

CWS/7/21 ORIGINAL: ENGLISH DATE: MAY 15, 2019

Committee on WIPO Standards (CWS)

Seventh Session Geneva, July 1 to 5, 2019

RESULTS OF THE SURVEY ON ELECTRONIC VISUAL REPRESENTATION OF INDUSTRIAL DESIGNS

Document prepared by the International Bureau

INTRODUCTION

1. At its sixth session held in in 2018, the Committee on WIPO Standards (CWS) approved the questionnaire on electronic visual representation on industrial designs. The CWS requested the Secretariat to issue a circular inviting IPOs to participate in the survey on industrial designs. (See paragraphs 178 and 180 of document CWS/6/34.)

In November 2018, the Secretariat issued circular C.CWS.110 requesting IP Offices to designate representatives to participate in the survey.

RESULTS OF THE SURVEY

2. The present survey was conducted from December 2018 to March 2019 using the questionnaire approved by the sixth session of the CWS. Thirty-six Offices responded to the circular to request a link to the survey. Twenty-five Offices submitted responses to the survey. The International Bureau analyzed the responses and prepared the following report for consideration by the CWS. The verbatim individual and collective responses are available at [https://www.wipo.int/edocs/mdocs/classifications/en/cws_7/cws_7_21-related1.zip].

- 3. The following 25 Offices participated in the Survey:
 - AU Australia
 - CA Canada
 - CH Switzerland
 - CN China
 - CO Colombia
 - CR Costa Rica
 - CZ Czech Republic
 - DE Germany
 - DO Dominican Republic
 - EE Estonia
 - EM European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO)
 - ES Spain
 - FR France
 - GB United Kingdom
 - HR Croatia
 - IE Ireland
 - IT Italy
 - JP Japan
 - KR Republic of Korea
 - MD Republic of Moldova
 - PT Portugal
 - RU Russian Federation
 - SE Sweden
 - SK Slovakia
 - UA Ukraine

4. The questionnaire addressed how IPOs currently handle design submissions, including file formats, view requirements, and publication practices.

5. Most Offices (84%) reported filing numbers for both paper and electronic format, indicating that they use both methods. Three Offices (CN, FR, IT) did not report any numbers for paper filing. Three Offices (CN, CR, DO) did not report any numbers for electronic filing.

6. For 2D image formats, every responding Office (100%) accepts JPEG, while support for other formats such as TIFF, PNG, GIF, and PDF is more limited (40% to 55%). Support for 3D submissions is much more limited. Only three Offices (AU, IT, PT) accept 3D PDF files, while other 3D formats are only accepted by one or two Offices (mainly KR or EU). Only three Offices (DO, IT, KR) accept video files as submissions. Five Offices (CO, CR, MD, SE, SK) accept holograms in some form.

7. For image limitations, all responding Offices (100%) accept images in color, black & white, and photographic images, while all but one Office (96%) accepts images in grayscale. Over half of Offices limit the maximum size of files submitted and the maximum number of designs per submission.

8. For paper submissions, 75% of Offices set a minimum paper size while 100% set a maximum paper size. Most Offices also set a maximum (75%) and minimum (50%) image size on paper. Most Offices (75%) allow more than one view on each page. Paper designs are converted to electronic form by 96% of Offices, with common output formats of JPEG, TIFF, or PDF. About one third of Offices store paper specimens for a period between 1 and 5 years, while another third store paper specimens indefinitely / forever.

9. About half (48%) of Offices do not transform defective images, but simply reject them. Other Offices will scale and resize (48%), convert the file format (48%), trim white space (28%), correct colors (16%) or perform other transformations.

10. Submission requirements are the same for applicants and non-applicants in only 16% of Offices. The other Offices either do not accept third party submissions at all (44%) or have no specific requirements for third party submissions (40%).

11. All Offices but one (CR) publish design representations online for access with a web browser. Between 20% and 30% of Offices also various other publication formats. Many Offices report that their publication format may differ from what the applicant submitted in size (72%) or file format (64%).

12. All Offices but one (DO) display images electronically for examination or administration purposes. Almost half (48%) also print images on paper for these purposes. The images used may differ from the original submission by the applicant in size (72%) or file format (64%). Searching of images by Offices is done with metadata (48%), automated image search (14%), a combination of the two methods (24%), or Locarno classification (16%).

13. Most Offices allow submission of multiple types of views, with over two thirds of Offices supporting aspect views (88%), magnifying views (92%), alternate positions (92%), exploded views (84%), fully assembled views (84%), partial views (76%), sectional views (68%), or a sequence of snapshots (80%). Similarly, many types of visual disclaimers are allowed, including broken lines (84%), blurring (60%), or color shading (60%).

14. Over half of Offices (56%) do not require exemplary views of designs to be selected. Of those that do, the exemplary image is most often selected by the Offices (41%). Only one Office (CN) requires the applicant to select the exemplary image.

15. The CWS is invited to:

(a) note the content of the present document; and

(b) request the International Bureau to prepare and publish the survey result as well as individual and collective responses on the WIPO website.

[End of document]