E

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

WIPO/ACE/18/42
ORIGINAL: ENGLISH
DATE: JUNE 4, 2026

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ENFORCEMENT

Eighteenth Session
Geneva, June 2 to 4, 2026

SUMMARY BY THE CHAIR

adopted by the Committee

1. The eighteenth session of the Advisory Committee on Enforcement (ACE) was held from June 2 to 4, 2026. The session was attended by 251 participants, representing 85 Member States, the European Union, and 28 Observers. Mr. Tim Werner, Legal Advisor, Swiss Federal Institute of Intellectual Property, Berne, served as Chair. Mr. Diego Pérez-Bernal, Director General of Enforcement, National Directorate of Intellectual Property (DINAPI), Paraguay, and Ms. Christine Pangilinan-Canlapan, Supervising Director, IP Rights Enforcement Office, Intellectual Property Office of the Philippines (IPOPHL), Taguig City, served as Vice-Chairs.

2. Under agenda item 1, the Chair and Mr. Edward Kwakwa, WIPO Assistant Director General, Global Challenges and Partnerships Sector, opened the session by welcoming the Committee and thanking Member States for their close engagement in the work of the Committee and the related activities undertaken by the Secretariat.

3. Under agenda item 2, the Committee adopted the Agenda (document WIPO/ACE/18/1).

4. Opening statements were delivered by the African Group, the Group of Central European and Baltic States (CEBS), China, Group B, Group of Latin American and Caribbean Countries (GRULAC), the European Union, the Like-Minded Group of Countries (LMCs), and by the delegations of Angola, Bangladesh, Brazil, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kazakhstan, Lesotho, Nigeria, Peru, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, Ukraine and the United Kingdom.

5. The Delegation of Germany, speaking on behalf of Group B, commended the Committee on its role as a multilateral forum for sharing experiences and discussing policy relating to the enforcement of intellectual property (IP), and lauded the Building Respect for IP Division. Group

B welcomed the many diverse contributions to the current session, including several from the Group's members, and the opportunity to exchange information on national experiences with regard to awareness-building activities, especially among young people, and mechanisms to resolve IP disputes in a balanced, holistic and effective manner. The sessions on combating digital piracy were especially important to all Member States. Without effective and balanced enforcement mechanisms, the infringement of IP rights (IPRs) would remain a major threat to economic development, undermining industries, employment and investment, and hampering innovation, while also putting at risk consumer safety and global public health. IP holders, in particular micro-enterprises, were vulnerable. Enforcement was important not only for rights holders, but also for consumers, civil society and the wider economy, irrespective of its stage of development. Combating IP infringements would remain a priority for all in order to prevent substantial economic losses. The latest data showed that the trade in counterfeit and pirated goods amounted to US dollars 467 billion per year and accounted for around 2.3 per cent of global imports. The Committee made it possible to share best practices at an international scale, which was important because, although laws, regulations and views on IP enforcement might differ from one region to another, all Member States shared the same goal: to achieve meaningful protection for IP.

6. The Delegation of El Salvador, speaking on behalf of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean Countries (GRULAC), noted with satisfaction that the GRULAC region was represented among the Vice-Chairs of the current session. At a time of rapid technological change and growing economic and social challenges, effective and balanced IP enforcement was key to strengthening innovation ecosystems, competitiveness and social well-being. The Committee was a valuable forum for promoting enforcement approaches that took into account the different realities and priorities of Member States, as set forth in Recommendation 45 of the WIPO Development Agenda (DA). Digital transformation and the growing interconnection of economies had given rise to opportunities for creating and disseminating knowledge, but also to new challenges, including counterfeiting, online piracy, the misappropriation of intangible assets, and other forms of infringement of IPRs. The impact of such practices on the holders of rights to traditional knowledge and cultural expressions was a particular source of concern. Those rights holders faced major difficulties in preventing misappropriation and ensuring respect for their rights. There was thus a need for balanced responses that strengthened IP enforcement without losing sight of broader objectives relating to development, inclusion, cultural diversity and access to knowledge. Addressing the issues of biopiracy and the misappropriation of genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge was of particular interest to the members of GRULAC. Those practices created legal uncertainty, caused economic losses, undermined biodiversity conservation efforts and posed significant challenges to the Indigenous Peoples and local communities that had preserved such knowledge for generations. The planned panel discussion on the impact of IP infringement on the biotechnology sector was especially timely, given the growing problem of counterfeiting in that sector, the repercussions of which affected all Member States. The discussion would shed light on the challenges and potential responses through IP systems and enforcement mechanisms. GRULAC looked forward to a substantive exchange on awareness-raising, institutional strengthening, dispute-resolution mechanisms, and capacity-building activities promoted by WIPO.

7. The Delegation of Albania, speaking on behalf of the Group of Central European and Baltic States (CEBS) welcomed the broad range of presentations planned for the current session, and the ongoing discussions on awareness-raising activities and strategic campaigns, especially those targeting young people. It was vital to leverage creative online media, collaborative projects and interactive tools in order to foster a genuine culture of respect for innovation and creators' rights among the younger generations. Institutional arrangements and mechanisms to resolve IP disputes in a balanced, holistic and effective manner were important; efficient resolution of IP disputes helped to maintain a competitive market in which businesses, particularly small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), could thrive. The focus on WIPO

legislative assistance was welcome, given the crucial importance of taking into account national flexibilities, levels of development, different legal traditions, possible abuse of enforcement procedures and broader societal interests when drafting national enforcement law. Capacity-building for national officials and enforcement agencies in line with DA Recommendations was essential. The credibility and efficiency of the IP system relied heavily on effective enforcement.

8. The Delegation of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the African Group, underscored the critical importance of technical assistance, technology transfer and coordination in the field of enforcement. Although the Committee had no norm-setting role, it had a clear mandate to work with public and private organizations to combat counterfeiting and piracy, to promote public education, provide technical assistance and coordinate information exchange and training efforts at the national and regional levels. Its work was fundamental for implementing the DA, in particular Recommendation 45. IP enforcement should be conducted in line with the objectives of Articles 7 and 8 of the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS), balancing the rights of IP holders with the need to promote social and economic welfare, to the mutual advantage of rights holders and consumers of IP.

9. The Delegation of China said that the country's "2026 Action Plan for Building a Strong Intellectual Property Nation" contained systematic IP enforcement and awareness-raising measures. Its aim was to strengthen judicial protection of IP, combat IP crime and provide a framework for further improving enforcement. In April 2026, China had hosted National Intellectual Property Awareness Week under the theme "Strengthening IP protection in emerging fields and accelerating the development of new-quality productive forces". Regions across China had showcased law enforcement achievements and disseminated case studies and information about IP through various channels, thereby enhancing public awareness of the subject. The rapid development of emerging technologies such as artificial intelligence (AI) posed new enforcement challenges, making it all the more important to strengthen international exchanges and cooperation. The Delegation welcomed the many presentations on IP enforcement and awareness-raising planned for the current session, and would take an active part in all discussions. Representatives from the National Copyright Administration of China, the State Administration for Market Regulation and the Shaanxi Provincial Intellectual Property Office would present their experiences and practices in the field of IP enforcement. China would continue to participate constructively in the Committee's work, in the framework of Recommendation 45. The challenges arising from technological change could be addressed effectively in a spirit of openness and inclusiveness and by strengthening international cooperation on IP enforcement, thereby promoting the development of a just and fair global IP governance system.

10. The Delegation of the European Union (EU), speaking on behalf of its Member States, noted that intangible assets had totaled US dollars 80 trillion in value globally in 2024. IPR-intensive industries generated almost half of total economic activity in the EU. Those industries also paid their employees higher wages: around 40 per cent more than other industries. Efficient and effective IP enforcement was thus of paramount importance. However, innovators, creators and SMEs faced significant challenges in enforcing their IPRs against counterfeiters, who were constantly developing new ways to infringe their rights. Counterfeiting and piracy also came at a high social and environmental cost. A recent study by the European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO) and the Organisation for Economic and Cooperation and Development (OECD), for instance, had revealed a link between counterfeiting and forced labor. Through its broad work program, the Committee helped delegations to identify effective measures for combating counterfeiting and piracy effectively. At the current session, the EU planned to make a presentation on enhancing IP enforcement through soft law measures, which complemented legislation. Such measures could provide a flexible and dynamic response to ever-changing counterfeiting and piracy trends and practices.

11. The Delegation of Brazil said that enforcement should not be of IP as such, but of the WIPO treaties as negotiated and ratified by Members, in their completeness. The goal was not merely to enforce rights for the sake of ensuring returns and profit on IP, but to implement a system meant to generate innovation, creativity and sustainable development. The DA, and in particular Recommendation 45, which is a synthesis of Articles 7 and 8 of the TRIPS Agreement, was especially important in that regard. Those provisions ought to be the standard against which to assess and align the Committee's work. Member States are encouraged to ratify or accede to the landmark WIPO Treaty on Intellectual Property, Genetic Resources and Associated Traditional Knowledge (GRATK), with its focus on biopiracy and the IPRs of Indigenous Peoples and local communities, in order to accelerate its entry into force. The planned panel discussion on the impact of IP infringement on the biotechnology sector was especially relevant for biodiverse developing countries. IP enforcement should also address the impacts of biopiracy on Member States' sovereignty and custodianship. The Committee should focus more on development by advancing discussions under its work program item C, with WIPO technical assistance that includes tools to prevent the abuse of IPRs and enforcement, protect the public interest and support the use of flexibilities available in the IP system. ACE was the proper WIPO venue for consideration of IP enforcement projects, including technical assistance, and members should avoid duplicating that work in the Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP). The Brazilian Delegation requested the Secretariat to provide the Committee with more information on the implementation of DA Recommendations relevant to enforcement. There was also a need for more comprehensive reporting on the activities of the Building Respect for IP Division than what had hitherto been provided in the annual report of the Director General to CDIP (document CDIP/36/2). Brazil took a development-oriented approach to IP enforcement, in line with the Government's broader objectives of promoting a favorable environment for innovation, industrial development and attracting sustainable investment. The National Council for Combating Piracy and Crimes against Intellectual Property (CNCP) served as a platform for developing policy, including through the implementation of the national plan to combat such illicit activities. The National Industrial Property Institute (INPI) had set up an intelligence and anti-counterfeiting coordination unit to improve information-sharing and enforcement. INPI also maintained national directories to combat counterfeiting of trademarks and geographical indications. Under pillar 5 of the country's national IP strategy, initiatives were being consolidated to strengthen enforcement and legal certainty, while promoting a robust innovation system. A balanced approach to enforcement should address not only counterfeiting and online piracy, but also biopiracy and the protection of resources associated with traditional knowledge and traditional cultural expressions. The Brazilian Delegation expressed concerns with approaches to IP enforcement that relied on unilateral evaluations, particularly where they might create pressures beyond multilaterally agreed norms, reduce the effective use of flexibilities available to Member States, and adversely impact foreign trade and development.

12. The Delegation of the United Kingdom, aligning itself with the statement delivered by the Delegation of Germany on behalf of Group B, said that the existence of differing approaches to IP enforcement across jurisdictions was consistent with Recommendation 45. Nonetheless, effective enforcement was essential for protecting IPRs and maintaining a balanced business environment that encouraged innovation, investment and sustainable economic growth, in line with national development priorities. The balanced work program, with its focus on awareness-raising, dispute resolution and efforts to combat digital piracy, reflected issues of importance to all Member States. Engagement with young people was critical to enforcement in the long term. The Delegation welcomed the tech for enforcement exhibit, which showcased innovative tools for supporting enforcement. The current counter-infringement strategy of the United Kingdom Intellectual Property Office (IPO) was nearing completion. Rapid technological advancement and the growth of digital commerce meant that IP enforcement challenges were increasingly cross-border in nature. The Office's enforcement division, therefore, would continue to focus on international collaboration. The recent visit by the Director General of WIPO to the United

Kingdom had provided a valuable opportunity to explore how the IPO and WIPO could further strengthen cooperation on enforcement. There was a need for coherent, evidence-based approaches, spanning awareness-raising, disruption and capacity-building. IP infringement was undermining progress towards achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The United Kingdom fully supported cross-border enforcement activities for all Member States, which could include awareness-raising and capacity-building efforts as a key enabler of sustainable development and innovative economies. The Building Respect for IP Division should work with other WIPO divisions to ensure a coherent and development-oriented response to piracy and counterfeiting.

13. The Delegation of the Russian Federation said that the Committee was an important international platform for developing practical approaches to the challenges arising from the rapid development of digital technology and new types of infringement. A comprehensive and interinstitutional approach was needed at the national and international levels to protect IPRs effectively. Because that task was shared in most countries by a broad range of national institutions, including IP offices, courts, enforcement bodies, customs and other agencies, the Committee was especially valuable for the exchange of experiences and good practices. The Delegation also noted the importance of the issues on the current session's agenda relating to improving institutional mechanisms for the enforcement of IPRs and emphasized that the discussions planned for the current session on how government agencies, rights holders, businesses and digital platforms could work together to combat the spread of counterfeit goods would be of particular interest and that the respect for IPRs went hand in hand with respect for the rights of online consumers. The Delegation attached particular importance to awareness-raising and educational initiatives, including those for youth, aimed at both increasing public awareness of the role of IP and training qualified personnel in this field. In this regard, it positively noted the contribution of the WIPO Russia Office, together with which the Federal Service for Intellectual Property (Rospatent) has been implementing various outreach activities, currently focused on empowering young people, women entrepreneurs, innovators and researchers in the use of IP.

14. The Delegation of Kazakhstan said that rapid digitalization was creating new enforcement challenges for governments, and that Kazakhstan was consistently improving its national IP protection system. The protection of IP under the law was enshrined in the country’s new Constitution, which had been adopted in March 2026. That would help to improve IP protection and enforcement, and stimulate innovation. The aim of amendments to IP law passed in 2025 was to intensify protection for rights holders, increase procedural transparency and adapt legal mechanisms to digital reality. Bearing in mind the principle of judicial independence and the importance of a homogeneous approach, the courts in Kazakhstan were guided in their decision-making by Supreme Court rulings on copyright and related rights. That was all the more important given the growing incidence of online infringement and, therefore, required increased specialization. Key to the protection of IPRs was cooperation between the judiciary, customs, enforcement bodies, rights holders and businesses. Although efforts were focused on combating the spread of counterfeit goods, prevention, training for judicial officers and businesspeople, and fostering a culture of respect for IP were just as important as punishing infringers. Kazakhstan was thus working to raise awareness among and train government officials, the judiciary, businesses and rights holders. The goal was to make the IP system easy to understand, accessible and usable for authors, inventors, businesspeople and investors.

15. The Delegation of Angola, aligning itself with the statement delivered by the Delegation of Kenya on behalf of the African Group, said that Angola especially valued the Committee’s efforts to promote a balanced and effective approach to IP enforcement that contributed to economic growth, innovation and sustainable development. Counterfeiting and piracy had an adverse impact on legitimate trade, discouraged investment, undermined innovation and, in some cases, endangered public health and consumer safety. The increasingly complex challenges arising from the digital environment required greater cooperation among Member

States and other stakeholders. Angola continued to conduct awareness-raising initiatives, foster institutional cooperation and promote capacity-building with a view to improving IP enforcement while ensuring respect for development priorities and the public interest. Sharing experiences and best practices within the Committee, particularly on technical assistance, training, digital enforcement tools and consumer education, was particularly important.

16. The Delegation of Peru highlighted that effective IP enforcement was indispensable to ensuring that innovation and creativity flourished. Peru strongly supported the non-normative nature of the Committee, the efforts of which should be focused on technical assistance and the exchange of best practices, in line with Recommendation 45. Peru was combating digital piracy through disruptive operations combined with awareness-raising programs. The success of that model lay in the consolidation of strategic partnerships between the public and private sectors.

17. The Delegation of Bangladesh, recalling Articles 7 and 8 of the TRIPS Agreement and Recommendation 45, said that enforcement was not an end in itself. Rather, it must support innovation, creativity, technology dissemination and transfer, consumer protection, public health, education, competition and sustainable development. Enforcement measures should remain proportionate, fair and consistent with countries' national priorities, development levels and legal traditions. They should include safeguards against the abuse of rights and litigation, excessive remedies, and over-blocking in the digital environment. They should not restrict lawful access to knowledge, medicines, educational materials and technologies. Topics of particular interest to developing countries being addressed at the current session included awareness-raising, institutional arrangements, legislative assistance, capacity-building, digital enforcement, AI and the biotechnology business sector. Awareness-raising campaigns should promote not only respect for rights but also an understanding of limitations and exceptions, TRIPS flexibilities, local innovation, geographical indications, traditional knowledge and the public interest. Capacity-building and legislative assistance should be demand-driven, transparent and balanced. They should not encourage TRIPS-plus approaches unless specifically requested by the Member States concerned.

18. The Delegation of the Republic of Korea said that emerging technologies such as AI and increasingly sophisticated manufacturing techniques had made counterfeit products more difficult to distinguish from genuine goods. Online piracy was jeopardizing the sustainability of the creative ecosystem. An effective response required not only strong investigative and legal measures but also preventive and evidence-based approaches involving all stakeholders. In order to build respect for copyright and reduce demand for illegal content, it was essential to understand customer behavior and improve public awareness. Recent amendments to the Copyright Act included the adoption of emergency access-blocking measures and the introduction of punitive damages provisions. The strategic deployment of anti-counterfeiting technologies could help to enhance supply chain monitoring, consumer protection, market transparency and targeted enforcement. The Republic of Korea had therefore strengthened public-private cooperation platforms providing stakeholders with practical solutions based on shared experiences. The tech for enforcement exhibit being held during the current session was a welcome initiative.

19. The Delegation of Lesotho, aligning itself with the statement delivered by the Delegation of Kenya on behalf of the African Group and referring to Part 3 of the TRIPS Agreement and Recommendation 45, underscored the importance of taking the different levels of development of Member States into account when enforcing IPRs. Enforcement must be coupled with public awareness, capacity-building and access to knowledge, especially for SMEs and young people. For those reasons, technical assistance should be driven by demand, tailored and inclusive.

20. The Delegation of Iran (Islamic Republic of), referring to Article 7 of the TRIPS Agreement and Recommendation 45, said that IP enforcement must balance rights with obligations and contribute to development, technological innovation and the transfer and dissemination of

technology. Efforts to raise awareness of IP were most effective when made accessible, in particular to young people. The planned panel discussion on the impact of IP infringement on the biotechnology sector was welcome and reflected the desirability of addressing the full spectrum of IP enforcement challenges in the Committee's work. The issue of enforcement in the biotechnology sector could not be examined in isolation from the risk of misappropriation of genetic resources and traditional knowledge, which disproportionately affected biodiverse developing countries. The GRATK Treaty provided the normative framework for discussions on that issue. The Secretariat should ensure that all legislative assistance on IP enforcement reflected the flexibilities available to Member States under international law, including the right to take account of their level of development, their legal traditions and the broader societal interests at stake. Enforcement law that failed to reflect those issues would not be sustainable, equitable or effective. The Secretariat should also report on the implementation of the DA in relation to enforcement.

21. The Delegation of Nigeria, aligning itself with the statement delivered by the Delegation of Kenya on behalf of the African Group, underscored the importance of the Committee's non-normative mandate. Respect for IP could not be achieved through enforcement measures alone. It required public awareness, education, stakeholder engagement and an enabling environment for innovation and creativity. The Committee's ongoing focus on raising awareness, particularly among young people, creators, innovators and SMEs, was therefore welcome. Addressing digital piracy, online infringement and the rapid evolution of emerging technologies required greater institutional cooperation, effective capacity-building and enhanced international collaboration, while ensuring that enforcement measures remained proportionate, balanced and supportive of broader development objectives.

22. The Delegation of Ukraine said that respect for IP could not be achieved without respect for international law and the principles of the United Nations Charter. Since the beginning of the full-scale military invasion of Ukraine by the Russian Federation in February 2022, Ukraine had faced systematic attacks against civilian infrastructure, its innovation ecosystem, and education, sports and support facilities. A massive Russian missile and drone attack on May 24, 2026, had left three people dead and more than 90 wounded in the capital, Kyiv. Around 300 sites, including nearly 150 residential buildings, had been damaged. Such attacks were part of a systematic campaign of terror against civilians and against the foundations of normal economic, social and cultural life. The Russian Federation, aside from its ongoing military aggression, was undermining the broader IP ecosystem in Ukraine. Since 2022, it had taken measures to facilitate the infringement of IPRs of foreign rights holders from countries that had expressed solidarity with Ukraine or imposed sanctions or other restrictive measures on the Russian Federation. That country must bear the legal consequences of its wrongful acts and be denied any privileges or honors within WIPO. WIPO activities, platforms and projects must be in strict compliance with the principles of the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Ukraine, within its internationally recognized borders. Ukraine deeply appreciated the continued support and solidarity shown by WIPO Member States and the Secretariat.

23. The Delegation of Albania, speaking on behalf of the Group of Central European and Baltic States (CEBS), said that the Group's members condemned the ongoing war of aggression conducted by the Russian Federation against Ukraine and demanded that it be stopped. For five years running, the war had caused unprecedented damage to the IP ecosystem in Ukraine, as had been confirmed in the Report on the Assistance and Support for Ukraine's Innovation and Creativity Sector and Intellectual Property System (document A/66/8), which had been prepared by the Secretariat for the Sixty-sixth Series of Meetings of the Assemblies of the Member States of WIPO in 2025. In addition to the unprecedented damage inflicted on research and cultural institutions, many Ukrainian innovators artists, creators, scientists and entrepreneurs had been forced to flee their homes. The CEBS group welcomed the WIPO General Assembly decision to continue providing support for the IP sector of Ukraine and looked forward to further reports on those activities and efforts to ensure that all

publications on WIPO resources and platforms upheld the principle of the country's independence and territorial integrity within its internationally recognized borders.

24. The Delegation of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of Albania, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Republic of Moldova, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden and Switzerland, expressed the full solidarity of this group of Like-Minded Countries (LMCs) with Ukraine and its support for that country's sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity within its internationally recognized borders. The Russian Federation should stop its invasion of Ukraine and cease all violations of international law. It must withdraw its troops from the entire territory of Ukraine. The Group remained committed to ensuring that the Russian Federation and its leadership were held fully accountable for waging a war of aggression against Ukraine and for the extensive damage caused. The decision adopted at the Sixty-sixth Series of Meetings of the Assemblies of the Member States of WIPO in 2025 with regard to assistance and support for the innovation and creativity sector and IP system of Ukraine must be implemented fully.

25. The Delegation of the Russian Federation, exercising its right of reply, noted that June 1 was International Day for the Protection of Children and that caring for children is regarded as one of the most important responsibilities of any State. Nevertheless, despite the progress achieved, significant challenges remain in this area, including terrorist acts targeting children. On May 22, 2026, the Ukrainian Armed Forces had attacked a school building and adjacent dormitory in Starobelsk, in the Lugansk People's Republic. In the attack, 21 students aged 14 to 18 had been killed and 41 wounded. The attack, which had been conducted in three waves, had been no accident. There were no military targets in the vicinity. Those who ordered the attack had known full well the nature of the target and had decided to kill children. In the ensuing 45 hours, the Ukrainian Armed Forces had launched a further 15 waves in an attempt to strike rescue crews. Ukraine and its minority of Western sponsors bore full responsibility for escalating hostilities and undermining political and diplomatic efforts to settle the conflict. The Delegation expressed its condolences to the families of the bereaved and called on national governments and the international community to condemn the terrorist attack in Starobelsk.

26. The Delegation of India said that, since its launch, the country's National Intellectual Property Awareness Mission (NIPAM) had reached more than 2.5 million students and teachers across the country. India had since launched NIPAM Digital, through which it was hoped to reach more than 10 million participants and strengthen the culture of innovation and respect for IP. India had issued many certificates of inventorship to recognize the contributions of scientists and technologists, which helped to build respect for IPRs and support their enforcement. Other awareness-raising and training programs were also under way. Their aim was to foster a broad understanding of IP in society and government. A series of innovation initiatives had helped to deepen engagement with IP among students, researchers, policymakers and professionals. The biotechnology sector in India had generated 3.5 million jobs and now comprised more than 10,000 startups. To support that growing ecosystem, the Biotechnology Industry Research Assistance Council (BIRAC) had been established. As of 2026, that initiative had engaged more than 1.5 million entrepreneurs, supported the filing of some 1,350 IP applications and facilitated the launch of more than 900 products.

27. Under agenda item 3, officers for the nineteenth session of ACE were elected on the understanding that their term of office would begin after the final meeting of the eighteenth session and continue up until and including the final meeting of the nineteenth session, regardless of the duration of the period between sessions. Mr. Fausto Vienrich Enriquez, Director of Copyright, National Institute for the Defense of Competition and the Protection of Intellectual Property (INDECOPI), Peru, was elected Chair. Ms. Katerina Dlabolova, IP Expert in the International Affairs Unit, Industrial Property Office of the Czech Republic and, Mr. Robi

Mbugua Njoroge King'a, Executive Director, Anti-Counterfeit Authority, Ministry of Investments, Trade and Industry, Kenya were elected Vice-Chairs.

28. Under agenda item 4, the Committee approved the participation of five non-governmental organizations (NGO) as ad hoc observers of ACE, namely: the American Apparel & Footwear Association (AAFA); the Anti-Counterfeiting Group (ACG); Anti Counterfeiting Trade Africa & Greater Maghreb (ACTA-GM); the Association of American Publishers (AAP); and the Union of European Practitioners in Intellectual Property (UNION-IP) (document WIPO/ACE/18/3).

29. Under agenda item 5, the Committee heard 33 presentations, highlights of two Secretariat-commissioned studies and three Secretariat presentations relating to various items of the work program (documents WIPO/ACE/18/4 to WIPO/ACE/18/41). In addition, a panel discussion was held on the impact of IP infringement in the biotechnology sector.

30. Under work program item A (exchange of information on national experiences on awareness-building activities and strategic campaigns as a means for building respect for IP among the general public, especially the youth, in accordance with Member States' educational or any other priorities), 11 Member States shared their experiences under the topic "Raising IP Awareness Through IP Office-led Initiatives": *Strengthening the IP Ecosystem Through Raising Public and Professional Awareness and Other Initiatives* by Ms. Ani Harutyunyan, Chief Specialist of the Copyright and Related Rights Department, Intellectual Property Office of the Republic of Armenia, Yerevan; *Informing Young People: An Online Awareness Campaign for Teenage Consumers on the Dangers and Impact of Counterfeit Products* by Ms. Stéphanie Leguay, Coordinator of the French National Anti-Counterfeiting Committee (CNAC), National Industrial Property Institute of France (INPI), Courbevoie; *Raising Awareness on Intellectual Property in Georgia Through Educational and Information Activities* by Ms. Darejani Mtchedlidze, Head of the Trademarks, Geographical Indications and Design Department, National Intellectual Property Center of Georgia (SAKPATENTI), Mtskheta; *Illegal Content Consumption Survey and Copyright Awareness in the Republic of Korea* by Ms. Emily Seonwoo Park, Policy Specialist, Copyright Policy Bureau, Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism, Sejong; *Engaging the Next Generation: Raising IP Awareness Among Young People* by Ms. Ilze Grava, Director of the Development and International Cooperation Department, Patent Office of the Republic of Latvia, Riga; *Raising Awareness Through Passion: "Support Football, Discourage Piracy"* by Mr. Diego Pérez Bernal, Director General of Enforcement, National Directorate of Intellectual Property (DINAPI), Asunción; *INDECOPI EDUCA: Program to Strengthen Regular Basic Education on Consumer Rights and Intellectual Property in Peru* by Mr. Fausto Vienrich Enríquez, Director of Copyright at the National Institute for the Defense of Free Competition and the Protection of Intellectual Property (INDECOPI), Lima; *Overview of the Communications and Campaigns Devised for Younger Audiences by the United Kingdom Intellectual Property Office* by Mr. Mike Bastin, Head of Campaigns, UK Intellectual Property Office (IPO), Newport; *Anti-counterfeiting Awareness-raising Advertising Campaigns in Spain* by Ms. Sara Boy Carmona, Head of Service, Spanish Patent and Trademark Office (SPTO), Madrid; *Youth Outreach Through Advanced Teacher Training Organizations* by Mr. Roger Hildebrandt, Head of the Promotion of the Use of IP Unit, German Patent and Trademark Office, Berlin; and *Drawing Innovation from the Heritage of the Qin and Han Dynasties, and Protecting Intellectual Property through the Rule of Law for the Benefit of the World: The Practice and Commitment of Shaanxi Province, China* by Ms. Liping Shen, Director General, Intellectual Property Office of Shaanxi Province, Xi'an. The contributions are contained in documents WIPO/ACE/18/4 to WIPO/ACE/18/11, WIPO/ACE/18/22, WIPO/ACE/18/24 and WIPO/ACE/18/28 respectively. In addition, a study commissioned by the Secretariat and titled *Piracy Uncovered: Understanding Consumer Perception and Consumption of Pirated Content in Malaysia and Viet Nam* by Ipsos, United Kingdom (document WIPO/ACE/18/41) was presented.

31. Following the presentations, statements were delivered by the delegations of Brazil and the United States of America.

32. The Delegation of the United States of America said that the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) had invested in a number of programs designed to introduce children and young students to the concepts of patents, trademarks and copyright in age-appropriate and engaging ways. One flagship, nationwide program was Camp Invention, a hands-on STEM (science, technology, engineering and mathematics) and innovation program founded in 1990 by the USPTO in partnership with the National Inventors Hall of Fame. It provided children of all ages immersive experiences that promoted creativity, entrepreneurship and inventive thinking, as well as an introduction to the workings of the USPTO and the value of IPRs. Specially trained teachers delivered the programs, which had reached more than 2.5 million students, teachers and inventors since 1990. The USPTO also maintained a freely accessible suite of online educational resources, including Young Inventor Spotlights, videos and activities featuring invention challenges and other engaging ways to explore innovation and IP. The National Inventors Hall of Fame Museum continued to fulfill its mission of recognizing inventors and invention, promoting creativity, and advancing the spirit of innovation and entrepreneurship. The Hall of Fame and USPTO were dedicated to expanding access to STEM education and nurturing future innovators. With regard to IP enforcement, laws alone were insufficient. They had to be applied transparently and go hand in hand with independent judicial review and meaningful deterrence. United States businesses and innovators continued to face challenges relating to IP theft and forced technology transfer in certain markets. All Member States needed to ensure that their enforcement regimes provided genuine protection for domestic and foreign rights holders.

33. The Delegation of Brazil said that the aim of the INPI-coordinated “IP in Schools” (*PI nas Escolas*) program, which was part of the country’s national IP strategy, was to build a culture of IP among students and teachers through educational activities promoting innovation, creativity, entrepreneurship and citizenship. With more than 400 volunteers and institutional partners, the program covered 22 federal states. Key achievements included two editions of the IP in Schools Award, held in 2022 and 2024, which had benefited more than 6,000 students across different school levels. A further edition of the Award was being planned for the 2026/2027 biennium, along with other initiatives, such as Young Inventor (*Jovem Inventor*), IP Cinema (*Cine PI*), IP in Outer Districts (*PI nas Periferias*) and the expansion of institutional partnerships. Such initiatives underlined the importance of education and awareness-raising as long-term policy tools to foster respect for IP, encourage responsible participation in innovation ecosystems, develop innovation capabilities and promote sustainable development.

34. Under work program item B (exchange of information on national experiences relating to institutional arrangements concerning IP enforcement policies and regimes, including mechanisms to resolve IP disputes in a balanced, holistic and effective manner), presentations were grouped into five topics.

35. Under the topic “Institutional Frameworks, Administrative and Criminal Enforcement Models”, four Member States and one Observer shared their experiences: *Role and Functions of the Guardia di Finanza in Efforts to Combat Counterfeiting* by Mr. Antonio De Cristofaro, Lieutenant Colonel, Head of 1st Section of Anti-Counterfeiting and Safety Products Group of Special Unit Goods and Services, Rome; *Law Enforcement Practices in China Against Infringement and Counterfeiting* by Mr. Qi Wang, Director, Fifth Inspection Division, Bureau of Law Enforcement and Inspection, State Administration for Market Regulation (SAMR), Beijing; *China’s Mechanisms for Promoting the Use of Legitimate Software and Its Achievements* by Mr. Hui Zhang, Division of Enforcement and Supervision, Copyright Department, National Copyright Administration (NCAC), Beijing; *Efforts and Challenges in Enforcing Design Rights Against Infringement* by Ms. Konno Chikako, Director, Overseas Business Support Office, International Cooperation Division, Japan Patent Office (JPO), Tokyo; *Guidelines for Criminal Investigations into Industrial Property Rights Infringements: An Italian Example* by Mr. Marco Musumeci, Programme Management Officer, United Nations Interregional Crime and Justice Research institute (UNICRI), Geneva; and *Effectiveness of the Patent and Design Enforcement*

Administrative System: the Peruvian Experience by Mr. Diego F. Ortega Sanabria, Technical Secretary of the Directorate of Inventions and New Technologies, INDECOPI, Lima. The contributions are contained in documents WIPO/ACE/18/17, WIPO/ACE/18/14, WIPO/ACE/18/15, WIPO/ACE/18/19, WIPO/ACE/18/31 and WIPO/ACE/18/20, respectively.

36. Following the presentations, statements were delivered by the delegations of Ecuador, the Philippines, the Russian Federation and the United States of America.

37. The Delegation of the Russian Federation said that it attaches great importance to the development of initiatives on education and information in the area of IP in order to raise the level of knowledge among the general public and of the business world and the professional world and amongst the youth. It noted that Rospatent provided a full cycle of personnel training for economic sectors under higher and postgraduate professional education programs. Specialists in this field were trained by its subordinate organizations, namely the Federal Institute of Industrial Property and the Russian State Intellectual Property Academy. In 2025, programs run by the two bodies had reached more than 45,000 people, including applicants, rights holders, patent attorneys, business representatives and other stakeholders. There was a particular focus on working with young people: the Academy's flagship event in 2025 had been the seventeenth edition of the International Intellectual Property Olympiad for High School Students. Held in conjunction with Rospatent, the Eurasian Patent Office and the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) Executive Committee, the Olympiad had attracted over 5,400 students from 66 Russian regions and 11 foreign countries. The twenty-ninth Rospatent International Conference on the theme "IP in the new model of scientific and technological development" featured 9 events with 53 speakers from 39 organizations. The Russian Federation and WIPO had held 24 joint webinars and six in-person seminars in 2025 in various regions, and Rospatent and the WIPO Russia Office were implementing two joint projects to promote IP use among young people, businesswomen, researchers and innovators. The Federal Institute of Industrial Property and Education Center had run numerous professional development and training courses in 2025, and the Academy, as the base organization of the CIS Member States, offered courses for undergraduate, graduate, postgraduate and doctoral students.

38. The Delegation of the United States of America said that it shared the concerns of Japan about counterfeiting. With cross-border e-commerce projected to grow to nearly US dollars 8 trillion by 2030, the volume of infringing goods flowing across borders, often in small parcels shipped directly to consumers, presented an unprecedented enforcement challenge. Relying on trademarks alone was no longer sufficient. Counterfeiters increasingly were shipping products and labels separately, and applying logos only after clearing customs. There was therefore a need to combine trademarks, designs and other IPRs into a comprehensive enforcement strategy. The United States was exploring how to strengthen design-based enforcement. In 2025, the USPTO had hosted the International Design Forum, a session of which had been dedicated to the border enforcement of design rights. Participants had highlighted how industrial rights were covered by a combination of different laws, such as sections of Title 19 of the United States Code on the customs seizure of goods or packaging that involved copyright, trademark, or trade name infringement (Sect. 1595a(c)(2)(c)), and exclusion orders issued for articles infringing patents, including design patents (Section 1337). The TRIPS Agreement only required customs suspension procedures for counterfeit trademarks and pirated copyright goods, but a growing number of jurisdictions had expanded border enforcement to cover designs, such as through application-based systems, simplified verification procedures or combinations thereof. Those approaches demonstrated a global trend towards comprehensive multi-IPR enforcement strategies. Ideas for intensifying design enforcement in the United States included proposals for legislation, some of which had support from major companies and leading associations that relied on design rights. All Member States should consider how their enforcement frameworks could be expanded to include design rights.

39. The Delegation of the Philippines said that IP enforcement in that country was based on strong interagency coordination and multi-stakeholder engagement, bringing together government agencies, rights holders, online platforms, industry stakeholders and consumers. The National Committee on Intellectual Property Rights (NCIPR) was composed of government agencies with enforcement mandates relating to IP, including the Department of Trade and Industry, the Department of Justice, the Bureau of Customs, the Philippine National Police, the National Bureau of Investigation, the Food and Drug Administration, and Intellectual Property of the Philippines. It served to coordinate enforcement strategy, intelligence gathering and joint operations, and as a platform for policy dialogue and capacity-building. The Intellectual Property Office of the Philippines (IPOPHL) and the Philippine Judicial Academy of the Supreme Court conducted an annual IP colloquium for judges of the special commercial courts, with a view to strengthening judicial understanding of evolving IP issues and promote consistent and effective adjudication of IP-related cases. IPOPHL and NCIPR held regular IP enforcement workshops for enforcement officers, custom officials and public prosecutors. The Philippines had implemented a voluntary site-blocking mechanism to enable timely action against pirate websites. The mechanism had helped to reduce access to infringing content and reinforce respect for IPRs online. IPOPHL promoted alternative dispute resolution mechanisms, the aim of which was to balance the interests of innovators, creators, businesses and the public while reducing the cost of and time expended on litigation.

40. The Delegation of Ecuador underlined the Committee's role as a platform for discussion in the framework of Recommendation 45 and expressed satisfaction with regard to an event held by WIPO in May 2026 on alternative dispute resolution mechanisms.

41. Under the topic "Consumer Behavior, Market Intelligence and Evidence-based Enforcement", four presentations were made: *Report on Criminal Enforcement of Intellectual Property Rights in Chile (2024)* by Ms. Eileen Frodden Kelly, Head of the Public Policy and Legislative Affairs Department, National Industrial Property Institute (INAPI), Santiago; *The Diverse World of Evidence Submission for Patent Litigation* by Mr. Thomas Moga Esq., Member, International Society for the Development of Intellectual Property (ADALPI), Geneva; *Dynamic Blocking Injunctions in Belgium* by Ms. Evi Werkers, Legal Officer at the Service for Combating Online Piracy and Illegal Online Gambling, Federal Public Service Economy, Brussels; and *Seeing the Unseen: Triangulating Firm-level Data, Consumer Behavior and Lived Perceptions to Map Counterfeiting in Kenya* by Dr. Robi M. Njoroge King'a, Executive Director and CEO, Anti-Counterfeit Authority, Nairobi. The contributions are contained in documents WIPO/ACE/18/29, WIPO/ACE/18/13, WIPO/ACE/18/23, and WIPO/ACE/18/27, respectively.

42. Under the topic "Digital Piracy, Online Enforcement and Intermediary Responsibility", Two Member States, three Observers and the European Union shared their experiences: *Digital Services Act (DSA): New Instruments in the European Union for Combating Online IP Infringements* by Mr. Harrie Temmink, Deputy Director, European Observatory on Infringements of Intellectual Property Rights, European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO), Alicante; *Dangers of the Digital Devalue Chain of Counterfeits* by Ms. Jennifer Hanks, Senior Director of Brand Protection, American Apparel & Footwear Association (AAFA), Washington, D.C.; *Efforts by Japan to Combat Cross-border Copyright Infringement and the Need for International Cooperation* by Ms. Yuka Igarashi, Unit Chief, Japan Copyright Office (JCO) Agency for Cultural Affairs, Government of Japan, Tokyo; *Combating Digital Piracy: Strategic Enforcement through DNS/IP Blocking and OSINT Tools* by Mr. Andrius Katinas, Head of Supervision Division, Radio and Television Commission, Vilnius; *Involvement of Intermediary Services in Site Blocking: How Lawmakers, Courts, and Institutions are Shaping the Role of Intermediaries in Addressing Online Copyright Piracy* by Mr. Okke Delfos Visser, Senior Vice President, Associate General Counsel, International, Motion Picture Association, Brussels; and *The Nexus Between Malware and Piracy – Enforcement Tools and Opportunities for Government to Take Action* by Dr. Elena Blobel, Director of Global Litigation, International Federation of Phonographic Industry

(IFPI), London. The contributions are contained in documents WIPO/ACE/18/36, WIPO/ACE/18/12, WIPO/ACE/18/18, WIPO/ACE/18/25, WIPO/ACE/18/26 and WIPO/ACE/18/34, respectively.

43. Under the topic "Technology, AI and Enforcement Tools", REACT made a presentation on *Driving IP Enforcement Through New Technologies and AI* by Ms. Liselotte Honig, Tech Lead, REACT, Amsterdam (document WIPO/ACE/18/30), and the Republic of Korea made one on *Trends in Anti-counterfeiting Technologies in The Republic of Korea* by Mr. Jun-Young Lim, Deputy Director, Intellectual Property Dispute Resolution Bureau, Ministry of Intellectual Property (MOIP), Daejeon (document WIPO/ACE/18/32).

44. Following the presentations, statements were delivered by the delegations of the European Union and Bulgaria.

45. The Delegation of the European Union (EU) said that the EUIPO Anti-counterfeiting and Anti-piracy Technology Guide mapped 40 categories of technology solutions for online and offline counterfeiting and piracy. The guide enabled searches for tools appropriate to the users' needs. EUIPO played a key role in publicizing the Recommendation of the European Commission on measures to combat counterfeiting and enhance the enforcement of IP rights, adopted in March 2024, and in monitoring compliance. EUIPO acted as a single point of contact for rights holders and law enforcement through its IP enforcement tool (IPAP). EUIPO was working with EU Member States on improving storage and destruction practices, promoted the EU cyber-theft toolkit, conducted training on a broad range of issues relating to IP enforcement, and was working on a model IP crime law inspired by the European Commission's recommendation. It was also further developing its IP enforcement scan voucher system.

46. The Delegation of Bulgaria said that the Patent Office of Bulgaria was focusing on strengthening cooperation with national law enforcement authorities, enhancing international cooperation and promoting awareness-raising and capacity-building initiatives. Under a memorandum of understanding signed in January 2026 by the Patent Office with the Office of the Public Prosecutor, a program for prosecutors on the fundamentals of IP, the use of databases and criminal IP infringements was being developed. In March 2025, the Patent Office had hosted a study visit of prosecutors from Romania under the EU Technical Assistance and Information Exchange (TAIEX) program. That initiative had also involved customs, the General Directorate for Combating Organized Crime and the Office of the Public Prosecutor. With regard to training, the Patent Office and EUIPO had organized a seminar on trademarks and industrial designs in April 2025 for IP practitioners, including judges and lawyers. Bulgaria was active in the European Network of Authenticities initiative. As a result of targeted enforcement and notable progress in criminal prosecutions relating to online piracy, Bulgaria had been removed from the watch list of the United States Special 301 report.

47. Under the topic "Alternative Enforcement Mechanisms and International Cooperation", four presentations were made: *Soft Law Mechanisms as a Means to Enhance IP Enforcement Policies: Sharing Practices from the European Union* by Ms. Virginie Fossoul, Team Leader, European Commission, Brussels; *The UNODC Passenger and Cargo Control Programme's Work on Intellectual Property Rights* by Mr. Kajetan Pradetto, Programme Officer, Passenger and Cargo Control Programme (PCCP), Border Management Branch, Division for Operations, United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), Istanbul; *Challenges and Strategic Priorities in IP Enforcement for 2026* by Mr. Gytis Brazauskas, Global Account Manager Tech and Automotive, REACT; and *Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development Free Trade Zone Certification: A Voluntary Tool To Strengthen Respect for Intellectual Property, Attract Innovation and Combat Infringement* by Mr. Piotr Stryszowski, Senior Economist, OECD, Paris. The contributions are contained in documents WIPO/ACE/18/16, WIPO/ACE/18/21, WIPO/ACE/18/33 and WIPO/ACE/18/37, respectively.

48. Additionally, a pre-recorded video presentation by Mr. Scott Martin, Aspen IP Consulting (former Deputy General Counsel and Executive Vice-President Intellectual Property at Paramount Pictures) was showcased, to present key findings from the study commissioned by the Secretariat on *AI Tools For Dealing with Copyright Piracy: Technological, Legal and Policy Dimensions* (document WIPO/ACE/18/35).

49. In addition to those contributions, the Secretariat made a presentation titled "Update on the WIPO ALERT PAY" (document WIPO/ACE/18/40). A panel discussion also took place on *the Impact of Intellectual Property Infringement in the Biotechnology Sector*, moderated by Ambassador Pimchanok Vonkorpon Pitfield, Permanent Representative of Thailand to the World Trade Organization (WTO) and WIPO in Geneva. Following the discussion, statements were delivered by GRULAC, the European Union, and the delegations of Brazil, Ecuador, India, Indonesia, Japan, Switzerland and the United States of America.

50. The Delegation of Brazil welcomed the fact that, following a GRULAC proposal, the Committee was finally providing an opportunity to address the issue of biopiracy within the broader discussions on IP enforcement, which had to be seen in the light of a long history of misappropriation of genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge from Indigenous Peoples and local communities. The issue of enforcement should not just be a matter of ensuring returns and profit. It should also be approached in line with a development-oriented approach contributing to innovation, technology dissemination, social welfare and a balanced system of rights and obligations, as enshrined in Article 7 of the TRIPS Agreement. Failure to comply with the requirement to disclose origin in countries where that requirement applied, and as provided for in the GRATK Treaty, constituted a violation of the IP system, insofar as such failure threatened the transparency upon which the social justification for patent exclusivity was based. The Treaty benefited Indigenous Peoples and local communities by creating a mechanism that contributed to recognition and prevention of misappropriation of their resources and knowledge. Member States should ratify or accede to the Treaty in order to allow its swift implementation. The panel discussion represented the kind of debate needed to ensure coherence between the various international IP instruments and maintain the system's effectiveness. It was, however, regrettable that no representatives of civil society or academia had taken part despite the fact that the proposal adopted under document WIPO/ACE/17/19 foresaw such participation. Involving Indigenous Peoples and traditional communities in discussion was critical to ensure benefit-sharing and promote sustainable development. On the subject of counterfeit drugs, a concern was raised on the partial framing of the issue, as the existence of an IP infringement does not inherently imply that a health product is substandard, unsafe, or lacks efficacy. The Brazilian delegation looks forward to further discussions of this Committee on issues that relate to enforcement and prevention of misappropriation of Genetic Resources, Traditional Knowledge and Traditional Cultural Expressions.

51. The Delegation of El Salvador (GRULAC) welcomed the rich exchanges arising from the panel discussion and noted the growing importance of biotechnology in areas such as public health, agriculture, scientific research and innovation. It was essential to address biopiracy and the misappropriation of genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge, given their impact on biodiversity and on the Indigenous Peoples and local communities that had preserved such knowledge for generations. There was a need for greater cooperation and dialogue to address enforcement issues in such technologically complex sectors. GRULAC welcomed the inclusion of the topic in the Committee's work. Such discussions would help to identify means of strengthening a balanced, effective and development-oriented IP system.

52. The Delegation of India, while acknowledging the need to combat counterfeiting, said that the primary threat was biopiracy, in particular attempts to patent genetic resources and traditional knowledge as novel inventions. In the past, India had been compelled to engage in legal battles in foreign patent offices to demonstrate that the country's cultural heritage did not constitute a new invention. Landmark victories in some of those cases had confirmed the

extent of the problem. In 2001, India had established the Traditional Knowledge Digital Library (TKDL). It categorized ancient medical and agricultural texts in searchable format for global patent offices, with a view to ensuring that Indian traditional knowledge was recognized as part of the prior art. By March 2026, TKDL had been involved in more than 350 cases across multiple jurisdictions, in which patent claims had been modified, withdrawn or rejected. IP enforcement must respect broader policy objectives such as biodiversity conservation, food security and access to affordable healthcare. The Committee could, at its nineteenth session, include wording in its work program to work further on biopiracy, misappropriation in biotechnology, related enforcement issues, best practices for examining biotech-related patent applications, including with regard to disclosure of origin requirements, capacity-building to help developing countries to monitor and challenge improper IP claims, and the role of enforcement in supporting the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization. Future discussions should contribute to strengthening the commitment of Member States to combat infringement of all IPRs while protecting the rights of holders of genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge.

53. The Delegation of Indonesia said that effective IP enforcement in the biotechnology sector should take into account the public interest flexibilities provided for under the TRIPS Agreement and support innovation while preserving policy space to address public health and development priorities. Mindful of Member States' obligations under the CBD, Nagoya Protocol and GRATK Treaty, it should be recognized that, for biodiversity-rich countries, IP infringement concerns went beyond counterfeiting and patent infringements and included the misappropriation of genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge without disclosure, authorization or fair benefit-sharing. Developing countries needed technical and training support for patent examination, the implementation of disclosure requirements, monitoring of inventions relating to genetic resources, and the effective operation of access and benefit-sharing mechanisms. A credible and balanced IP system should promote innovation and safeguard the legitimate rights and interests of countries and communities that served as custodians of the world's genetic resources and traditional knowledge. It was to be hoped that future discussions would include contributions from representative of civil society and academia.

54. The Delegation of Ecuador underscored the importance of biotechnology in addressing global challenges relating to public health, agriculture, food security, environmental sustainability and traditional knowledge. Ecuador was working to facilitate the voluntary deposit of traditional knowledge, as provided for in national law, as a means of preventing the misappropriation of traditional knowledge and ensuring that collective rights were recognized in the face of IPR claims. Events such as the panel discussion made it possible to appreciate the diversity of approaches to the matter.

55. The Delegation of the United States of America said that the panel discussion concerned the impact of IP infringement on the biotechnology sector, not biopiracy, genetic resources, traditional knowledge, or any other issues beyond the enforcement of industrial property rights and copyright. Each WIPO committee had a specific mandate. Member States should confine discussions to the mandate of each respective committee and not raise random subjects in random committees. Biopiracy, genetic resources and traditional knowledge fell within the mandate of the WIPO Intergovernmental Committee on Intellectual Property and Genetic Resources, Traditional Knowledge and Folklore (IGC). The Delegation of the United States stated that it could not support the proposal made by the Delegation of India because it fell outside of the mandate of the Committee and invited the Delegation of India to bring that proposal at the next session of IGC.

56. The Delegation of the European Union (EU) said that relevant issues had been raised during the panel discussion, such as the protection of confidential information, trade secrets and

the means of detecting infringements. The delegation concurred with the view expressed by the Delegation of the United States of America that IGC was the appropriate forum for discussing genetic resources and traditional knowledge. Discussions in ACE should remain focused on IP enforcement.

57. The Delegation of Japan said that enforcement of IPRs in the biotechnology sector was essential for innovation and benefited people globally through improved public health and welfare. Combating counterfeit goods in that sector, such as illicit pharmaceutical products, was crucial to preventing the spread of viruses and other health-related problems caused by such products. Nonetheless, the duplication of discussions on themes relating to the work of IGC should be avoided in sessions of ACE.

58. The Delegation of Switzerland said that the mandate of ACE was limited to the enforcement of IPRs, in particular relating to industrial property, copyright and related rights, as set forth in WIPO General Assembly document WO/GA/28/7. Issues relating to the misappropriation of genetic resources and traditional knowledge, including their relevance for Indigenous Peoples and local communities, fell within the mandate of IGC and should not be addressed by ACE.

59. There were no presentations under work program item C.

60. Under work program item D, the Secretariat made two presentations titled “Update on the Distance Learning (DL) Course on IP Enforcement” and “Update on the IMPACT Capacity-building Project”. Reference is made to documents WIPO/ACE/18/38 and WIPO/ACE/18/39.

61. Following the presentation on the DL Course on IP Enforcement, a statement was delivered by the delegation of Brazil.

62. The Delegation of Brazil welcomed the introduction of a new WIPO Academy course on IP enforcement and stressed the need to ensure that the course does reflect a balanced and development-oriented approach to the international IP system. The course would benefit from the inclusion of a specific module on the DA recommendations and more information on that subject in other modules. The course should also be updated to take into account recent normative developments, including the adoption of the GRATK Treaty. It was important that the course properly reflect the flexibilities available to Member States under the international framework and, in light of the obligation for WIPO capacity-building activities to contribute to the implementation of the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), and to other environmental considerations in the context of enforcement policies.

63. Under agenda item 6, the Secretariat introduced document WIPO/ACE/18/2/Rev. on recent WIPO activities relating to IP enforcement and building respect for IP, covering the period from January 1, 2025, to April 30, 2026. The document presents the work of the Building Respect for IP (BRIP) Division, which implements Expected Result 2.3 and Expected Results 4.2 and 4.3 under WIPO Strategic Pillars 2 and 4, respectively. Those activities are guided by the Program of Work and Budget 2024/25 and 2026/27, and DA Recommendations 1, 3, 6, 10 to 14, 17, 40 and 45. Key activities are set out in the document under international coordination and cooperation, highlighting the Organization’s work with intergovernmental organizations and NGOs on IP enforcement and building respect for IP. The document highlights awareness-raising activities, in particular the continued expansion of the WIPO–African Regional Intellectual Property Organization (ARIPO) IP Clubs project in Africa, which reached five countries in 2025; provides an update on strategic WIPO systems to facilitate cross-sectoral cooperation against counterfeiting and piracy; and highlights the growing number of Authorized Contributors and Authorized Users of WIPO ALERT, the conclusion of the pilot phase of WIPO ALERT-PAY, and ongoing work on the WIPO Customs Recordation and Information System (CRIS) to support IP enforcement at borders. The document also outlines support provided by

WIPO to Member States on legislation and capacity-building and highlights the seven youth-focused activities conducted under the WIPO Intellectual Property Youth Empowerment Strategy (IP-YES!) during the reporting period. The Committee took note of the information contained in the document.

64. Under Agenda Item 7 the Work of the ACE, the Committee agreed to consider at its nineteenth session, the following work program items:

- exchange of information on national experiences on awareness-building activities and strategic campaigns as a means for building respect for IP among the 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 mechanisms 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.

65. The Delegation of the United States of America, underlining the importance of robust enforcement of trade secrets, said that the 2016 Defend Trade Secrets Act (DTSA) had established a unified federal civil cause of action in the United States to address the misappropriation of trade secrets used in interstate or international commerce. The Act provided trade secret owners with access to federal courts nationwide, along with robust remedies including injunctive relief to prevent further disclosure or use of misappropriated information, monetary damages for actual losses and unjust enrichment, and, in appropriate cases, exemplary damages and attorney's fees. *Ex parte* seizure orders were also possible under the Act, allowing courts to act swiftly to preserve trade secrets at imminent risk of harm, balanced by safeguards against misuse. The Act had strengthened the confidence of innovators and businesses in safeguarding confidential information. In September 2025, the USPTO had hosted an event titled "Trade secrets and artificial intelligence – navigating the intersection of trade secrets and AI developments". Participants had concluded that (i) plaintiffs prevailed in approximately 80 per cent of federal trade secret cases, with employees identified as the most common perpetrators; (ii) the Act's extraterritorial reach allowed damages to be awarded for misconduct abroad where any act in furtherance of the misappropriation occurred in the United States; (iii) trade secret protections were increasingly favored for safeguarding AI algorithms, model weights and training data; (iv) the Act was sufficiently flexible to accommodate AI developments without requiring statutory changes; (v) greater international coordination was needed to encourage AI development while protecting legitimate trade secrets. It would be beneficial to all Member States to include a discussion on trade secret enforcement under agenda item 5, work program item B, at the Committee's nineteenth session. Effective trade secret enforcement was important for individual rights holders and essential for building the trust and certainty that underpinned global innovation and commerce.

66. The Delegation of El Salvador, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, asked for clarification of the proposal made by the Delegation of the United States of America.

67. The Delegation of the United States of America explained that it wished to hold a discussion on the Defend Trade Secrets Act which was passed 10 years ago, the experience of the United States of America in protecting trade secrets under the Act and the significant litigation that had ensued thereunder.

68. The Chair said that he took it that the proposal by the Delegation of the United States of America was an expression of interest under the work program.

69. The Delegation of Brazil said that it was not in a position to incorporate the additional topic of trade secrets into the work of the Committee.

70. The Delegation of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the African Group, said that the Group would require more time before agreeing to the proposal made by the Delegation of the United States of America.

[End of document]