

WIPO



13/490
PCT/AAQ/IV/9

ORIGINAL: English

DATE: October 27, 1973

WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION
UNITED INTERNATIONAL BUREAU FOR THE PROTECTION OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
GENEVA

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

INTERIM ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTIONS

Fourth Session: Tokyo, October 22 to 27, 1973

REPORT

prepared by the International Bureau

INTRODUCTION

1. The "PCT Interim Advisory Committee for Administrative Questions" (hereinafter referred to as "the Interim Committee") held its fourth session in Tokyo, at the invitation of the Japanese Government, from October 22 to 27, 1973.
2. The members of the Interim Committee are those States--39 in number--which have signed, or acceded to, the PCT, and, pursuant to a decision of the Executive Committee of the Paris Union, any other country which pledges a special contribution to the PCT budget. There is one State, Australia, which so far has qualified under the latter criterion. The following 17 States were represented: Austria, Brazil, Canada, Finland, France, Germany (Federal Republic of), Hungary, Iran, Japan, Netherlands, Norway, Romania, Soviet Union, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom, United States of America. The Philippines were represented by an observer. The following 21 were not represented: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Denmark, Egypt, Holy See, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Monaco, Senegal, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Yugoslavia.
3. One intergovernmental organization, the International Patent Institute (IIB), was represented by an observer.
4. The following six non-governmental organizations were represented by observers: Asian Patent Attorneys Association (APAA), International Association for the Protection of Industrial Property (AIPPI), International Chamber of Commerce (ICC), International Federation of Patent Agents (FICPI), Pacific Industrial Property Association (PIPA), Union of European Patent Agents (UNEPA).
5. The number of participants was approximately 60. The list of participants is annexed to this report.

OPENING STATEMENTS

6. The session was opened by the First Deputy Director General of WIPO, Dr. Arpad Bogoch. He stressed the importance of Japan in the field of industry in general and industrial property in particular, resulting from the position of its industry in producing consumer goods and from the worldwide recognition of the quality and ingenuity of its products. Japan had actively participated

in the program of WIPO in the field of industrial property and particularly in the elaboration of the PCT. It was therefore most appropriate for WIPO to hold an important meeting in the framework of the PCT in Tokyo, the more so, as that Treaty, once it entered into force, would be of great benefit both for Japanese industry and for the Japanese Patent Office. Recent weeks had shown several encouraging signs of progress towards the entry into force of the PCT. During the Munich Diplomatic Conference concerning the European Patent Convention, most Western European States had reiterated their intention to ratify the PCT and the European conventions at the same time. In the United States of America, the draft legislation necessary for the implementation of the PCT had recently been introduced in Congress and the Treaty itself had been the subject of hearings before the Senate, during which ratification had found unanimous support. In the Soviet Union, preparations for the entry into force of the PCT were continuing vigorously. Among the Latin American countries, Brazil was engaged in a large scale modernization of its patent system which would allow it to take full advantage of the PCT. Several African countries had already ratified the PCT. The particular interest of Japan in the Treaty was clearly evidenced by the fact that the Japanese Government had decided to host the present session of the PCT Interim Committees. WIPO was extremely grateful to the Japanese authorities, and in particular to the Japanese Patent Office, for the excellent facilities put at the disposal of the Committees, for the enormous amount of preparatory work connected with the organization of the meeting, and for the cordial hospitality extended to the participants.

7. Mr. Hideo Saito, Director General of the Japanese Patent Office, welcomed the participants on behalf of the Government of Japan. He underlined that the recent diplomatic conferences in the field of industrial property--in particular the conferences this year on the Trademark Registration Treaty (TRT) and the European Patent Convention (EPC)--illustrated the steady progress of unification and international cooperation in the field of industrial property. Japan had taken an active part in the work concerning the PCT and hoped that the sessions of the PCT Interim Committees now held in Tokyo would constitute an important step forward towards early implementation of the Treaty. Japan was keeping pace with the growing international activity in the patent field. A revision of the national patent legislation was under progress in order to adapt the national law to the PCT and thus to facilitate its early ratification. Japan was the first country to conclude an Agreement with the International Patent Documentation Center (INPADOC) in Vienna providing for the exchange of patent information. Japan expected to participate in the PAL system of INSPEC. Important efforts were being made in the field of centralized storage and dissemination of patent information through the creation of the Japan Patent Information Center. Japan was also giving technical assistance to developing countries in the patent field by providing and distributing English language abstracts of patent information useful to such countries. It was hoped that the current sessions of the PCT Interim Committees would facilitate the preparations for the implementation of the PCT, which Japan would wish to continue, keeping step with the leading countries of the world, and that they would thus be of assistance also to Japan in its efforts to participate as soon as possible in the PCT.

OFFICERS OF THE SESSION

8. The Interim Committee unanimously elected Mr. H. Mast (Germany (Federal Republic of)) as Chairman and Mr. L.A. Inozemtsev (Soviet Union) and Mr. A.M. Laidlaw (Canada) as Vice-Chairmen.

9. Mr. K. Pfanner, Senior Counsellor, Head of the Industrial Property Division, WIPO, acted as Secretary of the Interim Committee.

AGENDA

10. The Interim Committee adopted its agenda as contained in document PCT/AAQ/IV/1 Rev.Rev.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

11. The representative of the United States of America assured the Interim Committee of the continued interest of his country in moving towards early implementation of the PCT. He stated that two important steps essential to ratifica-

tion of the PCT had recently been taken. On September 21, 1973, a Bill had been introduced in the United States Senate containing the implementing legislation necessary for carrying out the provisions of the PCT. Secondly, on October 9, 1973, hearings had been held before the competent Committee of the United States Senate on the question of the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification of the PCT. On October 11, the Committee had favorably reported on the PCT to the Plenary of the Senate. It was expected that the Senate would act within the very near future in giving its advice and consent to ratification of the PCT. He added that hearings on the Strasbourg Agreement Concerning the International Patent Classification had been held before the competent Committee of the Senate on October 9, 1973. That Agreement had also been favorably reported on by the said Committee to the Plenary of the Senate on October 11, 1973.

ADMINISTRATIVE INSTRUCTIONS

12. Discussions were based on document PCT/AAQ/IV/2 (Draft Administrative Instructions) and document PCT/AAQ/IV/5 (Proposals of Germany (Federal Republic of)).

13. The Interim Committee proceeded to consider the draft of the Administrative Instructions section by section. A number of delegations made detailed comments, which are set forth below. The comments of a mere drafting nature were noted by the Secretariat for the purpose of further revision of the Administrative Instructions but they have not been reproduced in this report. All sections of the draft not referred to in the following paragraphs were approved by the Interim Committee without comment or subject only to comments of a mere drafting nature.

Section 002

14. The representative of the United States of America suggested that the forms which are used for correspondence solely between the receiving Offices or the International Searching Authority on the one hand and the applicant on the other hand should not be of obligatory nature. The number of forms of obligatory nature should be limited.

15. The representatives of the Soviet Union, Sweden and Japan shared the view of the representative of the United States of America that the number of forms of obligatory nature should be limited.

16. The representatives of France and Romania stated that it was highly desirable that all forms to be adopted be standardized both as to contents and as to layout.

17. The representative of WIPO was of the opinion that that question should be studied in more detail when the forms were again submitted to the Interim Committee for review.

18. The representative of Switzerland, supported by the representative of the United States of America, was not in favor of a case by case consideration of the obligatory character of the forms. For a determination of that question one should apply the following three principles:

- (i) three forms, namely the request form, the search report form and the preliminary examination report form, should be obligatory both as to their contents and as to their layout;
- (ii) all forms affecting the rights of the applicant, for instance by fixing time limits, should be obligatory as to their contents but optional as to their layout;
- (iii) all other forms which were essentially communications of an informative nature could be optional both as to their contents and as to their layout.

19. The representative of WIPO was of the opinion that an examination on a case by case basis was necessary and that general principles would not suffice. Already during a consideration of the forms before the Standing Subcommittee of the Interim Committee for Technical Cooperation, an attempt had been made to solve the problem by formulating general principles but the solution finally retained after examination of all forms was that, with the exception of three forms, all were considered to be of an obligatory nature.

20. In conclusion, the Interim Committee agreed to Section 002 as presented in the draft with the following proviso:

- (i) the parts in brackets in paragraphs (a) and (b) and the footnote should be deleted;
- (ii) a footnote to paragraph (c) would state the possibility for the later addition of further cases of non-obligatory forms and of a special provision for cases in which forms should be obligatory only as to contents but optional as to their layout.

Section 003

21. The representative of the United Kingdom queried the meaning of the words "otherwise by the practice of the International Bureau" in paragraph (d).

22. The representative of WIPO replied that the International Bureau had established a certain practice with respect to countries not having either English or French as an official language as to which of the two languages they wished to be used in correspondence from WIPO.

23. The representative of Romania suggested that in the case of paragraph (d) the receiving Offices should be consulted as to their choice of the language in which they desired to receive correspondence.

24. The representative of Japan raised the question whether, in the absence of any provision dealing with the language of correspondence which was addressed by the receiving Offices or the International Searching Authorities to the International Bureau, the Japanese Patent Office would be able to correspond with the International Bureau in Japanese. The representative of WIPO stated that the language of correspondence addressed to the International Bureau was neither regulated in Rule 92 nor in the Administrative Instructions. Whereas for the forms Japanese as one of the languages of the international application could be used, the question in what languages the International Bureau could accept correspondence depended on the rules with respect to working languages and languages of correspondence, established for the International Bureau by the General Assembly of WIPO. Here certain limits were necessary depending on the language proficiency of the staff and on budgetary considerations. These rules would, however, be applied with a certain flexibility. The question whether, under the PCT, correspondence in a certain language could be admitted by the International Bureau would largely depend on the number of PCT applications filed in that language. In other words, if many PCT applications should eventually be filed in German, Japanese or Russian, this would have its bearing on the question of language of correspondence. This depended, however, on developments which could not be foreseen, including the provision of adequate translation facilities in the International Bureau. Under these circumstances, it was preferable not to attempt at present to make rules on this subject. The Interim Committee agreed with this conclusion.

Section 102

25. The representative of the Netherlands drew the attention of the Interim Committee to the fact that the ISO standard for the indication of dates provided for a sequence opposite to that retained for the indication of dates in Section 102. The Administrative Instructions should follow the reverse order as recommended in the ISO standard.

26. The representatives of Sweden and Austria, indicating that the modern trend was in favor of the ISO standard, suggested that Section 102 should allow for the possibility of use of the ISO standard. The representative of Austria added that an adaptation of Section 102 to the ISO standard could be a precedent for later revision of ICIREPAT standards.

27. Upon a suggestion of the representative of WIPO, the Interim Committee agreed to include in brackets both solutions as alternatives and to leave the question open as long as necessary and possible. A footnote should explain the alternatives and state that the Administrative Instructions should eventually follow the practice which would generally be adopted in the field of industrial property.

Section 106

28. The Interim Committee after considerable discussion suggested the following amendments to Section 106: in the first line "shall" should be replaced by "should"; in item (iii) the heading should read "Disclosure of Invention", following a proposal by the representative of the United Kingdom; with respect to item (v) the Interim Committee, following a proposal by the representative of the Netherlands that the word "Best" should be deleted from the heading or that the words "Best Mode" should be replaced by the word "Examples", decided after a thorough discussion not to accept that proposal. It did decide, however, to delete the word "Claimed" from the heading.

Section 108

29. The representatives of the United States of America and UNEPA stated that the notion of the "first filed separate power of attorney" in paragraphs (a) and (b) of Section 108 was unclear and should be reviewed. The representative of WIPO said that a revised version of the Section would have to make it clear that the provision did not apply in the case of a power of attorney which was revoked.

Section 203

30. Upon a suggestion by the representative of the Soviet Union, it was agreed to clarify Section 203 by providing that the procedure of deletion must be applied to all copies of the international application.

Section 205

31. Following suggestions by the representatives of the Soviet Union and the United States of America, it was agreed to generalize Section 205 by providing that the various copies of the international application should be stamped and their identity verified not only in the case where the applicant had filed several copies but also where additional copies were prepared by the receiving Office itself.

32. The representative of the United States of America furthermore suggested that this provision should not leave the applicant the choice of indicating the copy to be used as the record copy. That choice should be left to the receiving Office, which would then have the possibility to choose the copy most suitable for reproduction purposes.

Section 207

33. With respect to the international application number, the representative of the Soviet Union proposed to clarify whether the year to be indicated in that number was that of the filing date or that of the date when the international application number was allotted. Furthermore, the serial number to be used by each receiving Office should at least provide for five digits in order to facilitate computer processing of the bibliographic data of the international application.

34. The representative of WIPO stated that the year to be included in the number should be that in which the international application was filed. A uniform number of digits for the serial number was certainly useful for the purposes of computer processing, but in cases where, as a consequence of a high number of annual filings, five digits would be fully used for the serial number as such, at least an additional digit should be provided for in order to permit correction runs in the course of computer processing.

35. The representatives of the Soviet Union and of Austria supported the proposal to provide for an additional digit for correction purposes.

36. The Interim Committee agreed to provide for a uniform minimum number of digits for the serial numbers to be used by the receiving Offices. The serial numbers should at least provide for five digits and should contain an additional digit for correction purposes.

37. Following a discussion of the question whether the year indicated in the international application number would have to be changed in cases where the international application was post-dated, the Interim Committee agreed with the suggestion of the Chairman that no change of the number should be made in such cases.

Section 209

38. Upon a suggestion by the Chairman, the Interim Committee agreed that the question should be examined whether Section 209 would not have to cover also the case of the later submitted sheets under Rule 20.2(a)(ii).

39. The representative of the United States of America suggested that paragraph (a) should cover all corrections resulting in a change of the date of receipt of the purported international application.

40. The representatives of Switzerland, Japan and the United States of America suggested the deletion of the text in brackets contained in paragraph (b)(ii) and (iii).

41. The Interim Committee agreed that Section 209 should be revised on the basis of the views expressed above.

Section 210

42. It was agreed to delete the text in brackets in paragraph (b)(ii) and (iii).

Section 211

43. The representative of the United Kingdom noted that it was not possible to maintain the original numbering of the sheets if the replacement sheets were fewer or more in number than the sheets replaced. He further noted that the same point arose with respect to Section 502.

44. The Interim Committee agreed that the present wording of Section 211 did not cover that case and should be revised accordingly.

Section 212

45. The representative of Austria observed that no corresponding two-letter codes were provided for under Parts D and F with respect to the International Searching Authority and the International Preliminary Examining Authority.

Section 303

46. The representative of Germany (Federal Republic of) stated that the sequence of items (i) and (ii) under paragraph (a) was in the reverse order of the sequence followed in the INPADOC Agreements of Cooperation. He proposed that the INPADOC sequence be adopted. He further proposed that item (iv) of paragraph (a), item (vi) of paragraph (b) and item (v) of paragraph (c) refer also to the relevant figures of the drawings.

47. The representative of the Netherlands proposed that item (ii) of paragraph (c) should read "number of volume and date of issue". Also, paragraph (d) should distinguish between the case where an abstract was published as part of another document and where it was published separately.

48. The representative of WIPO suggested that the wording "if pertinent" in items (iv) and (v) of paragraph (c) should be reconsidered.

49. The representative of the Netherlands responded that, in his view, those words could be deleted from item (iv) of paragraph (c), but as to item (iv) of paragraph (a), item (vi) of paragraph (b) and item (v) of paragraph (c), the words "if pertinent" should stand since the elements contained in these items were not always relevant.

50. With respect to paragraph (b)(iv), placed in brackets, the representative of Japan stated that, in his view, this item was an indispensable element in the identification of a book and that the citation of this element was consistent with Japanese practice.

51. The representative of the Netherlands remarked with respect to the proposal made by the representative of Japan that, if a book were not contained in the library, difficulties would arise in ordering the book without having the name of the publisher available.
52. The representative of the United States of America, while in principle agreeing with the representative of the Netherlands, remarked that, if only isolated pages of a book were contained in the search file, the searcher would have to order the book first in order to be able to cite the name of the publisher.
53. The Interim Committee agreed to maintain paragraph (b)(iv).
54. The representative of the United States of America suggested that under paragraph (d) an element should be included to indicate the source of the abstract. This proposal will be further examined.
55. The representative of Sweden suggested providing in paragraph (a) a new item (iv), according to which the International Searching Authorities could add "any other pertinent data necessary for the identification of the document". This proposal was approved.
56. The representative of Austria suggested clarifying the fact that the order of the elements contained in Section 303 was mandatory for citation purposes, by adding for that purpose at the end of the introductory portion the words "in that order". This proposal was approved.
57. The Interim Committee agreed to revise Section 303 in accordance with the views expressed.

Section 305

58. The representative of Germany (Federal Republic of) presented his proposal set forth in document PCT/AAQ/IV/5.
59. The representative of the Netherlands, supported by the representatives of Japan and the United States of America, pointed out that the proposal of the representative of Germany (Federal Republic of) relating to Section 305 was already essentially implemented in the printed draft of the international search report form contained in document PCT/AAQ/IV/4 (which provides for an identification of citations of particular relevance by the insertion of a letter in the appropriate column of the form). The solution of the problem proposed in that draft form was preferable to that of the proposal contained in document PCT/AAQ/IV/5.
60. The Interim Committee agreed to redraft Section 305 in conformity with the solution adopted in the printed draft of the international search report form contained in document PCT/AAQ/IV/4.

Section 306

61. The Interim Committee accepted the suggestion of the representative of the IIB to provide in paragraph (b) of Section 306 for a notification to the applicant where comments which were not timely submitted were nevertheless considered in establishing the translation.

Section 308

62. The representative of Germany (Federal Republic of) introduced his proposal contained in document PCT/AAQ/IV/5.
63. After the representatives of the United Kingdom and Japan had drawn the attention of the Interim Committee to the fact that it was too complicated for the International Searching Authorities to distinguish the various types of prior art referred to in the proposal under consideration, the representative of Germany (Federal Republic of) amended his proposal so as to provide for only one form of identification common to all types of prior art referred to therein, by using a letter as in the international search report form contained in document PCT/AAQ/IV/4.

64. The representative of the IIB supported the amended proposal of the representative of Germany (Federal Republic of). He stated that the experience of the IIB had shown that it was advantageous to draw special attention to those citations in the search report which defined the general state of the art. In his view, it should not be mandatory that the International Searching Authorities must specially search for documents relating to the general state of the art, but that, if such documents were revealed during the search, they should be indicated in the international search report.

65. The representative of the United States of America suggested that the amended proposal under discussion be further modified to express the fact that the citation of those references was not mandatory for the International Searching Authorities.

66. The representatives of the United Kingdom, Japan and the Netherlands stated that they could accept the amended proposal under discussion as further modified by the representative of the United States of America.

67. The Interim Committee approved Section 308 on the basis of the amended proposal of the representative of Germany (Federal Republic of) as further modified by the representative of the United States of America. The representative of WIPO expressed the view that this conclusion seemed to be at variance with the obligations under the PCT and reserved his position as to the next draft of this Section. The representatives of Sweden and the AIPPI shared this view.

Section 404

68. The representative of Germany (Federal Republic of) suggested that, in order to maintain a sequential order in the files of the published international applications, it would be better to have a new numbering series for the international publication.

69. The representative of the Netherlands agreed that the storage and binding of the published international applications would be extremely difficult if there was no sequence in the numbering series. Alternatively, he suggested that if one were to adopt a publication number corresponding to the application number, blank sheets containing the missing numbers resulting from withdrawals would have to be inserted in the files or in the bound volumes.

70. The representative of WIPO pointed out that, since the PCT provided for groups of international application numbers to be assigned to different receiving Offices, a continuation of this numbering system for the international publication presented practical difficulties. For that reason also, it was preferable to adopt a new numbering series for the international publication.

71. The representatives of Switzerland, Sweden, France and the IIB expressed their preference for a new numbering series for the international publication.

72. The representative of the IIB observed that if a two-digit designation for the year of publication were included in the numbering series, it would be much easier to identify the year of publication and this would facilitate the search for prior art.

Annexes

73. With respect to Annex D, which sets forth an example of a front page of the pamphlet, the representative of Germany (Federal Republic of) proposed the use of the INID code in connection with the bibliographic data and suggested the inclusion of the title of the invention and of the classification symbols in the part containing the bibliographic data. In respect of Annex E, containing information from the front page to be included in the Gazette, he suggested that the date of publication was not necessary, but that references to the title of the invention, the drawings and the abstract should be included.

74. The representative of WIPO stated in this context that the Gazette entry would be reproduced from the front page of the pamphlet and that it would consequently not be practical to admit differences. The proposal of the representative of Germany (Federal Republic of) should be reconsidered in this light.

75. The Interim Committee agreed that the Annexes should be revised to reflect all changes resulting from the suggestions adopted in respect of the provisions of the Administrative Instructions.

CONSIDERATION OF THE DRAFT FORMS

76. Discussions were based on document PCT/AAQ/IV/3.

77. On a request for clarification made by the representative of Canada with regard to the examination for compliance with Rule 9, the representative of WIPO confirmed that such an examination was not mandatory for a receiving Office.

78. After a discussion, in which several delegations announced that they would submit a number of detailed remarks concerning the forms in writing to the International Bureau, the Interim Committee agreed to postpone further consideration of the forms until a later session. It was agreed that written observations on the forms should be submitted to the International Bureau by February 28, 1974. Thereafter the International Bureau would prepare a revised version of the forms, taking into account the observations made.

79. The Interim Committee agreed furthermore to establish a Working Group on Forms. This Working Group, to which all members of the Interim Committee would be invited, should be composed of specialists in the field of standardization of Patent Office procedures. The Working Group will be convened by the International Bureau as soon as a revised draft of the forms has been communicated. Its task will be to examine the revised draft of the forms in detail before any further consideration of the forms by the Interim Committee itself. The Working Group will also consider the question of the mandatory or optional character of the forms and will deal with questions of the layout of the forms.

CONSIDERATION OF THE PRINTED FORMS

80. Discussions were based on document PCT/AAQ/IV/4.

81. The Interim Committee agreed to refer further consideration of this question to the Working Group on Forms. The International Bureau will submit a revised draft of the printed forms to the Working Group, taking into account any observations received by February 28, 1974, on that subject.

REPORT ON THE RESULTS OF THE MUNICH DIPLOMATIC CONFERENCE

82. Discussions were based on document PCT/AAQ/IV/6.

83. The representative of WIPO, in introducing document PCT/AAQ/IV/6, gave an oral report on the results of the Munich Diplomatic Conference for the Setting Up of a European System for the Grant of Patents (September 10 to October 5, 1973), as far as the results of that Conference were related to the PCT.

PROGRAM OF THE INTERIM COMMITTEE FOR 1974

84. The representative of the United States of America stated that the program of the Interim Committee should be kept to an essential minimum in view of the fact that the PCT budget during the interim period was based on special contributions only.

85. In the light of the discussions which took place during its fourth session, the Interim Committee approved the following program for the year 1974:

- (i) continuation of the elaboration of the Administrative Instructions;
- (ii) continuation of the work on the forms, first within the framework of the Working Group on Forms, which will consider in detail a revised version of the forms, and thereafter, on the basis of a version of the forms approved by the Working Group, again within the framework of the Interim Committee itself;

- (iii) preparation of a first draft of a guideline setting forth the duties of the receiving Offices under the PCT;
- (iv) preparation of a first draft of a guideline for applicants using the PCT;
- (v) preparation of a draft model agreement between the International Bureau and an International Searching Authority.

CLOSING STATEMENTS

86. Mr. K. Pfanner, Senior Counsellor, Head of the Industrial Property Division, WIPO, renewed the expression of gratitude on behalf of WIPO to the Government of Japan and in particular to the Japanese Patent Office for hosting this important series of sessions of the PCT Interim Committees in Tokyo. The Conference facilities put at the disposal of the Committees were excellent, and the Japanese authorities had made an enormous effort in skillful and efficient organization, both at the preparatory stage and during the meetings, in order to ensure a smooth and fruitful conduct of the business. The many signs of warm hospitality shown by the Japanese hosts throughout the sessions deserved a special word of gratitude. He thanked in particular Director General Hideo Saito, Engineer General Kotaro Otani and Counsellor Kazuaki Takami for their important personal contribution to the success of the sessions.

87. The Chairman, Mr. H. Mast (Germany (Federal Republic of)), thanked on behalf of the Interim Committee the Government of Japan for the excellent organization of the session and the kind hospitality offered to the participants.

88. Mr. Hideo Saito, Director General of the Japanese Patent Office, thanked the preceding speakers in the name of the Government of Japan for the words of gratitude extended to the Japanese authorities. He expressed his appreciation for the spirit of international cooperation demonstrated by all participants throughout the meetings and commended the PCT Interim Committees for the fruitful results achieved during the Tokyo sessions. He expressed the hope that the Tokyo sessions would not only promote the implementation of the PCT, but also contribute to a better understanding of Japan and its special situation. Finally, he assured the Committees of the continued active interest of his country in the successful continuation of their work.

89. This Report was unanimously adopted by the Interim Committee at its closing meeting on October 27, 1973.

/Annex follows/

LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS/
LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

I. ETATS MEMBRES/MEMBER STATES

ALLEMAGNE (REPUBLIQUE FEDERALE D')/GERMANY (FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF)

- Mr. H. MAST, Ministerialrat, Federal Ministry of Justice, Bonn
Mr. K.-H. HOFMANN, Abteilungspräsident, German Patent Office, Berlin Branch,
Berlin

AUTRICHE/AUSTRIA

- Mr. G. GALL, Oberkommissär, Ministry of Commerce, Trade and Industry,
Industrial Property Section, Vienna

BRESIL/BRAZIL

- Mr. G.R. COARACY, Chief, Patent Information Center, National Institute of
Industrial Property, Brasilia
Mr. A.C. BANDEIRA, Secretary of Information and Transfer of Technology, Assistant
to the President, National Institute of Industrial Property, Brasilia

CANADA

- Mr. A.M. LAIDLAW, Assistant Deputy Minister, Bureau of Intellectual Property,
Hull, Quebec
Mr. J. CORBEIL, Conseiller, Bureau de la propriété intellectuelle, Hull, Québec

ETATS-UNIS D'AMERIQUE/UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

- Mr. W.I. MERKIN, Assistant Commissioner, U.S. Patent Office, Washington, D.C.
Mr. H.D. HOINKES, Legislative and International Patent Specialist, U.S. Patent
Office, Washington, D.C.
Mr. F.J. COHEN, Head, Planning, Procurement and Foreign Documentation Branch,
U.S. Patent Office, Washington, D.C.
Mr. G.R. CLARK, General Patent Counsel, Sunbeam Corporation, Chicago, Ill.

FINLANDE/FINLAND

- Mr. E. WUORI, Deputy Director, Finnish Patent Office, Helsinki

FRANCE

- Mr. P. GUERIN, Attaché de Direction, Institut national de la propriété
industrielle, Paris

HONGRIE/HUNGARY

- Mr. E. TASNÁDI, President, National Office of Inventions, Budapest
Mr. G. BÁNREVY, Assistant Director General, Ministry of Foreign Trade, Budapest

IRAN

- M. G. RAISSIAN, Sous-Secrétaire d'Etat, Ministère de la Justice, Téhéran
M. H. JAMSHIDI, Directeur, Office d'enregistrement des sociétés et de la propriété industrielle, Téhéran

JAPON/JAPAN

- Mr. H. SAITO, Director-General, Japanese Patent Office, Tokyo
Mr. K. OTANI, Engineer-General, Japanese Patent Office, Tokyo
Mr. H. SAEGUSA, Director-General, General Administration Department, Japanese Patent Office, Tokyo
Mr. I. SHAMOTO, Appeal Examiner-in-Chief, Department of Appeals, Japanese Patent Office, Tokyo
Mr. Y. HASHIMOTO, Director of Moulding Machinery Division, Third Examination Department, Japanese Patent Office, Tokyo
Mr. K. TAKAMI, Counsellor for International Affairs, General Administration Department, Japanese Patent Office, Tokyo
Mr. K. ICHIOKA, Head of the Specialized Agencies Division, United Nations Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Tokyo

NORVEGE/NORWAY

- Mr. I. AUNE, Civil Engineer, Head, Examining Department, Norwegian Patent Office, Oslo

PAYS-BAS/NETHERLANDS

- M. J. DEKKER, Vice-président, Bureau pour la propriété industrielle, La Haye

PHILIPPINES

- Mr. M.R. DE JOYA, Attache, Embassy of the Philippines, Tokyo

ROUMANIE/ROMANIA

- M. L. MARINETE, Directeur, Office d'Etat pour les inventions et les marques, Bucarest
M. I. CAMENITA, Conseiller juridique, Office d'Etat pour les inventions et les marques, Bucarest

ROYAUME-UNI/UNITED KINGDOM

- Mr. A.F.C. MILLER, Principal Examiner, Patent Office, London

SUEDE/SWEDEN

- Mr. S. LEWIN, Head of Division, Royal Patent and Registration Office, Stockholm
Mr. L. TÖRNROTH, Head of Section, Royal Patent and Registration Office, Stockholm

SUISSE/SWITZERLAND

- M. J.-L. COMTE, Directeur adjoint, Bureau fédéral de la propriété intellectuelle, Berne

UNION DES REPUBLIQUES SOCIALISTES SOVIETIQUES/UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

- Mr. L.A. INOZEMTSEV, Expert, State Committee of the Council of Ministers of the USSR for Inventions and Discoveries, Moscow
- Mr. L.E. KOMAROV, Director, All-Union Research Institute of State Patent Examination, Moscow
- Mr. A.S. IGNATIEV, Expert, State Committee of the Council of Ministers of the USSR for Inventions and Discoveries, Moscow

II. ORGANISATION INTERGOUVERNEMENTALE/INTERGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATION

INSTITUT INTERNATIONAL DES BREVETS (IIB)/INTERNATIONAL PATENT INSTITUTE

- M. A. VANDECASTEELE, Conseiller au Service technique, La Haye

III. ORGANISATIONS NON GOUVERNEMENTALES/NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

ASIAN PATENT ATTORNEYS ASSOCIATION (APAA)

- Mr. K. YUASA, Yuasa and Hara, President of APAA, Tokyo
- Mr. M. OKABE, Okabe International Patent Office, Council of APAA, Tokyo
- Mr. K. ASAMURA, Asamura Patent Office, Member of APAA, Tokyo
- Mr. K. INOMATA, Vice-President, Kyowa Patent and Law Office, Tokyo

ASSOCIATION INTERNATIONALE POUR LA PROTECTION DE LA PROPRIETE INDUSTRIELLE (AIPPI)/
INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROTECTION OF INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY

- Mr. G.R. CLARK, First Vice-President, AIPPI, Chicago, Ill.
- Mr. S. MATSUI, Director, Patent and Licence Department, Takeda Chemical Industries, Ltd., Tokyo
- Mr. M. TAKEDA, Member of the Executive Committee of AIPPI, Nakamatsu International Patent and Law Office, Tokyo
- Mr. A. AOKI, Member of the Japanese Group of AIPPI, Tokyo
- Mr. A. SUGIMURA, Executive Member of the Japanese Group of AIPPI, Sugimura International Patent and Trade Mark Agency Bureau, Tokyo
- Mr. K. TOYOSAKI, Member of the Japanese Group of AIPPI, Tokyo
- Mr. A. KUKIMOTO, Patent Attorney, Member of the Japanese Group of AIPPI, Tokyo
- Mr. N. OSHIMA, Member of the Japanese Group of AIPPI, Tokyo
- Mr. N. MATSUBARA, Member of the Japanese Group of AIPPI, Tokyo

CHAMBRE DE COMMERCE INTERNATIONALE (CCI)/INTERNATIONAL CHAMBER OF COMMERCE (ICC)

- Mr. T. FUJII, Tokyo
- Mr. F. YOSHIDA, Senior Staff Member of Patent Department, Teijin Ltd., Tokyo
- Mr. S. ICHIKAWA, General Manager of Legal Department, Mitsui & Co., Ltd., Tokyo

FEDERATION INTERNATIONALE DES CONSEILS EN PROPRIETE INDUSTRIELLE (FICPI)/
INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF PATENT AGENTS

Mr. A. BRAUN, Patent Attorney, Basel

PACIFIC INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY ASSOCIATION (PIPA)

Mr. M. SUZUKI, First Representative of PIPA, Japanese Group, Manager, Patent Department, Toyota Central Research & Development Laboratory, Inc., Tokyo

Mr. H. SUGINO, Second Representative of PIPA, Japanese Group, General Manager, Patent Division, Tokyo Subaura Electric Co., Ltd., Tokyo

Mr. H. ONO, Chairman of Committee III, PIPA, Japanese Group, Manager, Patent Operation, IBM Japan, Ltd., Tokyo

UNION DES AGENTS DE BREVETS EUROPEENS/UNION OF EUROPEAN PATENT AGENTS (UNEPA)

Mr. W. COHAUSZ, General Secretary of UNEPA, Düsseldorf

Mr. K. HOFFMANN, Assistant General Secretary of UNEPA, Munich

IV. ORGANISATIONS OBSERVATEURS/OBSERVER ORGANIZATIONS

CENTRE INTERNATIONAL DE DOCUMENTATION EN MATIERE DE BREVETS/
INTERNATIONAL PATENT DOCUMENTATION CENTER (INPADOC)

Mr. G. RUBITSCHKA, Head, Commercial Department, Vienna

INSTITUTION OF ELECTRICAL ENGINEERS (INSPEC)

Mr. R.B. COX, Manager, Product Development, London

V. ORGANISATION MONDIALE DE LA PROPRIETE INTELLECTUELLE (OMPI)/
WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION (WIPO)

Dr. Arpad BOGSCH Premier Vice-directeur général/First Deputy Director General

Mr. K. PFANNER Conseiller supérieur, Chef de la Division de la propriété industrielle/Senior Counsellor, Head of the Industrial Property Division

Mr. Y.A. GROMOV Conseiller, Chef de la Section PCT, Division de la propriété industrielle/Counsellor, Head of the PCT Section, Industrial Property Division

Mr. J. KOHNEN Assistant juridique, Section PCT, Division de la propriété industrielle/Légal Assistant, PCT Section, Industrial Property Division

Mr. T. TAKEDA Consultant