

WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

世界知识产权组织

ORGANIZACION MUNDIAL
DE LA PROPIEDAD INTELECTUAL



ORGANISATION MONDIALE
DE LA PROPRIÉTÉ INTELLECTUELLE

المنظمة العالمية للملكية الفكرية

ВСЕМИРНАЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИЯ
ИНТЕЛЛЕКТУАЛЬНОЙ СОБСТВЕННОСТИ

C. PCT 874
08.13

The International Bureau of the World Intellectual Property Organization
./ (WIPO) presents its compliments and has the honor to transmit herewith the
report (document PCT/CTC/20/5), adopted by the Committee, for the twentieth
session of the *PCT Committee for Technical Cooperation* (PCT/CTC), which
was held in Geneva from September 23 to October 1, 2002.

The working documents are also available on WIPO's Web site
(see <http://www.wipo.int/pct/en/meetings>).

fr

October 28, 2002

Enclosure: document PCT/CTC/20/5

WIPO



PCT/CTC/20/5
ORIGINAL: English
DATE: September 26, 2002

E

WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION
GENEVA

INTERNATIONAL PATENT COOPERATION UNION
(PCT UNION)

PCT COMMITTEE FOR TECHNICAL COOPERATION

Twentieth Session
Geneva, September 23 to October 1, 2002

REPORT

adopted by the Committee

INTRODUCTION

1. The PCT Committee for Technical Cooperation (hereinafter referred to as “the Committee”) held its twentieth session in Geneva from September 23 to October 1, 2002.
2. The following members of the Committee were represented: Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Denmark, Ecuador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lesotho, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Monaco, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Senegal, Seychelles, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

and the European Patent Office (EPO). The Eurasian Patent Office (EAPO) and the African Regional Industrial Property Organization (ARIPO) were represented as special observers. The list of participants is contained in Annex I to this report.

3. Mr. Francis Gurry, Assistant Director General, opened the session and welcomed the participants on behalf of the Director General.

ELECTION OF A CHAIR AND TWO VICE-CHAIRS

4. The Committee unanimously elected Mr. Jørgen Smith (Norway) as Chair and Mr. Wang Jingchuan (China) and Mr. Miklós Bendzsel (Hungary) as Vice-Chairs.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

5. The Committee unanimously adopted the agenda as contained in Annex II to this report.

PCT MINIMUM DOCUMENTATION

6. Discussions were based on document PCT/CTC/20/4.

7. The International Bureau recalled the background to the proposal for a study of matters related to the PCT minimum documentation, as outlined, in particular, in paragraphs 4 to 8 of document PCT/CTC/20/4. It noted that the upcoming session of the Meeting of International Authorities under the PCT (PCT/MIA) would not be held in December 2002 (as was indicated in paragraph 10 of that document) but was expected to be held during the week of January 20, 2003.

8. The Delegation of the United States of America expressed strong support for the proposal for a study by PCT/MIA, noting the importance for the work of patent Offices of the incorporation of traditional knowledge periodicals and databases into the minimum documentation and of the possible access, within the framework of the PCT minimum documentation, to documents in certain technical fields via databases.

9. The Delegation of Finland supported the proposal as well as the statement made by the Delegation of the United States of America.

10. The Committee noted the contents of document PCT/CTC/20/4 and unanimously recommended to the Assembly of the PCT Union that PCT/MIA be requested to undertake the study proposed in that document and to make recommendations to the Committee on proposed modifications of PCT Rule 34 and proposed mechanisms for reviewing and maintaining the non-patent literature part of the PCT minimum documentation.

ADVICE TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE PCT UNION ON THE REQUEST OF THE
CANADIAN COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS TO BE APPOINTED AS
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY AND AS INTERNATIONAL
PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

11. Discussions were based on documents PCT/CTC/20/2 and PCT/CTC/20/2 Add. 1.

12. In response to an invitation by the Chair, the Delegation of Canada made a statement to the Committee. The Delegation stated that the growth and importance of intellectual property throughout the world in the past decade had influenced public policy, economic development and social welfare globally. This had resulted in intellectual property Offices being faced with an increase in demand for their products and services. Increasing filings of patent applications had led to growing workloads and backlogs in national Offices, including the Canadian Intellectual Property Office (CIPO). CIPO had received some 40,000 patent applications in 2001, which constituted an almost 50% increase over the previous five years.

13. The Delegation of Canada noted that the tremendous development in the utilization of the patent system had been mirrored by the extraordinary success of the PCT. Canadian applicants, like most applicants worldwide, had embraced the PCT system: there had been in 2001 a 16% increase in the number of PCT applications filed in Canada, which compared with an overall growth rate of 14% in PCT applications received by the International Bureau for the same year. As a consequence of these developments, CIPO had carried out an examination of its activities within the intellectual property community at large and more specifically with respect to the service level provided to Canadian applicants. As a result of this exercise, CIPO had become increasingly committed to building an international role, aiming for the highest standard of excellence in services. Furthermore, Canada had been assuming international leadership and cooperation roles reflecting its rising prominence and status among intellectual property Offices. CIPO had evolved accordingly and its rising status was reflected in collaboration ventures carried out with other intellectual property Offices, an example of such a venture being the specialized courses it offered in conjunction with WIPO on client service and quality management in the delivery of patent services; in these courses, CIPO was able to share with Offices of other countries its knowledge and practical experience in the provision of quality products and services.

14. The Delegation of Canada noted that documents PCT/CTC/20/2 and PCT/A/31/1 addressed the technical aspects of the appointment and the rationale for requesting the appointment as an International Searching Authority (ISA) and International Preliminary Examining Authority (IPEA). The documents also explained how CIPO, under the direction of the Commissioner, would fulfill the minimum human resource and documentation requirements set out under the PCT. CIPO had a highly qualified and competent growing corps of patent examiners who possessed bilingual (French and English) and sometimes trilingual capabilities; it had a modern and efficient automated patent processing system supported by a forward thinking and comprehensive information technology infrastructure; its collection of patent documents and on-line resources permitted it to meet PCT minimum documentation requirements on a virtual basis; and it had an organizational commitment in pursuit of excellence in client service delivery. The Delegation pointed out that minimal gaps in documentation would be corrected before the summer of 2004. The Delegation further stated that its request was also backed by several rounds of consultations with client groups on the relative merits and benefits of the status as an ISA and IPEA. Informal discussions were also held with members of the international community (mostly heads of Offices) and all such exchanges had revealed wide support for the submission.

15. The Delegation of Canada was of the view that, as a consequence of the requested appointment, client groups would benefit from greater access to the international patent system. Furthermore, it believed that status as an ISA and IPEA would reinforce CIPO's commitment to continued excellence in providing service to clients. Another benefit would be CIPO's ability to influence intellectual property matters within a broader international spectrum, this being the context in which CIPO sought a positive recommendation from the Committee. The Delegation indicated that the expected start date for ISA and IPEA services would be summer 2004. The Delegation reiterated its request for favorable consideration of its submission by the Committee; it also re-emphasized its continued goodwill towards WIPO and its Member States in the improvement of global intellectual property services.
16. The Delegations of the United States of America, Australia, Morocco, Ghana, Sri Lanka, Lesotho, Equatorial Guinea, Finland, and Antigua and Barbuda fully supported the proposal by the Delegation of Canada.
17. The Delegation of Japan, while supporting the proposal, highlighted the need for the current gaps in the minimum documentation held by CIPO to be filled on an urgent basis, and in any case before the starting date of CIPO's operation as an ISA and IPEA.
18. The Delegation of Kenya expressed its full support for the proposal and emphasized that, as a developing country, Kenya would benefit from such appointment.
19. The Delegation of the Republic of Korea fully supported the proposal and congratulated the Canadian Commissioner of Patents, especially in view of the large support received, referring to its own experience in 1997 when the Korean Intellectual Property Office had achieved appointment as an ISA and IPEA.
20. The Delegation of Algeria supported wholeheartedly the proposal and pointed to the fact that the appointment would further enhance existing links between its country and Canada, which was host to a large Algerian community.
21. The Delegation of Mexico expressed support for the proposal and commended CIPO for its high level of professionalism, the well-established cooperation links with the Mexican Industrial Property Office and especially the high caliber of CIPO's examiners, 20% of whom have doctorate qualifications.
22. The Delegation of the Russian Federation, while supporting the proposal in principle, expressed its concerns about the gap in paper-based minimum documentation currently held by CIPO, especially with respect to documents from the Russian Federation and the former Soviet Union.
23. The Delegation of Denmark supported the proposal but, referring to the intervention by the Delegation of Japan, also expressed the wish that CIPO would explain how CIPO would fill the gaps present in the minimum documentation currently held by CIPO.
24. The Delegation of Canada confirmed that CIPO was making efforts to acquire, hopefully in electronic form, the relevant missing elements of the minimum documentation, and it expressed its confidence that the gaps would be filled before the start of CIPO's operations as an ISA and IPEA.

25. The Committee unanimously recommended to the Assembly of the PCT Union that the Canadian Commissioner of Patents be appointed as an ISA and IPEA.

ADVICE TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE PCT UNION ON THE REQUEST OF THE NATIONAL BOARD OF PATENTS AND REGISTRATION OF FINLAND TO BE APPOINTED AS INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY AND AS INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

26. Discussions were based on document PCT/CTC/20/3.

27. In response to an invitation by the Chair, the Delegation of Finland made a statement to the Committee. It first pointed out that the National Board of Patents and Registration of Finland (“the Finnish Office”) was celebrating a jubilee year as the first Finnish patent was granted in 1842, 160 years ago. The Delegation pointed out that the Finnish Office started as an independent central Office in 1942, 60 years ago, when it was separated from the Ministry of Trade and Industry. There had been a significant rise in the number of patent applications in the world over the past few years and this had, in particular, put to the test the capacity of major patent Offices and caused ever-growing backlogs in search and examination. Therefore there was a real need for additional processing capacity in the PCT field in Europe and in the world. The Delegation noted that WIPO had in different contexts expressed concerns about this matter. Finland was ready to help by sharing some of the workload generated by the PCT system, and had therefore submitted its request for the appointment of the Finnish Office as an ISA and IPEA. The Delegation recalled that Finland was an industrialized, high-tech country and that the Finnish Office wished to guarantee good services to its clients, including inventors, small-and medium-sized enterprises and large-scale industry. The Delegation pointed out that the responsibility of the Committee was to deal solely with technical matters.

28. The Delegation of Finland also noted that the PCT system was actively used and very popular in Finland, and that, in the past five years, the number of international applications originating from Finland had doubled, last year being 1,623. The Delegation further pointed out that Finland had, for some time, ranked among the top eleven countries of origin of users of the PCT system. The Delegation stated that the present initiative was unanimously supported by all interested circles in Finland and that this had been evident during hearings organized by the Finnish Ministry of Trade and Industry.

29. With regard to the requirements under PCT Rule 34 (“Minimum Documentation”), the Delegation of Finland explained that, via EPOQUE, BNS and other international databases, the examiners at the Finnish Office had access to the entire PCT minimum documentation in electronic form, as well as to an extensive collection of paper-form documentation and to an in-house library system, Global Index Database (GID), used to manage patent documents received on CD-ROMs/DVDs. Today, the system contained about 6 million documents on hard disks and in jukeboxes.

30. The Delegation of Finland went on to explain that, currently, the Finnish Office had a staff of 480, including 92 persons with sufficient technical qualifications and experience to carry out searches and examinations, of whom 80 worked exclusively as examiners, and that the recruitment of additional staff needed to fulfill the PCT requirement had also started. The Delegation pointed out that Finnish industry and all of the Finnish Office’s clients had been satisfied with the standard of examination work by the Finnish Office, which used modern examination methods and tools. Electronic filing of applications with the Finnish Office

started in the spring of 2001, the aim being to introduce full electronic processing of applications and electronic file inspection before the end of 2004.

31. The Delegation indicated that Finland had estimated that the Finnish Office would be ready to start operations as an ISA and IPEA in the first half of 2004 in respect of international applications in Finnish, Swedish and English, originating from Finland, at the first stage. The Delegation was also confident that the Office had the qualifications needed for conducting novelty searches and examination work. It expressed its hope that its request would receive a positive response from the Committee.

32. The Delegation of Switzerland made reference to the upcoming discussions by the WIPO Assemblies on the Agenda for Development of the International Patent System (document A/37/6), which constituted a broader framework within which the Finnish Office's request needed to be considered. That document outlined a vision under which the role of the PCT would be considerably increased and it proposed the development of means for promoting the international patent system, one of such means being, in a first stage, the concept of regionalization of work. The upcoming discussions might permit the emergence of promising solutions for the sharing of work both at the European level and at the worldwide level. Because the question of distribution of PCT work was currently being discussed in Europe, many European countries would have preferred to defer a decision on the present matter. While the Delegation fully appreciated the role which the Finnish Office would be capable of playing in the PCT system and despite the unchallenged right of Finland to submit its application, the Delegation wondered whether it was wise to appoint a new ISA and IPEA in Europe at this time. The Delegation stated that it was not the only delegation convinced that certain technical questions would be solved for the next year, and that a well-founded decision could better be made in a year's time. The Delegation concluded by asking whether the Delegation of Finland would be prepared to defer its application until next year, noting that that question had been put forward to Finland in the context of discussions at the European level and that Finland had then given a negative reply. The Delegation stated that it would be useful to hear the views of the Committee on this point.

33. The Delegation of Estonia supported the Finnish Office's request, recalling that, during the July 2002 session of the Administrative Council of the European Patent Organisation in Stockholm, it had already supported the request. The Delegation pointed out that there was close cooperation between the Finnish Office and the Estonian Office. It also emphasized that the Finnish Office was well equipped and had very qualified examiners who provided high quality examination. The Delegation stated that the proposal also enjoyed the support of the group of Central European and Baltic States.

34. With reference to the intervention by the Delegation of Switzerland, the Delegation of Finland, raising a point of order, pointed out that the Committee was only a technical committee and not political one, and stated that the Committee should concentrate its deliberations on questions concerning the capacity and capability of the Finnish Office, not on whether the request should be postponed.

35. The Delegation of France emphasized that it had no doubts as to the Finnish Office's goodwill vis-à-vis handling PCT applications in the best possible manner, but it nevertheless associated itself with the statement made by the Delegation of Switzerland. The Delegation wondered whether other delegations would not prefer to see the matter deferred so as to permit consideration, in addition to technical factors, of the result of ongoing discussions in the European regional framework. Therefore, it seemed difficult, at this point, for the

Committee to give a reasoned advice on the matter to the PCT Assembly, noting that the Committee was provided for by the PCT itself and that the advice from the Committee had to be reasoned in order to guarantee the proper functioning of the PCT system and WIPO's image. The Delegation also pointed out that another reason for postponing the matter was the need to discuss the technical capacity of PCT Authorities as part of the ongoing discussion in certain regional patent organizations.

36. The Delegation of Germany supported the proposal made by the Delegation of Switzerland that the decision concerning the appointment of the Finnish Office as a PCT Authority should be deferred until next year. The Delegation noted that Finland was a member of the EPO, that there was an ongoing debate in the European Patent Organisation on how to further organize PCT work among the EPO and its member States, and that it would be advantageous first to extensively discuss the matter in the regional forum.

37. The Delegation of Algeria supported the proposal made by the Delegation of Switzerland to defer consideration of the request made by the Finnish Office until next year.

38. The Delegation of Italy fully understood the request by Finland and recognized the unchallenged right of that country to make such request. However, like other delegations, in particular the Delegations of Switzerland, France, Germany and Algeria, it felt that it would be wise to defer the matter until next year.

39. The representative of the EPO expressed full appreciation for Finland's obvious right to make the request for the Finnish Office to become an ISA and IPEA and stated that such right had never been questioned nor challenged. Considering the technical character of the Committee, the representative wished to draw the Committee's attention to certain points. The crucial questions were not whether the Finnish Office had the required number of examiners or whether the minimum documentation was available in electronic form or in paper form but whether the ongoing discussions within the European Patent Organisation on the distribution of workload among its member States would not justify the postponement of the matter so that the question could be considered further and in greater depth, and an appropriate solution found next year, including consideration of the establishment of a Nordic PCT Authority within the framework of Nordic cooperation.

40. The Delegation of Monaco stated that it had no doubt as to the Finnish Office's technical capacity. However, the Delegation supported the position taken, in particular, by the Delegations of Switzerland and France. The Delegation also felt that there were still some technical issues to be resolved. Therefore, the Delegation felt it wise to defer the decision until the next session of the PCT Assembly.

41. The Delegation of Denmark pointed out that neither of the two Offices seeking appointment as ISA and IPEA fulfilled all the applicable requirements, but that both were ready to take initiatives to meet those requirements before they started to act as PCT Authorities. The Delegation found that both Offices were in the same situation as other Offices had been when they had sought to become PCT Authorities. The Delegation recalled the technical nature of the present Committee. It stated that it would have preferred to discuss the question of a Nordic PCT Authority, as referred to by the representative of the EPO, before discussing Finland's request and stated that from a technical point of view the Finnish Office should be appointed as a PCT Authority. That would only be fair play. However, it noted that Finland had also expressed interest in discussing the question of a Nordic PCT

Authority and it was convinced that the idea of such an Authority could already be presented to the Assembly next year.

42. The Delegation of Mexico noted that, although Mexico was not a European country, it was an active PCT Contracting State and a developing country, and pointed out that it would not question the capacity of the Finnish Office, but that it seemed to it that the issue had not yet been fully discussed in Europe. Like the Delegations of Germany, Italy and France, the Delegation of Mexico favored deferring a decision on the request by Finland.

43. The Delegation of Brazil expressed understanding for the request by Finland but supported the proposal made by the Delegation of Switzerland to defer the matter in view of the current discussions concerning regionalization.

44. The Delegation of Austria thought it would be fair to address only technical questions in the Committee. It was of the opinion that both the Canadian and the Finnish Offices would fulfill the technical requirements. Nevertheless, the Delegation stated that it would not hinder a consensus on the matter.

45. The Delegation of Spain noted that, as was often the case in the field of patents and the PCT, technical and political elements were related. The Delegation indicated that it was in favor of deferral of a decision for the same reasons that had been expressed by, in particular, the Delegations of Switzerland and Germany, having in mind what had been said by the Delegation of Finland.

46. The Delegation of the United States of America noted the concerns raised on the issue and stated that, while the United States of America, like Mexico, was not a European country, it strongly supported the adoption of a solution to those concerns that would be acceptable to all parties involved, and it hoped that such a solution could be found within the coming year.

47. The Delegation of Finland noted that only one delegation had expressed concerns as to whether the National Board of Patents and Registration of Finland complied with the technical requirements; it asked the International Bureau to provide information on former cases, such as those of the national Offices of Spain, the Republic of Korea or Australia.

48. The International Bureau indicated that the Spanish Patent and Trademark Office had been appointed as an ISA in 1993 by the Assembly, following a positive recommendation by the PCT/CTC, although that Office did not at the time have the required number of technically qualified staff (that is, the number was below 100). The Agreement, as adopted by the Assembly, included a provision to the effect that the Office was required to comply with this requirement within three years from the entry into force of the Agreement. Secondly, in the case of the Korean Intellectual Property Office, which was appointed by the Assembly in 1997, the PCT minimum documentation was not fully available at the time. The Agreement provided that the appointment would enter into force one month after the date on which the Office notified the Director General of WIPO that it was in possession of all elements of the PCT minimum documentation (the notification being received by the Director General at the end of October 1999).

49. The Chair, noting that there was only little support for the request by Finland to be considered at the present time, asked the Delegation of Finland whether it wished to uphold its request to be considered at the present time or whether some other action should be pursued.

50. The Delegation of Finland remarked that no delegation had opposed its request and that delegations were only asking for the matter to be postponed for one year. The question posed by the Chair raised political considerations on which the Delegation would need to consult with its government.

51. In concluding the discussion on the matter, the Chair noted that delegations had not questioned the right of the Finnish Office to seek appointment as an ISA and IPEA and that compliance by the Office with technical requirements was not at issue; indeed, many delegations had expressed their confidence in the competence and technical capacity of the Finnish Office.

52. The Committee recommended to the Assembly of the PCT Union that further consideration of the request by the Finnish Office for appointment as an ISA and IPEA be deferred until 2003.

[Annexes follow]

ANNEXE I/ANNEX I

I. MEMBRES DU COMITÉ/MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

(dans l'ordre alphabétique des noms français des États/
in the alphabetical order of the names in French of the States)

AFRIQUE DU SUD/SOUTH AFRICA

Cecilia 'Maelia PETLANE (Ms.), Assistant Director Department of Trade and Industry, Companies and Intellectual Property Registration Office (CIPRO), Pretoria

ALGÉRIE/ALGERIA

Amor BOUHNİK, directeur général, Institut national algérien de la propriété industrielle (INAPI), Alger

Malika HABTOUN (Mme), sous-directrice de la protection industrielle, Institut national algérien de la propriété industrielle (INAPI), Alger

ALLEMAGNE/GERMANY

Raimund LUTZ, Deputy Director General, Federal Ministry of Justice, Berlin

Jürgen SCHADE, President, German Patent and Trademark Office, Munich

ANTIGUA-ET-BARBUDA/ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA

Gertel Uranie THOM (Mrs.), Attorney General, Ministry of Justice and Legal Affairs, St. John's

Laurie FREELAND-ROBERTS (Mrs.), Deputy Registrar, Registrar's Office, High Court, Ministry of Justice and Legal Affairs, St. John's

AUSTRALIE/AUSTRALIA

Ian HEATH, Director General, IP Australia, Canberra

Rick GOULD, Deputy Director General (Corporate Strategy), IP Australia, Canberra

AUTRICHE/AUSTRIA

Robert ULLRICH, Head, Department for International and EC Affairs, Austrian Patent Office, Vienna

BARBADE/BARBADOS

Maureen CRANE-SCOTT (Mrs.), Registrar, Corporate Affairs and Intellectual Property Office, St. Michael

BELGIQUE/BELGIUM

Leopold WUYTS, conseiller, Office de la propriété industrielle, Ministère des affaires économiques, Bruxelles

Monique PETIT (Mme), conseiller-adjoint, Office de la propriété industrielle, Ministère des affaires économiques, Bruxelles

BÉNIN/BENIN

Lola Juliette AYITE (Mme), directrice, Centre national de la propriété industrielle, Ministère de l'industrie du commerce et des petites et moyennes entreprises, Cotonou

BOSNIE-HERZÉGOVINE/BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

Žarko SAVIĆ, Acting Director, Institute for Standardization, Metrology and Patents of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Sarajevo

Alija KRDŽALIĆ (Miss.), Assistant Director, Institute for Standardization, Metrology and Patents of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Sarajevo

BRÉSIL/BRAZIL

José GRAÇA ARANHA, President, National Institute of Industrial Property (INPI), Rio de Janeiro

Leandro DA MONA OLIVEIRA, Assessor, Secretaria de Tecnologia Industrial, Ministerio do Desenvolvimento e comércio exterior, Brasilia

BULGARIE/BULGARIA

Mircho Rachev MIRCHEV, President, Patent Office of the Republic of Bulgaria, Sofia

Veneta Borisova SHAMANDURA (Mrs.), Administrative Secretary, Patent Office of the Republic of Bulgaria, Sofia

Magdalena RADULOVA (Miss.), Examiner, Patent Office of the Republic of Bulgaria, Sofia

BURKINA FASO

Etienne BAYALA, directeur, Direction nationale de la propriété industrielle, Ministère du commerce, de la promotion de l'entreprise et de l'artisanat, Ouagadougou

CANADA

David TOBIN, Commissioner of Patents, Registrar of Trade-marks and Chief Executive Officer, Canadian Intellectual Property Office (CIPO), Department of Industry Canada, Ottawa-Hull, Québec

Pierre TRÉPANIÉ, Special Advisor to the Chief Executive Officer, Commissioner of Patents, Registrar of Trade-marks, Canadian Intellectual Property Office (CIPO), Department of Industry Canada, Ottawa-Hull, Québec

Dilhari FERNANDO (Ms.), Director, Corporate Strategies Branch, Canadian Intellectual Property Office (CIPO), Department of Industry Canada, Ottawa-Hull, Québec

Barney DE SCHNEIDER, Director, Patent Branch, Canadian Intellectual Property Office (CIPO), Department of Industry Canada, Ottawa-Hull, Québec

Quan-Ling SIM, A/Chief, International Affairs Division, Corporate Strategies Branch, Canadian Intellectual Property Office (CIPO), Department of Industry Canada, Ottawa-Hull, Québec

CHINE/CHINA

TIAN Lipu, Deputy Commissioner, State Intellectual Property Office (SIPO), Beijing

LU Guoliang, Deputy Director General, International Cooperation Department, State Intellectual Property Office (SIPO), Beijing

ZENG Yanni (Miss), Project Administrator, International Cooperation Department, State Intellectual Property Office (SIPO), Beijing

CHYPRE/CYPRUS

Soteroula KYRIACOU-TSOKOU (Mrs.), Examiner, Registrar of Companies, Trademarks, Patents and Official Receiver, Ministry of Commerce, Industry and Tourism, Nicosia

COLOMBIE/COLOMBIA

Juan Guillermo MOURE PÉREZ, Superintendente Delegado para la Propiedad Industrial, Superintendencia de Industria y Comercio (SIC), Ministerio de Desarrollo Económico, Santafé de Bogota

Luis Gerardo GUZMÁN VALENCIA, Ministro Consejero, Misión Permanente, Ginebra

CONGO

Pascal NDINGA, directeur de l'antenne nationale de la propriété industrielle, Direction générale de l'industrie, Ministère du développement industriel, Brazzaville

CÔTE D'IVOIRE

Soro NAGOLO, directeur, Direction du développement industriel, Office ivoirien de la propriété industrielle (OIFI), Ministère de l'industrie et de la promotion du secteur privé, Abidjan

CROATIE/CROATIA

Ivan SUGJA, Deputy Head of Examiners, State Intellectual Property Office of the Republic of Croatia, Zagreb

Tatjana SUČIĆ (Mrs.), Head of the PCT Department, State Intellectual Property Office of the Republic of Croatia, Zagreb

CUBA

América Néstar SANTOS RIVERAS (Sra.), Viceministra de Ciencia, Tecnología y Medio Ambiente, Ministerio de Ciencia, Tecnología y Medio Ambiente, La Habana

María de los Angeles SÁNCHEZ TORRES (Sra.), Directora General, Oficina Cubana de la Propiedad Industrial (OCPI), La Habana

DANEMARK/DENMARK

Mogens KRING, Director General, Danish Patent and Trademark Office, Ministry of Economic and Business Affairs, Taastrup

Anne Rejnhold JØRGENSEN (Mrs.), Director, Industrial Property Law Division, Danish Patent and Trademark Office, Ministry of Economic and Business Affairs, Taastrup

Lene Juhl KJERRUMGAARD (Mrs.), Legal Adviser, Legal Department, Danish Patent and Trademark Office, Ministry of Economic and Business Affairs, Taastrup

ÉQUATEUR/ECUADOR

Nelson VELASCO IZQUIERDO, Presidente, Instituto Ecuatoriano de la Propiedad Intelectual (IEPI), Quito

ESPAGNE/SPAIN

José LÓPEZ CALVO, Director General, Oficina Española de Patentes y Marcas, Ministerio de Ciencia y Tecnología, Madrid

ESTONIE/ESTONIA

Matti PÄTS, Director General, Estonian Patent Office, Tallinn

Toomas LUMI, Deputy Director General, Estonian Patent Office, Tallinn

ÉTATS-UNIS D'AMÉRIQUE/UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Lois BOLAND (Mrs.), Acting Director, Office of Legislative and International Affairs, United States Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C.

Brad HUTHER, Senior Advisor to the Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property, Arlington

EX-RÉPUBLIQUE YOUGOSLAVE DE MACÉDOINE/THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA

Liljana VARGA (Mrs.), Assistant Director, Head of Legal Department, Industrial Property Protection Office, Skopje

Ognjan BLAGOEY, Head of Patent Department, Industrial Property Protection Office, Skopje

FÉDÉRATION DE RUSSIE/RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Guennadi Anatolievich NEGOULIAEV, Director, Department of International Cooperation, Russian Agency for Patents and Trademarks (ROSPATENT), Moscow

FINLANDE/FINLAND

Martti Jaakko Juhani ENÄJÄRVI, Director General, National Board of Patents and Registration of Finland, Helsinki

Pekka Tapani LAUNIS, Deputy Director General, National Board of Patents and Registration of Finland, Helsinki

Marja-Leena RINKINEVA (Mrs.), Senior Advisor, Ministry of Trade and Industry, Helsinki

Maarit LÖYTÖMÄKI (Mrs.), Deputy Director, National Board of Patents and Registration of Finland, Helsinki

Marjo AALTO-SETÄLÄ (Miss.), Coordinator, International and Legal Affairs, National Board of Patents and Registration, Helsinki

FRANCE

Michèle WEIL-GUTHMANN (Mme), conseiller juridique, Mission permanente, Genève

Benjamine VIDAUD-ROUSSEAU (Mme), conseiller juridique, Direction générale, Institut national de la propriété industrielle (INPI), Paris

Pascal DUMAS DE RAULY, chef du Service du droit international et communautaire de l'Institut national de la propriété industrielle (INPI), Paris

Jean Christophe BOCCON-GIBOD, Mission permanente, Genève

GABON

Malem TIDZANI, directeur général, Centre de propriété industrielle du Gabon (CEPIG), Ministère du commerce, de l'industrie, Chargé de la promotion des investissements et de l'intégration régionale, Libreville

GAMBIE/GAMBIA

Hagar Fola ALLEN (Mrs.), Registrar General, Registrar General's Department, Department of State for Justice, Banjul

GHANA

Elizabeth OWIREDU-GYAMPOH (Mrs.), Registrar General, Registrar General's Department, Ministry of Justice, Accra

Kwame ANYIMADU-ANTWI, Assistant Copyright Administrator, Ministry of Culture, Kumasi

GRÈCE/GREECE

Demetrios BOUCOUVALAS, Deputy Director General, Hellenic Industrial Property Organisation, Athens

GRENADE/GRENADA

Raymond ANTHONY, Attorney General, Ministry of Legal Affairs, St. George's

GUINÉE/GUINEA

Cécé KPOHOMOU, Directeur, Service national de la propriété industrielle (SPI), Ministère de l'industrie, du commerce et des PME, Conakry

GUINÉE-BISSAU/GUINEA-BISSAU

Bubacar JALÓ, chef, Répartition brevets et information technique, Direction générale de l'industrie, Ministère de l'économie et des finances, Bissau

GUINÉE ÉQUATORIALE/EQUATORIAL GUINEA

José NTUTUMU NZANG, Asesor Jurídico en Materia de Propiedad Industrial, Consejo de Investigaciones Científicas y Tecnológicas (CICTE), Malabo

HONGRIE/HUNGARY

Margit SÜMEGHY (Mrs.), Senior IP Adviser, Hungarian Patent Office, Budapest

Veronika CSERBA (Mrs.), Legal Officer, Hungarian Patent Office, Budapest

INDONÉSIE/INDONESIA

Walter SIMANJUNTAK, Director of Patents, Directorate General of Intellectual Property Rights, Department of Justice and Human Rights, Jakarta

IRLANDE/IRELAND

Tony MCGRATH, Principal Officer, Intellectual Property Unit, Department of Enterprise, Trade and Employment, Dublin

Jacob RAJAN, Principal Examiner of Patents, Intellectual Property Unit, Department for Enterprise, Trade and Employment, Dublin

ISLANDE/ICELAND

Ásta VALDIMARSDÓTTIR (Mrs.), Director General, Icelandic Patent Office, Reykjavik

Elin Ragnhildur JÓNSDÓTTIR (Mrs.), Head, Patent Department, Icelandic Patent Office, Reykjavik

ITALIE/ITALY

Giulio PRIGIONI, First Counsellor, Italian Delegate for Intellectual Property, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Rome

Maria Ludovica AGRO' (Mrs.), Director, Italian Office of Patents and Trademarks, Directorate General of Industrial Production, Ministry of Commerce, Industry and Handicrafts, Rome

Angelo CAPONE, Senior Officer, Head of "EP Patents and PCT" branch, Italian Office of Patents and Trademarks, Directorate General of Industrial Production, Ministry of Commerce, Industry and Handicrafts, Rome

JAPON/JAPAN

Shinjiro ONO, Deputy Commissioner, Japanese Patent Office, Tokyo

Hitoshi WATANABE, Director, International Cooperation Office, International Affairs Division, General Administration Department, Japanese Patent Office, Tokyo

Masashi FUKAZAWA, Assistant Director, International Affairs Division, General Administration Department, Japanese Patent Office (JPO), Tokyo

Takashi YAMASHITA, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

KENYA

Norah Khadzini OLEMBO (Mrs.), Managing Director, Kenya Industrial Property Institute (KIPI), Ministry of Trade and Industry, Nairobi

Evans Misati MBOI, Examination Officer (Patents), Kenya Industrial Property Institute (KIPI), Ministry of Trade and Industry, Nairobi

Geoffrey Muchai RAMBA, Examination Officer (Trademarks), Kenya Industrial Property Institute (KIPI), Ministry of Trade and Industry, Nairobi

KIRGHIZISTAN/KYRGYZSTAN

Roman O. OMOROV, Director, State Agency of Science and Intellectual Property under the Government of the Kyrgyz Republic, Bishkek

LESOTHO

Sentšuoë Ntšeliseng LENKA (Miss), Registrar General, Attorney General's Chambers, Ministry of Law and Constitutional Affairs, Maseru

'M'amotumi MALIEHE (Miss), Principal Industrial Property Counsel, Registrar General's Office, Ministry of Law and Constitutional Affairs, Maseru

LETTONIE/LATVIA

Guntis RAMANS, Acting Deputy Director, Patent Office of the Republic of Latvia, Riga

LITUANIE/LITHUANIA

Antanas PAVILONIS, Chief Administrator, State Patent Bureau of the Republic of Lithuania, Vilnius

Zenonas VALASEVIČIUS, Head of Inventions Division, State Patent Bureau of the Republic of Lithuania, Vilnius

LUXEMBOURG

Serge ALLEGREZZA, conseiller de Gouvernement 1ère classe, Direction de la propriété industrielle et des droits intellectuels, Ministère de l'économie, Luxembourg

Christiane DALEIDEN-DISTEFANO (Mme), représentant permanent adjoint, Mission permanente, Genève

MALAWI

Vincent Jeremy MZUMARA, Registrar General, Department of the Registrar General,
Ministry of Justice, Blantyre

MALI

Sountou KONATE DIAWARA (Mme), directrice, Centre Malien de promotion de la
propriété industrielle, Direction nationale des industries, Ministère de l'industrie, du
commerce et des transports, Bamako

MAROC/MOROCCO

Aziz BOUAZZAOUI, directeur, Office marocain de la propriété industrielle et commerciale,
Casablanca

MAURITANIE/MAURITANIA

Mohamed Salem OULD MAMOUNE, directeur de l'industrie, Direction de l'industrie,
Ministère des mines et de l'industrie, Nouakchott

MEXIQUE/MEXICO

Jorge AMIGO CASTAÑEDA, Director General, Instituto Mexicano de la Propiedad
Industrial (IMPI), México

Alfredo RENDON ALGARA, Director General Adjunto, Divisional de Asuntos Jurídicos,
Instituto Mexicano de la Propiedad Industrial (IMPI), México

Karla ORNELAS LOERA (Srta.), Agregada Diplomática, Misión Permanente, Ginebra

MONACO

Yann STRIDDE, chef de section, Direction de l'expansion économique, Division de la
propriété intellectuelle, Monaco

NIGER

Jérôme Oumarou TRAPSIDA, directeur du développement industriel, Direction du
développement industriel, Ministère du commerce et de la promotion du secteur privé,
Niamey

NORVÈGE/NORWAY

Jørgen SMITH, Director General, Norwegian Patent Office, Oslo

Lisbeth WOLTHER (Mrs.), Assistant Director General, Director of Legal and Political Affairs, Norwegian Patent Office, Oslo

NOUVELLE-ZÉLANDE/NEW ZEALAND

Neville HARRIS, Commissioner of Patents, Trade Marks and Designs, Ministry of Economic Development, Wellington

OUGANDA/UGANDA

Bisereko KYOMUHENDO, Acting Registrar-General, Ministry of Justice, Kampala

PAYS-BAS/NETHERLANDS

Robert Louis Marie BERGER, President, Netherlands Industrial Property Office, Rijswijk

Derk Jan DE GROOT, Head, Industrial Property Policy Unit, Ministry of Economic Affairs, The Hague

PHILIPPINES

Emma C. FRANCISCO (Mrs.), Director General, Intellectual Property Office, Manila

Angelina M. STA. CATALINA (Mrs.), First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

POLOGNE/POLAND

Grażyna LACHOWICZ (Miss), Senior Specialist, Patent Office of the Republic of Poland, Warsaw

PORTUGAL

Jaime Serrão ANDREZ, Président, Conseil d'administration, Institut national de la propriété industrielle, Ministère de l'économie, Lisbonne

Paulo SERRÃO, administrateur, Institut national de la propriété industrielle, Ministère de l'économie, Lisbonne

RÉPUBLIQUE CENTRAFRICAINE/CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Jacques KOMETAN, directeur général des services centraux, Ministère du commerce, de l'industrie et de la promotion du secteur privé, Bangui

RÉPUBLIQUE DE CORÉE/REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Eul-Soo SEO, Senior Deputy Director, International Cooperation Division, Korean Industrial Property Office (KIPO), Daejeon

RÉPUBLIQUE DE MOLDOVA/REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA

Liliana VIERU (Mrs.), Head, International Cooperation Division, State Agency on Industrial Property Protection (AGEPI), Kishinev

RÉPUBLIQUE POPULAIRE DÉMOCRATIQUE DE CORÉE/DEMOCRATIC PEOPLE'S
REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Jin Song JONG, Director, Department of Technology, Invention Office of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Pyongyang

Myong Hui HWANG (Mrs.), Head of Division, Trademark and Industrial Design Department, State Administration for Quality Management, Pyongyang

RÉPUBLIQUE TCHÈQUE/CZECH REPUBLIC

Karel ČADA, President, Industrial Property Office, Prague

Marcela HUJEROVÁ (Mrs.), Deputy Director, International and European Integration Department, Industrial Property Office, Prague

RÉPUBLIQUE-UNIE DE TANZANIE/UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA

Esteriano Emmanuel MAHINGILA, Registrar of Patents and Trade Marks, CEO of Business Registration and Licensing Agency, Ministry of Industry and Commerce, Dar-es-Salaam

ROUMANIE/ROMANIA

Liviu Antoniu Gheorghe BULGĂR, Director, Legal and International Cooperation Department, State Office for Inventions and Trademarks, Bucarest

Viorel PORDEA, Head, Preliminary Examination Department, State Office for Inventions and Trademarks, Bucarest

ROYAUME-UNI/UNITED KINGDOM

Alison BRIMELOW (Ms.), Chief Executive, The Patent Office, Newport

Ronald MARCHANT, Director of Patents, The Patent Office, Newport

Graham JENKINS, Director, Intellectual Property Policy Directorate, The Patent Office, Newport

Ben MICKLEWRIGHT, Policy Advisor, Intellectual Property Policy Directorate, The Patent Office, Newport

SÉNÉGAL/SENEGAL

Ibrahima DIOUCK, directeur de cabinet, Ministère de la culture, Dakar

Doudou SAGNA, chef, Service de la propriété industrielle et de la technologie, Ministère de l'artisanat et de l'industrie, Dakar

Pierre SAKHO, chef, Direction communication, Service de la propriété industrielle et de la technologie, Ministère de l'artisanat et de l'industrie, Dakar

SEYCHELLES

Cedric Gustave DODIN, Registrar General, Registration Division, Department of Legal Affairs, President's Office, Mahe

SINGAPOUR/SINGAPORE

Woon Yin LIEW (Miss), Director-General, Intellectual Property Office of Singapore (IPOS), Singapore

Shao Wei YING, Deputy Director (Intellectual Property), Ministry of Law, Singapore

SLOVAQUIE/SLOVAKIA

Emil ŽATKULIAK, Official, International Affairs Department, Industrial Property Office of the Slovak Republic, Banská Bystrica

SLOVÉNIE/SLOVENIA

Erik VRENKO, Director, Slovenian Intellectual Property Office, Ljubljana

Andrej PIANO, Permanent Representative to WIPO, Slovenian Intellectual Property Office,
Ministry of Economy, Ljubljana

SRI LANKA

Dissanayake Mudiyanse KARANARATNA, Director, National Intellectual Property
Office of Sri Lanka, Colombo

SUÈDE/SWEDEN

Gun HELLSVIK (Mrs.), Director General, Swedish Patent and Registration Office,
Stockholm

Ulf JANSSON, Director, Swedish Patent and Registration Office, Stockholm

Henry OLSSON, Special Government Adviser, Ministry of Justice, Stockholm

SUISSE/SWITZERLAND

Roland GROSSENBACHER, directeur, Institut fédéral de la propriété intellectuelle, Berne

Alexandra GRAZIOLI (Mlle), conseillère juridique, Division droit et affaires internationales,
Institut fédéral de la propriété intellectuelle, Berne

SWAZILAND

Beatrice Siphwe SHONGWE (Mrs.), Acting Registrar-General, Registrar-General's Office,
Ministry of Justice, Mbabane

TADJIKISTAN/TAJIKISTAN

Inom Gafurovitch TAKHIROV, Director, National Center for Patents and Information,
Dushanbe

TCHAD/CHAD

Brahim ADOUM, responsable de la structure nationale de liaison avec l'Organisation africaine de la propriété intellectuelle (OAPI), Ministère du commerce, de l'industrie et de l'artisanat, N'Djamena

TOGO

N'na Sary KANDA (Mme), directeur général, Institut national de la propriété industrielle et de la technologie (INPIT), Ministère du commerce, de l'industrie, des transports et du développement de la zone franche, Lomé

TRINITÉ-ET-TOBAGO/TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO

Mazina KADIR (Miss.), Controller, Intellectual Property Office, Ministry of Legal Affairs, Port of Spain

TUNISIE/TUNISIA

Saloua GHEDAMSI (Mme), directrice générale, Institut national de la normalisation et de la propriété industrielle (INNORPI), Tunis

TURQUIE/TURKEY

Selim Mustafa SENGÜN, President, Turkish Patent Institute, Ankara

Fusun ATASAY (Miss), Division Director, International Affairs Department, Turkish Patent Institute, Ankara

VIET NAM

Viet Hung TRAN, Deputy Director General, National Office of Industrial Property (NOIP), Hanoi

Quoc Khanh TRAN, Director, International Relations Division, National Office of Industrial Property (NOIP), Hanoi

YOUgoslavie/YUGOSLAVIA

Miodrag MARKOVIC, Advisor to the Director, Federal Intellectual Property Office, Federal Ministry for Economy and Internal Trade, Belgrade

ZAMBIE/ZAMBIA

Musesha Chitundu Joseph KUNKUTA, Controller, Patents and Companies Registration Office, Ministry of Commerce, Trade and Industry, Lusaka

Wilbrod Aggrey MULENGA, Manager, Information Systems and External Cooperation, Patents and Companies Registration Office, Ministry of Commerce, Trade and Industry, Lusaka

ZIMBABWE

Jameson Mupariwa MUKARATIRWA, Law Officer, Ministry of Justice, Legal and Parliamentary Affairs, Harare

OFFICE EUROPÉEN DES BREVETS (OEB)/EUROPEAN PATENT OFFICE (EPO)

Ingo KOBER, President, Munich

Jacques MICHEL, Vice President, DG1, European Patent Office, The Hague

York BUSSE, Principal Administrator (DG5), Head PCT Section, European Patent Office, Munich

Richard YOUNG, Directeur affaires internationales, European Patent Office, Munich

Adam KENDRICK, Administrator, European Patent Office, Munich

II. OBSERVATEURS SPÉCIAUX/
SPECIAL OBSERVERS

ORGANISATION EURASIENNE DES BREVETS (OEAB)/EURASIAN PATENT ORGANIZATION (EAPO)

Victor BLINNIKOV, President, Eurasian Patent Office, Moscow

Khabibullo FAYAZOV, Vice-President, Eurasian Patent Office, Moscow

ORGANISATION RÉGIONALE AFRICAINE DE LA PROPRIÉTÉ INDUSTRIELLE (ARIPO)/AFRICAN REGIONAL INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION (ARIPO)

Christopher Joel KIIGE, Director (Technical), Harare

III. BUREAU/OFFICERS

Président/Chair: Jørgen SMITH (Norway)
Vice-présidents/Vice-Chairs: WANG Jingchuan (China)
Miklós BENDZSEL (Hungary)
Secrétaire/Secretary: Isabelle Boutillon (Ms.) (OMPI/WIPO)

IV. BUREAU INTERNATIONAL DE L'ORGANISATION
MONDIALE DE LA PROPRIÉTÉ INTELLECTUELLE (OMPI)/
INTERNATIONAL BUREAU OF THE WORLD INTELLECTUAL
PROPERTY ORGANIZATION (WIPO)

Francis GURRY, sous-directeur général/Assistant Director General

Gary SMITH, directeur principal du Bureau du PCT/Senior Director, Office of the PCT

Philip THOMAS, directeur du Département des politiques en matière de brevets/Director,
Patent Policy Department

Bureau du PCT/Office of the PCT: Jay ERSTLING, conseiller principal/Senior Counsellor

Division juridique du PCT, Bureau du PCT/PCT Legal Division, Office of the PCT:
Isabelle BOUTILLON (Ms.), directeur par intérim/Acting Director;
Diego Agustín CARRASCO PRADAS, chef, Section des affaires juridiques du PCT et de la
coordination des séminaires/Head, PCT Legal Affairs and Seminar Coordination Section;
Hans-Georg BARTELS, juriste principal/Senior Legal Officer; Mamue KAMM (Mrs.),
administratrice de programme/Program Officer; Silvija TRPKOVSKA (Ms.), juriste/Legal
Officer;
Matthew Bryan, Chef, Section des affaires juridiques du PCT et des ressources
juridiques/Head, PCT Legal Affairs and Legal Resources Section

[L'annexe II suit/Annex II follows]

ANNEX II

AGENDA

adopted by the Committee

1. Opening of the session
2. Election of a Chair and two Vice-Chairs
3. Adoption of the agenda
4. PCT minimum documentation (See document PCT/CTC/20/4.)
5. Advice to the Assembly of the PCT Union on the request of the Canadian Commissioner of Patents to be appointed as International Searching Authority and as International Preliminary Examining Authority (See documents PCT/CTC/20/2 and PCT/CTC/20/2 Add.1.)
6. Advice to the Assembly of the PCT Union on the request of the National Board of Patents and Registration of Finland to be appointed as International Searching Authority and as International Preliminary Examining Authority (See document PCT/CTC/20/3.)
7. Adoption of the report of the session
8. Closing of the session

[End of Annex II and of document]