

## Advisory Committee on Enforcement

### Fourteenth Session Geneva, September 2 to 4, 2019

#### SUMMARY BY THE CHAIR

*adopted by the Committee*

1. The fourteenth session of the Advisory Committee on Enforcement (ACE) was held from September 2 to 4, 2019. The session was attended by 86 Member States, 1 Non-State Member and 26 Observers.
2. Under agenda item 1, Mr. Minelik Alemu Getahun, Assistant Director General, Global Issues Sector, WIPO, opened the session by welcoming the Committee and thanking the Member States for their close engagement in the work of the Committee and building respect for intellectual property (IP) in general. He noted that, over the previous year, numerous delegations had emphasized the importance they attached to balanced and effective enforcement, to awareness raising, to building respect for IP and to the work of the Committee in particular. He expressed the Secretariat's gratitude to the experts and panelists, coming from all regions of the world, who contributed to the work of the fourteenth session.
3. Under agenda item 2, Mr. Bemanya Twebaze, Registrar General, Uganda Registration Service Bureau (URSB), Uganda, was elected as Chair. Mr. Ray Augusto Meloni García, Director, Department of Distinctive Signs, National Institute for the Defense of Competition and Protection of Intellectual Property (INDECOP), Lima, Peru, and Ms. Elizabeth Jones, Senior IP Enforcement Policy Advisor, Copyright and IP Enforcement Directorate, Intellectual Property Office, Newport, United Kingdom, were elected as Vice-Chairs.
4. Under agenda item 3, the Committee adopted the Agenda (document WIPO/ACE/14/1).
5. Under agenda item 4, the Committee approved the participation as *ad hoc* observers in its fourteenth session of the Italian Audiovisual and Multimedia Content Protection Federation (FAPAV), the Transnational Alliance to Combat Illicit Trade (TRACIT) and TaC – Together Against Cybercrime International (document WIPO/ACE/14/3 Rev.).

6. The Committee heard Opening Statements by the Group of Central European and Baltic States (CEBS), the Asia and Pacific Group, the Group of Latin American and Caribbean Countries (GRULAC), Group B, the African Group, the Delegation of Trinidad and Tobago, the Delegation of Colombia and the Delegation of the European Union (EU).

7. The Delegation of Croatia, speaking on behalf of CEBS, noted with satisfaction the large number of contributions from Member States and their institutions, which would contribute to the exchange of experiences on the issues of enforcement. The Group thanked the contributors, including the Republic of Moldova – a CEBS member – for their work, which enhanced the work of the ACE. The Group had always been a strong supporter of the enforcement of IP rights (IPRs) as effective and balanced enforcement mechanisms were a key factor in ensuring the role of IP in contributing to economic development through the promotion and protection of innovation and creativity. The Group looked forward to learning about new initiatives and ideas under all four work program items as they were interdependent. It was pleased that discussions would cover the challenges and opportunities related to the digital space and new technologies. Lastly, the Group expressed its conviction that awareness raising, starting with the youth, was important for building sound societies that would respect enforcement regimes.

8. The Delegation of Singapore, speaking on behalf of the Asia and Pacific Group, noted that it was important for the Committee to continue to focus on the role entrusted to it by Member States and recalled that the ACE was established by WIPO General Assemblies in 2002 with a mandate to carry out technical assistance and coordination in the field of IP enforcement, without engaging in any norm-setting activity. The Group recognized the responsibilities of the Committee in coordinating the fight against counterfeiting and piracy, public education, assistance, the organization of regional and national training programs as well as the exchange of information on IP enforcement issues. The Group recalled that the ACE was set within the framework of Development Agenda Recommendation 45, in that it was tasked to approach IP enforcement in the context of broader societal interests and especially development-oriented concerns. The Group was of the view that the protection and enforcement of IPRs should contribute to the promotion of technological innovation. Additionally, such effort should also lead to the transfer and dissemination of technology, to the mutual advantage of producers and users in a manner conducive to social and economic welfare, so as to balance relevant rights and obligations. The Group believed that it was important for WIPO to continue to approach IP enforcement in a holistic and balanced manner, in building respect for IP, to ensure that the means to enforce IPRs were in line with the objectives of Article 7 of the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS Agreement), as referred to in Development Agenda Recommendation 45. The Group recognized the ACE as a valuable platform in which Member States could collaborate and share national experiences. The Group expressed its enthusiasm to exchange information on national experiences concerning awareness creation as well as policies and regimes for IP enforcement and dispute resolution. The Group welcomed the opportunity to learn more about WIPO's legislative assistance on IP enforcement, taking into account available flexibilities, levels of development, differences in legal traditions and the possibility of abuse of enforcement procedures. WIPO had been an instrumental partner to the Group and the Group looked forward to sharing its success stories on capacity building and support for Member States.

9. The Delegation of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, noted that it attached great importance to the Committee's work and its goal to ensure respect for IP in a sustainable manner. The Group was of the view that it was relevant to exchange information on measures that not only helped to protect and enforce IPRs but also contributed to preventing their abuse by right holders, a type of abuse which could curtail competition and innovation. As in preceding sessions, GRULAC members would participate in the meeting and deliver presentations on specific issues. Brazil would report on its national measures to combat piracy and IP crimes, Peru would share information about its pilot educational project *I Decide, I*

*Respect – I Respect IP and Reject Counterfeits*, and Trinidad and Tobago would premiere a WIPO-produced video on promoting IP. The Group followed with interest document WIPO/ACE/14/9 on the Building Respect for IP Database project and was looking forward to the presentation and any additional information the Secretariat would provide on the subject. GRULAC remained committed to continuing to contribute to the work of the Committee and was confident that the exchanges during the three days of the fourteenth session would be beneficial to all participants.

10. The Delegation of Canada, speaking on behalf of Group B, expressed its confidence in the ACE in contributing to the enhancement of IP enforcement, which it viewed as an essential element of an effective and meaningful IP system. The Group reiterated the importance that it continued to attach to the Committee and its subject matter, namely, the enforcement of IPRs. Without effective and balanced enforcement mechanisms, IPRs could not fulfill one of their central objectives of contributing to economic development through the promotion and the protection of innovation. The Group also noted that the effective enforcement of IPRs protected the public from sub-standard or unsafe goods. The Group believed that enforcement was a subject that all WIPO Members should take seriously, remain sincerely engaged in and consider as a common interest, irrespective of their levels of development. The Group also recognized that, beyond enacting appropriate laws and regulations, implementation and political commitment in the area of IP enforcement was key. The ACE was therefore an important platform at which to exchange experiences with other Member States. Finally, the Group expressed its satisfaction with the balanced nature of the four work program items and looked forward to hearing the perspectives of Member States during the fourteenth session of the ACE.

11. The Delegation of Uganda, speaking on behalf of the African Group, thanked those WIPO Member States which actively contributed to the Committee's work with their presentations, recognizing the value that these contributions brought for the purposes of sharing experiences in building respect for IP. The Group underscored the importance and essential role played by the ACE in the area of building respect for IP. The Group emphasized that it was of utmost importance that every IP system be supported by an effective enforcement mechanism, in line with international standards, in particular those set out in the TRIPS Agreement. The Group pointed out that a fair, non-discriminatory and effective IPR enforcement system was essential to the development of a balanced IPR regime that supported and encouraged creativity and innovation. Simply granting IPRs without effective mechanisms to enforce those rights would be a futile exercise. The Group believed that the ACE should carry out its work in a balanced manner, in accordance with WIPO Development Agenda Recommendation 45, in order to fulfil its mandate. Development Recommendation 45 enjoined WIPO to approach IP enforcement with due regard to broader societal interests and, in particular, to development-oriented concerns, including the promotion of technological innovation and the dissemination of technology to the mutual advantage of both creators and users. The Group outlined as its key interest in the context of the ACE the continued need for effective, demand-driven technical assistance and capacity building to enable developing and least developed countries to design IPR regimes that promoted both the development and upgrade of their local technological capacities. Such assistance should enable effective technology transfer and dissemination. The Group recalled WIPO Strategic Goal VI "International Cooperation on Building Respect for IP" as a broad, cross-cutting goal aiming to create an enabling environment that promoted respect for IP in a sustainable manner and to strengthen the capacity of Member States for the effective enforcement of IPRs, taking into account socio-economic interests and development-oriented concerns. The Group took particular note of document WIPO/ACE/14/2, which highlighted, in a non-exhaustive way, WIPO's recent activities in the field of building respect for IP carried out within the framework of program 17. The document provided valuable insights on what activities have contributed to the fulfilment of the mandate of the Committee. However, the Group requested that the next version of this document highlight, where appropriate, how WIPO took into account Development Agenda Recommendation 45 in

the implementation of its activities. The Group called on WIPO to intensify its capacity-building and awareness activities for developing countries and least developed countries in this field and affirmed that it would engage constructively in all deliberations and encourage individual members of the Group to take the floor, where appropriate, to share their national experiences.

12. The Delegation of Trinidad and Tobago stated its support for the continuing efforts of the ACE in its mandate to carry out technical assistance and coordination in the field of IP enforcement. The Delegation wished to associate itself with the statement made by the Delegation of Mexico on behalf of GRULAC. The national IP strategy of Trinidad and Tobago was informed by the exchange of information on campaigns and activities to build respect for IP, specifically amongst the youth. The Trinidad and Tobago Intellectual Property Office (TTIPO), during the first year of its Building Respect for IP Program, had engaged in numerous outreach activities through the education and training of government authorities, universities, businesses and schools. Trinidad and Tobago had been actively involved in an *ad hoc* committee together with the police, the Customs and Excise Division, Crime Stoppers and the Bureau of Standards to devise strategies on how to address the seizure of pirated and counterfeit goods. This effort had resulted in increased IP prosecutions. In this regard, a manual on IPR prosecution in Trinidad and Tobago was being developed with the assistance of WIPO's Building Respect for IP Division. In 2018, the TTIPO had formally launched its building respect for IP mobile unit called *IP Mobile*, as part of its national IP strategy. This project, originally conceptualized by WIPO, had proved to be a great success. The Delegation also pointed out that over the past year the TTIPO had been in discussions with the Curriculum Division of the Ministry of Education and with publishers of various textbooks in Trinidad and Tobago, with the ultimate goal of integrating IP lessons and teaching tools into the education curriculum. The Delegation highlighted that it would launch, on the first day of the fourteenth session of the ACE, an educational video that WIPO had executively produced and that was the result of a project that had begun in 2018 and culminated in 2019. The Delegation expressed its willingness to contribute to the continuing work of the ACE.

13. The Delegation of Colombia noted that Colombia was fully committed to the respect and promotion of IPRs. In particular, the Superintendency of Industry and Commerce effectively promoted and protected industrial property rights through the Office of Judicial Affairs, which resolved industrial property disputes.

14. The Delegation of the EU, speaking on behalf of the EU and its member states, emphasized that the EU was a strong supporter of the work and the mission of the Committee and reiterated the EU's commitment to contributing to the work of the ACE. It welcomed the contributions from the Spanish Patent and Trademark Office (OEPM), the Greek Ministry of Economy and Development, the Hellenic Copyright Organization (HCO), the Italian Communications Regulatory Authority (AGCOM) and the United Kingdom Police IP Crime Unit (PIPCU). The EU was also pleased to see contributions by the United Kingdom judiciary, the European Commission, the European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO), private sector representatives and representatives from academia and the legal profession in the United Kingdom. The EU continued to believe that the state-centric agenda point complemented the existing issue-centric agenda points in a balanced manner and noted with satisfaction that the high number of contributions received from WIPO Member States was indicative of the relevance of the state-centric agenda point for WIPO Members. The EU recognized the value of focusing discussions on WIPO Members' practical experiences as a means of learning from other countries and building on shared best practices. It therefore supported the Committee in continuing to place this item on future agendas. The EU was pleased that opportunities and challenges of the digital era would be at the core of discussions during the fourteenth session of the ACE and looked forward to the exchange of information on national experiences relating to institutional arrangements concerning IP enforcement policies and regimes. It was also particularly interested in the topics of arrangements to address online IP infringements and the

role of intermediaries in IP enforcement. The EU welcomed the inclusion of a topic on new technologies in IP enforcement as it was convinced that taking full advantage of the possibilities brought by blockchain or content recognition technologies, for instance, were key to creating efficient enforcement systems. The EU expressed its satisfaction that the work of the European Observatory on Infringements of Intellectual Property Rights concerning the use of blockchain technology to fight counterfeiting would be presented at the session. The Delegation also welcomed the topic on national and regional initiatives to prevent paid advertising on copyright-infringing websites and noted with interest that the Secretariat had proposed a Building Respect for Intellectual Property Database project to assist WIPO Member States in the coordination of voluntary measures undertaken in accordance with the “follow-the-money” approach to copyright infringement. The goals of this useful project were to reduce the flow of money to illegal website operators, to protect brands from being tarnished and to reduce the risk that legitimate advertising could lend an appearance of legality to illegal websites to the confusion of consumers. The EU noted that these goals echoed the objectives of the European Commission’s “Memorandum of Understanding on Online Advertising and IP Rights”, an initiative that the European Commission would present in more detail during the fourteenth ACE session. The Delegation was also pleased that the EUIPO would present its experiences during the side event “IP and Education: How to Introduce IP in Schools” and looked forward to the exchange of information on national experiences on awareness-building activities and strategic campaigns as a means for building respect for IP among the general public, especially the youth. The EU thanked the Secretariat for preparing the documents on the recent activities of WIPO in the area of building respect for IP (WIPO/ACE/14/2) and on national and regional experiences with WIPO’s capacity-building activities in this area (WIPO/ACE/14/13 Rev.). The EU and its member states supported the continuation of WIPO’s work in providing legal and technical assistance and stressed that the high value of such assistance depended particularly on its ability to account for the level of development and differences in legal traditions, as well as broader societal interests and Member State priorities. The EU and its member states saw WIPO as the global forum for all IP-related matters and believed that WIPO had an important role to play in coordinating Member States’ efforts to more effectively combat IPR infringements. The Delegation expressed its confidence that fruitful collaborations between countries would continue in a manner ensuring that a fair balance was kept between incentives to innovate and access to innovation.

15. Under agenda item 5, the Committee heard 33 expert presentations, one Secretariat presentation and four panel discussions relating to the various items of the work program (documents WIPO/ACE/14/4 Rev. to WIPO/ACE/14/14).

16. Under work program item A (“Exchange of information on national experiences on awareness building activities and strategic campaigns as a means for building respect for IP among general public, especially the youth, in accordance with Member States’ educational or any other priorities”), five Member States shared their experiences under the topic “Specific Awareness-raising Products or Activities of WIPO Member States”.

17. The presentations comprised “Keeping Pirates at Bay – India’s Anti-Piracy Campaign” by the Department for Promotion of Industry and Internal Trade (DPIIT), Ministry of Commerce and Industry; “Norwegian Awareness-raising Initiatives on Counterfeiting – Avoid Buying Counterfeit Goods Online and on Holiday” by the Norwegian Intellectual Property Office (NIPO); “The 2018/19 School Competition on Respect for Copyright in Oman” by the Innovation and Scientific Olympiad, Ministry of Education; “*I Decide, I Respect – I Respect IP and Reject Counterfeits* – A Recent Educational Program for High School Students in Peru” by the National Institute for the Defense of Competition and Protection of Intellectual Property (INDECOPI); and “*The Program for Cultural Change in the Republic of Moldova*” by the State Agency on Intellectual Property (AGEPI). Reference was made to document WIPO/ACE/14/4 Rev.

18. Discussions followed with interventions by the Delegations of the EU, Spain and the United Kingdom.

19. Under work program item B (“Exchange of information on national experiences relating to institutional arrangements concerning IP enforcement policies and regimes, including mechanism to resolve IP disputes in a balanced, holistic and effective manner”), presentations were grouped into six topics.

20. Under the topic “IP Enforcement Coordination”, six Member States shared their experiences. The presentations comprised “The Actions of the National Council on Combating Piracy and Intellectual Property Crimes (CNCP) in Brazil” by the CNCP; “The Coordination of IP Enforcement in Greece – The Collaboration Between the Coordinating Authority for Market Supervision and the Fight Against Illicit Trade (SYKEAAP) and the Greek Enforcement Authorities” by SYKEAAP; “A New Labelling System for Auto Spare Parts Distribution Channels in Morocco: The *Salamatouna* Certification Mark Combats Counterfeiting” by the Moroccan Office for Industrial and Commercial Property (OMPIC); “Recent Legislative Amendments to Strengthen the Protection of Industrial Property in the Republic of Korea” by the Korean Intellectual Property Office (KIPO); “The Comprehensive National Plan to Combat the Sale of Counterfeit Goods and Enforce Industrial Property Rights in Spain” by the OEPM; and “Enforcing IP Rights in Foreign Trade Zones” by the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO). These contributions are compiled in WIPO/ACE/14/5 Rev.

21. A panel discussion took place, moderated by Mr. Ermias Yemanebirhan, Director General, Ethiopian Intellectual Property Office (EIPO), with interventions from the Delegation of Germany and the Representative of the Eurasian Economic Commission.

22. Under the topic “New Technologies in IP Enforcement”, the Committee benefitted from two contributions. Dr. Daniel Kraus, Professor of Innovation Law and Director, Centre for Intellectual Property and Innovation, University of Neuchâtel, presented the “Swiss Experiences with IP Enforcement in the Digital Age”, while the EUIPO presented “New Technological Opportunities for IPR Protection and Enforcement: Blockathon – Fighting Counterfeits Through Blockchain Technology”. These contributions are compiled in document WIPO/ACE/14/6.

23. Discussions followed with interventions by the Delegations of South Africa and Greece.

24. Under the topic “Institutional Arrangements to Address Online IP Infringements”, a “Study on IP Enforcement Measures, Especially Anti-piracy Measures in the Digital Environment” (document WIPO/ACE/14/7) was presented by Ms. Jane Lambert, Barrister, Grey’s Inn, London, and Dr. Frederick Mostert, Professor of Practice, Dickson Poon School of Law, King’s College, London, and Research Fellow, Oxford Intellectual Property Research Centre, United Kingdom, following which four Member States presented their arrangements to address online IP infringements. The Member State presentations included: “China’s Experience in Online Copyright Protection” by the National Copyright Administration of the People’s Republic of China (NCAC); “The Greek Committee for the Notification of Copyright and Related Rights Infringement on the Internet” by the HCO; “Improving the Mechanisms to Counter the Online Dissemination of Pirated Content in the Russian Federation” by the Federal Service for the Supervision of Communications, Information Technology and Mass Media (Roskomnadzor); and “The United Kingdom PIPCU” by the PIPCU, City of London Police. These contributions are compiled in document WIPO/ACE/14/8 Rev.

25. A panel discussion took place, moderated by Dr. Frederick Mostert, with interventions by the Delegations of the United Kingdom, Spain, Peru, Colombia, Mexico, China and Sri Lanka and the Representatives of the International Federation of the Phonographic Industry (IFPI) and the European Brands Association (AIM).

26. Under the topic “Initiatives to Prevent Paid Advertising on Copyright-infringing Websites”, the Committee first heard a presentation by the WIPO Secretariat on “The Building Respect for IP Database Project” (document WIPO/ACE/14/9).
27. Discussions followed with interventions by the Delegations of Chile, the United Kingdom, Canada and the United States of America and the Representative of IFPI, during which the value of the project was recognized. Some Member States felt that the project would further benefit from the organization of a dedicated stakeholder consultation meeting.
28. Three Member States then presented their experiences on “Initiatives to Prevent Paid Advertising on Copyright-infringing Websites”. These presentations included: “The Role of AGCOM in Addressing Online Advertisements on Websites that Infringe IP Rights” by AGCOM; “Study on the Impact of Advertising on Copyright-infringing Websites on the Value of the Advertised Brands in the Republic of Korea” by the Korea Copyright Protection Agency (KCOPA); and “Stakeholders’ Cooperation Under the *Memorandum of Understanding on Online Advertising and IP Rights – An Update from the European Commission*” by the Directorate-General for Internal Market, Industry, Entrepreneurship and Small and Medium-sized Enterprises (DG GROW) of the European Commission. These contributions are compiled in document WIPO/ACE/14/10 Rev.
29. A panel discussion took place, moderated by Ms. Angela van der Meer, Senior Policy Advisor, Enterprise and Innovation, Innovation and Knowledge Department, Ministry of Economic Affairs and Climate Policy, Netherlands, with an intervention by the Delegation of Greece.
30. The next topic under discussion was “The Role of Intermediaries in IP Enforcement”. The Committee heard six presentations: one from an inter-governmental organization (IGO), one from a non-governmental organization (NGO) and four from private entities. The Universal Postal Union (UPU) presented on “IP Infringement and Mitigation Strategies in the International Postal Supply Chain”; the Computer and Communications Industry Association (CCIA) presented on “IP Protection Strategies of Online Intermediaries”; the Alibaba Group presented “Alibaba Group’s Achievements in IP Protection”, Amazon presented “Amazon’s Initiatives to Prevent Counterfeiting”, Facebook presented on “Protecting IP on Facebook and Instagram”; and Google presented on “Protecting Copyright in Google Search”. These contributions are compiled in document WIPO/ACE/14/11 Rev.
31. A panel discussion took place, moderated by Mr. Ray Augusto Meloni García, with interventions by the Delegations of China, Bolivia, Brazil and the United Kingdom and the Representatives of the IFPI and the AIM.
32. Subsequently, the topic “Judicial and Prosecutorial Discretion in IP Infringement Proceedings” was discussed. The Committee benefited from three presentations by Member States, namely “Judicial Discretion in IP Infringement Proceedings: The Experience of Russian Courts” by the Honorable Mr. Vladimir Popov, Judge, Supreme Court of the Russian Federation; “Prosecutorial Discretion in IP Infringement Cases in Saint Kitts and Nevis” by Mr. Valston Graham, Director of Public Prosecutions, Ministry of Justice; and “Exercising the Discretion to Grant Additional Damages Under Section 97(2) of the United Kingdom Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988” by the Honorable Ms. Charlotte Hart, District Judge, Intellectual Property Enterprise Court, High Court of Justice. These contributions are compiled in document WIPO/ACE/14/12.
33. Discussions followed with interventions by the Delegation of China and Ms. Lambert.

34. Under work program item C (“Exchange of information on national experiences in respect of WIPO’s legislative assistance, with a focus on drafting national laws of enforcement that take into account the flexibilities, the level of development, the difference in legal tradition and the possible abuse of enforcement procedures, bearing in mind the broader societal interest and in accordance with Member States’ priorities”), the Committee heard a presentation by Mongolia on “Mongolia’s Experience with Legislative Assistance Provided by WIPO in the Area of Intellectual Property Enforcement” by the Department of Legal Policy of the Ministry of Justice and Home Affairs. This contribution is captured in document WIPO/ACE/14/14.

35. Under work program item D (“exchange of success stories on capacity building and support from WIPO for training activities at national and regional levels for Agencies and national officials in line with relevant Development Agenda Recommendations and the ACE mandate”), one national and one regional experience were shared. The Companies and Intellectual Property Authority (CIPA) of Botswana presented on “WIPO’s Capacity-building Activities and Support for Training Activities in the Area of Building Respect for IP and IP Enforcement in Botswana”, while the Judicial Education Institute of the Eastern Caribbean Supreme Court presented on “The Eastern Caribbean Supreme Court and Capacity Building in IP”. These two contributions are compiled in document WIPO/ACE/14/13 Rev.

36. Under agenda item 6, the Secretariat introduced document WIPO/ACE/14/2 on recent activities of WIPO in the field of building respect for IP, guided by the Program and Budget, Development Agenda Recommendation 45 and WIPO Strategic Goal VI “International Cooperation on Building Respect for IP”. The document set out technical assistance in the field of building respect for IP, where requested services included legislative assistance, as well as training and awareness raising for law enforcement officials and the judiciary. The document also included activities aimed at further enhancing systematic and effective international cooperation with other IGOs, NGOs and the private sector, in order to ensure a balanced and transparent approach. Program 17 also contributed to a number of WIPO publications on the latest developments in the area of building respect for IP. The Secretariat noted that the description of each activity in the document was accompanied by information about the venue, any partnering organizations, participating countries, a brief summary of the objectives of the activity, and a web link to the full program. The Committee took note of the information contained in the document.

37. Under agenda item 7, the Committee agreed to continue to consider, at its fifteenth session, the following topics:

- Exchange of information on national experiences on awareness building activities and strategic campaigns as a means for building respect for IP among general public, especially the youth, in accordance with Member States’ educational or any other priorities;
- Exchange of information on national experiences relating to institutional arrangements concerning IP enforcement policies and regimes, including mechanism to resolve IP disputes in a balanced, holistic and effective manner;
- Exchange of information on national experiences in respect of WIPO’s legislative assistance, with a focus on drafting national laws of enforcement that take into account the flexibilities, the level of development, the difference in legal tradition and the possible abuse of enforcement procedures, bearing in mind the broader societal interest and in accordance with Member States’ priorities; and



- Exchange of success stories on capacity building and support from WIPO for training activities at national and regional levels for Agencies and national officials in line with relevant Development Agenda Recommendations and the ACE mandate.

[End of document]