (IPRs) from diverse perspectives.

8. The Delegation of Senegal, speaking on behalf of the African Group, reiterated the great importance the Group attached to the work and mandate of the ACE, underpinned by Recommendation No. 45 of the WIPO Development Agenda (DA) and Article 7 of the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS Agreement). The Group welcomed the privileged forum offered by the Committee for the fruitful exchanging of information, and sharing of experiences and practices that could help Member States improve their mechanisms to protect and build respect for IP in the interest of development. Nonetheless, the Group recalled that the mandate of the Committee expressly excluded any work geared towards norm setting or harmonization. IPR protection and enforcement had to take into account the specific needs of promoting innovation and transfer of technology in order to achieve the expected social and economic benefits. The Group took particular note of documents WIPO/ACE/12/2 and WIPO/ACE/12/14 relating respectively to WIPO's recent activities in the area of IPRs and WIPO's legislative assistance in the field of IPR enforcement. Finally, the Group welcomed the *International Conference on Building Respect for IP – Stimulating Innovation and Creativity*, held in Shanghai in November 2016. With regard to the future work of the Committee, the Group requested that WIPO's technical assistance activities, particularly in relation to the flexibilities offered by TRIPS Agreement, continue to be present on the Committee's agenda. In addition, the Group urged the Secretariat to take the necessary steps to encourage Member States to submit contributions in this regard. The Group finally expressed its commitment to participate constructively in the work of the twelfth ACE session and to contribute, whenever necessary, to the discussions on the various items on the agenda.

9. The Delegation of Georgia, speaking on behalf of CEBS, attached great importance to the work of the Committee. As Member States were facing multiple challenges in the area of

enforcement, the elaboration of an appropriate legal framework and building respect for IP through different campaigns were important, especially for different target groups, including the youth. The Group believed that the agreed work program would ensure an effective and constructive exchange of best practices. The Group noted that building respect for IP was a lengthy and complicated process, requiring many resources in order to implement the various layers of successful actions capable of changing people's habits and mindsets. The Group believed that the attractiveness and efficiency of the IP system depended on IPR enforcement and that the exchange of experiences in this area would assist Member States in developing enforcement policies in their countries. The Group reiterated its commitment to the work of the Committee and constructive engagement, which was demonstrated by the usual interest and presentations delivered by CEBS members.

10. The Delegation of Japan, speaking on behalf of Group B, noted its confidence that the twelfth ACE session would contribute to the appropriate enhancement towards IPR enforcement, which was one of the essential elements in the implementation of an effective and meaningful IP protection system. The Group reiterated the importance it continuously attached to the Committee and its subject matter, namely IPR enforcement, and noted that without effective and balanced enforcement mechanisms, IPRs would not be able to fulfill their central objective of contributing to development through the promotion and protection of innovations. The Group believed that enforcement was a subject that all WIPO members should take seriously, remain sincerely engaged in and consider as a common interest irrespective of their levels of development. The Group also recognized that the difficulties of effective enforcement existed in its application rather than in laws and regulations *per se*. It was therefore very important to learn lessons from the experiences of others, and the ACE was the place where delegations could do so. The Group expressed its satisfaction with the balanced nature of the four work program items, noting that the long list of presentations indicated the interest expressed by Member States and signaled the positive spirit in which the Committee operated.

11. The Delegation of Indonesia, speaking on behalf of the Asia and Pacific Group, urged Delegations not to lose sight of the mandate of the ACE, namely technical assistance and coordination in the areas of IP enforcement and building respect for IP, without engaging in any norm-setting activities. The Group recalled that the ACE should focus on the objectives of combating counterfeiting and piracy activities; public education; assistance; coordination to undertake national and regional training programs for all relevant stakeholders and exchange of information on enforcement issues. It was therefore desirable for the ACE to stay true to its mandate and program, guided by the General Assembly and relevant Strategic Goals and DA Recommendations. The ACE was important so that Member States could share national experiences, bearing in mind that, as IPRs were private rights and territorial in nature, the primary responsibility of enforcing them should be on the right holders and not governments. The TRIPS Agreement required WTO members to make available to right holders enforcement procedures to take effective action against acts of IP infringement but it did not create obligations to put in place a judicial system for the enforcement of IPRs that was distinct from the general law enforcement system. The Group shared its expectation that the technical assistance provided by WIPO on IP enforcement should continuously aim to be in accordance with DA Recommendation 45, which called upon WIPO to address IP enforcement in the context of broader societal interests and especially development-oriented concerns. It was important that WIPO continued to approach the issue of enforcement of IPRs in a holistic manner and in the context of building respect for IP, to ensure that the means to enforce IPRs were in line with the objectives of Article 7 of the TRIPS Agreement. The Group was of the view that not all items of the work program of the twelfth ACE session had been given equal weight and that the discussion of work program item three (exchange of information on national experiences of WIPO's legislative assistance on IP enforcement taking into account the flexibilities, the level of development, differences in legal

traditions and the possible abuse of enforcement procedures) was very limited. Having studied document WIPO/ACE/12/14, the Group believed that, from the perspective of building respect for IP, which was a broader concept than IP enforcement, it would be important to see legislative assistance activities on the strengthening of safeguards mechanisms in IP enforcement. While document WIPO/ACE/12/14 shed some light on the legislative assistance in the area of IP enforcement provided by WIPO Program 17 under Strategic Goal VI on building respect for IP, the evaluation of Strategic Goal VI and Program 17 that had been carried out by the WIPO Internal Oversight Division had been based on a limited sample size and had not represented adequately developing countries and least developed countries. The Group expressed its wish to see a more comprehensive presentation of WIPO's technical assistance in the area of IP enforcement, which should become part of the future work of the ACE, so as to enable Member States to be in a more knowledgeable position when requesting technical assistance. For future ACE sessions, the Group requested the Secretariat to present all training and capacity-building materials for the review of the Member States and proposed to discuss the important issue of how broader public policy questions were addressed in IP enforcement proceedings. The Group affirmed that it would remain constructive and engaging during the discussions.

12. The Delegation of China noted that it would actively and constructively participate in relevant discussions and experience sharing during the twelfth ACE session.

13. The Delegation of Iran (Islamic Republic of), associating itself with the statement made by Indonesia on behalf of the Asia and Pacific Group, noted that it attached great importance to the work of the Committee as the ACE provided an appropriate platform for Member States to exchange information on national experiences on specific aspects of IPRs without engaging in any norm-setting activity. Placing great importance on work program items three and four (exchange of success stories on capacity building and support from WIPO for training activities at national and regional levels for agencies and national officials in line with relevant Development Agenda Recommendations and the ACE mandate), the Delegation was of the view that these topics had not been given equal weight in the work program of the twelfth ACE session. The Delegation supported to maintain these important topics on the work program of the ACE and hoped to see broader discussions on these topics during the next session.

14. The Delegation of Brazil noted that since its establishment in 2002, the ACE had set priorities and allocated resources to trying to fulfill the Committee's mandate of carrying out technical assistance and coordinating efforts in the field of enforcement. The Delegation was of the view that all of WIPO's work in the area of enforcement should be consistent with the DA and, therefore, should reflect the changes that the DA promoted in the Organization. Building respect for IP, in a sustainable way, demanded the adoption of measures that not only helped to protect and enforce IPRs but also prevented their abuse by right holders with the potential of harming competition and innovation. The Delegation believed that it was perfectly possible to harmonize IP enforcement with the goals of promotion and transfer of technological innovation as well as social and economic development. The ACE, under its mandate, was the adequate venue to help delegates reach this balancing act. The Delegation considered that truly effective enforcement procedures would enable the protection of legitimate right holders' interests without curbing the dissemination of knowledge. Thus, the Committee could shed additional light on the interface between IPRs and competition policies. The Delegation expressed its willingness to engage in discussions on this matter to enhance the mutual understanding of IP and competition laws and procedures.

15. The Delegation of Côte d'Ivoire, aligning itself with the statement made by the Delegation of Senegal on behalf of the African Group, recognized the importance and impact of the mandate of

the ACE in the area of respect for IP. The Delegation invited all delegations to engage in constructive and highly enriching debates and exchanges, taking into account the spirit of balance.

16. The Delegation of Panama reported that the recent extension of the Panama Canal had led to an increase in goods being shipped from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean and handled at the Colón Free Trade Zone. The Delegation requested that, in line with this increase, IP capacity-building and awareness-raising activities also be increased in Panama, not only for the judiciary but also other relevant authorities such as security forces, customs, the public prosecution and the officers in the Colón Free Trade Zone, so as to avoid a rise in piracy and counterfeiting.

17. The Delegation of Sri Lanka noted its belief that the world should be more conscious of the areas of e-commerce and the sphere of Internet service providers with regard to the trafficking of counterfeit goods. The Delegation registered its interest in receiving technical assistance and support in relation to these important aspects for prosecutors, the judiciary, the police and customs. The Delegation further stated its support and appreciation for the activities conducted by WIPO.

18. The Delegation of Saudi Arabia emphasized that Saudi Arabia, like many other countries around the world, faced the challenge that IPR infringing goods were flooding into the country. The Delegation noted that important topics were on the agenda of the twelfth ACE session, in particular as regards the destruction of IP infringing goods, and explained that Saudi Arabia had very strict laws particularly with regard to customs, as well as stringent rules designed to punish and sanction IP infringement.

19. The Delegation of Mexico noted that some very important and innovative points in the area of IPR protection and enforcement would be discussed during the twelfth ACE session. The Delegation was aware that it was everyone's responsibility to protect IPRs and that public authorities and the private sector needed to work together to achieve this. The Delegation also reported on some regional practices aimed at enhanced IP enforcement, namely the Regional Seminar *Promoting IPR Enforcement Policy in Latin America: The Role of the Intellectual Property Office*, which, in 2016, was jointly hosted by the IMPI and the White House Office of the Intellectual Property Enforcement Coordinator (IPEC) of the United States of America in Tequila. The Delegation was of the view that customs were extremely important in the fight against IP infringements and reported that, two weeks before the twelfth ACE session, Mexico had participated in a seminar on IP protection and enforcement for IP offices and customs officials in Viet Nam organized by the United States of America and supported by various member states of the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation.

20. The Delegation of the EU, speaking on behalf of the EU and its member states, emphasized that it was a strong supporter of the work and the mission of the Committee and hoped that the more structured and predictable work program would allow the ACE to play a much greater role within the WIPO framework. The Delegation continued to believe that the state-centric agenda point complemented the existing issue-centric agenda points in a balanced manner. The Delegation believed that basing discussions on practical experiences of WIPO Member States enabled delegations to learn from other countries and build upon each other's practices. The Delegation therefore supported the Committee in continuing to place this item on future agendas. With regard to national experiences relating to institutional arrangements concerning IP enforcement policies and regimes, the Delegation pointed out that the EU itself had adopted a so-called follow-the-money approach to combat commercial scale IP infringement and that an important tool in this approach was the facilitation of industry-specific voluntary cooperation and self-regulatory agreements. With relation to documents WIPO/ACE/12/14 and WIPO/ACE/12/2, the Delegation expressed its hope that the twelfth ACE session would mark the start of a

meaningful exchange of information on national experiences in respect of WIPO's legislative assistance, emphasizing that any assistance by WIPO should continue to be flexible and take into account the level of development, the difference in legal tradition and the possible abuse of enforcement procedures, bearing in mind the broader societal interest and Member States' priorities. Highly valuing the work carried out by WIPO in providing assistance to Member States with training and awareness-raising activities, the Delegation wished to see more national and regional workshops, seminars, conferences and colloquia taking place in Europe. The Delegation was particularly pleased with the intensive cooperation between WIPO and the European Observatory on Infringements of IPRs of the EUIPO (EUIPO Observatory). With regard to the practical difficulties faced by all stakeholders at the intersection of IP and private international law, the Delegation welcomed the development of a resource tool on the intersection between IP and private international law and looked forward to the presentation with the hope that the tool would be of significant benefit to different legal actors such as judges, legislators, arbitrators and legal counsels world-wide. Regarding the future work of the ACE, the Delegation expressed its interest in seeing more discussion on the possibilities and effect of cooperation between the public and the private sector in IPR enforcement, in particular in the fight against commercial scale infringements. The EU could also contribute to these discussions, as it had adopted several novel solutions in the context of the follow-the-money approach to IPR enforcement, and the EU's bodies and initiatives, among them the EUIPO Observatory, were a valuable platform for encouraging greater collaboration in the enforcement of IPRs. The Delegation believed that WIPO was the multilateral hub for all IP related issues and had an important role to play in coordinating enforcement activities across its Member States to ensure the long-term integrity of the global IP system.

21. The Representative of South Centre noted that WIPO should approach IP enforcement in a holistic manner to ensure that the means to enforce IPRs were in line with the objectives of the WIPO DA and Article 7 of the TRIPS Agreement. He also recalled the provisions under Part III of the TRIPS Agreement. The Representative added that, as IPRs were private rights, the primary responsibility of enforcing IPRs lied with right holder not governments. He was of the view that the ACE should serve as a forum for Member States to review and discuss WIPO activities and share their national experiences, to ensure they were aligned with these objectives. Suggesting points for consideration by the Committee in the future, the Representative emphasized that it was important to address abuses of IP rights, abuses of IP enforcement procedures, and anticompetitive practices and to share national experiences on safeguards against such abuses or any threats or tactics that a Member State might suffer, undermining their rights to use TRIPS flexibilities in the area of IP enforcement. The Representative was further of the view that it was critical to improve data sources for studies aiming to quantify the global scale of counterfeiting and piracy and to ensure that the terms used were those defined under the TRIPS Agreement and that the methodology and resulting estimates of recent studies were not reliable. The Representative believed that it was critical to discuss the newly adopted definition of substandard and falsified medicines by the World Health Organization (WHO) in order to clearly distinguish issues of IPR infringement in relation to medical products from issues of quality, safety and efficacy. The Representative also suggested reviewing WIPO's technical assistance in the area of IP enforcement, as it was necessary to ensure that relevant government institutions involved in IP enforcement could appropriately determine on a case-by-case basis the balance between the interests of right holders and the public interest.

22. The Representative of the WCO noted that it was committed to capacity building in the area of IP in all of its member administrations and did its utmost to coordinate these activities with partner organizations such as WIPO. Recalling Part III Section 4 of the TRIPS Agreement on special requirements related to border measures, the Representative was grateful that the Delegations of Panama and Sri Lanka had drawn attention to the work of customs in the area of IP and noted that the WCO would continue to support this work.

23. The Representative of the CCIA emphasized that many online services went well beyond complying with local legal obligations to protect third-party brands and content and made voluntary efforts designed to assist copyright and trademark owners in protecting their rights. The Representative noted that some of the papers to be presented in the Committee offered some insight about what tools existed but did not present a complete picture of the available tools or their variety across the Internet ecosystem. The Representative noted that copyright and trademarks were not interchangeable but had different legal justifications and purposes and different levels of international harmonization. The Representative was therefore of the view that solutions for one subject did not necessarily translate to the other, highlighting that the lack of harmonization in substantive trademark law was particularly problematic when contemplating global, automated enforcement tools.

24. Under agenda item 5, the Committee heard 34 expert presentations, one Secretariat presentation and four panel discussions relating to the various items of the work program (documents WIPO/ACE/12/3 to WIPO/ACE/12/14).

25. Under the work program item “exchange of information on national experiences relating to institutional arrangements concerning IP enforcement policies and regimes, including mechanism to resolve IP disputes in a balanced, holistic and effective manner”, presentations were grouped into five topics.

26. Under the topic “The Environmentally Safe Disposal and Destruction of IP Infringing Goods”, Dr. Martin Guard, Independent Environmental Consultant, Geneva, presented the results of the Secretariat commissioned study “The Environmentally Safe Disposal and Destruction of Intellectual Property Infringing Goods”. Reference was made to document WIPO/ACE/12/3 Rev.

27. In addition, two Member States shared their experiences. The presentations comprised “Environmentally Safe Disposal of Intellectual Property Infringing Products: The Experience of the Italian Customs Administration” by the Customs and Monopolies Agency of Italy and “Environmentally Safe Disposal and Destruction of Goods Infringing Intellectual Property Rights – The Case of Mexico” by the Mexican Institute for Industrial Property (IMPI). Reference was made to document WIPO/ACE/12/4.

28. Discussions followed with interventions from the Delegations of South Africa, Ethiopia, Côte d’Ivoire, Morocco, Viet Nam, Panama, Argentina, the Philippines, Mexico, Thailand, Japan, Nigeria and the Representative of the Andean Community.

29. Under the topic “Coordinating Intellectual Property Enforcement at the National and Regional Level”, a total of ten Member States presented their experiences. Individual presentations were made on “Armenia’s Experience with Coordinating Intellectual Property Enforcement” by the Intellectual Property Agency of the Republic of Armenia (AIPA); “Coordinating the Enforcement of Intellectual Property Rights: A Key Goal in the National Industrial Property Strategy of Chile” by the National Institute of Industrial Property (INAPI) of Chile; “IPR Protection and IP Culture Building: The Practices of Shanghai Municipality, China” by the Shanghai Intellectual Property Administration (SIPA); “Enhancing National Collaboration on Enforcement Actions to Firmly Repress Intellectual Property Infringement in China – The Work of the National Leading Group on the Fight Against Intellectual Property Rights Infringement and Counterfeiting of China” by the Office of the National Leading Group on the Fight Against IPR Infringement and Counterfeiting of China; “Cooperation Among the Administrative Agencies Enforcing Intellectual Property Rights in Japan – Legal and Operational Aspects” by the Japan Patent Office (JPO); “Coordinating Intellectual Property Enforcement – An Important Pillar of

Namibia's Strategic Plan for Building Respect for Intellectual Property" by the Business and Intellectual Property Authority (BIPA) of Namibia; "Regional Cooperation on Intellectual Property Rights Enforcement in the Association of Southeast Asian Nations" by the Intellectual Property Office of the Philippines (IPOP HL); "Intellectual Property Enforcement Coordination and the Role of the Royal Thai Police" by the Central Investigation Bureau of the Royal Thai Police; "Coordinating Copyright Enforcement in Turkey" by the Directorate General of Copyright of Turkey; and "Intellectual Property Enforcement Coordination in Viet Nam and the Role of the National Office of Intellectual Property" by the National Office of Intellectual Property of Viet Nam (NOIP). Reference was made to document WIPO/ACE/12/5 Rev. 2.

30. A panel discussion took place, moderated by Mr. Miguel Ángel Margáin, Director General, IMPI, with interventions from the Delegations of Morocco, Brazil, Pakistan, Honduras, the United States of America, Nigeria, China, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Côte d'Ivoire, Egypt and the Representative of the WCO.

31. Under the topic "Efficient Court Procedures", three Member States presented on "Mechanisms to Resolve Intellectual Property Disputes in a Balanced Holistic and Effective Manner – Efficient Court Procedures". Individual presentations were made on "Effective Judicial Procedures for Intellectual Property Disputes in Egypt" by the Regional Institute for Intellectual Property, Faculty of Law, Helwan University, Cairo; "Efficient Court Procedures in Panama in the Field of Intellectual Property" by the Supreme Court of Justice of Panama; and "Efficiency and Effectiveness in the Proceedings Before the Federal Patent Court of Switzerland" by the Federal Patent Court of Switzerland. Reference was made to document WIPO/ACE/12/6.

32. A panel discussion took place, moderated by Mr. Sam Granata, Judge, Court of Appeal, Antwerp, Belgium, and Benelux Court of Justice, Luxembourg, with interventions from the Delegations of Brazil, Morocco, Chile, and Ethiopia.

33. Under the topic "IP Enforcement and Private International Law", Dr. Annabelle Bennett, former Judge, Federal Court of Australia and Judge Sam Granata presented the draft guide on "The Intersection Between Intellectual Property Law and Private International Law" (document WIPO/ACE/12/7 Rev.) to be jointly published by the Hague Conference on Private International Law (HCCH) and WIPO. HCCH presented on "The Work of the Hague Conference on Private International Law in Relation to the Enforcement of Intellectual Property Rights" (document WIPO/ACE/12/8 Rev.).

34. Discussions followed with interventions from the Delegations of Côte d'Ivoire, Israel, Iran (Islamic Republic of), China, the United States of America, Brazil and Chile.

35. Under the topic "Institutional Arrangements to Address Online IP Infringements", Dr. Frederick Mostert, Research Fellow, University of Oxford, United Kingdom, and Visiting Professor, King's College, London, presented the Secretariat commissioned "Study on Approaches to Online Trademark Infringements" (document WIPO/ACE/12/9 Rev. 2).

36. In addition, five Member States and one organization presented on "Institutional Arrangements Concerning Intellectual Property Enforcement Policies and Regimes to Address Online Infringements". Individual presentations were made on "The Italian Experiences in the Fight Against Intellectual Property Infringements on the Internet", delivered by the Intellectual Property Protection Special Unit, Guardia di Finanza, and the Central Inspectorate for Quality Protection and Fraud Repression in Agro-food Products Department (ICQRF), Ministry of Agricultural, Food and Forestry Policies of Italy; "Institutional Arrangements Put in Place in the Republic of Korea to Address the Proliferation of Counterfeit Goods Online" by the Korean Intellectual Property Office

(KIPO); “Challenges in Prosecuting Online Intellectual Property Infringement Cases: The Perspective of the Office of the Attorney General of Thailand” by the Office of the Attorney General of Thailand; “Website Blocking Injunctions: The UK Experience” by the High Court of Justice of England and Wales; “Institutional Arrangements to Address Online Intellectual Property Infringements – Europol’s Experience” by the Intellectual Property Crime Coordinated Coalition (IPC³), Europol; and “Cross-industry Voluntary Measures to Reduce Online Piracy” by the Motion Picture Association of America (MPAA). Reference was made to document WIPO/ACE/12/10 Rev.

37. A panel discussion took place, moderated by Dr. Frederick Mostert with interventions from the Delegations of Brazil, Mexico, Thailand, Israel, Morocco, Spain, Georgia and Ecuador.

38. Under the work program item “exchange of information on national experiences on awareness building activities and strategic campaigns as a means for building respect for IP among general public, especially the youth, in accordance with Member States’ educational or any other priorities”, presentations were grouped into two topics.

39. Under the topic “Consumer Attitudes and Behavior”, presentations were made by one organization and one independent consultant commissioned by the Secretariat. Presentations were made on “European Citizens and Intellectual Property: Perception, Awareness and Behavior” by the EUIPO Observatory (working document WIPO/ACE/12/11); and on the Secretariat commissioned “WIPO Consumer Survey Toolkit on Respect for Intellectual Property – Measuring Attitudes and Assessing the Effectiveness of Communications Campaigns”, by Mr. Mike Clubbe, Independent Consumer Research Consultant and CEO, Actualise Research Services, Twickenham, United Kingdom (document WIPO/ACE/12/12).

40. Under the topic “Specific Awareness-raising Products or Activities of WIPO Member States”, five Member States and one organization presented on “Awareness-building Activities and Strategic Campaigns as a Means for Building Respect for IP”. Presentations were made on “Educational Campaigns and Competitions for Young People to Build Respect for Intellectual Property in Antigua and Barbuda” by the Antigua and Barbuda Intellectual Property and Commerce Office (ABIPCO); “Raising Awareness of the Importance of Intellectual Property in Ethiopia” by the Ethiopian Intellectual Property Office (EIPO); “Building Respect for Intellectual Property and Increasing Awareness Among Schoolchildren: An Educational Priority in Georgia” by the National Intellectual Property Center of Georgia (SAKPATENTI); “The 2016/2017 School Students’ Competition on Tourism and Respect for Intellectual Property in Oman” by the Ministry of Education of Oman; “Building Respect for Intellectual Property Among the Public – The Peruvian Experience” by the Permanent Mission of Peru to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva; and “True Hunters: The Game that Teaches Teenagers to Respect Intellectual Property” by Link Campus University, Rome, Italy. Reference was made to document WIPO/ACE/12/13.

41. Discussions followed with interventions from the Delegations of Côte d’Ivoire, Honduras, Morocco, Switzerland, Argentina, the United States of America, China, the Philippines, Greece, Japan and the Representative of the Korea Invention Promotion Association (KIPA).

42. Under the work program item “exchange of information on national experiences in respect of WIPO’s legislative assistance, with a focus on drafting national laws of enforcement that take into account the flexibilities, the level of development, the difference in legal tradition and the possible abuse of enforcement procedures, bearing in mind the broader societal interest and in accordance with Member States’ priorities”, the Secretariat presented on “The Legislative Assistance Provided by WIPO in the Area of the Enforcement of Intellectual Property Rights” (document WIPO/ACE/12/14).

43. Discussions followed with interventions from the Delegations of Costa Rica, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, Senegal, speaking on behalf of the African Group, Ecuador and Brazil.

44. Under the work program item “exchange of success stories on capacity building and support from WIPO for training activities at national and regional levels for Agencies and national officials in line with relevant Development Agenda Recommendations and the ACE mandate”, a panel discussion took place, with the participation of the Delegations of Namibia, the Philippines, the Republic of Moldova and Madagascar.

45. Discussions followed with interventions from the Delegations of South Africa, Chile, and Brazil.

46. Under agenda item 6, the Secretariat introduced document WIPO/ACE/12/2 on recent activities of WIPO in the field of building respect for IP, guided by the Program and Budget, DA Recommendation 45, and WIPO Strategic Goal VI “International Cooperation on Building Respect for IP”. The document set out technical assistance in the field of building respect for IP, where requested services included legislative assistance, as well as training and awareness raising for law enforcement officials and the judiciary. The document also included activities aimed at further enhancing systematic and effective international cooperation with other international organizations, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and the private sector, in order to ensure a balanced and transparent approach. Program 17 also contributed to a number of WIPO publications on the latest developments in the area of building respect for IP. The Secretariat noted that the description of each activity in the document was accompanied by information about the venue, any partnering organizations, participating countries, a brief summary of the objectives of the activity, and a web link to the full program. The Committee took note of the information contained in the document.

47. Under agenda item 7, following statements from the CEBS Group, the African Group, Group B, and the Delegations of the Republic of Korea, Brazil, Indonesia, Chile, Ethiopia, Morocco and China, the Committee agreed to continue to consider, at its thirteenth session, the following topics:

- Exchange of information on national experiences on awareness building activities and strategic campaigns as a means for building respect for IP among general public, especially the youth, in accordance with Member States’ educational or any other priorities;
- Exchange of information on national experiences relating to institutional arrangements concerning IP enforcement policies and regimes, including mechanism to resolve IP disputes in a balanced, holistic and effective manner;
- Exchange of information on national experiences in respect of WIPO’s legislative assistance, with a focus on drafting national laws of enforcement that take into account the flexibilities, the level of development, the difference in legal tradition and the possible abuse of enforcement procedures, bearing in mind the broader societal interest and in accordance with Member States’ priorities; and

- Exchange of success stories on capacity building and support from WIPO for training activities at national and regional levels for Agencies and national officials in line with relevant Development Agenda Recommendations and the ACE mandate.

[End of document]