Attendees were treated to a warm welcome as well as a wide range of festive Brazilian dancing at the Opening Ceremony last night. Elisabeth Kasznar Fekete, President of AIPPI Brazil, gave a welcoming speech in front of a packed room. She said that Brazil is a very big country with business opportunities in every area. "Brazil will decide its own challenges," she said. "It is a land of opportunities."

Kasznar Fekete noted the increasing percentage of young people and influence of women in the country. She added that nearly 86 million have access to the internet. "We are in transition to a new business model," she said. "That has marketing and branding ramifications."

There are also hurdles to overcome. She noted some anti-IP people have been raising concerns over some of us who believe in IP.

Attendees were treated to a youth orchestra recital before Felipe Claro, President of AIPPI, took the stage. He noted that this year's Congress marked a lot of change, as it was the first Congress to take place on an annual basis, the first to be paperless, and the first with a new Executive Director.

He compared some of the challenges faced by the IP world to the earthquakes in his native Chile. "We are dealing with change all the time and [there is a challenge with] what needs to be preserved," he said.

The Opening Ceremony concluded with a dazzling display of dancing from around Brazil, displaying the diversity of the country.

UPC concerns raised with large audience

Transitional measures, fees, patent term extension, the availability of injunctions and the appointment of judges were all identified as key issues of concern at yesterday’s open meeting of AIPPI’s Standing Committee on the Unitary Patent and Unified Patent Court. The Standing Committee first met in full at the last Congress, in Toronto in 2014. At that meeting, it identified two important issues as the transitional regime applicable to the Unified Patent Court.

Continued on page 4

AIPPI goes paperless!

This is the first AIPPI Congress to trial a paperless system for attendees. All the documents, including Congress papers and the programme, are available online and on the AIPPI app, which can be downloaded for mobile devices.

If you need to print anything, pressing a button on the app will print out the documents immediately, and they can be collected from the copier room. If you do not have a computer or smartphone, you can also print from the printing stations available in the hotel.

The draft resolutions on this year’s Working Questions will still be available on paper, for delegates to study and review.
The four working questions to be studied at next year’s Congress in Milan were debated yesterday, in a discussion led by the Reporter General team.

Protection for industrial designs
Anne Marie Verschuur of Nauta Dutilh said an example of the requirements for the protection of industrial designs came in the Apple/Samsung case, which touched on the question of what is minimalistic design. The topic of industrial designs was last discussed at the 2012 Congress, which looked at the interplay between designs and copyright.

Some of the suggested questions to be explored included defining designs, the requirement for obtaining design protection, differences between registered and unregistered designs and whether parts such as the handle of a pan can be separately protected.

“T is something that hasn’t really been studied,” noted Ralph Nack of Noerr, when introducing the question. Most countries have no system for this important topic.

“The main problem here is we are focusing on a vast plethora of systems providing security on IP,” said Nack. “It’s a wonderful play-ground for AIPPI because there is so much to do!”

Nack suggested many questions for consideration including whether national laws provide for possibilities to create security rights over IP, whether there are caps or limits on the extent to which IP may be used as collateral in comparison to other assets, whether regulations provide a comprehensive security system regarding IP rights, how the creation of a security interest over an IP right affects the legal or actual position of the IP right holder, and whether there are specific mechanisms governing the liquidation of collateral over IP or do general commercial law principles apply.

Judge Hacon celebrates small-claim procedure
A small claims track set up to help parties resolve low-value IP disputes in the UK has “taken off” according to the judge in charge of the Intellectual Property Enterprise Court (IPEC) in London. Speaking at an event hosted by AIPPI’s UK group last week, Judge Richard Hacon said that 106 small claims were filed in the last 12 months, compared to 55 in the calendar year 2013.

“I am aware this needs narrowing down so don’t let all this knock your socks off,” he said. “Maybe one way of narrowing down the scope is to take the top three political points that come up.”

Linking and making available on the internet
The fourth question is a copyright question, and concerns deep linking, framing and embedding within hyperlinking.

There have been several CJEU judgments, including the Svensson judgment in February 2014 and the Betwarter judgment in October 2014. Yusuke Inui of Kabota Law said there were two issues unresolved in these cases: how should links or embedding of illegal content be treated and if the initial access is restricted by means of restriction on the website, does the hyperlinking/embedding require the copyright holder’s consent?

Possible topics for consideration include should framing or embedding of copyright works constitute copyright infringement when performed without authorisation of the copyright holder, should framing or embedding be treated differently to hyperlinking, what is the appropriate treatment for hyperlinking/embedding of illegal works, and what is the appropriate application of these issues to works where access is restricted.

The main problem here is we are focusing on a vast plethora of systems providing security on IP,” said Nack. “It’s a wonderful play-ground for AIPPI because there is so much to do!”

Nack suggested many questions for consideration including whether national laws provide for possibilities to create security rights over IP, whether there are caps or limits on the extent to which IP may be used as collateral in comparison to other assets, whether regulations provide a comprehensive security system regarding IP rights, how the creation of a security interest over an IP right affects the legal or actual position of the IP right holder, and whether there are specific mechanisms governing the liquidation of collateral over IP or do general commercial law principles apply.

Added matter: the standard for determining an adequate support for amendment
The third question addresses patent quality, and the extent to which amendments are allowed. Differences in approach can make it difficult for patent applicants trying to gain multinational patent protection.

Peter Leung
The hard work starts here

In an interview with the AIPPI Congress News, Reporter General Sarah Matheson provides a guide to what’s happening during this week’s Congress

“It’s a lot of work but very satisfying,” says Matheson. The Reporter General team narrow those down by focusing on issues that are topical and relevant, of practical interest and in an area where AIPPI can make a contribution to the development of the law. When it comes to deciding the four working questions to be tackled each year, they aim to cover the four areas of patent, trade mark/design, copyright and general IP issues. This year, two alternatives for each area were put to the Executive Committee before the final four were chosen.

However, not all the groups’ suggestions will lead to working questions being debated. Some lend themselves to educational sessions, perhaps because they warrant more analysis or are more particularly suited to interests in the host country. Sometimes, topics that are discussed in workshops this year will develop into working questions in the future. That is true of the panel on industrial designs and functionality this year.

This year, Matheson notes that once again there is a stream of pharmaceutical workshops, spanning trade mark, patent and technology transfer issues as well as the topical issue of personalised medicine. Expect that to address the recent Australian High Court decision in Myriad, which Matheson says took many Australian practitioners by surprise. There is also a double session on FRAND issues, which includes in-house counsel and judges and will look at the many recent developments worldwide on this thorny issue. And of particular interest to local practitioners will be the workshops on green technology and plant variety protection. “I know these are both big topics here in Brazil,” says Matheson.

There are two ticketed lunchtime panels, taking place today and tomorrow. Today’s will feature officials from the Australian, Brazilian and Japanese IP offices and will look at improving IP systems. Tomorrow’s panel will have an industry focus with speakers from Embraer, Canon and 3M and will be chaired by Matheson herself. “We will be addressing how to manage innovation in an anti-IP climate,” she explains. “IP has become much broader, there is greater politicisation and more recognition of its economic significance.”
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under Section 83 of the UPC Agreement, and the applicable law. As Committee chair Alan Johnson of Bristows said: “It was felt to be right that AIPPI should push toward harmonisation in these areas.”

Confusion and uncertainty
Annsley Merelle Ward, secretary of the Committee, said that Article 83 had led to “confusion and uncertainty” in particular regarding European patents that are opted out of the UPC during the transitional period. “If you don’t opt out, where can you litigate that patent, or where can litigation be forced on you?” she asked. There is a risk, said Merelle Ward, of conflicting decisions and a race to court. “The system is in danger of becoming the very thing it was intended to avoid. There is a fear of being ensnared in procedural hearings about which court has jurisdiction.”

The Committee has published two papers in the past year, concerning jurisdiction of patent issues and substantive law issues under Article 83, and has made two proposals: that AIPPI members should urge participating member states (1) to take effective measures to clarify the meaning and effect of Article 83 (at least with an interpretative note) and (2) to take effective measures to amend their national patent laws to harmonise with those provisions of the UPC Agreement that differ from national laws “to the maximum possible extent”.

The panel also featured Nicolas Moréy of the EPO, Judge Peter Meier-Beck of the German Federal Court of Justice, Tina Chappell of Intel, Lawrence Welch of Eli Lilly and Michael Frohlich of BlackBerry. Welch highlighted the “legal and political questions” raised by supplementary protection certificates in the UPC. Chappell said judges in the UPC needed to have more discretion on the awarding of injunctions, and that there should be a clearly stated test for an injunction to be awarded. “We need to prevent an incentive to engage in abusive tactics,” she said.

The timetable
Morey confirmed that the EPO expects to issue the first Unitary Patent at the end of 2016, based on when ratifications are expected: 13 member states need to ratify the Agreement before it can come into effect, including the three largest filers of European patents. Of the 28 EU member states, 26 are taking part in the enhanced cooperation (the exceptions at present are Croatia and Spain). However, Poland’s government has indicated it is unlikely to join at the beginning. That means the Unitary Patent system will initially cover up to 25 countries.

The EPO will soon be ready to undertake the additional responsibilities it will have for Unitary Patents, including administering translations, renewals and licences of right, said Moréy. The select committee had held 15 meetings so far, and has another scheduled this week, at which the difficult issue of the distribution of renewal fees will be discussed. He also said that the Office will hold workshops in countries with many users of the European system, such as the United States and Japan, in the latter part of 2016 once the date of implementation is closer.

Judge Meier-Beck stressed the importance of having panels with a balance of experienced and inexperienced judges, so that the latter can learn on the job. He also emphasised the importance of the UPC Court of Appeal, saying: “It’s an open question what will happen at second instance level.” While the Court is expected to include some experienced judges from countries that have a lot of patent litigation, such as Germany, the Netherlands and the UK, the number of divisions (see map) and rules specifying impartial panels mean there will inevitably be judges who have less familiarity with patent disputes. Some potential judges have already begun courses at the Training Centre in Budapest.

AIPPI has two consultations underway, said Committee co-chair Thierry Calame of Lenz & Staehelin. One concerns the relationship between UPC and EPO opposition proceedings, in particular in situations where an injunction has been granted on a patent that is subsequently found to be invalid. The other concerns UP renewal fees and UPC court fees. Details have been sent to national and regional groups, with responses due by November 16, and anyone interested is urged to take part. As Alan Johnson asked the packed audience last night: “Within the next 18 months this will be a reality, and decisions will have to be made. As a committee, what can we do to improve things and make it as good as it can be; how can you help us?”

First-timers reception
First-time attendees were welcomed by old hands from the AIPPI Bureau, including Deputy Reporter General John Osha urging them to attend Working Question hearings because they were “like being at the UN.”
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Luiz Henrique do Amaral has had a busy few months in his role as chair of the organising committee for this year’s Congress. Do Amaral, who has been attending the AIPPI events since the 1992 Congress in Japan, notes some novel features this year. Following Toronto last year, this is the first Congress to take place annually, rather than every two years.

“It was a challenge being the first Congress to do that and not knowing how people would react but the turnout shows this was a right decision and we are going on the right path,” he says. About 1,600 people are registered for the Congress.

The Congress is also going entirely paperless this year. Participants can download the conference app to view the programmes, documents and presentations. “There will be a lot of new things happening this year,” he says.

Education

There is much to discuss in the sessions. “We have very interesting topics, not only the questions that will be discussed during the Congress but also during the workshops and panel sessions,” he says. “We’ll deal with cutting-edge issues.”

Do Amaral identifies three important things for attendees in Rio: education, networking and the social programmes.

Do Amaral identifies three important things for attendees in Rio: education, networking and the social programmes.

Three priorities for this year’s Chair

Ahead of this year’s AIPPI Congress, Michael Loney spoke to organising committee chair Luiz Henrique do Amaral about education, networking and the social programme.

“We are a very important agribusiness country, not only for the production of grains like soya beans and corn and canola but also for beef. Brazil is the largest exporter of beef in the world so that is a very important topic.”

On the trade mark side, one important topic is to what extent pharmaceutical trade marks should be controlled or limited because of generics.

Do Amaral reports that the host country for this year’s Congress is facing a number of IP challenges. One of the biggest is the double examination of pharmaceutical patent application, in addition to that performed by the BPTO.

“In Brazil we are unhappy with the situation. It creates a lot of instability in the system. It shifts patentability examination to the board of health,” he explains. “TRIPs is very clear that there should not be double examination of patentability issues but that is happening in Brazil. That’s a very serious challenge.”

Another big challenge is the patent and trade mark application backlog in Brazil. “Things don’t seem to improve,” he says. “On the contrary, since the economic crisis that started this year the government has even announced some cuts that will affect the number of examiners and people working at the Patent Office. It will get worse before it gets better.”

Do Amaral says this affects innovation and investment. “A patent that is pending for a long time creates two combined problems,” he says. The first is rights holders find it hard to get investment because it is hard to assume ownership if a patent will issue or not, and therefore whether they will be infringing or not.

“It creates a problem for both the right holder and potential competitors in the generic industry because you don’t know if that patent will mature or not,” he says. “So if you invest, the patent owner may in the future say ‘you infringed my patent, you have...”
to pay me and stop doing what you are doing now. So that's a very bad problem that was created by the backlog.”

Networking

Do Amaral notes the convention centre is tailored for networking because the space is entirely booked for the AIPPI Congress. “Everyone there will be participating in the Congress so it will be very easy for people to see each other,” he says. “And connecting with the people you want should be easier than very large convention centres in which you can lose yourself.”

More than 400 European delegates are attending and about 170 people from North America. But this year’s event is sure to have more of a Latin flavour than usual, given its location. “It is going to be a little bit different in terms of having a large number of Latin Americans, especially Brazilians,” he says.

Do Amaral notes that this year’s Congress has the largest number of corporate members in AIPPI history ever. “That’s a very good sign,” he says. “It means the corporations are looking more and more to AIPPI to connect the issues and align the priorities.”

Social programmes

Every evening during the Congress there is an event organised by AIPPI or connected to the association. “This will I hope bring people together and we will have fun too,” he says.

The opening ceremony and welcoming reception took place last night at the Windsor Barra Hotel. There is a cultural evening tonight starting at 7pm at the Copacabana Palace Hotel at which you can enjoy a samba parade. The closing dinner on Wednesday takes place at the Jockey Club.

Soccer fans will be excited to hear the Brazilian IP Association (ABPI) has also organised a reception on Tuesday night at the Maracanã Stadium. “This year we were able to combine all the IP firms in Brazil in one single event which will take place at the Maracanã Stadium,” he says. “That is quite an achievement because as you can imagine putting together all of the law firms, and convincing everybody to put down the weapons to get together and have a nice event takes time and patience! I am very happy we are doing that.”

Do Amaral urges attendees to take advantage of Rio – just not while the Congress is on. He notes that the social programmes will be exciting and allow attendees to enjoy some of Rio’s sites.

“My first recommendation is stay in the conference no matter how beautiful the weather is outside and how nice the beaches look from the hotel!” he half jokes. “Participate in the programme and make sure that you’re not distracted to go elsewhere.”

“TRIPs is very clear that there should not be double examination of patentability issues but that is happening in Brazil”
It's a balancing act that would challenge an accomplished circus performer: how to support access to information in education and research on the one hand while ensuring proper recognition and remuneration for authors on the other hand. That is essentially the trick that delegates debating Question 246 are hoping to pull off today, and it's made harder by the divergent approaches taken to the question of exceptions and limitations around the world.

As Yusuke Inui of Kubota Law in Tokyo and an AIPI Assistant Reporter General notes, feelings on this issue go beyond the law: "Education is very much connected to the culture of the country; it's not simply about copyright. It's the cultural issues raised by this question that make it particularly important." Giorgio Mondini of Mondini Rusconi in Italy, who is chairing this question, adds: "We have to balance the rights of rights holders with the public interest to disseminate culture and science."

The digital challenge

Exceptions to the exclusive rights of the copyright owner are well established, but have come under greater scrutiny in recent years, as digital technology and online distribution have made copying easier, cheaper and more convenient. AIPI has tackled the copyright exceptions twice in the past five years, but not the specific issues concerning libraries, archives or education institutions (see box on the three-step test). In the EU, the Copyright Directive and the Orphan Works Directive both make it optional for member states to provide exceptions/limitations, including for libraries, educational establishments, museums and archives in their national laws. The UK, for example, updated its copyright exceptions in line with the Directive last year.

Despite the broad agreement that there should be exceptions or limitations in this field, there is wide divergence over questions such as which institutions should be covered and what they should be permitted to do. For example, should a library be able to make a digital copy of a physical work that may become damaged? Under what circumstances should copyrighted works be usable in course work or exams, or in distance education?

These were a few of the 30 questions tackled by AIPI national and regional groups in their reports. The majority (70%) of groups agreed that use under the

Culture clash over copyright

James Norton investigates Question 246 on exceptions and limitations to copyright protection for libraries, archives and educational and research institutions, which is being debated today

“It’s the cultural issues raised by this question that make it particularly important”

The three-step dance

The three-step test set out in the Berne Convention of 1886 permits the reproduction of a copyrighted work:
• in certain special cases;
• provided that such reproduction does not conflict with a normal exploitation of the work; and
• does not unreasonably prejudice the legitimate interests of the author.

AIPI Resolution on Q216A in 2010 confirmed that the three-step test should also apply to exceptions and limitations in the digital environment. Resolution Q216B in 2011 expanded on this, confirming that in general national laws should be harmonised relying on the three-step test. However, it was left to future studies to examine how to implement the test in specific circumstances. Neither Q216A nor Q216B studied the particular issues arising for libraries, archives or educational and research institutions.

The three-step dance
exceptions or limitations should be permitted automatically, and 70% also agreed that remuneration should be payable in at least some circumstances, though they disagreed on the details and on who should determine remuneration.

Looking specifically at libraries and archives, 60% of groups said the exceptions and limitations should only apply to public, non-profit and/or publicly accessible institutions, while 20% said they should apply to any library or archive. Around 40% of groups agreed that the exceptions and limitations should cover preservation and/or replacement, with around one-third saying they should apply to education and/or research activities. But there was great variance in the groups’ views on the conditions that should apply, including adherence to the three-step test, the possession of a legitimate copy, safeguards for digital copies and inter-library lending.

There was generally less consensus when it came to educational and research institutions. While 35% of groups felt that exceptions or limitations should apply to all institutions, 30% said they should be limited to those that are public and/or non-profit. And 40% said that exceptions and limitations should cover educational or research activities in general. As with libraries/archives, there was a variety of views on the conditions that should apply.

The WIPO context

Despite the divergences between nations and regions, most of the 40 groups that responded to this question said that harmonisation is desirable. The exceptions were the Finnish, French and US groups, which all expressed concerns about protecting national practices and policies. "I’m sure we will have a good discussion and I hope we can draft a resolution that everyone will agree on," says Inui.

The issue is timely as it is one of two main topics being discussed by WIPO’s Standing Committee on Copyright and Related Rights (SCCR) and is listed on the agenda for the SCCR next session in December this year. WIPO has also published a detailed report by Professor Kenneth Crews on exceptions and limitations for libraries and archives, which highlights the different approaches taken to this question worldwide. "The purpose of AIPPI’s work on this topic should be to try to find acceptable solutions that might be adopted by WIPO," says Mondini.

While WIPO members have agreed on the importance and the goal of enhancing the public service mission of libraries and archives, they differ on how best to achieve it. At the last meeting of the SCCR, delegates discussed national laws and practices and examined a chart to provide a structure to discuss the substance of each topic. "Hopefully AIPPI can confirm its position with a resolution at this year’s Congress and then present it to WIPO to inform that discussion," says Inui.

Orphan works

One of the questions raised by Question 246 is whether there should be any special treatment for orphan works – that is, copyright works whose author cannot be traced. Around 45% of the national/regional groups concluded that institutions should be required to make a reasonable search for the copyright holder before using an orphan work.

However, beyond that there were varying views: three groups said deposit of remuneration is required for orphan works, and two said that attribution of authorship is required if possible. One group said that attribution of authorship is required if possible. One group said that remuneration could be less for an orphan work, and six groups said there should be no special treatment. In the EU, the Orphan Works Directive (2012/28/EU) was enacted in 2012 and came into force in October 2014, though it has not yet been implemented in all member states. The directive applies to printed works, cinematographic and audio-visual works, phonograms and embedded works. It sets out what steps institutions should take to trace authorship, provides for pan-EU recognition of orphan status and enables remuneration to be paid if a copyright holder asserts ownership. The directive also set up an EU Orphan Works Database, which can be searched on OHIM’s website, and so far has more than 1,300 records.

"Orphan works is another area where different countries take different approaches," said Inui. "However, EU member states are progressing towards regional harmonisation despite their different cultures, and that is helpful for international harmonisation."
**VOXPOP**

**WHAT ARE YOU LOOKING FORWARD TO AT THIS YEAR’S AIPPI CONGRESS?**

Mikko Piironen, Papula Nevinpat, Munich, Germany

I’m looking forward to meeting old and new colleagues. I first attended the AIPPI Congress in 2006 but my last time was 2010 so I have some catching up to do! I have arranged lots of meetings and am interested in developments around the world, especially in Asia.

Alexey Vakhnin, Vakhchina & Partners, Moscow, Russia

I am planning to meet a lot of representatives from Brazil, Argentina and Chile as companies from these countries are becoming more active in Russia, for example in the wine industry. And of course Russia and Brazil have a lot in common as we are both members of the BRIC countries.


I am looking forward to getting some interesting new information in the educational sessions. I’m a patent attorney in Israel and a lot of our clients have questions about the Section 101 issue in the United States, which is very uncertain, so I’m hoping to learn more about that. This is my first time at the AIPPI Congress!

Alexey Vakhnin, Vakhchina & Partners, Moscow, Russia

I am planning to meet a lot of representatives from Brazil, Argentina and Chile as companies from these countries are becoming more active in Russia, for example in the wine industry. And of course Russia and Brazil have a lot in common as we are both members of the BRIC countries.

Rahul Vidyani, Vidyani Associates, New Delhi, India

I hope to meet old and new clients, attend some sessions and also explore the city.

Makoto Ono, Anderson Mori & Tomotsune, Tokyo, Japan

I am a member of the Pharmaceutical Committee, and we have had a very fruitful meeting today. There were lots of issues to discuss, including patent term extension, second medical use and of course the impact of the TPP.

Diane Dunn McKay, Porzio Bromberg & Newman, Princeton NJ, United States

I’ve been coming to the AIPPI Congress for four to five years, so I have lots of contacts to meet. This is also my first visit to Brazil. I have already seen a bit of the city and been for a swim in the sea and I hope to have time to see the sights after the Congress finishes.

Fernanda Emenciancio, ICAMP Trademarks and Patents, São Paulo, Brazil

This is my first AIPPI Congress and I expect it will be different from other meetings. I am looking forward to the panel discussions and have scheduled a few meetings. It is about combining knowledge and business. One area I am particularly interested in is designs, which have yet to take off in Brazil.

**TWEETS**

Renata Righetti

In Rio already, toasting to a great, successful Congress @AIPPI_ORG

JT I

We’re at @AIPPI_Org congress asking: does tobacco regulation provide a blueprint for other products? #plainpacks #ip

Citemap IP

At the Inventorship of multinational inventions committee meeting. #aippi #aippi2015

Smart & Biggar

@SmartBiggar is looking forward to seeing friends and colleagues at the AIPPI ORG World IP Congress in Rio! @AIPPI2015

John Anderson

Opening Ceremony at AIPPI in Rio - I hope to make some noise about co-operation on IPR enforcement. @AIPPI_ORG

INTA

INTA INTA sends a delegation to the 2015 @AIPPI_Org World Congress and plans @UnrealCampaign event in Brazil: http://ow.ly/Tj2UY

Knobbe Martens

We’re at @AIPPI_Org’s AIPPI World Congress event today in Rio de Janeiro!

**IP NEWS IN BRIEF**

**EUROPE/CHINA**

This year the European Patent Office and China’s State Intellectual Property Office (SIPO) celebrate 30 years of bilateral co-operation. The two offices looked back at the achievements of three decades of collaboration at a conference on October 9 in Lyon, France, attended by EPO President Benoit Battistelli and SIPO Commissioner Shen Changyu.

**AUSTRALIA**

In a decision that may introduce uncertainties into how patentability is determined, the High Court of Australia in D’arcy v Myriad Genetics has ruled that isolated genetic material is not patentable in a decision that appears to go even further than the US Supreme Court’s decision in Myriad. On appeal, the High Court reversed the Federal Court and the Full Federal Court, adopting an approach similar to the US Supreme Court’s. Like its American sister court, the Australia High Court found that the information contained in the molecule is the core of the invention. Thus it held that the molecule is not an artificial state of affairs and ineligible for patent protection.

**UNITED STATES**

The PTAB has instituted review of an inter partes review petition brought by the Coalition for Affordable Drugs, the first success for the Kyle Bass and Erich Spangenberg-backed entity after three previous denials of petitions. The Board will review a Cosmo Technologies patent covering a treatment for Crohn’s disease and ulcerative colitis. Shortly before Bass’s petition was instituted the Board also instituted petitions from Nathaniel August’s hedge fund Mangrove Partners challenging two patents owned by VirnetX. “An economic motive for challenging a patent claim does not itself raise abuse of process issues,” said Judge Stephen Siu. The patents had been upheld by the Federal Circuit in VirnetX’s disputes with Apple.

**WTO**

The WTO’s Public Forum took place in Geneva from September 30 to October 2, and included coverage of intellectual property and how IP rights can contribute to making trade work. A session organised by the US Chamber of Commerce’s Global Intellectual Property Centre discussed the perspectives of the private and public sectors and consumers on IP rights. It stressed that the TRIPS Agreement sets an important minimum standard of protection and provides the necessary legal security for businesses. A session organised by AIPPI focused on IP as a trade source. The session looked at the application of IP across countries and different business models. The enabling role of IP was also discussed, with examples from the fashion industry, the food industry and industrial joint ventures.

**EUROPE**

The OHIM last week released its IP Education report. The results of the study show that no specific standalone IP subject or comprehensive IP education programme exists in the current official curricula in the EU and non-EU countries/regions analysed. However, IP and IP-related themes are integrated into one or several subjects as a cross-curricular subject throughout all education levels. In both the EU and non-EU countries/regions analysed, copyright constitutes the most commonly referenced IP right within the official school curricula, whereas design, patent and trade marks are less apparent. In non-EU countries/regions, trade marks are referenced only at secondary levels.

**TPP**

An agreement on the Trans-Pacific Partnership was announced last week, the result of more than five years of negotiations. It covers 12 nations representing 40% of the world’s economy: Australia, Brunei, Canada, Chile, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Singapore, United States and Vietnam. Details of the Agreement were not published, but the IP chapter was leaked on Wikileaks.
Things to do in Rio

Rio has more to see and do than just Sugarloaf Mountain, Christ the Redeemer and the beaches of Copacabana and Ipanema. You should definitely see all those, but here are a few more ideas for what to do if you have spare time away from the Congress.

Enjoy the botanical gardens

Rio’s Botanical Gardens have more than 8,000 species of plants from around the world. The gardens’ most-well-known feature is the looming imperial palms, with more than 900 varieties of palm leaves and a 750 metre line of 134 palms leading from the entrance to the gardens.

The gardens were designed by order to Prince Regent Dom João in 1809. They were restored at the end of 2011.

Explore Tijuca National Park

If you have time to spare after the Congress, you could do worse than exploring the 8,300 acres of green rainforest at Tijuca National Park. Christ the Redeemer is located on Corcovado Hill within the park.

The park includes waterfalls and a wide array of plants, mammals, birds, amphibians and reptiles. You can take a four-hour jeep tour through the rainforest that takes in stops at Emperor’s Table and Mayrink Chapel, as well as stunning views at Vista Chinesa offering panoramas of Ipanema and Copacabana beaches, and beyond.

It is the most visited national park in Brazil, with more than 3 million visitors a year. The park is divided into four sectors: forest, Serra da Carioca, Pedra Bonita/Pedra da Gávea and black Liners/Covancas.

Get cultural at CCBB

The Centro Cultural Banco do Brasil is a multimedia cultural centre in a historic downtown building on Rua Primeiro de Março. The building was previously vital to Rio’s financial industry but was restored at the end of the 1980s and transformed into a focus for art exhibitions, film and culture. The beautiful roof alone is almost worth the visit.

This week, CCBB includes exhibitions on Orson Welles, Brazilian children’s programme Castelo Rá-Tim-Bum, and the history of Banco do Brasil, as well as visual art from Jaime Lauriano and a play from the Bagaceira Theatre Group. It is open every day from 9.00am to 9.00pm except Tuesday.

Visit the Maracanã

Soccer fans will be tempted by a visit to the historic Maracanã Stadium, which was built for the 1950 World Cup and has a capacity of almost 79,000. The stadium hosts games for the four main Rio teams. It also hosted the opening of the 2014 World Cup and will host the 2016 Summer Olympics opening ceremonies.

You can take tours around the stadium daily from 9.00am to 5pm. This includes seeing the dressing rooms and a collection of memorabilia from famous stars that have played there, including Pelé. But the best experience would be to take in the atmosphere at a game. Fluminense play Sao Paulo at 10pm on Wednesday 14, Vasco da Gama play Chapecoense at 7.30pm on Thursday 15, and Flamengo play Internacional at 4pm on Sunday 18.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07.30 – 08.30</td>
<td>RGT, PC Breakfast</td>
<td>Windsor (Terrace)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.00 – 12.30</td>
<td>Executive Committee I</td>
<td>Segovia I-IV (2nd Floor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30 – 11.00</td>
<td>Coffee break</td>
<td>Exhibition Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.30 – 14.00</td>
<td>Networking Lunch</td>
<td>Area Multiuso (Second Lower Level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.30 – 14.00</td>
<td>Lunch 1 with Keynote Speakers: Continuous improvement of IP systems (ticketed event)</td>
<td>Queluzes I-VII (First Lower Level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00 – 17.30</td>
<td>Plenary Session I Q246</td>
<td>Segovia I-IV (2nd Floor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00 – 17.30</td>
<td>Panel Session I Focus on FRAND</td>
<td>Louvre I-II (Ground Floor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00 – 15.30</td>
<td>Panel Session II PVP - using the right tools</td>
<td>Louvre III-IV (Ground Floor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00 – 15.00</td>
<td>Secretaries &amp; Treasurers meeting</td>
<td>Versailles I (Ground Floor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.00 – 16.00</td>
<td>Secretaries &amp; Treasurers Q&amp;A Session</td>
<td>Versailles I (Ground Floor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.30 – 16.00</td>
<td>Coffee break</td>
<td>Exhibition Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.00 – 17.30</td>
<td>Panel Session III Green technology: a changing climate for IP rights</td>
<td>Louvre III-IV (Ground Floor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.00 – 19.00</td>
<td>Women in AIPPI</td>
<td>Ground Floor Restaurant (Oceanico Hotel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.30 – 22.30</td>
<td>Cultural evening</td>
<td>Copacabana Palace Hotel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In an uncertain legal environment, we are one law firm that is not content simply to accept the status quo. We work constantly to influence the evolving body of Mexico’s intellectual property laws, with the goal of ultimately bringing them in line with international standards. While we continue to make great strides in this regard, clients from all over the world rely on us to prosecute, manage, and defend their IP portfolios under the laws that exist today. In other words, we work effectively with the system, even as we seek to change it.