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# INTRODUCTION

1. This draft General Report records the deliberations and decisions of the following 22 Assemblies and other bodies of the Member States of WIPO (the “Assemblies“):

(1) WIPO General Assembly, fifty-seventh (31st extraordinary) session

(2) WIPO Conference, forty-fifth (19th extraordinary) session

(3) WIPO Coordination Committee, eighty-third (55th ordinary) session

(4) Paris Union Assembly, sixtieth (34th extraordinary) session

(5) Paris Union Executive Committee, sixty-fourth (60th ordinary) session

(6) Berne Union Assembly, fifty-fourth (28th extraordinary) session

(7) Berne Union Executive Committee, seventieth (55th ordinary) session

(8) Madrid Union Assembly, fifty-eighth (33rd extraordinary) session

(9) Hague Union Assembly, forty-fourth (20th extraordinary) session

(10) Nice Union Assembly, forty-fourth (18th extraordinary) session

(11) Lisbon Union Assembly, forty‑first (16th extraordinary) session

(12) Locarno Union Assembly, forty-fourth (19th extraordinary) session

(13) IPC [International Patent Classification] Union Assembly, forty-fifth (21stextraordinary) session

(14) PCT [Patent Cooperation Treaty] Union Assembly, fifty‑sixth (32ndextraordinary) session

(15) Budapest Union Assembly, forty‑first (19th extraordinary) session

(16) Vienna Union Assembly, thirty‑seventh (17th extraordinary) session

(17) WCT [WIPO Copyright Treaty] Assembly, twenty-fourth (13th extraordinary) session

(18) WPPT [WIPO Performances and Phonograms Treaty] Assembly, twenty-fourth (13th extraordinary) session

(19) PLT [Patent Law Treaty] Assembly, twenty‑third (13th extraordinary) session

(20) Singapore Treaty [Singapore Treaty on the Law of Trademarks] Assembly, seventeenth (9th extraordinary) session

(21) Marrakesh Treaty [Marrakesh Treaty to Facilitate Access to Published Works for Persons Who Are Blind, Visually Impaired or Otherwise Print Disabled] Assembly, ninth (9th ordinary) session

(22) BTAP [Beijing Treaty on Audiovisual Performances] Assembly, fifth (5th ordinary) session.

meeting in Geneva from July 9 to 17, 2024, and which made decisions in joint meetings of two or more of the said Assemblies and other bodies convened (hereinafter referred to as “the joint meeting(s)“ and “the Assemblies of the Member States,“ respectively).

1. In addition to this draft General Report, separate draft Reports have been drawn up on the sessions of the WIPO General Assembly (WO/GA/57/12 Prov.), WIPO Coordination Committee (WO/CC/83/2 Prov.), Madrid Union Assembly (MM/A/58/2 Prov.), Hague Union Assembly (H/A/44/3 Prov.), PCT Union Assembly (PCT/A/56/3 Prov.), Budapest Union Assembly (BP/A/41/2 Prov.) and Marrakesh Treaty Assembly (MVT/A/9/2 Prov.). Furthermore, consolidated Reports of the sessions of the other bodies have also been drawn up, as follows: WIPO Conference (WO/CF/45/1 Prov.), Paris Union Assembly (P/A/60/1 Prov.), Paris Union Executive Committee (P/EC/64/1 Prov.), Berne Union Assembly (B/A/54/1 Prov.), Berne Union Executive Committee (B/EC/70/1 Prov.), Nice Union Assembly (N/A/44/1 Prov.), Lisbon Union Assembly (LI/A/41/1 Prov.), Locarno Union Assembly (LO/A/44/1 Prov.), IPC Union Assembly (IPC/A/45/1 Prov.), Vienna Union Assembly (VA/A/37/1 Prov.), WIPO Copyright Treaty Assembly (WCT/A/24/1 Prov.), WIPO Performances and Phonograms Treaty Assembly (WPPT/A/24/1 Prov.), Patent Law Treaty Assembly (PLT/A/23/1 Prov.), Singapore Treaty Assembly (STLT/A/17/1 Prov.) and the Beijing Treaty Assembly (BTAP/A/5/1 Prov.).
2. The list of the members and observers of the Assemblies, as of July 9, 2024, is set forth in document [A/65/INF/1 Rev.](https://www.wipo.int/about-wipo/en/assemblies/2024/a-65/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=633020)
3. The meetings dealing with the following items of the Agenda (document [A/65/1](https://www.wipo.int/about-wipo/en/assemblies/2024/a-65/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=633116)) were presided over by the following Chairs:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 14, 17, 18, 21 and 22 | Ambassador Alfredo Suescum (Mr.) (Panama), Chair of the WIPO General Assembly |
| Item 5, 7, 19, 20 | Vivienne Katjiuongua (Ms.) (Namibia), Chair of the WIPO Coordination Committee  |
| Item 11 | Abdulaziz Algabbaa (Mr.) (Saudi Arabia), Chair of the PCT Union Assembly |
| Item 12 | Loreto Bresky (Ms.) (Chile), Chair of the Madrid Union Assembly |
| Item 13 | Pascal Faure (Mr.) (France), Chair of the Hague Union Assembly |
| Item 15 | Szabolcs Farkas (Mr.) (Hungary), Vice-Chair of the Budapest Union Assembly |
| Item 16 | Franklin Ponka Seukam (Mr.) (Cameroon), Vice-Chair of the Marrakesh Treaty Assembly, as Acting Chair, in the absence of Fabiola Torres (Ms.) (Paraguay), Chair of the Marrakesh Treaty Assembly |

1. The agenda, as adopted, the list of documents and the list of participants appear in documents [A/65/1](https://www.wipo.int/about-wipo/en/assemblies/2024/a-65/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=633116), A/65/2 and A/65/INF/5, respectively.

## ITEM 1 OF THE CONSOLIDATED AGENDAOPENING OF THE SESSIONS

1. The Sixty-Fifth Series of Meetings of the Assemblies of WIPO was convened by the Director General of WIPO, Mr. Daren Tang (hereinafter referred to as “the Director General”).
2. The sessions were opened in a joint meeting of all the 22 Assemblies and other bodies concerned by Ambassador Alfredo Suescum (Mr.) (Panama), Chair of the WIPO General Assembly.
3. The Chair welcomed all delegations and noted the record number of delegates from all over the world. The Chair thanked Member States for his election and for the trust placed in him. He was honored to take on the role and assured Member States that he would do his utmost best to ensure that the work was concluded efficiently, effectively and successfully. He encouraged holding discussions in the spirit of multilateralism and constructive dialogue to contribute to the positive outcome of the Assemblies.

## ITEM 2 OF THE CONSOLIDATED AGENDAADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

1. Discussions were based on document A/65/1 Prov.1.
2. The Assemblies of WIPO, each as far as it is concerned, adopted the agenda as proposed in document A/65/1 Prov.1 (referred to in this document as “the Consolidated Agenda”).

## ITEM 3 OF THE CONSOLIDATED AGENDAAddress OF THE DIRECTOR GENERAL TO THE ASSEMBLIES OF WIPO

1. The Address of the Director General is recorded as follows:

“Ambassador Alfredo Suescum, Chair of the WIPO General Assembly,

“Ministers,

“Excellencies,

“Heads of Delegation,

“Friends and Colleagues,

“Good morning and welcome to the [Sixty-Fifth Series of Meetings of the Assemblies of the WIPO Member States](https://www.wipo.int/about-wipo/en/assemblies/2024/a-65/#:~:text=July%209%20to%2017%2C%202024,WIPO%20headquarters%20in%20Geneva%2C%20Switzerland.). This is our biggest Assemblies ever, with over 1400 registered participants, 900 onsite, 500 online. I am very pleased to welcome all of you back to WIPO, including the largest contingent of Ministers in attendance.

“Allow me at the outset to offer our solidarity as a WIPO community to all those in the Caribbean and the United States that have been affected by Hurricane Beryl, including some in the IP community who have had to miss this GA because of the disruptions. We have seen the scenes of destruction left in the wake of one of the strongest hurricanes on record and we wish all affected places and communities the best as you rebuild and recover.

\*\*\*

“This year instead of giving you only statistics and strategies, I want to start by sharing with you the stories of two women – Soňa Stančíková and Mariama Sarge. Sona and Mariama live thousands of kilometers apart, but are connected by one common thread – they are both using IP to create new opportunities for themselves and their communities.

“Sona is from the Detva region of Slovakia, the fourth generation of a family that has preserved traditional folk clothing and art. Her region is famous for a special type of embroidery long protected as a geographical indication. But like many new generation designers, Sona is putting her own spin on traditional practices.

“Last year, she joined our eleven-month [Training, Mentoring and Matchmaking Program for women entrepreneurs](https://www.wipo.int/tk/en/women_entrepreneurs/indigenous-peoples-gallery.html) in the Central European and Baltic States, one of 21 women from local communities in 15 countries to do so.

“She received specialized training on how to use IP to protect her designs and as a tool for branding and marketing her products. With our support, she was able to register her motifs and patterns as protected designs last year, safeguarding her creations and opening doors to new markets.

“[Mariama Sarge is from The Gambia](https://www.wipo.int/pressroom/en/stories/mariama-gambia-2024.html). A small business owner, she had little exposure to IP until hearing about a local WIPO workshop. Intrigued, she was soon one of 50 SME owners receiving comprehensive IP training and mentorship through a 6-month project, jointly delivered with local partners.

“Some of the participants used the training to register trademarks. Others refined business strategies. Mariama invented a Multifunctional Solar-Powered Cart – a cleaner, greener alternative for street vendors.

“With our help, she became the first female inventor to register a utility model in The Gambia. As she told us, “IP unlocks my creativity, mind and opportunities…I want to be part of the innovators of Africa”.

“Sona and Mariama are not alone.

“All over the globe, millions like them dream of changing the world and enriching our lives through their innovation and creativity.

“Our duty is to support them, and that is why our mission is to build a balanced and effective global IP ecosystem that supports innovators and creators everywhere.

\*\*\*

“To understand the context in which today’s innovators and creators operate, we must understand the global state of IP. Here we see several big trends.

“First, IP activity continues to grow steadily despite economic uncertainty, with its centers becoming more global.

“[Over 23 million IP applications were filed in 2022](https://www.wipo.int/edocs/pubdocs/en/wipo-pub-943-2023-en-wipo-ip-facts-and-figures-2023.pdf) – more than 40 every minute, and nearly three times the number of 15 years ago. 70% of these filings now come from Asia, Africa and Latin America.

“We also see the same explosion of IP activity in the area of copyright. For example, recorded music revenues in Sub-Saharan Africa grew by nearly 25% last year, the fastest growth rate globally. [WIPO research also finds that global film production has recovered post-pandemic](https://www.wipo.int/global_innovation_index/en/gii-insights-blog/2024/global-cinema.html), including in middle-income economies like Argentina, Brazil and the Philippines.

“These trends are supporting an invisible but inevitable shift in value creation from tangible to intangible assets, which are now worth over $60 trillion, more than the value of the top global economies combined.

“[Two weeks ago, WIPO released a major report showing that over the past 15 years, investments in intangible assets have grown three times faster than those in tangible assets](https://www.wipo.int/edocs/pubdocs/en/wipo-pub-rn2024-32-en-world-intangible-investment-highlights.pdf), reaching nearly $7 trillion last year.

“While advanced economies like Sweden, the US and France are the most intangible asset-intensive, growth is not limited to high-income economies. For instance, between 2011 and 2020, India recorded the fastest growth in intangible asset investment, as it moves more and more towards innovation driven development.

“These findings align with [WIPO’s Global Innovation Index, which uses enterprise-level data to reveal that Türkiye, Indonesia and Mexico are among the top 20 economies by intangible-asset intensity](https://www.wipo.int/global_innovation_index/en/gii-insights-blog/2024/corporate-intangible-assets.html). Intangible assets are therefore transforming not just advanced economies, but also emerging and developing economies.

“Second, the very patterns of innovation are also evolving and changing, with digital innovation increasingly important, and merging with industrial innovation. The line between hardware and software is blurring, and even the car, a classic symbol of the industrial age, is increasingly a software, data and entertainment center on four wheels. Almost a third of all patents filed today relates to digital technologies, and with the explosion of GenAI patents, this trend is set to continue.

“This means that we can no longer afford to look at IP only in separate legal silos, but instead as a portfolio of intangible assets that are used by enterprises to grow and countries to develop. IP policy-making will have to become more coordinated and holistic, looking at IP as a horizontal instead of a vertical.

“Third, all these shifts in innovation, technology and creativity are taking place in a world that is more divided geopolitically. Agreement has become difficult, and our ability to set global standards and norms has slowed down substantially.

“However, whilst consensus has become elusive, it is not extinct.

“Two months ago, in May, the entire WIPO community came together as one to conclude a historic new treaty after 25 years of negotiations. [This, 27th, WIPO Treaty on Intellectual Property, Genetic Resources and Associated Traditional Knowledge has sent a strong signal that even in difficult areas with high emotions and strong differences of views](https://www.wipo.int/pressroom/en/articles/2024/article_0007.html), it is possible for us as a global community to arrive at consensus – if we approach negotiations in the spirit of collaboration, pragmatism, transparency and inclusiveness, as was done in May. The result was not just a victory for the Indigenous Peoples and local communities, and a more inclusive IP ecosystem, but also victory for multilateralism.

“I urge Member States to continue this spirit of working as one, not only as we approach negotiations for a new Design Law Treaty in November, but as we continue the critical task of strengthening WIPO’s work around the world.

\*\*\*

“Dear Colleagues, Dear Friends,

“[It is now three years since we launched the Medium Term Strategic Plan (MTSP)
2022 – 2026](https://www.wipo.int/edocs/mdocs/govbody/en/wo_pbc_32/wo_pbc_32_3.pdf).

“The MTSP laid down a new vision for IP, where it is no longer just a technical matter of interest only to IP experts and specialists, but a powerful catalyst for jobs, investments, growth and economic development, and an enabler to address our common global challenges. With your endorsement of this strategy, we have worked hard together with you to bring this vision alive.

“As is customary at these Assemblies, I wish to take this opportunity to report on the work that has been done since I last addressed you as our Members.

“To do this, I will follow the 4 Pillars and Foundation of the MTSP.

“Under Pillar 1, our focus is on demystifying IP so that it is understandable, relatable and visible not just to IP insiders and experts, but the world at large.

“To do this, we are creating unique content that tells stories about how IP is changing lives on the ground. [We have produced more than 270 videos over the past 12 months](https://www.wipo.int/pressroom/en/stories/), including features on leather-bag branding in Bangladesh, women artisans in rural Spain and an incense-burning invention in Oman.

“These efforts are bringing our work to new audiences the world over. This includes on social media, where our followers grew by over 30 per cent last year to cross the half a million mark. New platforms like [Instagram](https://www.instagram.com/wipo/?hl=en) and [TikTok](https://www.tiktok.com/%40wipo) have been especially effective in reaching out to younger audiences.

“Our revamp of the way we communicate extends to our website, [which has been recently ranked as the world’s most accessible IP office website by the World Trademark Review](https://www.worldtrademarkreview.com/article/wipo-tops-ranking-of-worlds-most-accessible-ip-office-websites-overall-momentum-assist-users-slows). The World IP Day campaign also grows from strength to strength. This year’s theme was [IP and the SDGs, under which over 300 events took place worldwide](https://www.wipo.int/web/ipday/2024-sdgs/index), generating almost 60 million digital impressions, up nearly 50% on 2023, and producing real, global engagement on a vital issue at a critical time. I am pleased to announce that next year’s theme for World IP Day will be IP and Music, a matter close to my heart and many of you as well.

“We are also seeing a transformation of the way IP offices communicate with their audiences, and we hope that more of you will do so as it is vital that we are able to show the world what we do, counter untrue and false narratives about IP, and be confident, as an IP community, that IP can make a positive difference to the world.

\*\*\*

“Pillar 2 moves away from external communications to WIPO’s role as the global forum for discussing and setting IP standards and norms, as well as engagement on cutting edge IP topics.

“After our successful Diplomatic Conference in May, all eyes have [turned to the Diplomatic Conference on the Design Law Treaty in Riyadh this November](https://www.wipo.int/diplomatic-conferences/en/design-law/). Preparations for this have begun in earnest, and we have been working closely with the hosts, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, to put in place the right, and best, logistical, administrative and negotiating arrangements for a successful Conference.

“Beyond these once in a generation Diplomatic Conferences, hard work continues to take place in our many Committees and Working Groups. These support the exchange of best practices and the resolution of technical issues and standards that may not grab headlines but help oil the engines of the IP office. The Committee on Development and IP continues to be an incubator of many interesting programs at WIPO, supporting the continued mainstreaming of the Development Agenda in WIPO’s work.

“In parallel to these more formal and established forums, WIPO seeks to be *the* place where cutting-edge IP issues are discussed.

“[Our conversations on IP and Frontier Technologies are thriving](https://www.wipo.int/about-ip/en/frontier_technologies/), with a total of 9000 participants thus far. These rich conversations have allowed us to create an AI Policy Toolkit for IP offices and regulators, as well as a practical guide on Generative AI and IP for enterprises.

“We also organized our 2nd Global Conversation on IP backed financing, [on the important topic of IP valuation, collateralization and financing, gathering the innovation and finance communities – who do not often sit together, but need to come together – to discuss the use of IP as a financial asset](https://www.wipo.int/sme/en/securing-financing.html). Again, this Conversation is being accompanied by various other work, such as numerous case studies, the creation of an expert group on IP valuation and the piloting of IP valuation training in ASEAN.

“A new workstream around the future of IP has also been started to apply the disciplines of futures and scenario planning to WIPO’s work. Our first initiative in this area is WIPO Pulse, a global survey of what ordinary people think about IP and how these will change over time. Other initiatives will be announced in due course.

“This Pillar also includes our work in building respect for IP, which is fundamental to any healthy innovation ecosystem.

“[WIPO Alert – our global database of copyright-infringing websites –](https://www.wipo.int/web/wipo-alert) has grown to contain over 8,000 ‘live’ sites, and will now include a new module called WIPO Alert Pay, that will target the funding of online pirates. We are also moving towards CRIS, a Customs Recordation and Information System for Member States. Overall, there has been greater interest from developing countries for training on IP enforcement matters, and so we are stepping up such training for judges, prosecutors, regulators and professionals.

“Partnerships are also increasingly important as WIPO looks to scale up our work and find impact.

“Our work with NGOs like MPP, FICPI, IFLA, INTA, LESI, AUTM and ASIPI – just to name a few – have delivered a range of projects to different stakeholders, bringing their specialized knowledge and expertise to our work, and allowing us to engage with stakeholders that would otherwise not be in contact with WIPO.

“With regional IGOs, work is stepping up with partners including ASEAN, the OECS and the Pacific Forum. One milestone project is [AfricDeezayn](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wuM9GxZl7MQ), a new mobile app to raise awareness of design protection across West Africa, with ECOWAS as our key partner for this project.

“Beyond region platforms, our work across UN agencies also continues to strengthen. [Our trilateral cooperation with the World Health Organization and World Trade Organization returns to its broader roots](https://www.wipo.int/policy/en/global_health/trilateral_cooperation.html), with recent symposiums on climate change and human health, as well as IP, Competition Law, and Policy. We continue to work with ITC and UNCTAD to support women and young entrepreneurs, with ITU on harnessing AI and tech for good, and have just signed a cooperation agreement with the UN Office on Drugs and Crime on IP enforcement.

“I am also pleased to share that we are increasingly plugged into the larger UN processes like the Global Digital Compact and our Common Agenda. Our work there is to help use IP to harness the power of innovation, creativity and technology to put the SDGs back on track and build a better future for all. As a result, we are seeing an increase in collaborative work with UN bodies like the ECOSOC and with other UN agencies like ITU at events like the Summit of the Future and the COP process.

“Our belief is that partnerships are critical for success and scaling, and we will continue pursuing these avenues for collaborative work.

\*\*\*

“Pillar 3 relates to IP services and data. As the only UN agency that provides services directly to enterprises, it is critical that our that our global IP registries are efficiently run, and bring value to our users. Our Customer Experience Transformation Program seeks to put the customer at the center of these services and is progressing well, meeting the evolving needs of our diverse user base. Over the 2022-23 biennium, our customer satisfaction index was a strong 85%.

“To maintain this, we continue to invest in our systems and technology. New steps include the launch of WIPO Universal Search, which makes navigation of our website and global databases more efficient, as well as efforts to modernize the external-facing functions of the Hague Registry and further enhancements to our e-filing systems.

“[Our fastest growing service is the Arbitration and Mediation Center](https://www.wipo.int/amc/en/). In 2023, the AMC handled nearly 700 innovation and technology disputes, an increase of 24%, with mediation and domain name disputes showing very strong growth. To help meet new needs, tailored services have been introduced for fast-growing industries like video games, eSports, and green technology.

“As well as strengthening our own services, we continue supporting national IP offices to enhance their systems and infrastructure, as well as to digitize. [Over 90 IPOs use WIPO’s IP Office Systems](https://www.wipo.int/global_ip/en/activities/ip_office_business_solutions/), and last year Botswana became the first IP office in Africa to be fully digitalized through WIPO’s model office project.

“WIPO is also a global repository of IP data and information, which we are using to gain insights into the innovation ecosystem. We are proud to be one of the leading sources of research on IP and innovation trends, with recent highlights including a new [World IP Report on innovation and development](https://www.wipo.int/web/world-ip-report), and [an economics paper on AI and IP](https://www.wipo.int/edocs/pubdocs/en/wipo-pub-econstat-wp-77-en-artificial-intelligence-and-intellectual-property-an-economic-perspective.pdf). Our patent analytics work, that uses patent and other data to gain technology insights is also picking up, with Patent Landscape Reports on [IP and the SDGs](https://www.wipo.int/edocs/pubdocs/en/wipo-pub-rn2024-18-en-mapping-innovations.pdf), as well as on [GenAI](https://www.wipo.int/web-publications/patent-landscape-report-generative-artificial-intelligence-genai/index.html) this year.

“Of course, our flagship publication remains the [Global Innovation Index](https://www.wipo.int/global_innovation_index/en/2023/), which measures the innovation performance of over 130 Members, and is increasingly the benchmark innovation metric for countries, policy-makers, researchers and other stakeholders. The latest edition of the GII will be launched in late September this year.

“This Pillar also covers non fee paying “services” like WIPO Green. With a global database of nearly 130,000 technologies from over 140 countries, WIPO Green is the UN’s largest green tech platform, recognized as a game-changing digital solution at the UN SDG Summit last year. [Increasingly, we are focusing on the challenging task of deploying green technologies on the ground through new acceleration projects](https://www3.wipo.int/wipogreen/en/news/2024/news_0003.html), IP Management clinics and two editions of the Green Technology Book.

\*\*\*

“Excellencies,

“To ensure IP changes lives and accompanies people on their journeys, we must make what is intangible more tangible, what is technical understandable and what is abstract impactful.

“This is the work of Pillar 4, where we focus on the critical task of making sure that IP is able to drive growth and development around the world. Our work in this area has undergone major transformations through our relentless search for impact.

“[One example is the work of the WIPO Academy](https://www.wipo.int/academy/en/reports/2022-2023.html), which has trained close to 500,000 persons in the last 4 years, becoming the world’s biggest center for IP education, training, and skills-building.

“Since the launch of the MTSP, we have reimagined our course portfolio, going beyond the transfer of technical IP knowledge, to also include the building of practical IP skills.

“During these Assemblies we will launch a new IP EdTech service, designed to further tailor the Academy’s IP eLearning courses to national economies and audiences. In all, the Academy benefited 230,000 people over the biennium, 70% of whom were under 35 and over 80% from developing countries.

“Beyond general skills training, specialized instruction and support proceeds apace. A further 8 IP Training Institutes were established last year, taking our global IPTI network to 19. And we intend to grow this to 35 in time to come.

“Specialized support for specific stakeholders is also being delivered by other units, like the WIPO Judicial Institute, which has expanded its training for IP judges from around the world, developed a growing database of caselaw in WIPO Lex, and hosting an annual meeting of IP judges.

“Demand also remains constant for our traditional support in legislative and policy assistance where we have advised 36 countries in the past year, and in the development of 25 national IP and innovation strategies around the world.

“Alongside these established formats, we are innovating our development assistance through new packages and proposals.

“On packages, we continue to redesign our workstreams to address the needs of Members at different stages of development. These include WIPO Deliverables for LDCs and WIPO Graduation Support Packages, currently operating in Angola, Laos and Sao Tomé and Principe. We also have a new stream of support for Small Island Developing States and Landlocked Least Developing Countries.

“As for projects, we continue to transform our approach to development assistance. Where previously, WIPO may have held a one-off seminar or workshop, we now deliver intensive training and mentorship programs held over months, that bring IP closer to the grassroots and accompany innovators and creators on their journeys. With 82 of these projects either completed or in action, let me share a few achievements from the past year.

“First, [nearly 4,000 women entrepreneurs benefited from WIPO projects in 2023](https://www.wipo.int/pressroom/en/stories/bangladesh-women-2024.html). Much of this work focuses on specific sectors or communities. For example, our project for Women SMEs in Agribusiness supported 30 SMEs from 25 African countries, whilst our project for indigenous and local community entrepreneurs has now reached over 100 women in more than 60 countries.

“Good progress is also being made with IP GAP, [our gender action plan](https://www.wipo.int/edocs/pubdocs/en/wipo-pub-rn2023-1-en-wipo-intellectual-property-ip-and-gender-action-plan-the-role-of-ip-in-support-of-women-and-girls.pdf). We now have a network of over 70 IPOs addressing IP and gender issues, resulting in a new database of some 200 gender-based policies and initiatives from around the world. In 2023, over 100,000 women enrolled in WIPO Academy programs.

“Second, we have just launched [IP-YES!, WIPO’s first Youth Empowerment Strategy](https://www.wipo.int/edocs/pubdocs/en/wipo-pub-rn2023-52-en-wipo-intellectual-property-youth-empowerment-strategy-ip-yes.pdf). The aim of IP YES! is to provide a clear and coherent framework that sparks passion, builds skills, and equips younger generations, in all parts of the world, with knowledge, awareness and opportunities.

“Let me give an example of the type of work we want to prioritize. In Tunisia, we are collaborating with the Ministry of Youth to train local leaders in IP education so that they have the skills, and the confidence, to foster a culture of innovation and creativity, transforming youth centers into innovation centers as well.

“In all, more than 150,000 youth have benefited from WIPO Academy training in the past two years. Alongside this, through our IP4Youth&Teachers service we have also equipped 2,000 educators with the knowledge to deliver IP-focused lessons. IP YES! will further enhance these efforts worldwide.

“Third, SMEs in over 80 countries are benefiting from WIPO projects and initiatives. [This includes a record number of IP Management Clinics](https://www.wipo.int/sme/en/ip-management-clinic.html), with over 20 to be delivered in 30 countries this year.

“In Nigeria, our new IP Labs project, is the country’s first IP-based accelerator program for startups. During the first phase, we mentored 56 businesses, with 21 now receiving further support through a local IP management clinic.

“Beyond training, we provide tools to SMEs everywhere. [Our no-cost IP Diagnostics toolkit](https://www.wipo.int/web/wipo-ip-diagnostics)  has been used nearly 40,000 times, with 20 different versions adapted for local needs, including a customized tool for OAPI and Indian adaptations in Hindi, Bengali, Urdu and Tamil.

“Fourth, our support for R&D commercialization and universities continues to pick up pace. Our global network of Technology Innovation Support Centers or TISCs, have grown to nearly 1600 in over 90 countries, dealing with almost 2 million requests last year. We have also supported 600 universities in developing their IP policies, with WIPO providing direct training to staff from universities and research institutes in countries like Senegal and Zimbabwe. Earlier this year we help to build and connect tech transfer networks in the Baltic states.

“Fifth is our work in support of communities and traditional products. We are mentoring 100 traditional silk and carpet enterprises in Laos and Bangladesh, and we have begun a new phase in our project for traditional medicine practitioners, extending it from the pilot in Ethiopia to a further 9 African countries.

“Projects in support of local heritage are also being implemented in the likes of Chile, Georgia, Ghana, Kazakhstan and Tonga. And just last week, we celebrated the registration of Madd de Casamance as Senegal’s first Geographical Indication.

“And, sixth, for creators and the creative economy, [we have launched CLIP](https://goclip.org/en/), our free, online platform to help musicians understand IP, data and technology to earn a living. Last week, the extensive content on CLIP became available in all 6 UN languages and is attracting nearly 30,000 users a month.

“We are also stepping up our work in helping Members States understand and measure their creative economy, with a pilot project now underway in the Philippines. An additional 16 collective management organizations, including 9 LDCs, have also adopted WIPO Connect as their IT solution for managing copyright and related rights. I can further report that [the Global Book Service, run by our Accessible Books Consortium, now has over 1 million titles available for cross-border exchange through the Marrakesh Treaty](https://www.accessiblebooksconsortium.org/w/news/2024/wipo-s-accessible-books-consortium-hits-one-million-titles-with-royal-national-institute-of-blind-people-partnership). These books make a huge difference to blind and visually-impaired people around the world, with Marrakesh a powerful engine of equal opportunities.

\*\*\*

“Underpinning these efforts is our overall foundation, the financial and organizational health of WIPO. At the Program and Budget Committee last month, [we reported that 73% of targets were fully achieved over the biennium, with revenue of 972.2 million CHF and a surplus of 121.5 million CHF](https://www.wipo.int/edocs/mdocs/govbody/en/wo_pbc_37/wo_pbc_37_7.pdf). We will continue to use a Results-Based Management system which ensures that resources are utilized in line with organizational results and priorities, and we will continue focus on efficiency and prudent financial management so that WIPO remains financially healthy.

“In terms of IP filings, like many IP offices, economic uncertainties, together with high interest rates, led to a dampening of business sentiment and a slight dip in IP filings in both the PCT and Madrid last year, down 1.8% and 7% respectively. Although Hague filings grew by 1%.

“Although we are confident that these downturns are temporary and that growth will return in the second half of the year, we are monitoring the situation closely and Member States can be assured that we will act proactively to address the situation.

“Our efforts to transform the global IP ecosystem are not possible without also transforming our work culture. [We are committed to building a dynamic, proactive, open and transparent working environment](https://www.wipo.int/edocs/mdocs/govbody/en/wo_pbc_37/wo_pbc_37_inf_1.pdf), taking governance seriously, and also creating a more gender and geographically diverse workforce.

\*\*\*

“All the work above is just a snapshot of what we are fully doing, but as you can see, it is already of incredible depth and breadth.

“I want to take this opportunity to thank my DDGs and ADGs, as well as my many colleagues across the whole of WIPO, who are working hard and with passion to deliver all these results to you, and to express our collective gratitude to you as Members for your guidance, direction, partnership and support in our work.

\*\*\*

“Dear colleagues, Dear friends

“In conclusion, the work of transforming the global IP ecosystem is beginning to show results, not just in shaping new global IP standards and gaining attention of political and community leaders, but also in reaching deeper to the ground, and touching the lives of more people than ever.

“But this work is far from finished. For every Sona and Mariama who we have been able to help, there are millions of others out there who are still unable to bring their ideas to the market, and are hungry to use the power of IP to change their lives and the world.

“So let us continue as one WIPO community to put in place the right practices, norms, standards, policies and projects so that we can, together, make IP part of the journey of every innovator and creator, and make IP a catalyst for growth and development in every part of the world.

“Once again, I thank you for your support, guidance and direction as Members for our work, I pledge the full support of my colleagues as the Secretariat for the discussions ahead and wish you the very best for a fruitful and successful 65th Assemblies.

“Thank you.”

## ITEM 4 OF THE CONSOLIDATED AGENDAGENERAL STATEMENTS

1. The Delegations and Representatives of the following 143 States (including 11 on behalf of groups of States), seven intergovernmental organizations (IGOs) and 21 non‑governmental organizations (NGOs) provided oral or written statements under this agenda item: Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Holy See, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao (People’s Democratic Republic of), Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Lithuania, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe, European Union, African Intellectual Property Organization (OAPI), African Regional Intellectual Property Organization (ARIPO), Eurasian Patent Office, Patent Office of the Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf (GCC Patent Office), South Centre (CS), West African Economic and Monetary Union (WAEMU), Consortium for Common Food Names (CCFN), Global Intellectual Property Alliance (GLIPA), Innovation Council, Intellectual Property Latin American School (ELAPI), Inter American Association of Industrial Property (ASIPI), International Association for the Protection of Intellectual Property (AIPPI), International Generic and Biosimilar Medicines Association (IGBA), International Intellectual Property Commercialization Council (IIPCC), Organization for an International Geographical Indications Network (ORIGIN), Third World Network Berhad (TWN), All-China Patent Agents Association (ACPAA), Bahrain Intellectual Property Society (BIPS), China Council for the Promotion of International Trade (CCPIT), Corporación Latinoamericana de Investigación de la Propiedad Intelectual para el Desarrollo (Corporación Innovarte), Egyptian Council for Innovation and Creativity and Intellectual Property Protection (ECCIPP), Emirates Intellectual Property Association (EIPA), Emirates Reprographic Rights Management Association (ERRA), Institute for Intellectual Property and Social Justice (IIPSJ), Japan Intellectual Property Association (JIPA), Knowledge Ecology International (KEI) and Native American Rights Fund (NARF).
2. The Statements on this agenda item are included in the Annex.

## ITEM 5 OF THE CONSOLIDATED AGENDAELECTION OF OFFICERS

1. Discussions were based on document [A/65/INF/1 Rev.](https://www.wipo.int/about-wipo/en/assemblies/2024/a-65/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=633020)
2. Introducing Agenda Item 5, the Legal Counsel recalled that at the current year’s Assemblies, Member States were required to elect officers as follows: one Chair and two Vice‑Chairs for each of the WIPO Coordination Committee, the Paris Union Executive Committee, and the Berne Union Executive Committee. She also recalled that in the current year, with respect to the officers of the WIPO Coordination Committee, the Chair and the second Vice-Chair should be elected from among the delegates of the ordinary members of the Executive Committee of the Paris Union and the first Vice-Chair should be elected from among the delegates of the ordinary members of the Executive Committee of the Berne Union, in accordance with Rule 3(2)(a) of the Special Rules of Procedure of the WIPO Coordination Committee. Lastly, she recalled that the officers of the WIPO Coordination Committee, the Paris Union Executive Committee, and the Berne Union Executive Committee are appointed to a one-year term.
3. The Chair thanked the Legal Counsel and seeing no objections, gavelled the decision.
4. The following officers were elected:

WIPO Coordination Committee

Chair: [‑‑‑‑]

Vice-Chair: Karan Thapar (Mr.) (India)

Vice-Chair: [‑‑‑‑]

Paris Union Executive Committee

Chair: Denisse Pérez (Ms.) (Chile)

Vice-Chair: [‑‑‑‑]

Vice-Chair: [‑‑‑‑]

Berne Union Executive Committee

Chair: Gilbert Agaba (Mr.) (Uganda)

Vice-Chair: [‑‑‑‑]

Vice-Chair: [‑‑‑‑]

1. The list of all the officers of the Assemblies and other bodies appears in document [A/65/INF/2](https://www.wipo.int/about-wipo/en/assemblies/2024/a-65/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=633571).

## ITEM 6 OF THE CONSOLIDATED AGENDAADMISSION OF OBSERVERS

1. Discussions were based on document [A/65/3 Rev.](https://www.wipo.int/about-wipo/en/assemblies/2024/a-65/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=633004)
2. Introducing Agenda Item 6, the Legal Counsel drew the attention of delegations to document A/65/3 Rev. and invited Member States to consider applications for observer status by eight international NGOs and eight national NGOs as listed in paragraph 4 of document A/65/3 Rev. The Legal Counsel informed Member States that in respect of the eight national NGOs, and in conformity with the principles applicable to national NGOs that were adopted by Member States, the Secretariat held the requisite consultations with the Member State from which the NGO originated prior to the submission of the NGO’s request to the Assemblies. She further informed Member States that the necessary agreement had been received in respect of all eight national NGO applications concerned.
3. The Delegation of China expressed its opposition to the request by the Wikimedia Foundation to become an observer at WIPO. As for the other NGOs applying for observer status, as contained in document A/65/3 Rev., the Delegation had no objections. According to the document under consideration, the Wikimedia Foundation operated information projects, including the Wikipedia website, which, in the Delegation’s view, contained a large amount of content that violated the one-China principle. Over the past four years, China had repeatedly expressed concerns and clarified its position on the Wikimedia Foundation’s application for observer status at WIPO meetings. Until the Wikimedia Foundation addressed the serious concerns of China, the Delegation would continue to oppose firmly the Wikimedia Foundation’s request to become an observer. Furthermore, the Delegation wished to reiterate three main points concerning the application. First, it noted that the activities of WIPO observers must not undermine the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Member States, which constituted the minimum respect for WIPO rules. However, the Wikimedia Foundation’s projects violated the one-China principle, harming China’s sovereignty, and territorial integrity, and were running counter to the United Nations (UN) General Assembly Resolution 2758 and WIPO’s consistent position on the one-China issue. As a specialized agency of the UN, WIPO should implement strictly the relevant UN General Assembly Resolution and should not accept the Wikimedia Foundation as an observer. Second, the Delegation noted that applying to become a WIPO observer was a serious matter. Over the years, China had repeatedly expressed its concern about the existence of the Wikimedia Foundation and had emphasized its principled stance. However, the Wikimedia Foundation continuously disregarded those concerns and had made no concrete efforts to address them. Instead, it attempted to pass through year after year. According to the Delegation, that showed a lack of sincerity and undermined WIPO's authority and its long-term healthy development. Third, the Delegation wished to reiterate that the decision on the admission of observers had always been made by consensus among the Member States of WIPO and hoped that all parties would continue to maintain WIPO’s longstanding tradition of consensus-based working methods and a spirit of unity and cooperation.
4. The Delegation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, speaking on behalf of Group B, expressed support for all requests for observer status as contained in document A/65/3 Rev. The Delegation stated that it was Group B’s understanding that all requests for observer status received by the Secretariat contained the requisite information, which meant the information necessary to enable the consideration, and subsequent granting, of observer status. The published requests had complied with all proper procedures. Furthermore, Group B understood that all the organizations listed in document A/65/3 Rev. met the admission criteria and procedures for applying for observer status at WIPO as indicated on the WIPO website. In Group B’s view, observer organizations brought technical expertise and insights to the deliberations of WIPO. If observer organizations were able to show a direct relationship between their objectives and the field of intellectual property (IP), Group B believed it was important that organizations were able to observe and contribute to proceedings. Group B stated that it had been a common practice at WIPO to welcome the involvement of a wide variety of NGOs, IGOs, industry groups and other stakeholders in consultation processes and discussions regarding current IP issues. That approach had been part and parcel of the transparency and inclusiveness that Member States cherished at WIPO. Group B was not aware of any information that would lead Member States to believe that any of the organizations listed in document A/65/3 Rev. would not be able to bring valuable contributions to deliberations on current IP issues. Group B therefore urged the approval of the full list of requests for observer status, as contained in document A/65/3 Rev., in compliance with procedural steps.
5. The Delegation of Nicaragua reiterated that WIPO had been established to promote the use, protection, and promotion of IP for socio-economic development, and called for respect for the procedures regarding the admission of observers to WIPO. The Delegation called on WIPO for impartiality and transparency and the need not to be influenced by organizations that spread misinformation. It further stated that there were organizations that tried to manipulate public opinion through social media or propaganda and made efforts to mislead the public. The Delegation objected to the Wikimedia Foundation’s admission as an observer because it had information on its website that ran counter to the principles of WIPO and the relevant UN resolutions recognizing the one-China principle. The Delegation reiterated that there was only one China in the world and that the People’s Republic of China was the only legitimate Government of China. Therefore, the Delegation encouraged Member States not to admit the Wikimedia Foundation and to respect the principle of territorial integrity of members.
6. The Delegation of the Russian Federation, referring to document A/65/3 Rev., believed that it was advisable not to grant observer status to entities to which certain Member States had doubts or objections.
7. The Delegation of the United States of America expressed its support for the statement delivered by the Delegation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands on behalf of Group B. The Delegation supported the approval of the full list of observer applications in document A/65/3 Rev. and emphasized the essential functions fulfilled by observers in the work of WIPO Committees and the WIPO Assemblies as they offered diverse views and insightful perspectives on IP issues discussed by those bodies. The input observers provided helped to advance WIPO’s objectives and activities in an informed and transparent way. The Delegation regretted China’s continued rejection of the observer status request submitted by the Wikimedia Foundation. That approach was counterproductive to the work of WIPO. It appeared to the Delegation that China wanted to obstruct observer status for any organization that had a linkage to Taiwan, however tenuous, and had inaccurately stated that blocking the Wikimedia Foundation was a one-China issue. The Delegation noted that preventing the Wikimedia Foundation from joining as a WIPO observer was against the principles of openness, transparency, and international cooperation that WIPO stood for. Additionally, excluding the Wikimedia Foundation would deprive WIPO and its Member States of valuable insights and experiences that could inform and help navigate the complex landscape of IP in the digital age. The Wikimedia Foundation had shown its involvement in copyright issues throughout its chapters across countries, which was directly relevant to WIPO's work and its application to gain observer status should be decided only on its merits. Those decisions needed to be based on the organization's potential contribution to discussions on IP issues. The Delegation underlined that the organization should not be denied observer status for political reasons. Therefore, the Delegation urged the approval as WIPO observers of all organizations listed in document A/65/3 Rev. at the present session.
8. The Delegation of the Arab Republic of Syria expressed its support for the position taken by the Delegation of China regarding the Wikimedia Foundation. It noted that requests from Wikimedia were refused on several occasions because they violated UN principles. The Delegation said that it supported the one-China principle and the sovereignty that China had over its territories. The Delegation also emphasized the need to respect consensus in decision-‑making at WIPO.
9. The Delegation of Cuba expressed its support for the statement delivered by the Delegation of China and stressed the importance of consensus on that matter.
10. The Delegation of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea noted the concerns expressed by the Delegation of China, expressed that the good practice within the Organization was to take decisions on the admission of observers by consensus, and believed that the principle should be respected.
11. The Delegation of Iran (Islamic Republic of) noted the concerns raised by the Delegation of China and concurred with the observation that decisions on admission of observers had always been taken based on consensus among Member States and that the procedure should be continued.
12. The Delegation of Belarus noted the concerns raised by the Delegation of China regarding the admission of the Wikimedia Foundation as an observer. The Delegation stated that the position and justification of the Delegation of China were well-founded and pointed out that it would not be a good idea to admit Wikimedia as an observer because Member States had certain objections. Further, the Delegation underlined that the status as an observer at WIPO should be carried out in good faith and should come with constructive contributions to WIPO’s work. The Delegation reiterated its support for the principle of consensus when taking decisions at WIPO, including the admission of observers, and noted the absence of such consensus regarding the request for admission as an observer by the Wikimedia Foundation.
13. The Delegation of Pakistan considered the admission of responsible observers by WIPO as an important endeavour for the functioning of WIPO. Continued observer interaction at the WIPO Assemblies and at meetings of the Unions administered by WIPO enabled important support functions and guided the Member States in assessing the progress and priorities of WIPO’s work. The Delegation believed that a prerequisite for admission of organizations as observers was the acknowledgement and respect for globally recognized principles, in particular those laid down under UN resolutions. In the view of the Delegation, the Wikimedia Foundation championed partisan concepts and misinformation while its purported aim was to develop and disseminate technical educational content globally, which was a highly questionable act. The Delegation expressed its support for taking decisions by consensus on the matter of admission of observers. Thus, the Delegation seconded the position expressed by the Delegation of China and was not in a position to accept the admission of the Wikimedia Foundation as an observer at WIPO.
14. The Delegation of Algeria acknowledged the contributions of NGOs within UN specialized agencies, including WIPO. Further, the Delegation took note of the concerns raised by the Delegation of China, as well as other delegations, with regard to granting observer status to one of the applicants. The Delegation called for respecting the principle of consensus, which remained the framework for the work of the Assemblies and invited other delegations to continue in the same manner.
15. The Delegation of Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) supported the position set out by the Delegation of China, rejecting the request for observer status submitted by the Wikimedia Foundation in accordance with the practice in previous Assemblies. The Delegation explained that its position was based on its respect for the one-China principle and the constant position held by WIPO on the question of Taiwan. Finally, the Delegation stressed the importance of respecting the principle of consensus on that matter.
16. The Delegation of France said that it aligned itself with the statement delivered by the Delegation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands on behalf of Group B. France supported the granting of observer status to all NGOs that had requested such status for those Assemblies. The Delegation always supported the involvement and engagement of civil society in multilateral organizations. In conclusion, the Delegation reiterated its endorsement of the admission of the Wikimedia Foundation, which worked in favour of free sharing of knowledge, as an observer at WIPO.
17. The Delegation of Canada expressed support for the practical inclusion and participation of NGOs in relevant discussions in UN agencies such as WIPO. It believed that observers enriched conversations at WIPO and noted the importance of amplifying voices in UN agencies beyond those of Member States given WIPO’s impact on end users of the international IP system. The Delegation did not support the singling out of NGOs that demonstrated a significant interest in WIPO's work and expressed that the full slate of NGOs seeking admission as observers should be welcomed in their entirety.
18. The Delegation of Switzerland said that it aligned itself with the statement delivered by the Delegation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands on behalf of Group B, and supported all applications for observer status contained in document A/65/3/ Rev. reminding Member States that the Wikimedia Foundation had been waiting for admission as an observer since 2020. The Delegation explained that the aim of the Wikimedia Foundation was the free sharing of content in Switzerland and abroad, and that it had a direct link to IP. The Delegation believed the Wikimedia Foundation could make a significant contribution to the work of WIPO. The Delegation concluded by supporting the request for observer status by the Wikimedia Foundation and requested Member States to accept the application.
19. The Delegation of the United Kingdom supported the admission of the Wikimedia Foundation, and all other applicant‑organizations, as observers at WIPO. The Delegation saw no reason to prevent the admission of any applicant‑organization that made such a request for observer status.
20. The Delegation of China thanked the large number of countries that supported the Delegation’s position and said that those countries were also supporting justice. The Delegation recognized a few countries that supported the application of the Wikimedia Foundation and noted that their reasoning sounded convincing but was in fact deeply flawed. First, the Delegation reminded countries that the admission of observers must follow procedures and the decision should be made by the Assemblies as the rules were laid out in the Convention Establishing the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO Convention). Since the Secretariat can only conduct a formal examination of the documents of applicants, every Member State had a say in the admission decision regarding the applicants, which meant that as long as one Member State was against a particular admission, the applicant‑organization concerned could not become an observer. Second, the Delegation stated that the admission of observers must follow rules. As a UN specialized agency, WIPO must respect and follow the UN Charter and international law including the UN General Assembly’s resolutions. The Delegation recalled that a minimum standard was required from all parties for participation in the work of WIPO. The Delegation also underscored that the Wikimedia Foundation did not fulfil all the necessary conditions to become an observer and expressed the opinion that some countries had twisted the rules to provide a shortcut to observer status for the Wikimedia Foundation, which the Delegation found to be a politicization of the process. Third, the Delegation stated that the invitation to become an observer at WIPO must be conducive to the work of WIPO, and that the Delegation had always supported NGOs to take part in meetings of WIPO and encouraged them to make contributions to the IP endeavor. However, the Delegation underscored that any participation had to be based on rules. The Delegation expressed the view that the admission of a controversial organization as an observer at WIPO meetings would negatively impact the professional and cooperative working atmosphere and that this would be counterproductive and against the original purpose of allowing observers to participate. The Delegation emphasized that it had repeatedly expressed its position on this issue and urged the Wikimedia Foundation to adopt concrete measures to right their wrongs instead of trying to break through.
21. The Chair thanked all delegations for their statements and acknowledged that consensus had been reached on all the requests for admission as observers except for the request by the Wikimedia Foundation. The Chair therefore proposed to adopt a decision paragraph as contained in document A/65/3 Rev. except for the admission of the Wikimedia Foundation.
22. The Assemblies of WIPO, each as far as it is concerned, decided to grant observer status to the following organizations:

(a) International non-governmental organizations:

1. Boao Forum for Asia (BFA);
2. European Film Agency Directors (EFAD);
3. European Platform of Intellectual Property Administrators (EPIPA);
4. Independent Music Publishers International Forum (IMPF);
5. International Federation of Landscape Architects (IFLA);
6. International Olympic Committee (IOC); and
7. Latin American Federation of the Pharmaceutical Industry (FIFARMA).

(b) National non-governmental organizations:

1. Arab Public Relations Society (APRS);
2. Emirates Inventors Association;
3. Emirates Science Club;
4. Global Access in Action (GAiA);
5. Hugo Grotius gGmbH;
6. Intellectual Property International Forum – Quebec (FORPIQ);
7. Japan Commercial Broadcasters Association (JPA); and
8. Virtual Rights Specified Nonprofit Cooperation.

## ITEM 7 OF THE CONSOLIDATED AGENDADraft Agendas for 2025 Ordinary Sessions

1. See the report of the session of the WIPO Coordination Committee (document [WO/CC/83/2 Prov.](https://www.wipo.int/about-wipo/en/assemblies/2024/a-65/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=634014)).

## ITEM 8 OF THE CONSOLIDATED AGENDAREPORTS ON AUDIT AND OVERSIGHT

* + 1. Report by the Independent Advisory Oversight Committee (IAOC)
1. See the report of the session of the WIPO General Assembly (document [WO/GA/57/12 Prov.](https://www.wipo.int/about-wipo/en/assemblies/2024/a-65/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=634015)).
	* 1. Report by the External Auditor
2. Discussions were based on documents [A/65/5](https://www.wipo.int/about-wipo/en/assemblies/2024/a-65/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=631093) and [A/65/6](https://www.wipo.int/about-wipo/en/assemblies/2024/a-65/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=632231).
3. On behalf of the External Auditor, Mr. Damian Brewitt, Director, National Audit Office of the United Kingdom, delivered the following report:

“Chair, distinguished delegates, as Members will be aware this is the final presentation to you from our six-year mandate, and on behalf of the Comptroller and Auditor General of the United Kingdom, I wish to thank you for appointing us as your External Auditor and giving us the opportunity to work alongside WIPO’s Secretariat.

“Our engagement with you as the Assembly has been important and your observations and priorities have informed our work. Presenting to you has always been an important part of the governance process for us, to ensure we have been available to you and to highlight the main issues arising from our work, providing you with our independent and objective insight. My presentation today reflects the messages we also gave to the Program and Budget Committee in June.

“In my presentation today, I will cover the four main areas of our work. Firstly, the audit of the financial statements and financial management, then our review of governance and internal control matters where our report reflects on the evolution of the control environment over the past six years. I will then briefly cover our substantive performance topic of knowledge management. Finally, I will recap on the other main performance audit areas during our mandate, and conclude on how WIPO has responded to our observations. Turning first to the results of our audit of the financial statements. I am pleased to confirm that the External Auditor’s opinion on the financial statements was again unqualified. Our audit also confirms that the transactions have occurred in line with the Financial Regulations set by Member States.

“WIPO’s financial statements and accompanying financial commentary have remained of a consistent high quality, supported by sound systems of internal controls and reporting throughout our mandate. Our audit results were positive and identified no significant errors or control weaknesses. We have reported the detail of our work to the IAOC, with whom we have had a productive engagement throughout our mandate. I would like to thank the IAOC Members past and present for their support and scrutiny of our work.

“On financial management, WIPO has delivered consistently strong financial performance over our mandate, even during times of unprecedented circumstances including the pandemic and continuing global uncertainties, reflecting the cash generative business model. The market for intellectual property has remained buoyant, and WIPO has generated surpluses exceeding those forecast each biennium. Our reporting has highlighted the need to consider how surpluses resulting from this model are used, and alongside the existing reserves policies, we have noted the importance of fees remaining appropriate for users, within a more explicit framework of principles.

“Over our mandate there have been considerable changes in the returns from investments and in the value of employee benefit liabilities, largely reflecting changes in market conditions. WIPO has refined the valuation methodology for these liabilities and we have noted the considerations being given to establishing a separate vehicle to hold the scheme assets, noting the importance of any decisions being grounded in a cost benefit analysis.

“Moving now to the first topic area of our performance reporting, which speaks to the issues of governance and internal controls, mechanisms which provide Member States with assurance over the management of resources.

“Our audit has continued to conclude that WIPO has sound systems of internal control and no significant weaknesses have come to our attention. We have seen a continuous evolution in WIPO’s approach to its internal control environment. This has included a clearer articulation of the accountability framework, refining how internal controls are assured, a maturing approach to risk management and the modernisation of the financial regulations. We have emphasised the need to maintain focus on the most important controls and to find greater efficiency and simplification in business processes. These refinements will provide a sound basis for securing benefits from the planned move to the proposed cloud-based Enterprise Resource Planning system.

“During our time, the Statement on Internal Control has become fully aligned to the accountability framework and presents a clear and well evidenced articulation of the control environment, its results and the risks that have been managed during the period. We have drawn attention to the delays in instituting data analytics to inform compliance oversight. We see developments in this area delivering greater visibility on the operation of controls and better information to inform efficiencies in the cost of control.

“Turnover within the ethics function has delayed management in responding to issues we identified last year around potential conflict risks within PCT. However, WIPO has now presented an action plan to mitigate the potential reputational risks which we identified. We have noted that, with the changes within the Internal Oversight Division (IOD), there is a greater focus on the significant and material risks within the forward work program. We welcome these developments, together with the commitment to seek early adoption of changes in internal auditing standards and the piloting of an annual assurance opinion for 2024, with full adoption in 2025.

“Turning now to our review of knowledge management, WIPO’s approach to its internal records and knowledge management has faced challenges. It holds a significant volume of both digital and hardcopy records, which is not being handled according to archival management standards, making access difficult. While some of this information will be important for institutional memory, much is inactive and should either be permanently archived or securely destroyed.

“An initial strategy for an enterprise content management system or ECCM was developed in 2014, but progress in implementing it was slow. Following a review in 2020, WIPO revised its records and archive management policy and embarked on a new ECCM project with a budget of 8.8 million Swiss francs, aiming for completion in 2026.

“Alongside the technology implemented through this project, and the processes defined in the policy documents, it will be important for the project to ensure a focus and clear plan to address the people and cultural issues which will be critical for delivering a successful implementation of the changes. We noted that the plans could be further strengthened by developing an overarching strategy for records and knowledge management.

“I would now like to look back over our mandate, and how the Secretariat has responded to our earlier recommendations.

“In 2018, we considered the work of the Human Resources Management Department (HRMD). Since our initial work we have observed that internal training has become more strategically focused, supporting improved workforce planning and delivery of a more agile workforce. More objectivity, consistency and equity are being built into performance management systems, and the policies in this area have recently revised to further streamline process. Overall, WIPO has taken sound actions to enhance its approach to HR matters, with enhanced staff engagement. While these changes are yet to fully embed, they should deliver benefits to WIPO and its staff.

“In 2019, we reported on External Offices. We highlighted the need for a clear strategy to support the development of the network and to ensure alignment with WIPO’s needs. We recognize that it has remained difficult for Member States to reach a consensus on the scope of an evaluation of the External Offices, and this has hindered progress in the development of the network. In our view, Member States may find more cohesion in agreeing a high-level set of overarching principals, with an independent reviewer commissioned to formulate the detailed scope and deliver the evaluation report to support subsequent Member State’s discussion on actions.

“In 2020, we examined WIPO’s strategy for using reserves in the context of the Capital Master Plan. Our observations were aimed at both the strategic focus of the plan overall, and the management of individual projects. At the strategic level, we could not clearly determine how individual projects were prioritised. We highlighted the importance of investment decisions being driven by need and a clear link to WIPO’s objectives. In the latest CMP, there is greater articulation that projects should be of a strategic and special nature with a minimum threshold of three million Swiss francs. The project proposals are now more strategic, with an enhanced description of the implementation approach, a clearer articulation of the benefits and a better analysis of the potential risks. In our view, the approach and strategy for the use of reserves has been significantly enhanced.

“Last year, we observed that there was no overall estates strategy for the Organization. Our report also highlighted that existing workspaces did not lend themselves to an innovative and collaborative environment. WIPO has committed to develop a strategy taking account of our observations, recognising the evolving nature of the workforce and the need to optimise the use of space. The Secretariat’s intention is that the strategy will also address the need to develop smart and sustainable buildings that improve energy efficiency. The Secretariat proposes to share this strategy with Member States in 2025, before presenting Member States with proposals for any substantial new investment in its existing infrastructure. The planned approach addresses the substance of our recommendations and will enable WIPO to better demonstrate how it is maximising the use of its assets.

“In concluding on our work, I can confirm that progress was made in closing five recommendations from previous years, with six recommendations remaining in progress. In this our final year, we have not raised any specific new recommendations, but our report clearly highlights areas which WIPO may wish to consider and we have discussed these areas with management.

“We will engage with our successors in the handover to The Audit Board of the Republic of Indonesia. We have a long-standing relationship with our Indonesian colleagues, and we have a proven track record of securing effective handovers of previous audits. We have already prepared for discussions and knowledge sharing to enable the transition to be effective.

“Finally, I wish to express my thanks to the Director General and the staff of WIPO for their support and co-operation in facilitating our audit work over the past six years. We want to take this opportunity to wish WIPO every success in the continued delivery of its mandate.

“Thank you for your kind attention and I would be happy to take any questions or to provide further background to our audit report.”

1. The Chair thanked the External Auditor for the report.
2. The Delegation of Croatia thanked the External Auditor for its comprehensive and informative report. With regard to WIPO's External Offices, the Delegation made reference to document [A/64/14](https://www.wipo.int/about-wipo/en/assemblies/2023/a-64/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=619934), paragraphs 134, 141 and 284 and provided a summary of the said references. The Delegation indicated that one WIPO Member State had been violating the basic principles of the international legal order and the UN Charter, which had also been explicitly confirmed by the UN General Assembly Resolution ES-11/1, as well as five other related resolutions. The Delegation recalled that hosting an External Office was neither a right of WIPO Member States nor a precondition for cooperating with WIPO or receiving technical assistance. On the contrary, only a handful of Member States had hosted WIPO External Offices, and there had been negotiations for several years to decide the next location of an External Office. The Delegation stated that the WIPO External Office in the Russian Federation had been established under non-transparent circumstances which had led to the proliferation of requests to establish new External Offices. The Delegation, therefore, called for the closure of the WIPO External Office in the Russian Federation and requested that its staff and financial resources be moved to existing or new WIPO External Offices. The Delegation considered it unacceptable that a UN agency had an External Office in the country of a Member State that violated the basic UN principles and called for Member States to consider its closure. Taking into account the background information provided, the Delegation asked if the External Auditor had considered whether maintaining an External Office in a country that blatantly violated internal norms was in line with the UN’s general rules and principles including those for financial management. The Delegation stated the resolutions to be taken into account: UN resolution ES-11/1, Aggression against Ukraine of March 2, 2022; Resolution ES-11/2, Humanitarian consequences of the aggression against Ukraine of March 4, 2022; Resolution ES-11/3, Suspension of the right of membership of the Russian Federation in the Human Rights Council of April 7, 2022; Resolution ES-11/4, Territorial integrity of Ukraine, defending the principles of the UN Charter of October 12, 2022; Resolution ES-11/5, Furtherance of remedy and reparation for aggression against Ukraine from November 14, 2022 and Resolution ES‑11/6, Principles of the Charter of the UN underlying a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in Ukraine from March 2, 2023. In that regard, the Delegation also referred to the reports that dealt with similar subject matters such as the decision of the Security Council 1737 Sanctions Committee concerning WIPO’s Technical assistance to Iran (Islamic Republic of); the decision of the Security Council 1718 Sanctions Committee concerning WIPO’s Technical Assistance to the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea; and the independent external review Report on WIPO’s Technical assistance program in countries subject to UN sanctions . The Delegation asked the External Auditor whether that issue had been considered, whether there was a plan to do so, and whether it could be considered within its mandate. The Delegation requested that the External Auditor provide guidance on which competent oversight body or UN body could address those matters.
3. The Delegation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, speaking on behalf of Group B, expressed its gratitude to the External Auditor for the detailed report on the 2023 WIPO Financial Statements, as contained in document A/65/5, as well as the reflections and observations that it had shared throughout its mandate. Group B had analyzed the report carefully and attached great importance thereto. The Group encouraged WIPO to implement and close the six recommendations indicated in the report. Group B recalled the External Auditor’s observation that the reporting could be streamlined and the strategic focus within WIPO increased by defining key variables for decision‑making. Group B thanked the External Auditor for its valuable services and insights and looked forward to working with the incoming External Auditor. Regarding Group B's substantive comments, the Delegation recalled its statement as delivered on behalf of Group B at the thirty-seventh Program and Budget Committee (PBC) session.
4. The Delegation of Vanuatu thanked the External Auditor for the report. It indicated that the External Auditor had highlighted the need for a clear strategy to support the development of the network of External Offices, which had been raised for several years. The Delegation inquired if any action was taken on how to proceed with the delivery of the evaluation report of External Offices.
5. The External Auditor thanked the delegations for their comments and explained that the issue of External Offices was beyond its clearly defined mandate. Noting that the issues raised were policy matters for Member States, the External Auditor did not wish to comment thereon. The External Auditor emphasized that the most important point to report and reflect on was that there were no material issues that had been brought to its attention that had an impact on the regularity opinion provided on the financial statements. The External Auditor expressed its satisfaction with the transactions which were materially within the framework set for WIPO. Regarding the wider issue of External Offices, the External Auditor stated that it was aware of the difficulties in finding a consensus on the overall scope of any work to review the operations of the network of External Offices. The External Auditor then offered a potential solution to Member States from its perspective, which was to commission an independent expert to frame a scope for External Offices and to deliver against that scope, adding that it would provide Member States with recommendations and would allow them to base their discussions on the experts’ findings. The External Auditor hoped that it had responded to the questions and concluded by expressing its interest in the future approach for External Offices.
6. The Delegation of Croatia thanked the Chair and the External Auditor and stated that it had not received a response to its question. The Delegation wished to know which competent body it could refer to for a response, and therefore requested that the Secretariat respond to its question or request the Independent Advisory Oversight Committee (IAOC) to consider the matter and provide a response.
7. The Delegation of Libya thanked the Chair and said that it did not believe the Assemblies was the right place to condemn or endorse the political actions and practices of Member States. The Delegation stated that Member States should respect the technical nature of the Organization and therefore refrain from engaging in political disputes, which would not be beneficial for the session. Additionally, the Delegation expressed that such discussions did not have an outcome and that it was therefore unfair to continue them, as it also hindered the Assemblies’ provisional agenda and overshadowed the efforts and the work by the Secretariat for the success of the sessions. The Delegation stated that it fully sympathized not only with the people of Ukraine, but also with the Arab people in Palestine, because of the ongoing humanitarian crisis they are both going through, and it further added that it wished to see an end to both conflicts as soon as possible, because one lived in an interdependent world where the fate of one nation was inextricably linked to that of its neighbor. The Delegation urged fellow Member States to help the Secretariat conclude the agenda as planned.
8. The Delegation of Croatia thanked the Chair and stated that it wished to exercise its right to reply since it was of the view that the question it had raised was very pertinent to the topic under discussion, as well as technical, concrete and related to the rules of financial management of a UN organization. The Delegation further noted that the question was technically related to IP, which was part of the UN system, and as such, the work of the Organization was not occurring in isolation from UN principles.
9. The Secretariat reiterated that the question of the network of External Offices, as stated the previous day regarding an earlier agenda item, was a matter for Member States to decide on and that the work of the Secretariat thereon would be guided by them. The Secretariat reiterated that it stood ready to answer questions linked to the WIPO Performance Report (WPR) and to the agenda item regarding the Report of the External Auditor, as well as the Financial Regulation and Rules. However, it had limited responses regarding the decision on the work of External Offices.
10. The Chair thanked the Secretariat for its clarifications.
11. The Assemblies of WIPO, each as far as it is concerned, took note of the “Report by the External Auditor” (document A/65/5).
12. On behalf of the Director General and the entire Organization, the Secretariat thanked the National Audit Office of the United Kingdom for its exceptional service as WIPO’s External Auditor for the past six years. The Secretariat stated that it would not repeat its statement made at the thirty-seventh PBC session but it wished to put on record at the Assemblies its profound gratitude to the Auditors for their service, their professionalism, particularly the Comptroller, the Auditor General of the United Kingdom, as well as Mr. Brewitt and Mr. Irwin who led the audit teams throughout their mandate. The Secretariat added that the work of the External Auditor was instrumental in helping the Organization strengthen its financial management, governance, risk management and internal controls, amongst other areas.
	* 1. Report by the Director of the Internal Oversight Division (IOD)
13. See the report of the session of the WIPO General Assembly (document [WO/GA/57/12 Prov.](https://www.wipo.int/about-wipo/en/assemblies/2024/a-65/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=634015)).

## ITEM 9 OF THE CONSOLIDATED AGENDAREPORT ON THE PROGRAM AND BUDGET COMMITTEE (PBC)

1. Discussions were based on document [A/65/6](https://www.wipo.int/about-wipo/en/assemblies/2024/a-65/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=632231).
2. The Chair noted that one document was considered under the present item, as stated in the “List of Documents”, namely document A/65/6, “List of Decisions Adopted by the Program and Budget Committee”, which contained all decisions taken at the thirty-seventh PBC session.
3. The Secretariat stated that as 2024 was a non-budget year, only one session of the PBC was held from June 10 to 13, 2024. The Secretariat said that the agenda covered a broad range of items at the PBC, and Member States took note, or recommended for approval by the Assemblies, a number of items, as contained in document A/65/6. The decisions included recommendations to the Assemblies for the approval of WIPO’s Annual Financial Report and Financial Statements 2023, Funding for three Capital Master Plan Projects, namely the Madrid Information Technology Platform Project Phase II, the Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) system and updates to the building management system. It also recommended for approval the establishment of a multi-employer plan for the financing of employee benefit liabilities. The PBC’s list of decisions also included recommendations to the Assemblies to take note of WIPO’s positive performance and the achievement of its results in the 2022/23 biennium, as contained in the WPR. It also considered and made recommendations related to the reports by the audit and oversight bodies. Additionally, document A/65/INF/4 provided an update to the Status of the Payment of Contributions as at June 30, 2024. Finally, the Secretariat informed the delegations that since July 1, 2024, contributions were received from Grenada and Côte d’Ivoire, thereby reducing arrears to approximately 9.1 million Swiss francs.
4. The Chair thanked the Secretariat for its statement and recalled that delegations had already engaged very constructively and had an opportunity to express their views on all matters at the thirty-seventh PBC session. The Chair highlighted that their statements at the PBC had been duly recorded and would be reproduced in their entirety in the report, so that delegations did not need to repeat those statements at the Assemblies. The Chair advised delegations to refer to those interventions for the sake of efficiency and thanked the delegations for their understanding.
5. The Delegation of China stated that it had actively participated in the thirty-seventh PBC session, and was pleased that, under the strong leadership of the PBC Chair and Vice-Chair, the PBC completed all discussions effectively and all parties demonstrated great flexibility in a cooperative spirit on the topics of the Annual Report of Human Resources, the Annual Report by the Director, IOD, the Terms of Reference of the 2021 Evaluation of WIPO External Offices, as well as the Methodology for the Allocation of Income and Expenditure by Union, for which very meaningful discussions took place. The Delegation stated that the PBC reached consensus on topics such as the Capital Master Plan Projects and sustainability in procurement, which was highly appreciated. The Delegation thanked the IAOC, External Auditor and the Joint Inspection Unit (JIU) for participating in the thirty-seventh PBC session. The Delegation appreciated the Secretariat’s engagement with Member States before and during the meeting and thanked the Secretariat for its responses to the questions raised by Member States. The Delegation believed that the Program of Work and Budget 2024/25 as well as audit and oversight were part of the foundation of the Organization’s governance and operation, and it was pivotal for all the Member States as well as the Secretariat. The Delegation hoped that WIPO would implement all the decisions made at the thirty-seventh PBC session. In light of those discussions, as well as the needs of the Member States, WIPO should consider including more information in important documents such as the WPR and the Program of Work and Budget 2024/25.
6. The Delegation of Iran (Islamic Republic of), speaking on behalf of the Asia and the Pacific Group, thanked the Secretariat for the preparation of the report. The Group recalled its statements during the previous PBC session, reiterating the important role the PBC played in carrying out WIPO’s mission to lead the development of a balanced and effective IP ecosystem that enabled innovation and creativity for the benefit of all. The Group congratulated WIPO for its continued solid financial performance despite a volatile global environment. The Group commended efforts to increase the budgetary allocation of development oriented and technical assistance programs. The Group believed that continued effort in carrying out development and impact-driven programs could further contribute to facilitating Member States in achieving their Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The Group emphasized the need to re-intensify efforts towards supporting Member States in the implementation of the SDGs. It took note of the Preliminary Draft of the Terms of Reference of the 2021 Evaluation of WIPO External Offices and hoped that WIPO would make progress on that important agenda item, and it looked forward to constructive discussions that could facilitate an expeditious decision on that pending issue. The Group believed that the draft Terms of Reference (ToRs) should consider all relevant documents, including the decisions of the WIPO General Assembly and the views of the Member States. The Group recalled that the decision to open new External Officers was a Member State driven process and that, *inter alia,* the Guiding Principles regarding WIPO External Offices adopted at the 55th Series of Meetings of the Assemblies should be respected. The Group reaffirmed its commitment to contribute positively to deliberations on that matter.
7. The Delegation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, speaking on behalf of Group B, thanked the Secretariat for preparing the List of Decisions Adopted by the Program and Budget Committee as contained in document A/65/6. The Group commended the PBC Chair, Vice-‑Chairs and the Secretariat for their work before and during the thirty-seventh PBC session. Additionally, it commended the smooth and efficient running of the thirty-seventh PBC session. Lastly, the Group noted the discussion on the Preliminary Draft of the Terms of Reference of the 2021 Evaluation of WIPO External Offices and stated that it would continue to participate constructively in that discussion at the next PBC session.
8. The Delegation of the United Arab Emirates congratulated the Chair on his election and reiterated its confidence in the Chair’s ability to guide the work of the Assemblies. The Delegation supported the statement made by the Delegation of Iran (Islamic Republic of), on behalf of the Asia and the Pacific Group. The Delegation had carefully examined the List of Decisions Adopted by the Program and Budget Committee at the thirty-seventh PBC session contained in document WO/PBC/37/13 and noted that the Preliminary Draft of the Terms of Reference of the 2021 Evaluation of WIPO External Offices was based on the understanding that the network of External Offices was an essential tool to develop a balanced and effective IP system. The Delegation urged all Member States to bring about positive negotiations regarding that item. The Delegation stressed the interest in hosting an External Office in its country and drew attention to the need to reach consensus regarding the opening of External Offices based on the rules adopted.
9. The Delegation of the People’s Republic of Korea deeply regretted the lack of constructive discussion on the agenda item in recent years. The Delegation believed it was crucial for Member States to keep in mind that WIPO External Offices were designed to support applicants and promote innovative activities. The Delegation called for active involvement and participation in the review of the evaluation of WIPO External Offices and in the discussion to establish new External Offices.
10. The Delegation of Brazil acknowledged and appreciated WIPO’s positive financial results for the year 2023, with a surplus of 113.8 million Swiss francs and total reserves of 824.1 million Swiss francs, which were significantly higher than the established target of 222.5 million Swiss francs and a commendable management achievement. The Delegation agreed with the External Auditor’s view that such considerable and recurrent surpluses invited reflection on their optimal utilization to align with the means of the Organization, its ends, and particularly, its focus on improving the IP ecosystems to turn them into tools for innovation, competitiveness, creativity and technology transfer. Firstly, the Delegation invited WIPO to consider enhanced support for developing countries through the allocation of a significant portion of those surplus to initiatives aimed at strengthening IP infrastructures. That would include capacity building and technical assistance programs, and the establishment of sustainable IP training institutions that could foster local innovation and creativity. Secondly, WIPO could promote technological advancements, by investing, in particular, in projects that would facilitate technology transfer and innovation and would enhance the ability of developing countries to leverage IP for technological growth with a view to bridging the gap between different economic regions and promoting inclusive global development. Thirdly, on the SDGs, the Delegation advocated for the allocation of direct resources towards projects that fit with and accelerated the UN SDGs by integrating IP into the broader agenda of sustainable development to ensure that the benefits of innovation and creativity contribute to address global challenges such as climate change, health and education. The Delegation was confident that, with a strategic and inclusive approach, WIPO could utilize its financial resources to drive significant change by responding to the needs of developing countries and by focusing on innovation and sustainability to create a more balanced and equitable global IP landscape.
11. The Delegation of Thailand thanked the Secretariat for preparing the List of Decisions Adopted by the Program and Budget Committee. The Delegation noted the reports and fully supported the recommendations from the PBC to the Assemblies to approve, particularly the proposed revisions to the Internal Oversight Charter, the Capital Master Plan Projects and the proposal for the establishment of the multi-employer plan for After-Service Health Insurance (ASHI). The Delegation believed that the Capital Master Plan Projects were crucial for developing the infrastructure of WIPO systems and ensuring the efficient use of resources. The multi-employer plan could provide long-term sustainability for health insurance schemes. The Delegation said that it aligned itself with the statement made by the Delegation of Iran (Islamic Republic of) on behalf of the Asia and the Pacific Group, regarding the External Offices and Development Agenda (DA) implementation. Moreover, the Delegation expressed its openness to hear from the Member States regarding the methodology for the allocation of income and expenditure by union at the PBC, which should reflect the specific needs and operational structure of the Organization, as well as the development of the IP system from a holistic perspective. The Delegation believed that constructive dialogue could help reach consensus that benefited the entire Organization.
12. The Delegation of Saudi Arabia thanked the Secretariat for the preparation of the List of Decisions Adopted by the Program and Budget Committee. The Delegation commended efforts made by the PBC as well as the subsequent developments. The Delegation noted its participation in WIPO’s Funds-in-Trust (FIT), amounting to approximately 5 million Swiss francs. The FIT aimed at providing technical assistance to the countries of the near East and North Africa, encouraging studies and scientific research in the field of IP, as well as financing training programs, scholarships, training in the field of IP and facilitating publications. The Delegation stated that it would work with the Organization to enhance the effectiveness of the FIT in the interest of IP in Member States.
13. The Delegation of Colombia thanked the Secretariat for preparing the document and supported the statement made by the Delegation of Chile, on behalf of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean Countries (GRULAC), on Agenda Item 4. The Delegation recalled the decision taken in 2019 to consider the then 10 applications from Member States, including from Colombia, to host new WIPO External Offices, which should not be conditioned by the review of the current network of External Offices. The Delegation believed there should be a renewed effort by Member States to adopt a decision on the evaluation of WIPO External Offices to enable the extension of the network of External Offices. The Delegation believed that it would significantly contribute to achieving the SDGs, by establishing a regional agenda which would promote the use of IP by minority groups and by giving an incentive to innovation in the strategic use of IP with a more robust institutional framework in Latin America and the Caribbean. The Delegation reiterated its commitment to working together with WIPO and Member States to achieve that common objective.
14. The Delegation of the United States of America supported the statement made by the Delegation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands on behalf of Group B, and joined in consensus in taking note of the List of Decisions Adopted by the Program and Budget Committee contained in document A/65/6, and in approving the recommendations made by the PBC contained in the same document. The Delegation recalled its previous intervention at the thirty-seventh PBC session and in the opening statement of the Assemblies and emphasized the need for all WIPO unions to be financially self-sustainable. In the 2022/23 biennium, WIPO generated 96.1 per cent of its income from fees paid by users of its global IP systems. The main contributors to that income were the Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT) System, representing 77 per cent of total income, followed by the Madrid System, representing 17.5 per cent of the total income. Those systems provided the foundational backbone of the funding of WIPO. The Delegation stated that looking at the revenue generated, as compared to the expenses, was even more telling. In Annex VI of WPR 2022/23 (document WO/PBC/37/7), the PCT brought in a surplus of over 146 million Swiss francs, while the Madrid Union had nearly a 10 million Swiss francs surplus. At the same time, the Hague and Lisbon Systems ran a combined deficit of nearly 23 million Swiss francs. PCT applicants, in particular, were paying a much ‑elevated cost beyond the cost of services utilized in processing their application to, among other things, counterbalance those systems, running deficits, and applicants using those systems were effectively receiving discounts in relation to the cost of services processed. Those financial realities indicated that work needed to be done to balance financial burdens more equitably across applicants of the various systems in relation to cost recovery for those services provided, to bring each union to financial sustainability and stability. The Delegation looked forward to working with Member States to continue to drive WIPO and its decisions in a manner that supported a financially prudent path forward.
15. The Delegation of the Republic of Moldova, speaking on behalf of the Central European and Baltic States (CEBS) Group, looked forward to the prompt finalization of the PBC work on the Preliminary Draft of the Terms of Reference of the 2021 Evaluation of WIPO External Offices. The CEBS Group reiterated its commitment to engaging in that work to reach consensus on that important matter. The CEBS Group recognized the need to undertake an impartial review of the operations of External Offices in an objective, independent and transparent manner. The CEBS Group requested an external review with a view to obtaining a clear picture of how the External Offices contributed to achieving WIPO’s goals and building healthy IP ecosystems for the benefit of users. For the CEBS Group, that was a prerequisite for progressing with its work towards the possibility of opening new External Offices and for developing modalities of the operations based on lessons learned from the evaluation. The Delegation expressed the grave concern of the overwhelming majority of CEBS members regarding the operations and budget allocation of the WIPO External Office in Moscow. In the context of the discussions on the Program of Work and Budget 2024/25, the CEBS Group reiterated its request to the Secretariat to closely monitor the activities, program implementation and budget utilization over that period and to adjust budget allocation as necessary.
16. The Delegation of Ukraine supported the statement made by the Delegation of the Republic of Moldova, on behalf of the CEBS Group. The Delegation thanked the Secretariat, the PBC Chair and distinguished delegates for their productive efforts during the work of the PBC. The Delegation acknowledged the hard work of WIPO’s management in ensuring the financial stability of the Organization in such a challenging environment. The Delegation wished to build on the statements made about Ukraine from numerous distinguished delegates during the last Assemblies and in previous PBC sessions regarding budgeting activities in WIPO’s External Office in the Russian Federation. The Delegation stated that the Russian Federation's war of aggression against Ukraine continued to cause profound damage and destruction to the Ukrainian nation, its cultural heritage, and its intellectual and creative potential, which had been confirmed once again by the report of the International Bureau, and verified by many credible international organizations, including those in the UN system. The Delegation explained that the international wrongful act committed by the Russian Federation undoubtedly affected the dissemination of WIPO knowledge and projects, as well as utilization of the outcomes of External Office activities. Those problems had been amplified by the nearly completed IP legislation in the Russian Federation infringing rights of stakeholders from around the world. The Delegation reiterated that the Russian Federation needed to bear the legal consequences of its internationally wrongful acts and harassment against the IP community. The Delegation called for immediate termination of funding projects in the Russian Federation and emphasized that the only viable way to restore justice could be achieved by the complete closure of the External Office in Moscow. The Delegation indicated that it would be a practical solution that would not only allow WIPO’s financing to be better directed towards achieving WIPO’s mission and vision but would also prevent the Russian Federation from further inappropriate actions against not only Ukraine but the global IP community.
17. The Delegation of Lithuania said that it aligned itself with the statements delivered by the Delegation of the Republic of Moldova, on behalf of the CEBS Group, and the Delegation of Ukraine. The Delegation recalled that at the previous year’s Assemblies, the Program of Work and Budget 2024/2025 biennium was approved. The Delegation stated that while that approval was achieved by consensus, the decision underscored the need for financial prudence given the current global geopolitical and economic instability. The Assemblies requested the Secretariat to closely monitor the implementation of programs and the utilization of the budget for 2024/25 and to make necessary adjustments to budget allocations as needed. The Delegation reiterated its concerns regarding the budget allocation, and the continued operation of the WIPO External Office in the Russian Federation. One of the foundational principles of the WIPO Convention was respect for State sovereignty and equality, a principle that the Russian Federation blatantly violated, thus breaching the UN Charter, UN principles, and fundamental human values. The mission of WIPO’s External Offices needed to be aligned with WIPO’s overarching vision to foster the global IP ecosystem. Hosting an External Office in a Member State that violated core UN principles was untenable. The Delegation highlighted WIPO’s actions to closely monitor the activities of the WIPO External Office in the Russian Federation and believed that more was required. The most appropriate course of action would be to close the WIPO External Office in the Russian Federation following precedents set by other international organizations in Geneva.
18. The Delegation of Pakistan said that it aligned itself with the statement delivered by the Delegation of Iran (Islamic Republic of), on behalf of the Asia and the Pacific Group. The Delegation appreciated that WIPO had exercised due diligence in its internal control mechanism and noted with satisfaction that the Organization continued to display financial and administrative resilience, despite rising global challenges. The Delegation attached great importance to equitable geographical distribution within WIPO's workforce, appreciated the positive trend in the redistribution of the geographical representation over the past few years and hoped that the trend could be further reinforced. In pursuance of discussions at the PBC, the Delegation recommended supplementing the Annual Report on Human Resources with regional, subregional, country-wide data and analysis to effectively address the trajectory of collective progress towards achieving a more balanced workforce. In respect of the Preliminary Draft of the Terms of Reference of the 2021 Evaluation of WIPO External Offices, the Delegation reemphasized the importance of it being guided by the principles of objectivity, inclusiveness, transparency and neutrality. The key outstanding questions regarding the entity to be entrusted with the evaluation, its objectives and scope must be answered in keeping with the Guiding Principles regarding WIPO External Offices agreed by Member States in 2015. The Delegation strongly advocated for the evaluation to be conducted by an independent external entity to ensure impartiality and objectivity in the process of determining the need for both the existing External Offices, as well as the rationale for establishing new ones.
19. The Delegation of the Russian Federation thanked the Secretariat for presenting the List of Decisions Adopted at the thirty-seventh PBC session as contained in document A/65/6. The Delegation noted that although 2024 was not a budget year, the PBC agenda was extremely full. Member States considered and took decisions on a number of critical issues regarding the functioning and financing of WIPO’s work. The Delegation noted with satisfaction the overall constructive and fruitful work, and the decisions adopted at the thirty-seventh PBC session. The Delegation believed the decisions reflected the active involvement and multilateral approach of Member States when drafting and implementing the Program of Work and Budget 2024/25. The Delegation stressed that when planning and implementing WIPO’s work and taking decisions, it was necessary to take into account the long-‑term prospects and strategic interests of all parties and to structure the work of the PBC based on the principles of transparency, inclusivity and multilateralism. The Delegation appreciated the stable financial situation of the Organization and the high achievement of performance indicators, particularly in international registration systems administered by WIPO. The Delegation highlighted the growth in operating expenditure exceeding the limits in the approved Program of Work and Budget 2024/25. The Delegation called for a more cautious approach in evaluation and forecasting. The Delegation appreciated WIPO’s initiative to promote the digital agenda, particularly in the context of introducing frontier technologies in its operational work and expanding the language regime of international registration systems. The Delegation noted the importance of observing due caution with regard to security issues when introducing new technologies, particularly in the context of international registration systems and when implementing the provisions of international treaties administered by WIPO, including the recently adopted WIPO Treaty on Intellectual Property, Genetic Resources and Associated Traditional Knowledge (GRATK Treaty). The Delegation hoped that the Secretariat would adhere to an open approach in the future to give Member States a full picture of the situation regarding the financial and administrative work of the Organization. The Delegation hoped the Secretariat would listen attentively to proposals for improvements that had been expressed during the PBC. It recalled that the PBC decisions were taken by consensus, and Agenda Item 9 did not concern the WIPO External Office in the Russian Federation so there were no grounds to discuss that at the Assemblies.
20. The Delegation of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea recognized that WIPO’s External Offices including the External Office in the Russian Federation played an important role in building a bridge between WIPO and its Member States. The Delegation noted that the proposal to reduce the budget and close the WIPO External Office in the Russian Federation was unreasonable and unjustifiable. The Delegation stated that the issue had been politicized, and therefore opposed to the proposal to close the WIPO External Office in the Russian Federation.
21. The Delegation of Croatia recalled that at the previous Assemblies, it requested and urged the Secretariat and Member States to consider closing the WIPO External Office in Moscow since it was not appropriate that a UN agency had an External Office in the country that violated the principles of the UN Charter that was supported by at least five UN resolutions. The Delegation asked the Secretariat to advise what would be the appropriate agenda item to discuss the WIPO External Office in the Russian Federation to enable to conclude that matter.
22. The Delegation of Nicaragua reiterated that WIPO was created with a view to encouraging the use and protection of IP as a tool to contribute to the economic and social development of countries. The Delegation was grateful for the report and recognized the work involved. The Delegation believed that constructive work should be continued in the PBC on the issue of WIPO External Offices, and politicizing those issues undermined the technical nature of the Organization’s work. The Delegation believed that all decisions should be reached by consensus and did not find it was relevant at that time to be discussing the closing and opening of External Offices. The Delegation firmly opposed to considering the closure of the WIPO External Office in the Russian Federation.
23. The Delegation of Iran (Islamic Republic of) reiterated its position that WIPO was not an appropriate platform or forum to raise issues of political nature, as Member States’ actions should be in full conformity with WIPO’s mandate, principles and rules. The Delegation hoped that WIPO would focus on its main mandate and avoid contentious issues which would put its mission at risk.
24. The Delegation of Poland said that it aligned itself with the statement delivered by the Delegation of the Republic of Moldova, on behalf of the CEBS Group. The Delegation remained concerned about the WIPO External Office in the Russian Federation, and its budget allocation in the 2024/25 biennium.
25. The Delegation of the Syrian Arab Republic highlighted the importance of taking decisions based on objective criteria, rather than on the basis of political considerations. The Delegation did not support the politicization of the PBC. The Delegation highlighted the importance of procedures that were aligned with the values and principles of the Organization, and hoped that the Organization would respect its mandate and not move into political issues that would affect the quality of the work.
26. In response to the question raised by the Delegation of Croatia, the Legal Counsel explained that Agenda Item 9, Report of the Program and Budget Committee, concerned the List of Decisions Adopted by the Program and Budget Committee as prepared and presented to Member States for their consideration. Member States should consider taking note of and approving those decisions based on the recommendations made by PBC, which was a well-‑established practice. That was the exclusive purview of the agenda item. In addition, the Legal Counsel stated that to the extent that the questions related to matters of programmatic or budgetary activity more broadly, the PBC, as a subsidiary body of the WIPO General Assembly, considered those matters for discussion and deliberation prior to being presented to the Assemblies for final consideration.
27. The Delegation of Belarus stated that there were no grounds to support the proposals to reduce the budgetary allocation or close the WIPO External Office in the Russian Federation. Those initiating those proposals had not put forward the grounds for doing so because there were simply none. The Delegation believed those proposals were purely political in nature and had been put forward by specific Member States. The Delegation stressed that politically motivated initiatives at a specialized international organization, including WIPO, were not acceptable. Moreover, that initiative would impact the entire Organization because it concerned the External Offices network. The Delegation stated that the initiative would not only destroy the network, or the link between the network of WIPO and its mandate, but also the positive work that had been carried out over decades. The Delegation emphasized that the initiative would discriminate against many individuals, particularly inventors and innovators. Therefore, the Delegation found the initiative categorically unacceptable and did not agree with it.
28. The Delegation of Croatia thanked the Secretariat for its response. However, the Delegation stated that the Secretariat’s response did not address its question. The Delegation reiterated that its question was not related to budgetary concerns or the monitoring of the budgetary issues in the WIPO External Office in the Russian Federation, but concerned whether it was appropriate that a UN organization had an External Office which was not related to the humanitarian aid, in a country that violated the UN Charter’s basic principles, as was confirmed by the UN resolutions. The Delegation recalled that the Assemblies had used half an hour to discuss Wikimedia’s observer status on the grounds that Wikimedia was publishing information which was considered by some Member States as not aligned with the territorial integrity of certain countries. The Delegation explained that there was an issue of territorial integrity regarding a country that had been violated by another country which had an External Office. The Delegation believed that if it was appropriate to discuss the Wikimedia-related political issues, then it would be appropriate to discuss matters that pertained directly to WIPO’s mission. The Delegation reminded the delegations that WIPO did not have an External Office in every Member State. It was a handful of States where, for some historical reason, those External Offices had been established. The Delegation inquired if External Offices should be in a country that clearly demonstrated that it did not care about the fundamental principles of the UN Charter. The Delegation asked when and where that issue could be discussed, reiterating that it was not concerned about budgetary concerns, but about suspending operations in the External Office.
29. The Secretariat thanked delegations for their questions. In response to the question concerning the location of WIPO’s External Offices, the Secretariat recalled that it was ultimately the Member States that decided to open WIPO’s External Offices. However, the Secretariat stated that it could provide explanations to questions pertaining to the performance of WIPO External Offices.
30. The Delegation of China thanked the Legal Counsel for its clarifications on the procedures. The Delegation believed that it was very clear that Agenda Item 9 concerned the Report on the PBC session, and that WIPO’s Rules of Procedures laid out the procedures for the new proposals that had to be followed and respected. Regarding the mention of Wikimedia Foundation made by a Member State, the Delegation stated that the discussions on that matter were conducted under Agenda Item 6, Admission of Observers.
31. Noting that there were no further questions addressed to the Secretariat regarding the PBC, the Secretariat thanked Member States for their comments and helpful and constructive engagement during the PBC that had led to the conclusions.
32. The Assemblies of WIPO, each as far as it is concerned,
33. took note of the “List of Decisions Adopted by the Program and Budget Committee” (document A/65/6), and
34. approved the recommendations made by the Program and Budget Committee as contained in the same document.

## ITEM 10 OF THE CONSOLIDATED AGENDAReports from WIPO Committees

(i) The Standing Committee on Copyright and Related Rights (SCCR)

1. See the report of the session of the WIPO General Assembly (document [WO/GA/57/12 Prov.](https://www.wipo.int/about-wipo/en/assemblies/2024/a-65/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=634015)).

(ii) The Standing Committee on the Law of Patents (SCP)

1. See the report of the session of the WIPO General Assembly (document [WO/GA/57/12 Prov.](https://www.wipo.int/about-wipo/en/assemblies/2024/a-65/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=634015)).

(iii) The Standing Committee on the Law of Trademarks, Industrial Designs and Geographical Indications (SCT)

1. See the report of the session of the WIPO General Assembly (document [WO/GA/57/12 Prov.](https://www.wipo.int/about-wipo/en/assemblies/2024/a-65/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=634015)).

(iv) The Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP) and Review of the Implementation of the Development Agenda

1. See the report of the session of the WIPO General Assembly (document [WO/GA/57/12 Prov.](https://www.wipo.int/about-wipo/en/assemblies/2024/a-65/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=634015)).

(v) The Intergovernmental Committee on Intellectual Property and Genetic Resources, Traditional Knowledge and Folklore (IGC)

1. See the report of the session of the WIPO General Assembly (document [WO/GA/57/12 Prov.](https://www.wipo.int/about-wipo/en/assemblies/2024/a-65/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=634015)).

(vi) The Committee on WIPO Standards (CWS)

1. See the report of the session of the WIPO General Assembly (document [WO/GA/57/12 Prov.](https://www.wipo.int/about-wipo/en/assemblies/2024/a-65/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=634015)).

(vii) The Advisory Committee on Enforcement (ACE)

1. See the report of the session of the WIPO General Assembly (document [WO/GA/57/12 Prov.](https://www.wipo.int/about-wipo/en/assemblies/2024/a-65/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=634015))

## ITEM 11 OF THE CONSOLIDATED AGENDAPCT SYSTEM

1. See the report of the session of the PCT Union Assembly (document [PCT/A/56/3 Prov.](https://www.wipo.int/about-wipo/en/assemblies/2024/a-65/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=634004)).

## ITEM 12 OF THE CONSOLIDATED AGENDAMADRID SYSTEM

1. See the report of the session of the Madrid Union Assembly (document [MM/A/58/2 Prov.](https://www.wipo.int/about-wipo/en/assemblies/2024/a-65/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=634003)).

## ITEM 13 OF THE CONSOLIDATED AGENDAHAGUE SYSTEM

1. See the report of the session of the Hague Union Assembly (document [H/A/44/3 Prov.](https://www.wipo.int/about-wipo/en/assemblies/2024/a-65/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=634002)).

## ITEM 14 OF THE CONSOLIDATED AGENDAWIPO ARBITRATION AND MEDIATION CENTER, INCLUDING DOMAIN NAMES

1. See the report of the session of the WIPO General Assembly (document [WO/GA/57/12 Prov.)](https://www.wipo.int/about-wipo/en/assemblies/2024/a-65/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=634015).

## ITEM 15 OF THE CONSOLIDATED AGENDABudapest Union Assembly

1. See the report of the session of the Budapest Union Assembly (document [BP/A/41/2 Prov.](https://www.wipo.int/about-wipo/en/assemblies/2024/a-65/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=634012)).

## ITEM 16 OF THE CONSOLIDATED AGENDAMarrakesh Treaty Assembly

1. See the report of the session of the Marrakesh Treaty Assembly (document [MVT/A/9/2 Prov.](https://www.wipo.int/about-wipo/en/assemblies/2024/a-65/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=634013)).

## ITEM 17 OF THE CONSOLIDATED AGENDA

REPORT ON THE OUTCOME OF THE DIPLOMATIC CONFERENCE TO CONCLUDE AN INTERNATIONAL LEGAL INSTRUMENT RELATING TO INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY, GENETIC RESOURCES AND TRADITIONAL KNOWLEDGE ASSOCIATED WITH GENETIC RESOURCES

1. See the report of the session of the WIPO General Assembly (document [WO/GA/57/12 Prov.](https://www.wipo.int/about-wipo/en/assemblies/2024/a-65/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=634015)).

## ITEM 18 OF THE CONSOLIDATED AGENDA

ASSISTANCE AND SUPPORT FOR UKRAINE’S INNOVATION AND CREATIVITY SECTOR AND INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY SYSTEM

1. Discussions were based on documents [A/65/7](https://www.wipo.int/about-wipo/en/assemblies/2024/a-65/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=632100), [A/65/8](https://www.wipo.int/about-wipo/en/assemblies/2024/a-65/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=633431) and [A/65/9](https://www.wipo.int/about-wipo/en/assemblies/2024/a-65/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=633486).
2. The Chair opened Agenda Item 18, Assistance and Support for Ukraine’s Innovation, and Creativity Sector and Intellectual Property System, and noted that there were three documents under consideration, namely: document A/65/7 “Report on the Assistance and Support for Ukraine’s Innovation and Creativity Sector and Intellectual Property System”; document A/65/8 “Joint Proposal of the Central European and Baltic States Group (CEBS) and Group B on the Assistance and Support for Ukraine’s Innovation and Creativity Sector and Intellectual Property System”, and document A/65/9 “Proposal of the Delegation of the Russian Federation on the Assistance and Support for Ukraine’s Innovation and Creativity Sector and Intellectual Property System” which were received by the Secretariat on July 12, 2024, and July 15, 2024, respectively. The Chair then invited the Director General to introduce the agenda item.
3. The Director General introduced document A/65/7, containing an updated Report on the Assistance and Support for Ukraine’s Innovation and Creativity Sector and Intellectual Property System. The Director General noted that during the 64th Series of Meetings of the Assemblies held in July 2023, Member States took note of document A/64/8 and requested the International Bureau to continue providing concrete assistance and support to Ukraine, and to provide an updated report at the 2024 WIPO Assemblies. Since the last Assemblies, the International Bureau had continued to support Ukraine’s innovation and creativity sectors and IP system. The Director General stated that WIPO’s work in Ukraine was shaped and guided by a comprehensive Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) signed in July 2023 with Ms. Yulia Svyrydenko, Minister for Economy (Ukraine). Since then, WIPO had held over 30 meetings, both in person and online, with relevant government officials and other stakeholders from Ukraine which included Mr. Vitaliy Kindrativ, Deputy Minister for Economy, whom the Director General personally met in April 2024 in Geneva, alongside regular engagements with Ms. Olena Orliuk, Director, Ukrainian National Office of Intellectual Property and Innovations (UANIPIO), and other stakeholders, including the Supreme Court of Ukraine. The Director General explained that those consultations and engagements had enabled WIPO to continuously update and adapt the assistance provided, ensuring that it met the country’s evolving needs and those of its grassroots innovators and creators. The Director General stressed that the assistance was wide-ranging and comprised policy and legislative advice, capacity-building for various stakeholders, including members of the judiciary, patent and trademark examiners, and women entrepreneurs, as well as support for technoparks and other eligible institutions. WIPO also continued to raise IP awareness, deliver IP education, and develop new business tools for Ukrainian startups and small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs). The Director General highlighted that, despite severe challenges, Ukraine’s IP innovation and creative ecosystems continued to show resilience. Ukraine had extended its national network of Technology and Innovation Support Centers (TISCs), adding a further 23 TISCs since July 2023. A new IP & Innovations Hub had been established, and there had been an increase in the level of activity and training provided by the Ukrainian IP Training Center. He underscored that those were important milestones delivered with WIPO’s support. The Director General noted that an increase in national IP filings had been observed last year, with patent filings up by 5.5 per cent, trademark filings up by 55 per cent, and industrial design filings up by 35 per cent. The use of WIPO’s IP services had also increased in 2023. WIPO would continue to identify, working closely with the Government of Ukraine, areas where support was most needed and to provide concrete benefits to innovators, creators, and members of the IP community in Ukraine. WIPO would also focus on recovery so that Ukraine’s innovative and creative ecosystems were ready to support rebuilding efforts and the revitalization of the country’s economy. He reiterated his previous statement, emphasizing that peace was essential for innovation and creativity to thrive and expressed hope that peace would soon return to Ukraine. The Director General then turned the floor to the Director, Transition and Developed Countries (TDC) Division, to provide more details on the report.
4. The Secretariat extended its gratitude to the Director General for setting the stage for the important agenda item and provided the details of the report contained in document A/65/7. The report showcased the efforts made by the International Bureau to support Ukraine amidst the challenges posed by the ongoing war. It covered the period from July 2023 to May 2024 and was prepared based on inputs provided by various areas of the Organization, data related to national filings provided by the UANIPIO, and relevant sources developed by other international organizations such as the World Bank, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). The Secretariat highlighted some key achievements included in the report. First, it noted that since the 64th Series of Meetings of the Assemblies held in July 2023, WIPO had signed an MoU with the Ministry of Economy of Ukraine in July 2023. That was a pivotal step in the collaborative efforts, as the MoU drove the assistance and support provided by WIPO to Ukraine. The International Bureau had been in close contact with Ukraine throughout that entire timeframe. The Secretariat informed that since February 2024, at a policy level, it had actively supported the development of a 5-year National IP Strategy for Ukraine (2025‑2030). The strategic document covered industrial property, copyright, and other related matters and was fully aligned with Ukraine’s national goals and priorities. The Secretariat shared that the International Bureau had been coordinating and engaging in regular meetings with the National Expert Group and the national and international consultants to facilitate progress and ensure that strategic and substantive advice was provided at critical points throughout the process. The International Bureau had also been actively working with Ukraine to help modernize its copyright and industrial property legislative framework. Comments were provided on the new Copyright Law and its bylaws, as well as on the accreditation processes of Collective Management Organizations (CMOs). Additionally, the International Bureau offered policy advice on utility model systems, patent-related exceptions, and trade secret protection in industrial property. The Secretariat reported substantial progress in WIPO’s commitment to increasing IP knowledge and skills in Ukraine. The WIPO Academy’s IP Training Institutions (IPTI) project, which was completed in 2023, had enhanced the capacities of national trainers and developed new skills-building programs for Ukraine. In 2024, the International Bureau began developing four targeted projects for children, folk craft entrepreneurs, and continuous training for trainers on emerging technologies. Ukrainian participants took part in other programs provided by the WIPO Academy, such as courses on various IP topics, Joint Master’s programs, and more. The Secretariat emphasized that capacity and network building for patent and trademark examiners had been prioritized through two pilot projects initiated in 2024. Those projects facilitated experience and knowledge sharing and provided capacity ‑building opportunities among trademark and patent examiners. Special sessions with interpretation had been organized for Ukrainian trademark examiners, and the training program for patent examiners was crafted based on a thorough needs assessment. As a result, 59 trademark and 43 patent examiners had benefitted and continued to benefit from the two projects. The Secretariat reported that in November 2023, WIPO signed an MoU with the Supreme Court of Ukraine and that development significantly strengthened support for the judiciary during the reporting period paving the way for joint activities to enhance the judicial system for IP protection. That collaboration had resulted in the integration of Ukrainian judgements into the WIPO Lex-Judgments database and a series of capacity-building workshops for the Ukrainian judiciary. The Secretariat highlighted several activities that supported Ukrainian IP stakeholders in leveraging IP successfully. Furthermore, WIPO supported innovators, creators, SMEs, universities, and research institutions through various initiatives. The TISCs network had grown significantly since July 2023, establishing 23 new centers. Additionally, an IP & Innovations Hub was launched in 2023 to foster an effective innovation ecosystem in the country. The technopark project, which involved cross-‑regional experience sharing, had seen active participation from Ukrainian technoparks which enhanced their IP management methodologies. The Secretariat noted that support tools for SMEs and startups had also been developed which included translating and customizing key resources such as “Enterprising Ideas – A Guide to Intellectual Property for Startups” and “WIPO IP Diagnostics”. Furthermore, the Secretariat initiated consultations with Ukraine on an IP Audit project for government-funded institutions, which was still underway. The Secretariat further informed that three Ukrainian women entrepreneurs participated in the CEBS Women Entrepreneurs Project (WEP), which facilitated training, mentoring, and matchmaking for the participants, helping to enhance their ability to protect and promote traditional textile businesses through IP tools. Additionally, the Secretariat emphasized that the provision of access to information and technologies remained a priority. Thus, free access to the Access to Specialized Patent Information (ASPI) and Access to Research for Development and Innovation (ARDI), and other Research4Life programs for Ukrainian institutions had been extended until 2024. Training sessions for effectively utilizing those resources were planned for the near future. On a more technical level, the Secretariat stated that the International Bureau had consulted with Ukraine regarding implementing enhanced business solutions for UANIPIO, including extended data exchange and developing a program for introducing artificial intelligence (AI) tools into their work. The International Bureau continued to ensure that IP applicants from Ukraine, as well as UANIPIO, had access to the full range of WIPO IP services, including those provided by the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center, and that measures had been put in place to grant appropriate extensions, exemptions and other remedies as provided for in relevant WIPO treaties, rules and regulations. The Secretariat reported that the PCT System had been used steadily, international trademark applications of Ukrainian origin under the Madrid System, and designs contained in applications of Ukrainian origin under the Hague System had increased. The Secretariat referred to the statement by the Director General and reiterated that Ukraine had shown a slight increase in national IP filings across all IP rights in the past year. More specifically, in 2023, UANIPIO reported a rise of 5.5 per cent in patent applications compared to 2022, 47.4 per cent increase in utility models applications, 34.8 per cent increase in industrial design applications, and 55.4 per cent increase in trademark applications. The Secretariat emphasized that while those numbers remained below those documented in 2021, they were truly commendable. The Secretariat concluded by affirming that throughout the process, adequate financial and human resources for the implementation of technical and legal assistance, capacity-building, other projects and activities, aiming to restore and rebuild Ukraine’s IP sector and ecosystem, were ensured as appropriate and required, and were within the approved Program of Work and Budget. The Secretariat remained committed to maintaining close collaboration with Ukraine and providing comprehensive support and assistance to Ukraine’s innovation and creativity sector and IP system to contribute to rebuilding the ecosystem and strengthening the country’s economy. The Secretariat expressed its readiness to provide any additional information requested by Member States and to address any questions.
5. The Delegation of the Republic of Moldova, speaking on behalf of the CEBS Group, thanked the Director General and the Secretariat for preparing the report concerning the Assistance and Support for Ukraine’s Innovation and Creativity Sector and Intellectual Property System contained in document A/65/7. The CEBS Group commended the work that had been done to enhance the IP infrastructure and innovation ecosystem in Ukraine, considering the continuous evolving needs and the new circumstances on the ground as a direct result of the ongoing aggression by the Russian Federation. The CEBS Group welcomed the reported increasing trends in some national and international IP filings in 2023 as opposed to 2022. It expressed grave concerns about the findings that reflected that the Russian Federation’s war of aggression continued to significantly impact the innovation and creativity sector and the IP system in Ukraine, as the outcome was far below the pre-war level of 2021. That was reflected not only in the unprecedented damage to the infrastructure serving scientific, educational, research and cultural institutions but most importantly in the loss of potential and capacity of the stakeholders of the Ukrainian IP ecosystem. Among others, the report showed a decline by 36 per cent in designations in international trademark filings, 32 per cent in PCT filings, and 27 per cent decrease in the number of designs contained in international applications which revealed the serious damage that the Ukrainian IP system faced as opposed to the pre-war 2021 year. The outflow of intellectual capital, reflected in the 6.4 million Ukrainian refugees and other 3.7 million persons that have been internally displaced across Ukraine, was a subject of serious concern. The CEBS Group stated that the wide-ranging negative effects of the Russian Federation’s invasion against Ukraine, from the deteriorated mental health of the IP stakeholders, the brain drain caused by that humanitarian crisis and amplified by infrastructure damage as well as the reduced financial resources, emphasized the need for the international community to continue the support for the Ukrainian people in addressing the negative and long-lasting effects of the war. The above-mentioned facts left no doubt that it would take many years to compensate the damage caused by the war and therefore a long-‑term engagement on behalf of WIPO was needed. Noting the important role of the Organization in leading the development of an effective global IP ecosystem, the CEBS Group called upon WIPO and its Member States to stand in solidarity with the people of Ukraine, thus continuing to assist and support in addressing the immediate, medium and long-term impacts of the war on Ukraine’s innovation and creativity sector. The CEBS Group underscored the need for regular presentations to the WIPO Assemblies of a report on the conditions of the Ukrainian IP, innovation and creativity ecosystems and on the scope of WIPO’s technical assistance to address the damage on the Ukrainian IP ecosystem because of the ongoing Russian Federation’s war of aggression. The Group also urged the Russian Federation to heed the numerous demands of the international community to immediately seize its use of force against Ukraine and to immediately, completely and unconditionally withdraw its military forces from the territory of Ukraine within its internationally recognized borders. The Delegation presented document A/65/8, a joint proposal for a decision regarding the agenda item on behalf of both the CEBS Group and Group B members that was published on Saturday, July 13, 2024, adding that an earlier version was circulated among Group Coordinators the previous Thursday. The Delegation read out the proposed decision text that was also shown on the screen:
6. “The Assemblies of WIPO each in so far as it is concerned:

“Recalling their Decisions on the Assistance and Support for Ukraine’s Innovation and Creativity Sector and Intellectual Property System contained in documents A/63/10 and A/64/14;

“Take note of the Report on the Assistance and Support for Ukraine’s Innovation and Creativity Sector and Intellectual Property System contained in document A/65/7, and the continued negative impacts of the ongoing war on Ukraine’s innovation and creativity sector and IP system; and

“Request the International Bureau:

“a. to continue its close cooperation with Ukraine to ensure its ongoing support and assistance to the creators, innovators, and members of the IP community, focusing on mitigating the adverse effects of the war and rebuilding an innovative and creative ecosystem in Ukraine that benefits all stakeholders and strengthens the country’s economy; and

“b. to provide an updated assessment of the medium- and long-term impacts of the war on Ukraine’s innovation and creativity sector and ecosystem; and

“c. to take steps to ensure that publications on WIPO resources and platforms comply with the principles of sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity of Ukraine within its internationally recognized borders;

“d. to report on the implementation of this decision and other relevant activities at the 2025 WIPO Assemblies, and annually thereafter.”

The Delegation stated that both Group B and CEBS members believed that the proposed language was neutral and balanced while it ensured that Ukraine would continue to receive WIPO’s paramount support and assistance for its innovation and creativity sector, and reporting to the WIPO Assemblies would continue annually thereafter. The Delegation expressed hope that the proposed text could be adopted by consensus.

1. The Delegation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, speaking on behalf of the 31 members of Group B, thanked the Secretariat for preparing the report on the Assistance and Support for Ukraine’s Innovation and Creativity Sector and Intellectual Property System, contained in document A/65/7. The facts and evidence-based report highlighted the grave consequences of the Russian Federation’s illegal war of aggression which continued to that day. In addition to the direct general damage in Ukraine amounting to more than 150 billion US dollars, the report mentioned that more than 1400 buildings of 177 public scientific institutions that had been destroyed and damaged, as well as the damage of 400 UNESCO sites, namely 137 religious sites, 199 buildings of historical and artistic interest, 31 museums, 25 monuments, 15 libraries, and one archive. Furthermore, the report mentioned difficulties in collaboration between scientists and businesses due to poor communication networks, brain drain, damage and loss of research equipment as well as inability of collective management organizations to perform their duties resulting in significant loss of income for creative industries. Group B also observed that the number of IP applications remained low as compared to those registered before the war and highlighted the declining numbers of designations of Ukraine in Madrid and Hague applications. The Group appreciated the wide range of support and activities provided, and commended the MoU that was signed in July 2023 between WIPO and the Ministry of Economy of Ukraine on cooperation in the sphere of IP. Group B stated that it would ensure continued support and technical assistance to Ukraine as long as it was required, and noted that such support was available to any Member State that needed it. Group B expressed admiration for Ukraine’s resilience and courage and reiterated its full and unwavering solidarity with the people of Ukraine. It stated that the Russian Federation must instantly and completely withdraw its troops from the whole territory of Ukraine and fully respect Ukraine’s territorial integrity, sovereignty and independence within its internationally recognized borders. Group B fully supported the proposed decision language for the agenda item contained in document A/65/8 that was presented by the Delegation of the Republic of Moldova on behalf of the CEBS Group. Group B noted that the findings outlined in the report contained in document A/65/7 underscored the substantial effort needed to mitigate the damage resulting from that war. Recognizing the crucial role of WIPO in nurturing a robust global IP ecosystem, it urged WIPO and its Member States to reaffirm their commitment to providing ongoing assistance and support to creators, innovators, and members of the IP community. Group B remained focused on mitigating the adverse impacts of the war and fostering a resilient and innovative ecosystem in Ukraine. Therefore, it requested the International Bureau to conduct a comprehensive assessment of the medium and long-term effects of the conflict on Ukraine’s innovation and creativity sector and the overall ecosystem. As upholding the principles of State sovereignty, equality and territorial integrity was fundamental under the WIPO Convention, Group B emphasized the importance of ensuring that all publications on WIPO resources and platforms aligned with those principles concerning Ukraine’s internationally recognized borders. Group B expressed hope that the proposed decision could be adopted through consensus.
2. The Delegation of Ukraine expressed its sincere gratitude to the Director General for his leadership, commitment and understanding in supporting the Ukrainian IP system, creative and innovative sectors, and thanked the Secretariat for its contributions to the report. On behalf of all Ukrainian IP and innovation community, the Delegation expressed its sincere appreciation to all the distinguished WIPO Member States that showed the best examples of solidarity and advancing decisions on the Assistance and Support for Ukraine’s Innovation and Creativity Sector and Intellectual Property System within WIPO. Those commitments demonstrated to the global IP community the unity and strength in the face of the greatest challenges. The Delegation reiterated its statements made on various international platforms, both at the UN and within WIPO, that the consequences of the Russian Federation’s war of aggression against Ukraine had reached a global scale and had long gone beyond not only the regional but also the continental level. The Delegation stated that while that year`s World IP Day focused on SDGs – problems with global security, food, energy, environment and even the nuclear crisis that followed soon after the Russian Federation’s war of aggression against Ukraine, gave a whole new meaning to sustainable values. The Delegation stated that Ukraine was the first country in the world to collect evidence of ecocide, and that the Russian Federation’s aggression undermined the collective fight against the climate crisis. Moreover, Ukraine was suffering from the most destructive form of the Russian Federation’s vision of energy as a weapon. It had destroyed almost all of Ukraine’s thermal power generation and that had a huge impact on the ability of the IP Office to work and support national stakeholders. Currently, the IP Office had been working with a generator for 10 to 16 hours a day. As the equipment was already unable to resist the high temperatures, the Delegation expressed concerns about the prospects for the coming winter. Furthermore, the updated report reflected the areas of support and projects that Ukraine had been implementing together with WIPO in the framework of bilateral cooperation, and which had been strengthened by the adoption and extension of the decisions in 2022 and 2023. The Delegation indicated that a lot of useful measures had been taken and fully considered, including concrete support for the UANIPIO, legislative advice, and direct assistance to stakeholders from the innovative and creative industries, such as artists, designers, technology and science parks, IP managers, TISCs staff, IP experts and many others. It also mentioned the support at the strategic level in the development of the National IP Strategy, which focused on the mitigation of negative impacts in short, medium and long-term plans, as well as the strategic orientation of Ukraine’s membership in the European Union. As a result of all those efforts, there had been some positive trends in IP registration and filling across all IP rights, as well as in improvement of IP enforcement, many legislative developments and progress towards the European Union accession. The Delegation referred to the report which also clearly mentioned the deepening and continuation of the negative impacts of the Russian Federation’s war of aggression and the evolving needs of Ukraine, following last year’s assessment conducted by the International Bureau, and stressed that the importance of such a report was based on several factors. The report provided valuable insights that would serve as a basis for active counteractions against the described negative impacts, supporting the economy and population of Ukraine, preserving jobs and social stability. The methodology for collecting and analyzing adverse impact data would help to better develop crisis management practices by WIPO and its Member States, as well as to verify the data on atrocities committed by the Russian Federation and to counteract any forms of propaganda and disinformation. The Delegation emphasized the importance to continue to have those discussions with Member States and the Secretariat. The Delegation noted that while those discussions analyzed and sought ways to counteract such devastating impacts, the Russian Federation continued to devalue the work by using IP as a hostage and a weapon. As an example, last week the Federal Service for Intellectual Property (ROSPATENT) registered the Melitopol Cherry geographical indication and deliberately demonstrated disrespect to the whole IP community and misuse of WIPO platforms and resources to legitimize the illegal temporary occupation of Ukraine’s territories. In that regard, the Delegation requested WIPO to take all necessary practical steps to prevent such misuse of its platforms in compliance with the UN resolutions regarding territorial integrity of Ukraine. The Delegation stated that only through unity and courage, in the face of that threat, the high goals and mission of the Organization could be achieved, adding that the threat posed by the Russian Federation had long become a global concern. Thus, the Delegation reiterated its call for the only possible effective response to the Russian Federation’s brutal actions that were: closing the WIPO External Office in Moscow; suspending funding for any WIPO projects for the Russian Federation; ceasing cooperation with the Russian Federation officials and pressuring them to immediately stop using IP, WIPO platforms and resources to legitimize their illegal occupation of Ukraine’s territories; and continuing support and assistance measures for Ukraine with constant monitoring of their implementation.
3. The Delegation of Hungary, speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member states, stated that more than two years into the war of aggression that the Russian Federation launched against Ukraine in manifest violation of its obligations under the UN Charter and international law, the European Union and its member states were ever more steadfast in their support for Ukraine’s independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity within its internationally recognized borders. The European Union and its member states reiterated their support for a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in Ukraine. To that end, the aggressor must immediately, completely, and unconditionally, withdraw all its troops and military equipment from the entire territory of Ukraine and respect its sovereignty and territorial integrity in line with resolutions of the UN General Assembly. It also welcomed the outcome of the Summit on Peace in Ukraine which took place at Bürgenstock, in Luzern, Switzerland on June 15 and 16, 2024. The European Union and its member states thanked the Director General for the presentation of the updated report on the Assistance and Support for Ukraine’s Innovation and Creativity Sector and Intellectual Property System. It welcomed the valuable efforts made by the International Bureau on the implementation of the decisions taken at the 2022 and 2023 WIPO Assemblies. The European Union and its member states referred to the report which stated that the Ukrainian people continued to suffer from the IP specific implications of the war with further damage of infrastructure, loss or damage of research equipment, brain drain, significant decrease in income of creative industries, widespread displacement as well as decrease in research and development (R&D) funding due to the necessity to reallocate financial resources to national security and defense priorities. The European Union and its member states noted the resilience of the Ukrainian entrepreneurs, creators and innovators despite the serious outflow of intellectual capital. An increase in the number of IP applications had been recorded in 2023 compared to 2022. The European Union and its member states added that reaching the pre-war levels still proved to be a challenge in most sectors due to the ongoing war. Given that the Russian Federation’s aggression against Ukraine continued to significantly impact the innovation and creative sector and IP system of Ukraine, it remained essential that WIPO continued to ensure adequate and timely support to the recovery of the Ukrainian IP community in line with Ukraine’s needs. In that context, the European Union and its member states acknowledged the need for WIPO to provide regular reports, to the 2025 WIPO Assemblies and annually thereafter, on the assistance and support extended to Ukraine’s innovation and creativity sector and IP system to help mitigate the adverse effects of the ongoing war. The European Union and its member states supported the proposed draft decision for the agenda item contained in document A/65/8 that had been presented by the CEBS Group and Group Band reiterated its full and unwavering support to Ukraine and its people.
4. The Delegation of the United Kingdom stated that two and a half years after the Russian Federation launched its law-flouting full-scale war in Ukraine and its people, its country, its culture had been subjected to the most atrocious attacks and acts of aggression. The country had suffered in countless ways and the IP and innovation ecosystem had certainly not escaped. The Delegation underscored that that year’s excellent report identified clearly the increasing negative impact on the innovation and creativity sector, the damaged infrastructure, the loss of or damage to research equipment, the brain drain, and the other challenges presented to the creative industries and the people of Ukraine, as the Delegation of Ukraine set out so eloquently in its statement. The Delegation thanked WIPO for continuing to undertake research, reporting and crucially for identifying and then providing technical assistance to support Ukraine in the time of such dire need and welcomed the work undertaken so far. The Delegation encouraged WIPO to continue its efforts with the same tireless energy that the people of Ukraine had shown in the defense of their homeland and of their freedom. It fully supported the decision proposal put forward by Group B and the CEBS Group for the agenda item and stated that the United Kingdom’s support to Ukraine was ironclad. The Delegation condemned the Russian Federation’s violation of international law and of the UN Charter and stated that it would stand with its allies, with Ukraine in its fight for its freedom and its independence and for international law today, tomorrow, next week and for as long as it took.
5. The Delegation of the United States of America supported the decision language proposed jointly by Group B and the CEBS Group. The Delegation stated that it was disheartening that for the third year in a row members must address the widespread and deliberate destruction of Ukraine’s innovative and creative sector by the full-scale Russian Federation’s invasion. The Russian Federation’s relentless aggression had resulted in significant damage to Ukraine’s IP ecosystem undermining the backbone of its economic development and cultural diversity. The Delegation underscored that the recent Peace Summit hosted in Switzerland had been an opportunity for Ukraine together with many other countries to agree on a potential framework for a future peace settlement with the Russian Federation, one that protected Ukraine’s sovereignty and territorial integrity and in line with the UN Charter. The Delegation regretted that the Russian Federation had shown no support or readiness for any good faith negotiations or engagement for a durable peace. The Delegation stated that the Russian Federation could end that war at any time by withdrawing its forces from Ukraine instead of continuing to launch brutal attacks against Ukraine’s cities and ports at great cost to the Ukrainian people. The Delegation referred to the report which documented that Ukraine’s national IP filings had increased slightly in 2023 but were still well below pre-invasion levels, a sign that the Russian Federation’s aggression continued to rob Ukraine of its full potential. The Delegation admitted that Ukrainians continued to demonstrate incredible resilience despite the Russian Federation’s brutality. The report estimated the cost of restoring Ukraine’s public research infrastructure would be 1.26 billion US dollars, adding that the eventual reconstruction was not only expensive but would also take decades and generations to undo the emotional and cultural damage the Russian Federation had inflicted upon the people of Ukraine and their cultural heritage. The Russian Federation had damaged or destroyed nearly 1500 buildings owned by 177 public scientific institutions and referred to the reported destruction of more than 350 cultural and religious sites, 31 museums, 15 libraries. The Delegation underscored that when artists and writers were silenced, it stifled the voice of culture; when innovations were destroyed, it halted the progress of technology; and when education institutions were demolished, it dimmed the light of knowledge. The Delegation stressed the collective responsibility to call on the Russian Federation to immediately withdraw its forces from Ukrainian territory within its internationally recognized borders. It added that when the Russian Federation’s aggression ended, Ukraine could fully revive its IP ecosystem and meaningful contributions to the technical organizations such as WIPO. The Delegation thanked WIPO for researching and drafting the report and looked forward to the future reporting. It also appreciated the vital assistance that WIPO had provided to Ukraine’s creativity sector and its IP system. The Delegation stressed that the Russian Federation must stop its aggression and withdraw its forces from Ukraine, thereby allowing the Ukrainian partners to contribute fully to the global IP system through unhindered innovation and creativity.
6. The Delegation of Portugal said that it aligned itself with the statements delivered by the Delegation of Hungary on behalf of the European Union and its member states, the Delegation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands on behalf of Group B, the Delegation of the Republic of Moldova on behalf of the CEBS Group, and the Delegations of Ukraine, the United States of America, and the United Kingdom. The Delegation supported the decision point under that agenda item contained in document A/65/8 on the Joint Proposal of Group B and the CEBS Group. The Delegation indicated its constant support for the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine within its internationally recognized borders and reiterated its firm commitment to continue to provide support to Ukraine and to its people for as long as it was necessary and as much as it was required. The Delegation condemned the recent escalation in hostilities by the Russian Federation and particularly, the intensification of attacks against civilian critical infrastructure, adding that it was extremely concerned by the recent attack on the pediatric hospital in Kyiv. The Delegation welcomed the conclusions of the report contained in document A/65/7 on the Assistance and Support for Ukraine’s Innovation and Creativity Sector and Intellectual Property System, based on the decision of the previous year’s WIPO Assemblies. The Delegation supported the close cooperation between the Secretariat and Ukraine including the constant assessment of the impact of the war waged by the Russian Federation on Ukraine with annual reports and follow-up by future Assemblies.
7. The Delegation of France supported the statements delivered by the Delegation of Hungary on behalf of the European Union and its member states, the Delegation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands on behalf of Group B, and the Delegation of the Republic of Moldova on behalf of the CEBS Group. The Delegation thanked the Director General for presenting the report on the Assistance and Support for Ukraine’s Innovation and Creativity Sector and its Intellectual Property System. The report showed very clearly the devastating effects of the Russian Federation’s aggression on the IP system in Ukraine. The Delegation mentioned that everyday Ukraine’s economic development was undermined by the damage caused to its infrastructure. It supported the proposed decision contained in document A/65/8 submitted by the CEBS Group and Group B adding that, given the situation in Ukraine, and how essential it was to receive technical assistance from WIPO, that was appropriate. The Delegation noted that reports should be presented to future WIPO Assemblies sessions. Furthermore, the Delegation condemned in the strongest terms the continued aggressive war against Ukraine by the Russian Federation that was in complete violation of the most fundamental principles of the UN Charter and expressed its solidarity with, and unwavering support for, Ukraine and its people. The Delegation stated that the Russian Federation must stop its attacks immediately, especially those on civilian targets, and withdraw immediately, completely and unconditionally from all occupied Ukrainian territory in full respect for sovereignty, territorial integrity of Ukraine within its internationally recognized borders. That was the *sine qua non* for reestablishing lasting peace and preserving an international order based on the rule of law, as well as for technical assistance to end one day.
8. The Delegation of Japan expressed its appreciation for the efforts of the Secretariat for the updated report summarizing its various activities on the Assistance and Support for Ukraine’s Innovation and Creativity Sector and Intellectual Property System. The Delegation commended the MoU signed and implemented between WIPO and the relevant Ukrainian authorities, including the Ministry of Economy of Ukraine, as a fundamental demonstration of WIPO’s commitment to provide continued support to Ukraine. The report showed that the unjustified and unprovoked aggression by the Russian Federation had caused further damage to infrastructure, loss or damage to research equipment and the decrease in R&D funding. The ongoing war had had a tremendous negative impact on the innovation and creativity sector and IP system of Ukraine. The Delegation noted the need to ensure that the continued support and assistance would provide concrete benefits and impact focusing on mitigating the negative effects of the war and rebuilding innovative and creative ecosystem in Ukraine that would benefit all stakeholders and strengthen the country’s economy. The Delegation reiterated its solidarity with the people of Ukraine, supported rebuilding its IP infrastructure and the IP ecosystem, echoed the statement made by the Delegation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands on behalf of Group B, and supported the proposed draft decision.
9. The Delegation of Canada said that it aligned itself with the positions expressed by the Delegation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands on behalf of Group B, the Delegation of the Republic of Moldova on behalf of the CEBS Group, the Delegation of Hungary on behalf of the European Union and its member states, the Delegation of Ukraine, and all those who had expressed support for the language of the draft decision. The Delegation recognized the devastation to Ukraine’s innovation and creativity sector as a direct result of the Russian Federation’s war of aggression and was extremely and particularly concerned by the intensification of that unprovoked aggression. The Delegation stated that in line with the Assemblies’ decision the previous year, document A/65/7 was an evidence-based report highlighting further damage to Ukraine’s infrastructure, loss and damage of research equipment, brain drain, a decrease in R&D and a decrease in income of creative industries, all due to the Russian Federation’s aggression. The Delegation stood in support of Ukraine today, tomorrow, for as long as it took and as much as it was required and appreciated the urgent and necessary assistance Ukraine had received from WIPO to date to meet the pressing needs of its innovation and creativity sector. The Delegation supported the decision language as proposed by the Delegation of the Republic of Moldova on behalf of the CEBS Group, and the Delegation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands on behalf of Group B. The Delegation reiterated its firm support of Ukraine and called upon the Russian Federation to end its illegal war waged on Ukraine immediately.
10. The Delegation of Germany thanked the Secretariat for preparing the report on the Assistance and Support for Ukraine’s Innovation and Creativity Sector and Intellectual Property System, as well as the Director General for his presentation. The Delegation said that it fully aligned itself with the statements made by the Delegation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands on behalf of Group B, and the Delegation of Hungary on behalf of the European Union and its member states, and others in support. The Russian Federation’s continuing unprovoked and unjustified war of aggression against Ukraine had significantly impacted the innovation and creativity ecosystem in Ukraine, disrupting the creative spirit and innovators and creators. The Delegation appreciated that WIPO as the technical international organization competent in IP continued its technical cooperation with, and its support to, Ukraine to ensure that the nation’s IP was protected. It was imperative to stand united in the support for Ukraine with the aim to rebuilding its innovation and creativity ecosystem which was also underlined earlier that year at the Ukraine Reconstruction Conference which had taken place in Berlin. The Delegation believed that continued reporting on the matter was of the highest interest and underscored that the report should be given to the WIPO Assemblies and not to the PBC, because the decision to assist and support Ukraine’s innovation and creativity sector and IP system had been adopted by the WIPO Assemblies. The Delegation fully supported the proposed draft decision for the agenda item contained in document A/65/8 presented by the Delegation of the Republic of Moldova on behalf of the CEBS Group, and the Delegation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands on behalf of Group B, and expressed hope that it could be supported by all delegations and adopted by consensus. The Delegation reiterated its full unwavering solidarity with Ukraine and its people.
11. The Delegation of Norway said that it stood with Ukraine and expressed its support to the statements made by the Delegation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands on behalf of Group B, and the Delegation of the Republic of Moldova on behalf of the CEBS Group. The Delegation thanked the Secretariat for the report contained in document A/65/7 and supported the decision as proposed. The Russian Federation tried to break Ukraine’s resilience with waves of missile attacks often directed towards civilian infrastructure, as they attacked Ukraine’s largest hospital for children that month or as when they systematically destroyed energy infrastructure prior to the harsh Ukrainian winter. The Delegation was glad that Norway and many others had further stepped up the supply of arms to help Ukraine defend their country. The Delegation referred to the brave Ukrainians and called upon members to not give up. The Russian Federation’s war had devastating effects on the innovation and creativity sector and the IP rights system. The people of Ukraine were paying the price in economic terms, but most of all, in human suffering butit was heartening to note that the IP ecosystem in Ukraine was not broken, but in parts left standing. The Delegation thanked WIPO for its important work to that end and stressed that its support to Ukraine was about the evident right of Ukrainians to determine their own future, defending the principles on which European peace was based. The Delegation stated that it was not solely a European issue, as the Russian Federation’s aggression was a clear violation of Ukraine’s sovereignty and hence of the core tenants of the UN Charter, adding that a threat to those principles was a threat to us all.
12. The Delegation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, speaking in its national capacity, fully supported the statement it delivered on behalf of Group B, as well as the statements made by the Delegation of the Republic of Moldova on behalf of the CEBS Group, and the Delegation of Hungary on behalf the European Union and its member states. Its Delegation stood united with the people of Ukraine and commended their resilience. The report contained in document A/65/7 was yet one more witness of the Russian Federation’s illegal war of aggression and evidenced how deeply Ukraine’s innovation and creativity sector was impacted by the war. The Delegation supported Group B and the CEBS Group’s joint proposed decision language for the agenda item contained in document A/65/8. The Delegation underscored that continued support and assistance by WIPO should be ensured for as long as it was required by Ukraine, as well as reporting on it to the WIPO Assemblies. The Russian Federation must instantly and completely withdraw its troops from the whole territory of Ukraine and fully respect Ukraine’s territorial integrity, sovereignty and independence within its internationally recognized borders including in the IP system.
13. The Delegation of Poland fully supported the statements made by the Delegation of the Republic of Moldova on behalf of the CEBS Group, the Delegation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands on behalf of Group B, and the Delegation of Hungary on behalf the European Union and its member states. While analyzing the data contained in the report and looking for signs of hope for the better, it could not resist the temptation of taking a rather different perspective. The assessment of the significant negative impact of the Russian Federation’s war of aggression against Ukraine deserved making some projections about what Ukraine’s innovation and creativity ecosystem would look like today if it had not been purposely destroyed every day by the Russian Federation’s attacks on civilians and civilian infrastructure. In 2022, before the Russian Federation’s invasion, Ukraine had been a powerful regional science and technology economy with good prospects of growth. With the technology sector amounting to 4 per cent of the country’s gross domestic product (GDP), with around 5,000 IT companies and almost 300,000 IT specialists, Ukraine was on the trajectory of exemplary economic modernization. That had been lost because of the Russian Federation’s war of aggression against Ukraine and that day, instead of having a discussion on how Ukraine could further build on its success and serve as an example for others, Member States were forced to mobilize efforts and resources to provide immediate assistance to the IP stakeholders in Ukraine. The Delegation referred to the extensive talks about the role of women in IP and ways how to further assist them in bolstering their creativity and innovative potential that had taken place the previous week. It recalled the memory of a young Ukrainian, Yulia Zdanovska, a talented mathematician, winner of many European and international awards, a dreamer, a beautiful mind of our times that had been killed in one of the very first Russian Federation bomb strikes on her home city of Kharkiv at the age of 21 on March 8, 2022, exactly on the day when the whole world was celebrating the International Women’s Day. Yulia opened a long list of talented Ukrainians whose dreams of changing the world for the better would forever remain only an unfulfilled promise of the better tomorrow that would never come because of the Russian Federation’s unjustified and unprovoked full-scale war against Ukraine. No report could reflect such a loss and human suffering. The Delegation stated its full solidarity with Ukraine and its people. From day one of that cruel war Poland had welcomed an unprecedented number of refugees who had been forced to flee their country. Poland made its best efforts to help Ukrainian SMEs including creative and innovative businesses who had been forced to relocate literally overnight. In a very short time Polish universities had accommodated the needs of more than 50,000 Ukrainian students. Furthermore, the Delegation shared that 2022 had also shown over 70 per cent increase of the number of Ukrainian companies registered in Poland. It also added that a big part of the more than 30,000 Ukrainian enterprises registered in Poland represented information and communication technology (ICT) or creative industries. The Delegation underscored that Poland was making everything possible to support those who had decided to stay in Ukraine despite the dramatic situation by offering significant support to ensure operations of ICT services and launching specific instruments aimed at facilitating economic operation of the Ukrainian entities that represented only a few examples of the continued assistance of Poland to the people of Ukraine. The Delegation called upon joint efforts to support Ukraine in that dramatic time. The Delegation supported WIPO’s continued assistance aimed at rebuilding the Ukrainian IP and innovation system and it fully supported the draft decision contained in document A/65/8 presented by the Delegation of the Republic of Moldova on behalf of the CEBS Group, and the Delegation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands on behalf of Group B. It strongly objected to the business-as-usual approach to cooperation with the Russian Federation. The Delegation stated that as long as the Russian Federation continued its war of aggression against Ukraine and cynically ignored repeated demands to stop violating fundamental rules and principles of international law including the UN Charter, there was no possibility for a UN organization to offer its benefits or even expand its cooperation with the aggressor country. The Delegation demanded that the Russian Federation immediately stop the war, completely withdrew its troops from the whole territory of Ukraine and respected Ukraine’s territorial integrity, sovereignty and independence within its internationally recognized borders.
14. The Delegation of Switzerland thanked WIPO for the report on the Assistance and Support for Ukraine’s Innovation and Creativity Sector and Intellectual Property System contained in document A/65/7. The Delegation supported the Secretariat in its efforts to deal with the immediate, medium and long-term consequences dealt with in the report. It also supported the proposal tabled by the Delegation of the Republic of Moldova on behalf of the CEBS Group, and the Delegation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands on behalf of Group B, in document A/65/8.
15. The Delegation of Australia said that it aligned itself with the statements made by the Delegation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands on behalf of Group B, and the Delegation of the Republic of Moldova on behalf of the CEBS Group, and with all those who had expressed support for Ukraine. The Delegation condemned the Russian Federation’s illegal and immoral invasion of Ukraine which was a gross violation of international law and had significantly damaged Ukraine’s innovation and creative economy and IP sector. It welcomed WIPO’s provision of technical and financial assistance to support Ukraine’s IP system. The Delegation expressed its support to the proposal contained in document A/65/8 presented by the Delegation of the Republic of Moldova on behalf of the CEBS Group, and the Delegation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands on behalf of Group B.
16. The Delegation of Zimbabwe noted the Secretariat’s report contained in document A/65/7, and fully supported the assistance to distressed WIPO Members States, especially given that members remained off track in meeting almost all SDGs. The role of WIPO in achieving the SDGs could not be overemphasized. The Delegation also recalled that since the 63rd Series of Meetings of the Assemblies in 2022, Zimbabwe had continued to strongly advocate for broadening that invaluable support to a wider category of States beyond Ukraine, as challenges such as climate change, natural disasters, health-related epidemics, and rising geopolitical and trade tensions continually tested the very foundation of peace and stability, which were essential for a conducive global IP ecosystem to thrive. The Delegation remained deeply concerned with what they saw as a selective and somewhat arbitrary selection of one Member State over others which, in its view, were equally deserving of such support. The Delegation stated its opposition to any form of selectivity or discrimination in the treatment of WIPO Member States and recalled with regret that the agenda item was introduced at the expense of the long-cherished tradition and convention in WIPO to reach decisions through consensus. The Delegation emphasized the importance for WIPO Members to consider whether they wished to build an inclusive and transparent IP system or a system that was designed to benefit a few countries. The Delegation regretted the politicization of discussions in the specialized technical Organization, recognizing that there were other more appropriate forums mandated to delve into highly sensitive political issues.
17. The Delegation of Italy said that it aligned itself with the positions presented by the Delegation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands on behalf of Group B, the Delegation of the Republic of Moldova on behalf of the CEBS Group, and the Delegation of Hungary on behalf of the European Union and its member states. The Delegation thanked the Secretariat for the report contained in document A/65/7 and noted the reported harmful consequences of the Russian Federation’s unprovoked war of aggression on the Ukrainian innovation and creativity ecosystem. The Delegation also expressed support for the decision language proposed by the CEBS Group and Group B in document A/65/8 and emphasized the importance of adopting that by consensus and stressed the need for ongoing reporting on that issue to the WIPO Assemblies. The Delegation reaffirmed that it would continue to steadfastly support Ukraine throughout that period.
18. The Delegation of the Republic of Korea profoundly appreciated the efforts made by WIPO to implement the Assemblies’ decision on the support and assistance for Ukraine’s innovation and creative sectors, as contained in document A/65/7. The Delegation echoed the statement made by the Delegation of the Republic of Moldova on behalf of the CEBS Group, and the Delegation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands on behalf of Group B. It emphasized that to achieve the mission of WIPO as outlined in Article 3 of the WIPO Convention, which was to promote the protection of IP worldwide through international cooperation, it was essential for WIPO and its Member States to foster a balanced and effective global IP framework that nurtured innovation and creativity even in times of war. The Delegation supported the draft decision proposed by the CEBS Group and Group B as contained in document A/65/8.
19. The Delegation of New Zealand stated its support for the proposed decision as contained in document A/65/8. The Delegation unequivocally condemned the Russian Federation’s illegal and unprovoked war of aggression against Ukraine. It called again on the Russian Federation to cease its war of aggression, to withdraw its troops from within Ukraine’s internationally recognized borders and return to diplomatic negotiations, as a means to achieve a comprehensive, just, and lasting peace. The Delegation of New Zealand stood in solidarity with the people of Ukraine.
20. The Delegation of Denmark said that it aligned itself with the statement made by the Delegation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands on behalf of Group B, and the statement made by the Delegation of Hungary on behalf of the European Union and its member states. The Delegation acknowledged that the immense suffering of the Ukrainian people continued as the Russian Federation carried on its war of aggression against Ukraine, noting the substantial damages to the Ukrainian IP system. The Delegation highlighted the massive consequences that the war had on the IP infrastructure, including loss and damage to research institutions, brain drain, and displacements and highly appreciated the efforts made by the Secretariat in the implementation of the decisions taken at the 2022 and 2023 WIPO Assemblies. The Delegation drew attention to the importance of continuing the efforts to support Ukraine in those very difficult circumstances and called for continued reporting at the WIPO Assemblies as long as the war was affecting the Ukrainian IP community. The Delegation expressed its support for the draft decision presented by the Delegation of the Republic of Moldova on behalf of the CEBS Group, and the Delegation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands on behalf of Group B. It stood with the people of Ukraine and called on WIPO to do the same.
21. The Delegation of Lithuania said that it fully aligned itself with the statements delivered by the Delegation of Hungary on behalf of the European Union and its member states, the Delegation of the Republic of Moldova on behalf of the CEBS Group, and the Delegation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands on behalf of Group B. The Delegation appreciated WIPO’s engagement in consultations with Ukraine to ensure that its ongoing support and assistance delivered tangible outcomes for creators, innovators and members of the IP community. Referring to the report, the Delegation welcomed the information that the number of IP registrations in Ukraine had increased, however, drew the attention to the reported alarming significant impact on the innovation and creativity sectors and the whole IP system in Ukraine. It emphasized that the extensive damage inflicted over the past two years required coordinated and targeted efforts and international assistance to rebuild Ukraine’s IP sector, considering the long-term impacts of the Russian Federation’s aggression against Ukraine. The Delegation noted that the need for assistance and support for Ukraine’s innovation and creativity sector and IP system was brought up to the attention of WIPO and its Member States when the Russian Federation started an unprovoked and unjustified war against Ukraine and violated international law. As long as the aggression against Ukraine was ongoing, annual reporting must be kept on the agenda of the WIPO Assemblies which was the highest governing body of the Organization and took decisions on financing the most important activities and needs of Member States. Members of the innovation community in Ukraine needed assistance and solidarity, which should be granted in a targeted manner. The Delegation stressed that the intent of the joint proposal was to respond to an unfolding disaster and ensured that Ukraine received the support that it so urgently needed as soon as possible. The proposal was specific to the needs of Ukraine in that critical time and underscored that any potential objection to that proposal would be exceptionally political aimed at preventing Ukraine from receiving support. The Delegation acknowledged that Ukraine was not the only Member State in need of assistance and stated that the proposal did not affect in any way ongoing, demand‑driven technical assistance and capacity-building by WIPO. However, the Delegation believed that the urgent and extraordinary circumstances in Ukraine and the scale of harm and destruction warranted that support. The Delegation expected that the report, as well as the proposed decision presented under the agenda item by both the CEBS Group and Group B, would be widely endorsed with a firm commitment from WIPO to continue providing updates and annual reports to Member States during the WIPO Assemblies on its ongoing support and assistance to Ukraine.
22. The Delegation of Albania said that it aligned itself with the statements delivered by the Delegation of the Republic of Moldova on behalf of the CEBS Group, the Delegation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands on behalf of Group B, and the Delegation of Hungary on behalf of the European Union and its member states. The Delegation thanked the Secretariat for preparing the report as contained in document A/65/7 and its efforts to deliver assistance and support to the innovation and creativity sector and IP system of Ukraine. It expressed support to continue assisting Ukraine to mitigate the adverse effects of the Russian Federation’s aggression and to rebuild the Ukrainian IP system. The Delegation underscored that the Russian Federation’s illegal, unprovoked and unjustified war against Ukraine and its civilian infrastructures went on, affecting not only Ukraine and Europe but the entire world, causing economic and geopolitical instabilities which affected the efforts for further growth and development through boosting creativity and innovation. The Delegation emphasized the need for support and assistance to Ukraine and stood with the people of Ukraine. The Delegation fully supported the joint proposal submitted on behalf of the CEBS Group and Group B, which recalled the importance to continue WIPO’s assistance and support to Ukrainian IP stakeholders’ recovery from the consequences of the aggression by the Russian Federation.
23. The Delegation of Cuba reiterated its view and position that politicization of the work of the Organization should not be allowed. WIPO was a technical Organization and established procedures should be followed. The Delegation supported the right for all developing countries to receive technical assistance in an inclusive and balanced way, including countries suffering as a result of unilateral measures adopted against them.
24. The Delegation of Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) supported the statement made by the Delegation of Cuba and rejected the artificial politicization of the work of WIPO to the detriment of its substantive work. The Delegation stated that technical assistance should not be focused on one State alone when many countries required WIPO’s support for various reasons, such as crises like natural disasters, the effects of climate change, or being victims of illegal, criminal or unilateral coercive measures. The Delegation recalled that last year, those who wanted more technical assistance for more States were ignored. It noted that financing for everyone else was subject to the procedures of the relevant bodies within WIPO, such as the Committee on Development and Intellectual Property (CDIP) and the PBC. The Delegation took note of the report but observed that it presented a very biased view of the conflict, responding to political ends and undermining the regular work of WIPO which was a specialized Organization.
25. The Delegation of Nicaragua reiterated that WIPO had been created to encourage the use and protection of IP as a tool to contribute to the economic and social development of people adding that technical cooperation in that respect and support from Member States was important provided it respected procedures. Regarding the report contained in document A/65/7 on the Assistance and Support for Ukraine’s Innovation and Creativity Sector and Intellectual Property System, the Delegation reiterated what it had said at the previous Assemblies of WIPO under Agenda Item 21. The adoption of that issue did not respect the normal procedures of WIPO and did not have consensus. The Delegation added that the decision had been adopted without study and prior analysis, practically at the last minute, therefore, it did not respect the usual procedures. That was unprecedented in the modern history of WIPO. The Delegation pointed out that just one third of WIPO Member States expressed their support. The Delegation underscored that it could not allow that practice to be repeated and added that the issue had not been studied by the CDIP or by the PBC in a regular fashion. It also recalled that there was an established rule that projects focusing on technical assistance were within the competence of the CDIP in WIPO and such projects required a clear understanding of financing and cost assessment, which within WIPO was the competence of the PBC. The Delegation stated that the needs of a significant number of Member States that also required technical assistance, had not been considered, in particular that of developing countries, least‑developed countries (LDCs) and those facing major economic crises, pointing out that it undermined the principle of equity as the very basis of international relations. The Delegation stated that the report had been prepared in accordance with the resolutions and decisions that violated WIPO’s mandate and was clearly politically motivated. All WIPO decisions should be adopted by consensus. The Delegation urged Member States to avoid the politicization of the work of the Organization and called to respect its objectives.
26. The Delegation of Mali took note of the report contained in document A/65/7. The Delegation recalled that one of the essential aims of the Organization was to guarantee a balanced and effective global IP ecosystem to promote innovation, and creativity around the world. The Delegation underscored that at a time when many countries around the world were facing multifaceted and multi-dimensional crises, having to set aside considerable public financing for national defense and security, to the detriment of strategic sectors, such as innovation and creativity, the pursuit of such initiative could, in many people’s eyes, appear as preferential treatment that could undermine the principle of equity, which required a fair and equitable treatment of different Member States, that required assistance and cooperation.
27. The Delegation of the Russian Federation stated that in the context of the agenda item on providing technical assistance to Member States it was proposed to adopt a political declaration. The Delegation noted that the draft decision proposed by the Delegation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands on behalf of Group B, and the Delegation of the Republic of Moldova on behalf of the CEBS Group, was unacceptable, because it raised issues such as qualification of conflicts, territorial integrity, sovereignty, etc. The Delegation stated that such issues fell outside the purview of WIPO and rejected the selection of one State in respect of the provision of technical assistance. Such an approach was in contradiction with the principle of equality and equal rights, and it also encroached on the rights of other States who urgently needed technical assistance from the Organization. The Delegation emphasized that that was particularly unacceptable when the provision of technical assistance was based solely on political motives, which fell outside the purview of WIPO. Furthermore, the question of Ukraine’s real needs for support from WIPO, as well as the consequences of depriving other States, including LDCs, from such initiatives had never been considered. The Delegation mentioned that it was discriminatory on clearly invented and politicized grounds. The Delegation once again highlighted the infringements of the procedures of WIPO when dealing with the agenda item. The Delegation stated that since it was formally raised under the heading of provision of technical assistance, before coming to the Assemblies, the matter should have been dealt with by the PBC and the CDIP. However, the “Ukrainian matter” had not been put on the agenda of the mentioned bodies of WIPO and had never been considered at expert level either. The Delegation further believed that was a gross infringement of the rules of procedure of the Organization, and it objected to the politicized approach to the provision of technical assistance by circumventing of the agreed procedures for dealing with such issues within the appropriate committees of the Organization. The Delegation proposed a draft decision which considered taking note of that issue and drawing the attention of a relevant Committee, that being the PBC. It believed that its proposal was in line with the mandate of WIPO, in order to avoid politicization of the question of providing technical assistance and it also fully aligned with the relevant procedures of the Organization. The Delegation called upon Member States to carefully read through its proposal and offer their support to the proposed decision. The Delegation believed it could be adopted by consensus. It also stated that any other decisions containing politicized wording that fell outside the purview of WIPO would be unacceptable and thus objected to the proposed decision by Group B and the CEBS Group. The Delegation asked for the draft proposal by the Russian Federation to be put up on the screen, so that other delegations could become fully acquainted with it. The text of the draft proposal was the following:
28. “The Assemblies of WIPO each in so far as it is concerned:

“Took note of the Report on the Assistance and Support for Ukraine’s Innovation and Creativity Sector and Intellectual Property System contained in document A/65/7; and

“Decided to refer this agenda item to the attention of the Program and Budget Committee.”

The Delegation repeated that the main purpose of its proposal was to ensure that the Assemblies would take note of the matter, and that the agenda item would be referred to the appropriate committee which had the right competence, such as the PBC.

1. The Delegation of China stated that it had taken note of the report by the Secretariat. The Delegation reiterated that WIPO’s mission was to respect the international IP system and to serve innovation and development. It noted that WIPO’s Assemblies main responsibilities were to promote international IP cooperation. The Delegation stated that all parties should respect WIPO and the mandate given to the Organization by Member States, and respect the professionalism, technicality, neutrality, and objectivity of the nature of the work of the Organization. The Delegation urged members to refrain from impacting the procedures of the meeting due to political matters.
2. The Delegation of Belarus looking at the latest report by the Secretariat on the provision of the Assistance and Support for Ukraine’s Innovation and Creativity Sector and Intellectual Property System, recalled that the initiative was both contradictory and politicized and that some groups of countries were violating the approach to technical assistance taken by WIPO, and the principles of inclusivity and equal rights. From the beginning, the initiative had not been fully in line with WIPO’s mandate and its implementation continued in a way which was actively discriminating against other countries that needed assistance from the Organization, particularly those that might be affected by conflict, faced major economic difficulties, and in some cases were subjected to unilateral coercive measures. The Delegation stated that the initiative was forced, it deliberately politicized the WIPO agenda, and abused the mandate of the Organization. The Delegation categorically objected to that as the agenda and work of WIPO needed to remain inclusive and take into account the interests of all Member States of the Organization. The Delegation was not in a position to offer its support for the politicized proposed decision which fell outside the purview of WIPO’s mandate.
3. The Delegation of Luxembourg said that it aligned itself with the statements made by the Delegation of Hungary on behalf of the European Union and its member states, as well as the Delegation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands on behalf of Group B, and the Delegation of the Republic of Moldova on behalf of the CEBS Group. The Delegation thanked the Director General for presenting the updated and meticulous report and recognized all the tireless efforts undertaken by the Secretariat on implementing the decisions taken by the WIPO Assemblies in that regard. It condemned in the strongest possible terms the war of aggression by the Russian Federation against Ukraine in violation of international law including the UN Charter and in contradiction with the principle of the inadmissibility of acquisition of territory by force. The Delegation reiterated its unwavering support for Ukraine’s political independence and territorial integrity within its internationally recognized borders. Culture and the arts were essential for democratic societies, for preserving freedom of expression, also as a fundamental European value, and for maintaining Ukraine’s identity and traditions. The Russian Federation’s aggression continued to severely impact the innovation and creativity sector as well as the IP system in Ukraine. The Delegation stated that the report clearly showed the continued support was urgently needed. The Delegation fully supported the draft decision that was presented jointly by Group B and the CEBS Group and expressed the hope that it could be adopted by consensus. The Delegation supported the general principle in WIPO that the Secretariat should be able to support those Member States whose IP systems have been impacted whether by invasions, by conflicts, by wars of aggression, by natural disasters or emergencies. Recalling that the said topic was first brought to the WIPO Assemblies, and a decision was taken in 2022, the Delegation emphasized that the item should remain within the WIPO Assemblies. Underlining that the Assemblies made decisions on financing, with the PBC only issuing recommendations on those matters, the Delegation stated that the PBC was not a decision-making body.
4. The Delegation of Monaco said that it associated itself with the statements made by the Delegation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands on behalf of Group B, and supported the points made by the Delegation of the Republic of Moldova on behalf of the CEBS Group. The Delegation expressed its evident support for the draft decision tabled jointly by Group B and the CEBS Group. The Delegation particularly thanked the Secretariat for the report and above all, for all its work. The Delegation emphasized that the technical support provided to Ukraine was essential for the IP sector in the country to be maintained, despite the appalling circumstances. It acknowledged the resilience of the Ukrainian people and paid tribute to their efforts. The Delegation referred to the ongoing discussions regarding discrimination, inclusivity issues, and disparities in support among countries, emphasizing that the decision that had been taken in respect of Ukraine did not in any way relegate other countries needing support or lessen the support they had been offered. The Delegation also clarified that it did not create inequality or discrimination and assured that any country requiring assistance or support from WIPO would receive it. Referring to the principle of consensus, the Delegation pointed out that all present delegations had expressed a desire for WIPO to continue making decisions by consensus. It further explained that Group B and the CEBS Group had conducted consultations before submitting their text, with the goal of achieving broad consensus. However, it was pointed out that another delegation had submitted a different text, indicating that consensus would not be possible. The Delegation noted that development with deep regret. Emphasizing that the Assemblies were the supreme decision-making body of WIPO the Delegation stressed that it was essential for that matter to remain and be addressed in the WIPO Assemblies.
5. The Delegation of Latvia said that it aligned itself with the statements delivered by the Delegation of Hungary on behalf of the European Union and its member states, and the Delegation of the Republic of Moldova on behalf of the CEBS Group, and thanked the Director General and the Secretariat for preparing the Report on the Assistance and Support for Ukraine’s Innovation and Creativity Sector and Intellectual Property System. The Delegation pointed out that the report clearly demonstrated an increased negative impact following the Russian Federation’s unprovoked and unjustified war against Ukraine. The Delegation welcomed WIPO’s robust commitment, maintained close collaboration, and provided comprehensive support and assistance to Ukraine. One of its highest priorities was the continuation of WIPO’s efforts in supporting and assisting Ukraine in any way possible, including rebuilding the creative and IP sector, which had been crippled by the Russian Federation. The Delegation drew attention to the firsthand witnessing of the gruesome and horrifying damages being caused by the Russian Federation’s armed forces every single day on the territory of Ukraine. The Delegation stated that the discussion was not about politics, but clearly about regular people’s lives, the destruction of whole industries, and the probably irreversible damage to the Ukrainian innovation and creativity sector, which was the main topic of discussion at WIPO. The Delegation said that it was clear that there would be a severe need for long term recovery efforts for the Ukrainian innovation and creativity sector. Emphasizing that WIPO would have its full support in the future for all activities directed towards the Ukrainian innovation and creativity sector, the Delegation stressed the importance of continuing to report on the assistance and support for Ukraine’s innovation and creativity sector during the WIPO Assemblies annually. The Delegation also called on the WIPO Secretariat to pay special attention to ensuring that, in its everyday work, the Secretariat showed respect for Ukraine’s territorial integrity and did not legitimize violations of the UN Charter by the Russian Federation. The Delegation emphasized that war, as a brutal act, shreds the fabric of international law and tears at the core of what makes all of us human. Consequently, the Delegation called on the Russian Federation to listen to the call of Latvia and many other countries, to immediately stop its war against Ukraine, to withdraw its troops from the territory of Ukraine, and for ROSPATENT to understand that the occupation of a territory and the decision that their laws apply to that territory does not make it so. The Russian Federation was using ROSPATENT as a weapon in the ongoing war. The Delegation stressed that it was undisputed by the majority of Member States that the Russian Federation blatantly disregarded international law, calling into question its ability to be a responsible international player and a trusted party to any international agreement. The Delegation further emphasized that as long as the Russian Federation continued to violate international law, the Delegation could not see how it was possible to ignore the situation and return to business as usual in cooperation with the Russian Federation. The Delegation expressed its concern over arguments suggesting that WIPO was favoring only a few countries and that the issue was politicized. It noted that such statements were alarming and deemed them destructive and untrue, aiming to undermine the purpose of WIPO and its Member States. The agenda item was not about favoring some Member States as Ukraine was not the sole recipient of technical support, and the Delegation supported decisions to provide technical support to any country in need. The Delegation acknowledged that some Member States mentioned concerns about a biased view on the conflict and it questioned how that aligned with the statement made by the Russian Federation, which was invading Ukraine and mentioning something about fairness, equality, and human rights. The Delegation urged Member States to return to the realm of reality, where discussions were based on facts and judgments and not clouded by such statements. The Delegation invited all countries to support the purely technical and uncontroversial draft decision jointly put forward by Group B and the CEBS Group.
6. The Delegation of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea reiterated its position against the decision taken at the 63rd and 64th Series of Meetings of the Assemblies as the basis of that report, as well as of document A/65/8. The Delegation stated that those decisions were politically motivated and biased against a single country. It stated that all draft decisions should be adopted on the basis of consensus by all Member States. The Delegation also proposed to end all kinds of politicization at WIPO meetings and focus on discussing the issues in conformity with the mandate of WIPO.
7. The Delegation of the Czech Republic said that it fully aligned itself with the statements delivered by the Delegation of Hungary on behalf of the European Union and its member states, the Delegation of the Republic of Moldova on behalf of the CEBS Group, and the Delegation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands on behalf of Group B. The Delegation expressed its persistent support and solidarity with Ukraine, which had been facing a war of aggression by the Russian Federation for over two years. It condemned Russian Federation’s continued military actions, which had significant repercussions on people and businesses inside as well as outside Ukraine, including on the IP community and the relevant stakeholders. The Delegation expressed its gratitude for the assistance and support delivered by the Secretariat based on the relevant decision of the 64th Series of Meetings of the Assemblies, aiming to help Ukraine to rebuild its innovation and creativity sector and the IP system as described in the comprehensive and factual report, document A/65/7. The report provided evidence of the negative impact of the war on the Ukrainian IP ecosystem and its innovative and creative sector, as well as of the need for continued assistance from WIPO. It was not politicization when WIPO was urged to sustain its supporting activities in Ukraine as long as necessary. To keep that priority matter in the attention of WIPO’s highest governing body, the Delegation saw the need for continued reporting on those activities to the WIPO Assemblies. The Delegation further expressed full support for the proposed decision tabled jointly by the CEBS Group and Group B in document A/65/8 and believed that its carefully drafted language could be acceptable for all WIPO Member States. The Delegation was hopeful that at the next gathering the Member States would already be taking stock of the process of post‑war reconstruction of Ukraine within its internationally recognized borders. Reacting to concerns about possible discrimination raised by some delegations the Delegation stressed that the assistance provided to Ukraine did not prevent other Member States from requesting and receiving any WIPO assistance they might need, adding that it was not aware of any other Member States wishing to bring such needs to the attention of the WIPO Assemblies.
8. The Delegation of Estonia supported the statements made by the Delegation of the Republic of Moldova on behalf of the CEBS Group, the Delegation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands on behalf of Group B, and the Delegation of Hungary on behalf of the European Union and its member states. The Delegation reiterated the need for continuous support to help rebuild Ukraine’s IP and innovation system, damaged by the ongoing war of aggression by the Russian Federation, was evident and emphasized the crucial role of WIPO in providing that support. Furthermore, the Delegation thanked the Secretariat and the Director General for the report and for the support and assistance provided to Ukraine so far. Moreover, it stated that the horrific attacks on Ukrainian cities and their civilian infrastructure, including a children’s hospital just a week ago, were gross violations of international humanitarian law. The Delegation condemned the Russian Federation’s unjustified and unprovoked war against Ukraine. Acknowledging that Ukraine was not the only Member State in need of assistance, the Delegation clarified that the proposal by the CEBS Group and Group B did not affect the ongoing demand-driven WIPO technical assistance and capacity-building. The Delegation stressed that, considering the scale of harm and destruction to the IP and innovation system in Ukraine, that was a call made under urgent and extraordinary circumstances. It stated that the intent of the discussed proposal was to respond to an unfolding disaster and ensure that Ukraine received the support it urgently needed. The Delegation fully supported the general principle of WIPO’s supportive role regarding Member States whose IP systems had been impacted by invasions, conflicts, natural disasters, or emergencies, and recalled that the International Bureau had already taken in the past significant steps, such as the COVID-19 Response Package, in addition to regular technical assistance and capacity-building activities. The Delegation stated that, according to the General Rules of Procedure of WIPO, members were welcome to put forward proposals for support, and those should be discussed on their own right. Furthermore, it emphasized that, since the issue of assistance to Ukraine was initially brought to the WIPO Assemblies in the beginning of the full-scale war in 2022, it should remain on the agenda of the WIPO Assemblies as the highest governing body of the Organization. The Delegation also noted that the objections that had been discussed were not made with an honest attempt to address the needs of other countries. Instead, those objections described as political objections aimed at preventing Ukraine from receiving the support it so desperately needed due to the Russian Federation’s war of aggression.
9. The Delegation of Austria unequivocally condemned the illegal and unprovoked Russian Federation war of aggression against Ukraine that constituted a blatant violation of the UN Charter and international law and undermined the foundations of the international multilateral system, including WIPO. The Delegation thanked the Secretariat for the report on the Assistance and Support for Ukraine’s innovation and Creativity Sector and Intellectual Property System, which outlined the devastating impact of the Russian Federation’s war of aggression on Ukraine’s creativity sector. The Delegation said that it fully aligned itself with the statements made by the Delegation of Hungary on behalf of the European Union and its member states, the Delegation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands on behalf of Group B, the Delegation of the Republic of Moldova on behalf of the CEBS Group, and other Member States that had spoken in support of Ukraine. The Delegation supported the decision presented by the Delegation of the Republic of Moldova on behalf of two regional groups, and noted that the decision was technical and strictly focused on Ukraine’s needs for capacity ‑building, as assessed in the report presented by the Secretariat. While acknowledging that Ukraine was not the only Member State in need of assistance, the Delegation stressed that the discussed proposal did not affect WIPO’s ongoing demand-driven technical assistance and capacity ‑building. It emphasized that the decision at hand was specific to the needs of Ukraine’s creativity sector and should be considered on its own merits, considering the devastating situation caused by the Russian Federation’s war of aggression in Ukraine. The Delegation stated that it would not agree to move that issue to the PBC, which was not a decision‑making body. The Delegation expressed hope that the decision presented by Group B and the CEBS Group could be adopted by consensus without further prolonging the debate.
10. The Delegation of Iran (Islamic Republic of) supported the balanced proposal made by the Delegation of the Russian Federation.
11. The Delegation of Spain endorsed the statements made by the Delegation of Hungary on behalf of the European Union and its member states, the Delegation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands on behalf of Group B, and the Delegation of the Republic of Moldova on behalf of the CEBS Group, and reiterated its condemnation of the unprovoked and unjustified Russian Federation’s invasion of Ukraine. The Delegation described it as a flagrant violation of the fundamental principles of international law and the UN Charter. The Delegation expressed solidarity with and support for Ukraine and its people, committing to continue its support as long as necessary. It greatly appreciated the support and assistance provided by WIPO, in accordance with the decision made in 2022 and emphasized that WIPO was a key body in the multilateral system. The Delegation noted the progress made by WIPO and highlighted the signing of an MoU with the Ministry of Economy of Ukraine to improve cooperation and rebuild the creative and innovative sectors affected by the war. The Delegation noted that WIPO’s support for the development of a new Ukrainian IP strategy and the rebuilding of infrastructure was crucial, demonstrated the value of WIPO’s work to countries in need. The report provided a clear picture of the negative impact of the war on Ukraine’s innovative and creative sector, including the loss of talent and damage to research infrastructure. The Delegation supported the draft decision submitted by Group B and the CEBS Group and believed it would help further WIPO’s efforts in assisting and supporting Ukraine to mitigate the very negative impact of Russian Federation’s war.
12. The Delegation of the Syrian Arab Republic stated that it attached particular importance to IP and its relationship with development, especially in developing countries and LDCs suffering from economic crises that prevent their development. The Delegation noted that many of those countries were also affected by unilateral coercive measures, which had a major impact on the lives of their citizens and prevented them from developing their economies and the innovative and creative sectors. The Delegation underscored the importance of WIPO taking a global approach in considering the needs of Member States and in responding to them, especially to those affected by the unilateral coercive measures mentioned. It emphasized that such countries should be able to receive support to develop infrastructure without discrimination and in accordance with the principle of equality between Member States, without politicization. The Delegation pointed out that technical assistance and support to Ukraine was provided because of a unilateral decision taken by some countries, demonstrating politicization, which was evident in the report. The Delegation expressed support for the draft decision proposed by the Russian Federation and believed that any proposed technical assistance and support projects should be reviewed by the CDIP.
13. The Delegation of Croatia said that it aligned itself with the statements made by the Delegation of Hungary on behalf of the European Union and its member states, the Delegation of the Republic of Moldova on behalf of the CEBS Group, and the Delegation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands on behalf of Group B. The Delegation supported the general principle that WIPO should have a role in supporting Member States whose IP systems had been impacted by invasions, other conflicts, natural disasters, or emergencies. The Delegation noted that it was exactly the case for Ukraine, which was subject to brutal, unprovoked, unjustified, and illegal military aggression by the Russian Federation. The Delegation acknowledged that WIPO was already doing much in the area of emergencies, in addition to its regular technical assistance and capacity-building activities. The Delegation recalled that members were welcome, in line with the General Rules of Procedure of WIPO, to put forward proposals for support. The Delegation highlighted that the proposed action was in line with the UN General Assembly Resolution A/RES/ES-11/1 of March 2, 2022, which urged UN bodies and other international organizations to address the situation in the context of the Russian Federation’s aggression against Ukraine. The Delegation called upon Member States to support the proposed decision contained in document A/65/8, proposed jointly by the CEBS Group and Group B.
14. The Delegation of Belgium said that it aligned itself with the statements made by the Delegation of Hungary on behalf of the European Union and its member states, the Delegation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands on behalf of Group B, and the Delegation of the Republic of Moldova on behalf of the CEBS Group. The Delegation condemned the Russian Federation’s unprovoked war of aggression against Ukraine and noted that it severely impacted Ukraine’s innovation and IP system. The Delegation added its voice to the many other Member States expressing full and unwavering support to Ukraine, committing to that support for as long as needed. The report clearly indicated the devastating impact of the war on Ukraine’s innovation and creativity sector. The Delegation emphasized that the WIPO Assemblies, as its highest decision-making body, was the appropriate forum to consider that matter and did not preclude WIPO’s technical assistance to other Member States in need. The Delegation fully supported the draft decision put forward by Group B and the CEBS Group.
15. The Delegation of Slovenia said that it fully aligned itself with the statements made by the Delegation of Hungary on behalf of the European Union and its member states, the Delegation of the Republic of Moldova on behalf of the CEBS Group, and Delegation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands on behalf of Group B. The Delegation thanked the WIPO Secretariat for preparing the Report on the Assistance and Support for Ukraine’s Innovation and Creativity Sector and Intellectual Property System. It noted that the report highlighted how the last two years of the Russian Federation’s unjustified and unprovoked war of aggression against Ukraine had caused severe, unprecedented, and in some cases irreversible negative impacts on Ukraine’s innovation and creativity potential. Furthermore, the Delegation expressed the need for WIPO to continue supporting Ukraine to mitigate the consequences of the Russian Federation’s war of aggression and to provide regular reports to the WIPO Assemblies. It fully supported the proposed decision presented by the Delegation of the Republic of Moldova on behalf of the CEBS Group and Group B. In conclusion, the Delegation expressed Slovenia’s solidarity with Ukraine and the millions of people affected by the war.
16. The Chair invited the Delegations of the Republic of Moldova and the Kingdom of the Netherlands to present the decision proposal contained in document A/65/8.
17. The Delegation of the Republic of Moldova stated that as all esteemed delegates had heard the presentation during its Group’s statement, the main points of the proposed decision had been introduced and presented. It mentioned that the draft decision had been distributed to delegations in advance, giving all colleagues enough time to review it. It believed that the text was balanced, considered sensitivities, and was very practical while addressing the real situation. The Delegation concluded by noting that the text had already been seen by everyone.
18. The Delegation of the Kingdom of Netherlands stated that it fully aligned itself with the statement delivered by the Delegation of the Republic of Moldova. The Delegation noted that the text proposed on behalf of the two groups had been circulated in advance. The Delegation described the text as balanced and believed it had been properly presented in the meeting.
19. The Delegation of Ukraine in accordance with Rule 27(1)(b) of the WIPO General Rules of Procedure requested the voting by roll-call on the joint proposal of the CEBS Group and Group B on the Assistance and Support for Ukraine’s Innovation and Creativity Sector and Intellectual Property System submitted by the mentioned two groups as contained in document A/65/8. The Delegation also remarked that the aggressor State had neither legal nor moral rights to present any proposal regarding the Assistance and Support for Ukraine’s Innovation and Creativity Sector and IP System while deliberately and relentlessly destroying it for 29 months including by occupying and expropriating Ukraine’s assets and IP. The Delegation emphasized that the only proposal from the Delegation of the Russian Federation that it would support was the proposal to immediately, completely and unconditionally withdraw all its military forces from the territory of Ukraine within its internationally recognized borders and return to the respect of international law and WIPO principles. The Delegation called upon the WIPO Member States to support the real proposal presented by the CEBS Group and Group B and reject the fake one presented by the aggressor State. The Delegation added that in doing so Member States would reconfirm their genuine commitment to WIPO and the principles of the UN Charter and international law which were fundamental not only for WIPO’s work but for the existence of all its Member States.
20. The Delegation of the Republic of Moldova, speaking in its national capacity, supported the proposal made by the Delegation of Ukraine to vote by roll-call on the decision in line with Rules 25 and 27 of the WIPO General Rules of Procedure.
21. The Delegation of the Russian Federation, considering the request for putting the draft decision, tabled by Group B and the CEBS Group, to a vote, also requested a vote on the draft decision proposed by the Russian Federation under Rule 27(1)(b). It also asked the Secretariat to explain the voting procedure in such a situation. The Delegation suggested that it would fall under Rule 31 of the WIPO General Rules of Procedure.
22. The Delegation of Belarus supported the proposal made by the Russian Federation of putting the text which it had proposed in the draft decision to a vote.
23. The Legal Counsel noted that there were two proposals submitted, document A/65/8, a Joint Proposal of the CEBS Group and Group B on the Assistance and Support for Ukraine’s Innovation and Creativity Sector and Intellectual Property System, and the second proposal, document A/65/9, presented by the Russian Federation also on the Assistance and Support for Ukraine’s Innovation and Creativity Sector and Intellectual Property System. The Legal Counsel explained that in accordance with Rule 31 of the WIPO General Rules of Procedure if two or more proposals relate to the same question, the Assembly shall, unless it decides otherwise, vote on the proposal in the order in which they had been submitted. The Legal Counsel noted that the proposal as contained in document A/65/8 had been submitted first, therefore, a vote would be conducted on that proposal first. The Legal Counsel added that if that proposal passed, the decision had been taken, and if the proposal did not pass, the order of precedent applied under Rule 31 and the second proposal would be submitted to a vote.
24. The Delegation of the Syrian Arab Republic supported the statement made by the Delegation of Belarus to support the proposal made by the Russian Federation to vote on its draft proposal as contained in document A/65/9.
25. The Delegation of Chile, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, was firmly convinced that consensus was the best way of taking decisions in WIPO and in multilateral organizations in general. GRULAC noted that consensus was and remained one of the pillars of the activities and should be protected and guarded, and that all possible efforts of dialogue should be made to ensure it. Therefore, it called on all those involved to make efforts to reach consensus on that matter and avoid a call for a vote as a practice and a precedent in the Organization. GRULAC stated that if all efforts of dialogue were exhausted and there would be a vote, the GRULAC States needed more time for each Member State to receive the relevant instructions on voting from their capitals to be able to vote in their national capacities. In that regard, GRULAC asked to postpone the voting until all its Members received instructions from their capitals. GRULAC also urged all involved to use that time to continue to try to build a consensus solution.
26. The Delegation of the Republic of Moldova, speaking on behalf of the CEBS Group, took note of the position expressed by the Delegation of Chile on behalf of GRULAC, and stated that they had done their best to inform and reach out to colleagues and other groups to inform them about the content, logic and balance in the proposal. Therefore, the Delegation expressed the preference of the CEBS Group and the Group B to finalize the discussion and vote that day.
27. The Delegation of the Kingdom of Netherlands, speaking on behalf of Group B, said that it aligned with the previous statement made by the Delegation of the Republic of Moldova, on behalf of the CEBS Group, and stated that it declined any suspension and suggested to move on to the voting.
28. The Delegation of Monaco supported the statement made by the Delegation of the Republic of Moldova on behalf of the CEBS Group, and the Delegation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands on behalf of Group B. The Delegation reiterated that the text of the proposal had been submitted in advance to different colleagues and discussions had taken place in respect of the proposal. It also added that it was clear that by opposing the joint proposal from Group B and the CEBS Group and coming forward with an alternative text, the Russian Federation showed that it did not want a consensus. There had been plenty of time for delegations to receive instructions, particularly as the work program of the Assemblies had been circulated with Agenda Item 18 to be scheduled for that day. The Delegation supported the call for an immediate vote on that issue.
29. The Delegation of Colombia endorsed the statement made by the Delegation of Chile on behalf of GRULAC. The Delegation underscored the importance of retaining consensus as the basis for decision making in the Organization. It also reiterated the call for sufficient time to be given for the relevant consultations and for receiving instructions from capital.
30. The Delegation of Peru supported the statement made by the Delegation of Chile on behalf of GRULAC. It confirmed that Agenda Item 18 had been on the agenda for a long time but the proposals requiring decisions had only come in over the past few days. Therefore, the Delegation asked for more time to consult capitals and receive the relevant instructions.
31. The Delegation of Trinidad and Tobago supported the statement made by the Delegation of Chile on behalf of GRULAC, and stated that it would not be in a position to participate in a vote that evening due to the absence of instructions from the capital at that time.
32. The Delegation of Poland supported the proposals made by the Delegations of the Republic of Moldova on behalf of the CEBS Group, the Kingdom of the Netherlands on behalf of Group B, and Monaco and urged to immediately move to the voting as the draft decision was known to the Member States since the previous Friday.
33. The Delegation of Bahamas supported the statement made by the Delegation of Chile on behalf of GRULAC, in terms of postponing a vote for several reasons. It referred to the explanations provided by the Legal Counsel previously, that if there had been only one matter for consideration, Rule 25 would have kicked in and the Delegation would have fully accepted that. However, based on the advice from the Legal Counsel, Rule 31 kicked in as there was more than one proposal for consideration. The Delegation added that the second proposal had only been released that morning and considering the time difference the Delegation’s capital had not had a chance to consider it. The Delegation understood that if it voted for one proposal it automatically voted against another. Therefore, it asked for more time to consider both proposals fairly before voting.
34. The Delegation of Jamaica supported the statement made by the Delegation of Chile on behalf of GRULAC. It also noted that given the time difference between Geneva and its capital and the new proposal to consider, it would be unable to vote until it got a response from its capital.
35. The Delegation of France supported the request for an immediate vote made by Group B and the CEBS Group and supported by other delegations.
36. The Delegation of the Czech Republic supported the proposal made by the Delegations of Ukraine and the Republic of Moldova on behalf of the CEBS Group stressing that it valued the principle of consensus very much. It also mentioned that based on the experience from previous years there was little prospect of reaching consensus. The Delegation believed that all delegations already knew where they stood, and it urged to deal with the issue as soon as possible.
37. The Delegation of Latvia supported the CEBS Group’s suggestions and comments from Group B and the Delegation of Monaco. The Delegation referred to the last intervention made by the Delegation of Ukraine and underlined that the second proposal was made by the aggressor State and as it was known from the previous discussions last year that there was no intention from its side to have a consensus. It also added that based on where that proposal came from, it could not be considered as a fair or objectively or neutrally motivated proposal. The Delegation also agreed with the statement that positions on that topic were most likely taken and it urged to go ahead with the vote.
38. The Delegation of Germany also supported an immediate vote on the proposal by the CEBS Group and Group B. It stated that the discussion had shown that there was no consensus and therefore, its Delegation called for a vote.
39. The Delegation of Chile, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, requested a break for internal coordination according to the rules.
40. The Delegation of Brazil supported the request for a break made by the Delegation of Chile in accordance with the Rules of Procedure. It also pointed out that all regional groups needed to get instructions on how to vote. The Delegation underscored that there was a change in the program because that item was supposed to be taken up after the item on the Diplomatic Conference, but there was a change in order of items. In that regard, the Delegation stated that it required more time to consult with its capital to receive instructions. Furthermore, the Delegation recalled that one of the proposals had come in only on that day and it would be fair that regional groups could coordinate appropriately.
41. The Delegation of Mexico said that it aligned itself with the statements made by the Delegation of Chile on behalf of GRULAC. The Delegation reiterated that it was in the interest of WIPO that such important processes took place within sufficient time to ensure solidarity and transparency.
42. The Chair announced a break and stated that the Secretariat had got organized for the evening sessions that day. The Chair expressed hope that that would give GRULAC and other delegations sufficient time to consult with capitals to make it possible to continue with the item during that night.
43. Upon returning to the plenary, the Chair asked the GRULAC Coordinator whether they had managed to carry out internal consultations as well as about the results of such consultations.
44. The Delegation of Chile, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, thanked the Chair and the Member States and regretted that some members of the Group had not yet received instructions from their capitals and could not take part in the vote. Therefore, the Group asked for more time for the members to receive the instructions to be able to participate in the vote. It also noted that a lot of countries in the region wanted to take part in the vote, and thus, they needed a few more hours to receive the authorization from capitals.
45. The Delegation of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the African Group, stated that the Group had internal consultations and many members had not received instructions from the capitals. In that regard, the Group supported the proposal made by the Delegation of Chile on behalf of GRULAC, in terms of giving more time to the delegations to do their own internal consultations. The African Group believed that it would give legitimacy to any decision that would be taken as none would feel like being left behind.
46. The Delegation of the Republic of Moldova, speaking on behalf of the CEBS Group, underscored its respect for the procedures and the instruction of each delegation and the diplomatic system. It also acknowledged how decisions should be taken and that delegations needed more time to get the instructions. The Delegation repeated that it had done its best to ensure that colleagues and delegations were aware of the proposal and reiterated that no changes were made on its proposal and all countries had been well informed in advance. The Delegation restated that the CEBS Group and Group B wished to finalize that issue that same day and to get to the vote with all due respect to the national situations in terms of instructions and procedures. The CEBS Group conceded to a very short (30-40 minutes) break for the delegations to get as much additional instructions as possible.
47. The Delegation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, speaking on behalf of Group B, echoed the statement made by the Delegation of the Republic of Moldova on behalf of the CEBS Group. Group B expressed understanding that there had to be some communications with the capitals but recalled that the proposal had been circulated already the previous Friday and reiterated again the importance to vote that same day.
48. The Delegation of the Czech Republic supported the statements made by the Delegations of the Republic of Moldova on behalf of the CEBS Group, and the Kingdom of the Netherlands on behalf of Group B. The Delegation expressed understanding that the delegations needed more time to consider the new proposal which arrived only in the morning. Therefore, it proposed to divide the decisions because the second one would be voted upon only in case if there was no agreement on the first one. The Delegation suggested to have a vote on the first decision tabled jointly by the CEBS Group and Group B and if it failed, give more time to consider the second one.
49. The Delegation of Libya stated that the conference hall was divided into two parts. It noted that the first part overlooked the fact that an issue that had been the cause of a gridlock within the Security Council of the UN was being discussed. The Delegation doubted that the solution would be reached in WIPO when the experts in New York had not been able to do so. Furthermore, it noted that the second part acknowledged the fact that there had been a gridlock within the Security Council and considered that it was not feasible to reach consensus. The Delegation stated that consensus would not be reached that day as that was the issue that was supposed to be solved in the Security Council and not in WIPO.
50. The Delegation of the Russian Federation stated that it was ready to show flexibility as well as to vote that day or any other day, at the same time requiring a clear understanding why it was so important to vote that same day. The Delegation noted that the agenda for the item was quite free, and it could be voted at any point over the following two days of the Assemblies. The Delegation noted that one group of States for some reasons was trying to impose their position not considering logical and reasonable requests from other States to defer the decision under that agenda item to a more adequate time.
51. The Delegation of Monaco noted the importance of the statement made by the Delegation of Libya and reiterated that there would be no consensus whether now, in an hour or tomorrow. The Delegation mentioned the issue regarding consultations with capitals when the offices were already closed, would only make the process lengthy. The Delegation agreed to have a break and restated that the vote should take place on that day taking into consideration that there were equally important agenda issues to discuss by Wednesday.
52. The Delegation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, speaking on behalf of Group B, supported the statement made by the Delegation of Monaco and agreed to have a small break and then continue with the voting.
53. The Chair stated that there were several delegations that had stated that there would be no consensus. Therefore, it would be illogical to postpone a vote under those circumstances. After having heard different opinions, the Chair doubted that the consultations between different parties would lead to having closer positions. The Chair considered the requests from two important groups to maximize their participation in the process which everyone had said was very important and allocated additional time for consultation to conclude that process and not delay the topic. The Chair announced a break and expressed hope that the consultations would be fruitful and that the largest number of delegations would be able to take part in the very important vote.
54. Upon resuming the plenary, the Chair expressed gratitude for the previous statements made. The Chair recalled that the CEBS Group and Group B had proposed the adoption of the draft decision in document A/65/8. The Chair also mentioned that the Delegation of Ukraine had requested that the proposal be subject to a vote, which was seconded by the Delegation of the Republic of Moldova. The Chair further recalled that, before suspending the session earlier that evening, time had been given for delegations to consult their capitals to receive instructions before the vote. The Chair then invited the Legal Counsel to make the necessary statements and provide information regarding the voting process.
55. The Legal Counsel stated that, as announced by the Chair, a vote had been requested. The Legal Counsel recalled that the Delegations of the Republic of Moldova on behalf of the CEBS Group, and the Kingdom of the Netherlands on behalf of Group B, had submitted, in accordance with Rule 21 of the WIPO General Rules of Procedure, the proposal contained in document A/65/8 and projected on the screen. A vote on that proposal had been requested by the Delegation of Ukraine, which had been supported by the Delegation of the Republic of Moldova. Consequently, in accordance with Rule 25, the proposal should be put to a vote. The Legal Counsel drew the attention of delegations to document A/65/INF/1 Rev., paragraph 2, containing the list of Member States of the WIPO Conference. Delegations representing those Member States of the WIPO Conference would be invited to vote. The Legal Counsel further recalled that according to Article 7(3)(c) and (e), and subject to the provisions of Article 17 of the WIPO Convention, the WIPO Conference shall make its decision by a majority of two-thirds of the votes cast and abstentions shall not be considered as votes. With regard to the necessary quorum, which was constituted by one-third of the Member States of the WIPO Conference, pursuant to Article 7(3)(b) of the WIPO Convention, the Legal Counsel had been informed that the necessary number of Member States were present. Finally, the Legal Counsel recalled that in accordance with Rule 29 of the WIPO General Rules of Procedure, after the Chair had announced the beginning of voting, no one shall interrupt the voting except on a point of order in connection with the actual conduct of such voting.
56. The Chair announced the beginning of the voting in accordance with Rule 29 of the WIPO General Rules of Procedures and invited the Legal Counsel to guide the process.
57. The Legal Counsel informed delegations that, in accordance with Rule 27 of the WIPO General Rules of Procedure the vote would be conducted by roll-call. The Legal Counsel reminded delegations that, in order to proceed with the vote by roll-call, the roll-call would be called in the alphabetical order of the names in French of the States members of the WIPO Conference. The Legal Counsel requested the Chair to draw by lot the delegation to be called first.
58. The Chair drew by lot Solomon Islands as the Member State that would vote first.
59. The Legal Counsel thanked the Chair and restated for the delegations that the proposal submitted by the CEBS Group and Group B, on which the vote was being conducted, was as contained in document A/65/8 and projected on the screen. The Legal Counsel recalled that delegations would be called in alphabetical order and asked to state their vote. The Legal Counsel requested Member States supporting the proposal to respond ‘yes’, Member States not supporting the proposal, to respond ‘no’, and those Member States wishing to abstain from the vote, to respond ‘abstain’. The Legal Counsel recalled that pursuant to Rule 27(3) of the WIPO General Rules of Procedure the vote of each delegation would be recorded in the report of the session. The Legal Counsel announced the beginning of the voting.
60. The Result of the vote was as follows:

The Delegations – in the order of the voting, which followed the French alphabet and the names of the countries in French, beginning with the country that was drawn by lot – of Ireland, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, North Macedonia, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Nepal, Norway, New Zealand, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, United Kingdom, San Marino, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, Czechia, Timor-Leste, Türkiye, Ukraine, Uruguay, Albania, Germany, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Cyprus, Colombia, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Denmark, Ecuador, Spain, Estonia, United States of America, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Greece, Guatemala and Hungary voted “yes” (64). The Delegations – in the order of the voting, which followed the French alphabet and the names of the countries in French beginning with the country that was drawn by lot – of Iran (Islamic Republic of), Mali, Nicaragua, Syrian Arab Republic, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zimbabwe, Belarus, China, Cuba and Russian Federation voted “no” (11). The Delegations – in the order of the voting, which followed the French alphabet and the names of the countries in French, beginning with the country that was drawn by lot – of India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Malaysia, Mongolia, Mozambique, Uganda, Pakistan, Paraguay, Qatar, Dominican Republic, Sudan, Thailand, Tunisia, South Africa, Algeria, Saudi Arabia, Armenia, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Cambodia, Egypt, El Salvador, United Arab Emirates, Ethiopia and Honduras abstained from voting (35). The Delegations – in the order of the voting, which followed the French alphabet and the names of the countries in French, beginning with the country that was drawn by lot – of Solomon Islands, Kyrgyzstan, Kiribati, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives, Morocco, Mauritius, Mauritania, Namibia, Nauru, Niger, Nigeria, Niue, Oman, Uzbekistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Central African Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Holy See, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Tajikistan, Chad, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Afghanistan, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Azerbaijan, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Djibouti, Dominica, Eritrea, Eswatini, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Equatorial Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Cook Islands and Marshall Islands were absent (82).

1. The Chair informed that all votes had been counted and invited the Legal Counsel to announce the results.
2. The Legal Counsel announced the result of the vote. The Legal Counsel informed that the number of Member States entitled to vote was 192. The number of Member States absent was 82. The number of abstentions was 35. The number of votes cast was 75. The number of votes constituting the required majority was 50. Finally, the Legal Counsel noted that of the votes cast, there were 64 “yes” votes, and 11 “no” votes, which meant that the proposal had been adopted.
3. The Chair thanked the Legal Counsel and announced the following decision that was displayed on the screen:
4. The Assemblies of WIPO each in so far as it is concerned:

*Recalling* their Decisions on the Assistance and Support for Ukraine’s Innovation and Creativity Sector and Intellectual Property System contained in documents [A/63/10](https://www.wipo.int/edocs/mdocs/govbody/en/a_63/a_63_10.pdf) and [A/64/14](https://www.wipo.int/about-wipo/en/assemblies/2023/a-64/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=619934);

Took note of the Report on the Assistance and Support for Ukraine’s Innovation and Creativity Sector and Intellectual Property System contained in document A/65/7, and the continued negative impacts of the ongoing war on Ukraine’s innovation and creativity sector and IP system; and

Requested the International Bureau:

(a) to continue its close cooperation with Ukraine to ensure its ongoing support and assistance to the creators, innovators, and members of the IP community, focusing on mitigating the adverse effects of the war and rebuilding an innovative and creative ecosystem in Ukraine that benefits all stakeholders and strengthens the country’s economy;

(b) to provide an updated assessment of the medium- and long-term impacts of the war on Ukraine’s innovation and creativity sector and ecosystem;

(c) to take steps to ensure that publications on WIPO resources and platforms comply with the principles of sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity of Ukraine within its internationally recognized borders; and

(d) to report on the implementation of this decision and other relevant activities at the 2025 WIPO Assemblies, and annually thereafter.

1. The Delegation of the Republic of Moldova, speaking on behalf of the CEBS Group, welcomed the decision that would provide for continued reporting on technical and capacity‑ building assistance that Ukraine needed to rebuild its innovation and creativity sector and IP system destroyed by the Russian Federation’s unprovoked and unjustified war. The Delegation, on behalf of the CEBS Group and Group B, thanked all Member States for their support and took the opportunity to underline its strong dedication to continuing work in WIPO based on the decision by consensus. The Group referred to the questions raised in relation to similar situation elsewhere in the world and underlined that technical assistance and support by WIPO could be made available to any Member States in need for it. The CEBS Group looked forward to the next Assemblies when the International Bureau would report on the assessment and implementation of the decision.
2. The Delegation of the Russian Federation stated that it witnessed once again the situation where the openly politicized document had been submitted for voting. It also noted that the decision had been supported by 64 delegations that was just one-third of the overall number of WIPO Member States. The Delegation underlined that the result showed an absence of consensus on that question and reiterated that western States had managed again to push across their point of view despite the opinions of other Member States. The Delegation believed that such an outcome was indicative of the general situation in WIPO in respect of that particular question.
3. The Delegation of Hungary, speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member states, welcomed the decision adopted. The European Union and its member states stated that it was an important decision that would allow the WIPO Secretariat to report annually on the valuable technical assistance and capacity ‑building support for Ukraine’s innovation and creativity sector and IP system, impacted significantly by the Russian Federation’s aggression. The Delegation thanked the delegations for their continuous efforts and the support demonstrated in the adoption of the decision. The European Union and its member states underlined their commitment to continuing work within WIPO guided by decisions made through consensus.
4. The Delegation of Iran (Islamic Republic of) explained its vote. The Delegation supported the provision of WIPO’s technical assistance to countries that requested it and were in dire need without discrimination, it did not endorse any attempts to politicize the issue of technical assistance by expanding WIPO’s mandate beyond its intended scope. The Delegation underscored that WIPO was a specialized agency of the UN that serves as the global hub for IP services, policy information and collaboration. The Delegation believed that WIPO was not the appropriate platform for addressing political issues and Member States should adhere strictly to WIPO’s mandate principles, and rules. The Delegation expressed its commitment to upholding the principle of consensus which had been crucial to the Organization’s success. The Delegation hoped that WIPO’s activities would concentrate on its core mission and refrain from getting involved in contentious issues that could jeopardize its mission and hinder its ability to fulfill its mandate.
5. The Delegation of Ukraine expressed its gratitude to all delegations who supported the important mission of WIPO, the UN Charter, the victim of aggression, and the principles of multilateralism. The Delegation thanked all those delegations that had worked closely to ensure that WIPO remained relevant to its Member States and assured that they could count on Ukraine’s support for continued WIPO’s activities in support of the Member States, especially those who needed WIPO support. The Delegation reconfirmed the importance of WIPO’s mission to all Member States.
6. The Chair asked the Director General for any comments he would like to make on the discussion and what had been heard during the consideration of the agenda item.
7. The Director General stated that the Secretariat took note of the decision and took the directions of the Assemblies. He assured that the Member States could count on the Secretariat’s professionalism and work to implement the decision of the WIPO Assemblies. The Director General reiterated that the Secretariat was ready to work to implement the decisions of the Assemblies.
8. The Chair thanked the Director General and all delegations for their statements and participation in the work of the session and declared Agenda Item 18 closed.

## ITEM 19 OF THE CONSOLIDATED AGENDAREPORTS ON STAFF MATTERS

1. See the report of the session of the WIPO Coordination Committee (document [WO/CC/83/2 Prov.](https://www.wipo.int/about-wipo/en/assemblies/2024/a-65/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=634014)).

## ITEM 20 OF THE CONSOLIDATED AGENDAAmendments to Staff Regulations and Rules

1. See the report of the session of the WIPO Coordination Committee (document [WO/CC/83/2 Prov.](https://www.wipo.int/about-wipo/en/assemblies/2024/a-65/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=634014)).

## ITEM 21 OF THE CONSOLIDATED AGENDAADOPTION OF THE REPORT

1. Discussions were based on document [A/65/10](https://www.wipo.int/about-wipo/en/assemblies/2024/a-65/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=633651).
2. The Assemblies of WIPO, each as far as it is concerned,

(i) adopted the Summary Report (document [A/65/10](https://www.wipo.int/about-wipo/en/assemblies/2024/a-65/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=633651)); and

(ii) requested the Secretariat to finalize the Extensive Reports, post them on the WIPO website and communicate them to Member States by August 14, 2024. Comments should be submitted to the Secretariat by September 11, 2024, after which the final reports will be deemed adopted by September 25, 2024.

## ITEM 22 OF THE CONSOLIDATED AGENDACLOSING OF THE SESSIONS

1. Delegations taking the floor thanked the Director General, Secretariat, interpreters and translators for their work in the conduct of the Assemblies.
2. The Delegation of Chile, speaking on behalf GRULAC, said that the Group supported the efforts of WIPO to make the IP system effective and balanced, protecting rights holders and at the same time affording users' access to knowledge, culture, innovation and technology. The IP system should benefit all people, including women, young people, SMEs and entrepreneurs. It should also contribute substantively to solving the world’s social, environmental and economic problems. GRULAC commended WIPO Member States on their flexibility, the spirit of consensus that they had demonstrated in considering the various proposals, and the constructive and open approach to reaching agreement thereon. GRULAC was committed to the success of the forthcoming Diplomatic Conference to Conclude and Adopt a Design Law Treaty (DLT) in Riyadh and to that of other negotiations undertaken by WIPO.
3. The Delegation of Iran (Islamic Republic of), speaking on behalf of the Asia and the Pacific Group, said that the Group valued the established WIPO principle of decision-making based on consensus and therefore regretted that Member States had again been compelled to resort to a vote on one of those decisions. There was a need to address the underrepresentation of the Group’s member countries in the Organization’s governing and decision-making bodies, especially the WIPO Coordination Committee, through equitable geographical representation. Indeed, that approach, combined with merit-based recruitment, should prevail throughout the Organization, its workforce and in its activities. Agreement reached on issues concerning the Standing Committee on Copyright and Related Rights (SCCR) and the CDIP was welcomed, and the Group would work with everyone to advance discussions on the DA in 2025. The cooperative spirit of multilateralism that had led to the adoption of the GRATK Treaty should also characterize the forthcoming Diplomatic Conference to Conclude and Adopt a Design Law Treaty (DLT).
4. The Delegation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, speaking on behalf of Group B, said that it welcomed the decision on support and technical assistance for Ukraine. Group B would have preferred a consensus decision, reflecting its firm belief that consensus-based decisions were of the utmost importance in WIPO and made it possible to advance its normative agenda. Group B trusted that the forthcoming Diplomatic Conference would be conducted in the same positive spirit as that which had led to the adoption of the GRATK Treaty.
5. The Delegation of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the African Group, said that the Group commended other delegations for their constructive engagement, flexibility and good faith in negotiations, which had resulted in the sound decisions reached by the Assemblies, and looked forward to those decisions being implemented.
6. The Delegation of the Republic of Moldova, speaking on behalf of the CEBS Group, said that WIPO had shown that it was able to assist its Member States when they were confronted by challenges. Given the impact of the war waged by the Russian Federation on Ukraine and the damage it had done to that country’s innovation and creativity sector and IP infrastructure, the inclusion of such items on the agenda of the WIPO Assemblies had been valuable. The decision adopted under Agenda Item 18 would contribute to rebuilding the creativity industry and IP system in Ukraine and mitigate the adverse effects of the war. The CEBS Group urged WIPO to continue to cooperate with Ukraine and deliver adequate support to affected Ukrainian IP stakeholders. It was fundamental under the WIPO Convention to ensure that all publications on WIPO resources and platforms be aligned with the principles of sovereignty and territorial integrity. WIPO should report annually on that matter as it concerned Ukraine. The consensus‑based decisions reached in the SCCR and CDIP were welcome, as were those adopted by the WIPO Coordination Committee, the latter could have a positive impact on the representation of Member States in the Organization. The adoption of the GRATK Treaty had demonstrated the effectiveness of multilateralism and consensus, and it was to be hoped that the forthcoming negotiations on a design law treaty would be conducted in the same spirit.
7. The Delegation of China said that China welcomed the fruitful outcome of the Assemblies, the flexibility and constructiveness demonstrated by all parties and their efforts to reach consensual decisions on issues concerning the CDIP, the SCCR and human resources. Consensus had long been the cornerstone of the Organization’s smooth and effective operation. There was a need to cherish that principle and work in a spirit of solidarity and cooperation to continue achieving results conducive to the pursuit of the global IP cause. After the adoption of the GRATK Treaty, China looked forward to working with all parties in a constructive and inclusive fashion to overcome difficulties, bridge differences and crown the forthcoming Diplomatic Conference with similar success.
8. The Delegation of Indonesia said that the deliberations, decisions and reports of the Assemblies had underscored the importance of the Organization’s work in advancing IP and fostering innovation. Collaboration between WIPO and its Member States had greatly enhanced the ability of Indonesia to safeguard IP and drive economic growth. Ongoing efforts to implement the 45 Recommendations of the DA, consensus on the GRATK Treaty and other initiatives had proven that only collective endeavor guaranteed great achievements. The recent launch of a collective mark in Indonesia testified to the strength of collaboration with WIPO. Thanks to that mark, a small store in Bali was now able to obtain access to markets abroad, and Indonesia was able to celebrate its rich culture and empower its creative communities. The country’s DA project on creative industries underscored its dedication to leveraging IP for economic and social advancement, enhancing the competitiveness and sustainability of the creative sectors, promoting inclusive growth and preserving cultural heritage.
9. The Delegation of Hungary, speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member states, said that the European Union stood ready to engage constructively at the forthcoming Diplomatic Conference. The positive results of the Assemblies had been made possible by the flexibility shown by regional groups and delegations. The European Union remained committed to working with WIPO through consensus-based decision-making. It also welcomed the decision adopted on assistance and support for the innovation and creativity sector and IP system of Ukraine, which had been significantly affected by the aggression of the Russian Federation; it appreciated the support that had been and would be provided by WIPO in that regard, as well as the annual reporting on the related technical assistance and capacity ‑building that had been delivered. The European Union and its member states would continue to work constructively with all WIPO Member States to contribute to the further development of an efficient and balanced IP ecosystem for the benefit of all.
10. The Delegation of Algeria, speaking on behalf of the Arab Group, said that the Group was keen to see the decisions that had been adopted at the Assemblies implemented in the interests of all the Member States. The Arab Group intended to play an active part in the forthcoming Diplomatic Conference.
11. The Delegation of Saudi Arabia said that Saudi Arabia had taken an active part in the work of the Assemblies, including the business of its agenda items, side events and the organization of an exhibition on tourism and culture in the country, the Spirit of Saudi Arabia. It had engaged in numerous meetings with other Member States, which had led to several bilateral cooperation agreements. It had signed several agreements with WIPO too, among them a FIT agreement funded in the amount of 5 million Swiss francs. Saudi Arabia looked forward to hosting the forthcoming Diplomatic Conference on a Design Law Treaty in Riyadh, which, it was hoped, would prove to be yet another success for the Organization.
12. A short video presentation relating to the forthcoming Diplomatic Conference was shown.
13. The Delegation of the Russian Federation said that it was regrettable that not all Member States shared the principles of consensus and constructive international cooperation to build a balanced and effective global IP system. The statements and actions of certain delegations in relation to the registration and legal protection of IP were unacceptable and hypocritical, as were the unsubstantiated allegations levelled by them at the Russian Federation, which had always complied fully with its international obligations. The flagrant violation of international law by the European Union in relation to the intellectual property rights (IPRs) of Russian applicants and rights holders posed a significant threat to the global IP system, would have unforeseen consequences for the international registration system and were discriminatory and contrary to the spirit and letter of the core international IP treaties. They had a negative impact on ordinary people, such as inventors, authors, artists and entrepreneurs, and eroded trust in international mechanisms for the protection of IP. There was no place for discrimination on the basis of nationality or language. Yet again, a regrettable situation had arisen with regard to Agenda Item 18. At previous Assemblies, Member States and the Secretariat had been subjected to unprecedented pressure by certain delegations that had demanded an immediate vote on the matter. Political ambitions had so overshadowed rational thought that those delegations had disregarded the requests of colleagues from two regional groups for time to discuss that especially sensitive issue with their capitals. The disrespect shown for consensus as the foundation of WIPO operations and for the positions of different Member States had been extraordinary. Moreover, those particular delegations had repeatedly stated that a text had already been circulated, while remaining shamefully silent on the fact that the original draft decision had been different to the draft put to a vote, thereby deliberately misleading Member States. The decision had been adopted with 64 votes in favor, while some 130 delegations had not expressed support for it. The *de jure* adoption of decisions in that way was possible under the rules of procedure but it was clear that the initiative had not garnered broad support. Most Member States required technical assistance from WIPO and the vast majority of them followed the established procedure by submitting projects to the CDIP and then to the PBC. Ukraine, meanwhile, had disregarded all such rules by pushing through a decision on the matter for purely political reasons and in violation of the Organization’s mandate. Every year, delegates from around the globe were now forced to listen to the politicized assertions of certain Member States, vote during the night and pass decisions to the detriment of their own interests and expectations. The Delegation supported the non-political nature of the global IP system and open and constructive multilateral cooperation without selective treatment, double standards or attempts to manipulate concepts and artificially politicize work. The IP system must promote innovation and creativity, and not be a barrier to the fulfilment of human potential and the holistic development of people around the world.
14. The Delegation of Jamaica said that it aligned itself with the statement delivered by the Delegation of Chile on behalf of GRULAC and commended Member States and observers for their engagement during the Assemblies. WIPO was crucial to fostering innovation and creativity and protecting IPRs worldwide. The adoption of the GRATK Treaty had been the result of years of hard work, to which Jamaica had made a significant contribution.
15. The closing remarks of the Director General are recorded as follows:

“Excellencies,

“Distinguished Delegates

“Dear Colleagues, Dear Friends,

“We have reached the end of the 65th meeting of the WIPO Assemblies.

“I began these meetings by sharing how WIPO has been working hard to translate our collective vision of IP for everyone, everywhere into concrete action and results, and asking for your continued support for this work.

“I am therefore grateful that, over the past seven days, we have received your affirmation, encouragement and support in many different ways to continue transforming the global IP ecosystem so that it is a catalyst for growth and development in all countries, as well as a way to harness innovation and creativity to address our common global challenges.

“We welcome important decisions to fortify key areas of work, including our IP systems and standing committees, as well as your continued engagement with and scrutiny of our governance, oversight and other critical matters. By approving the recommendations of the Program and Budget Committee, you also endorsed various measures critical for the long-term health of the Organization and that will enhance the services and support that we provide for you.

“The Assemblies are not just about the work in this hall, they are also a chance to network, speed-date and engage in a variety of settings, formal and informal. I listened carefully to each of the opening statements made by Group Coordinators, Ministers and Member States, held close to 70 bilateral meetings with heads of IP offices and regional IP institutions, and met with many other stakeholders during our side events and NGO dialogue, often accompanied by food, drink and music from all over the world.

“During these engagements, some common themes emerged. The challenges and opportunities posed by digital technology, including generative AI, in the running of the IP offices; the need to bring IP to our younger generations; the importance of projects that deliver impact at the grassroots level; the continuing work to connect IP and development even more closely together, including through the Development Agenda; the use of IP to advance progress towards the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development; and a more diverse WIPO. I am glad to say that all these are priorities for us in the Secretariat and entirely aligned with our work of transforming the global IP ecosystem and WIPO itself.

“But to do this, we need to continue working as one, with you as our partners.

“We saw this in May, when, despite challenges, we threaded the needle to achieve a truly historic result, by consensus, in the shape of a new WIPO Treaty on Intellectual Property, Genetic Resources and Associated Traditional Knowledge.

“We saw this during these past seven days, where, on the vast majority of issues, we have been able to find common ground and to move forward as one.

“And we hope, as many of you expressed, to see this again in November, when we have another opportunity to advance the global IP ecosystem by agreeing a new design law treaty at the Diplomatic Conference in Riyadh in November. We hope that success can reaffirm the power of multilateralism to make a difference in the world.

\*\*\*

“Excellencies,

“These were the biggest Assemblies ever.

“More than 1,400 participants registered, with over 900 attending in person. And over the past seven days, alongside the formal discussions and meetings, 24 events were held, with 13 side events, 10 receptions and the WIPO Global Awards ceremony.

“A total of 21 Ministers attended from different regions of the world, the largest number ever to attend the Assemblies, and a strong affirmation of the attention countries are paying to the work of WIPO.

“The result has been an Assemblies with more activity and buzz than ever before. I am also pleased that there have been increased levels of networking, with what I sense to be an increasing number of cross-regional engagements – a very positive development.

“I believe that all these demonstrate in a very tangible way that the global IP community is becoming more engaged with one another, unified by common challenges, inspired by a common vision, and more confident in our ability to play a key role in the development of our countries, regions and the world. So let us continue working this way and to these ends.

“Dear friends and colleagues,

“In the midst of celebrating our successful Assemblies, it would be remiss of me not to share a few words of thanks.

“To our Chair, Ambassador Alfredo Suescum, thank you for your skillful leadership, suffused with equanimity and calmness. I suspect that being an expert fly fisher has something to do with this! Your guidance helped to steer these Assemblies towards a successful conclusion, and it has been a pleasure to work closely with you during this process.

“To Group Coordinators, I thank you once again for the difficult task of having to marshal a common regional view. We appreciate your steadfast engagement and tireless support, and your efforts paved the way for positive outcomes on a range of issues at these Assemblies.

“I also thank Member States, as well as our regional partners, stakeholders and observers, not just for engaging thoroughly with the substance of our agenda, but also for supporting a vibrant series of exhibitions, cultural receptions and side events that enriched these Assemblies.

“I would also like to pay tribute to my many colleagues in WIPO who have worked over weeks and months to ensure a successful outcome. To my sector leads, thank you for driving the work of WIPO forward and for the many engagements you have carried out on this podium, with delegations and beyond.

“I also thank my colleagues in the Secretariat, who are fully dedicated and committed to supporting the Chair and all Member States at these Assemblies. My sincere thanks go to everyone on the podium, as well as the wider team in the Diplomatic Engagement and Assemblies Division and Office of the Legal Counsel.

“I also wish to thank the many hundreds of colleagues working behind the scenes to facilitate these meetings. Whether involved in the preparation of documents and agenda items, or as part of our interpretation, translation, audiovisual, security, cleaning and catering teams, your tireless efforts are truly appreciated. On a personal note, let me also offer a special word of thanks to my front office for their invaluable support in managing my time.

“Lastly, let me offer everyone our best wishes as you stand down for the summer or head back home.

“Thank you.”

1. In his closing remarks, the Chair of the WIPO General Assembly said that a broad range of complex and important issues had been addressed at the current Assemblies. Many had been concluded with ease owing to the considerable preparatory work done upstream. While there had been disagreement on some points, they too had been resolved thanks to the effort, dedication, experience and spirit of diplomacy that had been displayed by all the delegations. The Assemblies had attracted a record number of delegations and Ministers, which underscored the growing acknowledgement of the importance of IP and the role of WIPO. They were no doubt satisfied with the results obtained. He was grateful to all for the faith they had placed in him as Chair, thanked the delegations and the Secretariat and wished all continued success.
2. A short video presentation of highlights from the current Assemblies, prepared by the Secretariat, was shown.
3. The Sixty-Fifth Series of Meetings of the Assemblies of WIPO was closed by the Chair of the WIPO General Assembly

[Annex follows]