

WIPO



E

WO/BC/20/3 – WO/PC/10/3

ORIGINAL: English

DATE: September 4, 1998

WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION
GENEVA

BUDGET COMMITTEE

Twentieth Session
Geneva, September 3 and 4, 1998

PREMISES COMMITTEE

Tenth Session
Geneva, September 3 and 4, 1998

REPORT

adopted by the two Committees

1. The twentieth session of the WIPO Budget Committee and the tenth session of the WIPO Premises Committee, hereinafter referred to as “the two Committees,” were held jointly at the Headquarters of WIPO on September 3 and 4, 1998.
2. The members of the Budget Committee are the following States: Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, China, Ecuador, Egypt, France, Germany, Hungary, India, Jamaica, Japan, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Senegal, Slovakia, South Africa, Switzerland (*ex officio*), United Kingdom, United States of America and Uzbekistan (27). The members of the Premises Committee are the following States: Algeria, China, Colombia, Croatia, France, Germany, India, Nigeria, Paraguay, Russian Federation, Sri Lanka, Switzerland and United States of America (13). The States members of the Budget Committee, of the Premises Committee or of the two Committees

which were represented at the session were the following: Bulgaria, Canada, China, Croatia, Ecuador, Egypt, France, Germany, Hungary, India, Jamaica, Japan, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Paraguay, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Senegal, Slovakia, South Africa, Switzerland, United Kingdom, United States of America (27). In addition, the following States members of WIPO but not members of the Budget Committee or the Premises Committee were represented by observers: Argentina, Bangladesh, Brazil, Kenya, Latvia, Luxembourg, Oman, Poland, Spain, Turkey and Zambia (11). The list of participants is contained in Annex 1 of this report.

3. The session was opened by the Director General of WIPO, who welcomed the participants.
4. The two Committees unanimously elected Mr. Shigeki Sumi (Japan) as Chairman and Mr. Dilip Sinha (India) and Mr. Dimiter Gantchev (Bulgaria) as Vice-Chairmen of the joint session of the two Committees.
5. The Chairman invited any observations on the draft agenda contained in document WO/BC/20/1-WO/PC/10/1.
6. The Delegation of the Netherlands, speaking on behalf of Group B, said that it accepted the agenda but would like to make a remark related to the agenda. The Delegation noted that on the provisional agenda for the meetings of the Assemblies of the Member States of WIPO, to be held next week, there were two items, N° 5 (“Budget Surplus Policy”) and N° 6 (“Special Reserve Fund Policy”) for which there was a feeling within Group B that, in view of the documents submitted for those items, those items might benefit from a full and open discussion within the Budget Committee of WIPO. The Delegation said it would appreciate it if this session of the Budget Committee could ask guidance of the General Assembly next week as to how to pursue this and to treat these items.
7. The Director General said he understood the spirit in which the Delegation of the Netherlands had made its statement, and noted that this was a matter for the General Assembly and the Budget Committee to reach an arrangement, which he thought was entirely feasible. The Director General drew attention to paragraph 79 of the report of the Budget Committee itself on its eighteenth session held from March 23 to 25, 1998, which stated “*The Budget Committee also noted the announcement by the Director General that the International Bureau will make a strategic long-term proposal on the utilization of the budget surplus and the reserve funds in a document for consideration by the Assemblies of the Member States at their next session in September 1998.*” and to paragraph 93 (ii) of the General Report of the Assemblies, held from March 25 to 27, 1998, which “noted that the Director General would make a strategic, long-term proposal on the utilization of the budget surplus and the reserve funds for consideration at their next session in September 1998.” So the reporting of the decisions by the Budget Committee itself and of the Assemblies stated that this was an item to be discussed in September, i.e., next week. However, the Director General saw merit in what the Delegation of the Netherlands had said, provided that it was put in a correct legal context. The General Assembly itself, when convened next week, should perhaps request the Budget Committee to rapidly examine these two items before any formal consideration by the General Assembly itself (but this could not be an automatic procedure without the General Assembly itself referring this matter to the Budget Committee next week). The Director General said

that, if there was an understanding on this, it could be done and he didn't see any difficulty as far as the International Bureau was concerned.

8. The Chairman said that his understanding was that the Budget and Premises Committees would leave this matter to the General Assembly, which would decide whether this issue should come back to the Budget Committee.

9. The two Committees then unanimously adopted the agenda contained in document WO/BC/20/1-WO/PC/10/1.

10. Discussions were based on document WO/BC/20/2-WO/PC/10/2 and WO/GA/23/5 entitled "Premises."

11. The Director General highlighted the four central points in document WO/BC/20/2-WO/PC/10/2. The first point was in relation to the new office building on the new lot; the proposal was to have 500 working places, to give a total of 1,509 working places in the premises owned by WIPO, including the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) Building. The idea, as repeatedly stated, in particular during the consultations of June 22 and July 8, is to have an intelligent, operational, functional building, equipped with the latest information technology facilities. In addition, the newly proposed building would have a car park for 300 vehicles and a 300-seat cafeteria. The second point was related to the new larger conference room, for which delegates knew of the difficulties that Conference Room A has, in particular when it comes to the meetings of the Assemblies. The idea is to have, in the proximity of the conference rooms and meeting rooms of this Organization, a larger room that would have 600 seats, and be equipped with the latest interpretation and audiovisual facilities. The Director General said that the justification was clear. While other facilities were also available in Geneva, and could sometimes accommodate larger meetings, such as in the CICG as would be the case next week, one should take into account the continuing increase in membership of the Organization. WIPO was special in the sense that the private sector has an important stake in the activities of the Organization, and private industry is continuously interested in what the Organization is doing; the non-governmental organizations have a very serious program with WIPO and it is the Secretariat's very solid feeling that the new conference room would be an investment for the Organization into the next century, which would never be regretted because of the increasingly important corporate image of intellectual property, the concerns that the global international intellectual property community shows, and the broad challenges of the next century. In the Secretariat's view, an investment of 12 to 15 million Swiss francs represented a very justified and logical investment for WIPO. Taking into account the growing importance of intellectual property, it was the responsibility of the International Bureau to draw the attention of the delegates to the fact that this was a serious proposal, and the investment in this kind of activity was not only logical but represented the substance of the challenges that were going to face the intellectual property system in the next century. The third point concerned the additional parking facilities, mainly for delegates and visitors, under the main building of WIPO; it was proposed that WIPO have approximately 280 additional parking places, which would result in a total of about 1,000 parking places in the WIPO owned buildings. Finally, the fourth point was the procedural context of where to go from here, the intention being to establish a working group that would prepare the international architectural competition, "international" because the Secretariat is totally committed to a fair competition with an international jury to examine the list of candidates who would submit projects; the international jury would select the candidates, hopefully by May

1999, and by October 1999, it is hoped that the international jury would make a firm selection of the winner or winners. The Director General concluded by saying that if plans go ahead as indicated in the document, it could be expected that the entire project would be completed by the year 2002.

12. The Delegation of Bangladesh noted that the document reflected the outcome of the discussions on these issues on a number of occasions. It agreed that the Secretariat had been very transparent in holding consultations with the Member States. The Delegation was in broad agreement with the proposals made in the document. However, it wondered if the involvement of Member States could be ensured in all stages of the construction. Referring to paragraph 42 of the document, it asked whether Member States would be consulted concerning the appointment of the international jury, and whether it would be possible to include some Member States in that jury, and in particular, proposed that the Chairman and the two Vice-Chairmen of the two Committees (or of the future WIPO Program and Budget Committee) could be members of that jury.

13. The Delegation of the Netherlands, speaking on behalf of Group B, said that the Committees were coming to the close of a debate which had been on the agenda of WIPO for quite a while, and acknowledged that the actual work would only start after the decisions contained in the document had been taken, and that the project, as the Director General mentioned, might be completed hopefully by the year 2002. The Delegation stated that, if there was going to be an emerging consensus in the two Committees today that a decision should be taken as formulated in paragraph 54 of the document, then Group B would be in a position to join that consensus. However, the Delegation suggested that paragraph 54, which covered approving construction of, respectively, the office block, the conference room and the additional parking, and approving the architectural competition, had a missing element, namely, financial information to re-cap what was mentioned in paragraph 51. The Delegation said that, for reasons of clarity and transparency, it would be a good idea to include an extra sub-paragraph in paragraph 54, to mention that the costs related to the entire project would not exceed the maximum amount of 82.5 million Swiss francs, and that if it appeared that the costs were going to exceed that maximum, then the issue would revert back to the Budget and Premises Committees.

14. The Director General said that he totally agreed with what had just been stated by the Delegations of Bangladesh and the Netherlands. With regard to the proposal of the Delegation of Bangladesh, while one was not yet at the stage of deciding who would be the members of the international jury, to ensure transparency and total accountability, there would be merit in perhaps having the current Chairman of the Budget and Premises Committees sit on the international jury in that capacity, and that would ensure a clear follow-up by the Member States on the dynamics and the deliberations of the international jury. One could also have a former senior government representative whose credibility is known and is not challenged. The intention is to make it a really international jury, so that its decisions are not put into doubt or challenged by anybody. As regards the suggestion by the Delegation of the Netherlands, that would cause no difficulty, since if there was any need for further endorsement, then the International Bureau would naturally come back to the Budget and Premises Committees.

15. The Delegation of South Africa, speaking on behalf of the African Group, said, as it had always stated during the previous meetings, the African Group supports the proposal in paragraph 54(a) (b) (c) and (d), and would not have problems in adding another sub-paragraph

on finances in paragraph 54 as was said by the Delegation of the Netherlands. It reiterated its previous proposal that Member States be actively involved in the whole process by the way of consultations.

16. The Delegation of the United States of America, noting that the Committees had spent a long time going down this road, thanked the Secretariat for the excellent work it had done in pulling this package together. The Delegation supported the intention to deal with the new building, the new conference room and the parking lot as one project, as that would involve efficiencies. It also applauded both the commitment to have a total spending limit, as indicated in previous discussions, and the commitment to transparency and accountability throughout the whole process. The Delegation added that it appreciated the patience that the Secretariat had shown in answering every and all possible questions.

17. The Delegation of China expressed its appreciation to the Secretariat for the steps undertaken since the last joint session of the two Committees and for the report provided. With regard to the premises matter, the Delegation raised two concerns, the first being the sufficient size of the new main conference room and the second being extension to the parking lots. These two matters were of importance to all the Member States, because increasing the size of the conference room and the parking space would improve the environment for delegates attending meetings at WIPO. The Delegation said it was essential to fully deliberate on the number of seats contained in the new main conference room and the extension of the parking space to ensure the work was in accordance with the desire of the Member States. The Delegation suggested that the importance of these issues were key points which should not be overlooked.

18. The Secretariat then proposed a text for a new sub-paragraph 54(e) which, following various comments, resulted in the approved text given in paragraph 32, below.

19. The Delegation of United Kingdom thanked the Secretariat for the excellent document and the work that had preceded it. The Delegation had in the past raised concerns over one aspect of the proposal, namely, the justification for a new conference room. It still has some remaining concerns, for example, whether existing suitable facilities near WIPO in Geneva could be used (such as the CICG where next week's meeting would be held). The Delegation also remained unconvinced that six weeks of meetings over a year, as explained in the document, would merit expenditure in the range of 12 to 15 million Swiss francs by the Organization. However, the Delegation also recognized the growing needs of the Organization, particularly as outlined by the Director General, and noted that the construction of a new conference room in conjunction with a new office building would minimize the cost and disruption to the work of the Organization. Therefore, as indicated earlier by the Group B Spokesman, the Delegation would be pleased to join with a consensus at this time on the whole document.

20. The Director General stated that he fully understood the preoccupation of certain delegations regarding the conference room but, as he had stated earlier, said that it was his firm conviction that this represented a real investment for the entire international intellectual community at large. To help understand this proposal, and perhaps also for capitals, an *aide-mémoire* was circulated regarding needs for the larger main conference room, which states very clearly the justification for this, in addition to the financial considerations that had

just been raised by the Delegation of the United Kingdom. The “Aide-Mémoire Regarding Need for Larger Main Conference Room” is contained in Annex 2 of this report.

21. The Delegation of Jamaica also thanked the Secretariat for the document provided for consideration, and offered the following comments. With respect to its paragraph 11, which indicated that there will be several underground connections to link the new building with existing building, the Delegation asked whether perhaps one underground connection may be sufficient with one above-ground connection, as at the *Palais des Nations*, where that appears to work well. With respect to paragraph 35 of the document, the Delegation asked whether the relevant authorities, zoning and traffic authorities, had been contacted regarding having an exit from the parking lot onto *Route de Ferney*. In relation to paragraph 47 of the document, the Delegation suggested that the fact that there could be one winner of each individual section of the competition should be made clearer. The Delegation accepted the new proposal for paragraph 54(e) as well as fully concurring with the sentiment expressed in paragraph 39 of the document with respect to the project being an integrated project, which would lessen the overall construction period for the project.

22. The Secretariat confirmed that the exit onto the *Route de Ferney* had indeed been cleared with the Geneva authorities.

23. The Delegation of Japan added its appreciation for the Secretariat’s effort in preparing the documents. Concerning the new conference room, the Delegation had some concerns on the issue, firstly, regarding the construction cost, especially if compared with a rental fee for the conference room like the CICG. The Delegation urged WIPO to try to cut down unnecessary expenses on the new conference room. The second concern was in relation to its rate of use, since the document suggested that the need for such a larger conference room appeared to be only six weeks a year, as the Delegation of the United Kingdom had mentioned. The Delegation of Japan was thus reluctant to have a new conference room and suggested WIPO should consider measures to increase its usage. Nevertheless, provided that the Secretariat could respond to its concerns and give additional explanations, the Delegation was ready to join the consensus.

24. The Delegation of Senegal thanked the International Bureau and the team that did the important work on finding a solution to the old problem of premises. The Delegation had no problem with the decisions which were being submitted for the approval of the meeting. However, it expressed some misgivings about the usefulness of adding paragraph 54(e) since the amounts stated were just indicative estimates, which could fluctuate for various reasons, in particular, the variation in prices and monetary instability. The Delegation felt, therefore, that WIPO should not run the risk of saying that the expenditures should not go beyond 82.5 million Swiss francs.

25. Responding to some points raised concerning the conference room, the Director General clarified that the six weeks period as indicated in the *aide-mémoire* was just indicative. He added that the Secretariat had been approached in the past by several non-governmental organizations and he also made reference to AIPPI and INTA, which are non-governmental organizations with which WIPO does have very close relationships and for which he would want to be able to offer conference facilities if requested by them. In addition, the Director General stated that whenever this new conference room was not in use by WIPO, the

Secretariat would intend to rent it out to sister organizations and other international organizations.

26. The Delegation of Slovakia stated its appreciation for the progress the Secretariat had made in sorting out the problem of additional working space for WIPO. Slovakia had always been a strong supporter of solving the problem of WIPO's additional working space by purchasing the "Steiner lot", which would provide a good opportunity for constructing a modern architectural structure matching the present WIPO building and making optimal use of available space in a new building. It added that the three main elements of the construction as outlined in the excellent document should provide to WIPO employees as well as to delegates a distinguished place to work. The Delegation pointed especially to the urgent need of having a new large main conference room for meetings like sessions of WIPO Governing Bodies, Diplomatic Conferences and the like, and therefore proposed that this element of construction be expedited. The whole construction was an integrated project and should be therefore treated in an integral way, aesthetically fitting into the local environment. By organizing an international competition and selection of the best proposals by an international jury, the optimal solution of the construction would be obtained and guaranteed, and the target date of end-2002 to complete the construction would thus be maintained. The Delegation considered that the cost estimates presented in paragraph 51 of the document were very reasonable and sound. The Delegation particularly welcomed the proposed process of continuous monitoring and consultations with the member States in a spirit of partnership with the Secretariat; this was another proof of maintaining the principles of accountability and transparency in the WIPO system of work. The Secretariat should not hesitate to call for any extraordinary joint sessions of the Budget and Premises Committees if there was a need for any important decision to be taken or additional funds from the Reserve Fund to be approved. In conclusion, the Delegation reiterated its full support for the steps presented in the document and to the decisions invited of the General Assembly, as stated in paragraph 54, including the new sub-paragraph (e) with a financial ceiling.

27. The Delegation of Mexico gave its entire support to the proposals contained in the document and added that they would be very good for the Organization. It added its support for the inclusion of a new paragraph 54(e) into the document as it would provide a certain number of guarantees. In connection with paragraph 41 of the document, the Delegation of Mexico requested that it would like the announcement of the international architectural competition referred to therein to be sent out at least four months before February 1, 1999, to give full opportunity to those that may be interested to come forward.

28. The Delegation of Croatia, speaking on behalf of the Central European and Baltic States, thanked the Director General and Secretariat for the documents which it considered as very comprehensive. It also thanked the International Bureau for the transparency in the work relating to the item of premises. It expressed its hope that this transparency would continue in the future activities in respect of premises. The Delegation added its support to the proposal from the Delegation of Bangladesh to include in the international jury the Chair of the Budget and Premises Committees. It concluded by joining the consensus and to accept the new paragraph 54(e).

29. The Delegation of the Philippines also expressed its appreciation to the Secretariat. It added its support to the proposals concerning paragraph 54(e). The Delegation reiterated its support for the proposed new conference room, as the construction was not just an expense,

but an investment. One had a choice whether to keep the assets as liquid assets or to convert them into fixed assets. The Delegation made reference to the *aide-mémoire* which indicated that with the expenditure of 12 to 15 million francs on the conference room, there would be a return of 4% or 5% per year, which was comparable to any liquid asset. The Delegation concluded by saying that it was good for the Organization's corporate image and, being an Organization in intellectual property, there was a value in corporate image.

30. The Delegation of Paraguay associated itself with what was stated by the Delegations of Mexico, Bangladesh and the Netherlands. It recognized the growing needs of the Organization and also shared in the concerns of the Organization. The Delegation of Paraguay gave its unconditional support to everything contained in the memorandum of the Director General.

31. With reference to paragraph 40 of the document, which referred to the working party which would prepare the international architectural competition, the Secretariat noted that the Swiss Government had stated that, while it would be happy to offer any assistance, it preferred not to serve on the working party since WIPO would be financing this project from its own resources, and thereby the Swiss Government would be in the same position as the other member States on this matter.

32. Following various comments concerning the proposed paragraph 54(e), the following paragraph was agreed by the two Committees:

“54.(e) To approve the allocation from the Special Reserve Fund for Additional Premises and Computerization of the maximum amount of 82.5 million Swiss francs for the execution of the aforementioned projects, it being understood that no additional expenditure on the projects over that amount could be undertaken without prior authorization from the Budget and Premises Committees and the General Assembly.”

33. The Chairman summarized the discussion by stating that it was his understanding that all proposals made by the International Bureau, namely in paragraph 54(a), (b), (c) and (d) of document WO/GA/23/5, and the new paragraph 54(e) as given in the preceding paragraph, were acceptable, and were adopted by the Budget and Premises Committees.

34. The Budget and Premises Committees decided to recommend to the General Assembly:

(a) to approve that the new office building to be constructed on the new lot have at least 500 working places, with the characteristics and facilities described in paragraphs 8 to 11 of document WO/GA/23/5;

(b) to approve that a new main conference room, with approximately 600 seats for delegates, be constructed on WIPO's present land, being integrated with the structure of WIPO's main building, as described in paragraphs 23, 24, 25, 29 and 30 of

document WO/GA/23/5;

(c) to approve the additional parking to be constructed as an extension of the present parking under the main WIPO Building, as described in paragraph 35 of document WO/GA/23/5;

(d) to approve the undertaking of a new international architectural competition for the said office building on the new lot, for the said main conference room and for the said additional parking, as described in document WO/GA/23/5;

(e) to approve the allocation from the Special Reserve Fund for Additional Premises and Computerization of the maximum amount of 82.5 million Swiss francs for the execution of the aforementioned projects, it being understood that no additional expenditure on the projects over that amount could be undertaken without prior authorization from the Budget and Premises Committees and the General Assembly.

35. At the report adoption session, the Director General made the following statement: “Distinguished delegates, I have the sad duty today of announcing to you the tragic and premature death of our two very dear friends and respected colleagues, Ludwig Baeumer and Joachim Bilger. It is a black day for all of us, and a long time will pass before the darkness lifts. The disappearance of Ludwig and Joachim is a terrible event for all of us. They were such great assets for the Secretariat, for the Member States and for me personally. Their dedication, loyalty and professionalism were without parallel, and they died while on the active service of this Organization.”

36. The Chairman observed that Mr. Baeumer and Mr. Bilger were two invaluable staff of the International Bureau, who were well known to delegates. It was a tragic event, particularly to the Chairman as he knew them both well, and knew how valuable they were not only to the Secretariat but also to all the Member States of WIPO. In memory of them both, the Chairman proposed a moment of silence.

37. All participants then observed a moment’s silence in memory of Ludwig Baeumer and Joachim Bilger.

38. The report was adopted by the two Committees.

[Annexes follow]

ANNEXE 1/ANNEX 1

I. ÉTATS MEMBRES/MEMBER STATES

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

AFRIQUE DU SUD/SOUTH AFRICA

Bongiwe QWABE (Ms.), First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

ALLEMAGNE/GERMANY

Li-Feng SCHROCK, Senior Counsellor, Federal Ministry of Justice, Bonn

Ulrich KALBITZER, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva

BULGARIE/BULGARIA

Dimitar GANTCHEV, Minister Plenipotentiary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

CANADA

Quan-Ling SIM, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

CHINE/CHINA

ZHAO Yangling (Mrs.), First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

CROATIE/CROATIA

Nikola KOPČIĆ, Director, State Intellectual Property Office, Zagreb

Gordan MARKOTIĆ, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva

ÉGYPTE/EGYPT

Amr ABDELAZIZ HAFEZ, Third Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

ÉQUATEUR/ECUADOR

Federico MENESES ESPINOSA, Ministro, Misión Permanente, Ginebra

ÉTATS-UNIS D'AMÉRIQUE/UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

James McGLINCHEY, Chief, Office of Intellectual Property and Competition, Department of State, Washington, D.C.

Thaddeus BURNS, Attaché, Office of the United States Trade Representative, Geneva

Soching TSAI (Ms.), First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

Karen JOHNSON (Ms.), First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

FÉDÉRATION DE RUSSIE/RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Alexandr BAVYKIN, Deputy Director, Legal Department, Foreign Ministry, Moscow

Andrei KOVALENKO, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

FRANCE

Rémy ROUL, secrétaire général adjoint, Institut national de la propriété industrielle, Ministère de l'industrie, Paris

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

Barbara KROHER (Mlle), Mission permanente, Genève

HONGRIE/HUNGARY

Margit SÜMEGHY (Mrs.), Head, Legal and International Department, Hungarian Patent Office, Budapest

INDE/INDIA

Dilip SINHA, Minister, Permanent Mission, Geneva

JAMAÏQUE/JAMAICA

Franz HALL, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva

JAPON/JAPAN

Shigeki SUMI, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva

Satoshi MORIYASU, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

Akinori MORI, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

MAROC/MOROCCO

Abdellah BEN MELLOUK, premier secrétaire, Mission permanente, Genève

MEXIQUE/MEXICO

Arturo HERNÁNDEZ BASAVE, Ministro, Misión Permanente, Ginebra

NIGÉRIA/NIGERIA

Yemisi Kikelomo MARCUS (Mrs.), Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva

NORVÈGE/NORWAY

Ingrid MOLLESTAD (Ms.), Second Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

PARAGUAY

Rodrigo UGARRIZA, Primer Secretario, Misión Permanente, Ginebra

PAYS-BAS/NETHERLANDS

Henk G.C. VAN DEN DOOL, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

PHILIPPINES

Leo J. PALMA, Attaché, Permanent Mission, Geneva

RÉPUBLIQUE DE CORÉE/REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Wom Joon KIM, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva

ROYAUME-UNI/UNITED KINGDOM

Helen FRARY (Miss), Second Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

SÉNÉGAL/SENEGAL

Khaly Adama NDOUR, conseiller, Mission permanente, Genève

SLOVAQUIE/SLOVAKIA

Martin HUDOBA, President, Industrial Property Office, Banská Bystrica

Vladimír BANSKÝ, Director, International and PCT Department, Industrial Property Office,
Banská Bystrica

SUISSE/SWITZERLAND

Anne BAUTY (Mme), chef de la Section État-hôte, Division politique III, Berne

II. OBSERVATEURS/OBSERVERS

ARGENTINE/ARGENTINA

Marta GABRIELONI (Sra.), Consejero de Embajada, Misión Permanente, Ginebra

BANGLADESH

Khalilur RAHMAN, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva

BRÉSIL/BRAZIL

Luiz Cesar GASSER, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

ESPAGNE/SPAIN

José CONSARNAU GUARDIOLA, Consejero, Misión Permanente, Ginebra

José Luis FERNÁNDEZ RANZ, Consejero financiero, Misión Permanente, Ginebra

KENYA

Juliet GICHERU (Mrs.), First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

LETTONIE/LATVIA

Zigrīds AUMEISTERS, Director, Patent Office of the Republic of Latvia, Rīga

LUXEMBOURG

Christiane DALEIDEN DISTEFANO (Mme), premier secrétaire, Mission permanente, Genève

OMAN

Abdenour SEDDIKI, Translator, Permanent Mission, Geneva

POLOGNE/POLAND

Dariusz MAŃCZYK, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva

TURQUIE/TURKEY

Murat Ahmet YÖRÜK, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

ZAMBIE/ZAMBIA

Emmanuel M. KATONGO, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva

III. BUREAU/OFFICERS

Président/Chairman:	Shigeki SUMI (Japon/Japan)
Vice-présidents/Vice-Chairmen:	Dilip SINHA (Inde/India) Dimitar GANTCHEV (Bulgarie/Bulgaria)
Secrétaire/Secretary:	Thomas KEEFER (OMPI/WIPO)

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

Kamil IDRIS, directeur général/Director General

François CURCHOD, vice-directeur général/Deputy Director General

Shozo UEMURA, vice-directeur général/Deputy Director General

Thomas KEEFER, sous-directeur général/Assistant Director General

Francis GURRY, conseiller juridique et directeur du Centre d'arbitrage et de médiation de
l'OMPI/Legal Counsel and Director, WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center

Khamis SUEDI, directeur du Bureau de la planification stratégique et du développement des
politiques/Director, Office of Strategic Planning and Policy Development

Giovanni TAGNANI, directeur de la Division des bâtiments/Director, Buildings Division

Richard WILDER, directeur-conseiller, Bureau des affaires juridiques et
structurelles/Director-Advisor, Office of Legal and Organization Affairs

José BLANCH, chef par intérim de la Section du budget/Acting Head, Budget Section

[L'Annexe 2 suit/
Annex 2 follows]

ANNEX 2

Aide-Mémoire Regarding Need for Larger Main Conference Room

- *Present Situation.* Delegates are familiar with insufficient size of Conference Room A, already involving six meeting weeks which could not be accommodated there in the year since September 1997. Also, Conference Room A is only one with facilities for six languages of interpretation.
- *Growing Numbers of Delegates.* Need for larger main conference room is becoming more pronounced with continuing growth in membership, increasing numbers of intergovernmental organizations and non-governmental organizations with observer status, and growing private sector interest, all stimulated by the ever-increasing importance of and worldwide interest in intellectual property. A solution is therefore needed now. To provide for the future, a main conference room with seats for about 600 delegates is necessary.
- *Other Requirements*
 - Own main conference room so that WIPO is master of its meetings schedule; avoid having to fit into the left-over weeks of other conference rooms (if even available); allows for parallel large meetings.
 - Needs “intelligent” conference room, with modern facilities for six languages of interpretation, as well as modern information technology and audiovisual facilities for multi-media presentations.
 - Main conference room to be located in close proximity to WIPO’s existing conference and meeting facilities (to allow for group meetings in particular); also add new facilities (delegates lounge, coffee bar, etc.).
- *Best Site.* On WIPO’s land, integrated into structure of main WIPO Building, providing good synergy with existing conference and meeting facilities and entrance hall, facilitating efficient serving of meetings by the Secretariat.
- *Benefits.* In addition to solving above-mentioned problems, new larger main conference room would properly accommodate future needs of the Organization in an integrated complex; ability to be the venue for non-State-sector meetings important for WIPO’s corporate image and to advance intellectual property issues.
- *Financial Considerations*
 - Construction cost of 12 to 15 million Swiss francs is reasonable and is affordable, to be financed from Special Reserve Fund for Additional Premises and Computerization.
 - Also reasonable investment, since one week rental of large (600-seat) conference room in other facilities in Geneva (if available) involves costs (for conference room rental, offices, rental of interpretation equipment sometimes needed, remuneration of staff of facility, rental of photocopiers, telephones and computer equipment, overtime of WIPO General Service staff for installation and removal of equipment and documents, and shuttle bus service, but not including extra time of WIPO Professional staff to go back and forth during meeting, and noting that certain requirements may not be met) ranging from about 20,000 Swiss francs at *Centre international de conférences de Genève (CICG)* to about 30,000 francs at *Palais des*

Nations to about 65,000 francs at PALEXPO, giving average estimated at about 30,000 francs per week. Making plausible assumptions of 10 weeks (not just six) of use by WIPO by year 2003, plus rental of about five weeks to Specialized Agencies and others at concessional rate of 20,000 francs per week, plus rental of about five weeks to private organizations at 40,000 francs per week, would result in savings/income of about 600,000 francs per year, giving rate of return of about 4% to 5%.

[End of Annex 2 and of document]