

WIPO



PCT/A/III/3

ORIGINAL: English/French

DATE: February 28, 1979

E

WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION
GENEVA

INTERNATIONAL PATENT COOPERATION UNION
(PCT UNION)

ASSEMBLY

Third Session (2nd Extraordinary)*
Geneva, April 25 to May 1, 1979

PROPOSALS FOR POSSIBLE AMENDMENTS TO THE REGULATIONS UNDER THE PATENT COOPERATION TREATY (PCT) AND TO THE REGULATIONS UNDER THE BUDAPEST TREATY ON THE INTERNATIONAL RECOGNITION OF THE DEPOSIT OF MICROORGANISMS FOR THE PURPOSES OF PATENT PROCEDURE

Memorandum by the International Bureau

1. Neither the Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT) nor the Regulations thereunder contain provisions specially designed for the specific case of international applications concerning microbiological inventions, by which is meant, in this Memorandum, international applications the subject matter of which involves a microorganism or the use thereof. Similarly, neither the Budapest Treaty on the International Recognition of the Deposit of Microorganisms for the Purposes of Patent Procedure (Budapest Treaty) nor the Regulations thereunder contain special provisions on international applications concerning microbiological inventions.
2. In order to consider the extent to which amendments to the PCT Regulations and to the Budapest Treaty Regulations should be envisaged with a view to filling the above gaps and harmonizing the machinery set up by the two Treaties, and in order to formulate concrete proposals where appropriate, the "PCT and Budapest Treaty" Working Group (hereinafter referred to as "the Working Group") met in Geneva from February 12 to 14, 1979, having

* *Editor's Note:* This electronic document has been created from the paper original and may contain errors. Please bring any such errors to the attention of the PCT Legal Division by e-mail at pct.legal@wipo.int

been convened by the Director General of the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO).

3. Annex A to this document contains the concrete proposals formulated by the Working Group (with an amendment proposed by the International Bureau), which are being submitted to the joint meeting of the PCT Assembly and the Interim Advisory Committee for the Preparation of the Entry Into Force of the Budapest Treaty, on April 30, 1979.

4. Annex B to this document contains brief comments of the proposals of the Working Group, prepared by the International Bureau.

5. Annex C to this document contains the report on the session of the Working Group.

6. The Assembly is invited to take a decision on the proposal to insert a new Rule 13bis into the Regulations under the PCT.

[Annexes follow]

ANNEX A

PROPOSALS FOR A NEW RULE 13BIS
OF THE PCT REGULATIONS

RULE 13BIS

MICROBIOLOGICAL INVENTIONS

13BIS.1 REFERENCE TO DEPOSIT OF MICROORGANISMS

(a) Where the subject matter of the international application involves a microorganism or the use thereof, that application may make reference to one or more deposits of the microorganism.

(b) Where such reference is made, it shall be made at least in the description. The reference in the description shall indicate, with respect to each such deposit, at least the name of the depositary institution, the date of receipt of the microorganism by that institution and the accession number of the deposit. If any such indication is not furnished in the description, it shall be furnished separately and at the latest before the technical preparations for international publication have been completed; in that case, the International Bureau shall publish it together with the international application.

(c) Where the international application contains such reference, the applicant shall, upon request, authorize and assure the furnishing of a sample of the microorganism by the depositary institution:

(i) to the International Searching Authority solely for the purposes of the international search;

(ii) where applicable, to the International Preliminary Examining Authority solely for the purposes of the international preliminary examination.

13BIS.2 DEPOSITARY INSTITUTION

To the extent that the Budapest Treaty on the International Recognition of the Deposit of Microorganisms for the Purposes of Patent Procedure is not applicable, the national law of each designated State shall determine the depositary institution with which the deposit referred to in Rule 13bis.1 shall be made.

13BIS.3 FURNISHING OF SAMPLES

Subject to Article 30(2) (a), no furnishing of samples of the microorganism referred to in Rule 13bis.1 shall take place before the expiration of the applicable time limits after which national procedure under Article 23 or national examination and other processing under Article 40 may start, except with the authorization of the applicant. If the effect of the international application ceases under Articles 24 or 39(2) in any designated or elected State after international publication, such ceasing of effect shall, as far as the furnishing of samples

of the microorganism is concerned, have the same consequences in that State as if the application had been withdrawn after the expiration of the applicable time limits referred to in the preceding sentence; the same shall apply, if the international application is considered to be withdrawn under Article 37(4).

PCT/A/III/3
BP/IAC/II/2
Annex A, page 3
PROPOSALS FOR AMENDMENT OF RULE 11
OF THE REGULATIONS UNDER THE BUDAPEST TREATY

RULE 11

FURNISHING OF SAMPLES

11.1 FURNISHING OF SAMPLES TO INTERESTED INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY OFFICES

(a) [Existing text of Rule 11.1]

(b) In the case of an international application under the Patent Cooperation Treaty, paragraph (a) shall be applicable *mutatis mutandis*, it being understood that, subject to Rule 13bis.3 of the Regulations under the Patent Cooperation Treaty, any “designated Office” within the meaning of the said Treaty shall, provided that it is the industrial property office of a Contracting State or of an intergovernmental industrial property organization, be considered as the industrial property office referred to in paragraph (a).

11.2 FURNISHING OF SAMPLES TO OR WITH THE AUTHORIZATION OF THE DEPOSITOR

[No change]

11.3 FURNISHING OF SAMPLES TO PARTIES LEGALLY ENTITLED

[(a) and (b): no change]

(c) In the case of an international application under the Patent Cooperation Treaty, paragraph (a) shall be applicable *mutatis mutandis*, it being understood that [subject to Rule 13bis.3 of the Regulations under the Patent Cooperation Treaty,]* any “designated Office” within the meaning of the said Treaty shall, provided that it is the industrial property office of a Contracting State or of an intergovernmental industrial property organization, be considered as the industrial property office referred to in paragraph (a), and it being further understood that, as far as the certification of publication for the purposes of patent procedure under paragraph (a) (ii) is concerned, the certification shall refer to the international publication of the international application and, where the national law provides for one of the acts referred to in Article 29(2) (i) and (ii) of the Patent Cooperation Treaty, to that act.

11.4 COMMON RULES

[No change]

[Annex B follows]

* The International Bureau proposes the addition of the phrase in square brackets (see Annex B, paragraph 19).

ANNEX B

COMMENTS ON THE WORKING GROUP'S PROPOSALS

1. From the standpoint of patent law, microbiological inventions are peculiar in that, sometimes, the disclosure of the invention in the written description is not sufficient, so that the microorganism itself has to be available. In such a case, the microorganism has to be either made freely accessible to the public or deposited with a “depository institution” in other words an institution that provides for the receipt, acceptance and storage of microorganisms and the furnishing of samples thereof--where the public would have access to them under certain conditions. If the microorganism itself has to be available but is not accessible to the public, the patent will be refused or invalidated for lack of sufficient disclosure r that is for a reason of substance.

2. An applicant filing a national or regional application will generally be focusing his attention on meeting the particular requirements of a single office. Where protection is sought for several countries in respect of the same invention, the task of the applicant becomes more complicated. Here, the Budapest Treaty and the PCT, each in its own way, offer possibilities for the simplification of this task.

3. Any adaptation of the provisions of the PCT (and more specifically the Regulations thereunder) in order to provide more appropriately for applications relating to microbiological inventions must take into account:

(a) The specific features of the PCT system and in particular:

(i) its decentralized structure, in the sense that several Offices (and Authorities) have specific roles within the system and not merely one Office, as is generally the case with national or regional filings;

(ii) the reservation to the national or regional Offices (of the designated states) of the role of the further processing of the international application for the purposes of the grant of protection;

(b) The need for special provisions to deal with the situation where the Budapest Treaty is not yet in force (or, later, is still not in force with respect to some designated States).

4. In the case of an international application under the PCT, the substantive question whether the accessibility of the microorganism is necessary to complete the disclosure is not considered in the course of the international phase but is a question for the national phase. Therefore the deposit of the microorganism is not, and could not be, a requirement under the PCT; it can only be a national requirement. In the International Bureau's opinion, which the Working Group shared, such a national requirement is compatible with Article 27 of the PCT, even though paragraph (1) of that provision forbids national requirements different from or additional to those of the PCT, in that the “substantive conditions of patentability” of national or regional law and the evidence in respect of it are reserved under paragraphs (5) and (6) of Article 27. Of course, the substantive conditions of patentability referred to are particularly those relating to “patentability” in the narrow sense (novelty, inventive step, industrial applicability), but “patentability” in the broad sense is also covered. This is discernible in the fact that the notes on Article 27(6) of the PCT give as an example “the question whether the

patent should go to the person who was the first to apply for protection or the first to invent” (see the Records of the Washington Diplomatic Conference, page 37), which is clearly a condition of “patentability” in the broad sense.

5. With regard to the inclusion, in the description contained in the international application, of a reference to the deposit of a microorganism, there is nothing in any of the provisions of the PCT or the Regulations thereunder as they now stand which would prevent the applicant from including such a reference. It would nonetheless be useful to provide expressly that the applicant may include such a reference. This is what is provided in paragraph (a) of the new Rule 13*bis*.1 which it is proposed to add to the PCT Regulations. This provision even provides the applicant with the opportunity to mention several deposits of the microorganism, which would enable him, where appropriate, to meet the requirements of several national (or regional) laws in advance.

6. Paragraph (b) of the new Rule 13*bis*.1 proposed for addition to the PCT Regulations specifies the details for the reference mentioned in paragraph (a). The reference may appear in various parts of the international application (in the claims, for instance), but it must in any case appear in the description. The three pieces of information that the reference in the description has to contain (name of depositary institution, date of receipt of the microorganism by that institution, accession number of the deposit) are those generally prescribed by national and regional legal systems that require the deposit of the microorganisms. To allow for the fact that the applicant, when filing his international application, does not always have these three pieces of information it often happens, for instance, that the accession number assigned to the microorganism deposit by the depositary institution is not communicated to him until later paragraph (b) allows him to complete the reference afterwards, provided that he does so sufficiently early for the International Bureau to publish the missing piece or pieces of information at the same time as the international application. It should be noted that the applicant has to submit a separate document to complete the reference, as the PCT does not allow any amendment of the description during the international phase other than the correction of obvious transcription errors. Finally, it was understood by the Working Group that the Administrative Instructions under the PCT would provide for further details with respect to the notification of the applicant, the International Searching Authority and the International Preliminary Examining Authority concerning the indications relating to the deposit or deposits of the microorganism and with respect to the communication of such indications to the designated Offices together with the international application.

7. In the international phase of the PCT procedure, as in the case of a novelty search and patentability examination carried out at the national (or regional) level, it will not normally be necessary for the searcher or examiner to have access to the microorganism itself. In the great majority of cases the search and the examination are effected on the basis of the written documents contained in the patent application. However, exceptional cases could arise--and perhaps the future development of microbiology will make such cases more frequent--in which access to the microorganism is necessary for the search and the examination. For this reason, paragraph (c) of the new Rule 13*bis*.1 which it is proposed to add to the PCT Regulations has the effect of giving access to the microorganism to the International Searching Authority and, where applicable (that is, when an International Preliminary Examination is made), to the International Preliminary Examining Authority, and specifies that it is for the applicant to arrange the furnishing of a sample by the depositary institution.

8. The new Rule 13*bis*.2 proposed for addition to the PCT Regulations deals with the depositary institution with which the deposit of the microorganism is to be made. In principle it is for national law in PCT terminology this expression covers also regional treaties of each designated State to determine that institution. It was understood by the Working Group that the general reference to national law included not only legal texts, but also the decisions made by authorities competent under national law. If national law gives the applicant a choice of depositary institutions with which to deposit his microorganism, it goes without saying that the exercise of this choice is not affected by the proposed Rule 13*bis*.2.

9. There is an important exception to the principle of the exclusive competence of the national law of each designated State: when the Budapest Treaty is in force, and insofar as the microorganism deposit is made in accordance with the Budapest Treaty, every designated State bound by that Treaty will have to recognize the deposit. Of course, as long as at least one of the States designated by the party filing the international application is not bound by the Budapest Treaty, and as long as the law of that State requires the deposit of the microorganism with a depositary institution that is not at the same time an international depositary authority under the Budapest Treaty, the applicant cannot benefit fully from the single deposit system provided for in the Budapest Treaty.

10. The new Rule 13*bis*.3 which it is proposed to add to the PCT Regulations deals with the question whether samples of the deposited microorganism may, during the international phase be furnished without the depositor's authorization, and replies to that question in the negative. The proposed Rule 13*bis*.3 is addressed to the national (or regional) legislator of the country of each designated Office. In situations where the Budapest Treaty would be applicable, this Rule would prevent the designated Office from obtaining a sample under Rule 11.1 of the Regulations under the Budapest Treaty, or giving a third party the certification provided for in Rule 11.3(a) of the same Regulations, before the start of the national phase; in all other situations, it would prevent the national (or regional) legislator from providing a system whereby the designated Office or a third party might have access to the microorganism without the consent of the applicant before the start of the national phase. On the other hand, as soon as the national phase has started, the normal provisions applicable under national (or regional) law would apply, including, where applicable, the system provided for in Rules 11.1 and 11.3 of the Regulations under the Budapest Treaty.

11. There are two possible exceptions to the principle of the non-accessibility of the microorganism during the international phase. The first follows from the phrase "subject to Article 30(2) (a)" at the beginning of the proposed Rule 13*bis*' 13. This phrase means that, if a third party has access to the international application by virtue of Article 30(2) (a) before the start of the national phase, national law may provide that such access extends to the deposited microorganism. The second exception is contained in the second sentence of the proposed Rule 13*bis*.3. This provision means that if, during the period between international publication and the start of the national phase, the international application ceases to have effect or is considered withdrawn in relation to a designated or elected State, the accessibility of the microorganism will be possible if the law of the State concerned allows access to it in the case of withdrawal of the application during the national phase (but accessibility will be impossible if the law of the State concerned does not allow access to the microorganism in the case of withdrawal of the application during the national phase) .

12. It is now appropriate to consider the question of the extent to which the Budapest Treaty or the Regulations thereunder need be amended for the purposes of harmonization with the

PCT. The only provision that seems to require examination in relation to the PCT is Rule 11 of the Regulations under the Budapest Treaty, which has to do with the furnishing of samples of the deposited microorganisms. Rule 11, like the Rules that refer to it (Rules 7.6, 9.2, 10.2(a) (iii), 10.2(e) and 12.1(c)), was drafted with national and regional patent procedures in mind rather than the PCT procedure. It must therefore be ensured that the furnishing of samples is possible within the PCT under the same conditions, *mutatis mutandis*, as within a national or regional procedure. An analysis appears below of the problems raised by each of the three cases of furnishing samples covered by Rule 11, namely, the furnishing of samples to interested industrial property offices (Rule 11.1), the furnishing of samples to or with the authorization of the depositor (Rule 11.2), and the furnishing of samples to parties legally entitled (Rule 11.3).

13. Concerning the furnishing of samples to interested industrial property offices (Rule 11.1), which offices can these be under the PCT? They are the designated offices. There is no need to take elected Offices into consideration since they are necessarily designated Offices. It is not necessary to take the receiving Office into consideration, since either it is also a designated Office and thus covered as such, or it is not a designated Office and then has no interest in receiving samples. As to the International Searching and International Preliminary Examining Authorities, they have at their disposal, if required, a sample of the microorganism for the purposes of the international search and the International Preliminary Examination under Rule 13*bis*.1(b) proposed for addition to the PCT Regulations, whose effect is that Rule 11.2(ii) on the furnishing of samples with the depositor's consent and not Rule 11.1 of the Regulations under the Budapest Treaty will apply.

14. Under Rule 11.1(i) and (ii), the patent application has to have been filed with the office that requests the sample and be pending before that office. Although an international application is physically filed with the receiving Office, it could be said that it is legally filed with each of the designated Offices; by the same token, it could be said that the international application is "pending" before each designated Office from the moment of its filing, even before the procedure actually takes place before each designated Office. However, for the sake of clarity, it seems advisable to provide expressly for the application of Rule 11.1 to the designated Offices (insofar as they are Offices of countries or organizations bound by the Budapest Treaty). However, it follows from the reference to the Rule 13*bis*.3 proposed for addition to the PCT Regulations that, subject to possible exceptions under that Rule, a sample can only be furnished to the designated Office during the national phase (see paragraphs 10 and 11 above).

15. Concerning the furnishing of samples to or with the authorization of the depositor (Rule 11.2), there is no problem in relation to the PCT.

16. With regard to the furnishing of samples to parties legally entitled (Rule 11.3), this takes place only on the basis of a "certification" issued by an industrial property office. It seems clear from the reference to national or regional law made in Rule 11.3 that only designated Offices may give the required certification, to the exclusion of the International Searching Authority and the International Preliminary Examining Authority. The same problem as with Rule 11.1 arises with regard to the condition that the application has to have been filed with the certifying Office (Rule 11.3(a) (i)). It would seem advisable, therefore, to provide expressly that each designated Office (insofar as it is the Office of a country or organization bound by the Budapest Treaty) may issue the required certification.

17. Moreover, an additional problem arises from the fact that the application generally has to have been published, and that such publication has to have been effected by the certifying Office (Rule 11.3(a) (ii)); however, it is difficult to accept, even as a legal fiction, that the international application is published by each of the designated Offices whereas, in fact, it is published by the International Bureau. It therefore seems advisable also to have special provisions on the reference to the publication that must be included in the certification. A distinction has to be made here between two cases. In the first, the national law of the designated State provides, in accordance with Article 29(2) (i) or (ii) of the PCT, that, if the language of the international publication is different from that in which the required national publications are effected, the effects of international publication are applicable only from such time as a translation into the latter language has been published or has been made available to the public, by laying open for public inspection as provided by national law; in that case the certification must refer to the subsequent national publication or making available to the public as well as to the international publication. In the second case, the national law of the designated State makes no such provision; then the certification has only to refer to the international publication.

18. With regard to the third (and most important) condition laid down by Rule 11.3, namely that concerning the applicable law (Rule 11.3(a) (iii)), there does not seem to be any problem, as the applicable law is that governing patent procedure before the designated Office concerned. One thing to be noted is that, in the first of the two cases referred to in the previous paragraph, national law remains free to specify the time as from which, and all other conditions under which, a sample may be furnished and this is not affected by the obligation to refer in the certification to the international publication and to another act (subsequent national publication or subsequent making available to the public). In other words national law may, in such case, provide, for instance, that a sample may only be furnished as from a time subsequent to that other act and the designated Office will have to await that time before issuing the certification.

19. The International Bureau proposes the insertion in the new Rule 11.3(c) of the Regulations under the Budapest Treaty of the phrase “subject to Rule 13*bis*.3 of the Regulations under the Patent Cooperation Treaty” the phrase appears in square brackets on page 2 of Annex A because it is not part of the Working Group’s proposal in order to harmonize the new Rule 11.3(c) with the new Rule 11.1(b) or the Regulations under the Budapest Treaty, which does contain that phrase in the Working Group’s proposal. It will thus be clear that, subject to possible exceptions under Rule 13*bis*.3 of the PCT Regulations, the furnishing of a sample to a third party, on the basis of a certification from the designated Office, may only take place during the national phase (see paragraphs 10, 11 and 14 in fine above). The express reference to Rule 13*bis*.3 will remove all risk of an interpretation contrary to the clear intention of the Working Group.

20. Inasmuch as it seems advisable to amend Rule 11 as indicated in paragraphs ‘12 to 19 above, it appears preferable, in order to avoid having to amend other provisions (those that refer to certain provisions of Rule 11), to complete Rules 11.1 and 11.3 rather than to create a new Rule 11.5.

21. Later, the question should be examined whether the forms for the application of Rules 11.1 and 11.3 can be amended to cover the case of international applications, or whether special forms will have to be drafted for that purpose.

WIPO



BPCT/II/7

ORIGINAL: English/French

DATE: February 14, 1979

WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION
GENEVA

PCT AND BUDAPEST TREATY WORKING GROUP

First Session
Geneva, February 12 to 14, 1979

REPORT

Adopted by the Working Group

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Convened by the Director General of the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), the "PCT and Budapest Treaty" Working Group (hereinafter referred to as "the Working Group") met in Geneva from February 12 to 14, 1979.
2. The member States of the International Patent Cooperation Union (PCT Union) and the member States of the Interim Advisory Committee for the Preparation of the Entry Into Force of the Budapest Treaty on the International Recognition of the Deposit of Microorganisms for the Purposes of Patent Procedure (that is, the States members of the Paris Union for the Protection of Industrial Property that had signed the Budapest Treaty and/or participated in the Budapest Diplomatic Conference) had been invited to the meeting of the Working Group. The following fifteen states were represented: Brazil, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany (Federal Republic of), Hungary, Italy, Madagascar, Mexico, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom, United States of America.
3. One intergovernmental organization, the European Patent Organization was represented in an observer capacity.

4. The following five international non-governmental organizations were represented as observers: European Federation of Agents of Industry in Industrial Property (FEMIP), International Association for the Protection of Industrial Property (IAPIP), International Federation of Patent Agents (FICPI), International Federation of Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Associations (IFPMA), Union of Industries of the European Community (UNICE).
5. The list of participants appears in Annex I to this Report.
6. Mr. K. Pfanner, Deputy Director General of WIPO, opened the meeting on behalf of the Director General of WIPO and welcomed the participants.
7. The Working Group unanimously elected Mr. J.-L. Comte (Switzerland) as Chairman and Mrs. E. Parragh (Hungary) and Mr. S. Rabearivelo (Madagascar) as ViceChairmen. Mr. F. Curchod (WIPO) acted as Secretary of the Working Group.

II. PROPOSALS FOR POSSIBLE AMENDMENTS

8. The Working Group considered proposals for possible amendments to the Regulations under the Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT) and to the Regulations under the Budapest Treaty on the International Recognition of the Deposit of Microorganisms for the Purposes of Patent Procedure prepared by the International Bureau, as contained' in document BPCT/I/2. After a general discussion of the' said proposals in which the Working Group also took into account observations on the said proposals by Japan and the Soviet Union, as contained in documents. BPCT/I/3 and 4, the Working Group decided to establish a Drafting Group which was entrusted with the task of revising the proposals for amendment in the light of the observations made in the discussion. The Drafting Group prepared a draft of revised proposals for amendment which was submitted to the Working Group in document BPCT/5.
9. The Working Group adopted the revised texts prepared by the Drafting Group, subject to a certain number of amendments. The revised texts, as adopted by the Working Group, are contained in Annex II to this Report.*
10. In the course of adopting the said revised texts, certain observations were made indicating the position of certain delegations concerning the said revised texts. The said observations and the understanding on which certain provisions were adopted are indicated in the following paragraphs.

* This Annex is in fact reproduced not here but earlier, as Annex A to documents PCT/A/III/3 and BP/IAC/II/2.

PROPOSALS FOR A NEW RULE 13BIS
OF THE PCT REGULATIONS

11. In adopting the text of Rule 13bis.1(b), it was understood by the Working Group that the Administrative Instructions under the PCT would provide for further details with respect to the notification of the applicant, the International Searching Authority and the International Preliminary Examining Authority concerning the indications relating to the deposit or deposits of the microorganism and with respect to the communication of such indications to the designated Offices together with the international application.

12. During the discussion of Rule 13bis.1(c), the Delegation of France expressed a reservation concerning the usefulness of making express provision for a right for the International Searching Authority and the International Preliminary Examining Authority to obtain a sample of a deposited microorganism, since that right existed even without such provision and even where there was no deposit of the microorganism.

13. In reply to a question raised by the Delegation of Spain with respect to Rule 13bis.2, it was understood by the Working Group that the general reference to national law included not only legal texts, but also the decisions made by authorities competent under national law.

14. The Delegation of Brazil, noting that its country had not signed the Budapest Treaty and also that the Brazilian Industrial Property Code did not consider as patentable discoveries in the field of microorganisms and the utilization of such discoveries, said that it could not associate itself at this time with the proposals of the Working Group concerning the text of proposed new Rule 13bis.

15. The Delegations of the United Kingdom and France said that, although they could accept the text of the proposed new Rule 13bis, they did not see the need for such provisions in the PCT, in particular as far as the provisions concerning the furnishing of samples to International Searching and Preliminary Examining Authorities were concerned.

PROPOSALS FOR AMENDMENT OF RULE 11
OF THE REGULATIONS UNDER THE BUDAPEST TREATY

16. When the Working Group adopted the texts of Rules 11.1(b) and 11.3(c), it noted statements of several' delegations to the effect that, in their opinion, a general statement that the provisions of Rules 11.1(a) and 11.3(a), respectively apply *mutatis mutandis* to international applications under the PCT would suffice as far as 'the reference to designated Offices was concerned.

17. With respect to Rule 11.3(c), the Delegation of the United Kingdom reserved its position concerning the implications which the latter part of that provision might entail for the national law of its country.

18. This report was unanimously adopted by the Working Group in its meeting on February 14, 1979.

[Annexes follow]*

* See footnote on previous page.

BPCT/I/7
ANNEXE I/ANNEX I

LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS/LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

I. ETATS/STATES

ALLEMAGNE (REPUBLIQUE FEDERALE D') / GERMANY (FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF)

U. HALLMANN, Head of Legal Section, German Patent Office, Munich

BRESIL/BRAZIL

G. ARROIO, Premier Secrétaire, Mission permanente, Genève

DANEMARK/DENMARK

D. SIMONSEN (Mrs.), Head of Division, Danish Patent and Trade Mark Office, Copenhagen

G. LUTKEN (Mrs.), Head of Department, Danish Patent and Trade Mark Office, Copenhagen

ESPAGNE/SPAIN

J. DELICADO MONTERO-RIOS, Director, Departamento Estudios y Relaciones Internacionales, Madrid

ETATS-UNIS D'AMERIQUE/ UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

S. SCHLOSSER, Attorney, Patent and Trademark Office, Washington, D.C.

FINLANDE/FINLAND

H. LOMMI (Mrs.), Senior Examiner, Patent and Registration Board, Helsinki

FRANCE

P. GUERIN, Attaché de direction, Institut national de la propriété industrielle, Paris

D. DARMON (Mlle), Conseiller, Institut national de la propriété industrielle, Paris

HONGRIE/HUNGARY

E. PARRAGH (Mrs.), Counsellor, National Office of Inventions, Budapest

ITALIE/ITALY

S. SAMPERI, Directeur, Bureau national des brevets, Rome

M. BELLENGHI, Directeur, Service des brevets, Gruppo Lepetit S.p.A., Milano

G. CAGGIANO, Expert, Conseil national de la recherche, Rome

MADAGASCAR

S. RABEARIVELO, Conseiller, Mission permanente, Genève

MEXIQUE/MEXICO

M.F. CHARRIN (Mme), Attaché, Mission permanente, Genève

PORTUGAL

R. SERRAO, Directeur des services, Institut national de la propriété industrielle, Lisbonne

ROYAUME-UNI/UNITED KINGDOM

D.C. CARTER, Superintending Examiner, Patent Office, London

A. NEEDS, Principal Examiner, Patent Office, London

SUEDE/SWEDEN

E. TERSMEDEN, Legal Adviser, Ministry of Justice, Stockholm

R. WALLES (Mrs.), Senior Examiner, Royal Patent and Registration Office, Stockholm

SUISSE/SWITZERLAND

J.-L. COMTE, Directeur adjoint, Bureau fédéral de la propriété intellectuelle, Berne

R. KAMPF, Chef de section, Bureau fédéral de la propriété intellectuelle, Berne

II. ORGANISATION INTERGOUVERNEMENTALE/
INTERGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATION

ORGANISATION EUROPEENNE DES BREVETS (OEB)/EUROPEAN PATENT
ORGANIZATION (EPO)

U.J. SCHATZ, Directeur principal, Munich

L.O. ASSARSSON, Directeur, Munich

L. GRUSZOW (Mme), Administrateur, Munich

III. ORGANISATIONS INTERNATIONALES NON GOUVERNEMENTALES/
INTERNATIONAL NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

Association internationale pour la protection de la propriété industrielle (AIPPI)/
International Association for the Protection of Industrial Property (IAPIP)

G. TASSET, Smith Kline – RIT, Rixensart

Fédération européenne des mandataires de l'industrie en propriété industrielle (FEMIPPI)/
European Federation of Agents of Industry in Industrial Property

G. TASSET, Smith Kline – RIT, Rixensart

Fédération internationale des conseils en propriété industrielle (FICIPI)/ International
Federation of Patent Agents

E. GUTMANN, Conseil en brevets d'invention, Paris

Fédération internationale de l'industrie du médicament (FIIM)/International Federation of
Pharmaceuticals Manufacturers Association (IFPMA)

A.D.W. MASSAM, Assistant Secretary, Association of the British Pharmaceutical Industry,
London

Union des industries de la communauté européenne (UNICE)/Union of Industries of the
European Community

R. KOCKLAUNER, Hoechst AG, Wiesbaden

IV. BUREAU/OFFICES

Président/Chairman: J.-L. COMTE (Suisse/Switzerland)
Vice-président/Vice-Chairmen: E. PARRAGH (Mrs.) (Hongrie/Hungary)
Secrétaire/Secretary: F. CURCHOD (OMPI/WIPO)

V. BUREAU INTERNATIONAL DE L'OMPI/
INTERNATIONAL BUREAU OF WIPO

K. PFANNER, Deputy Director General

M. HADDRICK, Head, PCT Division

F. CURCHOD, Chef de la section des projets spéciaux, Division de la propriété industrielle

V. TROUSSOV, Senior Counsellor, PCT Legal and General Section, PCT Division

S. ODDI, Senior Legal Officer, Special Projects Section, Industrial Property Division

[Fin du document/End of document]