

Industrial Property

Published monthly
Annual subscription:
Sw.fr. 140.-
Each monthly issue:
Sw.fr. 14.-

24th Year - No 9
September 1985

Monthly Review of the
World Intellectual Property Organization

Contents

WIPO MEETINGS

Paris Union. Committee of Experts on the Harmonization of Certain Provisions in Laws for the Protection of Inventions 267

ACTIVITIES OF OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

Industrial Property Organization for English-Speaking Africa 270

International Association for the Protection of Industrial Property 270

GENERAL STUDIES

Young People's Scientific and Technical Inventive Activity in Bulgaria (P. Sirakov and K. Iliev) .. 275

Vertical Patent Restraints in the United States of America: Exhaustion of Rights by an Authorized Sale, After the GTE Sylvania Case (R.H. Stern) 278

CALENDAR OF MEETINGS 295

ANNEX

Industrial Property Statistics for 1984 (Publication A)

INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY LAWS AND TREATIES

Editor's Note

BELGIUM

Patent Law (of March 28, 1984) (replacement sheet) Text 2-004

JAPAN

Act Concerning the Circuit Layout of a Semiconductor Integrated Circuit (Law No. 43, 1985, promulgated on May 31, 1985) Text 1-001

© WIPO 1985

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

WIPO Meetings

Paris Union

Committee of Experts on the Harmonization of Certain Provisions in Laws for the Protection of Inventions

First Session
(Geneva, July 8 to 12, 1985)

NOTE*

The Committee of Experts on the Harmonization of Certain Provisions in Laws for the Protection of Inventions (hereinafter referred to as "the Committee of Experts") held its first session in Geneva from July 8 to 12, 1985. The following States were represented at the session: Barbados, Belgium, Cameroon, China, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, France, Germany (Federal Republic of), Hungary, Japan, Madagascar, Malawi, Netherlands, Norway, Soviet Union, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom, United States of America, Uruguay (22). In addition, representatives of two intergovernmental organizations and of 18 non-governmental organizations participated in an observer capacity. The list of participants follows this Note.

The new name of the Committee of Experts reflects the extension of the terms of reference of the earlier committee, namely, the Committee of Experts on the Grace Period for Public Disclosure of an Invention Before Filing an Application, which had met in Geneva in May 1984;¹ the earlier terms of reference had been enlarged to include, in addition to the question of the grace period, other subjects in respect of which the harmonization of patent laws should be considered.

The Committee of Experts, along with continuing its discussion on the proposal to establish a grace period for public disclosure of an invention before filing an application, considered two previously undiscussed subjects of harmonization. The two new subjects were: (i) requirements in respect of the naming of the inventor by an applicant who is not the inventor and in respect of evidence to be furnished concerning the entitlement of such applicant; and (ii) requirements for granting a filing date to an application for a title of protection for an invention. The discussions were based on proposals

drawn up by the International Bureau reviewing the need for harmonization and containing draft treaty provisions establishing a uniform solution in respect of each of the three subjects.

On the question of a *grace period for public disclosure*, the International Bureau proposed that Contracting States agree that the patentability of an invention would not be affected by the fact that a disclosure of the invention, subject matter of a patent application, was made before the patent application concerning that invention was filed, provided that the said disclosure occurred six or 12 months before the filing or priority date of the application and that it was made (i) by the inventor, or (ii) by a third party, based on information acquired from, or in consequence of acts performed by, the inventor, or (iii) by an industrial property office, pursuant to an application filed without the consent of the inventor and based on information acquired from, or in consequence of acts performed by, the inventor.

The experts of nine countries (Barbados, Germany (Federal Republic of), Hungary, Japan, Malawi, Soviet Union, Switzerland, United Kingdom, United States of America) were in favor of the proposed solution, whereas the experts of seven countries (Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden) were opposed to it. The latter argued that any grace period was an exception to the principle of absolute novelty, and that a grace period which would extend beyond the limited cases of disclosure at an exhibition and disclosure because of an abuse would create legal insecurity: third parties may be unaware of the fact that a particular disclosure had no novelty-destroying effect since it benefited from the grace period. Among the non-governmental organizations representing the users of the patent system, there was a clear majority in favor of the proposed solution.

The Committee of Experts made suggestions for improving the drafting of the proposed treaty provision. As to substance, views were divided on the question of whether the claiming of a grace period could be subjected to formalities, such as a statement by the applicant to be submitted together with the application, to the effect that a specific disclosure made before filing should be treated as a disclosure benefiting from the grace period. As regards the duration of the grace period, the majority of the experts was in favor of six months. Several experts were in favor of 12 months. Some of the experts favored six months indicating that they could also accept 12 months. It was generally agreed that, in any case, the grace period should be counted backwards

* Prepared by the International Bureau.

¹ See *Industrial Property*, 1984, p. 313.

from the date of a validly claimed priority, and that it should be uniform for all countries.

With respect to the requirements concerning the *naming of the inventor* by an applicant for a patent who is not the inventor, the International Bureau proposed that the Contracting States agree that the inventor must be named by the applicant in the patent application or in a separate document by indicating the applicant's name and address and the legal grounds of the entitlement to file the application; furthermore, that any refusal of the patent application because of non-compliance with the said requirement could be pronounced only after a reminder by the industrial property office with which the application was filed remains unheeded by the applicant; finally, that a Contracting State may reserve the possibility of requiring a statement certifying that the inventor is aware of the application.

The Committee of Experts agreed that the mandatory minimum requirement for all Contracting States should be the obligation for the applicant to name the inventor and, where necessary for the purposes of identification, to indicate his address, but that each Contracting State should be free to require or not that the applicant furnish a declaration indicating the legal grounds of his entitlement to file the application. The Committee of Experts also agreed that each Contracting State would have to allow the applicant 16 months after the filing date or the priority date for the naming of the inventor and for the furnishing of the declaration of the applicant's entitlement (if such declaration is required), and that each Contracting State would have to provide that, in case the applicant does not spontaneously comply with any of the said requirements, its industrial property office has to remind the applicant to comply and has to allow not less than two months for such compliance. Finally, the Committee of Experts agreed that the question whether Contracting States should be allowed to require the furnishing of a statement certifying that the inventor is aware of the application should be further studied.

Concerning the requirements for *granting a filing date*, the International Bureau proposed that Contracting States agree that any patent application, in order to be granted a filing date, must comply with the following conditions: it must be in the prescribed language; it must contain an indication of the title of protection (patent, inventor's certificate, utility model, etc.) requested; it must identify the applicant; it must contain a description and claims; and, in the case of international or regional applications, it must contain the indication ("designation") of at least one State in which protection is desired. The International Bureau also proposed that the Contracting States should agree that any country may, if it so desires, make the granting of a filing date dependent on compliance with any of the following additional conditions: the application must name the inventor and, where the applicant is other than the inventor, it must contain a declaration and evidence of the legal grounds for the applicant's enti-

tlement; it must bear the signature of the applicant or his representative; and it must be accompanied by the payment of the filing fee.

The Committee of Experts agreed that each Contracting State should require, for the granting of a filing date, that the application contain the disclosure of the invention, a request for protection and the identification of the applicant ("minimum requirements"). The Committee of Experts also agreed that possible additional requirements should be listed in the treaty, it being understood that no other requirements would be permitted and that such a list of maximum requirements should include claims, the language of the application and the designation of a Contracting State under filing procedures covering several States. It was suggested that, with respect to those three possible additional requirements, applicants should have a time limit for correction without losing the filing date.

In conclusion, the Committee of Experts agreed that the three questions deserved a continued effort of harmonization at the international level. The Committee of Experts recommended, in essence, that the draft treaty provisions on the grace period should be revised in the light of its conclusions and, as far as the questions of the naming of the inventor and the requirements for granting a filing date were concerned, the International Bureau should, taking into account the recommendations that the Committee had made, not only revise the draft treaty provisions but also the arguments supporting them. The new texts should be submitted to the Committee at its next session.

In endorsing the continuation of the work of the International Bureau of WIPO in the field of the harmonization of patent laws, the Committee of Experts agreed that treaty provisions should cover further topics, such as: manner of claiming; unity of invention; manner of description; state of the art effect of applications prior to their publication or the grant of a patent; extension of process protection to products and reversal of burden of proof in respect of products manufactured by the protected process.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS*

I. States

Barbados: L.M. Duncan. **Belgium:** D. Vandergheyns. **Cameroon:** W. Eyambe. **China:** Tang Zongshun. **Denmark:** L. Østerborg. **Egypt:** W.Z. Kamil. **Finland:** J. Rainesalo. **France:** J. Divoy. **Germany (Federal Republic of):** I. Koch; F.-P. Koch; H. Bardehle. **Hungary:** E. Parragh. **Japan:** S. Uemura; Y. Masuda. **Madagascar:** P. Verdoux. **Malawi:** M.H. Chirambo. **Netherlands:** W. Neervoort. **Norway:** K.H. Reinskou. **Soviet Union:** A. Kortchagin. **Sudan:** N. Abd El Rahman. **Sweden:** K. Thelin; I. Schalin. **Switzerland:** J.-L. Comte; E. Caussignac; JU.-M. Souche; F.A. Jenny. **United Kingdom:** A. Sugden; M. Todd. **United States of America:** L. Schroeder; L. Maassel. **Uruguay:** J. Meyer-Long.

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

II. Intergovernmental Organizations

Commission of the European Communities (CEC): B. Schwab. European Patent Office (EPO): G.D. Kolle.

III. Non-Governmental Organizations

American Intellectual Property Law Association (AIPLA): R.C. Kline; H.C. Wegner. Asian Patent Attorneys Association (APAA): T. Yamaguchi. International Association for the Protection of Industrial Property (AIPPI): M. Santarelli. Bundesverband der deutschen Industrie e.V. (BDI): K.J. Heimbach; H. Goldrian. International Chamber of Commerce (ICC): M. Chome; J.M.W. Buraas. Committee of National Institutes of Patent Agents (CNIPA): J. Beier. International Confederation of Professional and Intellectual Workers (CITI): R. Loeb. Deutsche Vereinigung für Gewerblichen Rechtsschutz und Urheberrecht (GRUR): H. Goldrian. European Federation of Agents of Industry in Industrial Property (FEMIP): J. Brulle; G. Tasset. International Federation of Pharmaceutical Manufacturers' Associations (IFPMA): G. Tasset. International Federation of Inventors' Associations (IFIA): C.P. Feldmann; K. Lerstrup. International Federation of Industrial Property Attorneys (FICPI): J. Beier; K. Raffnsøe. Licensing Executives Society International (LES): M.

Monchey. International League for Competition Law (LIDC): J.-F. Leger. The Chartered Institute of Patent Agents (CIPA): C.J.W. Everitt. The New York Patent, Trademark and Copyright Law Association, Inc. (NYPTCLA): L.C. Robinson. Union of Industries of the European Community (UNICE): J. Brulle. Union of European Practitioners in Industrial Property (UEPIP): H.E. Böhmer.

IV. Officers

Chairman: J.-L. Comte (Switzerland). *Vice-Chairmen:* Tang Zongshun (China); P. Verdoux (Madagascar). *Secretary:* F. Balleys (WIPO).

V. International Bureau of WIPO

K. Pfanner (*Deputy Director General*); L. Baeumer (*Director, Industrial Property Division*); F. Balleys (*Head, Industrial Property Law Section, Industrial Property Division*); B. Bartels (*Head, PCT Legal Section, PCT Division*); A. Ilardi (*Senior Legal Officer, Industrial Property Law Section*); V. Yossifov (*Program Officer, Industrial Property Law Section*).

Activities of Other Organizations

Industrial Property Organization for English-Speaking Africa

First ESARIPO Patent*

The Industrial Property Organization for English-Speaking Africa (ESARIPO) granted its first patent on July 3, 1985 (Application No. AP/P/84/00003), one year after the entry into force of the Harare Protocol on Patents and Industrial Designs, which enables ESARIPO to grant patents for inventions.

ESARIPO was created by an Intergovernmental Agreement, concluded at Lusaka, Zambia, in December

* Note prepared by the International Bureau of WIPO.

International Association for the Protection of Industrial Property

Executive Committee

(Rio de Janeiro, May 12 to 18, 1985)

NOTE*

Introduction

The Executive Committee of the International Association for the Protection of Industrial Property (AIPPI) met in Rio de Janeiro (Brazil) from May 12 to 18, 1985. Approximately 300 participants from about 40 countries participated in the meeting.

The World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) was represented by its Director General, Dr. Arpad Bogsch, accompanied by Deputy Director General Dr. Klaus Pfanner. The Director General gave a speech at the opening ceremony on May 12, 1985, during which he outlined the topical activities of WIPO.

The questions considered by the Executive Committee included the influence of laws on restraint of trade or transfer of technology on know-how agreements, the protection of computer software and integrated circuits, the legal and economic importance of

1976. The headquarters are established in Harare, Zimbabwe. The present members of the Organization are Botswana, the Gambia, Ghana, Kenya, Malawi, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

According to the Harare Protocol, which constituted a further Intergovernmental Agreement, the Office of ESARIPO is empowered to grant patents and register industrial designs with effect in the Contracting States designated in the applications. At present, the following countries are bound by the Harare Protocol and can be designated: Botswana, Ghana, Kenya, Malawi, Sudan, Uganda, Zimbabwe. Therefore, in respect of these countries—and those that may accept the Protocol in the future—with one single application, an applicant is able to obtain protection in all countries designated in his application.

the protection of industrial designs, the relevance of trademarks for consumer protection, the patent protection of biotechnological inventions, the legal and economic significance of protection by utility models and the international registration of marks. In connection with those questions, the Executive Committee adopted various resolutions and observations, excerpts of which are reproduced below.

Resolutions and Observations Adopted

QUESTION 53¹

Influence of Laws on Restraint of Trade or Transfer of Technology on Know-How Agreement

RESOLUTION

AIPPI

Resolves

- (1) that continuation of know-how agreements should not be affected by laws on restraint of

* Prepared by the International Bureau of WIPO.

¹ See *Industrial Property*, 1983, p. 257.

trade or transfer of technology due to the legitimate disclosure of the know-how by a third party, except in cases where secrecy of the know-how disclosed is of the essence in the agreement;

- (2) that the foregoing shall apply *mutatis mutandis* to mixed agreements when the patent has lost its legal effect; and
- (3) that since know-how agreements are of a *sui generis* character, patent and know-how terms of a mixed agreement should be treated separately according to the respective legal character of patents and know-how.

QUESTION 57

Protection of Computer Software and Integrated Circuits

[The full text of this Resolution, to the extent it concerns computer software, is published in *Copyright/Le Droit d'auteur*. The text reproduced below contains only the conclusion on computer software and the observations on integrated circuits.]

A. Computer Software

RESOLUTION

II. Conclusion

In conclusion, AIPPI notes that the application of national or international legislation in the field of copyright seems to allow inexpensive and *immediate protection* of programs, which is necessary to safeguard the interests of the authors of computer programs.

But, AIPPI considers that the study of the consequences of the application of that legislation to computer programs has shown the necessity to clarify and to adapt the national copyright laws and the two international copyright conventions.

AIPPI is of the opinion that while an adequate interpretation of copyright laws continues to provide for protection of computer programs, it is necessary to improve the conditions of protection of computer software, perhaps by way of a special regime or specific rules, and that these conditions will be specified by further experience and technical evolution in this field.

Consequently, AIPPI decides to continue the study, without excluding the possibility of setting up a specific system, (notably one that excludes authors' rights [*droit d'auteur*]), of

- the protection of computer programs,
- the protection of the other elements of computer software.

B. Integrated Circuits

OBSERVATIONS

....

AIPPI acknowledges the financial and commercial importance of integrated circuits and the relative ease of copying them, and therefore is of the opinion that adequate protection must be sought.

Patent protection does not seem to be sufficient, because the creation of an integrated circuit does not always involve inventive activity.

Because of their functional and utilitarian character, integrated circuits and their means of manufacture seem not to be capable of being sufficiently protected by copyright or by industrial designs.

Protection by contract or by the rules against unfair competition appears not to be sufficient to prevent certain uses of integrated circuits and their means of manufacture.

Under those circumstances, integrated circuits should be protected in a more complete manner by other existing or future regimes, such as perhaps:

- by a specific new regime?
- by a utility model regime?

Must an integrated circuit possess certain qualities before benefiting from this protection?

And must these rights be more limited as to their scope and duration?

....

QUESTION 73²

Juridical and Economic Importance of the Protection of Industrial Designs

RESOLUTION

....

AIPPI confirms the need to improve the protection of industrial designs at international level and puts forward the following conclusions:

1. It has been said before that the extension and improvement of the international protection of industrial designs would be greatly enhanced by a harmonization of the systems of national protection. AIPPI

² See *Industrial Property*, 1983, p. 260.

refers on this point to the resolution passed by the Congress, which proposed a statute for the protection of industrial designs.

2. There would be room for the adaptation of the Hague Agreement in its most recent version (Hague Act of 1960, which came into effect in 1984) with a view to increasing the number of members. This improvement, which could be effected by a modification of the Agreement itself or of its rules of procedure, should be studied in the following directions:

(a) augmentation (to 18 months, for example) of the time within which the countries having provisions for examination can communicate their refusal of protection in respect of applications published in the bulletin of WIPO;

(b) the possibility of formally rectifying certain errors before publication;

(c) the lowering of the fees, the amount of which is a deterrent to the use of the Agreement.

3. Independently of the Hague Agreement, interested countries are invited to examine the possibilities of working out a regional convention established on lines analogous to those of the European patent.

....

QUESTION 80³

Trademark and Consumer Protection

RESOLUTION

....

A. Transfer of Trademarks and Granting of Licenses

....

AIPPI is of the opinion:

(a) that, in case of misleading use of a trademark by a transferee, or by a licensee or a related enterprise, neither the nullity of the trademark transfer or the trademark license, nor the forfeiture of the trademark, nor, in general, the cancellation of the trademark from the register, would constitute an appropriate sanction of trademark law against such misleading use;

(b) that it should not be required by law that the product of the licensee must necessarily have the same characteristics, including quality, as the product of the licensor, but that as far as licenses are concerned, it is generally in the interest of the trademark owner and the consuming public that the trademark owner imposes quality standards on the licensee and provides for an adequate control.

³ See *Industrial Property*, 1983 p. 261.

....

B. Relationship between "Informative Labeling" of Products and Trademark Law

....

AIPPI particularly *points out* that if national legislatures make informative labeling obligatory for the benefit of consumers, such regulation should preferably not:

(a) be instituted within the framework of trademark law, as this law only concerns the right to use the trademark;

(b) in any case include an overall obligation to distinguish goods or services by the affixing of a particular mark or include rules which impose the choice of a particular mark;

(c) encourage the degeneration of existing trademarks into generic terms by way of mandatory provisions as to the use of "designations which are usual in the trade;"

(d) diminish the role of the trademark in such a way that it lessens its capacity of distinguishing the goods or services of one enterprise from those of another;

(e) change the economic value of the trademark in such a way that proprietary rights are substantially affected. This could in some jurisdictions have an impact on the proprietors' constitutional rights.

....

QUESTION 82

Patent Protection for Biotechnological Inventions

RESOLUTION

....

AIPPI

notes that:

- an inconsistency exists between the actual laws which are based upon the general principle that a living organism *per se* cannot be the subject matter of a patent, and the state of science which nowadays makes it possible to describe and repeat procedures for the modification of a living organism;
- patent protection for particular biotechnological inventions exists in most States;
- processes involving the industrial use of living organisms are generally patentable;
- microorganisms *per se* and other biological materials, including plants, *per se*, are patentable in many States;

⁴ Informative labeling or the marking of products must not be confused with the identification of a product or its packaging with distinctive signs (trademarks, trade names).

- plants and even animals are also protectable in some States by special rights.

AIPPI

recognizes that the development of new techniques has made biotechnology of great economic importance and observes that, to encourage the development of these new techniques, there is a great desire to protect biotechnological inventions by patents and to harmonize the patent practices of different countries.

....

AIPPI

is of the opinion that biotechnological inventions should be protected by the application of the existing principles of patent law and that the creation of a special body of law is not necessary. Accordingly, subject matter in the field of biotechnology should be patentable if it meets the usual criteria for patentability.

In particular:

- There is no reason to consider an organism, be it a microorganism, plant or animal, as not being patentable subject matter merely because it is living or merely because its genes have not been modified.
- Other biological material, e.g., plasmids, enzymes, etc., should be considered patentable subject matter.
- A process for obtaining or using a living organism or other biological material should be considered patentable subject matter.
- No reason exists to exclude from patent protection biotechnological inventions relating to any particular field of industrial application, for example, food, medicines or chemical products.
- Although protection of plant varieties under laws conforming to the UPOV Convention presents a valuable system of protection and should continue, it is essential that techniques newly applied and products obtained thereby in the field of the development of new plants, and capable of meeting the patentability requirements, should become generally eligible for patent protection and, therefore, prohibition of double protection should not be maintained or provided for.
- If a written description is sufficient to make the living organism, or other biological material, available to a person skilled in the art, then deposit should not be required, but nevertheless deposit should always be considered as completing the requirement of sufficient disclosure particularly in relation to the repeatability of the invention, recognizing that practical problems in relation to some organisms will have to be solved.

....

In general, there exists no reason to limit the scope of protection of patents for biotechnological inventions.

....

QUESTION 83

**Legal and Economic Significance of
Protection by Utility Models**

RESOLUTION

AIPPI,

....

Looks favorably on the examination of the question of setting up a utility model system for the following reasons:

Utility models can encourage inventors to protect technical developments with a lesser inventive step than that necessary for a patent and to obtain protection both at a lower cost and more quickly.

Consequently, they are of particular interest to small and middle-sized industries and can promote technical development in developing countries.

....

QUESTION 85

Community Trade Mark

[For this Question, the Executive Committee has not adopted a Resolution, but a detailed report commenting on the most recent draft of the Community Trade Mark Regulation. This Report is not reproduced here.]

QUESTION 88

International Registration of Marks

RESOLUTION

AIPPI

1. *Takes note* of the work done in the WIPO Committee of Experts on the International Registration of Marks towards devising a new system to provide for an international registration which has a chance of being found acceptable to more countries than the 27 which are presently party to the Madrid Agreement;

2. *Further takes note* that there are several different ways of achieving such system, for example,

- modification of the Madrid Agreement,
- a new treaty which would be a "variant" of the Madrid Agreement, and which would be linked to it,
- a revival of the TRT, which up to now has been a failure,

and that of these alternatives an important number of national groups of countries presently adhering to the Madrid Agreement are strongly of the opinion that the first one should be considered first;

3. *Believes* that any system should be linked to the Community Trade Mark System;

4. *Believes* it possible that any such system would be more attractive to more countries if,

(a) the international registration could be based, not upon a home registration, but upon an application

which might already have been subjected to an examination of the absolute grounds of refusal, provided that this application matures into a registration,

(b) the time limit granted to member countries for notifying a provisional refusal, which is now one year, could be extended,

(c) the subject of fees could be reviewed,

(d) a second language could be introduced;

5. *Believes* that the subject of limited time dependency (central attack) should be studied further;

6. *Believes* that, if the above conditions could be fulfilled, such a system should have a good chance of acceptance by countries with examining trademark systems which are not at present prepared to join the Madrid Agreement as it stands;

....

General Studies

Young People's Scientific and Technical Inventive Activity in Bulgaria

P. SIRAKOV* and K. ILIEV**

**Vertical Patent Restraints in the
United States of America:
Exhaustion of Rights by an Authorized
Sale, After the GTE Sylvania Case**

R.H. STERN*

Calendar of Meetings

WIPO Meetings

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

1985

September 23 to October 1 (Geneva) — Governing Bodies (WIPO General Assembly, Conference and Coordination Committee; Assemblies of the Paris, Madrid, Hague, Nice, Lisbon, Locarno, IPC, PCT, Budapest, TRT, Vienna 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)

October 7 to 11 (Geneva) — Permanent Committee on Patent Information (PCPI): Working Group on General Information

October 21 to 25 (Geneva) — Nice Union: Committee of Experts

November 4 to 30 (Plovdiv) — WIPO/Bulgaria: World Exhibition of Young Inventors and International Seminar on Inventiveness for Development Purposes (November 12 to 15)

November 18 to 22 (Geneva) — Permanent Committee on Patent Information (PCPI): Working Groups on Special Questions and on Planning

November 25 to December 6 (Geneva) — Permanent Committee on Patent Information (PCPI): Working Group on Search Information

November 26 to 29 (Geneva) — Committee of Experts on a Treaty for the Protection of Integrated Circuits

December 2 to 6 (Paris) — Committee of Governmental Experts on Model Provisions for National Laws on Publishing Contracts for Literary Works (convened jointly with Unesco)

December 3 to 6 (Geneva) — Permanent Committee for Development Cooperation Related to Industrial Property

December 11 to 13 (Geneva) — Committee of Experts on the International Registration of Marks

UPOV Meetings

1985

October 14 (Geneva) — Consultative Committee

October 15 and 16 (Geneva) — Meeting with International Organizations

October 17 and 18 (Geneva) — Council

November 12 and 13 (Geneva) — Technical Committee

November 14 and 15 (Geneva) — Administrative and Legal Committee

Other Meetings Concerned with Industrial Property

1985

October 10 and 11 (Harrogate) — Pharmaceutical Trade Marks Group: 31st Conference on "Generic Prescribing—12 Diverse but Authoritative and Informed Viewpoints"

1986

March 14 (London) — Pharmaceutical Trade Marks Group: 32nd General Assembly

June 1 to 4 (San Diego) — The United States Trademark Association: Annual Meeting

June 8 to 13 (London) — International Association for the Protection of Industrial Property: XXXIII Congress

