No. LC/WIPO/98/105/ Date: 11/12/2003

To

Mr. Md. Asaduzzaman
Secretary
Ministry of Law, Justice and Parliamentary Affairs
Bangladesh Secretariat, Dhaka.

Attention: Ministry of Industries, Ministry of Commerce, Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Cultural Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Science, Information & Communication Technology and Permanent Mission of Bangladesh to the U.N. Offices.

Subject: Report on discussion between Bangladesh delegation and WIPO experts on proposed Patents and Designs Act, Trade Marks and Merchandise Marks Act, Copyright Act, 2000 and other subjects of intellectual property rights within the purview of WTO.

Sir,

In relation to subject mentioned above this is to inform you that a two member delegation comprising Secretary of the Law Commission, I myself and Mr. Md. Nurul Islam, Translation Officer of the Law Commission visited WIPO Secretariat, Geneva from 6-8 October to discuss about draft Patents and Designs Act, Trade Marks and Merchandise Marks Act and the Copyright Act, 2000.

It may be recalled here that the Law Commission prepared the working paper on Patents and Designs Act, 1911 on March 14, 2001 with a view to make the same updated and compatible with the TRIPS Agreement which binds Bangladesh as a member of World Trade Organisation.

After preparation of the working paper it was distributed amongst all the stakeholders of Bangladesh and exchange of views with the stakeholders at different stages took place in the conference room of the Commission. Some of the stakeholders also sent written suggestions.

A copy of the working paper was sent to the WIPO Secretariat inviting comments of its experts on the working paper. The experts of the WIPO Secretariat firstly communicated their comments on 27/5/2002 and after meeting of comments by the Commission it at the second stage made some other comments which were also met by sending remarks of the Commission on 28/5/2003.

As all the issues raised by the experts of the WIPO Secretariat could not be resolved through exchange of comments and remarks between the Law Commission and the WIPO Secretariat and a meeting was considered worthwhile, the WIPO arranged the present visit. Justice Naimuddin Ahmed who prepared the working paper having retired in the meantime, the Chairman nominated me and Mr. Nurul Islam to undertake the present visit for completing the unfinished work on the working paper and then submitting the final report to the Government. Besides the draft working paper (referred to as draft Act by WIPO in their correspondence) the WIPO officials also discussed generally about all IPR legislations relevant for Bangladesh.

At present it is thought that eight subjects fall within the scope of Intellectual Property Rights. These are 1) Copyright, 2) Patents, 3) Industrial Designs, 4) Trade Marks and Merchandise Marks 5) Geographical Indications, 6) Layout Designs of Integrated Circuits, 7) Plant Variety Protection and 8) Electronic Transactions or in other words Information Technology.

Out of these eight subjects Bangladesh has legislation on Patents and Designs since 1911, on Trade Marks since 1940 and on Copyright since 1962.

In most of the countries of the World Patents and Industrial Designs are two different subjects and they have two different legislations on the same.

Out of aforesaid eight subjects of intellectual property rights the Law Commission prepared the draft law on 5 subjects of which on four updating was done while fifth one, viz. Information Technology in other words Law on Electronic Transactions is completely a new enactment in the context of Bangladesh.

Bangladesh does not have any law on 3 subjects of Intellectual property rights, namely, 1) Geographical Indications, 2) Layout Designs of Integrated Circuits and 3) Plant Variety Protection.

Bangladesh as being one of the members of the least developed countries is enjoying protection upto 31st December 2005 to make all the existing laws on intellectual property rights compatible with TRIPS Agreement before the expiry of dead line. With regard to subjects on which Bangladesh does not have as yet any legislation on those subjects also Bangladesh may have to come out with draft legislation before expiry of the dead line. Because of signing as well as ratifying WTO Agreement an obligation has fallen upon Bangladesh to submit all the existing and would be legislations on intellectual property rights to the TRIPS Council before expiry of the dead line and if any of those is found to be inconsistent with the TRIPS Agreement the Government of Bangladesh may have to face embarrassment.

On the starting day of discussion i.e. on 6th October, 2003 in WIPO Secretariat at Geneva Mr. Kurt Kemper, Director Cooperation for Development (Intellectual Property Law) Department, WIPO took the delegation to his office from the hotel where the members of the delegation were staying. Then the delegation had discussion in his room for an hour joined by Mr. Ranjana Abeysekera, Deputy Director, Cooperation for Development, Bureau for Asia

and Pacific and Mr. Nuno Pires de Carvalho, Head, Industrial Property Law Section, Cooperation for Development (Intellectual Property Law) Department. In that meeting it was decided that full-fledged discussion would take place on draft Patents and Designs Act as experts of the Secretariat had the opportunity to examine the working paper of the draft Patents and Designs Act dated March 14, 2001 beforehand. In the said meeting a copy of Copyright Act, 2000 and draft Trade Marks and Merchandise Marks Act prepared in matrix form were also handed over to Mr. Nuno to discuss about those two laws and also to obtain views of the experts as to whether those meet the requirements set forth by TRIPS Agreement.

After end of meeting in the office of Mr. Kurt Kemper the delegation was taken to a discussion room where Mr. Nuno was assisted by Ms. Indunil Abeysekera, Consultant, Intellectual Property Law and Ms. Jean Chin, Legal Officer, Industrial Property.

While discussing on Patents and Industrial Designs as Bangladesh has one legislation on two subjects the experts of WIPO wanted to stress upon to define the term patent in the way 'the title granted to protect an invention'. The officials of the Law Commission tried to impress upon that under the proposed Act 'patents' has been described a patent granted under this Act and also the patent granted under the former Act. In this respect the officials of the Commission cited the definitions of patent as given in the Indian Patents and Designs Act, 1970 and the United Kingdom Patents Act, 1977. The WIPO Experts after having discussion accepted the proposition of the Law Commission and agreed that the way 'patent' has been defined should be kept intact.

In the draft Act the word "invention" has been defined as any manner of new and useful manufacture and includes an improvement and an alleged invention. After having discussion with the WIPO experts and Law

Commission's response already communicated it has been agreed upon to widen the definition of invention in the following formulation. 'Invention means any new, sufficiently inventive and useful-

1) art, process, method or manner of manufacture.
2) machine, apparatus or other article.
3) substance produced by manufacture

and includes any new, sufficiently inventive and useful improvement of any of them, and an alleged invention.'

The draft Act is being amended accordingly.

In the draft Act the term "convention country" has been defined as a country notified as such under sub-section 1 of section 144 of the Act. WIPO experts are of the view that if the convention country is defined in the aforesaid way the government will be required to update the list from time to time. In order to avoid it the WIPO experts suggested to define "convention country" as members of the World Trade Organisation. The suggestion seems to be reasonable and the draft Act is being amended accordingly.

In section 4 of the draft Act 18 items have been excluded from patentability but in relation to exclusion of food in clause (d) and plants in clause (k) and then again food in clause (r) sub clause (i) the WIPO experts are of the view that these are to be dropped from exclusion from patentiability as after 2005 the protection enjoyed by the least developed countries will no more be effective under the TRIPS Agreement unless the protection enjoyed by least developed countries is further extended in any WTO meeting. This suggestion appears to be reasonable and the draft Act is being amended accordingly.

Substances prepared or produced by chemical processes including alloys, optical glass, semi-conductors and inter metalic compounds have been kept excluded from patentiability in the draft Act vide section 4(e). In this

matter, also as before, the WIPO experts are of the opinion that it is better to drop it earlier as in the year 2006 if the protection is not extended the Council of TRIPS while reviewing the Patent Law of Bangladesh will not allow it to be excluded from patentability. The concrete suggestion of WIPO experts is that as keeping of food, plants and chemical substances excluded from patentability is in consistent with Article 27 of the TRIPS Agreement and before review of the patent law by the TRIPS Council, further exemption being very unlikely, it is better to exclude those at the earlier stage without requiring to go for amendment in 2006 with a view to make the same compatiable with the TRIPS Agreement. This suggestion also appears to be reasonable and the relevant section of the draft Act is being amended accordingly.

As regards aforesaid items, viz. food, chemical products the WIPO experts suggested to incorporate a provision for mail box system in the draft Act allowing any inventor to file application immediately after invention and keep the same pending for granting patent till expiry of dead line being enjoyed by Bangladesh as least developed country. The suggestion appears to be reasonable and a proviso may be added to section 4 of the draft Act in the following terms:-

Provided that an application for patent may be made under section 8 in respect of substances prepared or processed by chemical processes, substances intended to use, or capable of being used, as food or as medicine or as drug and plants but it shall remain pending for further action until the bar is lifted under the TRIPS Agreement.

As regards industrial application the WIPO experts suggested that handicraft and fishery should also be included within the scope of industrial application in section 7 of the draft Act. The WIPO experts also laid stress on including services within industrial application. The officials of the Commission expressed that if services is to be included within industrial application then that has to be defined in the definition clause of the proposed

Act or in section 7 of the said Act. In reply to this WIPO experts have said that it is not necessary to define the term "services" since the term "industry" is to be understood to include services in a broader sense. Following the discussion it is agreed to amend section 7 of the draft Act for including handicraft and fishery within the concept of industrial application. Accordingly the section is being amended.

Chapter V of the draft Act relates to exclusive marketing rights in respect of medicine and drug. The WIPO officials suggested that the entire chapter should be dropped from draft Act. In their earlier comments in respect of draft Act the WIPO stated that the said Chapter V was in accordance with Article 70-9 of the TRIPS Agreement. It was pointed out that paragraph 8 and 9 of Article 70 of the TRIPS Agreement apply only to country which did not provide as of 1 January 1995, patent protection for pharmaceutical and agricultural chemical products. The WIPO further pointed out that our existing Act, that is, Patents Act, 1911 does not appear to exclude pharmaceutical products from patent protection and that being so the provisions of Chapter V are unnecessary for compliance with the TRIPS Agreement and could be deleted.

It has been already stated above that following discussion this time with the WIPO officials some items including medicine and drug have been excluded from the non-patentability provision of section 4 of the draft Act. In other words medicine and drug in any case was neither excluded from patentability in the existing Act nor in the draft Act. It is, therefore, reasonable to think that the suggestion made by the WIPO in respect of Chapter V may be accepted. The said chapter will now be deleted from the draft Act.

Section 56 of the proposed Act relates to rights of patentees. It confers exclusive right to the patentee, his agent, or licencee to make, use, exercise, sell or distribute the invention in Bangladesh. According to WIPO experts this

section should contain the provision of parallel importation or controlled importation in order to meet any emergency or defeat any artificial crisis created by any individual or syndicate with the ulterior motive to make huge profit at the cost of sufferings of the members of the public. In their earlier comments on section 56 the WIPO only pointed out that the section does not fully reflect Article 28 of the TRIPS Agreement and are inconsistent with the provisions of section 113 of the draft Act. Section 10 of the WIPO draft law was referred to for consideration. In that section no provision is there for parallel or controlled importation. The rights of the patentee including exploitation have been elaborately laid down in that section. At another place of the WIPO earlier comments there is mention of parallel importation where the issue of exhaustion of rights has been discussed. A comment has been made that the draft Act is silent on the issue of exhaustion of rights. In the WIPO draft Act however no provision is found in respect of exhaustion of rights of a patentee which is said to be linked with the issue of parallel importation. The question of any emergency or creation of artificial crisis for which it is now suggested for incorporating a provision for parallel or controlled importation does not find any place either in earlier comments or in any provision of the WIPO draft Act. The suggestion for incorporating provision of parallel or controlled importation is found to be not necessary at least for the time being.

As regards the term of patent in the proposed Act (section 61) it has been provided that it shall be 20 years from the date of the patent. In the earlier Act it was sixteen years from the date of patent. The WIPO experts suggested that it should be 20 years from the filing date so as to make the same in conformity with Article 33 of the TRIPS Agreement. In their earlier comments WIPO made the same observation and referred to section 8 and 11 of the WIPO draft Act for consideration. In line with section 11(1) of the WIPO draft law it will be necessary to amend section 61(1) of the draft Act making the term of patent for 20 years from the date of filing of the application for patent. An amendment is accordingly being made in the draft law.

As regards grounds for granting compulsory licence the grounds as set forth in section 91(2) (a) of the draft Act is not comprehensive in the opinion of the WIPO experts and in order to make the same comprehensive they suggested to add the following words after the words reasonably practicable by deleting the semi colone and adding the following words and such lack of work is deemed abusive. The experts opined that this addition will fulfill the principle set forth in Article 8 of the TRIPS Agreement. The relevant section, viz. section 91(2) (a) requires to be amended accordingly and the draft Act has been so amended.

Chapter 26 of the proposed Act relates to international agreements. Section 144 of this chapter deals with notification as to convention countries. According to WIPO experts in order to meet requirements of Article 3 of the TRIPS agreement this section should be reformulated as follows:

"144- Notification as to convention countries (i) With a view to fulfillment of a treaty, convention or arrangement and without prejudice to the principle of national treatment under the TRIPS Agreement all the Members of the World Trade Organisation shall be treated as convention countries."

Section 145 of the aforesaid chapter speaks of notification as to countries not providing for reciprocity. According to WIPO experts this section is redundant as the concept of national treatment as enunciated in Article 3 of the TRIPS Agreement has binding effect for the member countries and thus no room should be kept for any national of non member country in the Act of a Member Country to TRIPS Agreement i.e. Member of the WTO. In view of that the WIPO experts suggested the deletion of section 145. The suggestion seems to be reasonable and section 145 will be deleted accordingly from the draft Act and necessary amendment will also be made in section 8(1).

It has been discussed earlier that in Bangladesh there is no separate law named Industrial Designs and here in the present Act the designs portion has been incorporated in part II. Chapter XXVIII relates to registration of designs. Section 162 of the chapter XXVIII deals with application for registration of designs. In this section applicant has been classified as proprietor of any new and original design. WIPO Experts are of the view that the term original is linked with creativity falling within the scope of copyright and bringing of the word original in this section will tantamount to encroaching into the domain of copyright and in that consideration they suggested deletion of the word original appearing after the word new. It appears from Article 25.1 of the TRIPS Agreement that protection for industrial designs may be provided that are new or original. That being so in order to make it consistent with the aforesaid provision it is necessary to substitute the word 'or' instead of 'and' between the words new and original in section 162. The relevant amendment is being made in the draft Act.

Chapter XXIX of the proposed Act relates to Copyright in Registered Designs and section 166 of this chapter deals with copyright on registration. In this matter the WIPO experts are of the view that copyright is a different subject having legislation on the same by all Member States of TRIPS Agreement which in other words mean Members of the World Trade Organisation. Any aspect of copyright should not be dealt with by any other law and according to them the caption of the chapter should be 'Right in Registered Designs' and the name of section 166 should be 'Right on registration' and from the word copyright appearing in the section the word copy should be deleted. Having considered the opinion of the experts in the light of their earlier elaborate comments on the subject it appears that there will be no conflict with the Berne Convention (Article 5) or any provision of the TRIPS Agreement if a design which is registered under the Act is also provided with copyright under section 166 of the Act. It is therefore suggested that the provision as in 166 may be retained.

Section 174 of chapter XXX deals with piracy of registered designs. The WIPO experts are of the view that in the naming of the section instead of word piracy the appropriate word is infringement as piracy is a subject falling within the scope of copyright. In their view in the body of the section from the word copyright the frontal part of the word copy should be deleted. It will be seen that it has already been decided that the provision for granting copyright to a registered design has been accepted on principle and section 166 of the draft Act is accordingly being retained. In such view of the matter it is felt that section 174 of the draft Act may be retained with the same terminology as it is now.

Section 192 of the proposed Act relates to reciprocal arrangements with other countries. The WIPO experts are of the view that the principle of national treatment as enunciated in Article 3 of the TRIPS Agreement should be the basis of treating the nationals of other member nations applying for registration of any design and any question of reciprocity would be a deviation of obligation of a country ensued upon it in respect of national treatment after becoming State party to the TRIPS Agreement as being Member of the WTO. Having examined the terms of section 192 of the draft Act and the provisions of Article 3 of the TRIPS Agreement it appears that they are not in conflict. Section 192 does not provide for different nationals but for the same national who has been granted a patent and which has been protected by the legislature of another country acquires some other rights which have been provided in sub-sections (2) (3) (4) of section 192. In such view of the matter we think that section 192 may be retained.

So far Bangladesh law on patent is concerned there is no provision for utility model certificate. According to WIPO experts the concept of utility model certificate can be integrated in the Patents and Designs Act. Utility Model Certificate is for less inventive products and also for small investors.

Instance may be given of handicraft. In the utility model the duration of protection is 7 years. Some countries of the world have separate legislation on utility model certificate and some countries have integrated it in the Patents Act. The suggestion given by the WIPO experts are quite useful and deserves to be considered. In the draft WIPO model law we have noticed the provisions with regard to utility Model Certificates. It has been pointed out in the objectives of the utility model certificates that one of the main advantages of a patent system is the encouragement of indigenous inventivity and the stimulation of creativity among the peoples of the country. Such encouragement and stimulation could result in a large number of inventive products some of which might not, however, meet all the stringent requirements for patentable inventions. Creativity of this kind, nevertheless, deserves reward and should be encouraged. The objectives are undoubtedly laudable. But having regard to the present nature and state of development of our known activities in the field of inventions which are few and far between. We are of the opinion that utility model certificates are something which are perhaps a little ambitious than their presently felt needs. However we may require to incorporate provisions for such certificates when the level of inventions will rise in our national activities. In the circumstances we think that the suggestion of the WIPO for incorporating provision for Utility Model Certificates in the draft Act may for the time being be kept in abeyance.

The draft Trade Marks Act prepared in matrix form was given to the WIPO experts on 6/10/2003. Instantly they made 5 copies of it and fixed next date that is 7th October to discuss on the matter. While making comments on the draft law shown in matrix form the experts emphasized that WIPO draft law should be the basis of any new enactment on Trade Marks. Besides Article 15 of the TRIPS Agreement and section 105 of the UK Act of 1994 shall have to be considered before the enactment of a new law on Trade Marks.

A question was raised in a Cabinet meeting to broaden the definition of goods so as to include agricultural products and herbal plants within the definition of goods. The matter was referred to the Law Commission seeking its opinion whether the definition of goods could be broadened so as to include agricultural products and herbal plants within the definition of goods. The Bangladesh delegation took it an opportunity to discuss the matter with the WIPO experts and they are of the view that if the definition is broadened in the way as desired by the Cabinet that would in no way make any room for creation of any confusion and ambiguity.

In the draft Act of Trade Marks the word 'mark' has been defined in section 2 subsection (11). The WIPO experts are of the view that there is no necessity of defining the word mark separately if the word "Trade Marks" in sub-section (24) of section 2 is defined inconformity with Article 15 sub Article 1 of the TRIPS Agreement as well as Trade Marks Act of United Kingdom 1994.

As regards requisites for registration in Parts A and B of the Register the WIPO experts are in favour of simplifying the registration procedure and they have recommended for doing away with registration procedure of Part A which means the registration procedure of Part B will be enough for the registration of trade marks.

Copyright Law of Bangladesh was enacted on July 18, 2000 after having exchange of views program with the WIPO experts taking place in June 2000 participated on behalf of the Commission by former Member, Justice Naimuddin Ahmed and former Research Officer Mr. Shawkot Ali Chowdhury. Justice Naimuddin Ahmed on his return from Geneva had tried to remove all the latches and lacuna of the law which surfaced during discussion with WIPO experts. However the WIPO experts this time could not make any comment on

the Copyright Act 2000 since the said law has been enacted in Bengali. Section 104 of the Copyright Act 2000 contemplates publication of an authentic English text of the Act. The said task has not yet been undertaken and it is the responsibility of the Ministry of Cultural Affairs to come out with authenticated English version of the Bengali text of Copyright Act. The job is required to be completed before 31st December 2005 firstly to have an on look on the authenticated English text by the WIPO experts and then to be examined by the TRIPS Council in order to ascertain the obligations ensued upon Bangladesh to make the law compatiable with TRIPS Agreement for being Member of the WTO has been fulfilled.

On 7 October, 2003 the delegation had meeting with Wang Zhengfa, Director, Developing Countries (PCT Division). PCT means Patent Cooperation Treaty. As expressed by Director Zhengfa the principal advantages of the PCT are that it saves work and money for applicants where patent protection is sought for an invention in several countries and that it makes the work of national offices more efficient, simpler and less costly.

The Director has further expressed that there are many advantages of PCT but the most significant one is that by filing only one application with the Patent Office by a national of Member of PCT country or with the International Bureau of WIPO, it would be possible to obtain the effect of regularly filed national or regional patent applications for all the PCT Contracting States designated by the applicant in the international application.

So far one hundred and twenty countries of the world adhered to PCT and amongst countries of this sub-continent it includes India and Sri Lanka.

As regards Bangladesh whether it should adhere to PCT or bound by the PCT there is necessity of discussing the issue with the concerned persons both

in governmental and nongovernmental level having sound knowledge on WTO and TRIPS Agreement.

The delegation had last meeting of 7th October 2003 with Dr. Rolph Jordens, Vice Secretary General, International Union for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants (UPOV) and Mr. Makoto Tabata, Senior Counsellor of the said office.

UPOV is an intergovernmental organisation with headquarters in Geneva. The purpose of UPOV convention is to ensure that the Members of the Union acknowledge the achievements of breeders of new varieties of plants, by granting to them an intellectual property rights, on the basis of a set of clearly defined principles.

As yet no country of this sub-continent has become Member of UPOV. But it has been disclosed by UPOV officials two countries of this region, viz. India and Sri Lanka are at the threshold of becoming Members of the UPOV.

So far Bangladesh is concerned if it decides to become a Member of UPOV the first requirement is that to have a legislation on UPOV safeguarding national interest together with fulfilling the requirements ensued upon Bangladesh for becoming State party to TRIPS Agreement as being Member of WTO.

As soon as legislation is made the policy makers of the State should think when to become Member of the UPOV and as to whether such Membership would have positive or negative impact on the national economy.

On the concluding day the delegation had meeting with Kifle Shenkoru, Acting Director Least-Developed Countries Division. Mr. Shenkoru emphasised the need for bringing the affairs of all the subjects of intellectual

property rights under one Directorate. Mr. Shenkoru was very happy to know in this respect in Bangladesh certain progress has been made as already a Department has been established named Department of Patents, Designs and Trade Marks with two wings and the person heading the Department to be known Registrar of Patents, Designs and Trade Marks. Prior to this there were two Registrars under two separate Acts. Mr. Shenkoru also assured that his Division will be always in the side of Bangladesh enabling it to achieve objectives for her elevation firstly to a developing country and then to developed country. Although this is a long way to go but it is possible if human resources are developed to the desired level, management at every level is improved, corruption is eliminated and the person who will be in the driving seat is accomplished with honesty, sincerity, dedication and patriotism.

After end of meeting with Mr. Shenkoru the delegation had final meeting with Mr. N.K. Sabharwal, Director, Cooperation for Development. Bureau for Asia and the Pacific and Deputy Director of the said Bureau Ranjana Abeysekera. Both of them assured that WIPO will provide all possible assistance to Bangladesh in enacting as well as updating IPR related laws and also invite officials of Bangladesh to attend different seminars and workshop and training programs on IPR related laws taking place in different parts of the world either as participant or as resource person. Both of them laid emphasis on greater cooperation between WIPO and Bangladesh in the form of technical assistance and training program.

In the afternoon of 8th October 2003 the delegation met His Excellency Dr. Taufiq Ali Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Bangladesh to Geneva. At that time Mr. Kazi Imtiaz Hossain Counsellor was also present. The delegation apprised him outcome of the discussion with the WIPO officials. His Excellency Permanent Representative requested the delegation to give copy of the report which it would prepare to all the concerned ministries

along with the Permanent Mission of Bangladesh to the UN Offices. His request was taken into account and report would be sent to all concerned.

In fine it may be noted here that as regards development of the Intellectual Property Rights Law in Bangladesh as yet there has not been any consistency and continuity. The different aspects of IPRs are being looked into by different ministries and departments and there has not been any coordination to do the job in a integrated way. It is obvious that the laws on Copyright and Trade Marks, Patents and Designs and the law to be enacted on IPRs in the field where we don't have any law are to be consistent with TRIPS Agreement so that the TRIPS Council while reviewing those laws in 2006 does not find any deviation in the domestic legislation in consideration of Bangladesh's obligation as being Member of the World Trade Organisation. This can be achieved if any official having sound knowledge on IPRs, WTO and drafting legislation is designated as focal point and either represent Bangladesh or remain present as member of delegation in the discussion and negotiation on IPR's and WTO taking place both in home and abroad.

Sincerely yours,

Ikteder Ahmed
Secretary, Law Commission
Old High Court Building, Dhaka-1000.
Phone: 880-2-9559004-5
Fax: 880-2-9560843
E-mail: lawcom@bttb.net.bd

No. LC/WIPO/98/105/671 Date: 02/11/2003

Copy forwarded for information and necessary action:

1. Secretary, Ministry of Industries Shilpa Bavan, Motijheel C/A, Dhaka.
2. Secretary, Ministry of Commerce, Bangladesh Secretariat, Dhaka.
3. Secretary, Ministry of Agriculture, Bangladesh Secretariat, Dhaka.
4. Secretary, Ministry of Cultural Affairs, Bangladesh Secretariat, Dhaka.
5. Secretary, Ministry of Science, Information & Communication Technology, Bangladesh Secretariat, Dhaka.

6. Secretary, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Segunbagicha, Dhaka.
7. His Excellency Dr. Taufiq Ali, Ambassador and Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of Bangladesh to the UN Offices and other International Organisatins to Geneva.
8. Private Secretary to the Hon'ble Minister, Ministry of Law, Justice and Parliamentary Affairs, Bangladesh Secretariat, Dhaka.
9. President, FBCCI, Motijheel C/A, Dhaka.
10. Mr. N.K.Sabharwal, Director Cooperation for Development Bureau for Asia and Pacific, WIPO.
11. Mr. Kurt Kemper, Director, Cooperation for Development (Intellectual Property Law) Department, WIPO.
12. Dr. Rolf Jordens, Vice Secretary General, UPOV, WIPO.
13. Mr. Kifle Shenkoru, Acting Director, Least Developed Countries Division, WIPO.
14. Mr. Ranjana Abeysekera, Deputy Director, Cooperation for Development, Bureau for the Asia and Pacific.

Ikteder Ahmed
Secretary