

Industrial Property

Published monthly
Annual subscription:
180 Swiss francs
Each monthly issue:
23 Swiss francs

33rd Year - No. 12
December 1994

Monthly Review of the
World Intellectual Property Organization

Contents

EDITOR'S NOTE

Announcement: Merger of WIPO Reviews, *Industrial Property* and *Copyright* 423

NOTIFICATIONS CONCERNING TREATIES ADMINISTERED BY WIPO IN THE FIELD OF INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY

Paris Convention.

I. New Member of the Paris Union: Singapore 424

II. Declaration Extending the Effects of Accession to Articles 1 to 12 of the Stockholm Act
(1967): Turkey 424

Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT). New Members of the PCT Union: Singapore, Uganda 424

Budapest Treaty. New Member of the Budapest Union: Singapore 424

WIPO ARBITRATION CENTER

The Services of the WIPO Arbitration Center 425

REGISTRATION SYSTEMS ADMINISTERED BY WIPO

Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT) 439

Madrid Union 440

Hague Union 440

ACTIVITIES OF WIPO IN THE FIELD OF INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY SPECIALLY DESIGNED FOR DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

Africa 441

Arab Countries 442

Asia and the Pacific 442

Latin America and the Caribbean 444

Development Cooperation (in General) 445

ACTIVITIES OF WIPO IN THE FIELD OF INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY SPECIALLY DESIGNED FOR COUNTRIES IN TRANSITION TO MARKET ECONOMY 447

[Continued overleaf]

WIPO 1994

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

OTHER CONTACTS OF THE INTERNATIONAL BUREAU OF WIPO WITH GOVERNMENTS AND INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS IN THE FIELD OF INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY	448
MISCELLANEOUS NEWS	450
SELECTED WIPO PUBLICATIONS	451
CALENDAR OF MEETINGS	452

**INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY LAWS AND TREATIES
(INSERT)**

Editor's Note

ALGERIA

Legislative Decree No. 93-17 Concerning the Protection of Inventions (of 23 Jumada Ethania 1414, Corresponding to December 7, 1993) Text 2-001

LITHUANIA

Patent Law (Law No. I-372, of January 18, 1994) Text 2-001

Editor's Note

ANNOUNCEMENT

Merger of WIPO Reviews, *Industrial Property* and *Copyright*

As of January 1, 1995, the monthly reviews of the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), *Industrial Property* and *Copyright*, will be merged into a single monthly review under the title *Industrial Property and Copyright*.

Current subscribers to one or both of the existing two reviews will receive the new merged review provided they send to WIPO by December 31, 1994, the completed subscription form inserted in this issue.

The annual subscription rate for the merged review will be 210 Swiss francs for Europe and outside Europe by surface mail, and 300 Swiss francs outside Europe by airmail. All subscribers will then be receiving the equivalent of two reviews instead of one as from the beginning of 1995.

As far as the legislative texts inserted in the existing reviews are concerned, all subscribers to the merged review will receive both sets of industrial property and copyright and neighboring rights laws. It will no longer be possible to subscribe separately to the legislative texts only; the merged review and the legislative inserts relating to the two fields will only be available as a single subscription.

Notifications Concerning Treaties Administered by WIPO in the Field of Industrial Property

Paris Convention

I. New Member of the Paris Union

SINGAPORE

The Government of Singapore deposited, on November 23, 1994, its instrument of accession to the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property of March 20, 1883, as revised at Stockholm on July 14, 1967, and amended on September 28, 1979.

Singapore has not heretofore been a member of the International Union for the Protection of Industrial Property ("Paris Union"), founded by the Paris Convention.

The Paris Convention as revised will enter into force, with respect to Singapore, on February 23, 1995. On that date, Singapore will become a member of the Paris Union.

Paris Notification No. 159, of November 23, 1994.

II. Declaration Extending the Effects of Accession to Articles 1 to 12 of the Stockholm Act (1967)

TURKEY

The Government of Turkey, referring to the deposit, made on February 12, 1976, of its instrument of accession to the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property of March 20, 1883, as revised at Stockholm on July 14, 1967, with a declaration to the effect that its accession shall not apply to Articles 1 to 12 (see Paris Notification No. 79¹), deposited, on October 28, 1994, a declaration by which it extends the effects of its accession to the said Articles.

Articles 13 to 30 of the said Convention entered into force, with respect to Turkey, on May 16, 1976.

Articles 1 to 12 of the said Convention will enter into force, with respect to Turkey, on February 1, 1995.

Paris Notification No. 158, of November 1, 1994.

¹ See *Industrial Property*, 1976, p. 90.

Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT)

New Members of the PCT Union

SINGAPORE

The Government of Singapore deposited, on November 23, 1994, its instrument of accession to the Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT), done at Washington on June 19, 1970.

The said Treaty will enter into force, with respect to Singapore, on February 23, 1995.

PCT Notification No. 99, of November 23, 1994.

UGANDA

The Government of Uganda deposited on November 9, 1994, its instrument of accession to the Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT), done at Washington on June 19, 1970.

The said Treaty will enter into force, with respect to Uganda, on February 9, 1995.

PCT Notification No. 98, of November 9, 1994.

Budapest Treaty

New Member of the Budapest Union

SINGAPORE

The Government of Singapore deposited, on November 23, 1994, its instrument of accession to the Budapest Treaty on the International Recognition of the Deposit of Microorganisms for the Purposes of Patent Procedure, done at Budapest on April 28, 1977, and amended on September 26, 1980.

The said Treaty will enter into force, with respect to Singapore, on February 23, 1995.

Budapest Notification No. 133, of November 23, 1994.

WIPO Arbitration Center

The Services of the WIPO Arbitration Center

CONTENTS

- I. Introduction
- II. The WIPO Arbitration Center: Institutional Arrangements
 - WIPO
 - WIPO Arbitration Center
 - WIPO Arbitration Council
 - WIPO Arbitration Consultative Commission
- III. Dispute-Resolution Procedures Offered
 - Types of Procedures
 - Advantages
 - Who May Refer Disputes?
 - What Sort of Disputes May Be Referred?
 - How to Refer Disputes
- IV. Good Offices: Submission Advisory Service
 - Purpose
 - Method of Operation
 - Advantages
- V. Mediation
 - Mediation: What It Is
 - Role of the Center
 - Fees of the Center
 - Mediator's Fees
 - Recommended Contract Clause and Submission Agreement
 - Venue of Mediation
- VI. Arbitration
 - Arbitration: What It is
 - Role of the Center
 - Fees of the Center
 - Arbitrator's Fees
 - Recommended Contract Clause and Submission Agreement
 - Place of Arbitration
- VII. Expedited Arbitration
 - Expedited Arbitration: What It Is
 - Role and Fees of the Center;
 - Arbitrator's Fees
 - Recommended Contract Clause and Submission Agreement
- VIII. Mediation Followed, in the Absence of a Settlement, by Arbitration
 - The Nature of the Combined Procedure
 - Role and Fees of the Center;
 - Mediator's and Arbitrator's Fees
 - Recommended Contract Clause and Submission Agreement
- IX. Lists of WIPO Mediators and Arbitrators
 - Appointments by the Center in Cases Administered by the Center
 - Appointments by the Center in Cases Not Administered by the Center
- X. Schedule of Fees
 - Mediation
 - Arbitration
 - Expedited Arbitration
 - Mediation Followed, in the Absence of a Settlement, by Arbitration
 - Appointment of Mediators or Arbitrators in Cases Not Administered by the Center
- XI. Conferences and Training Programs
 - Conferences
 - Training Programs
- XII. Further Information and Documentation

I. Introduction

The WIPO Arbitration Center administers a number of procedures, which are alternatives to court litigation, for the resolution of international commercial disputes involving intellectual property. Those procedures operate within the legal framework which has grown out of international commercial arbitration and which is recognized in both national laws and international conventions.

The present publication is intended to give an introduction to the WIPO Arbitration Center, the dispute-resolution procedures that it administers and the other services that it offers. The publication is divided into Sections containing brief information on the following subjects:

- the institutional arrangements of the WIPO Arbitration Center (Section II),
- an overview of the types of dispute-resolution procedure administered by the Center, and the perceived advantages of those procedures (Section III),
- the Submission Advisory Service offered by the Center to facilitate recourse to the dispute-reso-

- lution procedures administered by the Center (Section IV),
- mediation (Section V),
 - arbitration (Section VI),
 - expedited arbitration (Section VII),
 - the combined procedure of mediation followed, in the absence of a settlement, by arbitration (Section VIII),
 - the lists of specialized mediators and arbitrators maintained by the Center (Section IX),
 - the Schedule of Fees applicable to the dispute-resolution procedures administered by the Center (Section X),
 - the conferences and training programs organized by the Center (Section XI),
 - the further information and documentation that is available from the Center (Section XII).

II. The WIPO Arbitration Center: Institutional Arrangements

World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO)

WIPO is an intergovernmental organization whose headquarters are located in Geneva, Switzerland. It is a specialized agency of the United Nations system of organizations and has 150 Member States.

WIPO has a history of over 110 years, going back to 1883, when the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property was adopted, and to 1886, when the Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works was adopted.

WIPO is responsible for the promotion of the protection of intellectual property throughout the world. It administers some 16 multilateral treaties dealing with the legal and administrative aspects of intellectual property.

Over 50 nationalities are represented on the secretariat of WIPO, the International Bureau. The staff of the International Bureau comprises around 500 persons.

The annual income of the International Bureau is around 120 million Swiss francs. The principal source of that income is fees paid by the private users of the international registration services (for patents, trademarks and industrial designs) administered by the International Bureau, which account for around 80% of the income of the regular budget.

WIPO Arbitration Center

The WIPO Arbitration Center is an administrative unit of the International Bureau of WIPO. The establishment of the Center was approved by the General Assembly of WIPO in September 1993. The Center commenced operations in October 1994. It is located in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Center has two main roles, namely, the role of administering authority and the role of resource center.

The Center as Administering Authority

The Center administers four dispute-settlement procedures:

- mediation under the WIPO Mediation Rules,
- arbitration under the WIPO Arbitration Rules,
- expedited arbitration under the WIPO Expedited Arbitration Rules, and
- a combined procedure of mediation under the WIPO Mediation Rules followed, in the absence of a settlement, by arbitration under the WIPO Arbitration Rules.

As administering authority, the role of the Center is to perform the tasks and to make the decisions that are assigned to it by the WIPO Mediation, Arbitration or Expedited Arbitration Rules. One of those tasks is to appoint, where the parties do not themselves do so, or fail to do so within the periods of time set out in the Rules, the mediator or arbitrator. For this purpose, the Center maintains lists of specialized mediators and arbitrators (see Section IX, below). A fuller description of the tasks performed by the Center as administering authority is given below in the Sections on each of the procedures administered by the Center.

The WIPO Rules have been designed for use in any legal system. Mediations or arbitrations conducted in accordance with WIPO Rules may take place anywhere in the world.

Any person having legal capacity, regardless of national affiliation, may refer a dispute to any of the procedures administered by the Center.

The Center as Resource Center

As a resource center, the WIPO Arbitration Center endeavors to act as a bridge between the fields of intellectual property, on the one hand, and extrajudicial dispute-resolution, on the other hand. Specifically, the Center provides the following services in this respect:

- (i) The Center provides assistance in the drafting of contract clauses for use in contracts to refer future disputes under those contracts to a dispute-settlement procedure administered by the Center, as well as in the drafting of submission agreements to refer existing disputes to such a procedure.
- (ii) The Center provides the service of Good Offices (a Submission Advisory Service) where it will, at the request of a party to a dispute, endeavor to act as intermediary in convening a meeting of the parties to the dispute to discuss the submission of the dispute to a procedure administered by it (see Section IV, below).
- (iii) The Center will, against payment of a fee, appoint a mediator or an arbitrator at the request of the parties to a dispute submitted to mediation or arbitration that is not administered by the Center (see Section IX, below).

- (iv) The Center organizes conferences on various themes relating to the resolution of intellectual property disputes through mediation, arbitration or other dispute-settlement alternatives, as well as conducts training programs for mediators and arbitrators (see Section XI, below).
- (v) The Center makes available publications and documentation relating to the resolution of intellectual property disputes (see Section XII, below).

The Center is counselled in the discharge of its functions by two bodies, the WIPO Arbitration Council and the WIPO Arbitration Consultative Commission.

WIPO Arbitration Council

The WIPO Arbitration Council is composed of representatives of both the private and public sectors. The role of the Council is to provide advice and to make recommendations to the Center on matters of planning and policy, particularly in relation to the WIPO Mediation Rules, WIPO Arbitration Rules and WIPO Expedited Arbitration Rules.

The WIPO Arbitration Council is composed of the following six members:

- Marc Blessing, President, Swiss Arbitration Association (ASA);
- Michael Hoellering, General Counsel, American Arbitration Association (AAA);
- The Rt. Honorable Sir Michael Kerr, Honorary President, London Court of International Arbitration (LCIA);
- Zentaro Kitagawa, Professor of Law, and Director of Kyoto Comparative Law Center, Kyoto University, Japan;
- Jürgen Schmid-Dwertmann, Deputy Director General, Federal Ministry of Justice, Germany;
- Tang Houzhi, Professor, Vice-Chairman, China International Economic and Trade Arbitration Commission (CIETAC).

WIPO Arbitration Consultative Commission

The WIPO Arbitration Consultative Commission is composed of leading experts in the areas of arbitration and intellectual property. The principal function of the Consultative Commission is to provide opinions and advice to the WIPO Arbitration Center on non-routine issues in respect of which the WIPO Arbitration Rules require a decision to be taken by the Center in the course of the administration of an arbitration, such as the challenge, release or replacement of an arbitrator and certain aspects of questions concerning arbitrators' fees. For this purpose, the Center constitutes, whenever required, ad hoc committees composed of three members of the Consultative Commission. In special circumstances (such as the unavailability of a member of the Consultative Commission having knowledge of a particular national law in issue), the Center may also appoint an

outside expert who is not a member of the Consultative Commission to serve on such an ad hoc committee.

The WIPO Arbitration Consultative Commission is composed of the following members:

- Mohamed Aboul-Enein, Director, Cairo Regional Centre for International Commercial Arbitration, Egypt;
- Guillermo Aguilar-Alvarez, General Counsel, Undersecretariat for International Trade Negotiations, Ministry of Trade and Industrial Development, Mexico;
- Gerald Aksen, Reid & Priest, New York; Member, Board of Directors, and Former General Counsel, American Arbitration Association (AAA); Chairman, Association of the Bar of the City of New York, United States of America;
- Sheikh Salah Al-Hejailan, Law Office of Salah Al-Hejailan, Riyadh and Jeddah; Chairman, Higher Board, Euro-Arab Arbitration System, Saudi Arabia;
- Sheikha Haya Rashed Al Khalifa (Mrs.), Haya Rashed Al Khalifa Law Firm, Bahrain;
- Piero Bernardini, Ughi & Nunziante, Rome; Professor of Law; Vice-Chairman, Italian National Committee on Arbitration, Italy;
- Karl-Heinz Böckstiegel, Professor, Cologne University; President, London Court of International Arbitration (LCIA); Vice-Chairman, German Institute of Arbitration (DIS), Germany;
- Robert Briner, Lenz & Staehelin, Geneva; WIPO Liaison for the Intellectual Property Specialist Group, The Chartered Institute of Arbitrators; Chair, Business Law Section, International Bar Association (IBA), Switzerland;
- James Carter, Sullivan & Cromwell, New York; Co-Chair, Corporate Counsel Committee, American Arbitration Association (AAA); Chair, International Law Section, American Bar Association (ABA), United States of America;
- Dejun Cheng, Director, Legal Affairs Department, China Council for the Promotion of International Trade (CCPIT); Vice-Chairman and Secretary General, China International Economic and Trade Arbitration Commission (CIETAC); Vice-Chairman, Beijing Conciliation Centre;
- Joan Clark (Ms.), Ogilvy, Renault, Montreal; Executive President, International Association for the Protection of Industrial Property (AIPPI), Canada;
- Bernardo Cremades, J.Y.B. Cremades y Asociados, Madrid; President, Spanish Court of Arbitration; Member, London Court of International Arbitration (LCIA), Spain;
- Yves Derains, Derains & Partners, Paris; Former Secretary General, International Court of Arbitration, International Chamber of Commerce (ICC), France;
- Mayer Gabay, Attorney-at-Law, Jerusalem; Chairman, Israel Patents and Copyright Law Revision

- Committees; Judge, United Nations Administrative Tribunal, Israel;
- Sudargo Gautama, Professor of Law; Vice-Chairman, Indonesian National Arbitration Organization (BANI), Indonesia;
 - Horacio A. Grigera Naón, Senior Counsel, International Finance Corporation, Washington; Member, London Court of International Arbitration (LCIA), Argentina;
 - Gerold Herrmann, Secretary, United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL), Germany;
 - Eva Horváth (Ms.), President, Court of Arbitration, Hungarian Chamber of Commerce, Budapest, Hungary;
 - J. Martin Hunter, Barrister, Essex Court Chambers, London; Member, London Court of International Arbitration (LCIA), United Kingdom;
 - Tadashi Ishikawa, Oh-Ebashi Law Office, Osaka; Member, Council, Japanese Association of the Law of Civil Procedure; Former Vice-Chairman, International Relations Committee, Japan Federation of Bar Associations, Japan;
 - François Knoepfler, Knoepfler Gabus Gehrig, Neuchâtel; Member, Council of the Swiss Institute of Comparative Law, Lausanne; Chairman, Swiss Association of International Law; Member, Executive Committee of the Swiss Arbitration Association (ASA), Switzerland;
 - Yoshio Kumakura, Nakamura & Partners, Tokyo; Member, Council, Asian Patent Attorneys Association (APAA), Japan;
 - Pierre Lalive, Emeritus Professor, Geneva University; Honorary President, Swiss Arbitration Association (ASA), Geneva, Switzerland;
 - Martin Lutz, Lenz & Staehelin, Zurich; Secretary General, International Association for the Protection of Industrial Property (AIPPI), Switzerland;
 - Kéba M'Baye, Former Judge, International Court of Justice; Vice-President, International Olympic Committee (IOC), Senegal;
 - Jan Paulsson, Freshfields, Paris; Vice-President, London Court of International Arbitration (LCIA), France;
 - David Plant, Fish & Neave, New York; Chair, ADR Committee, American Intellectual Property Law Association (AIPLA), United States of America;
 - Robert Raven, Morrison & Foerster, San Francisco; Chair, Section on Dispute-Resolution, American Bar Association (ABA), United States of America;
 - Michael Ernst Schneider, Etude Lalive & Partners, Geneva; Member, Executive Committee, Swiss Arbitration Association (ASA), Switzerland;
 - Sang Hyun Song, Professor of Law, Seoul National University; President, Korean Intellectual Property Research Society, Inc; Member,

- Advisory Committee, Korean Supreme Court, Republic of Korea;
- Sir Laurence Street, Retired Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of New South Wales, Australia;
- Yasuhei Taniguchi, Professor of Law, Kyoto University; President, Japan Association of Civil Procedure, Japan;
- Albert Jan Van Den Berg, Stibbe, Simont, Monahan, Duhot, Amsterdam; Vice-President, Netherlands Arbitration Institute (NAI), Netherlands;
- Amos Wako, Attorney General, Attorney General's Chambers, Nairobi, Kenya.

III. Dispute-Resolution Procedures Offered

Types of Procedure

The WIPO Arbitration Center administers four dispute-resolution procedures. The procedures have different legal implications and consequences, as well as differing advantages. A brief description of each of the procedures is given below, and a fuller description in the individual Sections on each procedure.

Mediation

Mediation (also known as conciliation) is a procedure in which a neutral intermediary, the mediator, endeavors, at the request of the parties to a dispute, to assist them in reaching a mutually satisfactory settlement of the dispute. The mediator does not have any power to impose a settlement on the parties. Mediation is also voluntary in the sense that either party may, if it so chooses, abandon the mediation at any stage prior to the signing of an agreed settlement.

Arbitration

Arbitration is a procedure in which a dispute is submitted, by agreement of the parties, to an arbitrator or to a tribunal of several arbitrators who give a decision on the dispute that is binding on the parties. In contrast to a mediation, once the parties have freely agreed to submit a dispute to arbitration, a party cannot unilaterally withdraw from the arbitration.

Expedited Arbitration

Expedited arbitration is, as its name suggests, a form of arbitration in which certain modifications are introduced in order to ensure that the arbitration can be conducted and an award rendered in a shortened time frame and, consequently, at a reduced cost. To achieve those objectives, the modifications provide for a sole arbitrator (rather than a tribunal of several arbitrators), shortened time periods for each of the steps involved in the

arbitration proceedings, and condensed hearings before the sole arbitrator.

Mediation Followed, in the Absence of a Settlement, by Arbitration

This procedure combines, sequentially, both mediation and arbitration. Where the parties agree to submit to the procedure, they must first endeavor to resolve the dispute through mediation. If a settlement is not reached through mediation within the period of time designated by the parties (either 60 or 90 days are recommended), the dispute may be referred by either party to arbitration for a binding decision.

Advantages

Compared to court litigation, there are a number of advantages which the procedures described above share in common. Each procedure also offers particular advantages, which are described in the individual Sections devoted to each procedure.

The general advantages of the procedures are:

- (i) The procedures can result in considerable *savings of time and cost*. A mediation or arbitration can be commenced immediately and the parties do not need to await the allocation of court time.
- (ii) The procedures offer *autonomy* to the parties in choosing the applicable law, procedure and language of the proceedings, as well as flexibility in designing or adapting the procedure to their own particular circumstances.
- (iii) The procedures are based on the law and practice that has grown out of international commercial arbitration and are *neutral* to the law, language and institutional culture of the parties. They are administered by the WIPO Arbitration Center, part of an international organization with an international secretariat. Moreover, a venue that is neutral to the national affiliations of the parties can be chosen as the place in which the procedure will take place.
- (iv) In the highly technical area of intellectual property, it is possible to ensure that *specialized expertise* is represented on the arbitral tribunal or in the person of the mediator.
- (v) The procedures may be conducted in full *confidentiality*. The WIPO Mediation Rules and the WIPO Arbitration Rules contain not only provisions concerning the confidentiality of the mediation or arbitration as a whole, but also special measures directed at preserving the confidentiality of trade secrets involved in a dispute.
- (vi) The procedures offer a means of settling a dispute through a *single procedure*. Where a dispute concerns subject matter covered by intellectual property titles in a number of different countries, one procedure may have par-

ticular advantages of economy and efficiency over several different national court actions.

Who May Refer Disputes?

As mentioned above, the dispute-resolution procedures administered by the Center are open to all persons, regardless of national affiliations. There is no requirement that a person be connected in a particular way (such as by nationality or residence) with a State that is party to any particular treaty administered by WIPO.

Both individuals and enterprises or other entities having a recognized juridical personality may submit disputes to the procedures administered by the Center.

A State entity may be party to a dispute submitted to a procedure administered by the Center, provided that the State entity has, like any other party to a dispute that is referred to the Center, validly expressed its consent in writing to the reference of the dispute to such a procedure.

What Sort of Disputes May Be Referred?

The Center offers specialized services for the resolution of *intellectual property* disputes. However, the dispute-settlement procedures administered by the Center are not limited to dealing with disputes involving intellectual property questions. Such a limitation to purely intellectual property matters has been avoided in order to ensure that disputes may be resolved efficiently, effectively and comprehensively, without the need to refer them to other arbitration institutions or centers, and without incurring delays through arguments over the competence of an arbitral tribunal or mediator to deal with matters that may not be characterized directly as "intellectual property matters."

How to Refer Disputes

There are two ways in which disputes may be referred to a procedure administered by the Center.

First, a clause may be inserted in a contract providing for all *future* disputes arising under that contract to be submitted to one of the procedures administered by the Center. Recommended contract clauses to this effect are included in the individual Sections below on each of the procedures administered by the Center.

The second way in which a dispute may be referred is by a submission agreement between the parties to an *existing* dispute that provides for that dispute to be submitted to a procedure administered by the Center. Recommended submission agreements for the reference of existing disputes are also included in the Sections below on each of the procedures administered by the Center.

The Center also provides advice to interested parties on the drafting of contract clauses and submission agreements.

IV. Good Offices: Submission Advisory Service

Purpose

Disputes arise not only in the context of an existing contractual relationship, such as the relationship between manufacturer and distributor or between licensor and licensee, but also between parties which do not stand in any existing contractual relationship. An alleged infringement of an intellectual property right is a typical example of a dispute which commonly occurs between parties which do not stand in a contractual relationship. In such cases, because of the absence of an existing contractual relationship, the communications between the parties may often be limited to formal communications setting out the alleged rights and liabilities of the parties in relation to the dispute. The resulting climate prevailing between the parties is more likely to lend itself to insistence on perceived rights and liabilities than to discussion of the various possible means of resolving the dispute.

In such situations, there may also be distinct advantages in seeking to resolve the dispute through a procedure other than court litigation. The aim of the Center's Submission Advisory Service is to provide an opportunity for parties to a dispute to consider the advantages of submitting the dispute to such a procedure. In order to provide this opportunity, the Center offers to perform the role of a neutral intermediary in seeking to bring the parties to a dispute together. It will, if the parties agree, preside over a meeting of the parties convened for the purpose of discussing the possible submission of the dispute to a procedure administered by the Center, and provide, in appropriate circumstances, assistance in drafting a submission agreement.

Method of Operation

The Center's Submission Advisory Service is open to anyone. While the Service may be expected to be particularly useful in respect of those disputes where the parties do not stand in a business relationship, the Service is equally open to parties to a dispute which does arise in the context of a business relationship. Such parties may wish to use the Service either because the contract defining the business relationship does not provide for a means of dispute-resolution, or because they wish to discuss the possibility of modifying the means that are provided in the contract.

The Service is entirely *informal*. No special application or request form is required. A party wishing to use the Service has simply to approach the WIPO Arbitration Center and to request it to endeavor to convene a meeting between the parties to the dispute. For that purpose, the party should provide the names and contact details of the parties to the dispute and, if applicable, their representatives, as well as a brief description of the dispute. That description is required merely for

the purpose of enabling the Center to identify with precision the dispute when communicating with the parties.

The Service is *confidential*. Any details supplied by the parties to the Center will be maintained in the strictest confidence and will not be communicated to any outside parties. No recording of any kind is made by the Center of any meeting.

Meetings between parties to a dispute that are arranged by the Center are *without prejudice* to the rights of the parties in relation to the subject matter of the dispute. Prior to such meetings, each party will be requested to sign an undertaking that it will not use any statements, disclosures or offers made at any such meeting in any other proceedings, whether relating to the dispute or not.

The Service is entirely *voluntary and non-binding*. This means that the party making the request to the Center may withdraw its request or withdraw from any ensuing negotiations at any stage that it wishes. Similarly, and naturally, the other party to the dispute is under no obligation whatsoever to cooperate in any way and may choose to ignore the request to take part in a meeting for the purpose of considering the possibility of submitting the dispute to a procedure administered by the Center.

The Center does not charge for the Service. However, if a meeting is, at the parties' request, scheduled to take place outside Geneva, the travel and subsistence expenses of the Center must be paid, in advance of the meeting, by the parties in equal shares (unless they agree on some other division of those costs between themselves).

Advantages

There are several advantages offered by the Service that parties may wish to consider in assessing whether to use it.

The first, and obvious, advantage is the provision of a neutral forum for informal communication between the parties when such a forum might not otherwise exist.

If a meeting of the parties takes place, the meeting provides the opportunity for the parties to consider the range of options available to them in resolving their dispute, designing the dispute-resolution procedure that is most suitable to the circumstances of the dispute, and setting up the steps that are to be followed in implementing that procedure.

The parties remain in complete control, since the Service is entirely voluntary and non-binding.

V. Mediation

Mediation: What It Is

Mediation, which is also known as conciliation, is a procedure in which a neutral intermediary, the mediator, is appointed in order to assist the parties to a dis-

pute in reaching a mutually satisfactory settlement of the dispute. Such a settlement, if reached, is then expressed in the form of an enforceable contractual agreement between the parties.

Mediation is a non-binding procedure in two senses. First, the mediator does not have any power to impose a settlement on the parties. Secondly, either party may, if it so chooses, abandon the mediation process at any stage prior to the signing of an agreed settlement. In order to be successful, therefore, mediation depends very much on the good faith commitment of the parties to exploring the possibility of a settlement, as well as on the skill of the mediator and the confidence that the mediator is able to inspire in the parties.

Because it is a non-confrontational procedure, mediation is often considered to be particularly suitable to disputes arising in the context of an existing business relationship. In those contexts, mediation offers the opportunity to reach a settlement that is conducive to the maintenance or further development of the business relationship.

Role of the Center

The role of the WIPO Arbitration Center in a mediation administered by it is defined in the WIPO Mediation Rules. Those Rules provide for the Center

- to receive the Request for Mediation which initiates the mediation process;
- to appoint the mediator, where the parties do not themselves do so and do not provide for another procedure for appointment;
- to determine, in consultation with the parties and the mediator, the fees of the mediator;
- to obtain from each party an advance deposit covering the estimated costs of the mediation, including the mediator's fees and the other envisaged expenses, to administer payments out of those deposits and to account to the parties at the end of the mediation in respect of the deposits. Interest accruing on deposits administered by the Center is credited to the parties.

In addition, the Center will, where so desired by the parties, provide meeting and party rooms and interpretation and secretarial assistance. Where the mediation takes place at WIPO, the meeting and party rooms are provided free of charge. A charge is made for any other services, such as interpretation or secretarial assistance, which is separate from the registration fee payable to the Center for the administration of a mediation.

Fees of the Center

The Center charges a registration fee which is calculated by reference to the value of the mediation. The basis of calculation of the registration fee is set out in the Schedule of Fees contained in Section X, below.

Mediator's Fees

The fees of the mediator are calculated on an hourly or daily rate. A range of minimum and maximum hourly and daily rates for mediator's fees is set out in the Schedule of Fees contained in Section X, below. The fees are fixed within the minimum and maximum rates by the Center, after consultation with the mediator and the parties, taking into account the amount in dispute, the complexity of the subject matter of the dispute and any other relevant circumstances. The Center also determines the currency of the fees and the modalities and timing of their payment.

Unless the parties agree otherwise, the mediator's fees, as well as the registration fee of the Center and all other expenses of the mediation, are payable in equal shares by the parties.

Recommended Contract Clause and Submission Agreement

In order to refer *future* disputes under a contract to mediation under the WIPO Mediation Rules, the following clause is recommended for insertion in the contract:

“Any dispute, controversy or claim arising under, out of or relating to this contract and any subsequent amendments of this contract, including, without limitation, its formation, validity, binding effect, interpretation, performance, breach or termination, as well as non-contractual claims, shall be submitted to mediation in accordance with the WIPO Mediation Rules. The place of mediation shall be ... The language to be used in the mediation shall be ...”

In order to refer an *existing* dispute to mediation under the WIPO Mediation Rules, the following submission agreement is recommended:

“We, the undersigned parties, hereby agree to submit to mediation in accordance with the WIPO Mediation Rules the following dispute:

[Brief description of the dispute]

“The place of mediation shall be... The language to be used in the mediation shall be...”

Venue of Mediation

It is for the parties to choose where they wish the mediation to take place. Mediations administered by the Center may take place anywhere in the world.

VI. Arbitration

Arbitration: What It Is

As opposed to mediation, which is the continuation of direct negotiations between the parties with the aid of a neutral intermediary, arbitration involves the adju-

dication of rights by a tribunal composed of one or several arbitrators (referred to in the following as “the Tribunal”), who have the power to render a decision that is binding on the parties.

The procedure followed by the Tribunal, the power of the Tribunal, the rights and obligations of the parties and the role of the WIPO Arbitration Center as administering authority are defined in the WIPO Arbitration Rules.

It is for the parties to choose whether there will be a sole arbitrator or several arbitrators. If they do not exercise a choice, the WIPO Arbitration Rules provide for a sole arbitrator, unless the circumstances of the case are such that the Center, in its discretion, determines that a Tribunal composed of three arbitrators is appropriate.

The parties also choose the language of the arbitration. If they do not do so, the WIPO Arbitration Rules provide that the language of the arbitration will be the language of the contract clause or submission agreement by virtue of which the dispute has been referred to arbitration under the WIPO Arbitration Rules, subject to a power on the part of the Tribunal to determine otherwise, in the light of any observations made by the parties and the circumstances of the arbitration.

The law applicable to the substance of the dispute is also chosen by the parties. Failing a designation on the part of the parties, the Tribunal is empowered under the WIPO Arbitration Rules to apply the law that it determines to be appropriate.

The decision rendered by the Tribunal in the form of an award is final and binding on the parties and not usually subject to an appeal on the merits to a court of law.

In the majority of cases of international commercial arbitration, the parties comply with the award without the need to seek court enforcement. Where court enforcement is necessary, the procedure is relatively straightforward by virtue of the 1958 New York Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards. Over 90 States are party to the New York Convention, which obliges contracting States to recognize and enforce foreign arbitral awards subject to a limited number of specified exceptions.

Role of the Center

The role of the Center as administering authority is, as mentioned above, set out in the WIPO Arbitration Rules. In general, the Center’s role extends to six main functions:

- (i) Upon the commencement of an arbitration, it is for the Center to ensure that the arbitral proceedings get under way smoothly and that the Tribunal is established as required. In particular, at this stage, the Center
 - processes the written statements and other communications by the parties up until the establishment of the Tribunal;

- appoints, in accordance with the provisions of the Rules, where the parties themselves do not do so or where an arbitrator is not appointed within the applicable time limit, the arbitrator;
 - determines the fees of the arbitrator.
- (ii) The Center monitors compliance with certain prescribed time limits. In particular, it has the power, under the Rules, to extend certain time limits. In addition, the Rules require the Tribunal to give a status report to the Center where the arbitration proceedings are not declared closed or the award is not rendered within certain designated time periods.
 - (iii) After the establishment of the Tribunal, the Center may be called upon to take certain decisions which it is either impossible or inappropriate for the Tribunal itself to take, notably decisions on the challenge, release or replacement of an arbitrator. Such decisions will be referred by the Center to an ad hoc committee of the WIPO Arbitration Consultative Commission for an opinion. The parties are notified of the composition of the committee of the WIPO Arbitration Consultative Commission to which the decision is referred for opinion.
 - (iv) The Center will, where the parties so desire, arrange for administrative support services for the arbitration, in the form of hearing rooms, retiring rooms for the parties, recording equipment, interpretation and secretarial assistance. Where the arbitration is held at WIPO, the hearing and party rooms are provided free of charge. A charge is made for the provision of other services, such as interpretation, translation or secretarial assistance, which is separate from the Center’s fees for administering the arbitration (see below).
 - (v) The Center requires the payment of an advance deposit from each party in respect of the costs of the arbitration, administers payments under those deposits and accounts to the parties on the deposits at the conclusion of the arbitration. Interest accruing on deposits administered by the Center is credited to the parties.
 - (vi) The Center processes the award rendered by the Tribunal.

Fees of the Center

Two kinds of fees are payable to the Center in respect of an arbitration administered by it.

The first is a registration fee, which is calculated by reference to the amount in dispute, and which is payable by the Claimant at the time of submitting the Request for Arbitration.

The second is an administration fee, again calculated by reference to the amount in dispute, which is payable in respect of the claim by the Claimant and in respect of any counterclaim by the Respondent.

The basis of calculation of the registration fee and the administration fee is set out in the Schedule of Fees contained in Section X.

As mentioned above, where the hearings are held at WIPO, the Center provides hearing and party rooms free of charge. For other administrative support services, such as interpretation or secretarial assistance, a separate charge from the registration fee and the administration fee is made.

Arbitrator's Fees

The Center is responsible for fixing the amount and currency of the fees of the arbitrator, and the modalities and timing of their payment, after consultation with the arbitrator and the parties.

For this purpose, the Schedule of Fees, which is contained in Section X, below, establishes minimum and maximum ranges for the fees of the arbitrator. Within the minimum and maximum ranges, the fees will be determined taking into account the estimated time needed by the arbitrator for conducting the arbitration, the amount in dispute, the complexity of the subject matter of the dispute, the urgency of the case and any other relevant circumstances.

Recommended Contract Clause and Submission Agreement

In order to refer *future* disputes under a contract to arbitration under the WIPO Arbitration Rules, the following clause is recommended for insertion in the contract:

“Any dispute, controversy or claim arising under, out of or relating to this contract and any subsequent amendments of this contract, including, without limitation, its formation, validity, binding effect, interpretation, performance, breach or termination, as well as non-contractual claims, shall be referred to and finally determined by arbitration in accordance with the WIPO Arbitration Rules. The arbitral tribunal shall consist of [three arbitrators][a sole arbitrator]. The place of arbitration shall be ... The language to be used in the arbitral proceedings shall be... The dispute, controversy or claim shall be decided in accordance with the law of ...”

In order to refer an *existing* dispute to arbitration under the WIPO Arbitration Rules, the following submission agreement is recommended:

“We, the undersigned parties, hereby agree that the following dispute shall be referred to and finally determined by arbitration in accordance with the WIPO Arbitration Rules:

[Brief description of the dispute]

“The arbitral tribunal shall consist of [three arbitrators][a sole arbitrator]. The place of arbitration shall be... The language to be used in the arbi-

tral proceedings shall be... The dispute shall be decided in accordance with the law of...”

Place of Arbitration

The place of arbitration usually determines the law that will apply to the arbitration, that is, the law that will regulate, in particular, the relationship between the arbitration proceedings and the extent to which the courts of the place of arbitration may or will entertain actions in relation to the arbitration.

Under the WIPO Arbitration Rules, it is for the parties to agree upon the place of the arbitration, which may be anywhere in the world. If the parties do not so agree, the Center decides the place of arbitration in the light of any observations made by the parties and the circumstances of the arbitration.

VII. Expedited Arbitration

Expedited Arbitration: What It Is

Expedited arbitration is the same as arbitration under the WIPO Arbitration Rules (referred to in the following as “conventional arbitration”), but with certain modifications introduced in order to ensure that the arbitration can be conducted in a shortened time frame and, consequently, at a reduced cost.

The principal modifications introduced in order to meet the objectives of reduced time and cost are:

- (i) Whereas in conventional arbitration the Claimant may file the Statement of Claim later and separately from the Request for Arbitration that initiates the arbitration, in an expedited arbitration the Statement of Claim must be filed by the Claimant *with* the Request for Arbitration. Similarly, the Respondent must file the Statement of Defense *with* the Answer to the Request.
- (ii) The time periods applicable in the case of an expedited arbitration for the accomplishment of various steps in the arbitration proceedings are shorter than in the case of a conventional arbitration.
- (iii) In an expedited arbitration, there is always a sole arbitrator.
- (iv) Any hearings before the arbitrator in an expedited arbitration are intended to be condensed and may not, save in exceptional circumstances, exceed three days.

Expedited arbitration is a procedure that may be particularly suitable for cases where the value in dispute is insufficiently large to justify recourse either to court litigation or to conventional arbitration. Similarly, it may be considered desirable by small enterprises, which cannot afford to commit the financial resources or management time that would be required by court litigation or conventional arbitration. In addition, where a result

is required urgently, expedited arbitration may be the appropriate procedure.

Role and Fees of the Center; Arbitrator's Fees

The role of the WIPO Arbitration Center in an expedited arbitration administered by it is defined in the WIPO Expedited Arbitration Rules. Since those Rules are the same as the WIPO Arbitration Rules, with the exception of the modifications introduced to ensure a quicker procedure, the Center's role is the same in an expedited arbitration as in a conventional arbitration (see Section VI, above).

Similarly, the types of fees payable to the Center in respect of an expedited arbitration are the same, and are calculated on the same basis, as the fees payable for a conventional arbitration.

The fees of the sole arbitrator in an expedited arbitration are also determined in the same way as the fees of the arbitrator in a conventional arbitration. Naturally, the urgency of the case will be a factor that may assume particular importance in determining the amount of the arbitrator's fees within the minimum and maximum ranges of arbitrator's fees set out in the Schedule of Fees contained in Section X, below.

Recommended Contract Clause and Submission Agreement

In order to refer *future* disputes under a contract to expedited arbitration under the WIPO Expedited Arbitration Rules, the following clause is recommended for insertion in the contract:

"Any dispute, controversy or claim arising under, out of or relating to this contract and any subsequent amendments of this contract, including, without limitation, its formation, validity, binding effect, interpretation, performance, breach or termination, as well as non-contractual claims, shall be referred to and finally determined by arbitration in accordance with the WIPO Expedited Arbitration Rules. The place of arbitration shall be... The language to be used in the arbitral proceedings shall be... The dispute, controversy or claim shall be decided in accordance with the law of..."

In order to refer an *existing* dispute to expedited arbitration under the WIPO Expedited Arbitration Rules, the following submission agreement is recommended:

"We, the undersigned parties, hereby agree that the following dispute shall be referred to and finally determined by arbitration in accordance with the WIPO Expedited Arbitration Rules:

[Brief description of the dispute]

"The place of arbitration shall be... The language to be used in the arbitral proceedings shall be ... The dispute shall be decided in accordance with the law of..."

VIII. Mediation Followed, in the Absence of a Settlement, by Arbitration

The Nature of the Combined Procedure

Mediation followed, in the absence of a settlement, by arbitration is a combined procedure. The dispute is submitted first to mediation under the WIPO Mediation Rules. Then, if a settlement is not reached within a defined period of time (it is recommended that the parties provide for either 60 or 90 days), or if a party refuses to participate or to continue to participate in the mediation, the dispute is referred for a binding decision through arbitration under the WIPO Arbitration Rules (or, if the parties so agree, through expedited arbitration).

The advantage of the combined procedure is the incentive that it offers for a good faith commitment by both parties to the mediation process, since the consequence of a failure to reach an agreed settlement will be more tangibly measurable in terms of the financial and management commitment that would need to be incurred in the subsequent arbitration procedure.

Role and Fees of the Center; Mediator's and Arbitrator's Fees

The role of the WIPO Arbitration Center is the same in each part of the combined procedure as described above in the Sections on mediation and arbitration.

The same fees are payable to the Center in respect of the mediation component as in a mediation under the WIPO Mediation Rules. Likewise, if the dispute proceeds to arbitration, the same fees are payable to the Center in respect of the arbitration component as in an arbitration under the WIPO Arbitration Rules, *except that* the Center will credit the registration fee paid for the mediation against the registration fee payable for the arbitration.

Similarly, the mediator's fees and the arbitrator's fees are determined in the same way as in a mediation under the WIPO Mediation Rules and an arbitration under the WIPO Arbitration Rules, respectively.

Recommended Contract Clause and Submission Agreement

In order to refer *future* disputes under a contract to the combined procedure, the following clause is recommended for insertion in the contract:

"Any dispute, controversy or claim arising under, out of or relating to this contract and any subsequent amendments of this contract, including, without limitation, its formation, validity, binding effect, interpretation, performance, breach or termination, as well as non-contractual claims, shall be submitted to mediation in accordance with the WIPO Mediation Rules. The place of mediation shall be... The language to be used in the mediation shall be..."

“If, and to the extent that, any such dispute, controversy or claim has not been settled pursuant to the mediation within [60][90] days of the commencement of the mediation, it shall, upon the filing of a Request for Arbitration by either party, be referred to and finally determined by arbitration in accordance with the WIPO Arbitration Rules. Alternatively, if, before the expiration of the said period of [60][90] days, either party fails to participate or to continue to participate in the mediation, the dispute, controversy or claim shall, upon the filing of a Request for Arbitration by the other party, be referred to and finally determined by arbitration in accordance with the WIPO Arbitration Rules. The arbitral tribunal shall consist of [three arbitrators][a sole arbitrator]. The place of arbitration shall be... The language to be used in the arbitral proceedings shall be... The dispute, controversy or claim referred to arbitration shall be decided in accordance with the law of...”

In order to refer an *existing* dispute to the combined procedure, the following submission agreement is recommended:

“We, the undersigned parties, hereby agree to submit to mediation in accordance with the WIPO Mediation Rules the following dispute:

[Brief description of the dispute]

“The place of mediation shall be... The language to be used in the mediation shall be...”

“We further agree that, if, and to the extent that, the dispute has not been settled pursuant to the mediation within [60][90] days of the commencement of the mediation, it shall, upon the filing of a Request for Arbitration by either party, be referred to and finally determined by arbitration in accordance with the WIPO Arbitration Rules. Alternatively, if, before the expiration of the said period of [60][90] days, either party fails to participate or to continue to participate in the mediation, the dispute shall, upon the filing of a Request for Arbitration by the other party, be referred to and finally determined by arbitration in accordance with the WIPO Arbitration Rules. The arbitral tribunal shall consist of [three arbitrators][a sole arbitrator]. The place of arbitration shall be... The language to be used in the arbitral proceedings shall be... The dispute referred to arbitration shall be decided in accordance with the law of...”

IX. Lists of WIPO Mediators and Arbitrators

The WIPO Arbitration Center maintains lists of persons who are specially qualified to act as mediators and arbitrators. The lists contain in respect of each such person information on the person’s experience and train-

ing in mediation and arbitration, as well as on the person’s specialized expertise in one or several of the various fields of intellectual property.

The lists are the primary source used by the Center when it is called upon to recommend to the parties, or to make appointments of, mediators or arbitrators.

There are two sorts of cases, which are described in the following paragraphs, in which the Center may be called upon to make appointments.

Appointments by the Center in Cases Administered by the Center

The WIPO Mediation Rules, the WIPO Arbitration Rules and the WIPO Expedited Arbitration Rules provide for the Center to appoint a mediator or arbitrator in certain circumstances in respect of mediations or arbitrations administered by the Center.

In the case of mediations, the *WIPO Mediation Rules* provide for the mediator to be appointed by the parties. However, where the parties do not themselves appoint the mediator, and do not specify another procedure for the appointment of the mediator, the mediator will be appointed by the Center. An appointment by the Center is made only after consultation with the parties.

In the case of conventional arbitrations, the *WIPO Arbitration Rules* contain detailed provisions on the manner in which arbitrators are to be appointed. Where there is a sole arbitrator, they provide for the parties to appoint the sole arbitrator jointly. Where there are three arbitrators, each party appoints one arbitrator and the two arbitrators so appointed jointly appoint the third, presiding arbitrator. Where the parties themselves fail to exercise a right to make an appointment within a designated time period, or where the presiding arbitrator is not appointed within the applicable period of time, the appointment is made by the Center.

In cases where the Center is called upon to make an appointment of a sole or presiding arbitrator, the WIPO Arbitration Rules provide for the Center to send a list of identical names of prospective arbitrators to each of the parties for them to indicate any objections and to express preferences in relation to the prospective arbitrators on the lists. Details of the professional experience, qualifications and training of the prospective arbitrators on the list are sent with the list. The prospective arbitrator who receives the highest preference on the marked lists returned by the parties will, assuming availability and the absence of any disqualifying circumstances, be appointed by the Center.

In the case of expedited arbitrations, the *WIPO Expedited Arbitration Rules* provide for the parties to appoint jointly the sole arbitrator. Where they do not do so within the designated time period, the Center appoints the sole arbitrator. In view of the emphasis on a quicker procedure, it does not send a list of prospective arbitrators to the parties, but makes the appointment in the exercise of its discretion.

Appointments by the Center in Cases Not Administered by the Center

The Center will also, at the request of parties to a dispute, and against payment of a fee, appoint a mediator or an arbitrator for mediations or arbitrations that are not administered by it (such as ad hoc mediations or arbitrations or mediations or arbitrations administered by another institution). The amount of the fee charged for this service is set out in the Schedule of Fees contained in Section X.

X. Schedule of Fees

(All amounts are in United States dollars)

MEDIATION

Fees of the Center

Registration Fee (Article 21, WIPO Mediation Rules)

1. The amount of the registration fee shall be 0.1% of the value of the mediation, subject to a maximum registration fee of \$10,000. By way of example, the following registration fees would be payable where the value of the mediation is the following amounts:

<i>Value of Mediation</i>	<i>Registration Fee</i>
\$500,000	\$500
\$1,000,000	\$1,000
\$5,000,000	\$5,000
\$10,000,000 and above	\$10,000

2. The value of the mediation is determined by the total value of amounts claimed.

3. Where the Request for Mediation does not indicate any claims for a monetary amount or the dispute concerns issues that are not quantifiable in monetary amounts, a registration fee of \$750 shall be payable, subject to adjustment. The adjustment shall be made by reference to the registration fee that the Center, after consultation with the parties and the mediator, determines in its discretion to be appropriate in the circumstances.

4. Any monetary amounts in dispute expressed in currencies other than United States dollars shall, for the purposes of calculating the registration fee, be converted to amounts expressed in United States dollars on the basis of the official United Nations exchange rate prevailing on the date of submission of the Request for Mediation.

Mediators' Fees

Indicative Hourly and Daily Rates (Article 22, WIPO Mediation Rules)

	<i>Minimum</i>	<i>Maximum</i>
Per hour	\$300	\$600
Per day	\$1,500	\$3,500

ARBITRATION

Fees of the Center

I. Registration Fee (Article 67, WIPO Arbitration Rules)

<i>Amount of Claim</i>	<i>Registration Fee</i>
Up to \$1,000,000	\$1,000
\$1,000,001 to \$10,000,000	\$2,000
Over \$10,000,000	\$3,000

Notes

1. Where the amount of the claim is not specified at the time of submitting the Request for Arbitration, a registration fee of \$1,000 shall be payable, subject to adjustment when the Statement of Claim is filed.

2. Where a claim is not for a monetary amount, a registration fee of \$1,000 shall be payable, subject to adjustment. The adjustment shall be made by reference to the registration fee that the Center, upon examination of the Request for Arbitration or the Statement of Claim, determines to be appropriate in the circumstances.

3. The amount of claims expressed in currencies other than United States dollars shall, for the purposes of calculating the registration fee, be converted to amounts expressed in United States dollars on the basis of the official United Nations exchange rate prevailing on the date of submission of the Request for Arbitration.

II. Administration Fee (Article 68, WIPO Arbitration Rules)

<i>Amount of Claim or Counterclaim</i>	<i>Administration Fee</i>
Up to \$100,000	\$1,000
\$100,001 to \$1,000,000	\$1,000 + 0.40% (of the amount above \$100,000)
\$1,000,001 to \$5,000,000	\$4,600 + 0.20% (of the amount above \$1,000,000)
\$5,000,001 to \$20,000,000	\$12,600 + 0.10% (of the amount above \$5,000,000)
Over \$20,000,000	\$27,600 + 0.05% (of the amount above \$20,000,000 up to a <i>maximum</i> administration fee of \$35,000)

Notes

1. Where a claim or counterclaim is not for a monetary amount, the Center shall determine an appropriate administration fee.

2. For the purpose of calculating the administration fee, the percentage figures are applied to each successive part of the amount of claim or counterclaim. For example, if the amount of claim is \$5,000,000, the administration fee would be calculated as follows:

\$100,000		\$1,000
\$900,000 (difference between \$100,000 and \$1,000,000)	0.40%	\$3,600
\$4,000,000 (difference between \$1,000,000 and \$5,000,000)	0.20%	\$8,000
<u>\$5,000,000</u>		<u>\$12,600</u>

3. The maximum administration fee payable is \$35,000.

4. The amounts of claims or counterclaims expressed in currencies other than United States dollars shall, for the purposes of calculating the administration fee, be converted to amounts expressed in United States dollars on the basis of the official United Nations exchange rate prevailing on the date of submission of the claim or of the counterclaim, respectively.

Arbitrators' Fees

(See Table, page 438)

Notes

1. For the purpose of calculating the amount of claims, the value of any counterclaim is added to the amount of the claim.

2. For the purpose of calculating the minimum and maximum amounts of the arbitrators' fees, the percentage figures are applied to each successive part of the whole amount of claims. For example, if the amount of claim is \$1,500,000, the minimum fees for a sole arbitrator would be calculated as follows:

\$100,000		\$2,000
\$400,000 (difference between \$100,000 and \$500,000)	2.00%	\$8,000
\$500,000 (difference between \$500,000 and \$1,000,000)	1.50%	\$7,500
\$500,000 (difference between \$1,000,000 and \$1,500,000)	1.00%	\$5,000
<u>\$1,500,000</u>		<u>\$22,500</u>

3. Where a claim or counterclaim is not for a monetary amount, the Center shall, in consultation with the arbitrators and the parties, determine an appropriate value for the claim or counterclaim for the purpose of determining the arbitrators' fees.

4. The amounts of claims or counterclaims expressed in currencies other than United States dollars shall, for the purpose of determining the arbitrators' fees, be converted to amounts expressed in United States dollars on the basis of the official United Nations exchange rate prevailing on the date of submission of the claim or of the counterclaim, respectively.

5. The amounts and percentage figures specified in the Table for a three-person Tribunal represent the total fees payable to such a Tribunal, and not the fees payable to each arbitrator. Such fees shall be distributed between the three persons in accordance with the unanimous decision of those three persons. In the absence of such a decision, the distribution shall be 40% for the presiding arbitrator, and 30% for each of the other two arbitrators.

6. Where, by the agreement of the parties, a number of arbitrators other than one or three is appointed to a Tribunal, the scale of minimum and maximum fees for the Tribunal in question shall be determined by the Center. That scale shall be so determined by multiply-

ing the scale for a sole arbitrator by the number of arbitrators reduced by a factor that takes account of the sharing of work and responsibility among the arbitrators.

EXPEDITED ARBITRATION

The fees of the Center are the same as for an arbitration under the WIPO Arbitration Rules.

The arbitrator's fees are determined in the same way as the fees of an arbitrator in an arbitration under the WIPO Arbitration Rules.

MEDIATION FOLLOWED, IN THE ABSENCE OF A SETTLEMENT, BY ARBITRATION

The fees payable to the Center in respect of the mediation component are those payable for a mediation under the WIPO Mediation Rules. If the dispute proceeds to arbitration, the fees payable in respect of the arbitration are those payable for an arbitration under the WIPO Arbitration Rules *EXCEPT THAT* the Center will credit the registration fee paid for the mediation (up to a maximum amount of \$3,000) against the registration fee payable for the arbitration.

The fees of the mediator are determined in the same way as the fees of the mediator in a mediation under the WIPO Mediation Rules. Likewise, if the dispute proceeds to arbitration, the arbitrator's fees are determined in the same way as the fees of an arbitrator in an arbitration under the WIPO Arbitration Rules.

APPOINTMENT OF MEDIATORS OR ARBITRATORS IN CASES NOT ADMINISTERED BY THE CENTER

For each request to appoint a mediator or an arbitrator, a fee of \$750 is payable to the Center.

Notes

1. The fee of \$750 is payable by the party requesting the Center to appoint the mediator or the arbitrator.

2. No action will be taken by the Center on a request to appoint a mediator or an arbitrator until the fee of \$750 has been paid.

3. The fee of \$750 covers any related services to be rendered by the Center in connection with the appointment, such as a decision on a challenge or replacement of an arbitrator.

XI. Conferences and Training Programs

The WIPO Arbitration Center organizes both conferences on particular themes relating to mediation, arbitration and the resolution of intellectual property disputes, and training programs designed specifically for mediators or arbitrators or those wishing to receive training as mediators or arbitrators.

Conferences

Conferences are designed for large audiences and are intended to illustrate the advantages, opportunities and limitations of particular dispute-resolution procedures, or to provide an occasion for a detailed examination of a particular theme.

Training Programs

Training programs are designed for a limited number of participants and are intended to teach skills for, and to provide detailed insight into, mediation or arbitration, particularly under the WIPO Mediation Rules and the WIPO Arbitration Rules.

Details of planned conferences and training programs are available from the Center.

XII. Further Information and Documentation

The following publications are available in the following languages:

WIPO Arbitration Center: Introductory Information, English, French, Spanish, free of charge.

WIPO Mediation, Arbitration and Expedited Arbitration Rules and Recommended Contract Clauses and Submission Agreements, English, French, Spanish, free of charge.

Proceedings of the Worldwide Forum on the Arbitration of Intellectual Property Disputes organized jointly by WIPO and the American Arbitration Association (AAA), Geneva, March 3 and 4, 1994, English, French, 30 Swiss francs.

The above-mentioned publications and further information may be obtained from:

WIPO Arbitration Center
Director: Francis Gurry
34, chemin des Colombettes
1211 Geneva 20
Switzerland

Telephone: (41-22) 730 91 11
Facsimile: (41-22) 733 54 28 (WIPO)
(41-22) 740 37 00 (Direct to Center).

Arbitrators' Fees

(Article 69, WIPO Arbitration Rules)

Amount of Claims	Fees			
	Minimum		Maximum	
	Sole Arbitrator	Three-person Tribunal	Sole Arbitrator	Three-person Tribunal
Up to \$100,00	\$2,000	\$5,000	10.00%	25.00%
\$100,001 to \$500,000	\$2,000 + 2.00% (of the amount above \$100,000)	\$5,000 + 5.00% (of the amount above \$100,000)	\$10,000 + 4.00% (of the amount above \$100,000)	\$25,000 + 10.00% (of the amount above \$100,000)
\$500,001 to \$1,000,000	\$10,000 + 1.50% (of the amount above \$500,000)	\$25,000 + 3.75% (of the amount above \$500,000)	\$26,000 + 3.50% (of the amount above \$500,000)	\$65,000 + 8.75% (of the amount above \$500,000)
\$1,000,001 to \$2,000,000	\$17,500 + 1.00% (of the amount above \$1,000,000)	\$43,750 + 2.50% (of the amount above \$1,000,000)	\$43,500 + 2.00% (of the amount above \$1,000,000)	\$108,750 + 5.00% (of the amount above \$1,000,000)
\$2,000,001 to \$5,000,000	\$27,500 + 0.75% (of the amount above \$2,000,000)	\$68,750 + 1.90% (of the amount above \$2,000,000)	\$63,500 + 1.50% (of the amount above \$2,000,000)	\$158,750 + 3.75% (of the amount above \$2,000,000)
\$5,000,001 to \$10,000,000	\$50,000 + 0.50% (of the amount above \$5,000,000)	\$125,750 + 1.25% (of the amount above \$5,000,000)	\$108,500 + 1.00% (of the amount above \$5,000,000)	\$271,250 + 2.50% (of the amount above \$5,000,000)
\$10,000,001 to \$25,000,000	\$75,000 + 0.30% (of the amount above \$10,000,000)	\$188,250 + 0.75% (of the amount above \$10,000,000)	\$158,500 + 1.00% (of the amount above \$10,000,000)	\$396,250 + 2.50% (of the amount above \$10,000,000)
Over \$25,000,000	\$120,000 + 0.25% (of the amount above \$25,000,000)	\$300,750 + 0.65% (of the amount above \$25,000,000)	\$308,500 + 1.00% (of the amount above \$25,000,000)	\$771,250 + 2.50% (of the amount above \$25,000,000)

Registration Systems Administered by WIPO

Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT)

Training and Promotion Meetings With PCT Users

In September 1994, on the occasion of their participation in the sessions of the Governing Bodies of WIPO held in Geneva, officials from Australia, Bulgaria, Finland, Iceland, Japan, Kyrgyzstan, Malaysia, Mexico, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sri Lanka, Sweden, the United States of America and Zimbabwe had discussions at WIPO headquarters as follows:

Australia. Mr. Andrew A. Bain, Director General, Australian Industrial Property Organisation (AIPO), had discussions with WIPO officials on the possible further training of Chinese examiners in the administrative procedures under the PCT at the said Organisation.

Bulgaria. Mr. Kristo Iliev, President of the Patent Office, had discussions with WIPO officials on the conversion of inventors' certificates into patents and utility models in connection with the implementation of the PCT in Bulgaria.

Finland. Two government officials had discussions with WIPO officials on certain practical questions under the PCT.

Iceland. Mr. Gunnar Guttormsson, Director of the Icelandic Patent Office, had discussions with WIPO officials on the Icelandic industrial property legislation, more particularly, on amendments to the patent legislation which would be required in view of Iceland's possible accession to the PCT.

Japan. Mr. Akira Takashima, Commissioner, Japanese Patent Office (JPO), had discussions with the Director General and other WIPO officials on, *inter alia*, PCT matters. A government official had discussions with WIPO officials on the implementation and use of the PCT in Japan.

Kyrgyzstan. Mr. Roman O. Omorov, Head of the Patent Department of the State Committee on Science and New Technologies, had discussions with WIPO officials on the possible organization of a seminar on the PCT and the Madrid Agreement

Concerning the International Registration of Marks for participants from Central Asia, in Bishkek in July 1995.

Malaysia. Two government officials had discussions with WIPO officials on the organization of a possible WIPO mission to Malaysia on PCT matters.

Mexico. Two government officials had discussions with WIPO officials on Mexico's preparations for its accession to the PCT, the need for training government officials and the possible holding of a seminar on the PCT in Mexico.

Slovakia. A government official had discussions with WIPO officials on PCT matters.

Slovenia. Mr. Bojan Pretnar, Director of the Industrial Property Protection Office, and another government official had discussions with WIPO officials on PCT matters.

Sri Lanka. A government official had discussions with WIPO officials on PCT matters.

Sweden. A government official had discussions with WIPO officials on PCT matters.

United States of America. Two government officials had discussions with WIPO officials on PCT issues, in particular the possibility of the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) undertaking international search and international preliminary examination in Spanish for actual and potential PCT member States in Latin America.

Zimbabwe. Mr. Naboth Mvere, Controller of Patents, Trade Marks and Industrial Designs, had discussions with WIPO officials on PCT matters, Zimbabwe's possible accession to the PCT and WIPO's assistance in the training of national government officials.

* * *

Germany. In September 1994, three WIPO officials conducted a PCT colloquium for advanced PCT users organized by Institut für Management Forum,

an enterprise in Germany, at Prien am Chiemsee. There were 25 participants, mainly patent attorneys and heads of patent departments of industry.

Also in September 1994, two WIPO officials conducted an advanced PCT seminar for patent administrators, organized by the same enterprise at Prien am Chiemsee, for 17 participants from law firms and industry.

Pacific Industrial Property Association (PIPA). In September 1994, two representatives from PIPA had discussions with WIPO officials in Geneva on the advantages of the PCT.

Computerization Activities

EASY (Electronic Application SYstem) Project. In late August 1994, a WIPO official and a WIPO

consultant from the Netherlands had discussions with USPTO officials in Washington, D.C., on the progress of the EASY project.

Later in the same month, the same WIPO official had discussions in The Hague with officials of the European Patent Office (EPO) and the USPTO also on the progress of the said project.

United States of America. In September 1994, a government official had discussions with WIPO officials in Geneva on the possible development, by the USPTO, of a system similar to WIPO's DICAPS (Document Imaging and Computer-Assisted Publication System) system for the purpose of publishing national patent applications.

Madrid Union

Training and Promotion Meetings With Users of the Madrid System

Poland. In September 1994, on the occasion of his participation in the sessions of the Governing Bodies of WIPO held in Geneva, Mr. Wiesław

Kotarba, President of the Patent Office, had discussions with WIPO officials on issues raised by Article 14(2) (limitation of the application of the Stockholm Act (1967) to marks registered after the date on which that Act entered into force in respect of Poland) of the Madrid Agreement.

Hague Union

Training and Promotion Meetings With Users of the Hague System

In September 1994, on the occasion of their participation in the sessions of the Governing Bodies of WIPO held in Geneva, officials from Slovenia and the Benelux Trademark Office (BBM) had discussions at WIPO headquarters as follows:

Slovenia. A government official had discussions with WIPO officials on WIPO's possible cooperation in the training of government officials in the administrative procedures under the Hague Agreement Concerning the International Deposit of Industrial Designs and cooperation in the organization of a seminar on the said Agreement in Ljubljana.

Benelux Trademark Office (BBM). Mr. Pierre J.V. Rome, Director of BBM, had discussions with WIPO officials in Geneva on BBM's project for a designs data base intended to contain also the international designs having effect in the Benelux countries.

United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL). In September 1994, a UNCITRAL official had discussions with WIPO officials in Geneva on WIPO's international registration systems for marks and industrial designs.

Computerization Activities

Baltic States and Central and Eastern European Countries. In September 1994, a WIPO official attended, as an observer, discussions held in Paris between officials of the EPO and the National Institute of Industrial Property (INPI) (France) on the possibility of developing, on the basis of WIPO's ROMARIN (Read-Only Memory of Madrid Actualized Registry Information) CD-ROM, and under the name ROMARIN-TRACES, a common CD-ROM containing the national trademark registers of the Baltic States and Central and Eastern European countries.

* * *

* * *

Also in September, 1994, on the occasion of their participation in the sessions of the Governing Bodies

of WIPO held in Geneva, officials from Slovenia and the Office for Harmonization in the Internal Market (Trade Marks and Designs) (OHIM) had discussions at WIPO headquarters on the following subjects:

Slovenia. Mr. Bojan Pretnar, Director of the Industrial Property Protection Office, had discussions with WIPO officials on the possibility of including

Slovenian trademarks in the ROMARIN-TRACES project.

Office for Harmonization in the Internal Market (Trade Marks and Designs) (OHIM). Mr. Jean-Claude Combaldieu, President of OHIM, had discussions with WIPO officials on WIPO's computerized systems in the field of trademarks and their development with a view to possible cooperation between WIPO and OHIM in that respect.

Activities of WIPO in the Field of Industrial Property Specially Designed for Developing Countries

Africa

Assistance With Training, Legislation and Modernization of Administration

In September 1994, on the occasion of their participation in the sessions of the Governing Bodies of WIPO held in Geneva, officials from Burkina Faso, the Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Gabon, Guinea, Kenya, Madagascar, Swaziland, the African Intellectual Property Organization (OAPI) and the African Regional Industrial Property Organization (ARIPO) had discussions at WIPO headquarters as follows:

Burkina Faso. Mrs. Marie Blanche Bado, Director, Industrial and Commercial Promotion, Directorate of Industrial Development, held discussions with WIPO officials on matters of mutual interest and, in particular, the functioning of the CD-ROM equipment offered by WIPO to the said Directorate.

Congo. Mr. Pascal Ndinga, Director of the National Industrial Property Unit, held discussions with WIPO officials on intellectual property training possibilities in the Congo.

Côte d'Ivoire. Mr. Abdoulaye Touré, Director, Directorate of Industrial Technology, held discussions with WIPO officials on WIPO's possible support in industrial property training.

Gabon. Mr. Malem Tidzani, Director General, Directorate General of Industry, held discussions with WIPO officials on Gabon's recent accession to the Madrid Agreement Concerning the International Registration of Marks, on computerization in the field of industrial property at the national level and on the training of Gabonese officials.

Guinea. Mr. Faouly Bangoura, Head of the Industrial Property Service, held discussions with WIPO officials on Guinea's possible accession to further WIPO-administered treaties, in particular the Madrid Agreement and the Hague Agreement Concerning the International Deposit of Industrial Designs.

Kenya. Professor Norah K. Olembo, Director of the Kenya Industrial Property Office (KIPO), held discussions with WIPO officials on preparations for the WIPO Workshop on Patent Agency to be held in

Nairobi in November 1994 and on amendments to the Kenya patent regulations in order to align them with the provisions of the Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT).

Madagascar. Mr. Maurice Ratovonjanahary, Director General of the Malagasy Industrial Property Office, held discussions with WIPO officials on matters of mutual cooperation and certain questions related to the PCT.

Swaziland. Mr. Paul M. Shabangu, Principal Secretary, Ministry of Justice, and another government official held discussions with the Director General and other WIPO officials on cooperation between Swaziland and WIPO, including long-term training in the field of intellectual property.

African Intellectual Property Organization (OAPI). Mr. Albert Makita-Mbamba, *administrateur délégué* of OAPI, and another OAPI official held

discussions with WIPO officials concerning possible cooperation between the two Organizations.

African Regional Industrial Property Organization (ARIPO). Mr. Anderson Ray Zikonda, Director General of ARIPO, held discussions with WIPO officials on cooperation between the two Organizations and, in particular, on WIPO's representation at the 18th session of the ARIPO Administrative Council to be held in Kampala in November 1994 and the preparations for the seminar to be organized on that occasion.

* * *

Eritrea. In September 1994, WIPO organized a special briefing on international industrial property and copyright issues, with particular emphasis on WIPO's development cooperation activities, for 13 senior trade officials from Eritrea.

Arab Countries

Assistance With Training, Legislation and Modernization of Administration

In September 1994, on the occasion of their participation in the sessions of the Governing Bodies of WIPO held in Geneva, officials from Algeria, Egypt, Sudan and Tunisia had discussions at WIPO headquarters as follows:

Algeria. Mr. Djenidi Bendaoud, Director General of the Algerian Institute for Standardization and Industrial Property (INAPI), had discussions with WIPO officials on WIPO's assistance in modernizing INAPI's operations and in training its staff.

Egypt. Mr. Fattouh Abdel Gelil Hamed, President, Patent Office, Academy of Scientific Research and Technology (ASRT), discussed with WIPO officials Egypt's possible accession to the PCT, the organization of a PCT seminar in Cairo during the first

quarter of 1995 and future cooperation between his country and WIPO.

Sudan. Mr. Abd Elrahman Ahmed Ibrahim, Commercial Registrar General, discussed with WIPO officials future cooperation between his country and WIPO.

Tunisia. Mr. Mokhtar Hamdi, Head of the Industrial Property Department of the National Institute for Standardization and Industrial Property (INNORPI), requested WIPO's assistance in training the staff of the said Department in the use of CD-ROMs.

* * *

United Arab Emirates. In September 1994, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Resident Representative visited WIPO and discussed with WIPO officials the strengthening of the industrial property system in the United Arab Emirates.

Asia and the Pacific

Training Courses, Seminars and Meetings

WIPO Asian Workshop on the Use, Management and Enforcement of Industrial Property Rights for Small and Medium Enterprises (India). From

September 27 to 29, 1994, WIPO organized that Workshop in New Delhi, in cooperation with the Government of India and the Confederation of Indian Industry (CII). It was the first part of the WIPO Asian Roving Workshops under the same title, which

were organized successively in Colombo and Hanoi at the beginning of October 1994. The Workshop held in New Delhi consisted of two parts, i.e., presentations of papers on the first day, and consultations between WIPO experts and representatives of local small and medium enterprises on the second and third days. It was attended by 58 representatives of small and medium enterprises as well as government officials. A WIPO official and two WIPO consultants from the United Kingdom and the United States of America made presentations in the first part. In the second part, they conducted consultations with some 20 representatives from nine small and medium enterprises. This activity was financed under the UNDP regional project.

WIPO National Roving Workshop on the Use, Management and Enforcement of Industrial Property Rights in Small and Medium Enterprises (India). In late September and early October 1994, WIPO organized that Workshop in cooperation with the Department of Industrial Development of the Government of India and the CII in New Delhi, Hyderabad, Madras, Pune and Indore. There were some 250 participants in total, most of them coming from small and medium enterprises. Two WIPO consultants from the United Kingdom and an expert provided by the Government of India made presentations in each city. A WIPO official also attended the Workshop in New Delhi. The Workshop was held under the UNDP-financed country project "Modernization of the Patent Information System (PIS), Nagpur."

WIPO/Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) Subregional Round Table on Comparative Intellectual Property Systems in the ASEAN Member Countries (Indonesia). From September 14 to 16, 1994, WIPO organized that Round Table in Jakarta, in cooperation with the Secretariat of ASEAN and the Government of Indonesia. The Round Table was attended by 13 government officials and representatives from the private sector from Brunei Darussalam, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore and Thailand and 27 participants from Indonesia. Three WIPO officials and a WIPO consultant from the United Kingdom attended the Round Table and made presentations. Presentations were also made by participants from Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore and an official of the ASEAN Secretariat. A representative from the ASEAN-Geneva Committee also participated in the Round Table and made a presentation. The Round Table was organized under the European Commission (EC)-ASEAN Patents and Trademarks Program.

China. In September 1994, at the invitation of the Government of China, a WIPO official represented WIPO at the inaugural ceremony of the China

Trademark Association (CTA), held in Beijing. On that occasion, he also held discussions with Chinese government officials on cooperation between China and WIPO.

Assistance With Training, Legislation and Modernization of Administration

In September 1994, on the occasion of their participation in the sessions of the Governing Bodies of WIPO held in Geneva, officials from China, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Malaysia, Mongolia, the Republic of Korea, Sri Lanka and Viet Nam had discussions at WIPO headquarters as follows:

China. Mr. Gao Lulin, Director General of the Chinese Patent Office (CPO), had discussions with the Director General and other WIPO officials on future cooperation, including the use of Chinese experts in PCT seminars to be organized for Asian countries.

Two government officials had discussions with WIPO officials on the preparatory work undertaken by the CPO for China's accession to the Strasbourg Agreement Concerning the International Patent Classification and the Locarno Agreement Establishing an International Classification for Industrial Designs. In particular, they received detailed information on the rights and obligations under those Agreements.

India. A government official held discussions with WIPO officials on matters of mutual cooperation.

Indonesia. Mr. Nico Kansil, Director General of Copyrights, Patents and Trademarks, had discussions with WIPO officials on matters of mutual cooperation for the remainder of 1994 and for 1995 and Indonesia's possible accession to the PCT.

Iran (Islamic Republic of). Mr. Syed Reza Zavareie, Deputy Head of the Judiciary and Head of the Registration Organization of Deeds, Intellectual and Industrial Property, and two other government officials had discussions with the Director General and other WIPO officials on the UNDP-financed country project and its possible extension.

Malaysia. Mr. Datuk Samsudin bin Osman, Secretary General, Ministry of Domestic Trade and Consumer Affairs, and another government official had discussions with the Director General and other WIPO officials on matters of mutual interest, in particular WIPO's assistance in the patent and trademark fields.

Mongolia. Mr. Damdinsurengiin Demberel, Director of the Mongolian Patent Office, and another government official had discussions with WIPO officials on future cooperation and the possibility of organizing an industrial property seminar in Ulaanbataar in 1995.

Republic of Korea. Mr. Kwang-Koo Ahn, Commissioner, Korean Industrial Property Office (KIPO), and another government official held discussions with the Director General and other WIPO officials on various cooperation activities which could be carried out in 1995.

Sri Lanka. A government official had discussions with WIPO officials on the possibility of a UNDP-financed country project to upgrade the industrial property administration.

Viet Nam. Mr. Doan Phuong, Director General of the National Office of Industrial Property (NOIP), held discussions with WIPO officials on ongoing industrial property activities in Viet Nam.

* * *

India. In September 1994, two government officials undertook a study visit on trademark administration to the Benelux Trademark Office (BBM) in Luxembourg and to WIPO in Geneva. The study visit was organized under the UNDP-financed country project "Modernization of the Administration and More Effective Use of Trade Marks in India."

Indonesia. In September 1994, three WIPO officials had discussions with government officials in

Jakarta on the revision of the national intellectual property legislation.

Also in the same month, three government officials undertook a study visit on trademark administration to BBM in Luxembourg and to WIPO in Geneva. The study visit was organized under the UNDP-financed country project.

From mid-September to mid-October 1994, a WIPO consultant from Switzerland undertook a one-month mission to Jakarta to advise on curriculum development and intellectual property teaching in universities. This activity was organized under the UNDP-financed country project.

Malaysia. In September 1994, two government officials undertook a study visit to the Australian Industrial Property Organisation (AIPO) in Canberra and Melbourne. The study visit was undertaken under the UNDP-financed country project.

Viet Nam. In September 1994, a government official visited WIPO and held discussions with WIPO officials on intellectual property activities in favor of small- and medium-size enterprises.

Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN). In September 1994, further to the Second WIPO-ASEAN Consultation Meeting held in June 1994, the Director General of WIPO met with the ASEAN-Geneva Committee and discussed future WIPO activities of common interest. The said Committee is composed of the Permanent Representatives of the six ASEAN member countries: Brunei Darussalam, Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand. Four other WIPO officials participated in the meeting.

Latin America and the Caribbean

Training Courses, Seminars and Meetings

WIPO Regional Seminar on Technological Innovation and Industrial Property (Chile). On September 20 and 21, 1994, WIPO organized that Seminar in Santiago, in cooperation with the Government of Chile and the assistance of the Government of France. The Seminar was attended by some 180 government officials, private legal practitioners and representatives from research centers and universities, of which 10 participants came from Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Peru and Uruguay and the others from Chile. Two WIPO officials, four WIPO consultants from France and the United States of America, as well as four experts from Chile, made presentations.

WIPO National Seminar on Industrial Property for Judges and Magistrates (Uruguay). From September 15 to 17, 1994, WIPO and the Government of Uruguay organized that Seminar in Montevideo, with the support of the Supreme Court of Justice and the Center for Judicial Studies of Uruguay. It was attended by 108 government officials, judges and magistrates, lawyers, industrial property agents and university professors. A WIPO official and a WIPO consultant from Spain, as well as seven Uruguayan experts, made presentations. This activity was undertaken under the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB)-financed country project.

WIPO National Seminar on the Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT) (Argentina). On September 19, 1994, WIPO and the Government of Argentina jointly organized that Seminar in Buenos Aires. It was attended by more than 140 government officials and private practitioners. Two WIPO officials and a WIPO consultant from the United States of America made presentations.

Assistance With Training, Legislation and Modernization of Administration

Brazil. In September 1994, on the occasion of his participation in the sessions of the Governing Bodies of WIPO held in Geneva, Mr. Benedito Fonseca de Souza Adeodato, President of the National Institute of Industrial Property (INPI), had discussions with WIPO officials on a possible computerization cooperation project between WIPO and INPI.

Uruguay. In September 1994, a WIPO official and a WIPO consultant from Chile undertook a mission to Montevideo to provide advice to the National Directorate of Industrial Property on the production of a CD-ROM containing the bibliographic data and images of trademarks registered in Uruguay. The mission was financed by the UNDP-financed regional project and the IDB-financed country project.

Venezuela. In September 1994, a WIPO official undertook a mission to the Industrial Property Registry (SARPI) in Caracas to provide advice on computerization in the field of trademarks, and specifically on the production of a CD-ROM containing bibliographic data and images of the trademarks registered in Venezuela.

Permanent Secretariat of the General Treaty on Central American Economic Integration (SIECA). In September 1994, two WIPO officials participated in the Special Meeting of Heads of Industrial Property Offices in the countries of the Central American Isthmus and a Meeting of the Vice Ministers Responsible for Industrial Property in the Central American Isthmus held in San José. Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua and Panama were represented by government officials. The purpose of the Meeting of Industrial Property Heads was to finalize the draft Protocol of Amendment of the 1968 Central American Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property (Marks, Trade Names and Advertising Slogans and Signs). The Protocol was then approved by the Vice Ministers. It will be submitted later, for formal approval, to the Conference of Plenipotentiaries and thereafter to the legislators of the respective countries for ratification.

Development Cooperation (in General)

Training Courses, Seminars and Meetings

WIPO Seminar on Technical Information as an Aid to Industrial Development: Patent Documents (The Hague). In September 1994, 17 government officials attended that Seminar organized, in English and French, jointly by WIPO and the European Patent Office (EPO) in The Hague. The participants came from Algeria, Argentina, Benin, Guinea, Guyana, Indonesia, Malaysia, Mexico, Niger, the Philippines, Thailand, Togo, Viet Nam, Zambia and Hong Kong. The travel and subsistence costs of 14 of the participants were funded by the EPO. Presentations were made by EPO officials, officials of Member States of the EPO, representatives of private enterprises in the Netherlands and two WIPO officials.

WIPO Specialized Training Course on Patent Examination for Government Officials of Developing Countries (The Hague). In September 1994, 11 government officials attended that Course organized, in English, in The Hague by WIPO and the Bureau for Industrial Property—Patent Office (*Octrooiraad*) of the Netherlands, with the assistance of the Govern-

ment of the Netherlands. The participants came from Brazil, China, Egypt, Indonesia, Mongolia, Pakistan, the Philippines, Thailand and Venezuela. The expenses incurred by the participants were partly funded by the Netherlands and UNDP. Presentations were made by officials of the *Octrooiraad* and a WIPO official.

WIPO Specialized Training Course on the Legal and Administrative Aspects of Trademarks (The Hague). In September 1994, 23 government officials attended that Course organized, in English, by WIPO and BBM in The Hague. The participants came from Brunei Darussalam, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Panama, Peru, the Philippines, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Thailand, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zambia and Zimbabwe. The travel and subsistence costs of six of the participants were funded by UNDP, the EC and BBM. Presentations were made by BBM officials, officials of the member States of BBM (Belgium, Luxembourg, Netherlands), representatives of private enterprises in the Netherlands and two WIPO officials. The Course included visits to private enterprises in the Netherlands.

WIPO Training Course on Industrial Property (Munich). In September 1994, six government officials attended that Course organized, in English, by WIPO and the German Patent Office in Munich. The participants came from Bangladesh, Botswana, Ethiopia, the Gambia, Nepal and Panama. The travel and subsistence costs of five of the participants were funded by Germany. Presentations were made by German government officials and a WIPO official.

WIPO Training Course on Patent Documentation and Information (Vienna). In September 1994, six government officials attended that Course organized, in English, by WIPO and the Austrian Patent Office in Vienna. The participants came from Brazil, China, Cuba, Malaysia, Mexico and Viet Nam. About half of the travel and subsistence costs of the participants were funded by Austria. Presentations were made by Austrian government officials and a WIPO official.

WIPO Training Course on Patent Documentation, Searching and Examination Techniques (Stockholm). In September and October 1994, eight government officials attended that Course organized, in English, by WIPO and the Patent and Registration Office of Sweden in Stockholm. The participants came from Argentina, China, Ghana, India, Kenya, the Philippines, Thailand and Venezuela. The travel and subsistence costs of the participants were financed by the Government of Sweden. Presentations were made by officials of the Swedish Patent and Registration Office and a WIPO official.

WIPO Training Course on the Legal, Administrative and Economic Aspects of Industrial Property (Madrid). In September 1994, 16 government officials attended that Course organized, in Spanish, by

WIPO and the Spanish Patent and Trademark Office in Madrid. The participants came from Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay and Venezuela. The travel and subsistence costs of seven of the participants were funded by Spain. Presentations were made by officials of the Spanish Patent and Trademark Office and a WIPO official.

WIPO Training Course on the Legal, Administrative and Economic Aspects of Industrial Property (Strasbourg, France). In September 1994, 29 government officials attended that Course organized, in English and French, by WIPO and the Centre for International Industrial Property Studies (CEIPI) in Strasbourg, in cooperation with the National Institute of Industrial Property (INPI) of France and with the financial assistance of the Governments of France and Switzerland. The participants came from Benin, Burkina Faso, the Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Egypt, Fiji, Gabon, India, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Namibia, Nepal, Pakistan, Peru, the Republic of Korea, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, the United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Viet Nam and the Board of the Cartagena Agreement (JUNAC). Lectures were given by professors, lawyers and patent attorneys of or associated with CEIPI, INPI (France) officials, the Patent and Registration Office of Sweden, the EPO and four WIPO officials, as well as representatives of private enterprises in France and Germany. The Course was followed, for most of the participants, by practical training in industrial property in one of the following countries: Bulgaria, Canada, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, France, Hungary, India, Israel, Switzerland.

Activities of WIPO in the Field of Industrial Property Specially Designed for Countries in Transition to Market Economy

Regional Activities

Interstate Council for the Protection of Industrial Property. In September 1994, two WIPO officials attended the fourth meeting of the said Council held in Kiev. Five of the nine States members of the Council (Azerbaijan, Belarus, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Ukraine) were represented by 26 participants.

The main item on the agenda was the discussion of the measures to be taken for the ratification and implementation of the Eurasian Patent Convention, which had been signed on behalf of the Governments of Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, the Republic of Moldova, the Russian Federation, Tajikistan and Ukraine on September 9, 1994, in Moscow.

It was, *inter alia*, agreed that the Interstate Bureau, which is the executive body of the Interstate Council for the Protection of Industrial Property, would shortly distribute the draft Patent Regulations, Financial Regulations and Administrative Regulations to the signatory States of the said Convention and to WIPO and the European Patent Organisation (EPO), for comments.

Interstate Office for the Protection of Industrial Property/Czech Republic. In September 1994, on the occasion of their participation in the sessions of the Governing Bodies of WIPO held in Geneva, Mr. Viktor I. Blinnikov, President of the Interstate Patent Bureau, and Mr. Ladislav Jakl, President of the Industrial Property Office of the Czech Republic, had discussions with WIPO officials in Geneva on the possible organization of a symposium on the Eurasian Patent Convention.

National Activities

In September 1994, on the occasion of their participation in the sessions of the Governing Bodies of WIPO held in Geneva, officials from Armenia, Belarus, Bulgaria, Estonia, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Lithuania, the Republic of Moldova, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkmenistan, Ukraine and Uzbekistan had discussions at WIPO headquarters as follows:

Armenia. Professor Sarkis L. Khantardjian, President of the Armenian Patent Office, had discussions

with the Director General and other WIPO officials on questions relating to the national trademark legislation.

Belarus. Mr. Valery I. Kudashov, Head of the Belarus Patent Office, had discussions with WIPO officials on questions relating to licensing and know-how.

Bulgaria. Mr. Kristo Iliev, President of the Bulgarian Patent Office, and another government official had discussions with WIPO officials on the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)-financed country project which is being implemented by WIPO.

Estonia. Mr. Matti Päs, Director General of the Estonian Patent Office, had discussions with WIPO officials on industrial property legislation in Estonia and the country's possible adherence to various WIPO-administered treaties.

Kazakhstan. A government official had discussions with WIPO officials on the possibility of training national officials in the field of industrial property.

Latvia. Mr. Zigrīds Aumeisters, Director of the Patent Office, accompanied by another government official, deposited with the Director General Latvia's instrument of accession to the Madrid Agreement Concerning the International Registration of Marks, the Budapest Treaty on the International Recognition of the Deposit of Microorganisms for the Purposes of Patent Procedure and the Nice Agreement Concerning the International Classification of Goods and Services for the Purposes of the Registration of Marks.

Lithuania. Mr. Rimvydas Naujokas, Director of the State Patent Bureau, had discussions with WIPO officials on the draft law on industrial designs currently under consideration by the Government.

Republic of Moldova. Mr. Eugen M. Stashkov, Director General of the State Agency on Industrial Property Protection, had discussions with WIPO officials on, *inter alia*, the protection of scientific achievements in the country.

The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. Mrs. Sofija Todorova, Minister for Development,

Mr. Gorgi Filipov, Director of the Industrial Property Protection Office, and another government official had discussions with WIPO officials on cooperation in the modernization of the country's industrial property system, the possible organization of a regional seminar in the country and possible accession to the Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT).

Turkmenistan. Two government officials had discussions with the Director General and other WIPO officials on the protection of industrial property in Turkmenistan and the country's possible adherence to various WIPO-administered treaties. They were also briefed on the international trademark registration system under the Madrid Agreement and on the activities of the WIPO Permanent Committee on Industrial Property Information (PCIPI).

Ukraine. Mr. Valery L. Petrov, Chairman of the State Patent Office, had discussions with WIPO officials on the national trademark regulations and fees.

Uzbekistan. Mr. Akil A. Azimov, Director of the State Patent Office, made a study visit of WIPO's printing facilities and was briefed by WIPO officials on the work involved.

* * *

Albania. In September 1994, WIPO organized a study visit for two government officials in the fields of trademark search and examination and registration to the Austrian Patent Office in Vienna and the German Patent Office in Munich. This activity was carried out under the UNDP-financed country project.

Romania. In September 1994, a WIPO official participated as a speaker in a Symposium on Marks and Industrial Designs in a Market Economy organized by the State Office for Inventions and Trademarks in Bucarest.

Ukraine. In September 1994, the delegations represented at the fourth meeting of the Interstate Council for the Protection of Industrial Property (see above) attended the Meeting of Inventors of Ukraine held in Kiev to mark Inventors' Day. The Meeting was organized by the Inventors Association of Ukraine. A WIPO official welcomed the inventors on behalf of the Director General of WIPO. Another WIPO official also attended the Meeting.

Other Contacts of the International Bureau of WIPO with Governments and International Organizations in the Field of Industrial Property

National Contacts

In September 1994, on the occasion of their participation in the sessions of the Governing Bodies of WIPO held in Geneva, officials from Turkey and the United States of America had discussions at WIPO headquarters as follows:

Turkey. Mr. Uğur G. Yalçiner, President of the Turkish Patent Institute, had discussions with WIPO officials in Geneva on mutual cooperation and prepa-

rations for Turkey's possible accession to certain WIPO-administered treaties.

United States of America. Mr. Bruce A. Lehman, Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Commissioner of the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO), accompanied by another government official, had discussions with the Director General on WIPO's ongoing normative activities.

* * *

Andorra. In September 1994, an advisor to the Government for intellectual property affairs had discussions with WIPO officials in Geneva on the draft new trademark law prepared by the International Bureau at the request of the government authorities.

Germany. In September 1994, a WIPO official attended an information meeting organized by the German Patent Office in Munich on its project for a new patent information system called PATIS.

United States of America. In September 1994, a WIPO official attended a public hearing on intellectual property and the national information infrastructure organized by the Government of the United States of America's Working Group on Intellectual Property Rights and the National Information Infrastructure (NII), held in Los Angeles (California).

Later in September 1994, another WIPO official attended another public hearing on the same subject held by the same Working Group and NII in Washington, D.C.

United Nations

United Nations Administrative Committee on Co-ordination (ACC). In September 1994, the Director General and two other WIPO officials attended the meeting of ACC, held in New York.

United Nations Administrative Committee on Co-ordination (Organizational Committee) (ACC(OC)). In September 1994, a WIPO official attended a meeting of ACC(OC) in New York, in connection with the second regular session of ACC for 1994.

United Nations Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ). In September 1994, two WIPO officials attended a meeting of ACABQ, held in Geneva.

United Nations Consultative Committee on Administrative Questions (CCAQ). In September 1994, two WIPO officials attended a Workshop on International Civil Service Commission (ICSC) Job Classification, organized by CCAQ in Geneva.

United Nations Consultative Committee on Programme and Operational Questions (CCPOQ). In September 1994, a WIPO official participated in an informal meeting, held in Geneva, of the Geneva-based members of CCPOQ and discussed mainly the question of agency support costs.

International Computing Centre (ICC). In September 1994, two WIPO officials attended the

54th session of the ICC Management Committee, held in New York.

Also in September 1994, the Director General, accompanied by five other WIPO officials, visited ICC in Geneva which houses, among others, certain elements of WIPO's computer facilities. Three other WIPO officials also visited ICC later in the same month.

Intergovernmental Organizations

European Patent Organisation/European Patent Office (EPO). In September 1994, on the occasion of his participation in the sessions of the Governing Bodies of WIPO held in Geneva, an EPO official had discussions with WIPO officials on cooperation between WIPO and the EPO in respect of developing countries, including the countries of the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN), and of countries of Eastern and Central Europe and Central Asia.

Also in September 1994, two WIPO officials attended a meeting of the EPO's Working Party on Harmonisation, held in Munich.

General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT)-World Trade Organization (WTO). In September 1994, the Permanent Representative of Singapore, Ambassador M.L. Kesavapany, in his capacity as Chairman of the WTO's Preparatory Committee's Sub-Committee on Institutional, Procedural and Legal Matters, had discussions with the Director General and other WIPO officials in Geneva on the possibility of cooperation between WIPO and the future WTO.

Also in September 1994, two GATT officials had discussions with WIPO officials in Geneva on certain aspects of cooperation between WIPO and the future WTO, particularly as regards notifications to be made by the future WTO in accordance with the provisions of the TRIPS Agreement.

World Customs Organization (WCO) (formerly "Customs Co-operation Council (CCC)"). In September 1994, two WIPO officials attended the first meeting of the WCO's Joint Working Group Responsible for Revising the Model Legislation on Intellectual Property Rights, held in Brussels.

Other Organizations

Association of International Librarians and Information Specialists (AILIS). In September 1994, a WIPO official attended a meeting of the Executive Committee of AILIS, held in Geneva.

Conference Board Europe. In September 1994, a WIPO official attended, as a speaker, a meeting of

the Board's Council on Legal Affairs, held in Geneva.

Euro-Arab Arbitration System (Riyadh). In September 1994, Sheikh Salah Al-Hejailan, Chairman, Higher Board, Euro-Arab Arbitration System, had discussions with WIPO officials in Geneva on possible cooperation with the WIPO Arbitration Center.

International Association for the Protection of Industrial Property (AIPPI)–Hungarian Group (MIE). In September 1994, a WIPO official spoke on WIPO's activities in the field of industrial property at the ninth AIPPI-MIE Budapest International Conference organized by that Group in Budapest.

International Council of Archives (ICA). In September 1994, a WIPO official attended the XXth session of the Section of International Organizations of ICA, held in Florence (Italy).

International League for Competition Law (LIDC). In September 1994, a WIPO official participated in LIDC's 33rd Congress, held in Berlin.

Licensing Executives Society (LES)-Switzerland. In September 1994, a WIPO official made a presentation on the WIPO Arbitration Center at a meeting of LES-Switzerland, held in Rigi Kaltbad (Switzerland).

Patent Documentation Group (PDG). In September 1994, a WIPO official attended the 28th Meeting of the PDG's Working Group on Impact of Patent Laws on Documentation, held in Wuppertal (Germany). The WIPO official also gave demonstrations of WIPO's CD-ROM products: IPLEX (for intellectual property legislation), ROMARIN (Read-Only Memory of Madrid Actualized Registry Information) and JOPAL (*Journal of Patent Associated Literature*).

The Chartered Institute of Arbitrators (CIArb). In September 1994, a WIPO official spoke at the discussions during the Intellectual Property Supper given by the Chairman of CIArb at the House of Lords, in London.

Also in September 1994, the same WIPO official attended a special Fellowship Course of CIArb, held in Milan (Italy).

Miscellaneous News

Uzbekistan. The Law on Inventions, Utility Models and Industrial Designs of May 6, 1994, entered into force on June 1, 1994.

Selected WIPO Publications

The following new publications* were recently issued by WIPO:

- Administración Colectiva del Derecho de Autor y los Derechos Conexos*, No. 688(S), 40 Swiss francs.
- Background Reading Material on the Intellectual Property System of China*, No. 686/CN(E), 10 Swiss francs.
- Directory of Associations of Inventors*, 1994 edition, No. 622(EF), free.
- Franchising Guide*, No. 480(E)(F)(S), 15 Swiss francs.
- Guía de Licencias de Biotecnología*, No. 708(S), 50 Swiss francs.
- Industrial Property Protection in Central and Eastern Europe and in Central Asia*, No. 732(E), 15 Swiss francs.
- Industrial Property Statistics 1992*, Parts I (Patents) and II (Trademarks and Service Marks, Utility Models, Industrial Designs, Varieties of Plants, Microorganisms), No. IP/STAT/92/B (EF), 60 Swiss francs each.
- International Classification of Goods and Services for the Purposes of the Registration of Marks*, 6th edition, No. 500.1(DK)–Part I, 100 Swiss francs, No. 500.2(DK)–Part II, 80 Swiss francs.
- International Classification of the Figurative Elements of Marks*, 3rd edition, No. 502(G), 50 Swiss francs.
- International Patent Classification*, 6th edition–Vols. I to X, No. 560(E) (F), 400 Swiss francs.
- Introduction au droit et à la pratique en matière de marques*, No. 653(F), 35 Swiss francs.
- Lisbon Agreement for the Protection of Appellations of Origin and their International Registration and Regulations (as in force on January 1, 1994)*, No. 264(E) (F), 10 Swiss francs.
- Madrid Agreement Concerning the International Registration of Marks and Regulations (as in force on April 1, 1994) and Protocol*, No. 204(E) (F)(S), 15 Swiss francs.
- Protection Against Unfair Competition*, No. 725(E) (F)(S), 10 Swiss francs.
- Report of the Activities of WIPO in the Year 1993*, No. 425(A)(E)(F)(R)(S), free.
- The Hague Agreement Concerning the International Deposit of Industrial Designs and Regulations (as in force on April 1, 1994)*, No. 262(E)(F), 10 Swiss francs.
- WIPO Asian Regional Colloquium on the Judiciary and the Intellectual Property System, New Delhi, September 9 to 11, 1992*, No. 726(E), 30 Swiss francs.
- Worldwide Forum on the Arbitration of Intellectual Property Disputes*, No. 728(E), 30 Swiss francs.

* WIPO publications may be obtained from the Publications Sales and Distribution Unit, WIPO, 34, chemin des Colombettes, CH-1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland (telex: 412 912 OMPI CH; fax: (41-22) 733 5428; telephone: (41-22) 730 9111).

Orders should indicate: (a) the number or letter code of the publication desired, the language (A for Arabic, DK for Danish, E for English, F for French, G for German, R for Russian, S for Spanish), the number of copies; (b) the full address for mailing; (c) the mail mode (surface or air). Prices cover surface mail.

Bank transfers should be made to WIPO account No. 487080-81, at the Swiss Credit Bank, 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland.

Calendar of Meetings

WIPO Meetings

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

1995

- January 20 (Geneva)** **Conference on Rules for Institutional Arbitration and Mediation** (jointly organized by WIPO and the Swiss Arbitration Association)
- The aim of the Conference is to provide a comparative examination of the WIPO Arbitration Rules and the rules of a number of other arbitration institutions, as well as the UNCITRAL Rules. The Conference will also deal with a comparative examination of rules for expedited arbitration and rules for mediation.
- Invitations:* The Conference is open to all (against payment of the registration fee).
- April 5 and 6 (Melbourne, Australia)** **Symposium on the International Protection of Geographical Indications** (organized by WIPO in cooperation with the Government of Australia)
- The Symposium will deal with the protection of geographical indications (appellations of origin and other geographical indications) both on the national and multilateral level and, in particular, with the coexistence of geographical indications and trademarks.
- Invitations:* Governments, selected intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations and any member of the public (against payment of the registration fee).
- May 8 to 12 (Geneva)** **Consultative Meeting for the Preparation of the Second Part of the Diplomatic Conference for the Conclusion of the Patent Law Treaty**
- The meeting will discuss the preparation of the second part of the said Diplomatic Conference.
- Invitations:* States members of WIPO or the Paris Union and, as observers, certain organizations.
- May 29 to June 2 (Geneva)** **Committee of Experts on the Settlement of Intellectual Property Disputes Between States (Seventh Session)**
- The Committee of Experts will continue the preparations for a possible treaty on the settlement of intellectual property disputes between States. In particular, the Committee of Experts will consider the question of the relationship between the dispute settlement system to be established by the proposed Treaty and other dispute settlement systems, including the dispute settlement system to be established as a result of the Uruguay Round of GATT.
- Invitations:* States members of WIPO or party to treaties administered by WIPO not members of WIPO and, as observers, certain organizations.
- June 12 to 16 (Geneva)** **Committee of Experts on the Development of the Hague Agreement (Fifth Session)**
- The Committee will consider a revised draft new Act of the Hague Agreement Concerning the International Deposit of Industrial Designs intended to introduce into the Hague system provisions designed to encourage States not yet party to the Agreement to participate in the system and to facilitate greater use of the system by applicants.
- Invitations:* States members of the Hague Union and, as observers, States members of the Paris Union or of WIPO not members of the Hague Union and certain organizations.
- September 25 to October 4 (Geneva)** **Governing Bodies of WIPO and the Unions Administered by WIPO (Twenty-Sixth Series of Meetings)**
- All the Governing Bodies of WIPO and the Unions administered by WIPO meet in ordinary sessions every two years in odd-numbered years.
- In the sessions in 1995, the Governing Bodies will, *inter alia*, review and evaluate WIPO's activities undertaken since July 1994, and decide the program and budget of the International Bureau for the 1996-97 biennium.
- Invitations:* States members of WIPO and the Paris and Berne Unions and, as observers, other States members of the United Nations and certain organizations.

UPOV Meetings

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

1995

April 26 and 27 (Geneva)

Administrative and Legal Committee

Invitations: Member States of UPOV and, as observers, certain non-member States and inter-governmental organizations.

April 28 (Geneva)

Consultative Committee (Forty-Ninth Session)

Invitations: Member States of UPOV.

October 11 to 13 (Geneva)

Technical Committee

Invitations: Member States of UPOV and, as observers, certain non-member States and inter-governmental and non-governmental organizations.

October 16 and 17 (Geneva)

Administrative and Legal Committee

Invitations: Member States of UPOV and, as observers, certain non-member States and inter-governmental organizations.

October 18 (Geneva)

Consultative Committee (Fiftieth Session)

Invitations: Member States of UPOV.

October 19 (Geneva)

Council (Twenty-Ninth Ordinary Session)

Invitations: Member States of UPOV and, as observers, certain non-member States and inter-governmental organizations.