

SCT/24/6 ORIGINAL: ENGLISH DATE: FEBRUARY 14, 2011

Standing Committee on the Law of Trademarks, Industrial Designs and Geographical Indications

Twenty-Fourth Session Geneva, November 1 to 4, 2010

Document prepared by the Secretariat

SUMMARY OF THE REPLIES TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF NAMES OF STATES AGAINST REGISTRATION AND USE AS TRADEMARKS

INTRODUCTION

- At the twenty-first session of the Standing Committee on the Law of Trademarks, Industrial Designs and Geographical Indications (SCT) held in Geneva from June 22 to 26, 2009, members initiated discussions on the protection of official names of States against their registration and use as trademarks (paragraph 15 of document SCT/21/7).
- 2. At that session, the SCT agreed to request the Secretariat to prepare a draft questionnaire on the protection of official names of States against registration and use as trademarks, for consideration by the SCT at its twenty-second session in November 2009, and containing a concise list of questions, to be addressed to SCT members in the second half of 2010 (paragraph 14 of document SCT/22/8).
- 3. The twenty-third session of the SCT, which took place in Geneva from June 30 to July 2, 2010, considered the text of a draft questionnaire as published in document SCT/23/4. At that session, a number of delegations and representatives of observer organizations made drafting suggestions to the draft questionnaire, which were incorporated by the Secretariat and presented to the Committee in the form of an unofficial document. Following the adoption of the draft questionnaire by the

Ε

Committee, the Chair concluded that the questionnaire would be circulated to Member States with September 15, 2010, as the deadline for returns. The Secretariat was requested to compile the returns to the questionnaire and to present that compilation as a working document for the next session of the SCT.

- 4. Accordingly, the Secretariat produced the questionnaire contained in the Annex to document SCT/24/2 and circulated it under Circular letter C.7868, of July 22, 2010.
- 5. At its twenty-fourth session, the SCT considered document SCT/24/6 Prov., which reproduced, in Annex I, the replies to the questionnaire that were received until the closing date (September 30, 2010) from the following Member States: Albania, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America and Uruguay.
- 6. At that session, SCT members were requested to verify their replies and provide amendments or comments that they wished to see reflected in the document. The SCT decided that that the Secretariat should prepare a final version of document SCT/24/6 Prov., for submission to the next session of the SCT.
- 7. On November 30, 2010 replies were received from the following Member States: Canada, China (including Hong Kong SAR), Ireland and Republic of Korea. Annex I to the present document reproduces all replies in tabulated form showing individual replies according to country. When no reply was given, the corresponding entry remains empty. This part is followed by a quantitative analysis of the replies (Annex II).

[Annexes follow]

I. Protection of Names of States Against Registration as Trademarks					
	.				
		(c) Excluded from registration as			
		trademark for goods if the use of			
		the name of a State could be			
		considered to be misleading as to			
goods		the origin of the goods in respect			
	registration is sought	of which registration is sought			
		YES			
	YES	YES			
		YES			
NO	YES*	YES			
YES					
NO	YES	YES			
YES	YES	YES			
YES	YES*	YES			
	YES	YES			
		YES			
120	120	120			
VES	VES	YES			
		YES			
	125	125			
	VES	YES			
		YES			
		YES			
TES	TES	TES			
NO	VES	YES			
		YES			
		YES*			
		YES			
	YES	YES			
NO	YES	YES			
NO	NO	NO			
YES	YES	YES			
	NO				
YES	NO				
	1. Under the app (a) Generally excluded from registration as trademark for goods YES YES NO YES NO YES NO YES NO YES YES YES YES NO NO NO NO NO YES YES NO NO NO YES YES NO YES YES NO YES YES NO YES YES NO YES YES NO YES YES NO YES YES NO YES YES NO YES YES NO YES YES NO YES YES YES NO YES YES NO YES YES NO YES YES NO YES NO YES YES NO YES YES NO YES YES NO YES YES NO YES NO YES YES NO YES NO NO YES NO YES NO YES NO YES NO YES NO YES NO YES NO YES NO YES NO YES NO YES NO YES NO YES YES NO YES NO YES NO YES YES NO YES NO YES NO YES NO YES NO YES NO YES YES NO YES NO YES YES NO YES YES NO YES YES NO YES YES NO YES NO YES YES NO YES YES NO YES YES YES NO YES YES YES YES YES YES YES YES YES YES	1. Under the applicable legislation, names of State (a) Generally (b) Excluded from registration as trademark for goods if they could be considered descriptive of the origin of the goods in respect of which registration is sought YES YES YES YES YES YES YES YES NO YES YES YES NO YES YES YES NO YES YES YES NO YES YES YES YES YES YES YES YES YES			

Responding	I. Protection of Names of States Against Registration as Trademarks				
countries		plicable legislation, names of Sta			
	(a) Generally excluded from registration as trademark for goods	(b) Excluded from registration as trademark for goods if they could be considered descriptive of the origin of the goods in respect of which registration is sought	(c) Excluded from registration as trademark for goods if the use of the name of a State could be considered to be misleading as to the origin of the goods in respect of which registration is sought		
Oman	YES	YES	YES		
Peru	NO	YES	YES		
Poland	YES	YES	YES		
Portugal	YES	YES*	YES		
Republic of Korea	YES	YES	YES		
Republic of Moldova	YES	YES	YES		
Romania	NO	YES	YES		
Russian Federation	NO	YES	YES		
San Marino	NO	YES	YES		
Serbia	YES	YES	YES		
Singapore	YES	YES	YES		
Slovakia	YES	YES	YES		
Slovenia	NO	YES	YES		
South Africa	YES	YES	YES		
Spain	YES	YES	YES		
Sri Lanka	YES	YES	YES		
Sweden	NO	YES	YES		
Switzerland	NO	YES	YES		
Syrian Arab Republic	YES	YES	YES		
Trinidad and Tobago	YES	YES	YES		
Turkey	YES	YES	YES		
Ukraine	YES	YES	YES		
United Kingdom	NO	YES	YES		
United Republic of Tanzania	YES	YES	YES		
United States of America	NO*	YES	YES		
Uruguay	YES	YES	YES		

*Additional comments

BARBADOS:

Question 1(b) See Trademarks Act 1981, Section 9(1)(b).

CANADA:

Question 1(b)

Unless the Office receives confirmation from the trademark owner that the goods emanate from that geographical place. Also subject to acquired distinctiveness provisions.

FINLAND:

Even though names of States are not "generally excluded" under the applicable legislation, names of States as word marks are not considered distinctive marks in practice.

JAMAICA:

Question 1

Where the mark consists exclusively of the name of the State, it is generally excluded from registration. Where the word is included as part of the trademark, the mark as a whole is registered and the name of the State disclaimed.

JAPAN:

Question 1(a)

Under Japanese trademark law, there are no provisions which provide to "generally" exclude names of States from registration as trademarks for goods and services. However, names of States are generally refused registration because they are considered to be the source of origin or indicate the quality of the goods and services according to the Trademark Examination Manual.

NORWAY:

Question 1(a)

Generally if it is a word mark. However, if it is a word and device mark, it depends how dominant the name of State element is in the mark.

PORTUGAL:

Question 1(b) When composed solely by the name of a State.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Question 1(a)

Country names are not specifically excluded from eligibility for trademark protection. However, marks composed of or consisting of geographic signs, including names of States, submitted for trademark registration undergo analysis as part of a full substantive examination to determine if the proposed mark is geographically descriptive, geographically deceptively misdescriptive or deceptive in relation to the nature of the goods and/or services. U.S. law provides grounds for refusal of marks containing geographic source identifiers, including prohibitions on the registration of marks that consist of or comprise, among other things, "deceptive... matter" or that are "primarily geographically deceptively misdescriptive." U.S. law further prohibits registration of marks which, when used on or in connection with the goods or services of an applicant, are "primarily geographically descriptive" of them.

Responding	I. Protection of Names of States Against Registration as Trademarks				
countries		cable legislation, names of S			
	(d) Excluded from	(e) Excluded from	(f) Excluded	(g) Registrable as	
	registration as	registration as trademark	from	trademark for	
	trademark for	for goods if they can be	registration as	goods provided an	
	goods if they	considered incorrect as to	trademark for	authorization by	
	otherwise lack	the origin of the products	goods for	the competent	
	any distinctive	for which registration is	other reasons	authority is granted	
	character	sought			
Albania			YES	NO	
Australia	YES	YES	YES	NO	
Austria	YES	YES	NO	NO	
Azerbaijan					
Bangladesh	YES	YES	YES	YES	
Barbados	YES	YES	YES	YES	
Belarus					
Brazil	YES	YES	YES	NO	
Bulgaria	NO	YES	NO	YES*	
Canada	YES	YES	YES	NO	
Chile	YES	YES	YES	NO	
China	YES	YES	YES	YES	
Hong Kong SAR	YES	YES	YES	NO	
Croatia	YES	NO	NO	NO	
Czech Republic	YES	YES	YES	YES	
Denmark	YES	YES	NO	NO	
Dominican	YES	YES	YES	YES	
Republic					
Estonia	YES	YES	NO	NO	
Finland	YES	YES	NO	NO	
France	YES	*	NO	NO	
Georgia	YES	YES	NO	NO	
Germany	YES	YES	YES	NO	
Greece				YES	
Guatemala	YES	YES	NO	YES	
Hungary	YES	YES	NO	NO	
Iran (Islamic	YES	YES	NO	YES	
Republic of)	-	-	_	-	
Ireland	YES	YES	NO	NO	
Italy	YES	NO	NO	YES	
Jamaica	YES	YES	NO	NO	
Japan	YES	YES	NO	NO	
Jordan	YES	NO	NO	YES	
Kazakhstan	YES	YES	NO	NO	
Kenya	YES	YES	NO	YES	
Kyrgyzstan	YES	YES	YES	YES	
Latvia	YES	YES	NO	NO	
Lithuania	YES	YES	YES	YES	
Madagascar	YES	YES	NO	NO	
Malaysia	YES	YES	NO	YES	
Mexico	YES	NO	NO	NO	
Monaco	YES	NO	NO	YES	
Montenegro	YES	YES	YES	YES	
Morocco	YES	YES	NO	YES	
Myanmar	NO	NO	YES	YES	
New Zealand	YES	NO	NO	YES	
Nigeria	YES			NO	
	YES	YES	YES	NO	
Norway	TEO	110	TEO	NU	

Responding	I. Protection of Na	mes of States Against Regis	tration as Trader	marks		
countries	1. Under the applicable legislation, names of States are:					
	(d) Excluded from registration as trademark for goods if they otherwise lack any distinctive character	(e) Excluded from registration as trademark for goods if they can be considered incorrect as to the origin of the products for which registration is sought	(f) Excluded from registration as trademark for goods for other reasons	(g) Registrable as trademark for goods provided an authorization by the competent authority is granted		
Oman	YES	YES	YES	YES		
Peru	YES	NO	NO	NO*		
Poland	YES	YES	NO	YES		
Portugal	YES	YES	YES	NO		
Republic of Korea	YES	YES	YES	NO		
Republic of Moldova	YES	YES	NO	NO		
Romania	YES	NO	NO	NO		
Russian Federation	YES	YES	NO	NO		
San Marino	YES	NO	NO	NO		
Serbia	YES	YES	NO	YES		
Singapore	YES	NO	NO	NO		
Slovakia	YES	NO	YES	YES		
Slovenia	YES	YES		YES		
South Africa	YES	NO	YES	NO		
Spain	YES	YES	NO	YES		
Sri Lanka	YES	YES	NO	YES		
Sweden	YES	YES	YES	NO		
Switzerland	YES	YES	YES	NO		
Syrian Arab Republic	YES	YES	NO	YES		
Trinidad and Tobago	YES	YES	NO	YES		
Turkey	YES	NO	NO	YES		
Ukraine	NO	NO	NO	YES		
United Kingdom	NO	YES	NO	NO		
United Republic of Tanzania	YES	YES	YES	YES		
United States of America	YES	YES*	NO			
Uruguay	YES	YES	NO	YES*		

Question 1(f): Under the applicable legislation, names of States are excluded from registration as trademark for goods for other reasons (specify the reasons):

ALBANIA:

Article 142, paragraph (1), letter (g) of Law No 9947 dated 07.07.2008 "On Industrial Property" provides that: "A sign is not registered as a trademark if it consists of the name of a State". In interpretation of this provision, the implementing regulation of the above mentioned law provides that if a trademark consists only of the name of a State, that trademark is to be refused on absolute grounds for refusal because of lack of distinctive character. If the trademark contains other elements that are sufficient to give distinctive character to the trademark, then the trademark can be registered but the name of the State should, in any case, be disclaimed from the protection by the applicant because it is an element that refers to the geographical origin of the goods and as such the exclusive right to use the name of a State cannot be granted to any applicant.

AUSTRALIA:

If the trademark is substantially identical or deceptively similar to an earlier registered or pending trademark that claims the same or similar goods and/or services.

BANGLADESH:

According to section 8(F) of the Trademarks Act, 2009, if a Court decides that the mark is otherwise not entitled to protection, it is not registrable.

BRAZIL:

Geographic indications, imitations thereof likely to cause confusion or signs that might falsely suggest a geographic indication; signs that suggest a false indication with respect to origin, source, nature, quality or utility of the product or service to which the mark is directed; signs of a generic, necessary, common, usual or simply descriptive character, when related to the product or service to be distinguished, or those commonly used to designate a characteristic of the product or service with respect to its nature, nationality, weight, value, quality and moment of production or of giving a service, except when presented in a sufficiently distinctive manner; reproductions or imitations, in whole or in part, even with additions, of a mark registered by a third party, to distinguish or certify a product or service that is identical, similar and which are likely to mislead or cause confusion or association with a third party's mark.

CANADA:

Subject to grounds applicable to all trademarks such as confusion with an existing mark, or identical/likely to be mistaken for an official mark.

CHILE:

Article 20(a) of the Law 19.039 on Prohibitions from Registrations prohibits registration of State names.

CZECH REPUBLIC:

Common name used in course of trade, bad faith.

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC:

If they reproduce or imitate a registered appellations of origin, or are identical or similar with a registered trademark.

FINLAND:

However there can be likelihood of confusion with earlier rights.

GERMANY:

The name of State may be a generic term (e.g. JAVA: island and programming language).

HONG KONG SAR:

 Names of States which have become customary in the current language or in the honest and established practices of the trade are *prima facie* unregistrable as trademarks.
 Names of States which are identical or similar to the earlier trademark(s) in respect of identical goods or services are *prima facie* unregistrable as trademarks.

LITHUANIA:

As a general rule, a trademark is not registered if it falls under any absolute grounds of refusal. A trademark consisting of the name of the State is nevertheless subject to examination with regard to absolute grounds for refusal, even if an authorization is granted by the competent authority. Generally, name of a State may be registered, if an authorization was granted by a competent authority. For instance, permission for the use of Lithuanian State symbols in a mark or design shall be granted if these symbols are used respectfully, do not diminish the name of the Lithuanian State, are not contrary to public order and morality, and the applicant demonstrates that he meets at least one the following requirements:

 represents or will represent the Lithuanian State and public interests in other countries or international organizations whose activities are compatible with legal acts of the Republic of Lithuania;
 performs or will perform activities, or will elaborate products in the interest of Lithuanian public policy, economics, science and culture;

3) the goods or services are common in Lithuania; they represent or will represent its culture or traditions of manufacture;

4) uses or will use a trade mark or design to represent Lithuanian culture, science, historical or cultural heritage, traditions of manufacture, as well as to promote the image of Lithuania.

NORWAY:

Earlier protected trademarks - if there is a likelihood of confusion.

PORTUGAL:

When an earlier trademark (being also the name of a State) acquires distinctive character through use, the subsequent trademark can be refused via relative grounds.

SLOVAKIA:

Signs which contain geographical indications and are filed with respect to wines or for spirits not having that origin.

SWEDEN:

If the mark is confusingly similar to the name or trade name of another party, or to the trademark of another party registered on the basis of an earlier application, or to the trade symbol of such party, which was already established on the market when the application was made.

SWITZERLAND:

If they are considered contrary to the applicable law in Switzerland, including international treaties ratified by Switzerland.

UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA:

Likelihood of confusion.

* Additional comments

BULGARIA:

Question 1(g)

Only if the trademark has inherent distinctiveness - it is not a word mark and it has other additional distinctive elements such as specific colors, figurative elements, which make it capable of distinguishing the goods of one person from those of other persons.

FRANCE

Question 1(e) The "incorrect" notion does not exist in national legislation.

PERU:

Question 1(g) Grounds for refusal concern the non-distinctive, descriptive or misleading character of the sign and do not depend on the authorization from a competent authority.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Question 1(e)

Incorrect in the sense the proposed sign is deceptive, primarily geographically deceptive misdescriptive or primarily geographically descriptive as to the nature of the goods/services.

URUGUAY:

Question 1(g)

Article 5(1) of the Trademark Law: the following trademarks cannot be registered: flags, coats of arms, letters, words and other signs that identify foreign States or international intergovernmental organizations, provided that their commercial use is not authorized by a certificate issued by the State or organization concerned.

Responding	I. Protection of	f Names of States Against Reg	istration as Trademarks
countries		pplicable legislation, names of	
	(a) Generally	(b) Excluded from	(c) Excluded from registration as
	excluded	registration as trademark for	trademark for services if the use of
	from	services if they could be	the name of a State could be
	registration	considered descriptive of the	
	as trademark	origin of the services in	the origin of the services in respect
	for services	respect of which registration is sought	of which registration is sought
Albania	YES		
Australia	YES	YES	YES
Austria	NO	YES	YES
Azerbaijan	YES		
Bangladesh	YES	YES	YES
Barbados	NO	YES	YES
Belarus	YES		
Brazil	NO	YES	YES
Bulgaria	YES	YES	YES
Canada	YES	YES*	YES
Chile	YES	YES	YES
China	YES	YES	YES
Hong Kong SAR	YES	YES	YES
Croatia	NO	YES	YES
Czech Republic	NO	YES	YES
Denmark	NO	YES	YES
Dominican	YES	YES	YES
Republic			
Estonia	YES	YES	YES
Finland	NO*	YES	YES
France	NO	YES	YES
Georgia	YES	YES	YES
Germany	YES	YES	YES
Greece	YES		
Guatemala	NO	YES	YES
Hungary	NO	YES	YES
Iran (Islamic	YES	YES	YES
Republic of)	_		-
Ireland	NO	YES	YES
Italy	YES	YES	YES
Jamaica	NO*	NO*	YES
Japan	YES*	YES	YES
Jordan	YES	YES	YES
Kazakhstan	YES	YES	YES
Kenya	YES	YES	YES
Kyrgyzstan	YES	YES	YES
Latvia	NO	YES	YES
Lithuania	YES	YES	YES
Madagascar	NO	YES	YES
Malaysia	YES	YES	YES
Mexico	NO	YES	YES
Monaco	NO	YES	YES
Montenegro	YES	YES	YES
Morocco	NO	YES	YES
Myanmar	NO	NO	NO
New Zealand	YES	YES	YES
Nigeria	YES		
Norway	YES*	YES	YES
inolway	115	120	120

Responding	I. Protection of Names of States Against Registration as Trademarks				
countries	2. Under the applicable legislation, names of States are:				
	(a) Generally excluded from registration as trademark for services	(b) Excluded from registration as trademark for services if they could be considered descriptive of the origin of the services in respect of which registration is sought	(c) Excluded from registration as trademark for services if the use of the name of a State could be considered to be misleading as to the origin of the services in respect of which registration is sought		
Oman	YES	YES	YES		
Peru	NO	YES	YES		
Poland	YES	YES	YES		
Portugal	YES	YES*	YES		
Republic of Korea	YES	YES	YES		
Republic of Moldova	YES	YES	YES		
Romania	NO	YES	YES		
Russian Federation	NO	YES	YES		
San Marino	NO	YES	YES		
Serbia	YES	YES	YES		
Singapore	YES	YES	YES		
Slovakia	YES	YES	YES		
Slovenia	NO	YES	YES		
South Africa	YES	YES	YES		
Spain	YES	YES	YES		
Sri Lanka	YES	YES	YES		
Sweden	NO	YES	YES		
Switzerland	NO	YES	YES		
Syrian Arab Republic	YES	YES	YES		
Trinidad and Tobago	YES	YES	YES		
Turkey	YES	YES	YES		
Ukraine	YES	NO	YES		
United Kingdom	NO	YES	YES		
United Republic of Tanzania	YES	YES	YES		
United States of America	NO*	YES	YES		
Uruguay	YES	YES	YES		

* Additional comments

CANADA:

Question 2(b)

Unless the Office receives confirmation from the trademark owner that the goods emanate from that geographical place. Also subject to acquired distinctiveness provisions.

FINLAND:

Even though names of states are not "generally excluded" under the applicable legislation, names of states as word marks are not considered distinctive marks in practice.

JAMAICA:

Question 2(a) and (b)

Where the mark consists exclusively of the name of the State, it is generally excluded from registration. Where the word is included as part of the trademark, the mark as a whole is registered and the name of the State disclaimed.

JAPAN:

Question 2(a)

Under Japanese trademark law, there are no provisions which provide to "generally" exclude names of States from registration as trademarks for goods and services. However, names of States are generally refused registration because they are considered to be the source of origin or indicate the quality of the goods and services according to the Trademark Examination Manual.

NORWAY:

Question 2(a)

Generally if it is a word mark. However, if it is a word and device mark – depends on how dominant the name of State – element is in the mark.

PORTUGAL:

Question 2(b) When composed solely by the name of a State.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Question 2(a)

Country names are not specifically excluded from eligibility for trademark protection. However, marks composed of or consisting of geographic signs, including names of States, submitted for trademark registration undergo analysis as part of a full substantive examination to determine if the proposed mark is geographically descriptive, geographically deceptively misdescriptive or deceptive in relation to the nature of the goods and/or services. U.S. law provides grounds for refusal of marks containing geographic source identifiers, including prohibitions on the registration of marks that consist of or comprise, among other things, "deceptive... matter" or that are "primarily geographically deceptively misdescriptive." U.S. law further prohibits registration of marks which, when used on or in connection with the goods or services of an applicant, are "primarily geographically descriptive" of them.

Responding	I. Protection of Names of States Against Registration as Trademarks					
countries	2. Under the applicable legislation, names of States are:					
	(d) Excluded from	(e) Excluded from	(f) Excluded	(g) Registrable as		
	registration as	registration as	from	trademark for		
	trademark for	trademark for services if	registration as	services provided		
	services if they	they can be considered	trademark for	an authorization by		
	otherwise lack any	incorrect as to the origin	services for	the competent		
	distinctive	of the services for which	other reasons	authority is granted		
	character	registration is sought				
Albania			YES	NO		
Australia	YES	YES	YES	NO		
Austria	YES	NO	NO	NO		
Azerbaijan						
Bangladesh	YES	YES	YES	YES		
Barbados	YES	YES	YES	YES		
Belarus						
Brazil	YES	YES	YES	NO		
Bulgaria	NO	YES	NO	YES		
Canada	YES	YES	YES	NO		
Chile	YES	YES	YES	NO		
China	YES	YES	YES	YES		
Hong Kong SAR	YES	YES	YES	NO		
Croatia	YES	NO	NO	NO		
Czech Republic	YES	YES	YES	YES		
Denmark	YES	YES	NO	NO		
Dominican	YES	YES	YES	YES		
Republic						
Estonia	YES	YES	NO	NO		
Finland	YES	YES	NO	NO		
France	YES	*	NO	NO		
Georgia	YES	YES	NO	NO		
Germany	YES	YES	YES	NO		
Greece				YES		
Guatemala	YES	YES	NO	YES		
Hungary	YES	YES	NO	NO		
Iran (Islamic	YES	YES	NO	YES		
Republic of)						
Ireland	YES	YES	NO	NO		
Italy	YES	NO	NO	YES		
Jamaica	YES	YES	NO	NO		
Japan	YES	YES	NO	NO		
Jordan	YES	YES	NO	YES		
Kazakhstan	YES	YES	NO	NO		
Kenya	YES	YES	NO	YES		
Kyrgyzstan	YES	YES	YES	YES		
Latvia	YES	YES	NO	NO		
Lithuania	YES	YES	YES	YES		
Madagascar	YES	YES	NO	NO		
Malaysia	YES	YES	NO	YES		
Mexico	YES	NO	NO	NO		
Monaco	YES	NO	NO	YES		
Montenegro	YES	YES	YES	YES		
Morocco	YES	YES	NO	YES		
Myanmar	NO	NO	NO	NO		
New Zealand	YES	NO	NO	YES		
Nigeria			YES	NO		
Norway	YES		YES	NO		

Responding	I. Protection of Names of States Against Registration as Trademarks					
countries	2. Under the applicable legislation, names of States are:					
	(d) Excluded from registration as trademark for services if they otherwise lack any distinctive character	(e) Excluded from registration as trademark for services if they can be considered incorrect as to the origin of the services for which registration is sought	(f) Excluded from registration as trademark for services for other reasons	(g) Registrable as trademark for services provided an authorization by the competent authority is granted		
Oman	YES		YES	YES		
Peru	YES	NO	NO	NO*		
Poland	YES	YES	NO	NO		
Portugal	YES	YES	YES	NO		
Republic of Korea	YES	YES	YES	YES		
Republic of Moldova	YES	YES	NO	NO		
Romania	YES	NO	NO	NO		
Russian Federation	YES	YES	NO	NO		
San Marino	YES	NO	NO	NO		
Serbia	YES	YES	NO	YES		
Singapore	YES	NO	NO	NO		
Slovakia	YES	NO	NO	YES		
Slovenia	YES	YES		YES		
South Africa	YES	NO	YES	NO		
Spain	YES	YES	NO	YES		
Sri Lanka	YES	YES	NO	YES		
Sweden	YES	YES	YES	NO		
Switzerland	YES	YES	YES	NO		
Syrian Arab Republic	YES	YES	NO	YES		
Trinidad and Tobago	YES	YES	NO	YES		
Turkey	YES	NO	NO	YES		
Ukraine	NO	NO	NO	YES		
United Kingdom	NO	YES	NO	NO		
United Republic of Tanzania	YES	YES	YES	YES		
United States of America	YES	YES*	NO			
Uruguay	YES	YES	NO	YES*		

Question 2(f): Under the applicable legislation, names of States are excluded from registration as trademark for services for other reasons (specify the reasons):

ALBANIA:

Article 142 paragraph (1) letter (g) of Law No 9947 dated 07.07.2008 "On Industrial Property" provides that: "A sign is not registered as a trademark if it consists of the name of a State". In interpretation of this provision, the implementing regulation of the above mentioned law provides that if a trademark consists only of the name of a State, that trademark is to be refused on absolute grounds for refusal because of lack of distinctive character. If the trademark contains other elements that are sufficient to give distinctive character to the trademark, then the trademark can be registered but the name of the State should, in any case, be disclaimed from the protection by the applicant because it is an element that refers to the geographical origin of the goods and as such the exclusive right to use the name of a State cannot be granted to any applicant.

AUSTRALIA:

If the trademark is substantially identical or deceptively similar to an earlier registered or pending trademark that claims the same or similar goods and/or services.

BANGLADESH:

According to section 8(F) of the Trademarks Act, 2009, if a Court decides that the mark is otherwise not entitled to protection, it is not registrable.

BRAZIL:

Geographic indications, imitations thereof likely to cause confusion or signs that might falsely suggest a geographic indication; signs that suggest a false indication with respect to origin, source, nature, quality or utility of the product or service to which the mark is directed; signs of a generic, necessary, common, usual or simply descriptive character, when related to the product or service to be distinguished, or those commonly used to designate a characteristic of the product or service with respect to its nature, nationality, weight, value, quality and moment of production or of giving a service, except when presented in a sufficiently distinctive manner; reproductions or imitations, in whole or in part, even with additions, of a mark registered by a third party, to distinguish or certify a product or service that is identical, similar and which are likely to mislead or cause confusion or association with a third party's mark.

CANADA:

Subject to grounds application to all trademarks such as confusion with an existing mark, or identical/likely to be mistaken for an official mark.

CHILE:

Article 20(a) of the Law 19.039 on Prohibitions from Registrations prohibits registration of State names.

CZECH REPUBLIC:

Common name used in course of trade, bad faith.

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC:

If they reproduce or imitate a registered appellations of origin, or are identical or similar with a registered trademark.

FINLAND:

However there can be likelihood of confusion with earlier rights.

GERMANY:

The name of State may be a generic term (f.e. JAVA: island and programming language).

HONG KONG SAR:

 Names of States which have become customary in the current language or in the honest and established practices of the trade are *prima facie* unregistrable as trademarks.
 Names of States which are identical or similar to the earlier trademark(s) in respect of identical goods or services are *prima facie* unregistrable as trademarks.

LITHUANIA:

As a general rule, a trademark is not registered if it falls under any absolute grounds of refusal. A trademark consisting of the name of the State is nevertheless subject to examination with regard to absolute grounds for refusal, even if an authorization is granted by the competent authority. Generally, name of a State may be registered, if an authorization was granted by a competent authority. For instance, permission for the use of Lithuanian State symbols in a mark or design shall be granted if these symbols are used respectfully, do not diminish the name of the Lithuanian State, are not contrary to public order and morality, and the applicant demonstrates that he meets at least one the following requirements:

 represents or will represent the Lithuanian state and public interests in other countries or international organizations whose activities are compatible with legal acts of the Republic of Lithuania;
 performs or will perform activities, or will elaborate products in the interest of Lithuanian public policy, economics, science and culture;

3) the goods or services are common in Lithuania; they represent or will represent its culture or traditions of manufacture;

4) uses or will use a trade mark or design to represent Lithuanian culture, science, historical or cultural heritage, traditions of manufacture, as well as to promote the image of Lithuania.

NORWAY:

Earlier protected trademarks - if there is a likelihood of confusion.

PORTUGAL:

When an earlier trademark (being also the name of a State) acquires distinctive character through use, the subsequent trademark can be refused via relative grounds.

SWEDEN:

If the mark is confusingly similar to the name or trade name of another party, or to the trademark of another party registered on the basis of an earlier application, or to the trade symbol of such party, which was already established on the market when the application was made.

SWITZERLAND:

If they are considered contrary to the applicable law in Switzerland, including international treaties ratified by Switzerland.

UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA:

Likelihood of confusion.

* Additional comments

BULGARIA:

Question 2(g)

Only if the trademark has inherent distinctiveness - it is not a word mark and it has other additional distinctive elements such as specific colors, figurative elements, which make it capable of distinguishing the goods of one person from those of other persons.

FRANCE

Question 2(e) The "incorrect" notion does not exist in national legislation. PERU:

Question 2(g)

The grounds for refusal concern the non-distinctive, descriptive or misleading character of the sign and do not depend on the authorization from a competent authority.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

Question 2(e)

Incorrect in the sense the proposed sign is deceptive, primarily geographically deceptive misdescriptive or primarily geographically descriptive as to the nature of the goods/services.

URUGUAY:

Question 2(g)

Article 5(1) of the Trademark Law: the following trademarks can not be registered: flags, coats of arms, letters, words and other signs that identify foreign States or international intergovernmental organizations, provided that their commercial use is not authorized by a certificate issued by the State or organization concerned.

Responding	I. Protection of Names of States Against Registration as Trademarks					
countries	3. If the nam	e of a State is e	xcluded fro	m registration	as trademark in	respect of
	goods, this g			- 3		
	(a) Is raised		o the	(b) Can be	If the answer to	o the
	ex officio by	subquestion at		raised by	subquestion al	
		the affirmative,		third parties	affirmative, car	
	part of the	ground be rais		in	be raised:	5
	examination			opposition	independently	only
	of an	from other	together	procedures	from other	together
	application		-	•	grounds	with other
		grounds	with other		0	grounds
			grounds			5
Albania	YES	YES		NO		
Australia	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Austria	YES	YES		NO		
Azerbaijan	YES	YES		NO		
Bangladesh	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Barbados	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Belarus	YES	YES		-	-	
Brazil	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Bulgaria	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Canada	YES*	YES		YES	YES	
Chile	YES	YES		YES	YES	
China	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Hong Kong SAR	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Croatia	YES	. 20	YES	NO		
Czech Republic	YES	YES	120	NO		
Denmark	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Dominican	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Republic	120	120		120		
Estonia	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Finland	YES	YES		YES	YES	
France	YES	YES		NO	120	
Georgia	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Germany	YES	YES		NO		
Greece	YES	YES		YES		
Guatemala	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Hungary	YES	YES		NO		
Iran (Islamic	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Republic of)	120	120			120	
Ireland	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Italy	YES	YES		NO*		
Jamaica	YES	YES		NO		
Japan	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Jordan	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Kazakhstan	YES	YES		NO		
	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Kenya	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Kyrgyzstan	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Latvia	YES			YES		
Lithuania		YES			YES	
Madagascar	YES	YES		NO	VES	
Malaysia	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Mexico	YES	YES		NO		
Monaco	YES	YES		NO		
Montenegro	YES		YES	YES		YES
Morocco	NO			YES	YES	
Myanmar	YES	YES		NO		

Responding	I. Protection	of Names of Sta	ates Against	t Registration a	as Trademarks	
countries	3. If the nam	e of a State is e	xcluded from	m registration	as trademark in	respect of
	goods, this ground					
	(a) Is raised	If the answer to	o the	(b) Can be	If the answer to	o the
	ex officio by	subquestion at	oove is in	raised by	subquestion at	oove is in the
	the Office as	the affirmative,	can this	third parties	affirmative, car	n this ground
	part of the	ground be rais		in	be raised:	-
	examination	independently	only	opposition	independently	only
	of an	from other	together	procedures	from other	together
	application	grounds	with other		grounds	with other
		grounus			-	grounds
			grounds			-
New Zealand	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Nigeria	YES	YES				
Norway	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Oman	YES	YES			YES	
Peru	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Poland	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Portugal	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Republic of	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Korea						
Republic of	YES	YES		NO		
Moldova						
Romania	YES	YES		NO		
Russian	YES	YES				
Federation						
San Marino	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Serbia	YES	YES		NO		
Singapore	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Slovakia	YES	YES		NO		
Slovenia	YES	YES		NO		
South Africa	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Spain	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Sri Lanka	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Sweden	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Switzerland	YES		YES	NO		
Syrian Arab	YES			NO		
Republic						
Trinidad and	YES	YES		*	YES*	
Tobago						
Turkey	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Ukraine	YES	YES		YES	YES	
United Kingdom	YES	YES		YES	YES	
United Republic	YES	YES		YES	YES	
of Tanzania						
United States of	YES	YES		YES	YES	
America						
Uruguay	YES	YES		YES	YES	

* Additional comments

CANADA:

Question 3(a) Except for distinctiveness ITALY:

Question 3(b) The opposition procedure is not yet in force in the Office

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO:

Question 3(b)

If third party means a person who is not party to the opposition procedures, then the answer to this question is NO. If third party means a person who is a party to the opposition procedures, then the answer to this question is YES.

Responding	I. Protection of Names of States Against Registration as Trademarks					
countries	3. If the name of a State is excluded from registration as trademark in respect of goods, this ground					
	(c) Can be raised by third parties as an	If the answer to subquestion at	If the answer to the subquestion above is in the affirmative, can this ground		If the answer to subquestion ab affirmative, can be raised:	ove is in the this ground
	observation	independently	only together	registration	independently	only
		from other	with other	invalidation	from other	together
		grounds	grounds	procedures	grounds	with other
Albania	NO			YES	YES	grounds
Albania Australia	NO YES	YES		YES	YES	
Austria	NO	TEO		YES	YES	
Azerbaijan	NO			NO	TES	
Bangladesh	NO			YES	YES	
Barbados	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Belarus	123	115		YES	YES	
Brazil	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Bulgaria	NO	120		YES	YES	
Canada	NO			YES	YES	
Chile	NO			YES	YES	
China	NO			YES	YES	
Hong Kong SAR	NO			YES	YES	
Croatia	YES		YES	YES	120	YES
Czech Republic	YES	YES	120	YES	YES	120
Denmark	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Dominican	NO	120		YES	YES	
Republic				. 20	. 20	
Estonia	NO			YES	YES	
Finland	YES	YES		YES	YES	
France	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Georgia	NO	YES		YES	YES	
Germany	NO			YES	YES	
Greece	NO			YES	YES	
Guatemala	NO	YES		YES	YES	
Hungary	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Iran (Islamic	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Republic of)						
Ireland	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Italy				YES*	YES	
Jamaica	NO			YES	YES	
Japan	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Jordan	NO			NO		
Kazakhstan	NO			NO		
Kenya	YES	YES			YES	
Kyrgyzstan	YES	YES				
Latvia	NO			YES	YES	
Lithuania	NO			YES	YES	
Madagascar	NO			YES	YES	
Malaysia	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Mexico	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Monaco	NO			YES	YES	
Montenegro	YES		YES	YES		YES
Morocco	NO			YES	YES	
Myanmar						
New Zealand	NO			YES	YES	

Responding	I. Protection of Names of States Against Registration as Trademarks					
countries	3. If the name of a State is excluded from registration as trademark in respect of goods, this ground					
	(c) Can be raised by third parties as an	If the answer to subquestion at	oove is in the	(d) Can be raised by third parties in post	If the answer to subquestion ab affirmative, can be raised:	ove is in the this ground
	observation	independently from other grounds	only together with other grounds	registration invalidation procedures	independently from other grounds	only together with other grounds
Nigeria						
Norway	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Oman		YES			YES	
Peru	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Poland	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Portugal	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Republic of	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Korea						
Republic of	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Moldova						
Romania	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Russian	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Federation						
San Marino	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Serbia	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Singapore	NO			YES	YES	
Slovakia	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Slovenia	YES	YES		YES	YES	
South Africa	NO			YES	YES	
Spain	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Sri Lanka	NO					
Sweden	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Switzerland	NO			YES		YES
Syrian Arab	NO			NO		
Republic						
Trinidad and					YES*	
Tobago					-	
Turkey	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Ukraine	NO			YES	YES	
United Kingdom	YES	YES		YES	YES	
United Republic	YES	YES		YES	YES	
of Tanzania						
United States of	YES	YES		YES	YES	
America						
Uruguay	NO			YES	YES	

* Additional comments

ITALY:

Question 3(d) Not before the Office but only before the competent Court.

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO:

Question 3(c)

Observations are not recognized under the Trademark Law.

Question 3(d)

If third party means a person who is not party to the invalidation procedures, then the answer to this question is NO. If third party means a person who is a party to the invalidation opposition procedures, then the answer to this question is YES.

Responding	I. Protection of Names of States Against Registration as Trademarks					
countries	4. If the name of a State is excluded from registration as trademark in respect of services, this ground				respect of	
						46 0
		If the answer to the		(b) Can be		
	ex officio by			raised by	subquestion at	
		the affirmative,		third	affirmative, car	n this ground
	part of the	ground be rais		parties in	be raised:	
	examination		only	opposition	independently	
	of an	from other	together	procedures		with other
	application	grounds	with other		grounds	grounds
		U	grounds			
			0			
Albania Australia	YES YES	YES YES		NO YES	YES	
					TES	
Austria	YES	YES		NO		
Azerbaijan	YES	YES		NO		
Bangladesh	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Barbados	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Belarus	YES	YES				
Brazil	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Bulgaria	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Canada	YES*	YES		YES	YES	
Chile	YES	YES		YES	YES	
China	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Hong Kong SAR	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Croatia	YES		YES			
Czech Republic	YES	YES		NO		
Denmark	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Dominican	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Republic						
Estonia	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Finland	YES	YES		YES	YES	
France	YES	YES		NO		
Georgia	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Germany	YES	YES		NO		
Greece	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Guatemala	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Hungary	YES	YES		NO		
Iran (Islamic	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Republic of)						
Ireland	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Italy	YES	YES		NO		
Jamaica	YES	YES		NO		
Japan	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Jordan	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Kazakhstan	YES	YES		NO		
Kenya	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Kyrgyzstan	YES	YES	1	YES	YES	
Latvia	YES	YES	1	YES	YES	
Lithuania	YES	YES	1	YES	YES	
Madagascar	YES	YES		NO	. 20	
Malaysia	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Mexico	YES	YES		NO	120	
Monaco	YES	YES		NO		
	YES	IE3	YES	NO	YES	
Montenegro	NO		153	UNU	IES	
Morocco Myanmar	NO					
wiyaninai						

Responding	I. Protection of Names of States Against Registration as Trademarks					
countries	4. If the name of a State is excluded from registration as trademark in respect of services, this ground					
	(a) Is raised ex officio by	If the answer to the		(b) Can be raised by thirdIf the answer to the subquestion above is in affirmative, can this gro be raised:		ove is in the
	examination of an application	independently from other grounds	only together with other grounds	opposition procedures	independently from other grounds	only together with other grounds
New Zealand	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Nigeria	YES					
Norway	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Oman	YES		YES	YES		YES
Peru	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Poland	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Portugal	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Republic of	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Korea						
Republic of	YES	YES		NO		
Moldova						
Romania	YES	YES		NO		
Russian	YES	YES				
Federation						
San Marino	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Serbia	YES	YES		NO		
Singapore	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Slovakia	YES	YES		NO		
Slovenia	YES	YES		NO		
South Africa	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Spain	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Sri Lanka	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Sweden	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Switzerland	YES		YES	NO		
Syrian Arab Republic	YES			NO		
Trinidad and Tobago	YES	YES			YES*	
Turkey	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Ukraine	YES	YES		YES	YES	
United Kingdom	YES	YES		YES	YES	
United Republic	YES	YES		YES	YES	
of Tanzania						
United States of	YES	YES		YES	YES	
America						
Uruguay	YES	YES		YES	YES	

* Additional comments

CANADA:

Question 4(a) Except for distinctiveness

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO:

Question 4(b)

If third party means a person who is not party to the opposition procedures, then the answer to this question is NO. If third party means a person who is a party to the opposition procedures, then the answer to this question is YES.

		of a State is avai		I. Protection of Names of States Against Registration as Trademarks			
	4. If the name of a State is excluded from registration as trademark in respect of services, this ground			espect			
	(c) Can be raised by third parties as an	If the answer to the subquestion above is in the affirmative, can this ground be raised:		(d) Can be raised by third parties in post	If the answer to the subquestion above is in the affirmative, can this ground be raised:		
	observation	independently from other grounds	only together with other grounds	registration invalidation procedures	independent ly from other grounds	only together with other grounds	
Albania	NO			YES	YES		
Australia	YES	YES		YES	YES		
	NO	_		YES	YES		
	NO			NO	. 20		
	NO			YES	YES		
Barbados		YES		YES	YES		
Belarus		110		YES	YES		
	VES	VEC					
	YES	YES		YES	YES		
	NO			YES	YES		
	NO			YES	YES		
	NO			YES	YES		
	NO			YES	YES		
	NO			YES	YES		
	YES		YES	YES		YES	
Czech Republic	YES	YES		YES	YES		
Denmark	YES	YES		YES	YES		
Dominican Republic	NO			YES	YES		
	NO			YES	YES		
	YES	YES		YES	YES		
	YES	YES		YES	YES		
	NO	YES		YES	YES		
V	NO	123		YES	YES		
	NO			YES	YES		
	NO	YES		YES	YES		
0,	YES	YES		YES	YES		
``	YES	YES		YES	YES		
Republic of)							
	YES	YES		YES	YES		
	YES	YES		NO*	YES		
Jamaica				YES	YES		
Japan	YES	YES		YES	YES		
Jordan	NO			NO			
	NO			NO			
	YES	YES		YES	YES		
	YES	YES		YES	YES		
, 0,	NO	= -		YES	YES		
	NO			YES	YES		
	NO			YES	YES		
	YES	YES		YES	YES		
	YES	YES		YES	YES		
		163					
	NO			YES	YES		
0	YES		YES	YES		YES	
Morocco				YES	YES		
Myanmar							

Responding	I. Protection of Names of States Against Registration as Trademarks					
countries	4. If the name of a State is excluded from registration as trademark in respect					espect
	of services, this ground(c) Can beIf the answer to the(d) Can beIf the answer to the					
	(c) Can be			(d) Can be raised by third parties		
	raised by third parties	subquestion ab				above is in the
	as an	the affirmative, can this ground be raised:		in post registration	affirmative, can this ground be raised: independent only	
	observation					
	observation	independently	only	invalidation	ly from other	
		from other	together	procedures	grounds	with other
		grounds	with other	p	groundo	grounds
			grounds			g
New Zealand	NO			YES	YES	
Nigeria						
Norway	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Oman	YES		YES	YES		YES
Peru	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Poland	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Portugal	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Republic of	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Korea						
Republic of	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Moldova						
Romania	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Russian	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Federation		VEO		VEO		
San Marino	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Serbia	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Singapore	NO YES	VEC		YES YES	YES YES	
Slovakia	YES	YES YES		YES	YES	
Slovenia South Africa	NO	TES		YES	YES	
	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Spain Sri Lanka	NO	160		TEO	163	
Sweden	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Switzerland	NO	163		YES	TES	YES
Syrian Arab	NO			NO		115
Republic						
Trinidad and					YES*	
Tobago						
Turkey	YES	YES		YES	YES	
Ukraine	NO			YES	YES	
United Kingdom	YES	YES		YES	YES	
United Republic	YES	YES		YES	YES	
of Tanzania						
United States of	YES	YES		YES	YES	
America						
Uruguay	NO			YES	YES	

* Additional comments

ITALY:

Question 4(d) Not before the Office but only before the competent Court.

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO:

Question 4(c)

Observations are not recognized under the Trademark Law.

Question 4(d)

If third party means a person who is not party to the invalidation procedures, then the answer to this question is NO. If third party means a person who is a party to the invalidation procedures, then the answer to this question is YES.

Responding	I. Protection of Names of States Against Registration	as Trademarks
countries	5. In determining whether the inclusion of a name of a State in a trademark would be a ground for refusing the registration of that trademark for goods and/or services, consideration must be given to the potential deception of consumers as to the origin of the goods and/or services on, or in connection with which the trademark is proposed to be used	6. If under the applicable legislation, names of States are generally excluded from registration as trademark for goods and/or services, are there any exceptions to such exclusion?
Albania	NO	NO
Australia	YES	NO
Austria	YES	
Azerbaijan	NO	NO
Bangladesh	YES	YES
Barbados	YES	YES
Belarus	YES	NO
Brazil	YES	NO
Bulgaria	YES	YES
Canada	YES	
Chile	NO*	NO
China	NO	YES
Hong Kong SAR	YES	YES
Croatia	YES	
Czech Republic	YES	
Denmark	NO	
Dominican Republic	YES	YES
Estonia	YES	YES
Finland	YES*	
France	YES	
Georgia	YES	NO
Germany	YES	NO
Greece	NO	NO
Guatemala	YES	YES
Hungary	YES	NO
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	YES	YES
Ireland	YES	NO
Italy	NO*	YES
Jamaica	YES	YES
Japan	YES	YES
Jordan	YES	YES
Kazakhstan	YES	YES
Kenya	YES	YES
Kyrgyzstan	YES	NO
Latvia	YES	
Lithuania	YES	YES
Madagascar	NO	NO
Malaysia	YES	NO
Mexico	YES	
Monaco	YES	
Montenegro	YES	NO
Morocco	YES	
Myanmar	NO	NO
New Zealand	YES	NO
Nigeria	YES	NO
Norway	YES	NO

Responding	I. Protection of Names of States Against Registration as Trademarks				
countries	5. In determining whether the inclusion of a name of a State in a trademark would be a ground for refusing the registration of that trademark for goods and/or services, consideration must be given to the potential deception of consumers as to the origin of the goods and/or services on, or in connection with which the trademark is proposed to be used	6. If under the applicable legislation, names of States are generally excluded from registration as trademark for goods and/or services, are there any exceptions to such exclusion?			
Oman	YES	YES			
Peru	YES	NO			
Poland	YES	NO			
Portugal	YES	NO			
Republic of Korea	NO	NO			
Republic of	YES	YES			
Moldova					
Romania	NO				
Russian	YES				
Federation					
San Marino	YES				
Serbia	YES	YES			
Singapore	YES	YES			
Slovakia	YES	NO			
Slovenia	YES				
South Africa	YES	YES			
Spain	YES				
Sri Lanka	YES	YES			
Sweden	YES				
Switzerland	NO				
Syrian Arab Republic	YES	NO			
Trinidad and	YES	YES			
Tobago					
Turkey	YES	YES			
Ukraine	NO	YES			
United Kingdom	YES	NO			
United Republic	YES	YES			
of Tanzania					
United States of	YES	YES			
America					
Uruguay	YES	YES			

Question 6

If under the applicable legislation, names of States are generally excluded from registration as trademark for goods and/or services, are there any exceptions to such exclusion? If yes, specify:

BANGLADESH:

Registrable if permission is granted by the competent authority (Section 8(F) of the Law).

BARBADOS:

Excepted by Section 9 (1) (g) of the Trademarks Act 1981. Unless its use is authorized by an authority in the country concerned, that is competent to authorize the use of the mark as a trade mark or service mark.

BULGARIA

The names of the States are registrable as a trademark for goods and/ or services only when: - an authorization by the competent authority of the State is granted

- and the trademark has inherent distinctiveness, i.e. it is not a word mark and it has other additional distinctive elements such as specific colors, figurative elements etc. which make it capable of distinguishing the goods of one person from those of other persons.

CHINA:

If an authorization by the competent authority is provided.

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC:

In case of submission of the authorization from a competent authority in the State concerned.

ESTONIA:

There are no specific provisions in the Estonian Trade Marks Act for the grounds of refusal for the names of States. Legal protection shall not be granted to the sign which consists exclusively of geographical origin. The trademark is registrable, if it contains a geographical name and other elements which are distinctive (such geographical name constitutes an element of the trade mark which is not subject to protection). Legal protection shall not be granted if the geographical name is of such a nature to deceive the consumer as to the geographical origin of the goods and services. The applicant has to limit the list of goods and services to eliminate this decisive effect.

GUATEMALA:

According to Article 16(2) and 20(D) of the national Industrial Property Law.

HONG KONG SAR:

If names of States are refused for registration *prima facie* as trademarks for goods and/or services under section 11(1)(b), (c) or (d) of the trademarks Ordinance of Hong Kong SAR, they may be registrable as trademarks if evidence is filed to show that before the date of application the names have in fact acquired a distinctive character as a result of the use made of them.
 Names of States which designate the geographical origin of goods or services may be registered as certification marks or collective marks.

IRAN (ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF):

In the case of authorization from the competent authorities

JAMAICA:

If the name is being used in a fanciful manner or if the name of the State is not considered to be wellknown in the Jamaican jurisdiction.

JAPAN:

A trademark consisting of the names of States could be registered if it has acquired distinctiveness through use (secondary meaning).

KAZAKHSTAN:

Names of States can be included into the registration as trademark for goods and/or services as unregistrable element of a trademark.

KENYA:

When accompanied by other elements that would make the mark as a whole distinctive. However, such marks would only be registered with disclaimers on the use of such names. Other instances would be through provision of letters of consent from the cited authorities or evidence of having registered the said mark in the country with the same name.

LITHUANIA:

Generally, name of a State may be registered, if an authorization was granted by a competent authority. For instance, permission for the use of Lithuanian State symbols in a mark or design shall be granted if these symbols are used respectfully, do not diminish the name of the Lithuanian State, are not contrary to public order and morality, and the applicant demonstrates that he meets at least one the following requirements:

 represents or will represent the Lithuanian State and public interests in other countries or international organizations whose activities are compatible with legal acts of the Republic of Lithuania;
 performs or will perform activities, or will elaborate products in the interest of Lithuanian public policy, economics, science and culture;

3) the goods or services are common in Lithuania; they represent or will represent its culture or traditions of manufacture;

4) uses or will use a trade mark or design to represent Lithuanian culture, science, historical or cultural heritage, traditions of manufacture, as well as to promote the image of Lithuania.

REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA:

The applicant may appeal to the Art. 6quinquies of the Paris Convention for the registration "telle quelle", in case the applicant has the origin from the State concerned and there is no ground of refusal.

Also, the applicant can take action before the competent judicial authority providing sufficient proof that the requested trademark has acquired distinctive character in the territory of the Republic of Moldova.

SERBIA:

Registrable as a trademark provided an authorization by the competent authority is granted if the name of the State is only one element of the complex trademark which is not considered to be misleading of the origin for goods and/or services, and which can be considered simply as information of the origin for goods and/or services.

SINGAPORE:

If the mark as a whole is distinctive, does not consist exclusively of descriptive or generic elements, is not contrary to public policy or to morality, does not deceive the public, the use of the mark is not prohibited by any written law or rule of law and the mark is not applied for in bad faith, the mark may be registered.

TURKEY:

If the name of a State has a different meaning in Turkish, this can be considered as an exception. If authorization by the competent authority is granted, names of States are registrable.

UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA:

With an authorization from the competent authority.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

"Indications of regional origin" are not prohibited and may be registered as collective and certification marks. In addition, where an applicant can demonstrate that a geographic term has become associated with its goods or services and thus has acquired distinctiveness with respect to those goods or services, registration is permitted.

URUGUAY:

- when used by the State and local government as such
- public entities not depending on the State
- participative companies of the State
- geographical indications as stated in the law.

* Additional comments

CHILE:

Question 5

The name of a State would not be registrable as a trademark because the test of misleading or confusing sign would not be applicable. The situation would be different if the name of the State is accompanied by other words, in which case protection would be granted to the mark as a whole.

FINLAND:

In practice no consideration is made if the mark is a word mark consisting only of a name of the State and the applicant is from another State. In other cases possible deceptiveness is always considered.

ITALY

Question 5

The Office can not examine whether the trademark is deceptive.

PERU:

The grounds for refusal concern the non-distinctive or misleading character of the sign. There is no exclusion of registration only based on the fact that the sign includes a State name. In the case of signs considered a priori not distinctive or descriptive, secondary meaning can be claimed and has to be established.

Responding	II. Protection of Names of States Against Use as Trademarks			
countries	7. Under the applicable legislation,	8. Under the applicable legislation, names		
	names of States are excluded from	of States are excluded from use as		
	use as trademarks for goods	trademarks for services		
Albania	NO	NO		
Australia	YES	YES		
Austria	NO	NO		
Azerbaijan	NO	NO		
Bangladesh	NO	NO		
Barbados				
Belarus	YES	YES		
Brazil	YES	YES		
Bulgaria	YES	YES		
Canada	YES*	YES		
Chile	YES	YES		
China	YES	YES		
Hong Kong SAR Croatia	NO NO	NO NO		
Czech Republic	NO	NO		
Denmark	NO	NO		
Dominican	YES	YES		
Republic		NO		
Estonia	NO	NO		
Finland	NO	NO		
France	NO	NO		
Georgia	NO	NO		
Germany	YES	YES		
Greece	YES	YES		
Guatemala	YES	YES		
Hungary				
Iran (Islamic	YES	YES		
Republic of)				
Ireland	NO	NO		
Italy	NO	NO		
Jamaica	NO	NO		
Japan	NO*	NO*		
Jordan	NO	NO		
Kazakhstan	YES	YES		
Kenya	NO	NO		
Kyrgyzstan	YES	YES		
Latvia	NO	NO		
Lithuania	YES	YES		
Madagascar	NO	NO		
Malaysia	YES	YES		
Mexico	NO	NO		
Monaco	NO	NO		
Montenegro	NO	NO		
Morocco	NO	NO		
	NO	NO		
Myanmar Now Zoolond				
New Zealand	YES	YES		
Nigeria	YES	YES		
Norway	NO	NO		
Oman	YES	YES		
Peru	NO	NO		
Poland	YES	YES		
Portugal	YES	NO		
Republic of Korea	YES	YES		

Responding	II. Protection of Names of States Aga	ainst Use as Trademarks
countries	7. Under the applicable legislation, names of States are excluded from use as trademarks for goods	8. Under the applicable legislation, names of States are excluded from use as trademarks for services
Republic of Moldova	YES	YES
Romania	NO	NO
Russian Federation	YES	YES
San Marino	NO	NO
Serbia	NO	NO
Singapore	NO	NO
Slovakia	NO	NO
Slovenia	YES	YES
South Africa	NO	NO
Spain	NO	NO
Sri Lanka		
Sweden	NO	NO
Switzerland	NO	NO
Syrian Arab Republic	YES	YES
Trinidad and Tobago	YES	YES
Turkey	NO	NO
Ukraine	YES	YES
United Kingdom	NO	NO
United Republic of Tanzania	YES	YES
United States of America	NO*	NO*
Uruguay	NO	NO

* Additional comments

CANADA:

Question 7 If misleading or deception

JAPAN:

Questions 7 and 8

Japan does not have a comprehensive law that provides to "generally" exclude or prohibit the "use names of States as trademarks" for goods and services, but the act of causing mislead the public as to the source of origin or quality of the products are prohibited under the Unfair Competition Prevention Law (Article 2(1)(13)).

UNITED STATES OF AMERCIA:

Question 7

However, an interested party is entitled to bring a civil action under Section 43(a) of the Trademark Act which prevents the use of signs or any false designation of origin, false or misleading description of fact, or false or misleading representation of fact, which is likely to cause confusion, or to cause mistake, or to deceive as to the affiliation, connection, or association of such person with another person, or as to the origin, sponsorship, or approval of his or her goods, services, or commercial activities by another person. In addition, unfair competition laws may be applicable.

Question 8

However, an interested party is entitled to bring a civil action under Section 43(a) of the Trademark Act which prevents the use of signs or any false designation of origin, false or misleading description of fact, or false or misleading representation of fact, which is likely to cause confusion, or to cause mistake, or to deceive as to the affiliation, connection, or association of such person with another person, or as to the origin, sponsorship, or approval of his or her goods, services, or commercial activities by another person. In addition, unfair competition laws may be applicable.

countries 9. Where the applicable legislation excludes names of States from use as trademarks for goods and/or services, such exclusion is being provided Aubania Law against unfair (passing off) Australia YES Australia YES Australia YES Australia YES Australia YES Australia YES Barbados Image: trademark is the image of th	Responding	II. Protection of Na	mes of States Against	Use as Trademarks		
Itrademarks Law against unfair competition General tort law (passing off) Other Albania						
Under trademark lawLaw against unfair competitionGeneral tort law (passing off)OtherAlbaniaYESYESYESAustriaYESYESYESAustriaNESYESYESAzerbaijanImage: Second						
Iaw competition (passing off) Albania						
Albania YES YES Austria YES YES Austria Image and the second						
Australia YES YES YES Austria	Albania					
Austria Azerbaijan Image: Constraint of the second se		YES	YES	YES		
Azerbaijan Image: strate in the						
Bangladesh Image: Second						
Barbados YES Parail YES Belarus YES Parail YES* Bulgaria YES YES YES Canada YES YES YES Chile NO YES YES China YES YES YES Hong Kong SAR YES YES YES Croatia Image: Constrain the second s						
Belarus YES YES YES Brazil NO YES YES Canada YES YES YES Chile NO YES YES China YES YES YES Hong Kong SAR YES YES YES Croatia Croatia Image: Compute State Stat						
Brazil YES YES Bulgaria YES YES Canada YES YES Chile NO YES China YES YES China YES YES China YES YES Croatia YES YES Croatia Image: Constrain of the second		YES				
BulgariaYESYESYESCanadaYESYESYESChileNOYESChilaChinaYESCroatiaCroatiaCroatiaCroatiaCroatiaCroatiaCzech RepublicNONONODenmarkNONONODominicanYESStateRepublicStateStateEstoniaNONONOFinlandStateStateFranceGeorgiaNONOGergiaNONONOGereceYESYESGreeceYESStateGuatemalaYESYESIran (IslamicYESYESIran (Islamic of)JapanStateJapanJordanStateJordanYESYESKyrgyzstanYESNONONONOMadagascarNONOMalaysiaYESYESMadagascarNONOMontenegroYESNOMontenegroYESYESMontenegroYESYESManmarNONONONONOMontenegroYESYESManmarNONOManmarNONOManmarNONOManmarNONOManmarYESYESManmarNONOMontenegroYESYESManmar <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>YES*</td></t<>					YES*	
CanadaYESYESYESChileNOYESHong Kong SARYESCroatiaImage: Constraint of the second		YES				
Chile NO YES Hong Kong SAR YES Croatia Denmark NO NO Demmark NO NO Dominican YES Republic Estonia NO France Georgia NO NO NO Georgia NO Guatemala YES YES YES Guatemala YES YES YES Guatemala YES YES YES YES YES Guatemala YES YES YES Giatamica Japan Jordan Kazakhstan YES YES YES Kenya YES Madagascar NO <td></td> <td></td> <td>YES</td> <td>YES</td> <td></td>			YES	YES		
China Hong Kong SAR YES Croatia Czech Republic Denmark NO Dominican YES Republic Sample Estonia NO France Sample Georgia NO NO NO France Sample Georgia NO NO NO Germany YES YES YES Gatemala YES Japan						
Hong Kong SAR CroatiaImage: CroatiaImage: CroatiaCzech RepublicNONONOYES*Dominican RepublicYESImage: Croatia of the second			. 20			
CroatiaCroatiaCroatiaCzech RepublicNONONODenmarkNONONODominicanYESYESRepublicNONONOFinlandNONONOFranceImage: Constraint of the second seco						
Czech RepublicNONONOYESDominican RepublicYESImage: Constraint of the second se						
DenmarkNONONOYES*DominicanYESRepublicEstoniaNONONOFinlandFranceGeorgiaNONONOGermanyYESYESGreeceYESGuatemalaYESNOHungaryIran (IslamicYESYESYESYESYESJamaicaJapanJordanKazakhstanYESYESYESYESYESKenyaLithuaniaYESYESMadagascarNONOMalaysiaYESMonacoMontenegroYESNONONONOMorenceManaraNONONoNONOMalaysiaYESNoNOMorenceManaraNONONONoNONoNOMorenceMonacoMaysiaYESNoNONoNONoNONoNOMorenceMonacoMonaraNONoNONoNONoNONew ZealandYESYESYES<						
Dominican RepublicYESNONONOEstoniaNONONONOFinlandIIFranceIIGeorgiaNONONOGermanyYESYESYESGreeceYESIIGuatemalaYESNONOHungaryIIIran (Islamic IrelandYESYESYESYESYESJamaicaIJapanIIJordanYESYESKazakhstanYESYESKyrgyzstanYESYESMadagascarNONOMalaysiaYESIMasiaYESIMonacoIIMoracoIIMoracoIIMaranNONONONONOMoracoIMaranNONONoNONONoNONOMoracoIMamarNONONew ZealandYESYESYESNew ZealandYESYESYESNew ZealandYESYESYESNoNONoNONoNONoNONoNONoNONoNONoNONoNONoNONoNO<		NO	NO	NO	YES*	
RepublicNONONOEstoniaNONONOFinlandFranceGeorgiaNONONOGermanyYESYESGreeceYES-GuatemalaYESNONOHungaryIran (Islamic ItalyYESYESRepublic of)IrelandJapanJordanKazekhstanYESYESKenyaKyrgyzstanYESYESMadagascarNONOMalaysiaYES-MonacoMonacoMonacoMyanmarNONONONONONoNONOMorecoo-MamarNONONew ZealandYESYESYESNew ZealandYESYESYESNew ZealandYESYESYESNoNONoNONoNONoNONoNONoNONoNONoNONoNONoNONoNONoNONoNONoNONoNONoNONoN						
EstoniaNONONOFinland						
FinlandImage: scalar scala		NO	NO	NO		
FranceNONONOGeorgiaNONONOGermanyYESYESYESGreeceYESNONOGuatemalaYESNONOHungaryIran (IslamicYESYESYESRepublic of)IrelandItalyJamaicaJordanKazakhstanYESYESKenyaLithuaniaYESNONONONOLatvia-LithuaniaYES-MadagascarNONOMonacoMonacoMonacoMonegroYESNONONONOMorenegroYESNONONoNOMorenegroYESNoNONoNONoNOMorenegroYESNoNONoNONoNONoNOMorenegroYESYESYESNoNONoNONoNONoNONoNONoNONoNONoNONoNONoNONoNOMorenegroYESYES <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>						
GeorgiaNONONOGermanyYESYESYESGreeceYESNONOGuatemalaYESNONOHungaryIman (Islamic)YESYESIran (Islamic)YESYESYESRepublic of)Iman (Islamic)YESYESIrelandIman (Islamica)Iman (Islamica)Iman (Islamica)JamaicaIman (Islamica)Iman (Islamica)Iman (Islamica)JapanIman (Islamica)Iman (Islamica)Iman (Islamica)JordanIman (Islamica)Iman (Islamica)Iman (Islamica)JardanIman (Islamica)Iman (Islamica)Iman (Islamica)JardanIman (Islamica)Iman (Islamica)Iman (Islamica)JapanIman (Islamica)Iman (Islamica)Iman (Islamica)LatviaIman (Islamica)Iman (Islamica)Iman (Islamica)Iman (Islamica)Iman (Islamica)Iman (Islamica)Iman (Islamica)MontenegroYESIman (
GermanyYESYESYESYESGreeceYESNONOGuatemalaYESNONOHungaryIran (Islamic Republic of)YESYESIrelandIrelandIrelandIrelandJamaicaIranIranIranJapanIranIranIranJordanIranIranIranKazakhstanYESYESYESKenyaYESYESYESKordagascarNONOIranLithuaniaYESIranIranMadagascarNONONOMalaysiaYESNONOMonacoIranIranIranMonacoIranIranIranMonacoIranIranIranMoregroYESNONONoNONOIranMoregroYESYESIranManaraNONONONew ZealandYESYESYESYESYESNew ZealandYESYESYESYESYESYESYESYESYESYESYESYESYESYESYESYESYES		NO	NO	NO		
GreeceYESNONOGuatemalaYESNONOHungaryIran (IslamicYESYESRepublic of)YESYESYESIrelandIntelandIntelandIntelandJamaicaIntelandIntelandIntelandJapanIntelandIntelandIntelandJordanIntelandIntelandIntelandKazakhstanYESYESYESKenyaYESYESYESKenyaYESYESYESKadagascarNONONOMalaysiaYESIntelandMonacoIntelandIntelandMonacoIntelandIntelandMonacoIntelandIntelandMoreccoIntelandIntelandMyanmarNONONONew ZealandYES						
GuatemalaYESNONOHungary			160	160		
HungaryYESYESYESIran (Islamic Republic of)YESYESYESIrelandItalyItalyItalyItalyJamaicaItalyItalyItalyItalyJapanItalyItalyItalyItalyJordanItalyItalyItalyItalyJordanItalyItalyItalyItalyJordanItalyItalyItalyItalyJordanItalyItalyItalyItalyKazakhstanYESYESYESKenyaItalyYESYESKyrgyzstanYESNONOItihuaniaYESItalyYES*MadagascarNONONOMalaysiaYESItalyItalyMonacoItalyItalyItalyMontenegroYESNONOMoroccoItalyItalyMyanmarNONONONew ZealandYESYESYESYESYESYESYESYES			NO	NO		
Iran (Islamic Republic of)YESYESYESIrelandItalyJamaicaJapanJordanKazakhstanYESYESKenyaYESKyrgyzstanYESNOLatviaLithuaniaYESYESMadagascarNONOMalaysiaYESMonacoMontenegroYESNONONOMoroccoMyanmarNONONew ZealandYESYESYESYESYES		160	NO	NU		
Republic of)Image: second		VEC		VES		
IrelandImage: constraint of the systemImage: constraint of the systemItalyImage: constraint of the systemImage: constraint of the systemJamaicaImage: constraint of the systemImage: constraint of the systemJapanImage: constraint of the systemImage: constraint of the systemJordanImage: constraint of the systemImage: constraint of the systemJordanImage: constraint of the systemImage: constraint of the systemJordanImage: constraint of the systemImage: constraint of the systemKazakhstanYESYESYESKenyaImage: constraint of the systemYES*KyrgyzstanYESImage: constraint of the systemKyrgyzstanYESImage: constraint of the systemKyrgyzstanYESNONOItativiaImage: constraint of the systemYES*MadagascarNONONOMalaysiaYESImage: constraint of the systemMonacoImage: constraint of the systemImage: constraint of the systemMontenegroYESNONOMoroccoImage: constraint of the systemImage: constraint of the systemMyanmarNONONONew ZealandYESYESYESYESYESYESYES		TES	TES	TES		
ItalyImage: scalar						
JamaicaImage: scalar scala						
JapanImage: scalar						
JordanImage: scalar						
KazakhstanYESYESYESKenyaYESYESKyrgyzstanYESNONOLatvia </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>						
KenyaYESYESKyrgyzstanYESNONOLatviaImage: Second se		N/50	\/F0			
KyrgyzstanYESNONOLatviaLithuaniaYES-YES*MadagascarNONONOMalaysiaYESMexicoMonacoMontenegroYESNONOMoroccoMyanmarNONONONew ZealandYESYESYES		YES	YES			
LatviaYESYES*LithuaniaYESNONOMadagascarNONONOMalaysiaYESImage: Constraint of the second		1/50				
LithuaniaYESYES*MadagascarNONONOMalaysiaYESImage: Constraint of the second s		YES	NU	NU		
MadagascarNONONOMalaysiaYESMexicoMonacoMontenegroYESNONOMoroccoMyanmarNONONONew ZealandYESYESYES						
MalaysiaYESImage: Constraint of the second se					YES*	
MexicoImage: Constraint of the second se			NO	NO		
MonacoYESNONOMontenegroYESNONOMoroccoMyanmarNONONONew ZealandYESYESYES		YES				
MontenegroYESNONOMoroccoMyanmarNONONew ZealandYESYESYES						
MoroccoNONOMyanmarNONONew ZealandYESYES						
MoroccoNONOMyanmarNONONew ZealandYESYES	Montenegro	YES	NO	NO		
MyanmarNONONONew ZealandYESYESYES						
New Zealand YES YES YES		NO	NO	NO		
	Nigeria	YES	1			
Norway			1			
Oman YES NO YES		YES	NO	YES		
Peru 120 120 120		-	-	-		
Poland NO YES NO		NO	YES	NO		
Portugal NO NO YES						

Responding	II. Protection of Names of States Against Use as Trademarks						
countries	9. Where the applicable legislation excludes names of States from use as						
		trademarks for goods and/or services, such exclusion is being provided					
	Under trademark	Law against unfair	General tort law	Other			
	law	competition	(passing off)				
Republic of Korea	YES	NO	NO				
Republic of	NO	YES	YES	YES*			
Moldova							
Romania	NO	NO	NO				
Russian		YES		YES*			
Federation							
San Marino							
Serbia							
Singapore							
Slovakia							
Slovenia	NO	YES	NO				
South Africa	NO	YES	YES				
Spain	NO	NO	NO				
Sri Lanka		YES	YES				
Sweden							
Switzerland							
Syrian Arab	NO						
Republic							
Trinidad and	YES	YES	YES				
Tobago							
Turkey		YES					
Ukraine	YES	NO	NO				
United Kingdom							
United Republic	YES						
of Tanzania							
United States of	YES	YES	YES				
America							
Uruguay	NO	NO	NO				

Question 9. Where the applicable legislation excludes names of States from use as trademarks for goods and/or services, such exclusion is being provided by (please specify):

BRAZIL:

Law 9279 of May 14, 1996 (Chapter V) Infringement of Geographical Indication and Other Indications. Art. 194: Using a mark, commercial name, title of establishment, insignia, advertising expression or sign or any other form that indicates a source other than the true one, or selling or exhibiting for sale a product carrying such signs. Penalty – detention of 1 (one) to 3 (three) months, or a fine. Consumer Protection Law, September 11, 1990.

DENMARK:

The Danish Marketing Practices Act, Section 3, prohibits use of misleading or undue indications, just as it establishes an obligation for traders to be able to substantiate by documentation any factual statements made in their marketing or on their goods. Thus, false or misleading indications of the origin of the goods or services that are marketed by a trader or service provider are prohibited.

LITHUANIA:

- The Law on Possession, Use and Disposal of State and Municipal Assets of the Republic of Lithuania of 12 May 1998 No. VIII-729;

- The Law on Lithuanian National Emblem, Other Coats of Arms and Other Armorial Marks of the Republic of Lithuania of 10 April 1990 No. 1-130 (as last amended on 1 April 2008 No. X-1471);

- The Order of the Government of the Republic of Lithuania of 12 February 2001 No. 155 on Authority Concerned with Authorization to Use Official or Traditional (Abbreviated) State Name of the Republic of Lithuania, of Armorial Bearings, Flag or Other State Heraldic Objects or any Imitation from a Heraldic Point of View, also Official Signs and Hallmarks Indicating Control and Warranty, Stamps, Medals or Marks of Distinction in Trademarks and Designs;

- Regulation on Permission to Use Official or Traditional (Abbreviated) State Name of the Republic of Lithuania, of Armorial Bearings, Flag or Other State Heraldic Objects or any Imitation from a Heraldic Point of View, also Official Signs and Hallmarks Indicating Control and Warranty, Stamps, Medals or Marks of Distinction in Trademarks and Designs, approved by the Order of the Minister of Justice of the Republic of Lithuania on 10 April 2001 No. 65 (as last amended on 25 November 2008 No.1 R-449).

REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA:

Decree of the Government of the Republic of Moldova No. 1425 of 02.12.2003 on conditions of granting a permission of utilization of the official or historical denominations of the State in the marks on products and/or services, as well as in the industrial design.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION:

Law on protection of consumers' rights.

Responding	II. Protection of Na	ames of States Against Use as	Trademarks
countries	10. If under the	11. In determining whether	12. Use of names of States as
	applicable	there is a conflict between a	trademark on goods and/or
	legislation,	trademark that is being used	services is considered to constitute
	names of States	for goods and/or services	a potential case for the application
	are generally	and a name of a State,	of Article 10 of the Paris
	excluded from	consideration must be given	Convention for the Protection of
	use as	to a potential deception of	Industrial Property, which
	trademark, are	consumers as to the origin of	prescribes <i>inter alia</i> certain
	there any	the goods or services on	measures applicable in cases of
	exceptions to	which the trademark is	the "direct or indirect use of a false
	such exclusion?	proposed to be used.	indication of the source of goods".
Albania			YES
Australia	NO	YES	YES
Austria		YES	YES
Azerbaijan	NO	NO	YES
Bangladesh	NO	YES	YES*
Barbados		YES	YES
Belarus	NO	YES	YES
Brazil	NO	YES	YES
Bulgaria	NO	YES	YES
Canada	YES	YES	NO*
Chile	YES	YES	YES
China	YES	NO	NO
Hong Kong SAR	120	YES	YES
Croatia		YES	NO
Czech Republic		YES	YES
Denmark		YES	YES
Dominican	YES	YES	YES
Republic	0	0	0
Estonia	NO	NO	NO
Finland		YES	YES
France		YES	YES
Georgia	NO	NO	NO
Germany	NO	YES	YES
Greece	NO	YES	YES
Guatemala	YES*	YES	YES
Hungary		YES	YES
Iran (Islamic	YES	YES	YES
Republic of)	•	•	
Ireland	NO	YES	YES
Italy	NO	NO	YES
Jamaica	NO	YES	YES
Japan		YES*	YES*
Jordan		YES	YES
Kazakhstan	NO	YES	YES
Kenya	NO	YES	YES
Kyrgyzstan		NO	YES
Latvia		YES	YES
Lithuania	YES	YES	YES
Madagascar	NO	NO	NO
Malaysia	NO	YES	YES
Mexico		YES	YES
Monaco		YES	NO
Montenegro	NO	YES	YES
Morocco		YES	YES
Myanmar	NO	NO	NO
New Zealand	NO	YES	YES
		120	120

countries 10. If under the applicable 11. In determining whether there is a conflict between a trademark that is being uses 12. Use of names of States as trademark that is being uses are generally excluded from use as trademark that is being uses apotential cases for the application of Article 10 of the Paris names of States are generally excluded from use as and a name of a State, consideration must be given to a potential deception of consumers as to the origin of treademark, are proposed to be used. of Article 10 of the Paris Convention for the Protection of industrial Property, which the goods or services on which the trademark is proposed to be used. Norway YES YES Oman YES YES Peru	Responding	II. Protection of Na	ames of States Against Use as	Trademarks
NigeriaNOYESNONorwayYESYESYESOmanYESYESYESOmanYESYESYESPeruPollandNOYESYESPollandNOYESYESYESPortugalYESYESYESYESPotugalYESYESYESYESPotugalYESYESYESYESRepublic of KoreaNONOYESRomaniaNOYESYESMoldovaYESYESYESSenbiaNOYESYESSerbiaYESYESYESSlovakiaYESYESYESSlovakiaYESYESYESSpainYESYESYESSpainYESYESYESSyrian ArabNOYESYESSyrian ArabNOYESYESSyrian ArabNOYESYESUhited KingdomNOYESYESUnited KingdomNOYESYESUnited KingdomNOYESYESUnited States ofYESYESYESUnited States ofYESYESYESAmericaYESYESYES	countries	applicable legislation, names of States are generally excluded from use as trademark, are there any exceptions to	there is a conflict between a trademark that is being used for goods and/or services and a name of a State, consideration must be given to a potential deception of consumers as to the origin of the goods or services on which the trademark is	trademark on goods and/or services is considered to constitute a potential case for the application of Article 10 of the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property, which prescribes <i>inter alia</i> certain measures applicable in cases of the "direct or indirect use of a false
NorwayYESYESYESOmanYESYESYESPeru	Nigeria	NO	YES	NO
OmanYESYESYESPeru			YES	
PeruNOYESYESPolandNOYESYESPortugalYESYESYESPortugalYESYESYESRepublic of KoreaNONOYESRepublic ofYESYESYESMoldovaNOYESYESRussianNOYESYESFederationYESYESSan MarinoYESYESSingaporeYESYESSlovakiaYESYESSlovakiaYESYESSlovakiaYESYESSouth AfricaNOYESSpainYESYESSwedenYESYESSwitzerlandNOYESSyrian ArabNOYESSyrian ArabNOYESTurkeyYESYESUkraineYESYESUkraineYESYESUnited KingdomNOYESUnited States ofYESYESYESYESYESYESYESYESUnited States ofYESYESMericaYESYESYESYESYES		YES	YES	
PolandNOYESYESPortugalYESYESYESPortugalYESYESYESRepublic of KoreaNONOYESRepublic ofYESYESYESRomaniaNOYESYESRomaniaNOYESYESFederationYESYESYESSan MarinoYESYESYESSerbiaYESYESYESSlovakiaYESYESYESSlovakiaYESYESYESSouth AfricaNOYESYESSpainYESYESYESSwitzerlandNOYESYESSwitzerlandNOYESYESSubagoYESYESYESSuitarlandNOYESYESUhried KingdomNOYESYESUnited KingdomNOYESYESUnited KingdomNOYESYESUnited Kates of AmericaYESYESYESYESYESYESYESYES				
PortugalYESYESYESRepublic of KoreaNONOYESRepublic ofYESYESYESMoldovaYESYESYESMoldovaNOYESYESRomaniaNOYESYESRussianNOYESYESSan MarinoYESYESYESSerbiaYESYESYESSingaporeYESYESSlovakiaYESYESSlovakiaYESYESSouth AfricaNOYESSpainYESYESSwitzerlandNOYESSwitzerlandNOYESSyrian ArabNOYESYESYESYESSuth AfriceYESYESSuitarlandNOYESSuitarlandNOYESUhited KingdomNOYESUhited KingdomNOYESYESYESYESUnited KingdomNOYESYESYESYESUnited Kates of AmericaYESYESYESYESYESAmericaYESYES		NO	YES	YES
Republic of KoreaNOYESRepublic of MoldovaYESYESRomaniaNORomaniaNORussianNOYESYESFederationYESSan MarinoYESSerbiaYESSingaporeYESSlovakiaYESSlovakiaYESSouth AfricaNOYESYESSpainYESSyrian ArabNOSwedenYESSyrian ArabNOYESYESYESYESUhred KingdomNOYESYESUhried KingdomNOYESYESYESYESYESYESSyrian ArabNOYESYESYESYESUhred KingdomNOYESUhried KingdomNOYES <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>				
Republic of MoldovaYESYESYESRomaniaNONORussianNOYESFederationYESYESSan MarinoYESYESSerbiaYESYESSingaporeYESYESSlovakiaYESYESSlovakiaYESYESSouth AfricaNOYESSyainYESYESSouth AfricaNOYESSyainYESYESSyainYESYESSyrian ArabNOYESRepublicYESYESTrinidad and TurkeyYESYESUkraineYESYESUhited KingdomNOYESYESYESYESUnited KingdomNOYESYESYESYESUnited States of AmericaYES<				
MoldovaNORomaniaNORussianNORussianNOFederationYESSan MarinoYESSerbiaYESSingaporeYESSlovakiaYESSloveniaYESSouth AfricaNOYESYESSpainYESSwedenYESSwitzerlandNOSwedenYESSyrian ArabNOSyrian ArabYESYESYESYininda andYESYESYESSouth dricaNOSwedenYESSwitzerlandNOSyrian ArabNOYESYESYESYESSuitandardanYESYESYESSologo				
RomaniaNOYESRussian FederationNOYESYESSan MarinoYESYESYESSerbiaYESYESYESSingaporeYESYESSebiaSlovakiaYESYESYESSlovakiaYESYESYESSouth AfricaNOYESYESSouth AfricaNOYESYESSpainYESYESYESSwitzerlandNOYESYESSwitzerlandNOYESYESSyrian Arab TobagoNOYESYESTurkeyYESYESYESUkraineYESYESNOUnited KingdomNOYESYESUnited States of AmericaYESYESYESYESYESYESYESYESYESYESYES		120	120	120
Russian FederationNOYESYESSan MarinoYESYESSan MarinoYESYESSerbiaYESYESSingaporeYESYESSlovakiaYESYESSlovakiaYESYESSlovakiaYESYESSlovaniaYESYESSouth AfricaNOYESSpainYESYESSri LankaNOYESSwedenYESYESSwitzerlandNOYESSyrian ArabNOYESTrinidad and TobagoYESYESUkraineYESYESUhited KingdomNOYESVited RepublicYESYESUnited KingdomNOYESYESYESYESUnited States of AmericaYESYESYESYESYES			NO	
FederationYESYESSan MarinoYESYESSarbiaYESYESSingaporeYESYESSlovakiaYESYESSlovakiaYESYESSlovakiaYESYESSlovakiaYESYESSouth AfricaNOYESSpainYESYESSri LankaNOYESSwedenYESYESSwitzerlandNOYESSyrian Arab RepublicNOYESTrinidad and TurkeyYESYESVersionYESYESUhraineYESYESUnited KingdomNOYESUnited RepublicYESYESUnited States of AmericaYESYESYESYESYESYESYESYESYESYESYESSouth AfricaNOYESYESYESSouth AfricaNOYES		NO		YES
San MarinoYESYESSerbiaYESYESSingaporeYESYESSlovakiaYESYESSlovakiaYESYESSloveniaYESYESSouth AfricaNOYESSpainYESYESSpainYESYESSwedenYESYESSwitzerlandNOYESSyrian ArabNOYESTrinidad and TurkeyYESYESVesYESYESUkraineYESYESUnited KingdomNOYESViesYESYESUnited States of AmericaYESSet States of AmericaYESYESYESYESStates of AmericaYESStates of States </td <td></td> <td></td> <td>120</td> <td>120</td>			120	120
SerbiaYESYESSingaporeYESSlovakiaYESSlovakiaYESSloveniaYESSouth AfricaNONOYESSpainYESSpainYESSwedenYESSwedenYESSwitzerlandNOSwitzerlandNOYESYESSyrian ArabNORepublicYESTrinidad and TurkeyYESVESYESUkraineYESYESYESUhited KingdomNOYESYESUnited Republic of TanzaniaYES			YES	YES
SingaporeYESSlovakiaYESSlovakiaYESSloveniaYESSloveniaYESSouth AfricaNOYESYESSpainYESSpainYESSpainYESSwedenYESSwedenYESSwitzerlandNOSwitzerlandNOSyrian ArabNORepublicYESTrinidad and TurkeyYESVESYESUkraineYESYESYESUkraineYESYESYESUnited KingdomNOYESYESViried RepublicYESYESYESUnited States of AmericaYESYESYESYESYESYESYES				
SlovakiaYESYESSloveniaYESYESSouth AfricaNOYESSpainYESYESSri LankaNOYESSwedenYESYESSwitzerlandNOYESSyrian ArabNOYESRepublicYESYESTrinidad andYESYESTurkeyYESYESUkraineYESYESUnited KingdomNOYESUnited RepublicYESYESUnited States of AmericaYES				-
SloveniaYESYESSouth AfricaNOYESYESSpainYESYESYESSri LankaNONOSwedenYESYESSwitzerlandNOYESSyrian ArabNOYESRepublicYESYESTrinidad and TobagoYESYESUkraineYESYESUkraineYESYESUnited KingdomNOYESUnited RepublicYESYESUnited RepublicYESYESUnited States of AmericaYESYESYESYESYESYESYESYES				YES
South AfricaNOYESYESSpainYESYESSri LankaNOSwedenYESSwitzerlandNOSyrian ArabNOYESYESRepublicYESTrinidad and TobagoYESYESYESVerseyYESVerseyYESUkraineYESYESYESUnited KingdomNOYESYESUnited RepublicYESYESYESYESYESYESYESYESYESYESYESYesYESYesYESYesYESYesYESYesYesYesYesYesYesYesYesYesYesYesYesYesYesYesYesYesYes				
SpainYESYESSri LankaNOSwedenYESSwitzerlandNOSyrian Arab RepublicNOYESYESTrinidad and TobagoYESYESYESVerseYesVerseYes		NO		
Sri LankaNOSwedenYESSwitzerlandNOSyrian ArabNORepublicYESTrinidad and TobagoYESYESYESYESYESUkraineYESYESYESUnited KingdomNOYESYESYESYESUnited RepublicYES				
SwedenYESYESSwitzerlandNOYESSyrian ArabNOYESRepublicYESYESTrinidad and TobagoYESYESTurkeyYESYESUkraineYESYESUkraineYESYESUnited KingdomNOYESUnited RepublicYESYESUnited States of AmericaYESYESYESYESYES				
SwitzerlandNOYESSyrian ArabNOYESYESRepublicYESYESYESTrinidad and TobagoYESYESYESTurkeyYESYESYESUkraineYESYESNOUnited KingdomNOYESYESUnited Republic of TanzaniaYESYESYESUnited States of AmericaYESYESYES			YES	
Syrian Arab RepublicNOYESYESTrinidad and TobagoYESYESYESTobagoYESYESYESTurkeyYESYESYESUkraineYESYESNOUnited KingdomNOYESYESUnited Republic of TanzaniaYESYESYESUnited States of AmericaYESYESYES				
RepublicYESYESTrinidad and TobagoYESYESTurkeyYESYESUkraineYESYESUkraineYESYESUnited KingdomNOYESUnited Republic of TanzaniaYESYESUnited States of AmericaYESYES		NO		
Trinidad and TobagoYESYESYESTurkeyYESYESYESUkraineYESYESNOUnited KingdomNOYESYESUnited Republic of TanzaniaYESYESYESUnited States of AmericaYESYESYES				
TobagoYESYESTurkeyYESYESUkraineYESYESUnited KingdomNOYESUnited RepublicYESYESOf TanzaniaYESYESUnited States of AmericaYESYES		YES	YES	YES
TurkeyYESYESUkraineYESYESNOUnited KingdomNOYESYESUnited RepublicYESYESYESof TanzaniaYESYESYESUnited States of AmericaYESYES			-	-
UkraineYESYESNOUnited KingdomNOYESYESUnited RepublicYESYESYESof TanzaniaYESYESYESUnited States of AmericaYESYES			YES	YES
United KingdomNOYESYESUnited Republic of TanzaniaYESYESYESUnited States of AmericaYESYESYES		YES		
United Republic of TanzaniaYESYESYESUnited States of AmericaYESYES				
of Tanzania YES United States of America YES				
United States of America YES YES				
America			YES	YES
	Uruguay	NO	NO	NO

Question 10. If under the applicable legislation, names of States are generally excluded from use as trademark, are there any exceptions to such exclusion? If yes, specify:

CANADA:

If misleading or deception

CHILE:

The name of a State would not be registrable as a trademark because the test of misleading or confusing sign would not be applicable. The situation would be different if the name of the State is accompanied by other words, in which case protection would be granted to the mark as a whole.

CHINA:

If an authorization by the competent authority is provided.

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC:

In case of submission of the authorization from a competent authority in the State concerned.

IRAN (ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF):

In the case of authorization from the competent authorities.

LITHUANIA:

Article 5 of the Law on Lithuanian National Emblem, Other Coats of Arms and Other Armorial Marks provides for the list of entities entitled to use the Lithuanian national emblem and cases where the national emblem is used. If a trademark which consists of the name of the State is not registered, the use of such sign must comply with the Law on Possession, Use and Disposal of State and Municipal Asset, which states that the right to use the name of the State and the right to use armorial objects of the Republic of Lithuania is provided by the laws or prescribed by the order of the Government, if legislation does not establish the order for the use of such rights (Article 12). There are special Government orders, which enable the use of the name of a State in certain occasions, for instance, the Order of the Government of the Republic of Lithuania in Internet Domain Names, The Order of the Government of the Republic of Lithuania of 15 April 2009 No. 326 on the Right to Use the Name of State (the authorization was granted for internet domain lietuva1000.lt).

PORTUGAL:

Court decisions.

REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA:

In case the trademark is used for a justified purpose and is not considered misleading or false as to the origin of the goods/services in respect of which registration is sought.

UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA:

With an authorization from the competent authority.

* Additional comments

BANGLADESH:

Question 12

Use of false origin of the goods is included under the use of false trademark and trade description; this is punishable under section 73 of the Trademark Act 2009. If any citizen of Bangladesh is found guilty of instigating such offence outside Bangladesh, he will be punishable under the same section. Section 15 of the customs Act 1969 prohibits the importation of goods containing untrue indication of origin of goods. Under section 17 of the same Act, the Customs Authority is competent to confiscate the goods. Any interested person is authorized to lodge a complaint under the aforesaid sections.

CANADA:

Article 10 is not self-executing in Canada

GUATEMALA:

Question 10 According to Article 16(2) and 20(D) of the national Industrial Property Law. JAPAN:

Questions 11 and 12

Based on paragraph 1 of Article 10 of the Paris Convention and Article 1 of the Madrid Agreement (Source of Origin), the act of misleading the public as to the source of origin or quality of the products or the quality of the service are prohibited under the Unfair Competition Prevention Law (Article 2(1)(13)), although Japan does not have a comprehensive law that prohibits or excludes the "use of the names of States as trademarks" for goods and services.

[Annex II follows]

Quantitative Summary of Replies to the Questionnaire Concerning the Protection of Names of States Against Registration and Use as Trademarks (document SCT/24/6)

Questions		Replies	YES	%	NO	%		
I. Protection of Names of States Against Registration as Trademarks								
	(a) Generally excluded from registration as trademark for goods	72	44	61.1%	28	38.9%		
	(b) Excluded from registration as trademark for goods if they could be considered descriptive of the origin of the goods in respect of which registration is sought	68	65	95.9%	3	4.1%		
	(c) Excluded from registration as trademark for goods if the use of the name of a State could be considered to be misleading as to the origin of the goods in respect of which registration is sought	67	66	98.5%	1	1.5%		
 Under the applicable legislation, names of States are: 	(d) Excluded from registration as trademark for goods if they otherwise lack any distinctive character	68	64	94.1%	4	5.9%		
	(e) Excluded from registration as trademark for goods if they can be considered incorrect as to the origin of the products for which registration is sought	66	51	77.3%	15	22.7%		
	(f) Excluded from registration as trademark for goods for other reasons	67	25	37.3%	42	62.7%		
	(g) Registrable as trademark for goods provided an authorization by the competent authority is granted	69	33	47.8%	36	52.2%		

Questions		Replies	YES	%	NO	%
	(a) Generally excluded from registration as trademark for services	72	46	63.9%	26	36.1%
	(b) Excluded from registration as trademark for services if they could be considered descriptive of the origin of the services in respect of which registration is sought	67	64	95.5%	3	4.5%
2. Under the applicable legislation,	(c) Excluded from registration as trademark for services if the use of the name of a State could be considered to be misleading as to the origin of the services in respect of which registration is sought	67	66	98.5%	1	1.5%
names of States are:	(d) Excluded from registration as trademark for services if they otherwise lack any distinctive character	67	63	94.1%	4	5.9%
	(e) Excluded from registration as trademark for services if they can be considered incorrect as to the origin of the services for which registration is sought	64	49	76.6%	15	23.4%
	(f) Excluded from registration as trademark for services for other reasons	68	24	31.8%	44	68.2%
	(g) Registrable as trademark for services provided an authorization by the competent authority is granted	69	32	46.4%	37	53.6%
 If the name of a State is excluded from registration as trademark in respect of goods, this ground 	(a) Is raised <i>ex officio</i> by the Office as part of the examination of an application	72	71	98.6%	1	1.4%
	independently from other grounds	71	67	94.4%	0	0%
	only together with other grounds	71	3	4.2%	0	0%

Questions		Replies	YES	%	NO	%
	(b) Can be raised by third parties in opposition procedures	67	45	67.2%	22	32.8%
	independently from other grounds	45	45	100%	0	0%
	only together with other grounds	45	1	2.2%	0	0%
	(c) Can be raised by third parties as an observation	66	35	53.1%	31	46.9%
	independently from other grounds	35	36	102.8% [*]	0	0%
	only together with other grounds	35	2	5.7%	0	0%
	(d) Can be raised by third parties in post registration invalidation procedures	65	61	93.8%	4	6.2%
	independently from other grounds	61	61	100%	0	0%
	only together with other grounds	61	3	4.9%	0	0%
 If the name of a State is excluded from registration as trademark in respect of services, this ground 	(a) Is raised <i>ex officio</i> by the Office as part of the examination of an application	72	70	97%	2	3%
	independently from other grounds	70	63	90%	0	0%
	only together with other grounds	70	4	5.7%	0	0%
	(b) Can be raised by third parties in opposition procedures	65	44	67.7%	21	32.3%
	independently from other grounds	44	45	102.3% [*]	0	0%
	only together with other grounds	44	1	2.3%	0	0%

Questions		Replies	YES	%	NO	%
	(c) Can be raised by third parties as an observation	65	36	55.4%	29	44.1%
	independently from other grounds	36	36	100%	0	0%
	only together with other grounds	36	3	8.3%	0	0%
	(d) Can be raised by third parties in post registration invalidation procedures	68	63	92.6%	5	7.4%
	independently from other grounds	63	61	96.8%	0	0%
	only together with other grounds	63	4	6.3%	0	0%
ground for refusing the registration consideration must be given to the	n of a name of a State in a trademark would be a of that trademark for goods and/or services, potential deception of consumers as to the origin of the nection with which the trademark is proposed to be	that trademark for goods and/or services, tential deception of consumers as to the origin of the725880.5%14		14	19.5%	
	names of States are generally excluded from registration rices, are there any exceptions to such exclusion?	54	28	51.8%	26	48.2%
II. Protection of Names of States Again	nst Use as Trademarks	<u> </u>		1		
 Under the applicable legislation, na goods 	mes of States are excluded from use as trademarks for	69	29	42%	40	58%
8. Under the applicable legislation, na services	mes of States are excluded from use as trademarks for	69	28	40.6%	41	59.4%

Questions	Questions		YES	%	NO	%
 Where the applicable legislation excludes names of States from use as trademarks for goods and/or services, such exclusion is being provided 	Under trademark law	38	23	60.5%	15	39.5%
	Law against unfair competition	31	16	51.6%	15	48.4%
	General tort law (passing off)	29	14	48.3%	15	51.7%
Other		5	5	100%	0	0%
10. If under the applicable legislation, na trademark, there are any exceptions	ames of States are generally excluded from use as to such exclusion	41	13	31.7%	28	68.3%
goods and/or services and a name o	nflict between a trademark that is being used for f a State, consideration must be given to a potential gin of the goods or services on which the trademark is	69	57	82.6% 12		17.4%
a potential case for the application of	rk on goods and/or services is considered to constitute f Article 10 of the Paris Convention for the Protection es <i>inter alia</i> certain measures applicable in cases of indication of the source of goods".	69	57	82.6%	12	17.4%

[End of Annex II and of document]

^{*} The percentages corresponding to the sub-questions under questions 3(c) and 4(b) have been calculated on the basis of the replies provided to the main question. In cases where countries replied to the sub-questions and did not reply to the main question, the percentages exceed 100%.