

Industrial Property

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

26th Year - No. 11
November 1987

Monthly Review of the
World Intellectual Property Organization

Contents

NOTIFICATIONS CONCERNING TREATIES

Nice Agreement. Ratification of the Geneva Act (1977). Soviet Union 395

WIPO MEETINGS

Madrid Union. Working Group on Links between the Madrid Agreement and the Proposed (European) Community Trade Mark. Third Session (Geneva, June 22 to 26, 1987) 396

STUDIES

The "Innovations" Introduced into the Italian Patent System by Law No. 60 of February 14, 1987, by *M.G. Del Gallo Rossoni* 402

The Registration of Trademarks and the Protection of the Rights of Trademark Owners in the Soviet Union, by *A.N. Grygoryev* 410

BOOKS AND ARTICLES 421

NEWS ITEMS

China 421

CALENDAR OF MEETINGS 422

INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY LAWS AND TREATIES (INSERT)

Editor's Note

GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

First Implementing Regulation of the Law on Distinctive Signs for Goods (of December 3, 1984) Text 3-002

Regulations Concerning the Requirements for Applications for Distinctive Signs for Goods (of January 10, 1985) Text 3-003

(continued overleaf)

© WIPO 1987

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

ITALY

Law on the Harmonization of the Legislation on Patents for Industrial Designs with the Provisions of the Hague Agreement of November 6, 1925, as Revised, Ratified by Law No. 744 of October 24, 1980 (Law No. 60 of February 14, 1987) (<i>Extracts</i>)	Text 1-006
Legislative Provisions on Industrial Model Patents (Royal Decree No. 1411 of August 25, 1940, as last amended by Law No. 60 of February 14, 1987)	Text 1-007
Regulations Concerning Patents for Industrial Models (Royal Decree No. 1354 of October 31, 1941, as last amended by Law No. 60 of February 14, 1987)	Text 1-008
Law on Patents for Inventions (Royal Decree No. 1127 of June 29, 1939, as last amended by Law No. 60 of February 14, 1987) (replacement sheets)	Text 2-001

Notifications Concerning Treaties

Nice Agreement

Ratification of the Geneva Act (1977)

SOVIET UNION

The Government of the Soviet Union deposited, on September 23, 1987, its instrument of ratification of the Geneva Act of May 13, 1977, of the Nice Agreement Concerning the International Classification of Goods and Services for the Purposes of the Registration of Marks of June 15, 1957, as revised at Stockholm on July 14, 1967.

The said instrument of ratification contains the following declaration:

“The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics considers it necessary to declare that the provisions of Article 13 of the Agreement providing for a possibility of its application to colonies and dependent territories is in contradiction with Resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations 1514 (XV) of December 14, 1960.” (*Translation*)

The Geneva Act (1977) of the said Agreement will enter into force, with respect to the Soviet Union, on December 30, 1987.

Nice Notification No. 66, of September 30, 1987.

WIPO Meetings

Madrid Union

Working Group on Links between the Madrid Agreement and the Proposed (European) Community Trade Mark

Third Session
(Geneva, June 22 to 26, 1987)

NOTE*

The Working Group on Links between the Madrid Agreement and the Proposed (European) Community Trade Mark (hereinafter referred to as "the Working Group") met in Geneva for its third session from June 22 to 26, 1987.¹

The following States were represented at the meeting of the Working Group: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany (Federal Republic of), Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Morocco, Netherlands, Portugal, Romania, Soviet Union, Spain, Switzerland, United Kingdom, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia (24). Representatives of four intergovernmental and 16 non-governmental organizations also attended the meeting of the Working Group in an observer capacity. The list of participants follows this Note.

Discussions were based on a memorandum by the Director General, entitled "Possible Protocols to the Madrid Agreement" (document MACT/III/2 Rev. for the English version and MACT/III/2 for the French version), which contains draft Protocol A and draft Protocol B, with explanatory notes.

Protocol A is intended to bring about a reform in the present Madrid system which, at least for the time being, seems to be the reform required to increase the probability of Denmark, Greece, Ireland and the United Kingdom (the four countries members of the European Community but not party to the Madrid Agreement, hereinafter referred to as "the four States") finding the

Madrid system acceptable to them. The reform has the following three main features:

- (i) it allows a national application to be the basis of the international (Madrid) registration (instead of requiring that the basis be a national registration);
- (ii) it extends the time limit for notice of provisional refusal from one year to 18 months;
- (iii) it allows any designated trademark office to require that it be paid, in connection with each international (Madrid) registration in which it is designated, the same fee as it receives where the Madrid system is not used (rather than a certain share in the fees whose amount is established by the Assembly of the Madrid Union).

Protocol B establishes the link between the Madrid system and the future (European) Community Trade Mark system (as foreseen today), by allowing:

- (i) a Community application (provided that the applicant comes from a Community country) to be the basis of an international (Madrid) registration; and
- (ii) the effect of a Community registration to be obtained through an international (Madrid) registration.

The Director General, when introducing his memorandum, emphasized that, by preparing the two draft Protocols, a revision of the Madrid Agreement was *not* intended and that, consequently, the Madrid Agreement would continue to exist as it was at the present time, even if the Protocols were adopted and even after their adoption.

After the general debate, the Working Group examined in detail the two draft Protocols. The discussions are summarized below.

In the course of the discussion of the specific questions, all government delegations and, with one

* Prepared by the International Bureau.

¹ For Notes on the first and second sessions, see *Industrial Property*, 1986, pp. 185 and 376, respectively.

exception, all the non-governmental organizations were in favor of the proposed approach of the two Protocols and underlined the desirability of extending the membership of the Madrid Agreement and the interest in establishing links between the Madrid Agreement and the proposed (European) Community Trade Mark. The following points out the contents of the Articles of Protocol A and summarizes the discussion on its Articles and on Protocol B.

**Protocol A:
Amending, in the Relations between
Certain Countries, the Madrid Agreement**

Article A1: Applicability of the Madrid Agreement as Amended by the Protocol. The first paragraph of this Article establishes that the substantive and administrative provisions of the Madrid Agreement (Articles 1 to 13) will apply with respect to any country party to the Protocol. The second paragraph contains a so-called "safeguard" clause which safeguards the application of the Madrid Agreement as it now exists—that is, without any modification by the Protocol—to the international registration system in the relations of countries that, although party to the Protocol, are also party to the Madrid Agreement. In other words, the Protocol will apply between two countries party only to the Protocol, and between a country only party to the Protocol and a country party to both the Madrid Agreement and the Protocol, whereas the Madrid Agreement will continue to apply between countries party to the Madrid Agreement even if they are also party to the Protocol.

Several delegations of countries party to the Madrid Agreement and representatives of non-governmental organizations pointed out that they were satisfied with current arrangements under the Madrid Agreement and that a safeguard clause such as that contained in Article A1 was an essential element of Protocol A, if the countries currently party to the Madrid Agreement were to be able to continue to apply those arrangements among themselves. One participant, although in favor of the safeguard clause, nevertheless observed that it would generate complications for users to create groups of countries to which different rules would be applied.

Article A2: Requirement of National Filing, or National Registration, in the Country of Origin. This Article would allow the applicant to base his application for international registration either on a national application or on a national registration. Under the Madrid Agreement, the applicant has no choice: his application for international registration can only be based on a national registration.

The delegations of several member countries of the Madrid Union declared that they could accept the option for applicants under the Protocol to base applications for international registration on national appli-

cations, on the assumption that this enabled countries outside the Madrid Union to join that Protocol. No opposite view was expressed in this regard. The Delegations of Denmark and Greece pointed out that the possibility of applying for an international registration on the basis of a national application was a *sine qua non* for the accession of their countries. The representatives of non-governmental organizations who gave their views were in favor of the possibility provided by Article A2.

Article A3: Territorial Limitation. This Article provides that any country party to the Protocol shall be considered as a country having made the notification under Article 3*bis* of the Madrid Agreement, which means that automatically it shall be considered as if it had notified the International Bureau that the protection resulting from the international registration shall extend to that country only at the express request of the proprietor of the mark. This results in additional revenues for the country, and, in fact, all contracting countries have made use of the faculty foreseen in Article 3*bis* of the Madrid Agreement.

This Article presented no problem and was not commented upon.

Article A4: Refusal of Effect of International Registration. This Article proposes to extend from one year to 18 months the time limit within which the trademark office of any designated country must notify the International Bureau that, in that country, the effect of the international registration is, either provisionally or definitively, refused (on grounds permitted by the Madrid Agreement and specified in the notification).

In response to problems raised by various delegations with regard to Article A4, the Director General proposed two alternatives in a document distributed during the session (document MACT/III/3): (i) the first alternative not changing the 12-month period provided for in Article 5(2) and (5) of the Madrid Agreement but allowing opposition by a third party to be notified to the International Bureau within 30 days from the date of the expiration of the period allowed by the national law for possible oppositions to the registration by third parties; and (ii) the second alternative replacing the 12-month period by an 18-month period, except that oppositions by third parties could be notified as proposed in the first alternative.

Most of the delegations of the countries party to the Madrid Agreement that spoke, and also several representatives of non-governmental organizations, stated their preference for the first alternative, which appeared to have the twofold advantage of being an acceptable compromise and of not altering the time limit for notification of refusals laid down in the Madrid Agreement.

The Delegations of Denmark and Ireland stated that they were not in a position, for the time being, to pronounce on the two alternatives and that, while the

possibility of accepting the first alternative was not ruled out, the matter did, however, need to be studied further. The Delegation of the United Kingdom, which welcomed the new proposals, stated that the first alternative could cause difficulties but it was prepared to look positively at it, while not being in a position to commit itself at this stage. The Delegation of Greece mentioned that it could not ensure that all the grounds for refusal resulting from *ex officio* examination could be notified within a 12-month time limit and stated that the compromise proposal required further examination, but that, at first view, the second alternative could represent a positive step towards a solution to the problem.

The Director General mentioned in that connection that there should be a provision according to which any decision to amend the length of the period should be taken unanimously and that the period should be laid down in the Protocol or in the Regulations.

Article A5: Period of Validity and Renewal of the International Registration. This Article proposes to make the period of validity of the initial international registration and of each renewal 10 years, instead of 20 years as provided for under Articles 6(1) and 7(1) of the Madrid Agreement.

No discussion of this Article took place.

Article A6: Dependence and Independence of the International Registration; Transformation into National Applications. The first two paragraphs of this Article are a consequence of allowing international applications to be based not only on a national registration (as does the Madrid Agreement) but also on a national application (as would the Protocol).

The third and most important paragraph of this Article is placed between square brackets since views seem to be roughly evenly divided on the question whether or not the Protocol should—as it would pursuant to this paragraph—provide for what is commonly referred to as a “transformation system.” This paragraph would modify the “central attack” system of the Madrid Agreement (Article 6(3) of the Madrid Agreement). The eventual failure of the national registration or application on which the international registration is based would no longer necessarily remove *all* the effects of the international registration in *all* the designated States. The owner of the mark would have the right to “transform” the international registration into individual national applications in all or any of the countries designated in the former application for international registration. The date of the international registration would be the effective date of any national application filed in the course of such a transformation of the international registration, provided that the mark is the same, and to the extent to which the goods or services listed are the same, as under the international registration.

Although several delegations of countries party to the Madrid Agreement and representatives of non-governmental organizations declared themselves satisfied with the central attack system in its present form, they expressed their willingness to accept the principle of transformation of the international registration into national applications if that was a means of securing the accession of new countries.

Of the countries that are not party to the Madrid Agreement, the Delegation of the United Kingdom stated that it was relatively neutral on the question of transformation. The Delegation of Denmark, for its part, mentioned that the possibility of transformation into national applications was not a prerequisite of its accession and that it could content itself with the central attack system as it exists at present, and even would prefer it.

Article A7: Fees. This provision would enable any country party to the Protocol but not member of the Madrid Union to substitute an “alternative fee system” (the “national fee system”) for the present system (under which the amount of the fee is fixed by the Assembly of the Madrid Union) whenever it is a designated country. In other words, any Protocol country, in connection with an international registration or its renewal, could charge a fee which would be based on its national fee but could not go above a specified percentage (80% was proposed provisionally, for purposes of discussion) of the amount of the national fee.

In response to the desire expressed by some delegations for a better equilibrium between countries that are bound by the present uniform fee system and countries that could charge national fees, the Director General proposed an amendment to Article A7, contained in a document distributed during the session (document MACT/III/4). The amended Article would also allow present Madrid Union countries bound by the Protocol to charge national fees, not in their mutual relations, but with respect to countries bound only by the Protocol.

All of the delegations from Madrid Union countries which spoke, while expressing satisfaction with the present uniform fee system, declared that they would be willing to accept Article A7 as a compromise solution to bring the four States into the Madrid system. However, most of those delegations stated that the amount of national fees which could be charged under Article A7 should be less than the amount of the applicable national fees.

The Delegation of the United Kingdom stated that, since it could not now be determined what savings, if any, processing international applications would entail for its trademark office, the principle of a definite discount on its national fee for international applications was not acceptable. The Delegation could not indicate in advance what the extent of any discount should be if it proved possible in practice to give one.

The Delegation of Ireland drew attention to the fact that, since in its country more than 80% of all trademark applications filed by foreigners (except applicants from the United Kingdom and the United States of America) came from Madrid Union countries, it would be difficult to face a situation where lower fees for international registrations would be charged than for national registrations.

The Delegation of Denmark repeated its position with respect to the fee question as expressed at the second meeting of the Working Group, stating that the question was a delicate one and that the interests of users should be taken into account by adopting a fee system that was easy to administer and economic, the examination system in force in Denmark being relatively costly. At this stage it was not in a position to indicate exactly which percentage between 80 and 100 it would find reasonable and necessary in order to cover the costs involved in the handling of international marks.

The delegations and organizations which expressed themselves on the Director General's amendment of Article A7 supported the amendment.

Article A8: Changes in the National Application. This Article makes Article 9 of the Madrid Agreement, which deals with the notification by the office of the country of origin of certain changes in the national registers which also affect the international registration, also applicable to a national application on which an international registration is based.

No discussion of this Article took place.

Article A9: Assembly. This Article proposes to make the countries which become party to the Protocol, even if they are not party to the Madrid Agreement, members of the Madrid Union. In that case, they would not vote in the Assembly of the Union on matters concerning only Madrid Union countries that are not party to the Protocol.

In the discussions of this provision, it became clear that its drafting needed to be reviewed.

Article A10: Amendment of Articles 10 to 13 of the Madrid Agreement. This Article provides that countries only party to the Protocol would have no right under Article 13 of the Madrid Agreement, which deals with the modification of certain administrative provisions, when the proposed amendment concerns matters of interest only to countries that are party to the Madrid Agreement but not to the Protocol.

No basic objection was raised with respect to Article A10 during its discussion.

Article A11: Ratification and Accession; Entry into Force. This Article sets down the rules for ratification of, or accession to, the Protocol and for the entry into force of the Protocol. The Protocol would be open to any country party to the Paris Convention.

No comments were made on Article A11.

Article A12: Denunciation. This Article contains the rules concerning denunciation. Article 15 of the Madrid Agreement would apply to any denunciation of the Protocol, *mutatis mutandis*. Denunciation of the Madrid Agreement would entail denunciation of the Protocol, and denunciation of the Protocol would entail denunciation of the Madrid Agreement, except that countries that had been party to the Madrid Agreement before becoming party to the Protocol would be able to denounce the Protocol and remain party to the Madrid Agreement.

This provision did not seem to raise any objections but did raise several questions which would need to be clarified in the texts to be prepared for the diplomatic conference.

Article A13: Signature and Languages. Among others, this Article proposes that the Protocol be signed in a single copy in the English and French languages and that both texts be equally authentic.

No discussion of this Article was held during the session.

Conclusions on Protocol A. In reply to a question about the reasons for which a protocol to, rather than a revision of, the Madrid Agreement was proposed, the Director General said that the countries party to the Madrid Agreement were fully satisfied with the Madrid Agreement as it had existed for more than 90 years and as it is today; they did not wish to revise it but wished to maintain it, among themselves, without any change. This was the reason for which a revision of the Madrid Agreement was not proposed.

Several delegations and participants expressed their desire to go on with the work on Protocol A under all circumstances, as they favored facilitating and enabling non-Madrid Union countries to join the Madrid system through Protocol A, irrespective of the progress made towards the establishment of a (European) Community Trade Mark system and on Protocol B which was intended to establish links between that system and the Madrid system.

**Protocol B:
Concerning the Complementary Use of the
Madrid Agreement Concerning the International
Registration of Marks and the Regulation
on the Community Trade Mark**

Protocol B contains, on the one hand, the same features as Protocol A, which improve on the Madrid system but make the corresponding provisions applicable to the Community Trade Marks Office as well, and, on the other hand, the legal mechanisms to establish links between the Madrid system and the (European) Community Trade Mark system.

The Delegation of Belgium (the country holding the presidency of the Council of the European Commu-

nities at the time of the meeting), speaking on behalf of all the European Community Member States, reported that, since the last meeting of the WIPO Working Group, in July 1986, work on the (European) Community Trade Mark had progressed considerably and it was now possible to foresee the conclusion of that work in the relatively near future, either in 1987 or at least during 1988. However, a number of important matters remained to be resolved, among which was the matter of a link between the (European) Community Trade Mark and the Madrid Agreement, which was still under discussion. All the European Community Member States had expressed their interest in examining the possibility of setting up such a link. However, the question of the appropriate basis to be used within the Community legal system in order to establish that link remained under discussion. Consequently, the European Community Member States were not at present able to take a position as regards the final provisions in Protocol B (Articles B10 to B13). Moreover, acceptance of the link by the European Community Member States would depend on the other provisions contained in Protocol B. Furthermore, the time at which the link would be set up was also of importance.

The Representative of the Commission of the European Communities emphasized that a political will existed to achieve speedy results in respect of the (European) Community Trade Mark and that the Commission would shortly be submitting a proposal on links before the Council of the European Communities adopted the first instruments on the (European) Community Trade Mark.

Article B1: Applicability of the Madrid Agreement as Amended by the Protocol. Among the most important features of this Article, its first paragraph introduces the notion of "the eligible Community application," which means an application for the registration of a mark in the Community Trade Marks Office, provided that the applicant is a national of, is domiciled in, or has a real and effective industrial establishment in a country (one of the 12) belonging to the European Community. This definition puts applications made under the (European) Community Trade Mark Registration on an equal footing with national applications.

The first paragraph of Article B1 furthermore provides who has to apply the Protocol: (i) any country that is a party to the Protocol and (ii) the Community Trade Marks Office. It is to be noted that the European Community would not be a party to the Protocol but it would nevertheless be required to apply it.

No discussion of this Article took place.

Articles B2 to B6: These Articles deal with the requirement of application or registration in a national office or the Community Trade Marks Office, territorial limitation, refusal of effect of the international registration, documentary evidence, and the period of validity

and renewal of the international registration, respectively.

No discussion of Articles B2, B3, B5 and B6 took place, whereas it was agreed that Article B4, dealing with the refusal of effect of the international registration, would have to be amended to take the amendments of Article A4 of Protocol A into account.

Article B7: Dependence and Independence of the International Registration; Transformation into National Applications or a Community Application. This Article provides for the same effects as Article A6 of Protocol A (dependence and independence of the international registration), and it also provides for the establishment of a "transformation" system, except that it covers not only national offices and national marks but also the Community Trade Marks Office and marks registered in that Office (see above).

In the discussion of this Article, there seemed to be general agreement as to the need to have the possibility of transformation. In this respect, it was clarified that paragraph (3), which deals with "transformation" where the protection resulting from the international registration can no longer be invoked for the reasons specified in paragraph (2), did not cover the case of a transformation of the European Community Trade Mark when it served as the basis for an international registration. Article B7(3) applied only to the case in which the national mark, serving as the basis for an international registration which extended to the Community, no longer benefited from protection and in which, an international registration having elapsed, protection in the Community was no longer afforded by that international registration. In that case, the owner of the registration could carry out the transformation provided for in Article B7(3) and file for a Community Trade Mark by the normal route.

Article B8: Fees. This Article provides for the same effects as Article A7 of Protocol A, except that it covers not only national offices but also the Community Trade Marks Office (see above); that is, it would also allow the Community Trade Marks Office to receive part of the fee it would normally be entitled to charge for marks applied for and registered with it.

The Director General informed the meeting that Article B8 would be redrafted so as to make it clear that the Community Trade Marks Office was in the same position as the national trademark offices of countries that would become members of the Madrid Union through accession to the Protocol, as the Community Trade Marks Office and national trademark offices should be placed on the same footing.

Articles B9 to B11 and B13 and B14: These Articles deal with changes in the national or Community applications, the Assembly, amendment of Articles 10 to 13 of the Madrid Agreement; denunciation and termination, and signature and languages.

No discussion of these Articles took place.

Article B12: Ratification and Accession; Entry into Force. In particular, paragraph (4) of Article B12 provides for two conditions for the entry into force of the Protocol: (i) that the European Community notify that it "accepts the application" of certain provisions of the Protocol, meaning that the European Community would not "accept" the Protocol as such, since it is not a contracting party, but that it would accept the "application" of the Protocol in its—the European Community's—trademark system whether that application means, as already stated, rights or obligations; and (ii) that at least two instruments of ratification of or accession to the Protocol be deposited.

No discussion of this Article took place.

Conclusions

In his concluding remarks, the Director General said that he intended to prepare a document on the question of convening a diplomatic conference, for the Assembly of the Madrid Union when it meets in September 1987. That document would propose that the diplomatic conference be convened in 1988 for the adoption of Protocol A and possibly also Protocol B. The reasons to be put forward for convening such a conference would be that the differences which remained were not important and may be expected to be resolved relatively easily by the diplomatic conference. It would further propose that a preparatory meeting be convened in order to organize the procedural aspects of the conference. Such a preparatory meeting would not try to improve upon the draft texts of the Protocols; as usual, those texts would be proposed—on the basis of the discussions of the present meeting—by the International Bureau of WIPO and communicated many months in advance to the countries and organizations invited to the diplomatic conference.²

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**

I. States

Austria: O. Leberl; G. Mayer-Dolliner. **Belgium:** W.J.S. Peeters. **Bulgaria:** P. Karajanev. **Czechoslovakia:** E. Mück; L. Dokoupil. **Democratic People's Republic of Korea:** Kim Yu Chol; Yun Myong Jin. **Denmark:** L. Østerborg; J.E. Carstad; C.B. Schmidt. **France:** B.

² *Editor's Note:* The document referred to was issued by the Director General. The Assembly of the Madrid Union decided that the Diplomatic Conference should take place in the first half of 1989 and the preparatory meeting in the second half of 1988.

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

Vidaud. German Democratic Republic: S. Schröter. **Germany (Federal Republic of):** A. von Mühlendahl; R. Sannwald. **Greece:** P. Geroulakos. **Hungary:** G. Pusztai. **Ireland:** V. O'Reilly; H.F. Blake. **Italy:** M.G. Fortini; M.G. Del Gallo Rossoni. **Luxembourg:** F. Schlessler. **Morocco:** M.S. Abderrazik. **Netherlands:** H.R. Fürstner; M.C. Geuze; E.C. Nooteboom. **Portugal:** R.A. Costa de Moraes Serrão; E. Rocha. **Romania:** R. Susan. **Soviet Union:** L. Salenko. **Spain:** J. Delicado Montero-Rios; A. Casado Cerviño. **Switzerland:** J.-D. Pasche. **United Kingdom:** A. Sugden; M. Todd. **Viet Nam:** Nguyen Duc Than; Ngo Dinh Kha. **Yugoslavia:** T. Lisavac; R. Tešić.

II. Intergovernmental Organizations

Benelux Trademark Office (BBM): L.J.M. van Bauwel. **Commission of the European Communities (CEC):** B. Schwab; A. Brun. **European Free Trade Association (EFTA):** G. Aschenbrenner. **Secretariat of the Council of Ministers of the European Communities:** H.W. Kunhardt; J. Huber; R.J. Meijer.

III. Non-Governmental Organizations

Association française des praticiens du droit des marques et des modèles (APRAM): C.M. Sautory; R. Baudin. **Benelux Association of Trademark and Design Agents (BMM):** W.F.P. Goosen. **Chartered Institute of Patent Agents (CIPA):** T.L. Johnson. **Committee of National Institutes of Patent Agents (CNIPA):** T.L. Johnson; A. Hansmann. **European Association of Industries of Branded Products (AIM):** G.F. Kunze. **European Communities Trade Mark Practitioners' Association (ECTA):** G. Peters; F. Gevers. **European Federation of Pharmaceutical Industries' Associations (EFPIA):** P. Bocken; P.H. Nielsen. **Federal Chamber of Patent Attorneys (FCPA):** A. Hansmann. **Institute of Trade Mark Agents (ITMA):** E.R. Roberts. **International Association for the Protection of Industrial Property (AIPPI):** D.H. Tatham. **International Chamber of Commerce (ICC):** J.M.W. Buraas. **International Federation of Industrial Property Attorneys (FICPI):** A.L. de Sampaio. **Max Planck Institute for Foreign and International Patent, Copyright and Competition Law:** H.P. Kunz-Hallstein. **Trade Marks, Patents and Designs Federation (TMPDF):** D.G. Parsons; D.T. Rossitter. **Union of European Practitioners in Industrial Property (UEPIP):** C. Kik. **Union of Industries of the European Community (UNICE):** H. Molijn.

IV. Officers

Chairman: A. von Mühlendahl (Germany (Federal Republic of)).
Vice-Chairmen: P. Karajanev (Bulgaria); T. Lisavac (Yugoslavia).
Secretary: P. Maugué (WIPO).

V. International Bureau of WIPO

A. Bogsch (*Director General*); A. Schäfers (*Deputy Director General*); L. Baeumer (*Director, Industrial Property Division*); P. Maugué (*Senior Counsellor, Industrial Property (Special Projects) Division*); H. Lom (*Senior Legal Officer, Industrial Property Division*); M. Weil-Guthmann (*Consultant, Industrial Property Division*).

Studies

The "Innovations" Introduced into the Italian Patent System by Law No. 60 of February 14, 1987

M.G. DEL GALLO ROSSONI*

**The Registration of Trademarks and the Protection of
the Rights of Trademark Owners in the Soviet Union**

A.N. GRYGORYEV*

Books and Articles

Book Reviews

An Introduction to the System of Industrial Property in China, by Liu Gushu. China Patent Agent (Hong Kong) Ltd., Hong Kong, 1987. — 236 pages.

This publication (in English and Chinese), which reflects the great experience of its author, the First Deputy Chairman and General Manager of China Patent Agent (Hong Kong) Ltd., contains explanations concerning the industrial property system in China in general, the main features of the Chinese trademark law, filing of patent applications, and patent agency, questions of particular interest to foreigners and questions relating to technology transfer. The texts of the patent and trademark laws (in English and Chinese) are reproduced in the appendix. Thus, this publication will be useful for all those who wish to obtain protection of industrial property rights in China.

LB

News Items

CHINA

*Director General of Patent Office
of the People's Republic of China*

We have been informed that Mr. Gao Lulin has been appointed Director General of Patent Office of the People's Republic of China.

Calendar of Meetings

WIPO Meetings

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

1987

- November 23 to December 4 (Geneva) — Permanent Committee on Patent Information (PCPI): Working Group on Search Information
- December 2 to 4 (Geneva) — Joint Unesco-WIPO Consultative Committee on the Access by Developing Countries to Works Protected by Copyright (convened jointly with Unesco)
- December 7 and 8 (Geneva) — Permanent Committee on Industrial Property Information (PCIPI)
- December 7 to 11 (Geneva) — Committee of Governmental Experts on the Printed Word (convened jointly with Unesco)
- December 9 to 11 (Geneva) — Permanent Committee on Industrial Property Information (PCIPI) — Executive Coordination Committee

1988

- February 1 to 5 (Geneva) — Locarno Union: Committee of Experts on the International Classification for Industrial Designs
- February 4 (Geneva) — Hague Union: Users' Meeting
- February 15 to 19 (Geneva) — Permanent Committee on Industrial Property Information (PCIPI): Working Group on Automation
- March 7 to 11 (Geneva) — Committee of Experts on the Establishment of an International Register of Audiovisual Works
- March 14 to 18 (Geneva) — Permanent Committee on Industrial Property Information (PCIPI): Working Group on Standardization and Exchange
- March 21 to 25 (Geneva) — International Patent Classification (IPC) Union: Committee of Experts
- April 18 to 22 (Paris) — Committee of Governmental Experts on Photographic Works (convened jointly with Unesco)
- April 18 to 22 (Geneva) — Madrid Union: Assembly (Extraordinary Session)
- April 25 to 28 (Geneva) — Committee of Experts on Measures Against Counterfeiting and Piracy
- May 16 to 20 (Geneva) — Permanent Committee for Development Cooperation Related to Industrial Property
- May 30 to June 10 (Geneva) — Permanent Committee on Industrial Property Information (PCIPI): Working Group on the International Patent Classification (IPC)
- June 9 and 10 (Geneva) — Permanent Committee on Industrial Property Information (PCIPI): Ad Hoc Working Group A
- June 13 to 17 (Geneva) — Committee of Experts on the Harmonization of Certain Provisions in Laws for the Protection of Inventions (Fifth Session)
- June 13 to 17 (Geneva) — Permanent Committee on Industrial Property Information (PCIPI): Executive Coordination Committee; Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT) Committee for Technical Cooperation (PCT/CTC)
- June 20 to 24 (Geneva) — Nice Union: Preparatory Working Group
- June 27 to July 1 (Geneva) — Committee of Governmental Experts for the Synthesis of Principles Concerning the Copyright Protection of Various Categories of Works (convened jointly with Unesco)
- September 12 to 16 (Geneva) — International Patent Classification (IPC) Union: Committee of Experts
- September 14 to 16 (Geneva) — WIPO Worldwide Forum on the Impact of Emerging Technologies on the Law of Intellectual Property
- September 22 and 23 (Geneva) — Permanent Committee on Industrial Property Information (PCIPI)
- September 26 to October 3 (Geneva) — Governing Bodies (WIPO Coordination Committee; Executive Committees of the Paris and Berne Unions)
- October 4 to 7 (Geneva) — Permanent Committee on Industrial Property Information (PCIPI): Working Group on Automation
- October 10 to 14 (Geneva) — Permanent Committee on Industrial Property Information (PCIPI): Working Group on Standardization and Exchange
- October 24 to 28 (Geneva) — Committee of Experts on Biotechnological Inventions and Industrial Property (Fourth Session)
- November 21 to December 2 (Geneva) — Permanent Committee on Industrial Property Information (PCIPI): Working Group on the International Patent Classification (IPC)
- November 28 to December 2 (Geneva) — Committee of Experts on Model Provisions for Legislations in the Field of Copyright
- December 5 to 9 (Geneva) — Madrid Union: Preparatory Committee for Diplomatic Conference
- December 12 to 16 (Geneva) — Permanent Committee on Industrial Property Information (PCIPI): Executive Coordination Committee
- December 19 (Geneva) — Information Meeting for Non-Governmental Organizations on Intellectual Property

UPOV Meetings

1988

- February 19 (Geneva) — Council
- April 18 to 21 (Geneva) — Administrative and Legal Committee
- April 22 (Geneva) — Consultative Committee
- June 7 to 9 (Edinburgh) — Technical Working Party on Automation and Computer Programs
- June 13 to 15 (Wageningen) — Technical Working Party for Vegetables
- June 16 and 17 (Wageningen) — Workshop on Variety Examination (for Lettuce)
- June 20 to 24 (Melle) — Technical Working Party for Ornamental Plants and Forest Trees
- June 28 to July 1 (Hanover) — Technical Working Party for Fruit Crops, and Subgroups
- July 5 to 8 (Surgères) — Technical Working Party for Agricultural Crops
- September 27 and 28 (Cambridge) — Workshop on Variety Examination (on Examination Techniques)
- October 11 to 14 (Geneva) — Administrative and Legal Committee
- October 17 (Geneva) — Consultative Committee
- October 18 and 19 (Geneva) — Council
- October 20 and 21 (Geneva) — Technical Committee

Other Meetings Concerned with Industrial Property

1987

- November 30 to December 4 (Strasbourg) — Center for the International Study of Industrial Property (CEIPI): Present Status of European Patent Law and Practice — Seminar on the Drafting of Claims and Oppositions
- December 7 to 11 (Munich) — European Patent Organisation (EPO): Administrative Council

1988

- January 25 to 30 (Strasbourg) — Center for the International Study of Industrial Property (CEIPI): Present Status of European Patent Law and Practice — Seminar on Legal Problems
- March 24 (London) — Institute of Trade Mark Agents (ITMA): International Conference on “New Vistas in Trade Marks”
- March 29 and 30 (Oxford) — Pharmaceutical Trade Marks Group (PTMG): Annual General Meeting and Conference on Education and Training
- April 10 to 15 (Sydney) — International Association for the Protection of Industrial Property (AIPPI): Executive Committee
- June 27 to July 1 (Cannes) — International Federation of Industrial Property Attorneys (FICPI): World Congress
- July 24 to 27 (Washington, D.C.) — International Association for the Advancement of Teaching and Research in Intellectual Property (ATRIP): Annual Meeting
- September 15 to 18 (Angers) — International League for Competition Law (LIDC): Congress
- November 7 to 11 (Buenos Aires) — Inter-American Association of Industrial Property (ASIPI): Congress

