INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE PROTECTION OF PERFORMERS, PRODUCERS OF PHONOGRAMS AND BROADCASTING ORGANIZATIONS (ROME CONVENTION, 1961)

INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE
Twentieth Ordinary Session

Geneva, September 7 to 9, 2009

REPORT

adopted by the Committee

INTRODUCTION

1. The Intergovernmental Committee of the International Convention for the Protection of Performers, Producers of Phonograms and Broadcasting Organizations (Rome Convention), hereinafter referred to as “the Committee”, convened in accordance with Article 32(6) of the Convention and Rule 10 of the Rules of Procedure of the Committee, held its 20th Ordinary Session at the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) headquarters in Geneva, from September 7 to 9, 2009.

2. The following nine Member States of the Committee were represented: Belgium, Colombia, France, Germany, Hungary, Japan, Mexico, Poland and the United Kingdom.
3. The following thirteen States party to the Convention, but not members of the Committee participated: Barbados, Brazil, Czech Republic, El Salvador, Greece, Ireland, Republic of Korea, Romania, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, Togo, Turkey; and six States not party to the Convention, were represented as observers: Cameroon, Iran, Malaysia, Qatar, Senegal and the United States of America.

4. Representatives of the following four international non-governmental organizations attended in an observer capacity: Association of European Performers’ Organizations (AEPO), European Broadcasting Union (EBU), European Sound Directors Association (ESDA) and Ibero-Latin-American Federation of Performers (FILAIE).

5. The representatives of the three sponsoring Organizations – the ILO, UNESCO and WIPO – attended the meeting of the Committee in their advisory capacity.

6. The list of participants is attached as an annex to this report.

I. OPENING OF THE SESSION

7. Mr. Michael Keplinger, Deputy Director General of WIPO, welcomed the participants on behalf of the Director General of WIPO and opened the meeting.

II. ELECTION OF THE CHAIRPERSON AND TWO VICE-CHAIRPERSONS

8. Following a proposal made by the Delegation of Germany, the Committee unanimously elected, by acclamation, Ms. Antoinette Graves from United Kingdom as Chairperson, and Ms. Joanna Kluczewska–Strojny from Poland and Mr. Kiyoshi Saito from Japan as Vice-Chairpersons.

III. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

9. The Committee unanimously adopted the Provisional Agenda (document ILO/UNESCO/WIPO/ICR.20/1 Prov. Rev.). The Secretariat informed the Committee that, following the Rules of Procedure of the Committee, non-governmental organizations could not attend meetings of the Committee unless it had granted them observer status. Following a request from the European Sound Directors Association (ESDA), which already had observer status with WIPO, to be granted observer status in the Committee, the Committee approved it.
IV. INFORMATION ON THE STATE OF ADHERENCE TO THE ROME CONVENTION (DOCUMENT ILO/UNESCO/WIPO/ICR.20/2)

10. The Secretariat informed the Committee that since the nineteenth session, the following eight States had acceded to the Rome Convention: Algeria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Republic of Korea, Montenegro, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan and Viet Nam. Those new accessions had brought the number of States party to the Convention to 88, as of September 7, 2009.

11. The Committee took note of this information.

V. INFORMATION ON STATES NOT PARTY TO THE ROME CONVENTION BUT PARTY TO THE INTERNATIONAL COPYRIGHT CONVENTIONS REFERRED TO IN ARTICLE 24 OF THE ROME CONVENTION (DOCUMENT ILO/UNESCO/WIPO/ICR.20/3)

12. The Secretariat informed the Committee that since the nineteenth session, the following five countries had acceded to the Berne Convention: Brunei Darussalam; Montenegro, Nepal, Samoa and Yemen. Those new accessions had brought the number of States party to the Convention to 164, as of September 7, 2009.

13. As regards the Universal Copyright Convention, the Secretariat informed the Committee that since the nineteenth session, one country, Montenegro, had acceded to the Convention, thus bringing the total number of accessions to 100, as of September 7, 2009.

14. The Committee took note of this information.

VI. INFORMATION ON MEMBERSHIP OF THE CONVENTION FOR THE PROTECTION OF PRODUCERS OF PHONOGRAMS AGAINST UNAUTHORIZED DUPLICATION OF THEIR PHONOGRAMS (PHONOGRAMS CONVENTION), OF THE CONVENTION RELATING TO THE DISTRIBUTION OF PROGRAMME–CARRYING SIGNALS TRANSMITTED BY SATELITE (SATELLITES CONVENTION) AND OF THE WIPO PERFORMANCES AND PHONOGRAMS TREATY (WPPT) (DOCUMENT ILO/UNESCO/WIPO/ICR.20/4)

15. The Secretariat informed the Committee that since the nineteenth ordinary session of the Intergovernmental Committee, the Phonograms Convention had entered into force for Bosnia and Herzegovina on May 25, 2009, thus bringing the total number of accessions to 77, as of September 7, 2009.

16. As regards the Satellites Convention, the Secretariat informed the Committee that since the nineteenth session of the Intergovernmental Committee, the Satellites Convention had entered into force for Bahrain, El Salvador, Honduras, Moldova, Montenegro, Oman, Singapore, Togo and Vietnam, thus bringing the total number of accessions to 34, as of September 7, 2009.

17. The Committee took note of this information.
VII. REPORT ON THE ACTIVITIES OF THE THREE ORGANIZATIONS TO PROVIDE ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING FOR DEVELOPING COUNTRIES WITH A VIEW TO PROMOTING THE PROTECTION OF PERFORMERS, PRODUCERS OF PHONOGRAMS AND BROADCASTING ORGANIZATIONS (DOCUMENT ILO/UNESCO/WIPO/ICR.20/5)

18. The Representative of ILO pointed out that ILO’s main activities of relevance to the Rome Convention in the four-year period were outlined in Annex I of document ILO/UNESCO/WIPO/ICR.20.5, notably as regards technical assistance in developing countries through an ILO/UNCTAD/UNESCO project on the creative industries, and training on Business Skills for Artists.

19. The representative of UNESCO, referring to the activities carried out by this Organization, stated that these included information and awareness-raising activities; capacity-building activities; studies and research; activities related to enforcement and management of rights, as well as legal and technical assistance provided to member States at their specific request.

20. More specifically, the representative highlighted the following activities:

- The adoption in 2005 of the Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions, which recognized in its Preamble “the importance of intellectual property rights in sustaining those involved in cultural creativity” and referred in some provisions to the contribution of artists.

- The development of the World Observatory on the Social Status of Artists, aiming at collecting information on the social and fiscal status of artists, on international standards and national laws regulating their status and rights, and on international mobility. The Observatory currently covered 50 countries.

- The development of the World Anti Piracy Observatory, to be launched in the second half of 2009, following a recommendation of the Intergovernmental Copyright Committee in 2005. The Observatory was the first web reference tool of this kind and aimed at providing information on measures, procedures and policies in the field of anti-piracy and enforcement of copyright. One hundred country profiles had been provided so far.

- In the field of capacity building, seminars on enforcement of copyright had been organized in 2006, 2007 and 2008 in three sub-regions in Africa, leading to a second phase of training to be developed at the national level.

21. The representative of WIPO referred to the detailed description of WIPO’s activities in the document. During the past few years, WIPO had intensified its cooperation with developing countries and least developed countries (LDCs) and had supported them in developing and modernizing their IP systems consistent with their development priorities and national plans. The key focus had been to support countries in building national capacity in terms of IP infrastructure, institutions and human resources. The technical assistance program and activities of WIPO had been designed in close consultation with the countries concerned.
and taking into account the recommendations of the Development Agenda. These had been tailored to respond to their diverse and specific needs in order to develop and enhance their capacity in important areas of IP such as planning for IP development; awareness building; human resource development; strengthening of relevant institutions and infrastructure; formulation of legislation, taking into account flexibilities under the current international IP regime; and enhancing professional capabilities, including awareness raising and capacity building tools for small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), at the national and regional levels.

22. All delegations that took the floor thanked ILO, UNESCO and WIPO for their legal and technical assistance.

23. The Delegation of Sweden commented on some activities mentioned in document ILO/UNESCO/WIPO/ICR/20.5. Referring to the ILO Pilot Project on Poverty Reduction through Employment Creation and Trade Expansion in Creative Industries in five ACP Countries, the speaker stressed the importance of this project, focused on concrete means for creating an enabling environment for the creative industries, which were of considerable economic importance for developing countries. In this respect, he emphasized the usefulness of the Business Skills for Artists training package. He welcomed and commended UNESCO’s creation of a World Anti–Piracy Observatory as well as the UNESCO Anti-Piracy Training for Trainers, which would make enforcement of copyright more efficient. He noted that from the Swedish experience of organizing development cooperation programs, stakeholders in the cultural, media and entertainment sectors in developing countries considered piracy as a major problem that stifled the development of the local artistic creativity. He also highlighted the great need for practical tools helping the stakeholders to be better prepared when concluding appropriate contracts. In this respect, he mentioned the usefulness of a publication containing several types of contracts for the music sector, which had been developed after the UNESCO training program “Copyright as a Tool for Music Industry Development” in Tanzania. With regard to WIPO activities, the Delegation supported the main thrust of the various WIPO programs as outlined in paragraph 3 of Annex III of the abovementioned document and informed the Committee of the various programs that his country had conducted with WIPO since 2004: every year, three programs on, respectively, industrial property, copyright and for LDCs aimed at designing and implementing practical country projects for improving the IP system. These programs, financed by the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA), were each attended by 25 participants from developing countries and LDCs, and were held for three weeks in Stockholm. They were followed six months later by a follow-up session in one of the participating countries, and by country projects to be undertaken by each participant. Finally, the Delegation stressed the importance of the WIPO Advisory Committee on Enforcement (ACE) and of the Global Congresses on counterfeiting and piracy, which provided a very useful forum for exchange of practical information and documentation on counterfeiting, piracy and enforcement.

24. The Delegation of Japan informed the Committee on the activities developed by its government through voluntary contributions – funds in trust with WIPO – for the promotion of and training in copyright and related rights in developing countries, especially in Asia and the Pacific region. The speaker underlined the importance of the Rome Convention and the WPPT for the protection of performers.
VIII. THE FUTURE OF THE ROME CONVENTION: REPORT ON CURRENT INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF RIGHTS OF PERFORMERS, PRODUCERS OF PHONOGRAMS AND BROADCASTING ORGANIZATIONS (ILO/UNESCO/WIPO/ICR.20/6)

25. A representative of the Secretariat presented document ILO/UNESCO/WIPO/ICR.20/6 and outlined recent developments, which mainly concerned the protection of audiovisual performances and the protection of the rights of broadcasting organizations.

26. While there had been ongoing discussions on both items, no conclusive progress towards new international norm-setting had been made. Regarding the protection of audiovisual performances, an issue that had been on the Agenda of all the annual sessions of the WIPO General Assembly since the inconclusive Diplomatic Conference in 2000, it had been decided that discussions on the topic should be resumed in the Standing Committee on Copyright and Related Rights (SCCR). At the eighteenth session of the SCCR in May 2009, the SCCR encouraged the WIPO Secretariat to continue organizing regional and national seminars on the topic. The SCCR reaffirmed its commitment to work on developing the international protection of performances in audiovisual media, and requested the WIPO Secretariat to prepare a background document on the main questions and positions, and organize, in Geneva, informal and open-ended consultations among all members of the Committee on possible solutions to the prevailing deadlock. The issue would remain on the Agenda of the next session of the SCCR.

27. Regarding the protection of broadcasting organizations, the WIPO General Assembly had decided that a diplomatic conference could not be convened before agreement had been reached, on a signal–based approach, on the objectives, specific scope and object of protection of a treaty. Work on the issue was, however, continuing as the eighteenth session of the SCCR in May 2009 had requested the WIPO Secretariat to commission a study on the socio–economic dimension of the unauthorized use of signals, including the impact of the lack of access on the one hand and the need for an effective protection for broadcasters, on the other hand, with the aim to be available for discussion at the twentieth session of the SCCR. The Secretariat was also requested to organize regional and national seminars upon the request of Member States or regional groups on the objectives, specific scope and object of protection of a possible draft treaty.

28. The representative of the Ibero–American Federation of Performers (FILAIE) said that he was not optimistic about the future of the Rome Convention as far as performers were concerned. Recalling the historical context and evolution of the rights of the performers, he said that the development of the new technologies had added new challenges and forms of potential conflicts. Stressing the limited rights of the performers and the specificity of their work, he stated that the Rome Convention was not providing the proper protection of performers as it should have done. Article 19 of the Convention took away any protection from them in the audiovisual area once they had agreed to the fixation, and the Convention did not even mention moral rights. The only positive element was that Article 12 presupposed the existence of collective management organizations. He concluded by saying that unless specific provisions for the effective protection of performers were included in the Convention, it was not at all attractive for them.
29. The representative of the European Sound Directors Association (ESDA) endorsed the intervention of the representative of FILAI E. With regard to the protection of performers, ESDA would welcome an addition to Article 2 in order to define the role of sound director, as compared to the producer, in the recording studio as their actual roles had been subject to misunderstandings. While often referred to as producers, sound directors were neither producers nor acted as representatives of producers. He underscored the importance of the Rome Convention and subsequent treaties, notably the WPPT, and that any discussion on the future of the Rome Convention needed to consider what happened in the recording process so as to accurately identify all rights holders. He argued that the Convention should be made more applicable to the future, reflecting the realities of modern recording processes and not be based on historical relics.

30. The representative of the Association of European Performers Organisations (AEPO-ARTIS) also endorsed the comments made by the representative of FILAI E. He stated that the effects of the Rome Convention had been lost and there was therefore a need for more consultations. He called on all parties to reopen the debate.

31. The Delegation of Japan commended the work and efforts of WIPO in this field. The speaker underlined the need to respect the delicate balance between all three groups of related rights holders, including the need to finalize work on both the proposed draft WIPO Audiovisual Performances Treaty and on the issue of the protection of the rights of broadcasting organizations. His Government looked forward to further progress and would continue to be actively engaged in the discussions.

32. The Delegation of Colombia strongly supported a speedy convening of a diplomatic conference on the protection of audiovisual performances to examine audiovisual rights and appropriate measures regarding national treatment and differences in national law regarding the transfer of rights.

33. A representative of the Secretariat observed that the issue had been on WIPO’s Agenda for many years and that it remained on the Agenda of the next SCCR session. To consider a review or similar activities relating to the Rome Convention would not make sense before the related issues on the SCCR’s Agenda had been resolved.

34. The Chairperson noted that the Committee agreed with this conclusion.


35. A representative of the Secretariat recalled that during its nineteenth session, the Committee had agreed that the periodicity of its sessions had to be adapted to developments affecting the Rome Convention’s legal framework. In this context it was difficult to foresee how the ongoing discussions regarding the protection of audiovisual performers and broadcasting organizations would evolve, and within which timeframe. He then introduced document ILO/UNESCO/WIPO/ICR.20/7 regarding the amendment of Rule 11 of the Rules of Procedure. The document presented a proposal which contained three elements, namely: (i) to suspend Rule 11 of the Rules of Procedure, according to which the Committee should meet in ordinary session once in each odd–numbered calendar year; (ii) to request the
Secretariat to convene the next ordinary session of the Committee not later than a year after any decisive new development regarding the protection of the rights of performers, producers of phonograms and broadcasting organizations had taken place, such as the adoption or revision of one or more international treaties in the area; and (iii) to retain an item on Rule 11 of the Rules of Procedure on the agenda of the next session of the Committee.

36. The Chairperson invited the Committee to consider the proposal.

37. The Delegation of Japan underscored the importance of the Rome Convention and supported the proposal for the suspension of the next ordinary session of the Committee until new and substantial developments would have taken place.

38. Noting that there were no further comments or objections from the Committee regarding the proposal, the Chair stated that the following decision proposed in document ILO/UNESCO/WIPO/ICR.20/7 was adopted unanimously:

The Committee:

recalls
– that according to Rule 12 of its Rules of Procedure, the Committee shall meet in extraordinary session at the request of the majority of the members of the Committee;

and

decides
– to suspend Rule 11 of its Rules of Procedure according to which the Committee shall meet in ordinary session once in each odd–numbered calendar year;

– to request the Secretariat to convene the next ordinary session of the Committee not later than a year after any decisive new development regarding the protection of the rights of performers, producers of phonograms and broadcasting organizations has taken place, such as the adoption or revision of one or more international treaties in the area; and

– to retain an item on Rule 11 of the Rules of Procedure on the agenda of the next session of the Committee.

X. OTHER BUSINESS

39. The Secretariat stated that the Draft Report would be prepared and presented to delegates on September 9, 2009, for consideration. Thereafter a meeting would be convened to elect members of the next IGC as per documents ILO/UNESCO/WIPO/RCEM/2009/1 Prov. and ILO/UNESCO/WIPO/RCEM/2009/2.
XI. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT

The Committee unanimously adopted this report with the proposed amendments submitted by certain delegations.

XII Closing of the session

After the customary expression of thanks, the Chairperson declared the session closed.

[Annex follows]
ANNEX

(dans l’ordre alphabétique des noms français des États/
in the alphabetical order of the names in French of the States)

I. ÉTATS MEMBRES DU COMITÉ/
MEMBER STATES OF THE COMMITTEE

ALLEMAGNE/GERMANY
Eike NIELSEN, Judge, District Court, Federal Ministry of Justice, Berlin
Antoinette Mager DOMINICE (Ms.), Federal Ministry of Justice, Berlin

BELGIQUE/BELGIUM
Pieter LEENKNEFT, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

COLOMBIE/COLOMBIA
Angelino GARZÓN, Embajador, Representante Permanente, Misión Permanente, Ginebra
Martha Irma ALARCÓN LÓPEZ (Sra.), Ministro Consejero, Misión Permanente, Ginebra

FRANCE
Anne le MORVAN (Mme), chargée de mission au Bureau de la propriété littéraire et artistique, Ministère de la culture et de la communication, Paris

HONGRIE/HUNGARY
Péter MUNKÁCSI, Deputy Head, Copyright Section, Legal and International Department, Hungarian Patent Office, Budapest

JAPON/JAPAN
Atsuko YOSHIDA, Deputy Director, International Affairs Division, Agency for Cultural Affairs, Tokyo
Kiyoshi SAITO, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva
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MEXIQUE/MEXICO
Gerardo Dasyel MENDOZA CAPELILLO, Permanent Mission, Geneva
María Victoria Romero CABALLERO, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

POLOGNE/POLAND
Dariusz URBANSKI, Head Expert, Legal Department, Ministry of Culture and National Heritage, Warsaw
Joanna KLUCZEWSKA–STROJNY (Ms.), Head, Media and Copyright Law Division, Legal Department, Ministry of Culture and National Heritage, Warsaw

ROYAUME–UNI/UNITED KINGDOM
Martin BOYLE, Policy Advisor, Copyright and IP Enforcement Directorate, Intellectual Property Office, Newport
Antoinette GRAVES (Ms.), Head of Music, Broadcasters and Sports Team, Copyright and IP Enforcement Directorate, Intellectual Property Office, Newport

II. OBSERVATEURS/OBSERVERS

a) États parties à la Convention qui ne sont pas membres du comité/
States party to the Convention who are not members of the Committee

BARBADE/BARBADOS
Corlita BABB–SCHAEFER (Ms.), Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva

BRÉSIL/BRAZIL
Thaís Valério MESQUITA (Ms.), First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

EL SALVADOR
Rodrigo Rivas MELHADO, Ministro Consejero, Misión Permanente, Ginebra
GRÈCE/GREECE
Stella KYRIAKOU (Ms.), Attaché, Permanent Mission, Geneva

IRLANDE/IRELAND
Brian HIGGINS, Third Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

RÉPUBLIQUE DE CORÉE/REPUBLIC OF KOREA
Seong–Joon PARK, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

RÉPUBLIQUE TCHÈQUE/CZECH REPUBLIC
Pavel ZEMAN, Director, Copyright Department, Ministry of Culture, Prague

ROUMANIE/ROMANIA
Rodica PÂRVU (Ms.), Director General, Romanian Copyright Office, Bucharest

SLOVÉNIE/SLOVENIA
Dušan VUJADINOVIC, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva

SUÈDE/SWEDEN
Henry OLSSON, Special Government Advisor, Division for Intellectual Property and Transport Law, Ministry of Justice, Stockholm

SUISSE/SWITZERLAND
Emanuel MEYER, chef de la Division du droit d’auteur et des droits voisins, Institut fédéral de la propriété intellectuelle, Berne

TOGO
Koudjo Omabuè NOUDONOU, directeur de cabinet, Ministère de la communication et de la culture, Lomé
Simfèilé TAGBA, attaché d’administration, Ministère de la communication et de la culture, Lomé
TURQUIE/TURKEY

Gunay KIRACI, Deputy Director General, Directorate General of Copyright and Cinema, Ministry of Culture and Tourism, Ankara

Ahmet ASENNA, General Secretary, Copyright Organization, Ankara

Erkin YILMAZ, Expert, Directorate General of Copyright and Cinema, Ministry of Culture and Tourism, Ankara

b) Autres États/
Other States

CAMEROUN/CAMEROON

Blaise Jacques NKENE, directeur des arts, des spectacles et des entreprises culturelles, Ministère de la culture, Yaoundé

ÉTATS–UNIS D’AMÉRIQUE/UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Michael SHAPIRO, Senior Counsel, Office of Intellectual Property Policy and Enforcement, United States Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce, Alexandria, Virginia

Michele J. WOODS (Ms.), Senior Counsel for Policy and International Affairs, United States Copyright Office, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

IRAN (RÉPUBLIQUE ISLAMIQUE D’)/IRAN (ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF)

Ali NASIMFAR, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

MALAISIE/MALAYSIA

Rafiza RAHMAN, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva

QATAR

Khalif Juma AL–HITMI, Inspector Judicial Control, Copyright Office, Doha

SÉNÉGAL/SENEGAL

Elhadji Ibou BOYE, conseiller, Mission permanente, Genève
c) **Organizations non gouvernementales/ Non-Governmental Organizations**

Association des organisations européennes d’artistes interprètes (AEPO–ARTIS)/Association of European Performers’ Organisations (AEPO–ARTIS)
Xavier BLANC, General Secretary, Brussels
Guenaëlle COLLET (Ms.), Head, AEPO–ARTIS Office, Brussels
José María MONTES, Managing Director, Legal and International Affairs, Artístas
Intérpretes Sociedad de Gestión (AISGE)
Abel MARTÍN (General Manager, AISGE)
Isabelle FELDMAN (Ms.), Legal and International Affairs Director, Administration of the Rights of Artists and Musicians (ADAMI)

European Sound Directors Association (ESDA)
Peter Filleul, London

Fédération ibéro-latino-américaine des artistes interprètes ou exécutants (FILAIE)/Ibero-Latin-American Federation of Performers (FILAIE)
Luis COBOS PAVON, Presidente, Madrid
Susana RINALDI (Ms.), Vice presidente, Madrid
Miguel PÉREZ SOLIS, Asesor Jurídico, Madrid

Union européenne de radio-télévision (UER)/European Broadcasting Union (EBU)
Peter Cyriel GOETHALS, Legal Adviser, Legal Department, Geneva

III. **SECRÉTARIAT/SECRETARIAT**

**ORGANISATION INTERNATIONALE DU TRAVAIL (OIT)/INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANIZATION (ILO)**

John MYERS, Industry Specialist, Media, Culture, Graphical; Sectoral Activities Department, International Labour Office, Geneva

Camille GOBET (Ms.), Intern, Geneva

**ORGANISATION DES NATIONS UNIES POUR L’ÉDUCATION, LA SCIENCE ET LA CULTURE (UNESCO)/UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION (UNESCO)**

Petya TOTCHAROVA (Ms.), Legal Officer, Section for the Diversity of Cultural Expressions, Paris
ORGANISATION MONDIALE DE LA PROPRIÉTÉ INTELLECTUELLE (OMPI)
WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION (WIPO)

Michael S. KEPLINGER, vice–directeur général, Secteur du droit d’auteur et droits connexes/Deputy Director General, Copyright and Related Rights Sector

Jørgen BLOMQVIST, directeur de la Division du droit d’auteur/Director, Copyright Law Division

Richard OWENS, directeur de la Division du commerce électronique, des techniques et de la gestion du droit d’auteur/Director, Copyright E–Commerce, Technology and Management Division

Carole CROELLA (Mme/Ms.), conseillère, Division du droit d’auteur/Counsellor, Copyright Law Division

Denis CROZE, Directeur conseiller par intérim, Bureau du vice–directeur général, Secteur du droit d’auteur et droits connexes/Acting Director–Advisor, Copyright and Related Rights Sector

Boris KOKIN, conseiller juridique principal, Division du droit d’auteur/Senior Legal Counsellor, Copyright Law Division

Víctor VÁZQUEZ LÓPEZ, conseiller juridique principal, Division du commerce électronique, des techniques et de la gestion du droit d’auteur/Senior Legal Counsellor, Copyright E–Commerce, Technology and Management Division

Geidy LUNG (Mme/Ms.), juriste principal, Division du droit d’auteur/Senior Legal Officer, Copyright Law Division

Manisekaran AMASI, Consultant, Division du droit d’auteur/Copyright Law Division
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