

Published monthly
Annual subscription:
160 Swiss francs
Each monthly issue:
16 Swiss francs

Copyright

26th year — No. 5
May 1990

Monthly Review of the
World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO)

Contents

WIPO MEETINGS

Group of Consultants on the Collective Administration of Copyright and Neighboring Rights
(Geneva, March 19 to 23, 1990) 161

STUDIES

International Congresses on the Protection of Intellectual Property, by *Ricardo Antequera
Parilli* 166

CORRESPONDENCE

Letter from Mauritius, by *Ariranga G. Pillay* 174

CALENDAR OF MEETINGS 178

COPYRIGHT AND NEIGHBORING RIGHTS LAWS AND TREATIES

(INSERT)

Editor's Note

LESOTHO

Copyright Order, 1989 (No. 13 of 1989) Text 1-01

MAURITIUS

The Copyright (Amendment) Act 1988 (No. 45, of December 20, 1988) Text 1-01

© WIPO 1990

ISSN 0010-8626

Any reproduction of official notes or reports, articles and translations of laws or agreements, published
in this review, is authorized only with the prior consent of WIPO.

WIPO Meetings

Group of Consultants on the Collective Administration of Copyright and Neighboring Rights

(Geneva, March 19 to 23, 1990)

REPORT

adopted by the Group of Consultants

I. Introduction

1. The Program and Budget of the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) for the 1990–91 biennium adopted by the Governing Bodies of WIPO at their twentieth series of meetings in Geneva in October 1989 (see documents AB/XX/2, Annex A, PRG.03(4) and AB/XX/20, paragraph 199) contains the following program item: "The International Bureau will convene a group of consultants to consider what advice should be given to governments in respect of the collective administration of certain rights—particularly musical performance rights—in the field of copyright. Such advice should be useful in countries in which legislation on the matter is not existing or incomplete or in which the experience in the field is limited."

2. The Group of Consultants mentioned in the preceding paragraph met at the headquarters of WIPO in Geneva from March 19 to 23, 1990.

3. The consultants, who had been invited in their personal capacity by the Director General of WIPO, were nationals of the following nine countries: Algeria, Argentina, Brazil, Germany (Federal Republic of), Hungary, India, Indonesia, Mali, United States of America.

4. Other consultants representing five international non-governmental organizations also participated in the meeting.

5. The list of participants follows this report.

II. Opening of the Meeting

6. The meeting of the Group of Consultants was opened by Mr. Henry Olsson, Director, Copyright

and Public Information Department of WIPO, who welcomed the participants on behalf of the Director General.

III. Election of the Chairman

7. The Group of Consultants elected Mr. Péter Gyertyánfy (Hungary) Chairman of the meeting.

IV. Documentation

8. The Group of Consultants had before it two documents prepared by the International Bureau of WIPO on certain basic questions and principles of collective administration of copyright and neighboring rights (documents GC/CA/2 and 3).

V. General Discussion

9. The consultants were unanimous in acknowledging the high quality of the documents prepared by the International Bureau of WIPO. They found that the principles proposed in the report on certain basic questions of collective administration (document GC/CA/3) were an excellent basis for offering advice to governments in respect of such administration of copyright and neighboring rights.

10. It was agreed that the first four chapters of the document should be considered background material and that the discussions should concentrate on Chapter VI of that document which offered conclusions and, particularly, principles, and which outlined certain questions proposed for further consideration. Chapter V was considered a kind of commentary to those principles and questions.

11. During the general discussions, some consultants made certain clarifications on the descriptive part of the document, and stated that they would have comments on specific points.

12. One consultant representing a non-governmental organization underlined and welcomed the fact that the study also dealt with collective administration of the so-called neighboring rights and not only that of copyright.

13. Another consultant referred to the fact that, in his country, collective administration was not as widespread as in certain other countries and that—in various cases—non-voluntary licenses were rather applied where individual exercise of rights was not feasible. He also referred to the development of new technology which seemed to make it necessary to consider a new approach with a wider application of collective administration schemes.

14. Some consultants referred to the specific conditions, in this field, in various developing countries and noted with satisfaction that those conditions had been duly taken into account.

VI. Discussion of the Proposed Principles

15. *Principle (a)*. In general, there was agreement on this principle. It was noted that, in practice, the individual exercise of rights was not always the best means to defend the interests of authors, and that it was more appropriate to leave the choice between collective and individual exercise of rights to the freedom of association of the owners of rights concerned.

16. *Principle (b)*. In general, there was agreement on this principle. However, it was suggested that the two elements included in it might be subject to two separate principles. One principle could describe what was or was not a full collective administration, and another one could state the need for collective administration also in the case of simple rights to remuneration.

17. It was noted that when full collective administration was described, the addition of a further element, namely the enforcement of rights, if necessary through litigation, should be considered.

18. In respect of the second sentence of the principle concerning the administration of mere rights to remuneration, it was suggested that it should be further clarified what the term "negotiation," mentioned there, might involve. In that respect, it was proposed that two elements might be mentioned,

namely, the determination of the condition of the uses of works and the level of fees to be paid for such uses.

19. *Principle (c)*. It was suggested that the principle might differentiate between three possibilities: firstly, a separate organization for various rights and various categories of rights owners; secondly, a more general organization administering various rights and various categories of rights owners; and, thirdly, what was referred to as the "coalition" or the "joint venture" of separate organizations.

20. The majority of the consultants who spoke on this matter were of the view that separate organizations were more appropriate and might administer more efficiently the rights concerned. In cases of joint interests, it was rather the "coalition" or the "joint venture" of such organizations which was the more adequate solution. However, some arguments were also mentioned in favor of organizations with a more general repertoire, in particular, in developing countries.

21. Several comments were made on whether it was appropriate for the same organization to administer both copyright and the so-called neighboring rights. The majority of consultants who spoke on this matter considered that such joint administration was not recommendable; however, certain examples were mentioned where such solution might be feasible.

22. *Principle (d)*. One consultant pointed out that free market competition might also be advantageous in the field of collective administration and that such competition might justify the existence of more than one organization for the administration of the same category of rights in a country. Other consultants expressed opposing views, stressing that the very notion of "market" was alien to collective administration of copyright and neighboring rights. The great convenience for bilateral arrangements of having only one collecting society dealing with only one collecting society in another country was stressed by some consultants. There was agreement, however, that the text of the principle was appropriate, and it was only the commentary that might have to reflect the aspects discussed.

23. *Principle (e)*. This principle was also supported, in general. There was agreement among the consultants that, as a rule, private organizations should be recommended for collective administration, and that public organizations, even in developing countries, should rather be considered a temporary solution necessitated by the specific conditions of those countries.

24. Reference was also made to paragraphs 256 and 257 of Chapter V where it was mentioned that, in many cases, public and private elements could be found in the same organization in the form of, e.g., public supervision of private organizations and, e.g., governing bodies composed of representatives of authors in public organizations. It was stated that, actually, the two alternatives which could really be recommended were a private organization, on the one hand, and a public organization with the intensive participation of authors (a mixed type organization), on the other hand.

25. *Principle (f)*. Although some wording changes were proposed, the consultants expressed their agreement with this principle.

26. It was proposed, however, that, as a first sentence, a further sentence should be added to the principle where the basic principle of the freedom of association of owners of rights should be stated.

27. *Principle (g)*. Some consultants referred to various national situations in relation to the practical aspects of the extended collective administration clause.

28. It was suggested to modify the wording of the summary description of that form of administration (which was in brackets in the principle) to reflect further typical elements thereof existing in various countries. Otherwise, there was agreement on this principle.

29. *Principle (h)*. Although there was general agreement concerning the text of this principle, various consultants proposed that, in the commentary, it should be stated that the legal presumption to facilitate the operation of blanket licenses granted by collective administration organizations was only justified when such organizations were sufficiently established and representative.

30. It was noted that the guarantee to be given in case of blanket licenses was only justified and feasible where there was only one organization to administer a certain category of rights, and that one of the disadvantages of the establishment of parallel organizations in the same field was that users could hardly obtain such a guarantee.

31. It was clarified that the reference, in the second sentence of the principle, to individual claims of rights owners only concerned those rights owners who were not represented by the collective administration organization but whose works were also covered by the global blanket license.

32. There was agreement among the consultants that, as a rule, a rights owner not represented by the collective administration organization was only entitled to receive a payment for the use of his work covered by a global blanket license granted by the organization that was the same as the payment received by rights owners represented by the organization for the same kind of use, and that the obligation of the organization to pay an indemnity also only extended to the amount of such a payment.

33. *Principle (i)*. Although, in general, there was agreement that the purpose and the essence of this principle were appropriate, several consultants were of the view that the principle should not express an absolute necessity for, but only the desirability of, an adequate government supervision, and only—or mainly—where it was needed to prevent possible abuse of a monopolistic position. It was also proposed that the scope of government supervision be reconsidered.

34. Some consultants referred to various elements of government supervision in their countries, and noted that, in respect of such supervision, it was important to take into account the fact that conditions varied from country to country.

35. Reference was also made to systems where government supervision was operating in order to prevent abuse of *de facto* monopolistic position of collective administration organizations. One consultant suggested that in return for the acceptance of governmental supervision, collecting societies should be granted exemption for certain antitrust provisions in national legislations.

36. *Principle (j)*. In general, there was agreement on this principle and only some wording changes were suggested (e.g., that a reference should be made to the statutory organs of the collective administration organizations duly mandated by the rights owners to represent them).

37. *Principle (k)*. There was agreement on this principle also. However, it was found necessary that it be clarified in the commentary that the expression "that may concern the exercise of those rights" meant such information only as related to the administration of the rights of the party concerned.

38. One consultant suggested that, in the commentary, a reference should be made to the role of the international non-governmental organization represented by him which role included the adoption and regular updating of model contracts for reciprocal representation between the member

societies of the organization, *inter alia*, with the obligation to furnish appropriate information to each other.

39. *Principle (l)*. There was agreement on this principle. One consultant referred to the situation existing in some developing countries where government supervision existed in respect of the tariff system in order to protect the interests of authors.

40. *Principle (m)*. There was agreement on this principle also. However, it was suggested that the prescription of the obligation of the users to facilitate the monitoring and collecting activities of collective administration organizations should be recommended, as a rule, in respect of the application for licenses and the supply of programs by users.

41. *Principle (n)*. Although the essence of this principle was considered appropriate, some consultants suggested that it should be made more flexible. It was, however, also pointed out that remunerations collected for rights owners could not be used for purposes other than covering the costs of administration—in the sense in which the notion of costs of administration is outlined in paragraph 311 of the document—and the distribution of the remunerations to the rights owners entitled to those remunerations without the agreement of the rights owners concerned, and it was rather only in respect of the manner of obtaining such agreement where the principle, possibly with an appropriate explanation in the commentary, might have to be made more flexible.

42. *Principle (o)*. There was general agreement on this principle. It was proposed, however, that the phrase “as much in proportion to the actual use of their works as possible” should not be interpreted in a simplistic manner to only mean such aspects as, e.g., the frequency of the use and the length of the works, but should be considered to also allow the evaluation of such further aspects as the nature of the use, the genre of the work or the type of participation in a performance. It was understood that those aspects should only be referred to in the comments to the principle.

43. *Principle (p)*. One consultant proposed that this principle should be reserved for stressing the obligation to grant equal treatment to foreign rights owners, and the question of the status of rights owners not represented by the collective administration organization should be dealt with separately. The proposal was supported by other consultants. With that modification, this principle was considered appropriate.

44. Another consultant suggested that the question of the status of rights owners not represented by a collective administration organization, in the case of global blanket licences, should be dealt with within the framework of principle (b). That idea was supported by other consultants. It was stated that, in such a case, although the same general distribution rules should be followed as the ones applied in respect of the members of the organization and other rights owners represented by it, the additional costs emerging from the identification of the rights owners not represented might also be taken into account as a calculation element.

45. *Principle (q)*. After a discussion of the notion of “agency activities,” general agreement was expressed concerning this principle. It was proposed that the comments to the principle should clarify the meaning of “tasks other than collective administration” and, particularly, the meaning of “agency activities.”

VII. Discussion of Further Questions

46. It was considered that the questions mentioned in paragraph 315 of the document, in general, had been discussed partly in the analytic chapter of the document and partly during the discussions of the principles by the Group of Consultants. Therefore, although it was stated that all the questions referred to above might deserve further studies, there were only two questions in respect of which substantive comments were made, namely questions (a) and (f).

47. *Question (a)*. One consultant representing an international non-governmental organization referred to the fact that “electrocopying” was still a relatively new phenomenon and, in that field as well as in the field of data bases, the possibilities of collective administration schemes were still under study; therefore, he was of the view that any specific principles on those subjects would be premature. Reference was made also to the fact that the document, when dealing with reprographic reproduction, also touched upon the questions of “electrocopying” and data bases.

48. Another consultant representing another international non-governmental organization stated that, in the field of rental, although collective administration was applicable in exceptional cases, such administration was not an appropriate way of exercising rights. Still other consultants disagreed with that view emphasizing the advantages of, and the need for, collective administration also in the field of rental.

49. It was mentioned that it should be studied whether the collective administration of rights relating to the reproduction of musical works on video support would also be appropriate.

50. *Question (f)*. The consultants who took the floor on this question described various methods employed by collective administration organizations to use remunerations due to unidentifiable rights owners.

51. It was generally agreed upon that the collective administration organizations remained responsible towards rights owners who could not be identified, but might become known later, until the end of the prescription period of the rights involved. It was, however, also stressed that, in the case of collective administration, such a prescription period should be reasonably short; as a rule, it should not be longer than five years.

52. *The Question of "Split Membership."* One consultant representing an international non-governmental organization referred to the difficulties that the "split membership" of rights owners (that is, their membership is more than one organization in respect of the same rights) might create. Other consultants agreed that such "split membership," wherever possible, should be avoided, but reference was made to certain antitrust regulations. It was suggested that a separate principle might state that rights owners should be encouraged (not obliged) to join only one organization in respect of a certain category of rights, and, where there was an appropriate organization in the country where they were nationals or residents, preferably that organization. The principle might also contain a statement similar to the one included in the second sentence of Principle (d), that is, it might stress that membership in more than one organization, in respect of the same category of rights, might decrease or even eliminate the advantages of collective administration rights.

53. *Annex I to the Document*. It was found that all the questions covered by Chapter VIII: Collective Administration of Rights of the Model Provisions for Legislation in the Field of Copyright (which was included in that annex), had been discussed during the discussion by the Group of Consultants of the various principles. Therefore, no further comments were made.

VIII. Adoption of the Report and Closing of the Meeting

54. This report was unanimously adopted by the Group of Consultants.

55. After the usual thanks, the Chairman declared the meeting closed.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

I. Consultants Invited in Their Personal Capacity

- Mr. Salah Abada, Directeur général, Office national du droit d'auteur (ONDA), Alger
- Mr. Mamadou Coulibaly, Directeur, Bureau malien du droit d'auteur (BMDA), Bamako
- Mr. Péter Gyertyánfy, Director of Administration, Hungarian Bureau for the Protection of Authors' Rights (ARTISJUS), Budapest
- Mr. Eduard Merz, Head, Department of Legal Affairs, German Patent Office, Munich
- Mr. Leandro Darío Rodríguez Miglio, Chief, International Affairs, Argentine Society of Authors and Music Composers (SADAIC), Buenos Aires
- Mr. Ralph Oman, Register of Copyrights, Copyright Office, Library of Congress, Washington
- Mr. Jagdish Sagar, Joint Secretary, Department of Education, Ministry of Human Resource Development, New Delhi
- Mrs. Vanisa Santiago, Chief Executive, União Brasileira de Compositores (UBC), Rio de Janeiro
- Mr. Sadikin Zuchra, Secretary General, Indonesian Composers and Arrangers Association (PAPPRI), Jakarta

II. Consultants Representing International Non-Governmental Organizations

International Bureau of Societies Administering the Rights of Mechanical Recording and Reproduction (BIEM): A. Vacher-Desvernais. International Confederation of Societies of Authors and Composers (CISAC): J.-A. Ziegler; J. Corbet; M.J. Freegard; G. Messinger; S. Matsuoka. International Federation of Musicians (FIM): R. Vikström; Y. Burckhardt; Y. Åkeberg. International Federation of Reproduction Rights Organisations (IFRRO): F. Melichar; J.S. Alcn; C. Clark. International Federation of the Phonographic Industry (IFPI): G. Davies; T.R. Pearcy; D. De Freitas.

III. Observer

Mauritius Society of Authors (MASA): E. Riviere.

IV. Secretariat

H. Olsson (*Director, Copyright and Public Information Department*); M. Fiesor (*Director, Copyright Law Division*); P. Masouyé (*Legal Officer, Copyright Law Division*).

Studies

**International Congresses on
the Protection of Intellectual Property**

Ricardo ANTEQUERA PARILLI*

Correspondence

Letter from Mauritius

The Mauritius Copyright Act

Airanga G. PILLAY*

Calendar of Meetings

WIPO Meetings

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

1990

- May 28 to June 1 (Geneva)** **Committee of Experts on the International Protection of Geographical Indications**
 The Committee will examine a document prepared by the International Bureau of WIPO on the need for a new multilateral treaty on the international protection of geographical indications and its possible content.
Invitations: States members of the Paris Union and, as observers, certain organizations.
- June 5 to 8 (Geneva)** **Consultative Meeting of Developing Countries on the Harmonization of Patent Laws**
 This consultative meeting will, on the basis of a working document prepared by the International Bureau of WIPO, study problems of particular relevance to developing countries in connection with the preparation of a treaty supplementing the Paris Convention as far as patents are concerned (patent law treaty).
Invitations: Developing countries members of the Paris Union or WIPO.
- June 11 to 22 (Geneva)** **Committee of Experts on the Harmonization of Certain Provisions in Laws for the Protection of Inventions (Eighth Session)**
 The Committee will continue to examine a draft treaty supplementing the Paris Convention as far as patents are concerned (patent law treaty).
Invitations: States members of the Paris Union and, as observers, States members of WIPO not members of the Paris Union and certain organizations.
- June 19 to 22 (Geneva)** **Preparatory Meeting for the Diplomatic Conference for the Conclusion of a Treaty Supplementing the Paris Convention as Far as Patents Are Concerned**
 The Meeting will prepare the organization of the diplomatic conference which will be convened to negotiate and adopt a treaty supplementing the Paris Convention as far as patents are concerned (patent law treaty).
Invitations: States members of the Paris Union.
- June 25 to 29 (Geneva)** **Committee of Experts on the Harmonization of Laws for the Protection of Marks (Second Session)**
 The Committee will continue to examine a draft trademark law treaty.
Invitations: States members of the Paris Union, the European Communities and, as observers, States members of WIPO not members of the Paris Union and certain organizations.
- July 2 to 6 (Geneva)** **PCT Committee for Administrative and Legal Matters (Third Session)**
 The Committee will examine proposals for amending the Regulations under the Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT), in particular in connection with the procedure under Chapter II of the PCT.
Invitations: States members of the PCT Union and, as observers, States members of the Paris Union not members of the PCT Union and certain organizations.
- July 2 to 13 (Geneva)** **Committee of Experts on Model Provisions for Legislation in the Field of Copyright (Third Session)**
 The Committee will continue to consider proposed standards in the field of literary and artistic works for the purposes of national legislation on the basis of the Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works.
Invitations: States members of the Berne Union or WIPO and, as observers, certain organizations.
- September 24 to October 2 (Geneva)** **Governing Bodies of WIPO and the Unions Administered by WIPO (Twenty-First Series of Meetings)**
 Some of the Governing Bodies will meet in ordinary session, others in extraordinary session.
Invitations: As members or observers (depending on the body), States members of WIPO or the Unions and, as observers, other States and certain organizations.

- October 15 to 26 (Geneva)** **Committee of Experts Set Up Under the Nice Agreement (Sixteenth Session)**
 The Committee will complete the fifth revision of the classification established under the Nice Agreement Concerning the International Classification of Goods and Services for the Purposes of the Registration of Marks.
Invitations: States members of the Nice Union and, as observers, States members of the Paris Union not members of the Nice Union and certain organizations.
- October 22 to 26 (Geneva)** **Committee of Experts on the Settlement of Intellectual Property Disputes Between States (Second Session)**
 The Committee will examine principles for a possible multilateral treaty.
Invitations: States members of the Paris Union, the Berne Union or WIPO or party to the Nairobi Treaty and, as observers, certain organizations.
- October 29 to November 2 (Geneva)** **Committee of Experts on a Protocol to the Berne Convention (First Session)**
 The Committee will examine whether the preparation of a protocol to the Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works should start, and—if so—with what content.
Invitations: States members of the Berne Union and, as observers, States members of WIPO not members of the Berne Union and certain organizations.
- October 29 to November 2 (Geneva)** **Working Group on a Possible Revision of the Hague Agreement (First Session)**
 This working group will consider possibilities for revising the Hague Agreement Concerning the International Deposit of Industrial Designs, or adding to it a protocol, in order to introduce in the Hague system further flexibility and other measures encouraging States not yet party to the Hague Agreement to adhere to it and making it easier to use by applicants.
Invitations: States members of the Hague Union and, as observers, States members of the Paris Union not members of the Hague Union and certain organizations.
- November 26 to 30 (Geneva)** **Working Group on the Application of the Madrid Protocol of 1989 (Second Session)**
 The working group will continue to study Regulations for the implementation of the Madrid Protocol of 1989.
Invitations: States members of the Madrid Union, States having signed or acceded to the Protocol, the European Communities and, as observers, other States members of the Paris Union expressing their interest in participating in the Working Group in such capacity and certain non-governmental organizations.
- December 10 to 14 (Geneva)** **PCT Committee for Administrative and Legal Matters (Fourth Session)**
 The Committee will continue the work started during its third session (July 2 to 6, 1990).
Invitations: States members of the PCT Union and, as observers, States members of the Paris Union not members of the PCT Union and certain organizations.
- 1991**
- January 28 to 30 (Geneva)** **Information Meeting(s) on the Revision of the Paris Convention**
 An information meeting of developing countries members of the Paris Union and China and, if it is so desired, information meetings of any other group of countries members of the Paris Union will take place for an exchange of views on the new proposals which will have been prepared by the Director General of WIPO for amending the articles of the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property which are under consideration for revision.
Invitations: See the preceding paragraph.
- January 31 and February 1 (Geneva)** **Assembly of the Paris Union (Fifteenth Session)**
 The Assembly will fix the further procedural steps concerning the revision of the Paris Convention and will take cognizance of the aforementioned proposals of the Director General of WIPO. It will also decide the composition of a preparatory meeting which will take place in the first half of 1991.
Invitations: States members of the Paris Union and, as observers, States members of WIPO not members of the Paris Union and certain organizations.
- June 3 to 28**
(dates and place to be confirmed) **Diplomatic Conference for the Conclusion of a Treaty Supplementing the Paris Convention as Far as Patents Are Concerned**
 This diplomatic conference will negotiate and adopt a treaty supplementing the Paris Convention as far as patents are concerned (patent law treaty).
Invitations: To be decided by the preparatory meeting to be held from June 19 to 22, 1990 (see above).

- September 23 to October 2 (Geneva)** **Governing Bodies of WIPO and the Unions Administered by WIPO (Twenty-Second Series of Meetings)**
 All the Governing Bodies of WIPO and the Unions administered by WIPO meet in ordinary sessions every two years in odd-numbered years. In the sessions in 1991, the Governing Bodies will, *inter alia*, review and evaluate activities undertaken since July 1990, and consider and adopt the draft program and budget for the 1992-93 biennium.
Invitations: States members of WIPO or the Unions and, as observers, other States members of the United Nations and certain organizations.
- November 18 to December 6 (dates and place to be confirmed)** **Diplomatic Conference on the Revision of the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property (Fifth Session)**
 The Diplomatic Conference is to negotiate and adopt a new Act of the Paris Convention.
Invitations: States members of the Paris Union and, without the right to vote, States members of WIPO or the United Nations not members of the Paris Union as well as, as observers, certain organizations.

UPOV Meetings

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

1990

- June 25 to 29 (Geneva)** **Administrative and Legal Committee (Twenty-Seventh Session)**
 The Committee will continue the preparations for the Diplomatic Conference for the Revision of the UPOV Convention.
Invitations: Member States of UPOV and, as observers, certain non-member States and intergovernmental organizations.
- October 10 and 11 (Geneva)** **Fifth Meeting with International Organizations**
 The meeting is to enable international non-governmental organizations to express views on questions concerning the revision of the UPOV Convention.
Invitations: Member States of UPOV and certain international non-governmental organizations.
- October 12, 15 and 16 (Geneva)** **Administrative and Legal Committee (Twenty-Eighth Session)**
 The Committee will continue the preparations for the Diplomatic Conference for the Revision of the UPOV Convention
Invitations: Member States of UPOV and, as observers, certain non-member States and intergovernmental organizations.
- October 17 (Geneva)** **Consultative Committee (Forty-Second Session)**
 The Committee will prepare the twenty-fourth ordinary session of the Council.
Invitations: Member States of UPOV.
- October 18 and 19 (Geneva)** **Council (Twenty-Fourth Ordinary Session)**
 The Council will examine the reports on the activities of UPOV in 1989 and the first part of 1990 and approve documents for the Diplomatic Conference for the Revision of the UPOV Convention.
Invitations: Member States of UPOV and, as observers, certain non-member States and intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations.

1991

- March 4 to 19 (dates and place to be confirmed)** **Diplomatic Conference for the Revision of the UPOV Convention**
Invitations: Member States of UPOV and, without the right to vote, States members of the United Nations not members of UPOV as well as, as observers, certain organizations.

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

Non-Governmental Organizations

1990

- September 27 and 28 (Brussels) International Federation of Reprographic Rights Organisations (IFRRO): Annual General Meeting
- October 7 to 13 (Budapest) International Confederation of Societies of Authors and Composers (CISAC): Congress

1991

- April 22 to 29 (Aegean Sea) International Literary and Artistic Association (ALAI): Congress

