

Industrial Property

Published monthly
Annual subscription:
Sw.fr. 125.-
Each monthly issue:
Sw.fr. 12.-

21st Year - No. 10
October 1982

Monthly Review of the
World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO)

Contents

INTERNATIONAL UNIONS

- Budapest Treaty (Microorganisms). Change in Fees under Rule 12.2 of the Regulations: National Collection of Industrial Bacteria 275
- Nairobi Treaty (Olympic Symbol). Accession: Egypt 275

ACTIVITIES OF OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

- International Association for the Protection of Industrial Property. Executive Committee 275

WIPO MEETINGS

- Legal Training Course on Trademarks 278

SPECIAL STUDIES

- Period of Grace for Invention Disclosure
 - Introduction 279
 - The Period of Grace for Novelty (H. Bardehle) 279
 - Period of Grace for Prior Disclosure or Prior Use of an Invention by the Inventor (K. Esaki) . 282
 - Affording a Period of Grace for Disclosure of an Invention by the Inventor Prior to Filing a Patent Application (P. Mathély) 285
 - Grace Period for Filing a Patent Application? (T.F. Smegal, Jr.) 288

GENERAL STUDIES

- Theoretical and Practical Aspects of Planned Innovation in Hungary (B. Szántó) 291

NEWS FROM INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY OFFICES

- Switzerland 295

NEWS ITEMS

- Pakistan 297

BOOK REVIEWS

- 298

CALENDAR OF MEETINGS

- 299

INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY LAWS AND TREATIES

- *Editor's Note*
- HUNGARY
 - Decree of the Council of Ministers Concerning Innovations (No. 38/1974 (X.30), as amended by Decree No. 70/1981 (XII.28)) Text 2-001
 - Decree Concerning Remuneration to be Paid for Employee Inventions and Certain Other Measures Related to Inventions (No. 45/1969 (XII.29), as amended by Decree No. 71/1981 (XII.28)) Text 2-005
- BILATERAL TREATIES
 - AUSTRIA/CZECHOSLOVAKIA—Treaty between the Republic of Austria and the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic on the Protection of Indications of Source, Appellations of Origin and Other Denominations Referring to the Origin of Agricultural and Industrial Products (of June 11, 1976) Text 5-010
 - CHINA/NEW ZEALAND—Exchange of Notes Concerning the Registration of Trademarks (Beijing, June 18, 1975) Text 3-010

© WIPO 1982

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.

ISSN 0019-8625

International Unions

Budapest Treaty (Microorganisms)

Change in Fees under Rule 12.2 of the Regulations under the Budapest Treaty

NATIONAL COLLECTION OF INDUSTRIAL BACTERIA

The following notification addressed to the Director General of WIPO by the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to the United Nations Office and other International Organizations at Geneva, under Rule 12.2(a) of the Regulations under the Budapest Treaty on the International Recognition of the Deposit of Microorganisms for the Purposes of Patent Procedure, was received on September 17, 1982, and is published by the International Bureau of WIPO pursuant to Rule 12.2(b) of the said Regulations:

The fees payable to the National Collection of Industrial Bacteria as published in the March 1982 issue of *Industrial Property* are changed as follows:

- for storage of a micro-organism in accordance with the Treaty: £180.00;
- for the issue of a viability statement, where a fee may be charged: £20.00;
- for the furnishing of a sample in accordance with Rule 11.2 or 11.3: £15.00 plus the actual cost of carriage.

[End of text of the Notification of the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland]

The fees set forth in the said Notification of the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland will apply as from the thirtieth day following the date (October 31, 1982) of the publication of the said fees in the present issue of *Industrial Property*, that is, as from November 30, 1982 (see Rule 12.2(c) of the Regulations under the Budapest Treaty), and will replace the fees published in the March 1982 issue of *Industrial Property*.

Budapest Communication No. 13 (this Communication is the subject of Budapest Notification No. 29, of September 28, 1982).

Nairobi Treaty (Olympic Symbol)

Accession

EGYPT

The Government of Egypt deposited, on September 1, 1982, its instrument of accession to the Nairobi Treaty on the Protection of the Olympic Symbol, adopted at Nairobi on September 26, 1981.

The said Treaty will enter into force, with respect to Egypt, on October 1, 1982.

Nairobi Notification No. 7, of September 7, 1982.

Activities of Other Organizations

International Association for the Protection of Industrial Property

Executive Committee
(Moscow, April 19 to 24, 1982)

Introduction

The Executive Committee of the International Association for the Protection of Industrial Property (IAPIP) met in Moscow (Soviet Union) from April 19 to 24, 1982. Approximately 160 participants from about 35 countries attended the meeting.

The World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) was represented by Mr. L. Baeumer (Director, Industrial Property Division).

The essential contents of the resolutions adopted by the Executive Committee are reproduced below.

Resolutions Adopted*

QUESTION 67

Revision of the Paris Convention

* Text of the resolutions received from IAPIP.

QUESTION 45

Value of Industrial Property for Technical Development and Economic Progress in Developing Countries**I. On Article 5A: Sanctions for Failure to Work; Compulsory License and Lapsing, Suspension**

The IAPIP

recalls that the Convention presupposes the existence in all countries of the Union of a patent system which is effective and which therefore permits the universal application of its provisions.

(A) The IAPIP

affirms once again emphatically that the consequence of the weakening of the protection of industrial property would be to raise obstacles to the transfer of technology;

is convinced that certain proposals, formulated at the Nairobi session, and alleged to be put forward as beneficial to developing countries, would lead, if adopted in the national law of these countries, to their no longer having an effective system for the protection of patents, even though these countries would remain members of the Union and, as such, would continue to benefit from the provisions of the Paris Convention;

declares itself opposed to the introduction in the Paris Convention of provisions of such a character, which would affect the Convention in a fundamental manner;

and *affirms* that, if such provisions should nevertheless be introduced into the Convention, they should be applicable only to developing countries, despite the difficulty which it recognizes in defining developing countries.

(B) After having examined the proposal formulated at the Nairobi session permitting developing countries to provide in their national law a provision pursuant to which a compulsory license could, under certain conditions, be exclusive even as against the patentee,

the IAPIP

believes that no situation justifies turning a patent against the inventor himself so that this inventor is excluded from the working of his own invention;

is convinced that such a measure would constitute a serious obstacle to the transfer of technology;

and *affirms* once more that a compulsory license must never be exclusive.

(C) After having examined the proposal formulated at the Nairobi session permitting developing countries to provide in their national law a provision pursuant to which the lapsing or revocation of a patent could be

declared under certain conditions as the primary sanction without need for the preliminary measure of a compulsory license,

the IAPIP

believes that the elimination of a preliminary compulsory license which today constitutes a condition precedent, would destroy all objective criteria and render the application of the sanction of lapsing subject exclusively to decision by a national authority,

reaffirms, as it has always maintained, its opposition in principle to this sanction, because such a sanction results in the destruction of the very patent right itself.

(D) The IAPIP

has taken knowledge with interest of a proposal for the substitution of the sanction of suspension to the sanctions of a compulsory license and lapsing.

Under this solution, when a patent has not been worked by the expiration of a certain term, the rights of the patentee are suspended. As the rights of the patentee are suspended, anyone is entitled to work the invention or import the patented goods. If the patentee undertakes to work the invention, the effects of the patent are restored, but a person who has begun to work may continue to work by virtue of his vested right. On the other hand, a person who has simply imported the goods would not be entitled to continue importing.

However, the IAPIP *has noted* the difficulties which the sanction of suspension is likely to raise, and *has decided* to continue an in-depth study of this question.

II. On the final clauses: Article 20 and following

After having examined the proposals for revision of Articles 20 and 27

1. On Article 20: Ratification or Adherence by the Countries of the Union; Coming into Force

The IAPIP

notes that, at the Nairobi session, it was proposed to provide that a country which signed the new act could, in order to be bound by this act, either ratify this act, or else declare its acceptance or approval of this act.

In order to insure the juridical certainty of nationals of member States of the Union, the IAPIP *expresses* the wish that whatever procedure may be used—ratification, acceptance or approval—the national laws of each country shall provide that the new act shall be directly applicable to such nationals in the State in question.

2. On Article 27: Application of Prior Acts

The IAPIP

has taken knowledge of the draft Article 27 of the basic proposals and of the elimination, in this draft, of paragraph 3 which presently appears in the Stockholm text, pursuant to which countries outside the Union, which become party to the new act, shall apply the same as against any country of the Union which is not a party to this act, while such country shall apply, in its relations with the countries of the Union which have become party to the new act, the most recent act to which it is a party;

recognizes that the retention of the rule of Article 27, paragraph 3, in the text of the contemplated new act, would result in permitting the new act to be applied even as against nationals of a State which has not yet ratified this new act. Such a result, however, would be very serious by reason of the fact, most particularly, that Article 5A constitutes a weakening of the rights of the patentee;

notes that the provision which appears in the proposal for a new Article 27(2) leaves to each of the countries of the Union in regard to which the new act has not come into force, the option to declare that it agrees that countries party to the new act may apply this act to its nationals;

and is of the opinion that, in the circumstances, no solution more satisfactory than the elimination of paragraph 3 of Article 27 appears possible.

QUESTION 72

Protection of Collective and Certification Marks

Considering that pursuant to Article 7^{bis} of the Convention, countries of the Union have undertaken to accept for filing and to protect collective marks belonging to associations, subject to the conditions referred to therein,

but considering that the Convention does not provide a precise meaning for the expression "collective marks,"

IAPIP

I. *believes* it to mean, or include, two types of marks, intended for use by a plurality of natural or juristic persons, designated and defined as:

- (a) "certification marks" are marks which are used to indicate that the goods or services so identified are certified to possess certain characteristics or qualities, and
- (b) "collective marks" strictly speaking are marks which are used to indicate that the goods or ser-

vices so identified have been produced, distributed or performed by members of a certain group of persons;

without limiting the generality of the foregoing definition of a certification mark, the certain characteristics or qualities possessed by the goods or services may relate to such things as their nature, properties, compositions, method of manufacture, mode of performance and so on.

It is recognized that, in certain circumstances, a mark may have the properties of both a certification mark and a collective mark;

II. *appreciates* that, quite apart from the provisions of Article 7^{bis}, marks exist of the kind described and are of increasing economic and social importance;

III. *is of the opinion* that:

the right to register and the protection afforded to certification marks and collective marks should be organized within the general framework of trademark law subject to the special considerations noted;

IV. *decides*:

to reserve the question of the application of the system of certification marks and collective marks to the protection of geographical names.

QUESTION 75

Prior Disclosure and Prior Use of the Invention by the Inventor

I. IAPIP,

concerned that an inventor who publicly discloses his invention before filing a patent application may thereby deprive himself of the ability to obtain valid patent protection; *confirms* the resolution adopted at Buenos Aires which:

- *recognizes* that Article 11 of the Paris Convention provides very limited protection for a disclosure made by an inventor at certain international exhibitions;
- *considers* that it is in the public interest that the inventor should be given greater protection from the consequence of a prior disclosure by himself, and
- therefore *considers* it desirable that where a public disclosure of an invention originates from an inventor, such public disclosure shall not be taken into consideration in assessing the patentability of the invention, if the first patent application is filed by the inventor or his successor within a certain period, beginning from the disclosure.

IAPIP

declares in favor of the principle of introducing such a period of grace under the following terms and conditions:

1. A disclosure originating or derived from the inventor shall not by itself establish a right of priority but rather shall not be considered as part of the state of the art as against the inventor or his successor in title if it occurs within the grace period.
2. Such disclosure shall include all acts of disclosure to the public by means of a written or oral description, by use, or in any other way, notwithstanding where such disclosure takes place.
3. The grace period shall be six months preceding the filing date of the patent application, or, if a Union priority is claimed, the date of the first filing according to Article 4 of the Paris Convention.

4. The burden of proof shall be on the applicant or patentee to prove that such disclosure originated with the inventor or was derived from the inventor.
5. The inventor or his successor in title shall benefit from the grace period without being required to deposit a declaration of such disclosure.
6. The grace period shall apply to patents of invention, inventors' certificates and utility models.

II. IAPIP,

recommends that the grace period shall be implemented by a provision of the Paris Convention or by an international treaty within the framework of the Paris Convention and expresses the wish that preparatory work be undertaken as soon as possible.

WIPO Meetings

Legal Training Course on Trademarks

(Beijing, May 11 to 20, 1982)

NOTE*

In May 1982, WIPO organized in Beijing, China, at the invitation of the General Administration for Industry and Commerce, a Legal Training Course on Trademarks.

The Director General of WIPO, Dr. Arpad Bogsch, opened the course and lectured in it. The other lecturers were Dr. Albrecht Krieger, Director General in the Federal Ministry of Justice of the Federal Republic of Germany, Mr. Ivor Davis, the Comptroller-General of Patents, Designs and Trade Marks in the United Kingdom, Mr. Gerald Mossinghof, the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks of the United States of America, Mr. Eric Offner, a practising lawyer in New York, and a member of the staff of WIPO.

There were about 230 participants in the lecture course who came from many parts of China. They received the texts of the lectures in Chinese and in English, and asked numerous questions during the periods devoted to discussion.

The trademark lecture course was the seventh course organized by WIPO in China. The first was a seminar in Shanghai in 1979 on industrial property licenses and technology transfer arrangements. The second was a seminar in Beijing, also in 1979, on patent information and the International Patent Classification. The third was a "Legal Training Course on Patents" at the newly-established Patent Office of China in Beijing in 1980. These first three courses were organized with the State Scientific and Technological Commission of China. The fourth was a "Patent Agency Course" in Beijing in 1981, organized with the China Council for the Promotion of International Trade. The fifth was a "Patent Documentation Seminar" in Beijing in 1981, organized with the Chinese Patent Office.

And the sixth was a lecture course on copyright also in May 1982, organized with the National Publishing Administration of China.

In the seven courses which have been organized so far, about 800 Chinese officials have participated, and WIPO has provided 16 weeks of training.

*Prepared by WIPO.

Special Studies

Period of Grace for Invention Disclosure

Studies by: H. Bardehle, K. Esaki, P. Mathély and T.F. Smegal, Jr.

INTRODUCTION

At an informal meeting convened by the Director General of WIPO in December 1981, a broad exchange of views was held with international non-governmental organizations essentially concerned with industrial property. One of the topics discussed at that meeting was the question whether there should be a period of grace for the public disclosure of an invention by the inventor prior to filing a patent application.

As an initial response to the concern expressed at that meeting, WIPO invited several eminent specialists to contribute to the study of the said question. The purpose of this exercise is to lay a foundation for possible future WIPO action by defining and analyzing the question and discussing possible solutions thereto. Their contributions appear below.

In a few words, the issue is the following.

Under most patent legislation, the public disclosure of an invention by an inventor prior to filing a patent application destroys the novelty of the invention (unless an exception applies under national law, for example, in the case of disclosure at an international exhibition) and thereby disqualifies the invention from patent protection. This is true even when the disclosure is a result of unawareness of the patent law or is made out of practical necessity. As a prime purpose of the patent system is to encourage inventive activity and the public disclosure of inventions and not to expose inventors unduly to the risk of losing their right to patent protection, the need has been proclaimed by the interested circles to create and recognize internationally a period of grace for the disclosure of an invention by the inventor prior to filing a patent application. In other words, there should be no adverse consequence to the rights of the inventor—hence the word “grace”—if the disclosure occurred during the said period.

The Period of Grace for Novelty*

H. BARDEHLE**

**Period of Grace for Prior Disclosure
or Prior Use of an Invention by the Inventor**

K. ESAKI*

**Affording a Period of Grace for Disclosure
of an Invention by the Inventor Prior to
Filing a Patent Application**

P. MATHÉLY*

Grace Period for Filing a Patent Application?

T. F. SMEGAL, Jr. *

General Studies

Theoretical and Practical Aspects of Planned Innovation in Hungary*

B. SZÁNTÓ**

News from Industrial Property Offices

SWITZERLAND

Swiss Intellectual Property Office

Activities Report 1981*

1. Patents

Before the entry into force of the revised Patent Law¹ in 1978, the implementation of that Law was restricted to national patent applications and patents. Since then, the handling of European and international applications as well as the administration of those European titles which confer protection in Switzerland had to be dealt with, too. The number of staff was gradually adapted to the new circumstances. Thanks to continual administrative and technical measures, the Office is capable of coping with the changed work load. The backlog increased initially, but since 1980 more patent applications have been processed than filed, and in the year under review the number of pending applications was reduced from 39,633 to 37,659.

*Excerpted from the report issued under the same title.

¹See *Industrial Property Laws and Treaties*, SWITZERLAND — Text 2-001.

The internationalization of the patent field has led to a repartition of work between the regional and international authorities (the European Patent Office (EPO) and WIPO) and the Swiss Intellectual Property Office. On the one hand, the number of national applications has dropped with the new methods for acquiring patent protection. On the other hand, however, the procedures available through the multinational treaties involve additional work for the national offices which, in part, is unexpectedly time consuming. This applies above all to the examination as to formal requirements, but also to the integration of the European patent applications into the Swiss Intellectual Property Office data bank and the administration of European patents with effect in Switzerland.

These facts plus the tight finances of the Government and the freezing of new jobs in the federal administration caused the Swiss Intellectual Property Office to take further rationalization measures in the year under review. Routine work has been simplified, namely processes recurring more than once daily.

In the year under review there were 79,969 patents in force and with effect in Switzerland.

Since 1971 the number of valid patents has decreased by almost one fourth (1971: 103,470). This is mainly due to the changed economic situation. At the beginning

of the last decade a larger number of patents, once granted, were usually maintained for a longer period. In the present economic situation, however, the financial burden resulting from the annual fees that were substantially raised in 1978 and which are applicable to pending patent applications as well seems to have had decisive consequences. The conclusion may be drawn that industrial property rights of less economic value are abandoned sooner, increasingly even before the grant of the patent; this means conscious selection of those patents that are to remain in force. Nevertheless, there is a tendency towards keeping alive chosen patents for a longer period of protection.

The patents in force at the end of the year under review were filed between 1962 and 1981: some 10,000 thereof in the period from 1962 to 1967, 47,000 from 1968 to 1975 and about 20,000 from 1976 to 1981.

It is evident that almost three quarters of all Swiss patents are in foreign hands, and that three countries (Germany, Federal Republic of, United States of America and France) own the majority of them. This fact may seem surprising initially, but it reflects a situation typical for a highly developed but small industrial country. The constant interest in strongly protected patents in Switzerland indicates its significance as an industrial center and market place. As a consequence of the European procedure, it can be expected that the foreign allotment of Swiss patents will decrease in the course of the next few years. As far as the Swiss allotment is concerned over half of those patents come from the more industrialized areas (cantons of Zurich, Basel and Aargau).

2. Trademarks

In 1981, the number of applications for national trademark registration increased as compared with previous years. It is now at 6,842, the highest figure since 1970, when about 7,000 applications were filed.

In view of the growing backlog of applications, measures have been introduced in order to rationalize the examination: the notification procedure and the checking whether a person is entitled to file an application have been considerably simplified. These new methods have proved a success and were welcomed by applicants.

The work for the total revision of the Trademark Law is proceeding. At the end of 1982 or early 1983, the Swiss Intellectual Property Office intends to submit the first draft it has prepared to a commission for consultation.

If everything goes as planned, the draft for a new Trademark Law could be presented to Parliament during the next legislative term.

3. Appeals

Few decisions of the Office have been contested both in the patent sector and the trademark sector.

In the field of *patents*, the decisions of the Swiss Federal Court in respect of appeals in administrative matters concern two cases of *restitutio in integrum* and one case of postponement of the filing date. All cases decided this year by the Boards of Appeal concern patent applications filed before the entry into force of the revised Patent Law. The patentability of such inventions is judged according to the law more favorable to the applicant. With regard to novelty, the applicable law is the one which was valid before January, 1978. However, the Boards of Appeal have deduced from the wording of new Section 1(2) that at present less great demands should be made upon the inventive step than upon the "inventive level" as formerly defined. Furthermore, they have stated that technical progress is no longer an independent criteria of a patentable invention; it may nevertheless indicate that the invention is not obvious for a person skilled in the art.

In the field of *trademarks*, the appeals in administrative matters lodged in 1981 with the Swiss Federal Court were — as in previous years — in respect of trademarks that the Office had not considered capable of being protected. In most cases registration had been refused because the trademarks in question contained a sign that is public property. A second category comprised trademarks that had had to be refused due additionally to their deceptive character. Finally, one appeal (still pending at the end of the year) concerned the Office's refusal to grant a request to amend the registration date of an international trademark.

4. International Activities

Switzerland was represented at the Diplomatic Conference on the Revision of the Paris Convention which took place in Nairobi from September 28 to October 24, 1981.

In the year under review Switzerland ratified two international treaties:

the Budapest Treaty, of April 24, 1977, on the International Recognition of the Deposit of Microorganisms for the Purposes of Patent Procedure, which entered into force for Switzerland on August 19, 1981;

the Bilateral Treaty with Hungary on the Protection of Indications of Source, Appellations of Origin and Other Geographical Denominations, which entered into force on August 14, 1981.

5. Development Assistance

In the year under review, Switzerland again financed the program for two trainees with the Swiss Intellectual Property Office and the Center for the International Study of Industrial Property (CEIPI) in Strasbourg. Furthermore, one of the Swiss Intellectual Property Office's officials spent some time working in Yaoundé; this stay was part of a long-term development program aimed at

establishing a documentation center for the African Intellectual Property Organization (OAPI).

In cooperation with WIPO and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the Swiss Intellectual Property Office has been instructing and advising civil servants from developing countries for years. To date, over 35 legal, technical and administrative government employees from some 18 countries have been trained in Switzerland so that they could constructively help in setting up authorities for intellectual property in their respective home countries. In addition, many foreign visitors and delegations have been shown special procedures or equipment in the Swiss Office.

6. Financial Situation

For the third consecutive year, the balance sheet shows a positive result: expenses and expenditure

amount to about 21 million Swiss francs, whereas income in total is 23 million francs.

However, expenses for personnel increased by approximately 7% in comparison with last year and printing costs for patent specifications by 12%. Despite a slightly reduced overall income due to smaller receipts from annual fees, there is still a surplus of 2 million Swiss francs, which is, nevertheless, significantly less than the 3.4 million of 1980.

In particular, the income from applications and other patents fees has noticeably decreased. Two years ago income was still over 3 million Swiss francs; in the year under review this figure was almost one-third less. For the first time for many years there were even slightly less annual fees paid — the main source of income. It remains to be seen whether this decrease means a new trend which could touch upon the legal obligation that the Office's income must match expenditure.

News Items

PAKISTAN

Controller of Patents and Designs

We have been informed that Mr. Mohammad Zafar has been appointed Controller of Patents and Designs.

Book Reviews

Legislação da Propriedade Industrial e do Comércio de Tecnologia, by the Instituto Nacional da Propriedade Industrial, selected, compiled and annotated by Denis Borges Barbosa. Forense, Rio de Janeiro, 1982. — 682 pages.

As Arthur Carlos Bandeira, President of the National Institute of Industrial Property (INPI), notes in his preface, the role of INPI and of industrial property in Brazil has been greatly expanded in recent years, primarily through the promulgation of the Industrial Property Code and subsequent regulations. The industrial property system has been integrated into the system for the regulation of commerce and technology with the result being that INPI, in addition to its traditional functions, is now an active participant in the technological and economic development of Brazil and in the regulation of foreign capital through the examination of license agreements.

In view of its enlarged scope, INPI felt it essential to include in one volume the texts of all legislation dealing with industrial property and technology transfer. The number and complexity of the subjects covered clearly reflect the broad range of INPI's functions.

The compilation includes the complete text of the Industrial Property Code as well as all complementary legislation in fully annotated and cross-referenced form. In addition, topical indexes are provided to facilitate access to legislative provisions. This work is therefore of obvious utility to everyone with practical or academic interests in the Brazilian industrial property system.

JE

Das Recht der Arbeitnehmererfindung in der arabischen Welt, by N. Mangalo. Vol. 55 in *Schriftenreihe zum gewerblichen Rechtsschutz*, Max Planck Institute for Foreign and International Patent, Copyright and Competition Law. Carl Heymanns Verlag KG., Cologne, etc., 1982. — 275 pages.

When one considers that roughly 80% of all inventions in industrialized countries are made by employees, it becomes clear that employee invention statutes play a central role in the encouragement of research and innovation. Nevertheless, that importance has not been adequately recognized up to now in developing countries. As regards the Arab countries, only eight of them, namely, Algeria, Egypt, Iraq, Kuwait, Libya, Somalia, Sudan and Syria, have provisions on employee inventions but none of those countries has a special law on this matter since the statutory provisions are found either in the patent law or the civil code. The varying approaches of the law of employee inventions in the other 13 Arab countries can be derived from the general principles recognized in civil rules and customs of their varying legal systems.

Mangalo's study focuses on the legal treatment of employee inventions in theory and practice under the Arab legal systems. Reflecting the various approaches to the treatment of employee inventions in each Arab country, the various aspects of employee invention law are analyzed and critically evaluated.

In those countries that do not have an employee invention statute, discussion of this legal field requires the examination of indirectly applicable laws and customs as well as general principles underlying those legal systems that must be observed in concluding bilateral or multilateral contracts. In this context, various concepts in the respective legal systems, which to some degree are influenced by Islamic, French or English law, have to be taken into account.

The book can be recommended to everyone who wishes to familiarize himself with the complex issues arising in connection with employee inventions in Arab countries.

LB

Industrijska Lastna v ekonomskih odnosih s tujino, by B. Pretnar. Center za samoupravno normativno dejavnost, Ljubljana, 1982. — 90 pages.

The topic of this book is industrial property in economic relations with foreign countries. While there is no lack of analyses of the legal aspects of industrial property, there are surprisingly few works that deal with its microeconomic and market effects. This work, therefore, helps to fill a significant gap.

The author's thesis is that although the role of industrial property varies according to market structure, it is nevertheless an important factor in economic growth, in particular with respect to exports and technology transfer. The author cogently develops his argument by examining industrial property in relation to competition theory, marketing mix and business strategy, and the licensing of technology. He then devotes a large portion of this work to studying business decisions related to industrial property, for example, when, where and how to apply for protection, what to do in the event of infringement and whether or not to acquire or sell technology by means of licensing. By analyzing these decisions from the viewpoint of an economist, the author is able to provide much practical guidance to enterprises in developing their industrial property strategy.

As this work is published in Slovenian, its readership will naturally be a limited one. It is therefore to be hoped that translations into other languages will soon follow so that the text may reach a wider audience.

JE

Patent — Tabelle — Übersicht über materielles und formelles Recht in 50 Ländern, by H. Schade, 6th edition by J. Schade. Carl Heymanns Verlag KG., Cologne, etc., 1982. — 161 pages.

This completely revised and enlarged sixth edition of the well-known work by the late H. Schade presents, in table form, the main characteristics of the patent legislation of 50 countries. It allows the reader to find "at a glance" for any given country:

- the national legislation in force (including references to the texts published in English by WIPO in *Industrial Property* (before 1962) in French in *La Propriété industrielle*) and to those published by the German Patent Office in *Blatt für Patent-, Muster- und Zeichenwesen*);
- the applicable international treaties;
- the kinds of titles of protection granted;
- whether powers of attorney must be certified;
- the provisions relating to priority claims, patentability, the filing of applications, novelty (and whether there is an examination as to novelty), inspection of documents, opposition, the term of patents, compulsory licenses;
- the amount of the principal fees;
- the address of the Patent Office.

The part entitled "*Internationales Recht*" briefly indicates the history and contents of the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property as well as of the Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT) (whose Regulations it reproduces in part); other multilateral treaties are also mentioned. The European Patent Convention is summarized in table form in the same way as the national legislation.

The sixth edition of this manual incorporates—as far as possible—the legislative amendments introduced by the countries which have adopted the European Patent Convention or the PCT, or both.

This work, whose presentation is clear and concise, will no doubt be of great use to both patent theoreticians and patent practitioners.

EG

Calendar

WIPO Meetings

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

1982

- November 8 to 12 (Geneva) — Working Group on Model Contracts Concerning Co-Publishing and Commissioned Works (convened jointly with Unesco)
- November 15 to 19 (Berne) — Permanent Committee on Patent Information (PCPI) — Working Group on Search Information — Subgroup on IPC Classes F 01, F 02, H 01, H 03, H 04
- November 22 to 26 (Geneva) — Governing Bodies (WIPO Coordination Committee; Executive Committees of the Paris and Berne Unions)
- November 29 to December 3 (Geneva) — Permanent Committee on Patent Information (PCPI) and PCT Committee for Technical Cooperation (PCT/CTC)
- December 6 to 10 (Geneva) — International Patent Classification (IPC) — Committee of Experts
- December 6 to 10 (Paris) — Berne Union and Universal Copyright Convention — Working Group on the Formulation of Guiding Principles Covering the Problems Posed by the Practical Implementation of the Licensing Procedures for Translation and Reproduction under the Copyright Conventions (convened jointly with Unesco)
- December 13 to 17 (Paris) — Berne Union, Universal Convention and Rome Convention — Subcommittees of the Executive Committee of the Berne Union, of the Intergovernmental Copyright Committee and of the Intergovernmental Committee of the Rome Convention, respectively, on Copyright and Neighboring Rights Problems in the Field of Cable Television (convened jointly with ILO and Unesco)

1983

- January 25 to 29 (New Delhi) — Permanent Committee for Development Cooperation Related to Copyright and Neighboring Rights
- January 31 to February 2 (New Delhi) — Regional Committee of Experts on the modalities of implementation in Asia of the model provisions for national laws on intellectual property aspects of the protection of expressions of folklore (convened jointly with Unesco)

UPOV Meetings

1982

- November 15 (Geneva) — Information Meeting with International Non-Governmental Organizations
- November 16 and 17 (Geneva) — Administrative and Legal Committee
- November 18 and 19 (Geneva) — Technical Committee

Meetings of Other International Organizations Concerned with Industrial Property

1982

- European Patent Organisation: November 29 to December 3 (Munich) — Administrative Council
- Institut de Recherche en Propriété Intellectuelle Henri Desbois: November 23 (Paris) — Symposium on "L'examen des marques à l'épreuve de la pratique"
- Pacific Industrial Property Association: November 3 to 5 (Kobe) — 13th International Congress
- Union of European Practitioners in Industrial Property: December 3 (Paris) — Fifth Round Table on Industrial Designs

1983

- Benescience Foundation: April 27 to 29 (Munich) — Conference on Patent Claim Drafting and Interpretation
- International Association for the Protection of Industrial Property: May 23 to 27 (Paris) — XXXII Congress

