

# Industrial Property

Published monthly  
Annual subscription:  
Sw.fr. 95.—  
Each monthly issue:  
Sw.fr. 10.—

15<sup>th</sup> year - No. 4  
April 1976

Monthly Review of the  
World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO)

## Contents

### INTERNATIONAL UNIONS

- **Paris Convention.** Ratification of the Stockholm Act. Greece . . . . . 123
- **Strasbourg Agreement.** Ratification. Luxembourg . . . . . 123

### WIPO MEETINGS

- **Nice Union.** Ad Hoc Committee of Experts for the Revision of the Nice Agreement . . . . . 123
- **International Patent Classification (IPC) Union.** Committee of Experts . . . . . 125
- **ICIREPAT.** Plenary Committee . . . . . 126

### GENERAL STUDIES

- **INPADOC Today** . . . . . 128
- **Computerized Legal Data Processing at the National Institute of Industrial Property (France) (Micheline Dellinger)** . . . . . 142

### OBITUARY

- **Stephen P. Ladas** . . . . . 146

### CALENDAR OF MEETINGS . . . . . 147

### ANNEX

- **Announcement of Vacancy. Competition No. 301**

### INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY LAWS AND TREATIES

- *Editor's Note*
- Explanations concerning *Industrial Property Laws and Treaties*
- **Mexico** — Law on Inventions and Marks . . . . . Text 1-001, page 001
- **Bilateral Treaties**
  - Convention between the French Republic and the Spanish State on the Protection of Appellations of Origin, Indications of Source and the Denominations of Certain Products . . . . . Text 5-001, page 001
  - Agreement between the French Republic and the Republic of Austria on the Protection of Indications of Source, Appellations of Origin and Denominations of Products of Agriculture and Industry (Incorporating a Protocol) . . . . . Text 5-002, page 001
  - Treaty between the French Republic and the Swiss Confederation on the Protection of Indications of Source, Appellations of Origin and other Geographical Denominations . . . . . Text 5-003, page 001

© WIPO 1976

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.



## International Unions

### Paris Convention

#### Ratification of the Stockholm Act

#### GREECE

The Government of Greece deposited on April 12, 1976, its instrument of ratification of the Stockholm Act of July 14, 1967, of the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property of March 20, 1883.

Pursuant to the provisions of Article 20(2)(c) and (3), the Stockholm Act of the Paris Convention will enter into force with respect to Greece on July 15, 1976.

Paris Notification No. 80, of April 15, 1976.

### Strasbourg Agreement

#### Ratification

#### LUXEMBOURG

The Government of Luxembourg deposited on April 6, 1976, its instrument of ratification of the Strasbourg Agreement Concerning the International Patent Classification of March 24, 1971.

The said instrument of ratification was accompanied by the following declaration:

“ In accordance with Article 4(4)(ii), the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg does not undertake to include the symbols relating to groups or subgroups of the Classification in the documents and notices referred to in paragraph (3). ” (*Translation*)

Pursuant to the provisions of Article 13(1)(b), the Strasbourg Agreement will enter into force with respect to Luxembourg on April 9, 1977.

Strasbourg Notification No. 26, of April 9, 1976.

## WIPO Meetings

### NICE UNION

#### Ad Hoc Committee of Experts for the Revision of the Nice Agreement

#### First Session

(Geneva, March 1 to 4, 1976)

#### Note \*

On convocation by the Director General of WIPO, the ad hoc Committee of Experts for the Revision of the Nice Agreement Concerning the International Classification of Goods and Services

for the Purposes of the Registration of Marks met in Geneva from March 1 to 4, 1976.

Fifteen States members of the Nice Union were represented; two States members of the Paris Union but not of the Nice Union, one intergovernmental organization and one international non-governmental organization were represented by observers. The list of participants follows this Note.

The discussions of the ad hoc Committee took place on the basis of a document containing proposals by the International Bureau for the revision of Article 3(3) to (6) of the Agreement, and of three documents containing comments submitted by Australia, the Soviet Union and Spain on the International Bureau's proposals.

The ad hoc Committee unanimously agreed to propose the removal of the right of members of the

\* This Note has been prepared by the International Bureau.

Committee of Experts, provided for in Article 3(5) of the Agreement, to delegate their powers to the expert of another country.

It also unanimously agreed that a proposal should be made both to remove the right of experts to submit their opinions in writing, provided for in Article 3(5) of the Agreement, and to abstain from including in the Agreement a provision allowing the Committee of Experts as a whole to take decisions by correspondence.

All the delegations agreed that the unanimity rule, foreseen in Article 3(3) of the Agreement, made any necessary amendment to the Classification very difficult and that consequently it should be abandoned. With regard to the replacement of unanimity by a qualified majority, the delegations were split into two camps which were unable to reconcile their differences. On the one hand, some delegations recommended a qualified majority beyond the  $\frac{3}{4}$  proposed by the International Bureau while, on the other, some delegations preferred a  $\frac{3}{4}$  majority, considering that any higher majority would be unacceptable and would not constitute a change in the existing system significant enough to warrant the holding of a diplomatic conference. In conclusion, the ad hoc Committee recommended to the International Bureau that two alternatives be provided for, in the preparatory documents for the Diplomatic Conference for the revision of the Agreement, with respect to the qualified majority for decisions of the Committee of Experts concerning amendments to the Classification. Under one of these alternatives, such decisions would require a majority of  $\frac{3}{4}$  of the votes of the countries present and voting. Under the other alternative, such decisions would require a majority of  $\frac{5}{6}$  of the votes of the countries present and voting. Under both alternatives, all other decisions of the Committee of Experts would require a simple majority of the votes of the countries present and voting. The definition of "amendment" would remain as now appearing in Article 3(3) of the Agreement. Each member country of the Committee of Experts should have one vote. Abstentions should not be considered as votes.

During the discussions, the question was raised as to whether authentic English texts of the Agreement, on the one hand, and of the Classification, on the other, should be provided for. The question was also raised of the minimum number of instruments of ratification or accession required for the entry into force of the revised Agreement. It was agreed that the International Bureau should study these matters and submit such proposals as it saw fit in the preparatory documents for the Diplomatic Conference.

Lastly, the question was considered of the procedure to be applied in respect of decisions on proposals for modification of the Classification (including in particular amendments and additions) after the

entry into force of the revised Act of the Agreement for a certain number only of Contracting States. It was generally agreed that it was not possible to apply two different sets of provisions to decisions concerning the same proposal for modification according to whether the Contracting State concerned was party to the revised Act of the Agreement or not. In this connection, the representative of the International Bureau suggested that a proposal be made to the Diplomatic Conference to pass a resolution requesting the Assembly of the Nice Union to take a decision in due course to the effect that, upon entry into force of the revised Act of the Agreement, the revised procedure for decisions on proposals for modification would be applied by the Committee of Experts with respect to all Contracting States and that the Regulations under Article 3(1) of the Agreement should be amended accordingly. The ad hoc Committee was of the opinion that further study was necessary before a decision in this matter could be reached. It requested the International Bureau to carry out such a study and recommended that appropriate proposals on the question be included in the preparatory documents for the Diplomatic Conference.

## List of Participants \*

### I. States Members of the Nice Union

**Algeria:** G. Sellali. **Austria:** G. Mautner-Markhof. **Belgium:** J. Degavre. **Czechoslovakia:** J. Zelko. **Denmark:** R. Carlsen. **France:** P. Maynial; C. May. **Germany (Federal Republic of):** E. Steup; B. Pagenberg. **Hungary:** M. Bognár. **Netherlands:** E. van Weel. **Norway:** A. Kaarhus; A. Guldhav. **Portugal:** J. van-Zeller Garin. **Sweden:** C. Uggla. **Switzerland:** F. Balleys; E. Schmidt. **United Kingdom:** R. L. Moorby. **United States of America:** D. B. Allen.

### II. Other States, Members of the Paris Union

**Iraq:** A. Al-Khafaji. **Trinidad and Tobago:** G. A. Stewart.

### III. Intergovernmental Organization

**Benelux Trademark Office:** L. J. M. van Bauwel.

### IV. International Non-Governmental Organization

**International Chamber of Commerce (ICC):** A. de Sampaio.

### V. Officers

**Chairman:** E. Steup (Germany, Federal Republic of); **Vice-Chairmen:** M. Bognár (Hungary); R. Carlsen (Denmark); **Secretary:** L. Egger (WIPO).

### VI. WIPO

K. Pfanner (*Deputy Director General*); L. Egger (*Counsellor, Head, International Registrations Division*); C. Werkman (*Counsellor, Head, Trademark and Design Classification Section, International Registrations Division*); F. Curchod (*Head, Special Projects Section, Industrial Property Division*).

\* A list containing the titles and functions of the participants may be obtained from the International Bureau.

INTERNATIONAL PATENT CLASSIFICATION  
(IPC) UNION

**Committee of Experts**

Second Session

(Geneva, January 26 to 29, 1976)

**Note\***

The Committee of Experts of the International Patent Classification (IPC) Union held its second session in Geneva from January 26 to 29, 1976. The following eleven of the seventeen States members of the Committee of Experts were represented: Austria, France, Germany (Federal Republic of), Netherlands, Norway, Soviet Union, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom, United States of America. Japan, a special observer within the Committee, and the International Patent Institute (IIB), were also represented. A list of participants and of the officers of the session follows this Note.

**Rules of Procedure.** The Committee amended its Rules of Procedure to confirm that, in the event of a representative of the IIB being elected as Chairman of one of the Working Groups, the Steering Committee should nevertheless be composed of eleven ordinary members.

**Primary Purpose of, and Needs to be Met by, the IPC.** The Committee took note of the fact that the IPC was a means of obtaining an internationally uniform classification of patent documents, and agreed unanimously that:

(i) the primary purpose of the IPC should be to serve as an effective search tool for the retrieval of relevant patent documents by patent offices and other users for establishing the novelty and evaluating the inventive step (including the assessment of technical advance and useful results or utility) of patent applications;

(ii) the other purposes of the IPC (of equal importance to developing and developed countries), should be to serve as:

- (a) an instrument for the orderly arrangement of patent documents in order to facilitate access to the information contained therein;
- (b) the basis for selective dissemination of information to all users of patent information; and

(c) a basis for the preparation of industrial property statistics which in turn permit the assessment of technological development in various areas.

The Committee further agreed that the IPC, as a search tool, was of utmost importance not only to national offices but also to regional offices and international organizations carrying out searches for their member States, as well as to individual searchers and industry and that, in order to be an effective search tool, the IPC had to be constantly adapted to the development of technology. The revision work should, however, be restricted to necessary changes in the system and the advantages of a change should always be weighed against the costs and the amount of work involved.

**Principles to be Followed in the Application of the IPC.** The Committee agreed that the Foreword and Guide to the IPC should more clearly identify the matter in a patent document which should be classified, decided that the Guide to the third edition of the IPC should be amended to include clear provisions on the "obligatory" and "non-obligatory" classification, and adopted the following recommendation under Article 5(3)(ii) of the Strasbourg Agreement:

"The Committee of Experts recommends, in conformity with Article 5(3)(ii) of the Strasbourg Agreement Concerning the International Patent Classification, that patent documents be classified in accordance with the following rules:

"*Obligatory Classification* (symbols appearing before the double oblique stroke)

"According to Article 4, paragraph (3), of the Strasbourg Agreement Concerning the International Patent Classification, in classifying a patent document, the competent authorities of the countries of the Special Union shall indicate the complete symbols of the Classification applied to the invention to which this patent document relates.

"For this purpose, it is necessary to identify the technical subject or subjects with which the invention is immediately and essentially concerned or to which it relates.

"To establish this, consideration must be given to the invention defined by the claims, with due regard to the description and the drawings (if any) whenever necessary for the interpretation of the claims, in order to identify the technical subject(s) to be classified. The classification symbols allotted should not be restricted to those of the place(s) in the Classification which cover only one aspect of a technical subject identified. Due regard should also be given to further places in the Classification where

\* This Note has been prepared by the International Bureau.

other aspects of that technical subject may need to be classified.

“*Non-Obligatory Classification* (symbols appearing after the double oblique stroke)

“There are often parts of the technical disclosure of a patent document which, although not part of the invention, constitute useful supplementary information to searchers. Since, upon publication of the patent document concerned, such parts of the technical disclosure will be relevant for future applications, it is desirable that such information also be classified. Additionally, it is desirable in certain areas of technology, which are indicated in the Classification, that complementary information, relating to the constituent elements of an invention which has already been classified as such, be classified as well. It is therefore recommended that, in order to improve the benefits to be derived from the Classification, the competent authorities of the countries of the Special Union also indicate the relevant symbols in respect of these two kinds of information.”

**Principles for the Revision of the IPC.** The Committee issued a recommendation to the technical Working Groups concerning the identification and renumbering of entries of the IPC which are amended in the course of the revision work.

**Revision of the Foreword and Guide to the IPC.** The Committee agreed that the Guide to the IPC should be revised and decided that a small ad hoc body should be charged with the task of producing a first draft of a revised Guide but postponed its decision on the composition of the small ad hoc body as well as the recommendation on the possible dates for its meetings until its next session.

**Duration of the Revision Period and Procedure for the Preparation of the Third Edition of the IPC.** A large majority of the members of the Committee were in favor of entry into force and publication of new editions of the IPC every five years. The Committee agreed that amendments approved by the Committee during the earlier part of a revision period should not undergo further amendment during the same revision period, except where absolutely necessary. This would allow offices to undertake reclassification of documents, translation of the IPC into other languages and other preparatory work for the entry into force of the new edition of the IPC as soon as amendments to the IPC had been approved by the Committee.

The Committee agreed on a tentative time schedule for the preparation of the third edition of the IPC which would allow application of the symbols of the third edition of the IPC as from January 1, 1980, when the new edition should enter into force.

## List of Participants \*

### I. Member States

**Austria:** J. Fichte. **France:** O. Kavrychine. **Germany (Federal Republic of):** A. Wittmann; K. Sölla. **Netherlands:** G. J. Koelewijn. **Norway:** P. E. Lillejordet. **Soviet Union:** Y. Plotnikov. **Spain:** E. Peñas-Penela. **Sweden:** J. von Döbeln. **Switzerland:** E. Caussignac. **United Kingdom:** D. G. Gay; V. S. Dodd. **United States of America:** L. Schroeder; T. F. Lomont.

### II. Associate Member

**Japan:** T. Kanehira.

### III. Intergovernmental Organization

**International Patent Institute (IIB):** A. Vandecasteele; F. C. R. de Laet.

### IV. Officers

**Chairman:** G. J. Koelewijn (Netherlands); **Vice-Chairmen:** L. Schroeder (United States of America); O. Kavrychine (France); **Secretary:** B. Hansson (WIPO).

### V. WIPO

F. A. Sviridov (*Deputy Director General*); P. H. Claus (*Technical Counsellor, Head, Patent Information Division*); B. Hansson (*Counsellor, Head, IPC Section, Patent Information Division*); A. Sagarminaga (*Technical Officer, IPC Section*); R. Andary (*Technical Officer, IPC Section*); A. Okawa (*Consultant*).

\* A list containing the titles and functions of the participants may be obtained from the International Bureau.

## ICIREPAT

### Plenary Committee

#### Eighth Session

(Geneva, February 2 to 4, 1976)

#### Note \*

The Plenary Committee of the Paris Union Committee for International Cooperation in Information Retrieval Among Patent Offices (ICIREPAT) held its eighth session in Geneva from February 2 to 4, 1976<sup>1</sup>. A list of participants follows this Note.

**Election of a Second Vice-Chairman.** In accordance with Article 8(1) of the Organizational Rules of ICIREPAT the Plenary Committee unanimously

\* This Note has been prepared by the International Bureau.

<sup>1</sup> A Note on the seventh session of the PLC was published in *Industrial Property*, 1975, p. 363.

elected Mr. G. Borggård, Director General of the Swedish Patent Office, as a Vice-Chairman of the Plenary Committee. In the absence of the Chairman, Mr. Borggård chaired the session.

**Past and Current ICIREPAT Activities.** The Plenary Committee noted the reports on activities and suggestions of the Technical Committee for Search Systems (TCSS) and the Technical Committee for Standardization (TCST).

The Plenary Committee adopted several recommendations prepared by the technical committees including revised versions of two Chapters of the ICIREPAT Manual ("Characteristics of ICIREPAT Shared-Use Systems" and "Guiding Principles for Non-Conventional Retrieval Systems") as well as "Guidelines on the Minimum Size of Margins of Published Patent Documents produced by the Reproduction of Non-Composed Masters."

**Needs of Developing Countries in the Field of Patent Documentation and Patent Information Retrieval.** The Plenary Committee expressed the opinion that a number of developing countries should be informed about the activities of ICIREPAT. The Plenary Committee approved the text of a questionnaire on the needs of developing countries in the field of patent documentation and of patent information retrieval to be sent to the said countries by the International Bureau.

**Long-Term Program for Development of an Integrated System for Patent Search.** The Plenary Committee approved the plan for the Long-Term Program of ICIREPAT.

**Program for 1977.** The Plenary Committee noted the proposals for the ICIREPAT Program for 1977 made by the representatives of Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, France, the German Democratic Republic, Germany (Federal Republic of), the Netherlands, Norway, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom and

the International Patent Institute (IIB) and asked the International Bureau to prepare, for consideration at the next (ninth) session of the Plenary Committee, a final draft of the ICIREPAT Program for 1977.

## List of Participants \*

### I. Member States

**Czechoslovakia:** M. Fořtová. **Denmark:** A. Morsing. **France:** D. Cuvelot. **German Democratic Republic:** R. Blumstengel. **Germany (Federal Republic of):** W. Weiss. **Japan:** T. Kanehira. **Netherlands:** J. Dekker. **Norway:** E. O. Kjeldsen. **Soviet Union:** E. Y. Artemiev; G. Neguliaev. **Spain:** N. Rodríguez Toro. **Sweden:** G. Borggård; L. G. Björklund. **Switzerland:** R. Egli. **United Kingdom:** D. G. Gay; V. S. Dodd. **United States of America:** L. Schroeder.

### II. Intergovernmental Organization

**International Patent Institute (IIB):** J. A. H. van Voorthuizen.

### III. Observer Organizations

**Commission of the European Communities (CEC):** H. Bank. **International Patent Documentation Center (INPADOC):** G. Quarda.

### IV. Chairmen of the Technical Committees

*Chairman of the Technical Committee for Search Systems:* D. G. Gay.

### V. Officers

*Chairman:* G. Borggård (Sweden); *Secretary:* P. H. Claus (WIPO).

### VI. WIPO

A. Bogsch (*Director General*); F. A. Sviridov (*Deputy Director General*); P. H. Claus (*Technical Counsellor, Head of Patent Information Division*); H. Konrad (*Technical Counsellor, Head of ICIREPAT and Statistics Section, Patent Information Division*); V. Evgeniev (*Technical Officer, ICIREPAT and Statistics Section*); A. Okawa (*Consultant*).

\* A list containing the titles and functions of the participants may be obtained from the International Bureau.

**General Studies**

**INPADOC Today**



























**Computerized Legal Data Processing at the  
National Institute of Industrial Property  
(France)**

Micheline DELLINGER \*







## Obituary

### Stephen P. Ladas

(1899—1976)

Stephen Pericles — for his friends “Steve” — Ladas died in New York City on March 13, 1976. He was 77 years old.

More than 50 of these years were devoted to the theory and practice of industrial property and copyright laws. His knowledge and his experience in these fields were unique since they covered, in equal depth, both the national laws of most countries and international relations in these fields.

Three monumental works written by Ladas bear witness to this unique knowledge and experience: *The International Protection of Industrial Property*, 1930, *The International Protection of Literary and Artistic Property*, 1939, and *Patents, Trademarks and Related Rights*, 1975. All of them were published under the auspices of Harvard University, at which Ladas received his American law degrees after having obtained a law degree in Greece, where he was born.

The interest that Ladas took in international intellectual property relations and his influence on the development of those relations were reflected not only in his books and countless articles (those published in BIRPI/WIPO periodicals are cited at the end of these paragraphs) but also in the leading role which he played in various specialized interna-

tional associations, particularly the International Association for the Protection of Industrial Property (IAPIP), and in many international meetings. The last of those meetings in which he participated was that of the WIPO Committee of Experts dealing with questions relating to the revision of the Paris Convention which took place in December 1975.

The views held by Ladas were always forward-looking. He had a keen sense of things to come and had more progressive ideas about the aspirations of developing countries, for example, than most of his contemporaries.

He spoke his mind with a frankness which was sometimes misunderstood by people who did not know him closely enough but which increased the admiration of those who did, because his sincerity was complete.

With his passing, the world has lost one of the great authorities on international intellectual property law of this century.

A. B.

*Postscriptum.* Articles and “Letters” signed by Stephen P. Ladas were published, as cited below, in *La Propriété industrielle*: 1930, pp. 113, 218, 254; 1931, p. 120; 1932, p. 16; 1933, p. 103; 1934, p. 126; 1935, p. 95; 1938, p. 66; 1941, p. 33; 1942, p. 12; 1946, p. 188; 1948, p. 118; 1950, p. 176; 1951, p. 152; 1952, p. 173; 1954, p. 31; 1955, p. 134; 1962, pp. 35, 250; 1963, p. 222; 1965, pp. 17, 54; 1972, p. 216; 1973, p. 84; in *Industrial Property*: 1962, pp. 32, 238; 1963, p. 222; 1965, pp. 15, 52; 1972, p. 208; 1973, p. 81; and in *Le Droit d’auteur*, 1940, p. 73.

## Calendar

### WIPO Meetings

#### 1976

- June 8 to 15 (Lansanne) — Paris Union — Group of Governmental Experts for the Revision of the Paris Convention**
- June 14 to 18 (Geneva) — Permanent Legal-Technical Program — Working Group on the Model Law for Developing Countries on Inventions and Know-How**
- June 21 to 25 (Geneva) — Permanent Legal-Technical Program — Working Group on Licensing Guidelines**
- June 28 to July 2 (Geneva) — International Classification of the Figurative Elements of Marks — Provisional Committee of Experts**
- September 6 to 10 (Geneva) — Paris and Madrid Unions — Working Group on the Use of Computers in Trademark Operations**
- September 6 to 17 (Washington) — International Patent Classification (IPC) — Working Group III**
- September 21 to 24 (Geneva) — ICIREPAT — Plenary Committee (PLC)**
- September 27 to October 5 (Geneva) — WIPO General Assembly, Conference and Coordination Committee; Assemblies of the Paris, Madrid, Hague, Nice, Lisbon, Locarno, IPC and Berne Unions; Conferences of Representatives of the Paris, Hague, Nice and Berne Unions; Executive Committees of the Paris and Berne Unions; Committee of Directors of the Madrid Union; Council of the Lisbon Union — Ordinary Sessions**
- September 27 to October 8 (Rijswijk) — International Patent Classification (IPC) — Working Group II**
- October 11 to 15 (Geneva) — International Patent Classification (IPC) — Steering Committee**
- October 13 to 21 (Geneva) — Nice Union — Temporary Working Group**
- October 18 to 22 (Geneva) — ICIREPAT — Technical Committee for Standardization (TCST)**
- October 18 to 22 (Geneva) — International Patent Classification (IPC) — Committee of Experts**
- October 25 to 29 (Geneva) — ICIREPAT — Technical Committee for Search Systems (TCSS)**
- November 1 to 6 (Geneva) — Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT) — Interim Committees**
- November 8 to 19 (Stockholm) — International Patent Classification (IPC) — Working Group IV**
- November 22 to 26 [or 30] (Geneva) — Paris Union — Group of Governmental Experts for the Revision of the Paris Convention**
- November 29 to December 3 (Geneva) — Permanent Legal-Technical Program — Working Group on the Model Law for Developing Countries on Inventions and Know-How**
- November 29 to December 10 (Rijswijk) — International Patent Classification (IPC) — Working Group I**
- December 8 to 17 (Paris) — Berne Union — Committee of Governmental Experts on the Double Taxation of Copyright Royalties**  
*Note: Meeting convened jointly with Unesco*
- December 13 to 17 (Geneva) — Nice Union — Committee of Experts**

#### 1977

- February 21 to 24 (Colombo) — Permanent Legal-Technical Program — World Symposium on the Importance of the Patent System to Developing Countries**
- March 14 to 18 (Geneva) — Permanent Legal-Technical Program — Permanent Committee (4th Session)**
- September 26 to October 4 (Geneva) — WIPO Coordination Committee; Executive Committees of the Paris and Berne Unions; Assemblies of the Madrid and Hague Unions; Conference of Representatives of the Hague Union; Committee of Directors of the Madrid Union**
- November 28 to December 5 (Paris) — Berne Union — Executive Committee — Extraordinary Session**
- December 6 to 8 (Geneva) — International Convention for the Protection of Performers, Producers of Phonograms and Broadcasting Organizations — Intergovernmental Committee — Ordinary Session (organized jointly with ILO and Unesco)**

## UPOV Meetings in 1976

**Council:** October 13 to 15

**Consultative Committee:** October 12 and 15

**Technical Steering Committee:** November 17 to 19

**Committee of Experts on International Cooperation in Examination:** November 16

**Committee of Experts on the Interpretation and Revision of the Convention:** September 14 to 17

*Note:* All these meetings will take place in Geneva at the headquarters of UPOV

**Technical Working Party for Fruit Crops:** June 16 to 18 (Hanover - Federal Republic of Germany)

**Technical Working Party for Forest Trees:** August 17 to 19 (Humlebak - Denmark)

**Technical Working Party for Vegetables:** September 21 to 23 (Cambridge - United Kingdom)

## Meetings of Other International Organizations concerned with Intellectual Property

### 1976

**June 14 and 15 (Paris) — Licensing Executives Society (LES) —** Conference on new forms and new problems for international transfers of technology

**June 22 to 24 (Rijswijk) — International Patent Institute —** Administrative Board

**July 5 to 9 (Bellagio) — International Broadcast Institute —** Conference

**August 30 to September 3 (Stockholm) — International Federation of Musicians —** Congress

**September 6 to 10 (Budapest) — Hungarian Group of AIPPI and Hungarian Association for the Protection of Industrial Property —** Conference on the Significance of Protection of Industrial Property in International Industrial Cooperation

**September 13 to 17 (Vienna) — International Federation of Actors —** Congress

**September 26 to October 2 (Montreux) — International Association for the Protection of Industrial Property —** Executive Committee

**September 27 to October 1 (Paris) — International Confederation of Societies of Authors and Composers —** Congress

**October 11 to 16 (Varna) — International Writers Guild —** Congress

### 1977

**January 17 to 21 (Strasbourg) — Council of Europe —** Legal Committee on Broadcasting and Television

**November 28 to December 5 (Paris) — United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) —** Intergovernmental Copyright Committee established by the Universal Copyright Convention (as revised at Paris in 1971)