



Disclaimer: unless otherwise agreed by the Council of UPOV, only documents that have been adopted by the Council of UPOV and that have not been superseded can represent UPOV policies or guidance.

This document has been scanned from a paper copy and may have some discrepancies from the original document.

Avertissement: sauf si le Conseil de l'UPOV en décide autrement, seuls les documents adoptés par le Conseil de l'UPOV n'ayant pas été remplacés peuvent représenter les principes ou les orientations de l'UPOV.

Ce document a été numérisé à partir d'une copie papier et peut contenir des différences avec le document original.

Allgemeiner Haftungsausschluß: Sofern nicht anders vom Rat der UPOV vereinbart, geben nur Dokumente, die vom Rat der UPOV angenommen und nicht ersetzt wurden, Grundsätze oder eine Anleitung der UPOV wieder.

Dieses Dokument wurde von einer Papierkopie gescannt und könnte Abweichungen vom Originaldokument aufweisen.

Descargo de responsabilidad: salvo que el Consejo de la UPOV decida de otro modo, solo se considerarán documentos de políticas u orientaciones de la UPOV los que hayan sido aprobados por el Consejo de la UPOV y no hayan sido reemplazados.

Este documento ha sido escaneado a partir de una copia en papel y puede que existan divergencias en relación con el documento original.



UPOV/C/VI/12
Original: English
Date: November 10, 1972

INTERNATIONALER VERBAND
ZUM SCHUTZ VON
PFLANZENZÜCHTUNGEN

UNION INTERNATIONALE
POUR LA PROTECTION
DES OBTENTIONS VÉGÉTALES

INTERNATIONAL UNION
FOR THE PROTECTION OF
NEW PLANT VARIETIES

COUNCIL

Sixth Session

Geneva, November 7 to 10, 1972

DRAFT REPORT

1. The sixth session of the Council of UPOV was held in Geneva, at the headquarters of UPOV, from November 7 to 10, 1972, the items mentioned in paragraphs 3 to 8 below having been dealt with by unanimous consent of all member States and all signatory States on November 7, and those mentioned in paragraphs 115 to 131 below by unanimous consent of the Council on November 10.

2. The list of participants is contained in the Annex to this report.

Opening of the Session; Admission of Observers; Adoption of the Agenda (Items 1-3 of the Agenda)

3. The session was opened by Professor Dr. Ludwig Pielen, Chairman of the Council of UPOV, who welcomed the participants, in particular the observers from countries which had not yet been represented at Council meetings of UPOV, some of whom had come a long way to attend. The Council unanimously admitted the observers.

4. The agenda as set forth in document UPOV/C/VI/1 was adopted unanimously.

Adoption of Report of the Fifth Session of the Council (Item 4 of the Agenda)

5. The report as contained in documents UPOV/C/V/28 and 28 Add was unanimously adopted with the following changes and observations:

- (a) re paragraph 7: it should be noted that the admission of observers by the Council should apply also to subsidiary bodies created by the Council. The Secretariat was requested to inform the respective Chairmen of this decision.
- (b) re paragraph 46 (German text only): "Kartoffeln" (potatoes) should be replaced by "Möhren" (carrots).

- (c) re paragraph 61 (English text): "highly sensitive to daylight" should be changed to "highly sensitive to day length"; French: "sensible à la lumière du jour" to "sensible à la longueur du jour"; German: "tageslichtempfindlichen" to "tageslängeempfindlichen."
- (d) re paragraph 78: it was noted that the Council would discuss the question of harmonization of protection periods in member States at its next (seventh) session in 1973 and that the Secretariat would prepare a document on the subject for that session.
- (e) re paragraph 101: Subparagraph (d) should read as follows:
"as far as the German intentions were concerned, the Secretariat had been informed."

Summary of the Fifth Meeting of the Consultative Working Committee (Item 5 of the Agenda)

6. The Chairman reported that the Consultative Working Committee, at its previous meeting, held on April 13 and 14, 1972, had dealt with the following questions:

- (a) preparation of the Diplomatic Conference and in particular the Draft Additional Act;
- (b) the Symposium to be held in the United Kingdom in July 1973;
- (c) the Working Capital Fund of UPOV and
- (d) contacts with ISTA.

The Council was aware of developments at the Diplomatic Conference, which was taking place at the same time. As for the Symposium and the Working Capital Fund, these items were to be discussed later during the session. The question of contacts with ISTA had been dealt with in the sense that whereas close contacts with ISTA and other organizations were considered desirable, no need was felt for any institutionalization in this respect.

Annual Report for 1971 (Item 6 of the Agenda)

7. The Chairman introduced document UPOV/C/V/4, which was adopted with the addition of a note to the effect that the new Chairman of the Council had entered into office in 1971.

Financial Report and Audit Report for the 1971 Financial Year (Item 7 of the Agenda)

8. Documents UPOV/C/VI/2 and 3 were approved. The Council took note of the fact that on December 31, 1971, the Reserve Fund amounted to 141,855.40 Swiss francs.

1973 Program and Budget (Item 8 of the Agenda)

- 9. Discussions took place on the basis of document UPOV/C/VI/5.
- 10. The Chairman introduced the budget by saying, in the name of the Council, that its presentation and form corresponded more to the Council's wishes and thanked the Secretary General and his representatives for the effort in giving detailed justifications. On the President's proposal the Council agreed to remove the Symposium expenses from the 1973 Ordinary Budget and treat the item as a special budget to be discussed and adopted separately.
- 11. Program. The discussion was then opened on Part I of Document UPOV/C/VI/5.

12. The Secretary General wished to propose an addition to the program and budget; it concerns the compilation and publication of the Acts of the 1961 Conference (the discussion of this proposal is reported in paragraphs 23 to 28 below).

13. Council Meeting. It was proposed by the Chairman, and agreed by the Council, that the annual meeting of the Council should be advanced to the first half of October rather than the first half of November, as is now the case.

14. The Secretary General pointed out that it would be good practice, as from next year, to allow some time in order for the draft report of the meeting to be prepared and adopted before the end of the meeting.

15. This suggestion was accepted by the Council, which was of the opinion that it could complete its normal business in two days, leaving the third day for the adoption of the report, as suggested.

16. Consultative Working Committee. On a proposal from the Chairman, it was decided that this Committee should meet next year at the end of April or beginning of May, i.e. prior to the Symposium.

17. The Vice Secretary General pointed out, however, that this may mean some additional expense to what had been foreseen since the interpretation costs had been based on the assumption that this Committee would meet at the same time as the Working Group on Variety Denominations.

18. Technical Working Parties. On a proposal from the representative of Germany (Fed. Rep.) it was agreed that a Working Party for Forest Trees be added to the existing ones.

19. On a proposal from the representative of the United Kingdom it was agreed that the two Technical Working Parties on Self-fertilized and Cross-fertilized Agricultural Crops should be merged to cover all agricultural crops, as work on self-fertilized agricultural crops was nearly completed. This means that there would still be five Technical Working Parties:

- (a) Agricultural Crops;
- (b) Vegetables;
- (c) Fruit Crops;
- (d) Ornamental Plants;
- (e) Forest Trees.

20. The Secretariat assured the Council that it would give priority to this important work of the Technical Working Parties. All members present assured the Chairman and the Secretariat of all their help and cooperation in helping the new Technical Working Party.

21. On a proposal from the representative of the Netherlands, the Council also agreed to ask the Steering Committee to synchronize the work of the above-mentioned Working Parties, including a decision as to which Working Party would be responsible for a species which is used for different purposes, for instance as an ornamental and a forest plant.

22. Joint Trial Arrangements. On a proposal from the representative of the United Kingdom, and after a discussion in which most of the member States took part, the Council decided that the Technical Steering Committee should be asked:

- (a) to reaffirm the resolution of 1961, attached to the Convention, recommending "studies necessary for the organization of the examination on an international basis and for the conclusion of the arrangements provided for in Article 30 of the Convention"; and
- (b) to report annually to the Council on arrangements entered into, progress of arrangements being discussed and plans for future arrangements.

23. Information and Documentation Service. The proposal of the Secretary General to publish the Acts of the 1961 Diplomatic Conference was discussed. The Secretary General pointed out that, apart from the use of these Acts for scholars and for historical purposes, it was indispensable for the Secretariat to have them, if only to define some of the terms used in the Convention which were not very clear. He said that, if necessary, the publication of the Acts could be deferred but that the compilation was necessary as a matter of urgency since it was now over ten years since the Conference took place.
24. The Secretary General advised the Council that there would be a consultant available in 1973 who is a specialist in this field as he has compiled several acts of diplomatic conferences for WIPO. This man may not be available after 1973.
25. The cost of compiling and printing the said Acts in one language (in French for a start) and, if necessary, any prior Acts, would be around 40,000 Swiss francs which could be found from the Reserve Fund which is likely to be increased substantially in 1972 owing to the late recruitment of one 'P' and one 'G' staff members.
26. After discussion, the Council agreed to ask the Secretariat to undertake the task of compiling, and agreed in principle, on the printing of the Acts.
27. The Council requested the Consultative Working Committee to examine the manuscripts and to decide in what form and to what extent they should be printed.
28. The Council also agreed that, in order to facilitate the Secretariat's task, all documentation available in the member States, including existing translations thereof, should be sent to the Secretariat for editing and compiling.
29. Advice to Governments. In order to leave no misunderstanding as to the very high importance which the Council attaches to this item of the program, the words "as far as possible" were deleted from paragraph 12 of document UPOV/C/VI/5.
30. Public Relations. The Chairman stated that the Secretariat should attend meetings of other intergovernmental organizations in an observer capacity only when there were some important points of interest to UPOV being discussed.
31. Symposium. The word "June" should be replaced by "July" in paragraph 14 of Part I of document UPOV/C/VI/5. In the same paragraph the words "under the sponsorship of UPOV and" should be deleted. Further reference is made to paragraphs 47 to 51 below.
32. The program as adopted is contained in document UPOV/C/VI/13, Part I.
33. Budget. The discussion then proceeded on Part II of document UPOV/C/VI/5.
34. In introducing this second part the Chairman said that the present budget was within the estimates which had been established last year (see document UPOV/C/V/29).
35. The Secretary General agreed with the Chairman but wished to stress that the estimates for the year after the budget year were given as a tentative indication only and were not to be taken as a budget for these years. These figures were given to help the Council members in assessing future costs of decisions they were in the process of making.
36. The Vice Secretary General further pointed out that whereas detailed calculations were made in respect of each figure in the budget year under review, the figures given for the year next to the budget year were mere extrapolations corresponding to the estimated inflationary trend only and without due regard to possible change in the level of activities.
37. Missions. The Vice Secretary General explained that a long-distance mission should be construed as a mission to some faraway country, i.e. South America, Australia or New Zealand. On a question from the representative of Germany (Fed. Rep.), the Secretary General stated that missions in connection

with the Symposium were not included in the budget of 16,000 Swiss francs proposed for 1973.

38. The representative of Germany (Fed. Rep.) requested that future financial reports should contain an analysis of the actual expense under this subhead. The Secretariat agreed that this should be done.

39. Conferences. In answer to a query from the representative of Germany (Fed. Rep.) the Secretariat stated that minute writers provided by WIPO were part of the common services and covered by the common expenses. It was doubtful if the Secretariat could manage without this service.

40. With the exception of the Symposium budget which was discussed separately (see paragraphs 47 to 51 below) the Council unanimously approved the expense budget for 1973 totalling 573,000 Swiss francs, made up as follows:

proper expenses	382,000 Swiss francs;
common expenses	191,000 Swiss francs.

41. Income. After discussion the Council considered that the Reserve Fund, which stood at approximately 142,000 Swiss francs at the end of 1971, was likely to be increased by 60 to 80,000 Swiss francs in 1972 (mainly due to late recruitment of personnel) and that such a Reserve Fund should permit the maintenance of the value of a unit of contribution to 26,000 Swiss francs (instead of the 25,850 Swiss francs for 1972).

42. The Secretariat drew the attention of the Council to the fact that if the value of the contribution units were not increased slightly but regularly each year, and the Reserve Fund were to be used instead to meet inflationary increases, a substantial jump in contributions would become necessary sooner or later, when the Reserve Fund had been exhausted.

43. After discussion, it was unanimously decided that the value of the contribution unit for 1973 would be fixed at 26,000 Swiss francs. The Council, however, was aware of the necessity of considering an increase in the value of the contribution unit for the 1974 budget.

44. The total income budget would, therefore, be 533,000 Swiss francs, made up as follows:

total contributions	
(20 units x 26,000 Swiss francs)	= 520,000 Swiss francs;
miscellaneous income	= 13,000 Swiss francs.

45. The difference between the budget income (533,000 Swiss francs) and the budget expenditure (573,000 Swiss francs), excluding the cost of the Symposium, will be 40,000 Swiss francs which, in accordance with the Financial Regulations of UPOV, will be covered by the Reserve Fund.

46. The final budget figures as adopted can be found in document UPOV/C/VI/13, Part II (Ordinary Budget).

47. Symposium Budget. Discussions took place on the basis of document UPOV/C/VI/11, as revised by a Working Party which had met prior to the Council meeting. The Council adopted the budget which provided for the expenditure of 96,500 Swiss francs and income of 50,000 Swiss francs. The detailed figures can be found in document UPOV/C/VI/13, Part III (Special Symposium Budget). The following participant's fees were fixed by the Council on the recommendation of the Working Party:

100 Swiss francs for each person nominated by Governments or States and
200 Swiss francs per person for other participants,

both amounts including transportation for visits to the plant breeding station in Cambridge and other places (expenses listed as "excursions" in the Special Symposium Budget).

48. The income is based on the estimated attendance of:

100 persons nominated by

Governments x 100 Swiss francs = 10,000 Swiss francs;
 200 other participants x 200 Swiss francs = 40,000 Swiss francs;

and the Council took note of the fact that the number of participants was uncertain, and that the Council should be prepared for an increase in the total cost or a decrease in accordance with the actual number of participants.

49. It was decided that the net cost of the Symposium, i.e. the difference between actual expenditure made and actual income received now estimated at 46,500 Swiss francs, be taken out of the Reserve Fund. The Council, however, accepted that the figure of 46,500 Swiss francs was an estimate and, while it hoped that this estimate would not be exceeded, it gave its authorization for the actual cost of the Symposium to be taken from the Reserve Fund.

50. In doing so, the Council referred to its earlier decision on the principle of covering the Symposium cost from the Reserve Fund (see Document UPOV/C/V/28 Add., paragraph 124).

51. The Council noted with satisfaction that the host country would pay for the necessary accommodation (conference rooms and working committees' rooms including interpretation equipment), possible travel costs of interpreters, all office services (telephone, document reproduction, etc.) and some hospitality (reception and refreshments during meetings).

Working Capital Fund (Item 9 of the Agenda)

52. Discussions took place on the basis of document UPOV/C/VI/6.

53. The document was introduced by the Secretariat, which gave a brief summary of the proceedings at the Consultative Working Committee meeting held on April 13 and 14, 1972.

54. The Consultative Working Committee had been requested by the fifth session of the Council to consider the detailed document on the subject prepared by the Secretariat (UPOV/WC/V/3) and to fix the amount of the Working Capital Fund subject to approval by the said Council at its sixth session. The Secretariat reported that the Consultative Working Committee had not reached a unanimous decision as to the amount which should be fixed for the Working Capital Fund and that the representative of the United Kingdom voted against the amount proposed on the basis that it was unnecessarily high.

55. The representative of the United Kingdom repeated his views and said that although he still considered that the amount of 150,000 Swiss francs suggested by the Consultative Working Committee was high, he would, in a spirit of cooperation, withdraw his opposition.

56. The representative of France, who had also expressed some reservations (see document UPOV/WC/V/6, paragraph 60) as to the size of the Working Capital Fund, withdrew these reservations.

57. The Council, therefore, unanimously decided:

(a) to fix the amount of the Working Capital Fund at 150,000 Swiss francs;

(b) to approve the following decisions of the Consultative Working Committee:

(i) to base the share of the member States in the Working Capital Fund on the units established for the purpose of the annual contributions under Article 26(4) of the Convention. However, voluntary contributions should not be taken into account for the purpose of calculating the share in the Working Capital Fund;

- (ii) that, if a member State officially changed to a higher class under the present Convention or to a class involving an increase in the number of units under a revised Convention, it would be called upon to pay into the Working Capital Fund an additional amount in proportion to the number of additional units it had officially chosen to contribute as its obligatory contribution; the additional payments would increase the total of the Working Capital Fund;
- (iii) to invite the member States which had to pay amounts to the Working Capital Fund to do so in the course of 1973.
- (c) To fix the contribution towards the Working Capital Fund of new members joining the Union, either under the present Convention or under a revised Convention, at 8,333 Swiss francs for each unit it officially elects to contribute under the contribution class chosen; such additional payment(s) would increase the Working Capital Fund.

58. Following the above decisions of the Council:

- (a) Denmark, Germany (Federal Republic), the Netherlands and the United Kingdom need not pay any additional amounts to the Working Capital Fund as their contributions to this Fund have already been paid.
- (b) The amount to be paid by France is 41,667 Swiss francs (equivalent to five contribution units under Class I).
- (c) The amount to be paid by Sweden is 8,333 Swiss francs (equivalent to one contribution unit under Class III).

Thus, once France and Sweden have paid the above-mentioned amounts, the share of each member State in the Working Capital Fund will be as follows:

	<u>Class</u>	<u>(Units)</u>	<u>Swiss francs</u>
Denmark	III	(1)	8,333
France	I	(5)	41,667
Germany (Federal Republic)	I	(5)	41,667
Netherlands	III	(1)	8,333
Sweden	III	(1)	8,333
United Kingdom	I	(5)	41,667
		<hr/>	<hr/>
	TOTAL:	(18)	150,000
		=====	=====

59. New Members. The Secretariat, as requested by the Consultative Working Committee (document UPOV/WC/V/6 paragraph 59), drew the attention of all observers to the obligations of new member States in respect of the Working Capital Fund as laid down in the Financial Regulations of UPOV and as fixed by the Council (see paragraph 58 above).

60. On a question raised by the representative of Sweden, the Secretariat stated that a formal request for the payment of the Working Capital Fund would be made to the two countries which have still to pay monies into the Fund, i.e. France and Sweden. The Council invited those two countries to make such payments in the course of 1973.

Administrative and Financial Regulations (Item 10 of the Agenda)

61. Discussions took place on the basis of documents UPOV/C/VI/7 and UPOV/C/VI/10.

62. In introducing the documents, the Secretary General stressed that the change in the Financial Regulations was mainly concerned with the regularization of the legal situation which arose from the replacement of BIRPI by WIPO. The proposed changes had been submitted to the Government of the Swiss Confederation in accordance with Article 20(2) of the Convention and, by letter reproduced in document UPOV/C/VI/10, the Swiss Government had replied that they had no special comments to make on the said changes.

63. The representative of Germany (Fed. Rep.) pointed out that the agreement between UPOV and BIRPI on technical and administrative cooperation as approved, in accordance with Article 25 of the Convention, by arrêté of the Swiss Government on October 21, 1969 (document UPOV/C/IV/6), was not submitted for revision.
64. The Secretary General replied that, although WIPO was the legal successor to BIRPI, it would be advisable to revise that document.
65. The representative of the United Kingdom raised the principle that the Council should be advised of the amendments proposed in WIPO Staff and Financial Regulations well in advance in order that the Council would be able to make a decision on the subject.
66. The Secretary General observed that the Council remained free to amend the UPOV Administrative Regulations in the event it would not wish to be bound by a specific amendment to the WIPO Staff Regulations and Rules. However, the Secretariat did understand the spirit in which the request was made and undertook to mail to the members of the UPOV Council all the WIPO documents concerning such changes at the same time as they were mailed to the members of the WIPO Administrative Bodies.
67. The representative of the United Kingdom thanked the Secretariat and expressed the wish that the Secretary General would draw the attention of the Council members to proposed amendments which would be out of the ordinary.
68. Dates for Submission of the Budget, Management Report and Financial Accounts. The representative of Germany (Fed. Rep.) stated that the date proposed by the Secretariat as a new deadline for the above-mentioned three reports (September 1) was too late as, if the Council meetings, as had been previously decided, were to be held at the beginning of October, it would not give enough time for all the authorities concerned in member States to study the documents and to give their representatives their views or comments. This was particularly the case with the budget.
69. The Secretariat said that it did not intend to use the proposed deadline as an excuse to publish these documents later than they were published at present, but merely that the new deadline would enable the Secretariat not to be in violation of the rules.
70. After an exchange of views, the new deadline of September 1 for all documents was approved by the Council on the understanding that they were ultimate deadlines for issuing all the documents and that the Secretariat would make a particular effort in giving priority to the budget in order that this document could be accelerated and mailed, as far as possible, well in advance of this deadline.
71. The Council therefore:
- (a) unanimously adopted the amendments to the Administrative Regulations of UPOV contained in Annex I of document UPOV/C/VI/7; the Administrative Regulations, as amended, are contained in document UPOV/C/VI/14;
 - (b) unanimously adopted the amendments to the Financial Regulations of UPOV contained in Annex II to document UPOV/C/VI/7 subject to changing the words "Ad Article 2" to "Ad Article 2(a)" and "Ad Article 3" to "Ad Article 3(a)"; the Financial Regulations, as amended, are contained in document UPOV/C/VI/15;
 - (c) unanimously approved the interpretation of Article 1 of the Administrative Regulations of UPOV as set forth in paragraph 12 of document UPOV/C/VI/7.

Reports on Legislative, Administrative and Technical Progress (Item 11 of the Agenda)

(i) Signatory States

72. The representative of Belgium reported that draft laws on the protection of plant varieties and on the ratification of the Convention had been submitted to the Council of Ministers in June 1972 and were presently under discussion in the Conseil d'Etat in view of the new administrative and judicial procedures which they involved. He expected that the drafts would be definitively submitted to Parliament in January 1973 and approved during the first half of 1973, so that ratification might take place during the second half of 1973. He said that the species to be covered by the protection would probably be limited to the list in the Annex to the Convention.

73. The representative of Italy explained that some delay had arisen in the adoption of his country's draft law for the ratification of the Convention, due to the recent change in Government. He said that the law had been submitted again to the Council of Ministers and was now before the legislative Chambers; he added that more precise information would be available at the end of 1972. Referring to the declaration made by Italy on signing the Convention in 1961 to the effect that Italy, under the power granted by Article 4(5) of the Convention, would apply Articles 2 and 3 of the Convention of Paris for the Protection of Industrial Property with regard to the protection of plant varieties, the Italian representative stated that the question of protecting new varieties by means of patents or by means of a special title of protection was still under discussion and that, so far, no final decision had been made.

74. The representative of Switzerland informed the Council that his country was interested in ratifying the Convention as soon as possible. He referred to the two draft laws that had been prepared in his country--one on plant varieties, the other on seeds. He said that the first of these, which had been welcomed in professional and agricultural circles, was presently under discussion, but that its transmission to the Federal Chamber had been delayed since some administrative questions had to be settled first. He expected that the amended draft would be submitted to legislature in the second half of 1973 or the spring of 1974. As to species to be protected, he said that Switzerland was mainly interested in wheat, maize, red clover, ryegrass, lettuce, and roses, and perhaps also vine plants.

(ii) Interested States

75. The representative of South Africa reported that he had learned that a draft law to amend the existing Act for the protection of plant varieties had been prepared in his country and was to be transmitted to interested circles.

76. The representative of Austria reminded the Council that Austria already had two laws, one on plant varieties, the other on seeds, but that accession to the Convention was not possible, since the plant variety law did not meet the requirements of the Convention. He announced a change in the position of the breeders' associations which were now actively in favor of accession. He said that the necessary new law was being drafted, but that its adoption might take some years (perhaps four). The representative requested the Council to allow experts from Austria to sit in the Technical Working Parties, in view of his country's intention to accede to the Convention.

77. The representative of Spain explained that the draft law on plant variety protection had not yet been discussed, the delay being mainly due to the work on the new scheme under the 1971 Law on Seed and Nursery Production, which had recently been approved. He said that a positive step had been the creation of a Working Committee within the National Institute for Seed and Nursery Production, which would study rules for the protection of plant varieties and make proposals. He pointed out that experts from Spain were participating in some of the Technical Working Parties. He stated that his country hoped for an even greater cooperation with UPOV and intended that the draft law to be discussed would correspond closely with the Paris Convention to enable accession to the Union.

78. The representative of Finland reported that steps had already been taken towards the protection of plant varieties. He said that a committee would be able to begin work on the preparation of a draft law in the winter of 1973. He added, however, that a system of protection of breeders' rights presented some problems of a budgetary nature, which would have to be resolved.

79. The representative of Hungary pointed out that the main features of his country's new patent law, relevant to plant varieties, were based on the plant variety Convention. He reported that there had initially been some reluctance in Hungarian agricultural circles to make use of the new law, but that this seemed no longer to be the case. He emphasized the advantages of the Hungarian system for foreign breeders: (1) there were no restrictions as to who may file an application; (2) the Hungarian Office accepted the priority of foreign applications based on foreign plant variety laws; (3) the Office accepted, as evidence of novelty, homogeneity and stability, the reports issued by foreign bodies. He then referred to the difficulties facing Hungarian breeders in UPOV countries, which--he said--were due to the working of the reciprocity requirement provided for in some UPOV countries and to the conflict between the Plant Variety Convention and the Industrial Property Convention in relation to priority. He thought that these difficulties could be resolved in the light of the objectives of UPOV. He stated that his country appreciated the work of UPOV, the main obstacle to accession was of a financial nature. He hoped that the changes brought about by the Diplomatic Conference currently taking place would enable smaller countries to accede.

80. The representative of Gabon informed the Council that although the requisites for acceding to the Convention were far from present in his country, it was conscious of the advantages of joining UPOV. He pointed out the financial obstacles, especially in relation to setting up the basic infrastructure for protection. He stated that his country would be grateful for any assistance that UPOV could give, and suggested that it might be expedient to have a provision in favor of developing countries, similar to those adopted in the framework of the Berne Convention.

81. Welcoming the representative of Gabon, the Chairman stated that there were provisions in the Plant Variety Convention to help countries having difficulties in acceding (for instance, in relation to contributions); there were also possibilities for giving advice to such countries.

82. The representative of Ireland reported that his country had no plant variety legislation, since until recently it had felt no need for such legislation. Now, he stated, the Ministry of Agriculture had set up a Committee, some of whose members were present, to prepare the skeleton of plant variety legislation and implementing machinery, the Committee's work was due to be completed in six months.

83. The representative of the United States of America reported that the Rules of Practice under the new law would enter into force on November 27, 1972; the Office was fully staffed, and the first certificate would shortly be issued. He stated that 286 applications had been filed under the new law, covering 56 crops or species. He said that the Plant Variety Commissioner was in touch with other countries concerning the question of reciprocity. The Office was preparing "objective description forms" for each crop, with a view to computerization, and was sending the forms to interested public and private circles for comments. He offered to give experts interested information on his country's system for computerizing description work. The representative told the Council of his country's interest in collaborating with the technical committees of UPOV.

84. The representative of the United States of America answered a number of questions relating to aspects of the system in his country. In this context, the discussion centered on two points. The first related to the testing system, namely, the fact that the genuineness of a variety was primarily determined in the United States of America on the basis of the breeder's statement, whereas the Convention required the examination to be under the control of the national Office. It was agreed that a pragmatic solution should be adopted, in the form of a continuing dialog with a view to harmonization; there was no need for institutionalization, but the technical experts could study the matter and their final report could be discussed.

85. The second major point concerned reciprocity. It was pointed out that there was a practical difficulty in this connection due to the separate existence of two bodies responsible for plant variety protection: the United States Patent Office (vegetatively propagated plants except potatoes) and the Plant Variety Office (sexually propagated plants); there was also the legal difficulty in that patents were not normally granted for plant varieties in the UPOV countries.

86. The representative of the United States of America replied that a merger of the Patent Office and the Plant Variety Office was planned. Since no decision had been taken, he was unable to give a formal answer to the legal aspect raised, but he felt that some legal means would be found to enable his country to give reciprocal protection in the case of a crop, where protection of the same crop was accorded to his country's nationals in the foreign country concerned.

87. Commenting on a question from a Netherlands representative, the Chairman stated that it was not at present possible for the United States of America to join UPOV due to the existence of that country's two systems which called for unification. Experts from that country should take part in the Technical Working Parties of interest to it, so as to bring about a greater harmonization.

88. Agreeing with the Chairman, the representative of the United States of America reaffirmed that his country hoped to join the Union when the conditions made it possible, and expressed the wish that an invitation to participate in the way suggested could be extended also to the United States Patent Office.

89. The representative of Japan reported that the plant protection programs were being given increasing attention. His country already had a registration system under the 1945 Agricultural Seed and Seedling Act. Further developments were being examined in governmental and private circles. He expressed his country's wish for closer contacts with member States of UPOV.

90. The Vice Secretary General announced that the representative of Norway was unable to attend the meeting but had informed him that Norway was studying the question of introducing plant variety protection.

91. Two points arising from the reports from individual countries were then discussed. The first had been prompted by the Hungarian representative's reference to the adverse consequences of the possibility under the Convention of limiting protection on a reciprocity basis. This was a problem not only as between member States of UPOV and non-members granting patent protection for plant varieties, but also as between UPOV members themselves since the lists of species protected in each country did not coincide. The United Kingdom representative suggested that the question of removing the reciprocity provision from the Plant Variety Convention should be studied, particularly since its value was diminishing as more and more species were protected. The representative of Sweden referred to the cost involved when examination was extended to a species in which the country concerned was not interested; he pointed out that this illustrated the importance of developing the joint trials referred to earlier.

92. It was decided that reciprocity limitation should be studied with a view to the next Revision Conference. It was first suggested that this was a matter for the Technical Steering Committee; but since the question was a matter of general policy it was decided that the UPOV Secretariat would prepare the study for the attention of the Consultative Working Committee.

93. The second point arising from the reports from individual countries was the request made by the representatives of Austria and the United States of America for their experts to take part in the Technical Working Parties. The Chairman reminded the Council that it had previously decided that such invitations to experts were a matter for the Council to decide. It was agreed that the Technical Working Parties should be authorized to invite experts from those two countries from time to time, when this was of mutual advantage.

94. Two queries were raised at this point. One concerned the question whether Hungary also wished to send experts to the above-mentioned sessions. The representative of Hungary said that he would make a proposal to that effect to his

Ministry of Agriculture. The other point was whether "Technical Working Parties" also included the Fee Harmonization Working Party and the Working Group on Variety Denominations. The Chairman replied that it did, but that participation in the Working Party on Fees, for instance, would probably not be of mutual advantage except where a non-member State was shortly to join the Union. It was noted that in any event, Austria and the United States of America wished to send experts only to the Technical Working Parties.

Guidelines for the Preliminary Examination of New Varieties and Joint Trial Arrangements (Item 13 of the Agenda)

95. The Chairman of the Technical Steering Committee, Mr. Bustarret (France), presented the report on its work during the preceding year (document UPOV/ST/I/2). He emphasized that although the Council had entrusted his Committee with the further task of reporting on joint trials, it had confined itself to the essential task, which was to coordinate the work of the Technical Working Parties with a view to the harmonization of the conduct of technical examinations. He then gave an outline of his Committee's work, reporting on the progress in preparing the guidelines for the conduct of examinations relating to a number of species. He pointed out that the Guidelines drawn up by the individual Technical Working Parties contained a number of general rules, which were expressed differently in the documents. His Committee had therefore prepared draft "General Remarks to Guidelines for the Examination of New Plant Varieties with Respect to Distinctness, Homogeneity and Stability." These Remarks were now before the Council in the form of document UPOV/ST/I/3. This document had been prepared by a drafting committee, which had however only been able to conduct its work by correspondence. Mr. Bustarret pointed out that although this document represented the substantive position of the Technical Steering Committee, its drafting needed to be amended in some respects.

96. Mr. Bustarret then described the procedure that his Committee proposed for adopting the Guidelines. In the first place, his Committee sought the Council's approval in principle of the general rules applicable to all species. In the second place, his Committee asked the Council to give it a kind of delegated authority in the preparation of the specific rules relating to each species in accordance with the generally approved philosophy. Mr. Bustarret explained that the Council would be overburdened if it had to examine each specific Guideline in detail. He added that the delegated authority sought did not entail a transfer of functions from the Council.

97. It was agreed that this kind of authority should be given. The Chairman stated that the Guidelines would have to be submitted to the Council for review, under a general procedure to be decided, but that the Council could not discuss specific Guidelines in detail. The representative of the United Kingdom added that one of the Council's tasks would be to ensure that the rules did not conflict with the technical systems of non-member countries.

98. The Vice Secretary General asked whether it would be possible to begin work on preparing the General Remarks, and the twenty Guidelines now available, for printing by offset, so that the material could be ready for the Symposium.

99. Referring to the General Remarks, Mr. Bustarret stated that document UPOV/ST/I/3 could be discussed but should not be considered final. Apart from the drafting changes needed, there were one or two very important aspects on which the Council's assistance was sought--in particular, as to the interpretation of "important characteristics" and "sufficiently homogenous" in Article 6 of the Convention. It was necessary to see whether the Council agreed with the two solutions reached by the Committee. Mr. Bustarret then described the problems relating to these two aspects.

100. Since many participants had not had the opportunity of studying document UPOV/ST/I/3 in detail, it was decided to defer discussion until later. However, when the Council resumed its session, it was agreed that in view of the importance of the issues involved and of the fact that the Technical Steering Committee had not completed its work and needed time to study points of drafting and also of substance, the Committee should be invited to re-examine and complete

the document and to bring it back to the Consultative Working Committee and the Council at a later stage.

101. It was decided (1) that the General Remarks should be referred back to the Steering Committee; (2) that the four Guidelines which had already been submitted to the Council (those on wheat, maize, roses and apples) should be published as soon as possible as "provisional," and (3) that the other guidelines which were ready should be published as soon as possible afterwards.

Symposium on Plant Breeders' Rights (Item 12 of the Agenda)

102. The discussions on the financial and budgetary aspects of the Symposium have been reported in paragraphs 47 to 51 above. Discussions on other matters were referred to the Symposium Working Party which met immediately after the session of the Council (see document UPOV/73SW/II/1).

Reports from Member States on the Harmonization of Lists of Species Eligible for Protection and Other Progress in Member States (Item 14 of the Agenda)

103. The representative of Germany (Fed. Rep.) referred to the Council's decision that member States should annually report to the Council on progress in extending protection to non-obligatory species (document UPOV/C/V/32). He stated that the position in his country had not changed since the preceding year, but that it hoped to extend protection to 20 new species in the fields of ornamental plants, fruit and forest trees. In particular, in line with the resolution of the Council, protection was intended for carnations, freesias, apples, cherries, plums and pears.

104. The representative of Denmark reported that his country had extended protection to three new species: lucerne, rape, and bougainvillea. He stated that there were difficulties in extending protection so that further progress was unlikely for the present.

105. The representative of France reported that it was intended to extend protection to some ornamentals and herbage species. He stated that budgetary provision to carry out the necessary studies had been accorded for 1973. He pointed out however that members of the French plant variety committee had some reservations on the subject, owing to the difficulty of granting a strong title of protection for these species in view of the criteria that had been established in infringement cases before the French courts.

106. The representative of the Netherlands pointed out that almost all agricultural and vegetable species were protectable in his country, but that lucerne, clover and sugar beets were still excluded from protection due to technical difficulties involved. As to the three species listed in the Annex to document UPOV/C/V/32 as not being protected in the Netherlands, he said that a working party was studying the question of extension and pointed out that these species were still protectable but not by means of plant breeders' rights. His country was, he said, considering the possibility of extending protection in the field of ornamentals, on the basis of bilateral discussions with other member States, covering the questions of reciprocity and trials. He also said that an extension of protection to raspberries was not under consideration.

107. The representative of Sweden reported that most of the important crops, including the obligatory species, were protectable under the new law. Referring to the three ornamental species listed in the column for his country in the Annex to document UPOV/C/V/32, he said that the absence of protection was partly due to financial difficulties in testing, which illustrated his country's dependence on joint trials.

108. The representative of the United Kingdom explained that the position had not changed since the previous year. The United Kingdom was, however, considering the extension of protection to timothy, cock's-foot, red and white clover and lilies. It was in consultation with France and the Netherlands concerning *Agrostis*, poa and maize, and hoped that plant breeders' right schemes could be set up in these fields.

Harmonization of Fees (Item 15 of the Agenda)

109. The Chairman of the Fee Harmonization Working Party, Miss Thornton (United Kingdom), reported on the work of the two-day meeting in December 1971. She said that a draft report and recommendation had been prepared but had not yet been circulated. She said that the Working Party had considered the fees in member States and had agreed that the application fee should be divided into two: a fee payable on filing, and a fee payable on grant. It had also agreed on the total amounts to be paid by applicants for each variety in the course of a ten-year period, including application fee, test fee and annual fees (renewal fees). For renewal fees, she stated that the Committee had recommended a sliding scale as opposed to a flat rate system; it had also made a recommendation concerning the payment of the fee for trials carried out in another member State. She announced that the United Kingdom had already taken the measures in conformity with the recommendations and that the members of the Council would shortly be receiving the relevant legislation.

110. The representative of Germany (Fed. Rep.) announced that the recommendations were also being applied in his country. He then referred to one additional aspect in the work of the Fee Harmonization Committee, relating to the compulsory registration of some species in an official catalog, provided for by most member States; he stated that the members of the Committee had agreed to try to exercise their influence in their countries with a view to the harmonization of the registration fees with the plant variety protection fees.

111. In answer to a representative of the Netherlands, who had pointed out that the Council had also resolved that data on national fees should be collected, the Vice Secretary General stated that the work in this connection had almost been completed.

112. It was emphasized that the Fee Harmonization Working Party should be a permanent body, since it was essential that the different national fees should not become out of step on account of inflation.

Recruitment of an Administrative and Technical Assistant (Item 18 of the Agenda)

113. The Vice Secretary General outlined the background to the proposal that Dr. Thiele-Wittig should be appointed to this post (document UPOV/C/VI/9). He explained that since it was proposed to offer the candidate the grade of P.3 upon satisfactory completion of the probationary period, the Secretary General was seeking the approval of the Council, this being required by the Administrative Regulations for appointments at the P.3 level.

114. The Council took note of the appointment of Dr. M.H.W. Thiele-Wittig as Administrative and Technical Assistant of UPOV and of the grading of his post during the two-year probationary period at P.2 level, and approved the prospect of his promotion to P.3 grade on completion of his probationary period being held out to him, subject to satisfactory service during that period.

Elections (Item 16 of the Agenda)

115. Pointing out that Article 18 of the Convention did not specify the term of office of the Vice-Chairman of the Council, the Chairman stated that it had been agreed that the terms of office of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman should overlap. Since the current Chairman's office had two more years to run, he proposed that the new Vice-Chairman to be elected should remain in office for three years, subject to the possibility of prematurely withdrawing due to special circumstances. He noted that the United Kingdom, the Netherlands and Germany (Fed. Rep.) had, so far, provided the Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen of the Council and referred to a gentleman's agreement that there should be as much rotation as possible so that each country could take a share in the responsibility.

116. On the proposal of the representative of France, seconded by the representative of Germany (Fed. Rep.), Professor Esbo (Sweden) was unanimously elected to the office of Vice-Chairman. The Chairman thanked the former Vice-Chairman, Mr. de Zeeuw, for his excellent services.

117. The Chairman of the Fee Harmonization Working Party, Miss Thornton (United Kingdom), announced that she would like to resign from her office and to put it up for election, because she felt that it was very important that the elections relating to the working parties should all be made at the same time.

118. The representative of Germany (Fed. Rep.) noted that the chairmanship of the Technical Steering Committee was not up for election since the present Chairman, Mr. Bustarret, France, would hold office for two more years. He proposed the following list of Chairmen of the Technical Working Parties, the Fee Harmonization Working Party and the Working Group on Variety Denominations.

Technical Working Parties:

- | | |
|------------------------|---|
| (i) Agricultural Crops | Mr. R. Duyvendak (Netherlands) |
| (ii) Vegetables | Dr. A. Roux (Germany (Fed. Rep.)) |
| (iii) Fruit Crops | Mr. H. Harding (United Kingdom) |
| (iv) Ornamental Plants | Mr. J.M. Evans (United Kingdom) |
| (v) Forest Trees | An expert from Denmark (the name to be communicated to the Secretariat) |

Fee Harmonization Working Party Mr. B. Laclavière (France)

Working Group on Variety Denominations Mr. S. Mejegaard (Sweden)

119. On the proposal of the representative of Denmark, it was decided that the Secretariat would send letters to the member countries asking them for the names of the members of the Working Party on Forest Trees; the list of members would then be sent to the representative of Denmark who would communicate the chairman's name to the Secretariat.

120. Mr. Mejegaard asked the Council whether his entry into office as Chairman of the Working Group on Variety Denominations could be postponed until January 1, 1973, since he would be unable to preside at the next meeting of the Working Group in December. The previous Chairman of the Working Group, Dr. Böringer, agreed to resume office for the December meeting provided that Mr. Mejegaard would assist him in his conduct of business.

121. The request of Mr. Mejegaard had prompted some discussion on the question whether the terms of office should not all begin at the start of the calendar year, but it was eventually agreed that the elections should continue to take effect at the end of the Council meeting concerned.

122. The Chairman expressed his gratitude to the former chairmen of the Working Parties and to their members and wished the new chairmen success.

Date of the Next Meeting (Item 17 of the Agenda)

123. The Council confirmed its decision, mentioned in paragraph 13 above, to hold its next meeting in the first half of October 1973, the exact date to be decided later.

Other Business (Item 18 of the Agenda)

124. Salary of the Secretary General. On the proposal of the representative of the Netherlands, seconded by the representative of the United Kingdom, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"The Council of UPOV hereby resolves that the salary of the Secretary General be increased, exceptionally and for the year 1973 only, by 13,000 Swiss

francs in recognition of the additional functions he has been and is being called upon to perform during the early development of the Union and of its secretarial services."

125. The Council realized that, in order to provide for this salary increase, a sum which was considerably larger than 13,000 Swiss francs should be taken into account in order to cover additional costs, which are normal within the Organization, and which would result in a total cost in the order of 20,000 Swiss francs. The Council decided to leave the exact calculation of the amount to the specialists of the Common Services.

Notes by the Secretariat:

(1) The calculation gives the following result (in Swiss francs) on the basis of the Staff Rules and Regulations as applicable from November 1972:

	<u>Swiss francs</u>
Basic Salary	13,000
Post Adjustment	3,123
Total Salary	16,123 =====
Increased UPOV contribution to the Pension Fund	4,368
Total Expenditure	20,491 =====

(2) In accordance with Article 23(3) of the UPOV Convention, the above resolution of the Council has been submitted to the Government of the Swiss Confederation for approval.

126. It was therefore unanimously agreed that the expenditure for 1973 should be increased by the necessary amount and that, to the extent that such an amount would not be covered by savings, it should be drawn from the Reserve Fund.

127. Thanking the Council, the Secretary General said that their resolution not only showed him that his services had been appreciated, but also marked the successful collaboration between WIPO and UPOV. He added that due to the good cooperation with the Vice Secretary General, the Union had made an excellent start.

128. Next Revision Conference. The representative of Germany (Fed. Rep.) pointed out that the next revision conference might be much more difficult and suggested that the Consultative Working Committee should begin to consider the questions for revision.

129. Agreeing with the representative of Germany (Fed. Rep.), the Chairman noted that the three years normally needed for the preparation of a revision conference were especially necessary in the present case. He proposed that the Consultative Working Committee should prepare suggestions, without proposing solutions, in time for the next Council Meeting.

130. The representative of the United Kingdom pointed out that the Symposium in July 1973 might also produce ideas for revision. He said that the Convention should be looked at from the viewpoint of facilitating the accession of countries with different systems. He added that it was generally agreed that Article 13 of the Convention should be reconsidered; this should be a question for the December 1972 and subsequent meetings of the Working Group on Variety Denominations. He suggested that some general problems could be considered late in 1973.

131. Closure. The Chairman thanked the participants at the Council session, expressed the Council's pleasure at the presence of the observers and representatives of signatory States and closed the session.

Annex follows

LIST OF PARTICIPANTSI. MEMBER STATESDENMARK

Mr. P. SKIBSTED, Head of Department, Ministry of Agriculture, Copenhagen

Mr. E. SØNDERGAARD, Director, Plant News Agency, Copenhagen

Mr. J.F. SIMONY, Head of Department, Board of Environmental Protection,
Copenhagen

FRANCE

Mr. B. LACLAVIERE, Secrétaire général du Comité de la protection des
obtentions végétales, Paris

Mr. R. SAUGER, Ingénieur général du Génie rural, des Eaux et des Forêts,
Paris

Mr. J.G. BUSTARRET, Président du Comité directeur technique de l'UPOV,
Versailles

GERMANY (Federal Republic)

Ministerialdirektor Professor Dr. L. PIELEN, Bundesministerium für
Ernährung, Landwirtschaft und Forsten, Bonn

Dr. D. BÖRINGER, Präsident, Bundessortenamt, Bemerode/Hannover

Regierungsdirektor Dr. W. KNOBLOCH, Bundesministerium für Ernährung,
Landwirtschaft und Forsten, Bonn

NETHERLANDS

Mr. A. DE ZEEUW, Director, Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries,
The Hague

Mr. J.I.C. BUTLER, Chairman, Board for Plant Breeders' Rights,
Wageningen

SWEDEN

Professor H. ESBO, Chairman, National Plant Variety Board, The National
Swedish Central Seed Testing Institute, Solna

Mr. S. MEJEGAARD, Judge of the Court of Appeal, Hägersten

Dr. T. FRITZ, National Plant Variety Board, Solna

UNITED KINGDOM

Mr. L.J. SMITH, Controller of Plant Variety Rights, Ministry of
Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, London

Miss E.V. THORNTON, Plant Variety Rights Office, Ministry of Agriculture,
Fisheries and Food, London

Mr. A.F. KELLY, Deputy Director, National Institute of Agricultural
Botany, Cambridge

489

II. SIGNATORY STATES

BELGIUM

Mr. R. DERVEAUX, Conseiller juridique, Ministère de l'Agriculture,
Brussels

ITALY

Mr. P. ARCHI, Ambassadeur, Ministère des Affaires étrangères, Rome

Mr. G. TROTTA, Magistrat de Cour d'Appel, Conseiller juridique,
Ministère des Affaires étrangères, Rome

SWITZERLAND

Mr. M. ROCHAIX, Directeur, Station fédérale de recherches agronomiques,
Lausanne

Mr. G. BODMER, Chef de section diplomatique, Division des organisations
internationales, Département politique fédéral, Berne

Mr. R. KÄMPF, Chef de section, Bureau fédéral de la propriété
intellectuelle, Berne

Mr. R. GFELLER, Adjoint scientifique, Division de l'agriculture,
Département fédéral de l'économie publique, Berne

III. OTHER INTERESTED STATES

AUSTRIA

Dr. R. MEINX, Direktor, Bundesanstalt für Pflanzenbau und Samenprüfung,
Vienna

FINLAND

Dr. K.R. MANNER, Institute of Plant Breeding, Jokioinen

HUNGARY

Dr. Z. SZILVASSY, Vice-President, Hungarian Patent Office, Budapest

Dr. G. PALOS, Legal Adviser, Patent Office, Budapest

IRELAND

Mr. T. O'SULLIVAN, Senior Agricultural Inspector, Cereal Station,
Ballinacurra, Midleton, Co. Cork

Mr. C.B. DEVLIN, Agricultural Inspector, Department of Agriculture
and Fisheries, Dublin

Mr. D. HICKEY, Assistant Principal, Agricultural Production Division,
Department of Agriculture and Fisheries, Dublin

JAPAN

Mr. M. NISHIMURA, Technical Official, Vegetable and Flower Division,
Raw Silk and Horticulture Bureau, Ministry of Agriculture and
Forestry, Tokyo

Mr. S. KATAOKA, Managing Director, Japan Campaign for the Promotion
on a Plant Patent Law, Tokyo

SOUTH AFRICA

Mr. J.A. Thomas, Attaché agricole, Ambassade d'Afrique du Sud,
Paris

SPAIN

Mr. L. MIRO-GRANADA, Ingénieur agronome, Dirección General de la
Producción Agraria, Ministerio de Agricultura, Madrid

Dr. J. MIRANDA DE ONIS, Ingénieur agronome, Instituto Nacional de
Investigaciones Agrarias, Departamento de Catalogación y Conservación
de Variedades, Ciudad Universitaria, Madrid

Dr. M. VADELL, Ingénieur agronome, Instituto Nacional de Semillas,
Ciudad Universitaria, Madrid

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Mr. B.M. LEESE, Jr., Chief Examiner, U.S. Department of Agriculture,
Agriculture Marketing Service, Grains Division, Plant Variety
Protection Office, Hyattsville, Md.

IV. OFFICERS

Professor Dr. L. PIELEN, Bonn - Chairman

Mr. A. DE ZEEUW, The Hague - Vice-Chairman

V. REPRESENTATIVES OF UPOV

Professor G.H.C. BODENHAUSEN, Secretary General

Mr. H. SKOV, Vice Secretary General

VI. REPRESENTATIVES OF WIPO

Mr. M. LAGESSE, Counsellor, Administrative Division

Mr. A. JACCARD, Head, Financial Section

Mr. D. DEVLIN, Legal Assistant, Industrial Property Division

/End of Annex
and of document/